

CEU Revision Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: April 20, 2017

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Ken Todd, Committee Chair, opened the meeting by discussing the agenda for the day.

Rebecca Sammons conducted a roll call. Those committee members in attendance were:

Ken Todd, FBPE

Babu Varghese, FBPE

Bill Bracken, FBPE

Public advisors in attendance were:

Bill Dunn, Suncam

Rick Barber, Licensed Engineer

Jaime Gold, Licensed Engineer

Al Garza, Licensed Engineer

Gerry Ward, Licensed Engineer

Art Nordlinger, IEEE

Dr. Fred Bloestcher, FAU

Staff in attendance:

Larry Harris, FBPE Counsel

Zana Raybon, FBPE Exec. Director

Rebecca Sammons, FBPE Assist. Exec. Director

No new items of specific concerns with the current rule were brought up at the meeting. The following list are those concerns that have been raised to date that were deemed worthy of further discussion.

1. What types of "Board" participation can an engineer expect to be given CEU credit? As an example, various technical Civic Boards.
2. What type of educational courses can be given CEU credit? i.e., engineering business courses
3. Should the course be required to designate whether it is an advanced course or basic material? Apparently, too many courses are not teaching to the expectation of attendees.
4. Courses offered should be less broad in coverage and cover fewer subjects in more detail.
5. Should we develop a methodology for checking compliance of the rule by providers?
6. Should feedback be obtained from students to ascertain quality of courses? If the courses receive a consistently poor review, then should FBPE not renew the approval of the provider?
7. Should the current list of unacceptable topics for coursework be expanded?
8. Can we allow out of state providers other than a Florida provider be acceptable for providing course work that Fla. P.E. get credit for?
9. Should we use an ANSI standard for evaluating the credentials of providers?
10. How is the area of practice requirement going to be administered, specifically for engineers who don't have a specific area of practice?
11. What has the Board done in auditing providers or courses? Has there been communication with a provider concerning concerns about what the provider is offering?
12. How do we hold providers accountable for meeting the requirements of courses offered?

13. Is a roughly 19% rate of P.E.s audited that did not have proper documentation of having met the CEU requirements acceptable? What can be done to improve that?
Note: Rebecca Sammons reported that FBPE audited about 1000 P.E.s (3% of all currently licensed P.E.s) during the last renewal period and of those audited 188 could not produce documentation of having met the CEU requirements.
14. Can there be a carryover of excess CEUs (with a maximum number of CEUs allowed) from one renewal cycle to the next?
15. Can CEU credit be given for voluntary participation in STEM, K-12 engineering functions, or Mathcounts?
16. Can FBPE accept CEU credits that have been approved from other states?

Discussion was had on the above list for possible ideas to address the concern. The discussion started with Larry Harris, FBPE Attorney concerning those items that had potential legal problems, if we took action since the material presented by Mr. Harris may impact some of the other issues to be discussed.

Items # 8, 14, 15, & 16 – Larry Harris and Bill Bracken

#8 - Can we allow out of state providers other than a Florida provider be acceptable for providing course work that Fla. P.E. get credit for?

Mr. Harris indicated that in order to give credit for courses in other states the provider for a course in another state must be a Florida approved provider. Ms. Raybon indicated that the board staff already apply the existing rule this way, and Mr. Harris agreed that application of the language is acceptable. Therefore, the group agreed that no revision to the CEU rule for this item is necessary.

#14 - Can there be a carryover of excess CEUs (with a maximum number of CEUs allowed) from one renewal cycle to the next?

Mr. Harris indicated that his discussion with other Florida Boards and his peers at the Attorney General's office indicated this had never been done before and would be difficult to pass since the current statute does not allow carryover. Given that, the group decided there was little to gain to go down this path and therefore would drop this off the issues list. However, it was suggested that FES lobby the legislature to revise the statute to allow carryover of CEU credits from one renewal cycle to the next. Mr. Todd said he would bring this up at the next Board meeting and ask Charlie Geer to check if FES would be willing to do so.

#15 - Can CEU credit be given for voluntary participation in STEM, K-12 engineering functions, or Mathcounts?

Mr. Harris indicated that this could be done provided the rule language is consistent with the statute language and the NCEES CPC guidelines. The three items listed in this item #15

must provide some benefit to the licensee through the enhancement of his or her professionalism. Many of the group agreed they do fulfill this requirement. The rule revision would also have to limit the number of hours to three (3) credits per renewal cycle. Mr. Harris will work on language to bring back to the committee.

#16 - Can FBPE accept CEU credits that have been approved from other states?

Mr. Harris indicated this is very similar to item #8. The answer to this suggestion is the same as the answer to item #8. The FBPE staff have already applied the existing rule language so that as long as the provider of a course in another state is a Florida approved provider then that course can be counted toward the CEU requirement within Florida. The only exception would be the one hour of ethics and one hour of rules that are specific to Florida. Ethics and rules from other states are not eligible for credit in Florida.

The following items will be discussed at the next conference call on May 17th.

1. Item # 1- Rick Barber- What types of “Board” participation can an engineer expect to be given CEU credit? As an example, various technical Civic Boards.
2. Items # 2, 7, & 10 – Fred Bloestcher
 - #2 - What type of educational courses can be given CEU credit? i.e., engineering business courses.
 - #7 - Should the current list of unacceptable topics for coursework be expanded?
 - #10 - How is the area of practice requirement going to be administered, specifically for engineers who don’t have a specific area of practice?
3. Items # 3, 4, & 6 – Bill Dunn
 - # 3- Should the course be required to designate whether it is an advanced course or basic material? Apparently, too many courses are not teaching to the expectation of attendees.
 - #4 - Courses offered should be less broad in coverage and cover fewer subjects in more detail.
 - #6 - Should feedback be obtained from students to ascertain quality of courses? If the courses receive a consistently poor review, then should FBPE not renew the approval of the provider?
4. Items #5 & 9 – Jaime Gold
 - #5 - Should we develop a methodology for checking compliance of the rule by providers?
 - #9 - Should we use an ANSI standard for evaluating the credentials of providers?
5. Items #11, 12, &13 – Ken Todd
 - #11 - What has the Board done in auditing providers or courses? Has there been communication with a provider concerning concerns about what the provider is offering?
 - #12 - How do we hold providers accountable for meeting the requirements of courses offered?

#13 - Is a roughly 19% rate of P.E.s audited that did not have proper documentation of having met the CEU requirements acceptable? What can be done to improve that?
Note: Rebecca Sammons reported that FBPE audited about 1000 P.E.s (3% of all currently licensed P.E.s) during the last renewal period and of those audited 188 could not produce documentation of having met the CEU requirements.

Although item #13 was dropped off the list, Art Nordlinger asked that this item be brought up before the FBPE at the April meeting to provide direction as to how the FBPE should proceed in implementing the current rule language.

The Chair reminded the group that should any of them have any new concerns they should be sent to Rebecca Sammons, as the Committee Point Person, to be sent to all the participants.

The group agreed to hold the next conference call on Wednesday, May 17, 2017 at 12:00 p.m.
The conference call was adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m.

DRAFT