

CEU Revision Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: May 31, 2017

Time: 11:00 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, P.E.

Public advisors in attendance were:

Bill Dunn, Suncam

Pat Ferland, FES

Jaime Gold, Licensed Engineer

Al Garza, Licensed Engineer

Brett Cunningham, Licensed Engineer

Gerry Ward, Licensed Engineer

Art Nordlinger, IEEE

Dr. Fred Bloestcher, FAU

Staff in attendance:

Larry Harris, FBPE Counsel

Zana Raybon, Executive Director

Rebecca Sammons, FBPE Assist. Exec. Director

The following items were discussed:

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 indicated in his review of what other states had done on this subject he felt that those few states that did give credit rules did not have a clear definition and it would be difficult to develop clear meaningful language. Therefore, he recommended that this item not be pursued any further. The group agreed.

2. 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 had not yet had an opportunity to work with Mr. Harris to develop revised language that addresses these subjects. He will do so prior to the next conference call.

#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 said he had briefly discussed the possibility of using this software with Zana Raybon, Zana indicted she thought the system had promise and she and Bill will discuss in greater detail and bring back a report for the next conference call.

3. 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. No decision was made concerning this item as the group will wait and see what comes out of the discussion on the VERSA program between Bill Dunn and Zana before making any decision.

#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 as an additional option for providers. 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). She and Mr. Harris will work on language to bring back to the group at the next conference call.

4. 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?

Ken said he had discussed #11 and #12 with FBPE staff and found that there has been relatively little discussion between FBPE staff and providers as the FBPE does not approve courses. Furthermore, FBPE staff indicated there have been very complaints about courses and the few complaints received have been handled by the Executive director.

Given, this, Ken recommended these two items not be pursued any further. The group agreed.

#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.

Ken indicated that he raised this question to the full Board at their regular April 2017 meeting. After much discussion, it was agreed by the FBPE that licensees that did not supply documentation of having taken the required hours of courses in one cycle should be subject to being audited again at the next renewal cycle as long as the word "random" was removed from the rule. The CEU group all agreed that the 19% non-compliance needs to be addressed.

Bill Dunn said that there could possibly be another problem that should be addressed and that is one of a licensee being able to create their own certificate of attendance. He said in this day of technology that can easily be done and since there is no monitoring of the attendance by the FBPE it is easy to do. Mr. Dunn offered to review all the audited licensees that provided documentation from his courses to verify that they actually took the course and he would provide that information to Zana. Art Nordlinger said he could do the same thing on behalf of IEEE. Ken Todd said he would work with Mr. Harris to develop language addressing this issue and bring it back to the next conference call.

Mr. Todd asked Mr. Harris about his work schedule for the next few weeks to determine if there was time enough for him to work with the four participants of this group who were charged with developing rule language for the next conference call. He said if he had about three weeks that would work. After discussing everyone's availability for the next conference call, the best date available for most people was Tuesday, June 27th. Mr. Harris said that would be more than enough time and he would be in contact with the four individuals to set up a time for them to discuss their proposed language. All four participants, who were to develop language, were asked to do so ASAP and send the tentative language to Mr. Harris at least a week before their turn with Mr. Harris.

The next conference call be held on Tuesday, June 27th beginning at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.