CEU Revision Committee Meeting
Minutes

Date: May 17, 2017   Time: 12:00 p.m.

Ken Todd, Committee Chair, opened the meeting by discussing the agenda for the day. He indicated he was going to reorder the Agenda as he had a meeting with FEMA at 1:30 p.m. that necessitated the conference call ending at 1:00 p.m.

To be sure we had time to select the next conference call date before we ran out of time the next meeting date was discussed. Several dates were discussed and it was agreed that the next conference call would be held Wednesday, May 31, 2017, beginning at 11:00 a.m.

Rebecca Sammons conducted a roll call.   **Those committee members in in attendance were:**
Ken Todd, FBPE   Babu Varghese, FBPE

Public advisors in attendance were:
Bill Dunn, Suncam
Pat Ferland, FES   Gerry Ward, Licensed Engineer
Jaime Gold, Licensed Engineer   Art Nordlinger, IEEE
Al Garza, Licensed Engineer   Dr. Fred Bloestcher, FAU

Staff in attendance:
Larry Harris, FBPE Counsel   Rebecca Sammons, FBPE Assist. Exec. Director

The following items were 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.

   Rick was out of town and will make his report at the next conference call.

2. Items # 2, 7, & 10 – Fred Bloestcher
   #2 - What type of educational courses can be given CEU credit? i.e., engineering business courses.

   Fred gave a report on what other states did in regard to this subject. Only two states allow business type course. After the group discussed the pros and cons, it was decided that only technical subjects should be given CE credits.

   #7 - Should the current list of unacceptable topics for coursework be expanded?

After a lot of discussion on this subject the group agreed that a better definition of trade courses versus engineering courses should be developed. Fred will work with Mr. Harris to develop language that can be presented to the FBPE that distinguishes between the two types of courses and bring it back to the group for discussion.

#10 - How is the area of practice requirement going to be administered, specifically for engineers who don't have a specific area of practice?

The area of practice is defined already in 61G15.22.002 under definitions. Fred will work with Mr. Harris to develop revised language that is clear to all licensees what their area of practice is and how it defines the type of courses each licensee should be taking.

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.

   There was a belief among the group that language should be developed to better define the difference between an advanced course and a basic course and the depth that a particular course should have in covering a subject. Mr. Dunn will work with Mr. Harris to develop revised language that addresses these subjects.

   #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?

   Mr. Dunn report there is a software program (VERSA) that would allow a vendor to report all education courses taken by a licensee and could also serve as a means of license renewal. This program also allows the participants of the course to provide feedback for what they thought of a course which would help those thinking about taking the course determine if this might be an appropriate course for them. He said the only drawback would be whether DBPR would allow the VERSA software to be used and not their own software as is currently used. Mr. Dunn will discuss the possibility of using this software with Zana Raybon and bring back a report for the next conference call.

4. Items #5 & 9 – Jaime Gold
   #5 - Should we develop a methodology for checking compliance of the rule by providers?

   Jaime Gold recommended a committee be formed that that could review these course on a volunteer basis. This would not require any revision to the current rule. This an alternative to using the VERSA program brought up by Mr. Dunn.

#9 - Should we use an ANSI standard for evaluating the credentials of providers?

Jaime Gold recommended adding IACET and ACCET to paragraph 61G15-22.011. Mr. Harris said he felt that implementing this idea might run afoul of the anti-trust laws and he would do some additional research. Bill Dunn expressed a concern about having to share proprietary information to a competitor (the two groups mentioned above). Given the hour for the conference call was up and there were more comments not discussed completely, this discussion will be continued at the next conference call.

Ken Todd will make his report at the next conference call.

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.

    The meeting was adjourned at 1:02 p.m.