

# CEU Revision Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: July 10, 2017

Time: 3:30 p.m.

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

Zana Raybon conducted a roll call. **Those committee members in attendance were:**

Ken Todd, FBPE

Bill Bracken, FBPE

**Public advisors in attendance were:**

Bill Dunn, Suncam

Pat Ferland, FES

Art Nordlinger, IEEE

Al Garza, Licensed Engineer

Gerry Ward, Licensed Engineer

**Staff in attendance:**

Larry Harris, FBPE Counsel

Rebecca Sammons, FBPE Assist. Exec. Director

Zana Raybon, Executive Director

The following items were discussed:

There were no revisions noted for the June 27, 2017 meeting minutes, therefore the meeting minutes are considered final.

## Reports

Jaime Gold was not in attendance to the conference call. However, she had submitted language that she and Mr. Harris had drafted to address her assigned language revision to the rules to address the following question: Should we develop a methodology for checking compliance of the rule by providers? After research of the subject, Ms. Gold suggested that the only revision to the rule she would recommend is to add an additional organization that monitors the compliance by providers of the rule. All agreed this would be beneficial and have no down side. Therefore, her revised language the group agreed to is as follows:

Proposed language to Rule 61G15-22.011:

“1) Applicants for continuing education provider status must either be registered as a continuing education provider with the Registered Continuing Education Program (RCEP) of the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) or International Association for Continuing Education and Training (IACET) as of March 1, 2015, or meet the requirements of subsection (2) of this rule to demonstrate the education and/or the

experience necessary to instruct professional engineers in the conduct of their practice.  
(2) To demonstrate the education and/or the experience necessary to instruct professional engineers in the conduct of their practice for continuing education credit, an applicant for continuing education provider status must be a regionally accredited educational institution, a commercial educator, a governmental agency, a state or national professional association whose primary purpose is to promote the profession of engineering, an engineer with a Florida license to practice engineering who is not under disciplinary restrictions pursuant to any order of the Board, a vendor with specific knowledge related to the licensee's area of practice, or an engineering firm that possesses an active certificate of authorization issued by the Board pursuant to Section 471.023, F.S."

Dr. Bloetscher had a conflict and was unable to attend the conference call. However, he provided some additional revised language to address the issues he was assigned to look into. The two areas were as follows:

"Should the current list of unacceptable topics for coursework be expanded?" and "How is the area of practice requirement going to be administered, specifically for engineers who don't have a specific area of practice?"

After much discussion it was agreed that the proposed language went beyond the authority of the Board and therefore it was the opinion of the group that the revised language should not be used. Mr. Harris also pointed out that the rule already has a definition for area of practice and that is any one of the areas for which there is a licensing exam. It was discussed that given the way the rule is currently written the licensee can determine what his or her area of practice is and take courses that are closely related to their practice. There is no need to attempt to further clarify the rule that currently has some flexibility built into the rule regarding area of practice.

Bill Dunn then addressed the following issue:

"Should feedback be obtained from students to ascertain quality of courses?"

Bill reported that he had met with Zana Raybon about a possible software program (Versa) that would allow the vendor to report all courses taken by a licensee and allow the licensees to provide feedback of the course taken. Zana indicated she would like to explore the idea. Bill said he would like to present this concept to the FBPE to ask permission to work with Zana and DBPR in using this program in lieu of the current system used by DBPR. The group agreed this was a good idea. Gerry Ward asked the process be broadened to be more than just a monitoring process. He said he would write-up how he would like to see this broadened to be reviewed by the group before our next conference call.

Ken Todd indicated he would provide as part of the packet for the next conference call all of the rule revisions the group has agreed to send to the FBPE Rules Revision. This will provide the group with one last opportunity to review what rule revisions have been written to date before they are presented to the FBPE Rules Committee for consideration of a rule change.

The next conference call be held on Thursday, July 27<sup>th</sup> beginning at 9:00 p.m.  
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

DRAFT