



AN OFFICIAL NCEES PUBLICATION FOR THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION, OPINIONS, AND IDEAS REGARDING THE LICENSURE OF ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS

## FEATURE STORY

## GLOBAL ECONOMY REQUIRES GLOBAL VIEW ON ACCREDITATION

MICHAEL MILLIGAN, PH.D., P.E.  
ABET EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
(PICTURED)

DANIELA IACONA  
ABET INTERNATIONAL  
RELATIONS MANAGER



**A**s world economies become more globalized, engineers of all types routinely transcend political and geographic borders. U.S. industries that once focused only on the domestic market are increasingly engaged in multinational projects involving technical professionals from numerous countries around the world. In addition, there is a vast amount of technical

goods and services imported into the United States that are designed, built, and tested by engineers and technicians educated outside the country. One question may come to mind: "How is the educational experience of engineers from outside the United States evaluated for quality?" The answer, in part, is through the

accreditation of engineering education programs, a process in which ABET Inc. plays a key role.

ABET is the recognized accreditor for college and university programs in applied science, computing, engineering, and technology. Among the most respected accreditation organizations in the United States, ABET has provided leadership and quality assurance in higher education for more than 75 years. It accredits over 3,100 programs at more than 600 colleges and universities worldwide. ABET ensures the quality of engineering programs outside the United States through two different means: the direct accreditation of academic programs and active participation in multinational mutual recognition agreements, or MRAs.

In 2007, ABET began to directly accredit academic programs outside the United States. The evaluation and accreditation processes used, as well as the accreditation criteria, are the same as those used for U.S. programs. At present, ABET accredits 181 programs at 39 institutions in 20 countries outside the United States in computing, engineering, and engineering technology.

In addition to accreditation of individual programs, ABET is engaged in a number of international mutual recognition agreements with other accrediting organizations. These agreements are intended to improve technical education and foster the mobility of students, graduates, and sometimes faculty. Ultimately, these agreements have a direct bearing on public safety and welfare, not just for assuring the quality of educational programs from which our professional engineers graduate, but also because we all use products and services developed in other countries. ABET has a direct role in assuring that these agreements are appropriate and viable.

### What is an MRA?

Mutual recognition agreements are agreements between organizations that accredit technical degree programs. These are nongovernmental agreements that recognize the substantial equivalency of the organizations' accreditation processes and the graduates' preparedness to begin professional practice at the entry level. Substantial equivalency means that the accreditation systems have comparable standards, outcomes, and processes, though they may not be absolutely identical. Currently, ABET is a signatory to four MRAs: the CEAB/EAC Bilateral

*continued on page 10*

One question may come to mind: "How is the educational experience of engineers from outside the United States evaluated for quality?"



JOSEPH TIMMS, P.E.  
NCEES PRESIDENT

## FROM THE PRESIDENT

# Willingness to work together has improved communication and cooperation

**M**eeting with my counterparts at other organizations that represent various aspects of the engineering and surveying professions has been an interesting experience for me. While our approaches may be different, the overall objective appears to be the continual improvement of the profession.

In December, I attended two meetings at the headquarters of the American Society of Civil Engineers in Reston, Virginia. Both were an excellent exercise in information sharing.

While our approaches may be different, the overall objective appears to be the continual improvement of the profession.

The first was a leadership meeting between the National Society of Professional Engineers, ABET, ASCE, and NCEES. In attendance were the executive directors, presidents, and presidents-elect, as well as some other key staff members. The agenda was developed from a list of questions that each organization submitted prior to the meeting.

For ABET, the questions addressed included an update on their long-range plans for

international accreditation, the potential for consideration of additional engineering education outcomes, and plans for accrediting online programs. On the latter, ABET leadership noted that there are no 100-percent online bachelor of science programs in engineering that are either accredited or seeking accreditation. However, there are accredited programs with substantial online content.

NSPE leadership reported on its recently adopted position statement concerning engineering education outcomes and its proposed white paper on generic versus discipline-specific licensure of engineers. We thanked NSPE for its work in putting together a report on state laws and industrial exemptions.

ASCE provided an update on its certification program dealing with sustainable design in civil works. NCEES continues to oppose any certification program that will mislead the public into thinking they are getting professional engineer advice and service from non-engineers.

We covered such areas as the status of computer-based testing and the decision made by the Council at the annual meeting to move ahead with converting the FE and FS exams to a computer-based format as soon as is practical. The *Model Law* engineering

education requirements and faculty licensure were also discussed. ASCE and NSPE were most interested in the work we are doing this year on the industrial exemption issue. They want to continue to maintain a good dialogue between the organizations on this subject.

The second meeting was with the American Association of Engineering Societies. One of the highlights was a presentation by Art Schwartz and Tom Smith, who serve as deputy executive director and general counsel for NSPE and ASCE, respectively. Schwartz and Smith presented a comparison study of the codes of ethics used by the AAES member societies. This study highlighted the major differences and similarities among the various codes. This study will be a useful reference for our Law Enforcement Committee, since one of their charges this year is to review our ethics section of the *Model Law* and *Model Rules* and recommend any changes.

One of the best impressions that I have about both of these meetings is the improvement in communications and cooperation between the various organizations. I think a lot of the credit for this improvement in the willingness to work together goes to our executive director, Jerry Carter, and his counterparts Michael Milligan, Ph.D., P.E., of ABET; Patrick Natale, P.E., of ASCE; and Lawrence Jacobson of NSPE.

$$v_2 = \frac{20 \text{ km} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{1000 \text{ m}} \times \frac{1}{(\pi)(0.5)^2} \times \frac{10,000 \text{ cm}^2}{1 \text{ m}^2} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{1000 \text{ m}}}{60 \text{ s}}$$

$$v_2 = 4.24 \text{ m/s}$$

## Two task forces added for 2010-11

**N**CEES President Joseph Timms, P.E., has formed two new task forces for 2010-11. They will join the other 13 task forces and standing committees addressing charges this year. The task forces will present their preliminary findings at the zone meetings in April and May. After considering feedback from zone delegates, they will submit their final reports. The Council will vote on any resulting motions at the annual meeting in August.

### Alternate Licensure Pathway Task Force

**Chair: Henry Liles Jr., P.E. (North Carolina board emeritus member)**  
**Members: 5**  
**Board of Directors liaison: Dale Jans, P.E. (president-elect)**

The Alternate Licensure Pathway Task Force will study another way to fulfill the additional education requirement for engineering licensure. The Engineering Education Task Force began developing the pathway last year, and the Council voted at the 2010 annual meeting to approve further study.

The concept includes additional coursework beyond a degree from an EAC/ABET-accredited engineering program, six years of engineering experience, and a structured mentoring program.

### Sustainable Building Design Task Force

**Chair: William Dean, P.E. (Georgia board member)**  
**Members: 5**  
**Board of Directors liaison: Gene Dinkins, P.E., P.L.S. (treasurer)**

Originally convened in 2008-09, the Sustainable Building Design Task Force will continue to address the relationship between sustainable building design and licensure.

It will study the issue of building commissioning, which is a process for verifying that a building's systems—such as HVAC, electrical, or wastewater control—are operating as intended by the owner and as designed by the building architects and engineers. The task force will draft a position statement on the role of professional engineers in building commissioning services for Council consideration.

It will also review the recommendations of the 2008-09 task force and continue to study issues concerning LEED certification and the possibility of engineering work being performed by unlicensed individuals.



# Sound investigations are critical to enforcement program's effectiveness

If you don't know whether your program is legally defensible, perhaps it's time for your board's counsel to review your processes to ensure compliance with applicable laws.

**A**n effective, proactive enforcement program is essential to a licensing board fulfilling its mission to protect the public. A board must have the ability to conduct investigations of alleged wrongdoing. Investigations should be thorough and unbiased and provide the basis for informed and fair decisions.

The investigative and legal staff play a key role in achieving the program's goals. Effective enforcement requires dedicated resources, whether you have one or 10 investigators. The North Carolina board, which considers itself to have a robust enforcement program, spends about a one-third of its annual budget on enforcement activities.

Without trained, dedicated, and qualified enforcement staff, the board simply won't have an effective program. Ask yourself who's doing the investigations for the board. Are they qualified? Do they receive adequate training and support? Who determines the charges and directs the investigations, and is this the right person for the job? Do the investigators, disciplinary review committees, and board know the standard of proof and the elements necessary to prove violations? What legal guidance do the decision makers, including investigators, receive?

## Ensure sound investigative procedures

It's important to have a legally defensible program so that the board doesn't use its resources fighting lawsuits or have decisions overturned. If you don't know whether your program is legally defensible, perhaps it's time for your board's counsel to review your processes to ensure compliance with applicable laws.

There are any number of options to help prepare your enforcement staff to investigate professional practice complaints. Board legal counsel can provide some of the training and guidance necessary. NCEES offers law enforcement programs at the annual meeting. A valuable aspect of attending NCEES law enforcement programs is networking with other enforcement people. In North Carolina, half of our professional engineers don't reside in the state, so it's important to have good lines of communication with other boards to address enforcement issues that arise.

Other organizations that can provide valuable training to your staff include the Council on Licensure, Enforcement, and Regulation, better known as CLEAR. It offers basic and specialized National Certified Investigator/Inspector Training programs and holds annual conferences. The Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards, or FARB, holds Attorney Certification

$$1000 \frac{\pi \cdot 1.5}{4} \cdot 7.9^2 - 1000 \frac{\pi \cdot 3^2}{4} \cdot 1.98^2$$

$$110,288 - 27,712$$

$$\frac{kg}{m^3} m^2 \left( \frac{m}{s} \right)^2$$

Seminars and annual forums, and John E. Reid & Associates Inc. offers interview training programs.

### Actively search for violations

It is important for member boards to actively look for potential violations, including unlicensed practice, by reviewing public records. Boards should seek compliance if appropriate or initiate investigations if warranted. Boards can also review trade publications, the Yellow Pages, and the Internet for potential violations.

Another important proactive activity is to regularly check the NCEES Enforcement Exchange. In North Carolina, more disciplinary actions are taken against professional engineers for being disciplined in other jurisdictions than for responsible charge, incompetency, or continuing professional competency violations. In fact, it is the number two reason professional engineers are disciplined.

In general, North Carolina only pursues cases in which a licensee has been restricted or has had his or her license revoked, suspended, denied, or surrendered as the result of a disciplinary action. North Carolina

Board Rule 21 NCAC 56.0701(h) states, “A Professional Engineer or Professional Land Surveyor who has received a reprimand or civil penalty or whose professional license is revoked, suspended, denied, or surrendered as a result of disciplinary action by another jurisdiction is subject to discipline by the Board if the licensee’s action constitutes a violation of G.S. 89C or the rules adopted by the Board.”

If the person or firm isn’t fit to practice somewhere else, we don’t want them practicing in our state, and we owe it to the citizens of North Carolina to see that they don’t. The NCEES *Model Law* has a similar provision (Section 150.10 A.5). If your board has such language in its rules or law, it should be pursuing these types of disciplinary actions.

The North Carolina board also engages in business licensure and compliance activities and has a staff member assigned exclusively to this activity. Violation cases involving businesses, including non-licensees, account for a quarter of the board’s violation cases annually. In an effort to reduce this number, we have developed close ties with the Office of the Secretary of State, which flags

potential violations and refers firms to the board to obtain licensing information. The board then attempts to address unlicensed practice or offers to practice informally as appropriate. The board also works closely with other boards on licensing issues to ensure businesses remain compliant with the statutory requirements.

Enforcement is much more than simply responding to complaints. An effective enforcement program requires a sustained, multifaceted approach that includes a dedicated enforcement staff, sound processes, and the support and leadership of the board.



JERRY CARTER  
NCEES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## HEADQUARTERS UPDATE

# NCEES prepares for Board Presidents Assembly

Although the BPA is held only every two years, it's an important opportunity to address concerns and ensure the NCEES mission is being carried out in accordance with the wishes of the member boards.

The start of 2011 has been a busy time at NCEES headquarters as we make final preparations for the Board Presidents Assembly, which will be held February 10–12. Although the BPA is held only every two years, it's an important opportunity to address concerns and ensure the NCEES mission is being carried out in accordance with the wishes of the member boards.

This meeting was first conducted in 1991, with attendance limited to board presidents and chairs (or designated representatives). For the 2001 and 2003 meetings, member board administrators were funded to attend a meeting in conjunction with the BPA. The value of MBA participation in the Board Presidents Assembly was quickly realized, and in 2003 the Council approved a resolution authorizing funding of MBAs to all future meetings.

The first several BPAs were limited to specific topics such as Council finances and strategic planning. The agendas for recent meetings, including the 2011 BPA, include reports from NCEES leadership and staff on a wide range of ongoing initiatives.

This year's meeting will begin with an orientation explaining NCEES and its leadership structure. It will continue with information concerning ongoing NCEES activities and will end with concurrent sessions for the board presidents and MBAs.

We will also unveil the revamped NCEES Speakers Kit for Engineers and explain how it can be used to help engineering students understand the benefits of licensure and the licensure process. The kit has been an extremely helpful resource since it was introduced in 2003, but it was time to update the

content and give it a fresh look in keeping with our brand. The new version provides more flexibility: speakers can customize the PowerPoint presentation for a particular audience, and we'll distribute the presentation electronically, allowing NCEES to update the content more often. We are currently developing a new Speakers Kit for Surveyors that will be available later this year.

### Credentials Evaluations update

The meeting will also give us a chance to introduce Stefani Goodenow, the new manager of credentials evaluations. Before joining NCEES, Stef worked for Clemson University and TriCounty Technical College. She is experienced in reviewing academic transcripts, including foreign transcripts, and we are excited about the knowledge and dedication she brings to NCEES.



Stef and I will lead a BPA session covering the latest on the NCEES Credentials Evaluations service, including the new NCEES Engineering Education Standard now used for credentials evaluations.

We have a full agenda to cover at this year's BPA. It will be a busy time but also a very productive one. I look forward to seeing everyone there.

### Shop NCEES

You can now shop for NCEES clothing online. Visit the My NCEES section of [ncees.org](http://ncees.org) to view available merchandise—including shirts, hats, and fleeces—and download an order form.

# Future City helps students turn ideas into reality

## National competition aims to provide fun, exciting engineering challenge

**T**he National Engineers Week Foundation's 2011 Future City Competition is encouraging students to go beyond dreaming about the future and start building it.

As part of their challenge to use engineering principles to design a city 150 years in the future, each student team is addressing this year's theme: Providing a Reliable and Effective Health Care System That Improves a Sick, Injured, or Disabled Patient's Quality of Life and Comfort. The teams must

- Create a computer model of their city
- Research an engineering problem related to this year's health care systems theme and write an essay on their solution
- Build a 3-D model of their city using recycled materials
- Present their model and ideas to engineers at the regional competitions

Regional winners will compete at the national finals in Washington, D.C., which will take place during Engineers Week, February 20–26.

Now in its 19th year, the Future City Competition has received national acclaim for helping students discover how engineers can make a difference in the world while also helping them develop their skills in science, technology, engineering, and math.

This year, sixth graders were invited to join seventh- and eighth-grade students in the competition, which is expected to attract more than 33,000 students from 1,100 middle schools across the United States.

### NCEES sponsors Future City special award

As part of its support for National Engineers Week and Future City, NCEES is sponsoring the special award for Best Land Surveying Practices. NCEES Past President Martin Pedersen, L.S., and Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors Chair Gary Thompson, P.L.S., will represent NCEES as judges for the award.

Pedersen has been a judge since NCEES began sponsoring the award in 2004. He said what keeps him coming back each year is the chance to talk to students about what they've learned about surveying practices while designing their cities.

"Through their engineering mentors and teachers, a lot of the students now know that they need to consider surveying in the project," he said. "But if they don't know about surveying, we can move into an educational role. I'll ask them if they know what the initials 'L.S.' on my name badge stand for, and then I'll explain what a professional land surveyor does."

Thompson is judging the Best Land Surveying Practices award for a second year, and he will also be a judge for the national grand prize. He agrees that including an award that focuses on surveying practices is an important and effective outreach opportunity.

"Some students still don't know a lot about what surveying is, but they're enthusiastic about the competition and so are their families, so it's great to be able to use Future City to teach them about what engineers and surveyors contribute to our society," he said.

More information on the Future City Competition and other 2011 EWeek activities is available at [futurecity.org](http://futurecity.org) and [eweek.org](http://eweek.org).

# Georgia requires NCEES Record for comity licensure

## Board wants to streamline evaluations, increase licensee mobility

In an effort to improve its licensure process, the Georgia State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors recently began requiring an NCEES Record for professional engineers seeking licensure by comity.

The state joins four other jurisdictions that have set this requirement: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Puerto Rico require engineering comity licensure applicants to have an NCEES Record. Kentucky requires a Record for both engineering and surveying comity licensure applicants.

“Some people may establish a Record because a board requires it, but the high renewal rate suggests they find real value in keeping it.”

An NCEES Record contains the documentation needed for comity licensure, the process by which someone licensed in one state applies for licensure in another jurisdiction. This includes college transcripts, exam and employment verifications, and professional recommendations. NCEES collects and stores this information and then submits it to a state licensing board on the individual's behalf when he or she is applying for comity licensure.

Darren Mickler, executive director of the Georgia board, explained the reasons for the move, which took effect January 1, 2011: “We’re going paperless where possible, and electronic submission is a big saving on manpower and storage space. Using an NCEES Record also ensures we get a complete application. NCEES has done the verifications for us, so we’re several steps ahead when we get our hands on it.”

The Georgia board did not just consider the advantages for itself. “Now, licensees know their application is complete before it comes to us. Plus, having a Record in place gives them added mobility—and we encourage that,” Mickler explained. “If an applicant already holds an NCEES Record, there’s just a short online application. And for those who do have to set up a Record, they’re sending NCEES the same things we required before. But now at the end of it, they have their Record.”

Leigh Fricks, manager of the Records department at NCEES, said she is encouraged that licensees are finding that Record valuable: “Ninety percent of Record holders are now renewing their Record each year; that’s up from 80 percent four to five years ago. Some people may establish a Record because a board requires it, but the high renewal rate suggests they find real value in keeping it.”

### Moving forward

Although the Records program has existed in some form since the 1920s, NCEES continues to look for ways to improve the service. In 2008, the Records program moved to a Web-based format, allowing licensees to apply and renew their Records and request transmittals online. The format also allows boards to review Records electronically. It is currently updating its database to make it more user-friendly for licensees and to upgrade services for boards. Fricks also is assisting the Evaluations of Applications Task Force this year with its work to identify ways the program can better serve member boards and licensees.

Fricks invites board members and administrators to meet with her if they are considering requiring an NCEES Record for comity licensure applications. Those interested in learning more can contact her at [lfricks@ncees.org](mailto:lfricks@ncees.org) or 800-250-3196.



# UPDATE

## October 2010 Exam Pass Rates

### FE EXAM

FE pass rates for examinees who attended EAC/ABET-accredited engineering programs:

Exam Module	First-Time Takers	Repeat Takers
Chemical	83%	51%
Civil	70%	27%
Electrical	68%	30%
Environmental	79%	32%
Industrial	69%	29%
Mechanical	82%	34%
Other Disciplines	71%	34%

### FE EXAM—OTHER DISCIPLINES MODULE ONLY

Only EAC/ABET degrees with more than 50 examinees are reported.

Examinee Degree Discipline	First-Time Takers	Repeat Takers
Aeronautical/Aerospace	88%	75%
Agricultural	69%	80%
Architectural	68%	43%
Biomedical	70%	25%
Biological	77%	54%
Chemical	78%	34%
Civil	71%	31%
Electrical	61%	30%
Environmental	67%	34%
General Engineering	76%	30%
Mechanical	80%	40%
Mining and Mineral	52%	42%
Nuclear	88%	71%
Petroleum	64%	28%
Structural	69%	40%

### PE EXAM

Exam	First-Time Takers	Repeat Takers
Agricultural	68%	50%
Architectural*	75%	47%
Chemical	82%	36%
Civil	62%	27%
Control Systems	69%	47%
Electrical/Computer	66%	35%
Environmental	77%	48%
Fire Protection	52%	29%
Industrial	80%	44%
Mechanical	73%	37%
Metallurgical/Materials	64%	50%
Mining/Mineral Processing	79%	46%
Naval Architectural/ Marine Engineering*	85%	75%
Nuclear	57%	50%
Petroleum	80%	44%
Structural I	47%	21%
Structural II	54%	24%

\*These exams are administered only in April. Pass rates shown are for April 2010.

### SURVEYING EXAMS

Exam	First-Time Takers	Repeat Takers
FS	70%	40%
PS	64%	30%

# ACCREDITATION

*continued from cover*

Agreement (between Engineers Canada and ABET for engineering programs), the multilateral Washington Accord (for engineering), the multilateral Seoul Accord (for computing), and the multilateral Sydney Accord (for engineering technologists).

When a student graduates from a program accredited by an agency that has signed an MRA, the graduate may be considered to have the educational qualifications necessary to pursue licensure, registration, or certification in another country whose accrediting organization also has signed that MRA.

## Washington Accord

Established in 1989, the Washington Accord is the MRA for accreditation of engineering programs. Currently, the accord has 13 signatories: ABET, Engineers Australia, Engineers Canada, Institute of Engineering Education Taiwan, Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Engineers Ireland, Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education, Accreditation Board for Engineering Education of Korea, Board of Engineers Malaysia, Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand, Institution of Engineers Singapore, Engineering Council of South Africa, and Engineering Council UK.

Each organization that seeks to become a signatory of the Washington Accord goes through a rigorous two-step process. First, an accrediting agency must be approved by the signatories for provisional status. Provisional status indicates that the signatories believe that the accreditation system has the potential to reach signatory status. Provisional status does not guarantee that the organization will obtain signatory status, but the signatories agree to work with the organization to improve its processes, standards, and outcomes, as needed. Organizations with provisional status have no recognition rights for their programs or graduates.

The second step to achieving signatory status is a comprehensive review of the accreditation system. A review team, composed of representatives from signatory agencies, evaluates the criteria, policies, and procedures. They also serve as observers on accreditation visits to several programs at multiple campuses and the accreditation decision-making meeting. Admission to the Washington Accord requires a recommendation of approval by the review team and unanimous agreement of the signatories.

Once an accreditor becomes a signatory, it is subject to additional reviews to ensure that the processes, standards, and outcomes continue to be met. ABET is actively involved in these review and monitoring processes. Every six years, a monitoring team evaluates a Washington Accord signatory in a review comparable to the initial review. Experienced ABET team chairs and program evaluators serve on the review and monitoring teams. Between monitoring visits, signatories exchange observers during their evaluation cycle. In addition, signatories are required to submit a report identifying any changes in the organization, processes, criteria, etc., at the biennial meetings of the accords.

In addition to being actively involved in the review and monitoring process, ABET has also worked with several of these accrediting organizations in developing and improving their accreditation systems. Specifically, ABET has worked with its counterparts in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, and one will note several similarities to ABET in their criteria and procedures.

Like ABET, many of the signatories have adopted an outcomes-based accreditation system that focuses on what is learned, rather than only on what is taught. ABET recognizes programs accredited by the signatories, within their jurisdiction, as substantially equivalent to

# MEMBER BOARD NEWS

**ARKANSAS** Dan Young is a new appointee. Ivan Hoffman and Woodrow Turner are no longer board members.

**CALIFORNIA** Joanne Arnold is now the acting executive officer.

**FLORIDA PS** Robin Petzold and Lamar Evers are new appointees. Mary Hanna Clodfelter and Louis Lebron are no longer board members.

**INDIANA** Elizabeth Kiefner Crawford is the new director for the PE and PS boards.

**KANSAS** Forrest Erickson is a new appointee. Ken Vaughn is no longer a board member.

**NEVADA** Samuel Palmer is a new appointee. Stuart Hitchen is no longer a board member.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE PE** Thomas Bowen is a new appointee. Marc Morin is no longer a board member.

**NEW JERSEY** Arthur Russo, 87, passed away on November 24. He had served as the board's executive director for the past 20 years. Joseph Grabowy is now the acting executive director.

**PENNSYLVANIA** DeAndra Burger is the new board administrator.

**UTAH** Richard Oborn is the new board administrator.

**VERMONT PS** Emeritus member and NCEES past president Robert Krebs was elected to the Vermont House of Representatives for 2011–12.

## Upcoming Events

### February 4-5

ACCA Meeting  
San Antonio, Texas

EPE Committee Meeting  
Clemson, South Carolina

### February 10

Alternative Licensure Pathway Task  
Force Meeting  
Atlanta, Georgia

### February 11-12

Board Presidents Assembly  
Atlanta, Georgia

### February 18-19

Board of Directors Meeting  
Key West, Florida

### February 20-26

Engineers Week

### February 25-26

UPLG Committee Meeting  
Memphis, Tennessee

### March 5

Finance Committee Meeting  
Orlando, Florida

POLC Meeting  
Atlanta, Georgia

### March 10-13

Exam Audit Committee Meeting  
Clemson, South Carolina

### March 11-13

CBT Task Force Meeting (tentative)  
Clemson, South Carolina

### March 20-26

Surveyors Week

## ACCREDITATION

*continued from page 10*

programs accredited by ABET. The expected graduate attributes are consistent among the signatories; therefore, ABET recognizes graduates of these programs as being adequately prepared for professional practice at entry level in their home country as well as in the United States. This recognition is effective the year signatory status is obtained and applies only to students who graduate on or after that date.

The Washington Accord helps employers and licensing boards identify qualified engineers and provides assurance that the individual's degree program has adequately prepared him or her to practice engineering. This role has become increasingly important with the rise in globalization and mobility of professionals.

ABET recognizes the attributes and competencies of graduates from signatory-accredited programs as being substantially equivalent to those of graduates from ABET-accredited programs, and we strongly encourage U.S. licensing boards and NCEES to do the same.

For more information on the Washington Accord, as well as links to signatories and recognized programs, visit [www.ieagreements.org/Washington-Accord](http://www.ieagreements.org/Washington-Accord). You can also contact Daniela Iacona at [diacona@abet.org](mailto:diacona@abet.org) with any questions.

L. Joseph Timms, P.E.  
*President*  
Bridgeport, West Virginia

David L. Whitman, Ph.D., P.E.  
*Past President*  
Laramie, Wyoming

Dale A. Jans, P.E.  
*President-Elect*  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Gene L. Dinkins, P.E., P.L.S.  
*Treasurer*  
Columbia, South Carolina

Nancy L. Gavlin, P.E., S.E.  
*VP Central Zone*  
Chicago, Illinois

David H. Widmer, P.L.S.  
*VP Northeast Zone*  
Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania

Govind Nadkarni, P.E.  
*VP Southern Zone*  
Corpus Christi, Texas

Patty Mamola, P.E.  
*VP Western Zone*  
Reno, Nevada

Jerry T. Carter  
*Executive Director/Secretary*  
Clemson, South Carolina



P.O. Box 1686  
(280 Seneca Creek Rd)  
Clemson, SC 29633 USA

PERIODICALS  
POSTAGE PAID  
CLEMSON, SC  
29633

Licensure  
**EXCHANGE**

PUBLISHED BY NCEES

**Jerry T. Carter, Executive Director  
and Publisher**

**Keri B. Anderson, Manager of  
Corporate Communications**

**Jennifer L. Williams and  
Doug McGuirt, Editors**

**Ragenia P. Thompson, Graphics and  
Print Coordinator**

ISSN NO. 1093-541X

VOLUME 15, ISSUE 1

All articles within *Licensure Exchange*  
may be reprinted with credit given to this  
newsletter and to NCEES, excluding those  
articles reproduced in *Licensure Exchange*  
with permission from an original source.

POSTAL NOTICE

*Licensure Exchange* is published bimonthly by  
NCEES, 280 Seneca Creek Road, Seneca, SC  
29678-9214.

Periodicals postage paid at Clemson, SC 29633

Postmaster: Send address changes to  
*Licensure Exchange*, P.O. Box 1686,  
Clemson, SC 29633-1686

## Spotlight On: Surveying segment now airing on PBS stations

**S**urveyors do so much more than measure property boundaries. And thanks to a new promotional campaign airing on PBS stations nationwide, the public will have a chance to learn about surveying in the 21st century.

*Spotlight On: Surveying* was delivered to 355 PBS affiliates on December 30, 2010. The stations will now begin rotating the segment into their broadcasting schedules. According to Trivue Entertainment, the producers of *Spotlight On*, the segment will air at least 500 times, reaching over 3 million viewers across the United States.

The six-minute segment focuses on surveyors' work to keep the public safe. It highlights different types of surveying, such as forensic and hydrographic surveying. It also shows some of the cutting-edge technology used in the profession, such as 3-D laser scanning used to establish underground subway systems and robotic theodolites that map inhospitable places like swamps and mines.

As part of its efforts to promote the surveying profession and its role in protecting the public, NCEES contributed \$30,000 to the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping for the segment's production.

"We're excited to contribute to such an engaging, high-quality campaign to educate the public on the important and varied work of professional surveyors," said NCEES Executive Director Jerry Carter.

"We're excited to contribute to such an engaging, high-quality campaign to educate the public on the important and varied work of professional surveyors."