EDUCATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EXAMINATION: licensure in the engineering and surveying professions is often described as a three-legged stool made of these three qualifications. But this description is missing a very important fourth “E”: enforcement. By not acknowledging enforcement as an integral part of professional licensure, board members risk losing sight of one of their primary purposes, which is to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

I spent 16 years as the director of enforcement for the Kentucky board. A few years following my retirement from that position, I was named a member of the board by our governor and have served in that capacity for the past two years. My observations on this issue come from someone who has seen many changes within the Council, and I applaud the progress this organization has made over the years. What has not changed is that we have continued to promote the idea that licensure consists only of education, experience, and examination.

So, how does enforcement fit in? Enforcement speaks directly to the very basis of your service as a member of a board created not for the purpose of building these professions but for protecting the public. I wish enforcement were not a necessity within our chosen professions, but it is a reality. Let’s look at some important numbers regarding your professional life:

- Education: generally four years
- Experience: another four years
- Examination: at least two exams (the Fundamentals and the Principles and Practice)

Following these three E’s, most of us will enjoy a licensed professional career of over 40 years. This means that our state licensing boards must exercise oversight of licensed professional engineers and surveyors over this extended period of time. In licensing and regulating the engineering and surveying professions, we must recognize that as important as the initial three E’s are, successful licensure candidates have met only a threshold level of competency at that point. Equally critical is that little or no confirmation of the ethical character of the licensee has occurred. When we become licensed, we still have a long professional life ahead. Everyone will not perform at an appropriate level. Boards are obligated to address these failures by providing protection to those who have every reason to expect it. In fact, giving the appropriate attention to enforcement concerns in your jurisdiction is the very essence of your existence as a licensing board. Quite simply, failing to confront these issues means you are not doing your job.

Thankfully, these problems are the product of a relatively small segment of our professional communities. But, allow me to provide an example of this type of misconduct:
EPE investigates support for professional practice exam

THIS YEAR, THE COMMITTEE ON EXAMINATIONS FOR Professional Engineers (EPE) has been evaluating member board support for an exam covering professional practice areas. As charged by the president, the EPE Committee surveyed member boards to gauge member board support for developing a practice exam—would they use such an exam as a licensure requirement if one were available?

The survey was sent to all members and administrators of engineering boards. The committee received 209 responses, representing 49 of the 56 engineering boards. For this survey, the terms “practice exam” and “professional practice exam” were defined as a nontechnical professional practice exam or module used to test a candidate’s level of awareness and knowledge in the professional, ethical, regulatory, contractual, and legal aspects of practicing as a professional engineer.

The survey results indicated that disciplinary actions often involve professional practice issues. Respondents estimated that 67 percent of their respective state licensing boards’ disciplinary actions addressed professional practice issues and that only 33 percent addressed technical competence. They reported that these disciplinary actions related to professional practice issues fell into the following categories (total percentage greater than 100 percent since some actions fit multiple categories):

- Ethics.................................................................38%
- Business practices...........................................33%
- Contracts..........................................................12%
- Financial.........................................................11%
- Other...............................................................27%

Respondents seem fairly evenly divided on using testing or training to address professional practice disciplinary actions. Fifty-one percent said their board required individuals to complete additional testing or training in a knowledge area related to the complaint. Forty-nine percent said their board did not require such testing or training.

However, the survey results did not indicate overwhelming support for a separate professional practice exam. The majority of respondents (70 percent) said their board does not test candidates in professional practice areas as a requirement for licensure. Most do not support adding such a requirement: 59 percent of respondents said their board is not in favor of adding a professional practice requirement for licensure (41 percent said their board supports such a requirement). Only 30 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Licensees who have been disciplined for a professional practice issue would have likely avoided the complaint and disciplinary action if they had been required to complete testing or training in professional practice areas as part of the licensure process.”

While the survey results did not indicate strong support for a professional practice exam, they did indicate a concern for ethics-related issues. Survey respondents indicated that almost 40 percent of disciplinary actions related to professional practice involve ethics issues. Of respondents whose boards required testing or training for disciplinary actions related to professional practice, 72 percent said this testing or training related to ethics. Of respondents whose board tests for professional practice knowledge for licensure, 28 percent said the testing includes ethics, and 52 percent said it includes laws and rules.
The survey also enquired about continuing professional competency (CPC) requirements. While most boards have CPC requirements (73 percent of respondents indicated that their board has such requirements), it appears that most CPC credits can be obtained in any area licensees choose. The survey asked the number of hours required in business practices, contracts, ethics, financial, technical, and other. While there was a wide range of reported hours required for each of these areas, the most common number was zero. Sixty-five percent of respondents said their board has no specific requirements for any of these areas. The following percentages of survey respondents reported that their board has no requirements for the areas specified:

- Business practices...........................................................47%
- Contracts..........................................................................67%
- Ethics................................................................................25%
- Financial...........................................................................73%
- Technical...........................................................................18%

While many boards recognize the importance of professional practice knowledge, it appears from these survey results that there is not currently a strong interest in a professional practice exam. The results indicate that ethics is a common factor in disciplinary actions and that more CPC opportunities in the area of ethics are needed.

The committee recommends that the president charge the appropriate committee to investigate if and how each jurisdiction tests its candidates for ethics and state rules and regulations and to provide recommendations for best practices.

Martenson is a member of the Minnesota board and a member of the 2015–16 EPE Committee.

A dual licensee, while being investigated for competency issues, attempts to bribe the investigator. Ultimately, when facing formal charges regarding both competency and ethics, the respondent surrenders both licenses. Instead of this ending the case, he then begins an extended period of unlicensed practice, forcing the board to investigate and prosecute him four more times. Finally, after being jailed for the second time, he gets the message and ceases his illegal activities. This individual was so well regarded in the professional community that he had served as the president of one of the professional societies.

The point of the example is that all licensees do not possess the strong moral fiber that we expect of them. Are these individuals in the majority? Thank goodness, no. It’s an example of 90 percent of the problems being caused by 10 percent of the population. Left unchecked, however, this minority will cause irreparable harm to the public and cause great harm to the profession.

Are we, as licensing boards established to protect the public, devoting an adequate level of attention to enforcement? Far too many times, we are not doing an adequate job. If your board cannot provide an affirmative answer, then who is protecting the public from members of our professions who either cannot or will not practice at an appropriate level either technically or ethically?

We must take responsibility. It is time for us to step up and provide the adequate level of attention that enforcement needs. We start by acknowledging that enforcement is part of professional licensure.

Fentress is a member of the Kentucky board and a member of the 2015–16 Committee on Law Enforcement.
So, what happens at the annual meeting?

IF YOU HAVE NEVER ATTENDED AN NCEES ANNUAL meeting (or haven’t been to one in several years), I hope that a little more information about the meeting will encourage you to click the “Register” button.

The official business of the Council is conducted on Thursday afternoon and Friday. Each officer gives his or her annual report, and any motions for Council action are presented. These motions are usually made by committees and task forces, but member boards and the board of directors may also present motions. The Council will debate and vote on them, with each board having one vote. We will also discuss and vote on the annual budget of NCEES, and we will elect a new president-elect. All of the reports and motions are published in the Action Items and Conference Reports, which will be posted on MyNCEES by July 1.

Between business sessions, the four zones hold meetings to attend to their individual business.

Workshops are primarily held on Wednesday of the annual meeting week. Programs often include technical topics of interest to the engineering and surveying professions and licensure as well as ethics and professional development. Continuing education credits are given for many of these workshops. If your schedule allows, I strongly encourage you to attend the Wednesday activities. If you are new to NCEES, it is a great time to become acclimated before the business side of the meeting begins on Thursday. To help with this, we offer lunch on Wednesday to first-time attendees. NCEES leadership and staff will be on hand to welcome our boards’ newest members and staff and provide an orientation.

On Thursday morning, we hold three forums: engineering, surveying, and member board administrators. Members of these groups discuss licensure and administration issues of most importance to them. Public members of boards typically make their own choices about which forum to join. A fourth group, made up of state board staff and others who work in law enforcement duties, meets for its forum on Friday afternoon. This group also meets for a day-long professional development workshop on Saturday, known as the Law Enforcement Program.

The 95th NCEES annual meeting will be held August 24–27 in Indianapolis, Indiana. Our annual meeting is designed to meet three objectives: 1) provide a face-to-face opportunity to conduct Council business that impacts state boards and licensed professionals, 2) offer workshops and programs that we consider to be timely and informative, and 3) network and learn from members and staff of other boards as well as representatives from other professional societies. The activities and events that accomplish these objectives include workshops, forums, business sessions, and social receptions.

Finally, there is also ample time on the agenda for socializing and networking. We host a welcome reception, luncheons, and an awards and installation banquet. But there are plenty of opportunities to talk with others throughout the meeting—before or after sessions, during breaks, and at meals. These informal conversations are a great time to learn about what other boards and organizations are doing, including initiatives they are working on and issues they are dealing with.

Funding available

NCEES offers funding for board representatives to attend the meeting. It funds two voting representatives from each member board. It also funds all member board members and staff attending the meeting for the first time and who were appointed to their boards in the last 24 months (for this year, that’s those initially appointed or hired since August 24, 2014).

Regardless of whether you are an annual meeting veteran or first-time attendee, we are confident your time will be well spent by joining us in Indianapolis. We hope you say “Yes” to our invitation coming soon. I am looking forward to seeing you there.
MBA Committee pens guidance for decoupling PE requirements

TO ADDRESS ITS CHARGE TO DEVELOP A SET OF BEST practices for separating the experience and examination requirements for initial licensure, the Committee on Member Board Administrators developed a white paper entitled *Procedural Guidance for Decoupling Experience and PE Exam Requirements for Licensure*. The purpose of this paper is to provide general guidance and share best practices if a board decides to adopt the decoupling of experience and the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) exam. This article provides highlights from that paper, which will be included as part of the committee’s annual meeting report. The entire paper will be available for download from MyNCEES as part of the *Action Items and Conference Reports* this July.

“Decoupling” is the disconnection of experience requirements for licensure from the requirements for taking the PE exam. Licensure candidates could apply to take the PE exam after meeting the educational requirements for licensure and passing the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam. Experience requirements would still have to be met before such candidates could apply for licensure.

Without decoupling, the PE exam application is a de facto licensure application. With it, the PE exam application is just that—candidates seeking approval to sit for the exam—nothing more. Once a candidate passes the PE exam and obtains the appropriate experience, he or she could then apply for licensure.

The NCEES *Model Law* used to require that the four years of experience be earned before a licensure candidate could take the PE exam. Delegates voted in 2013 to remove the timing aspect of the requirements from the model document. It is up to individual licensing boards to decide if they want to implement this change in their practice laws or policies. If your board chooses to adopt decoupling, it should address the following topics.

**Educate your state professional societies.** One of the biggest hurdles is misunderstanding what decoupling is, and more importantly, what it is not. We suggest developing a one-page document briefly explaining the benefits of decoupling, with an emphasis on the fact that the requirements to become licensed have not changed.

**Are changes to your law or rules necessary?** If so, follow your jurisdiction’s procedures. Consider involving your state’s professional societies so they can join you in dealing with your state legislature.

**Select an effective date for the new process.** If a law or rule change is required, the effective date will be determined during that process. If you have flexibility, starting after the previous exam cycle closes is a good choice. This gives you the end date for developing a time line. Other dates along the time line will include application creation/modification, instructions modifications, and website changes.

**Decide on appropriate approval model for PE exams.** NCEES will soon offer various approval options for PE exams. Your board can select the appropriate option and then set up the approval criteria with NCEES.

**Develop an education plan to reach potential PE exam applicants.** For a significant procedural change such as this, communication is critical. Potential examinees need to be aware of the change so they can consider early test taking. Develop a concise document explaining why, when, and how: why you have made the change, when individuals can take advantage of the opportunity, and how to apply. Consider several formats, including website posting, social media, and speaking engagements.

**Modify or create the necessary applications.** Do this in advance—at least six months out. Remember, the application to sit for the PE exam will no longer be an application for licensure. Previously, if someone passed the exam, a P.E. license was issued. This sounds like a simple statement, but it really is a cultural change.

*Cox is the executive director of the Kentucky board and a member of the 2015–16 Committee on Member Board Administrators.*
IN SEPTEMBER 2015, THE STATE OF IDAHO OFFICIALLY agreed to recognize the United Kingdom’s Chartered Engineer status in the process for awarding a P.E. license, subject to a minimum of eight years of post-registration experience. The state of Idaho’s decision provides a good opportunity to outline the general requirements and process involved in becoming a Chartered Engineer in the U.K.

Chartered Engineer is a professional title awarded and administered by the Engineering Council—the U.K. regulatory body for the engineering profession. Successful candidates may identify themselves using the abbreviation CEng. The Engineering Council holds the national database, or Register, of 180,000 Chartered Engineers, 20 percent of whom reside overseas. It also sets and maintains the internationally recognized standards for the engineering profession in the United Kingdom, which are described in the UK Standard for Professional Engineering Competence (UK-SPEC). The UK-SPEC licenses engineering institutions to assess their members against the competences. UK-SPEC is set out in generic terms so that the professional engineering institutions can interpret these for the discipline(s) for which they are responsible. Each institution develops its own procedures for assessment, but they must comply with criteria laid down by the Engineering Council.

Applicants wishing to apply for professional registration as a Chartered Engineer must first become a member of one of the professional engineering institutions. The Engineering Council currently licenses 35 institutions. Each represents a particular sector or engineering discipline, such as the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) or the Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE). To maintain registration, Chartered Engineers must remain a member of a licensed institution, and consequently, the Engineering Council is able to confirm standing and disciplinary record when Chartered Engineers apply for licensure elsewhere. Licensed institutions are responsible for supporting their registrants’ continuing professional development (CPD) and undertaking investigation and disciplinary action when necessary. In addition to using the post-nominal CEng,

Chartered Engineers identify themselves with their institution membership grade, for example, Jane Smyth CEng IMechE. Separate annual fees are paid for CEng registration and institution membership.

The Engineering Council works very closely with numerous international organizations to ensure that its standards are globally recognized and to facilitate the international mobility of registered engineering professionals.

How to become a UK Chartered Engineer

Education. The CEng title can be awarded to anyone who can demonstrate the required competences and commitment set out in the professional standard UK-SPEC. Knowledge and understanding are important components of professional competence. Formal education is the usual, though not the only, way of demonstrating the necessary knowledge and understanding. An accredited integrated master’s degree (MEng) or a combination of an accredited bachelor with honors degree and accredited or approved further learning to master’s level, demonstrates the required knowledge and understanding for Chartered Engineers.

Candidates without an accredited degree can become registered if they are able to provide sufficient evidence of further qualifications and experiential learning that meet the standards set in UK-SPEC. Some institutions require a written technical report to evidence the required level of learning.
The process. Registration is competence-based and follows a peer-assessment process. Guidance and mentoring can be provided to candidates by supervising engineers who are registered and normally employed in the same company as the candidate. Applicants for registration submit a portfolio of information to their professional engineering institution, including examples of how they have developed and exercised professional competence. The licensed institution reviews the candidate’s academic qualifications, experiential learning where applicable, recorded initial professional development, experience, commitment to ethical standards, and compliance with the registering professional engineering institution’s code of conduct.

If the candidate’s portfolio satisfies the requisite experience, knowledge, and understanding, the candidate is invited to a professional review interview by his or her institution. The candidate must demonstrate to two Chartered Engineers, who are trained interviewers, how the required competences and commitment are met. The interviewers determine whether the candidate meets all of the requirements and is eligible to be awarded the CEng title or not. A final decision is made by the responsible committee.

Continuing professional development
Once an applicant becomes a registered Chartered Engineer, he or she must continue to develop his or her knowledge, expertise, and personal qualities through CPD. Following the CPD Code for Registrants, Chartered Engineers must proactively look for professional development opportunities in the workplace and through structured activities such as courses, private study, preparing papers and presentations, and involvement in professional body work. CPD also includes supporting the learning and development of others, such as through mentoring.

Conclusion
It is not a legal requirement for engineers in the U.K. to become professionally registered. However, alongside the significant personal rewards, becoming a Chartered Engineer provides assurance for employers and wider society, in the U.K. and beyond, that engineers listed on the national Register have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and integrity to meet society’s needs. By recognizing the CEng status, licensing bodies outside the U.K. are ensuring that Chartered Engineers are able to bring their proven knowledge, experience, and professional attitude to benefit their society.

The Engineering Council works very closely with numerous international organizations to ensure that its standards are globally recognized and to facilitate the international mobility of registered engineering professionals. Among its international activities, the Engineering Council is the U.K. partner in the International Engineering Alliance, the European Federation of National Engineering Associations, and the European Network for the Accreditation of Engineering Education. It is also the U.K. signatory to the international engineering competence agreements known as the International Professional Engineers Agreement and the International Engineering Technologist Agreement.

More information on accredited courses, guidance, and other resources about professional registration in the United Kingdom, including a digital copy of UK-SPEC, can be found on the Engineering Council’s website (www.engc.org.uk).

As Head of International, Turff leads on facilitating mobility of Engineering Council registrants worldwide. She represents the Engineering Council in the International Engineering Alliance and a number of European organizations.
NCEES BROUGHT TOGETHER A GROUP OF YOUNG professionals this past year to conduct research and provide feedback about engineering and surveying licensure. The 12-member NCEES Emerging Engineers and Surveyors Group included engineering and surveying students, engineering and surveying interns, and recently licensed professional engineers and surveyors, all aged 35 or under. Scott Bishop, P.S., a member of the Utah board, chaired the group, and he did a masterful job of capturing the energy of this group and keeping the conversations on track.

One of the group’s efforts was to create and disseminate a survey to their contemporaries. The survey included questions on what or who motivated them to pursue an engineering or surveying career and impediments in registering for NCEES exams, applying to a state board, or the licensure process in general. More than 1,000 responses were received, and in many cases, they validated our current thinking. Many said that they were encouraged to study engineering or surveying by a family member or friend who was a member of that profession. Most acknowledged a love of math and science and the desire to become a part of a respected profession and one that could offer career advancement and financial security. Not surprisingly, many responded that they wanted to effect change and to have a positive impact on the world around them.

The responses for one question for the engineering participants astounded me. The question was, “When and how did you first hear about the FE exam?” Of the 471 engineering students who responded to the survey, 293 answered this free-response question. Of these, 68 said that they first heard of the FE exam through this survey. So nearly a quarter of those who responded—who are currently pursuing an engineering degree—had never heard of the FE exam or licensure as a professional engineer.

These responses clearly indicate that more needs to be done on engineering campuses to at least make engineering students aware of the licensure process and that a license will be required for them to own or operate an engineering business or to offer professional services directly to the public. I recognize that licensure is not required for all disciplines of engineering, but not providing information about licensure to engineering students does not afford them the opportunity to enhance their career choices and to augment their marketability to future employers.

The most troubling responses from surveying participants involved what they thought of the public perception of the surveying profession. Their responses included:

- The public has no idea what a surveyor actually does.
- They think surveyors are guys in orange vests in the middle of an intersection.
- The public tends to think that surveyors are not very smart and make road construction take too long.
- The public thinks surveying is a necessary evil.

There is a decline in individuals pursuing surveying-related degrees and expressing an interest in the profession. As the survey responses indicate, the surveying profession’s image could be negatively influencing individuals considering a surveying career.

In recent years, NCEES has expended significant funds to promote the value of licensure for both the engineering and surveying professions. NCEES exhibits at many technical conferences and student-led organizations, and we constantly evaluate our communication efforts to ensure that our messaging is in a form and manner that suits the youth of today. This year, the Future of Surveying Task Force is continuing to evaluate the current state of the surveying
profession in terms of what steps can be taken to mitigate the
low number of candidates seeking licensure as professional
surveyors. In January, the task force hosted a forum of 18
surveying-related organizations to identify key strategies to
strengthen the future of the surveying profession, including
boosting the profession’s image and increasing public
awareness about what professional surveyors do and how they
benefit society.

We have distinct concerns in promoting the two professions.
For engineering, our issue is not a lack of potential candidates
to become professional engineers; it is ensuring that
engineering students are aware of the licensure process and
the benefits of being a P.E. For the surveying profession, the
issue is that fewer individuals are pursuing surveying-related
degrees and starting on the path to P.S. licensure. The image
of surveying is one area that NCEES will be focusing on to
promote the profession.

More work is needed, and we must investigate every opportunity
that allows NCEES, member boards, and individuals an occasion
to promote the value of licensure in the engineering and
surveying professions.

NCEES launches national surveying education award

NCEES IS PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE THE INAUGURAL NCEES
Surveying Education Award. This annual award will recognize
surveying programs that best reflect the organization’s mission
to advance licensure for engineers and surveyors in order to
safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

NCEES will award prizes of $10,000 to up to 10 qualifying programs
to assist with each program’s continued efforts to promote the
importance and value of licensure. Surveying education programs
are encouraged to visit ncees.org/surveyingaward to learn more and
complete the application process.

All applications and supporting documentation must be received
by NCEES on or before June 1, 2016. Award recipients will be
notified after July 1, 2016.
WYOMING’S CELEBRATIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH DiscoverE Engineers Week reached a whole new level in 2016. Planning for the effort began in early fall of 2015 when the Wyoming Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors met with representatives from the University of Wyoming College of Engineering and Applied Science and the School of Energy Resources. During that meeting, we decided that the 2016 outreach would focus on third-grade classrooms throughout Wyoming. The intent was to match professional engineers with students to present a STEM-focused course along with a fun hands-on activity. The college of engineering coordinated a “mint mobile” activity, prepared kits for all classrooms, and developed an instructional video for the engineering volunteers.

To help promote the event, we partnered with several entities, including the Wyoming Engineering Society and the Wyoming Department of Education. This high-level support was key in getting the information to teachers and engineering volunteers. Additional support was garnered through a statewide newspaper advertisement and Wyoming Public Radio picking up on the story as interest grew.

The original goal for this first-year event was to reach 50 classrooms. The actual results were even better, with 70 classrooms and more than 1,300 third graders reached. More than 50 professional engineers from across Wyoming volunteered their time. While the statistics are remarkable, the feedback from the teachers and children explains the real impact of the event and its power to inspire.

One teacher from Laramie, Wyoming, offered, “My students absolutely loved every minute of the lesson, as did I. I wish we could make more of our lessons as authentic and engaging as this lesson. We can’t wait to do this again next year!”

Paige, a third grader from Buffalo, Wyoming, wrote the following to the professional engineers that presented in her classroom:

Dear Mr. Hall and Mr. Shavlik, Thank you for building half of our town. You were so nice to my class. I really really want to be an engineer when I grow up. This is what I want to build when I’m older [drew a picture of a building]. Someone said a girl cannot be an engineer; well, times change. Sure, I like necklaces, but that does not mean that I cannot do a boy’s job. You made me realize that girls can do what boys do, and I thought that you made other girls realize that too.

When we shared this note on the board’s Facebook page, the post had more than 2,000 views and spurred several female engineers to leave messages of encouragement for Paige. Additionally, the CEO of KL&A, the firm that employs Mr. Hall and Mr. Shavlik, offered, “We have a place for Paige just as soon as she is ready for it.”

The success of the 2016 events has encouraged the partners to begin planning for 2017. We will be seeking sponsorships to help fund the effort, with the goal of reaching even more classrooms and grade levels.
UPCOMING EVENTS

ARKANSAS
Rodney Williams is a new appointee.

DELAWARE PE
Charles McAllister is a new appointee.

HAWAII
Benedict Lee has been named an interim member.

KANSAS
Shelby Lopez is the new executive director.

MICHIGAN
While Andrew Brisbo remains with the PE and PS boards, Cheryl Pezon now serves as member board administrator.

MINNESOTA
Darcy Hield, Margaret (Meg) Parsons, and Paul Vogel are new appointees. Lyn Berglund, David Landecker, and Paul May are no longer members.

NEBRASKA PE
Jon Wilbeck is now interim executive director, replacing Steve Masters.

NORTH CAROLINA
John Logsdon and Bobbie Shields are new appointees. Nils Joyner Jr. and Teresa Helmlinger Ratcliff are no longer members.

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
Esther Fleming is the new executive director, replacing Florence Sablan.

OHIO
Nelson Kohman is no longer a member.

TENNESSEE PE
Susan Maynor is a new appointee. Ellery Richardson is a new board attorney. Wilson Borden is no longer a member.

TEXAS PE
Emeritus member Jim Nichols passed away February 11 at the age of 92.

WEST VIRGINIA PS
Paul Hill, James (Tom) Rayburn, and Sefton Stewart are new appointees. Mark Hornish, Roy Shrewsbury II, and Anthony Sparacino Jr. are no longer on the board.

MEMBER BOARD NEWS

NCEES OUTREACH

MARCH 29-APRIL 1 Engineering Deans Institute, San Francisco, California

APRIL 1-2 National Association of Engineering Student Councils National Conference, Twin Cities, Minnesota

APRIL 14-15 ABET Symposium, Hollywood, Florida

MAY 24-26 Society of Military Engineers Joint Engineer Training Conference and Expo, Phoenix, Arizona
Save the date for 2016 NCEES annual meeting

Registration will soon open online for member board members and staff attending the 2016 NCEES annual meeting. This year’s meeting will be held August 24–27 in Indianapolis, Indiana.

The NCEES annual meeting is the culmination of the Council’s work for the year. Delegates will meet to decide key licensure issues and take some time to explore Indiana’s capital city. The agenda offers opportunities to

- Vote on the issues at the business sessions, including the election of a new president-elect and motions presented by the 2015–16 NCEES committees and task force
- Take part in the technical workshops for professional engineers and surveyors, member board administrators, law enforcement staff, and first-time attendees
- Discuss professional issues at the forums for engineers, surveyors, MBAs, and enforcement staff
- Learn about NCEES and how to navigate the annual meeting at the first-time attendee luncheon
- Network and share ideas with delegates and guests at social events

Invitations to register online will be sent in early May.