NCEES
advancing licensure for engineers and surveyors

105TH NCEES ANNUAL MEETING

Henderson NEVADA

ACTION ITEMS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS

Action Items and Conference Reports
105th NCEES Annual Meeting
Henderson, Nevada
August 18–21, 2026

Mission
The mission of NCEES is to advance licensure for engineers and surveyors in order to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Vision
The vision of NCEES is to set the global benchmark for professional licensure in engineering and surveying by enabling seamless mobility and safeguarding the public through forward-looking standards.

©2026 by the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying®

Contents

Introduction 1

Annual meeting business agenda 2

Consent agenda 3

Board of directors' positions on all motions 3

Meeting information
Convention rules 7
Provisions of the *Bylaws* relating to the 2026 annual meeting 8
NCEES official motions form 11
Acronyms and abbreviations 12

Officer reports
2025–26 NCEES leadership 14
President's report 15
President-elect's report 17
Treasurer's report 22
Central Zone vice president's report 24
Northeast Zone vice president's report 26
Southern Zone vice president's report 28
Western Zone vice president's report 30
NCEES Foundation chair's report 32
Chief executive officer's report 33

Committee reports with motions
Special Committee on Bylaws 36
Committee on Finances 47
Advisory Committee on Council Activities 64
Committee on Education 72
Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures 80
Committee on Law Enforcement 92
Committee on Licensure 98
Committee on Member Board Administrators 110
Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines 118
Structural Practice Task Force 129

Committee reports without motions
Committee on Awards 142
Committee on Examination Audit 144
Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers 146
Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors 149
Mission Initiatives Task Force 152

New business 156

Unfinished business 157

Introduction

This publication includes all officer, committee, and task force reports from the 2025–26 fiscal year, along with the motions that will be presented for Council vote at the annual meeting. The proposed 2026–27 operating and capital budgets are also included. We encourage all member boards to review these reports and motions so that your board can decide on its vote before the annual meeting.

The latest meeting information and resources are posted at ncees.org/annual_meeting.

Please contact NCEES if you have questions about any reports or motions so we can respond before the annual meeting.

Sincerely,

Davy McDowell, P.E.
NCEES Chief Executive Officer

Annual Meeting Business Agenda

NCEES President Elizabeth Beckett, P.E., presiding

Wednesday, August 19

9:00–10:45 a.m., Business Session 1

Call to order
Welcome
Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation
Introduction of NCEES board of directors and past presidents
Quorum report
Introduction of guests from other organizations
Announcements and practice motions
Officer reports

- President
- President-elect
  - Actions taken by board of directors
  - Approval of 2025 annual meeting minutes
  - Approval of consent agenda
- Treasurer
- Central Zone vice president
- Northeast Zone vice president
- Southern Zone vice president
- Western Zone vice president
- Chair of the NCEES Foundation board of directors
- Chief executive officer
  - Speeches from nominees for 2026–27 president-elect (if election is contested)
  - Speeches from nominees for 2026–29 treasurer

Thursday, August 20

9:00–10:00 a.m., Business Session 2

Call to order
Introduction of new motions to agenda
Election of 2026–27 president-elect
Committee and task force reports with motions

- Special Committee on Bylaws (15 motions)
- Committee on Finances (9 motions)
- Advisory Committee on Council Activities (10 motions)

11:30 a.m.–12:15 p.m., Business Session 3

Call to order
Committee and task force reports with motions (continued)

- Committee on Education (6 motions)
- Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (18 motions)
- Committee on Law Enforcement (2 motions)

2:00–4:00 p.m., Business Session 4

Call to order
Committee and task force reports with motions (continued)

- Committee on Licensure (10 motions)
- Committee on Member Board Administrators (4 motions)
- Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (13 motions)
- Structural Practice Task Force (6 motions)

Board of directors motions (3 motions)
New business
Unfinished business

- Approval of budgets

Consent Agenda

The board of directors endorses the following motions as potential consent items. Council delegates will be asked to approve the individual motions on the consent agenda. It is proposed that this ratification be made with a single motion. However, any member board may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and returned to the non-consent agenda for separate consideration and action by the Council.

- Bylaws..... Motions 1–15
- Finance..... Motions 1–7, 9
- ACCA..... Motions 1–5, 9–10
- Education..... Motions 1, 3–6
- EPP..... Motions 1–6, 8–11, 13–18
- Law Enforcement..... Motions 1–2
- Licensure..... Motions 1–9
- MBA..... Motions 2–4
- UPLG..... Motions 1–13
- SPTF..... Motions 1–6
- Board of directors..... Motions 1–3

Board of Directors' Positions on All Motions

Motion number	Topic	Board of directors' position	Consent agenda	Page number
Bylaws 1	Amend *Bylaws* 3.03	Endorses	Yes	39
Bylaws 2	Amend *Bylaws* 3.04	Endorses	Yes	39
Bylaws 3	Amend *Bylaws* 4.04	Endorses	Yes	40
Bylaws 4	Amend *Bylaws* 4.06	Endorses	Yes	40
Bylaws 5	Amend *Bylaws* 6.02	Endorses	Yes	41
Bylaws 6	Amend *Bylaws* 7.01	Endorses	Yes	42
Bylaws 7	Amend *Bylaws* 7.05	Endorses	Yes	43
Bylaws 8	Amend *Bylaws* 7.06	Endorses	Yes	43
Bylaws 9	Amend *Bylaws* 7.07	Endorses	Yes	44
Bylaws 10	Amend *Bylaws* 3.021	Endorses	Yes	44
Bylaws 11	Amend *Bylaws* 7.01	Endorses	Yes	45
Bylaws 12	Amend *Bylaws* 7.02	Endorses	Yes	45
Bylaws 13	Amend *Bylaws* 7.08	Endorses	Yes	45
Bylaws 14	Amend *Bylaws* 7.11	Endorses	Yes	46
Bylaws 15	Amend *Bylaws* 7.12	Endorses	Yes	46
Finance 1	Postpone adoption of operating budget	Endorses	Yes	52
Finance 2	Postpone adoption of capital budget	Endorses	Yes	52
Finance 3	Approve $100,000 contribution to NCEES Foundation	Endorses	Yes	52

Motion number	Topic	Board of directors' position	Consent agenda	Page number
Finance 4	Approve $8.6 million transfer to NCEES Foundation	Endorses	Yes	53
Finance 5	Amend FP 1C	Endorses	Yes	53
Finance 6	Amend FP 1D	Endorses	Yes	54
Finance 7	Amend FP 6	Endorses	Yes	54
Finance 8	Amend FP 6	Endorses	No	55
Finance 9	Amend FP 3B	Endorses	Yes	55
ACCA 1	Amend AP 3	Endorses	Yes	67
ACCA 2	Amend AP 18	Endorses	Yes	67
ACCA 3	Amend PP 2	Endorses	Yes	68
ACCA 4	Amend PP 5	Endorses	Yes	68
ACCA 5	Charge Bylaws Committee to amend *Bylaws* 4.04	Endorses	Yes	69
ACCA 6	Amend AP 8B	Does not endorse	No	69
ACCA 7	Amend AP 8C	Does not endorse	No	70
ACCA 8	Amend AP 8D	Does not endorse	No	70
ACCA 9	Charge Bylaws Committee to add non-voting language for ex-officio members in *Bylaws*	Endorses	Yes	71
ACCA 10	Charge UPLG to amend *Model Law* 120.20	Endorses	Yes	71
Education 1	Amend NCEES Credentials Evaluations Policies	Endorses	Yes	75
Education 2	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a	Endorses	No	75
Education 3	Amend PS 2.8	Endorses	Yes	77
Education 4	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 240.30 C	Endorses	Yes	78
Education 5	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 240.30 B	Endorses	Yes	78
Education 6	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 240.30 J	Endorses	Yes	79
EPP 1	Amend EDP 3A	Endorses	Yes	82
EPP 2	Amend EDP 3E	Endorses	Yes	82
EPP 3	Amend EDP 3G	Endorses	Yes	83
EPP 4	Amend EDP 4A–C	Endorses	Yes	83
EPP 5	Amend EDP 5A–B	Endorses	Yes	84
EPP 6	Amend EDP 6A	Endorses	Yes	84
EPP 7	Amend EAP 1C	Endorses	No	85

Motion number	Topic	Board of directors' position	Consent agenda	Page number
EPP 8	Amend EAP 6	Endorses	Yes	85
EPP 9	Amend EAP 7D	Endorses	Yes	86
EPP 10	Amend EDP 7A	Endorses	Yes	86
EPP 11	Amend EDP 7E–F	Endorses	Yes	87
EPP 12	Adopt EDP on reinstatement of suspended exam	Endorses	No	87
EPP 13	Delete EDP 7G	Endorses	Yes	88
EPP 14	Amend EDP 4E–F	Endorses	Yes	88
EPP 15	Amend EDP 5D	Endorses	Yes	89
EPP 16	Amend EDP 6C–D	Endorses	Yes	90
EPP 17	Amend EDP 8	Endorses	Yes	91
EPP 18	Delete EDP 12	Endorses	Yes	91
Law Enforcement 1	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 130.10 A.1	Endorses	Yes	96
Law Enforcement 2	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 240.15 A.8	Endorses	Yes	96
Licensure 1	Adopt PS on experience reporting guidelines and definitions for professional surveying licensure	Endorses	Yes	103
Licensure 2	Amend PS 4.2	Endorses	Yes	103
Licensure 3	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 110.20 J–K	Endorses	Yes	104
Licensure 4	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 240.20 H–I	Endorses	Yes	104
Licensure 5	Charge UPLG Committee to delete *Model Law* 140.30	Endorses	Yes	105
Licensure 6	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 230.20 A.7	Endorses	Yes	105
Licensure 7	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 230.20 A.9–10	Endorses	Yes	105
Licensure 8	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 230.20 B.10–11	Endorses	Yes	106
Licensure 9	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 230.40 B.2 and D.2	Endorses	Yes	106
Licensure 10	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 130.10 B.2.a(2)	Does not endorse	No	107
MBA 1	Charge Bylaws Committee to add non-voting MBE to board of directors in *Bylaws*	Does not endorse	No	113
MBA 2	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 120.80 A–B	Endorses	Yes	116

Motion number	Topic	Board of directors' position	Consent agenda	Page number
MBA 3	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Rules* 230.60 D	Endorses	Yes	117
MBA 4	Charge NCEES staff to create committee impact award	Endorses	Yes	117
UPLG 1	Amend *Model Rules* 220.10 C	Endorses	Yes	122
UPLG 2	Amend *Model Rules* 230.20 A	Endorses	Yes	122
UPLG 3	Amend *Model Rules* 230.60 A.4	Endorses	Yes	123
UPLG 4	Amend *Model Rules* 230.20 A.6	Endorses	Yes	123
UPLG 5	Amend *Model Rules* 230.20 B	Endorses	Yes	124
UPLG 6	Amend *Model Rules* 230.20 B.4	Endorses	Yes	124
UPLG 7	Amend *Model Rules* 230.30 A	Endorses	Yes	125
UPLG 8	Amend *Model Rules* 230.40 A	Endorses	Yes	125
UPLG 9	Amend *Model Rules* 230.40 H	Endorses	Yes	126
UPLG 10	Amend *Model Rules* 240.30 G	Endorses	Yes	126
UPLG 11	Amend *Model Rules* 240.30 I	Endorses	Yes	127
UPLG 12	Amend *Model Law* 110.20 S	Endorses	Yes	127
UPLG 13	Amend *Model Rules* 230.60 E	Endorses	Yes	128
SPTF 1	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 110.20 A.3	Endorses	Yes	135
SPTF 2	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 110.20	Endorses	Yes	135
SPTF 3	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* 110.20 A.3	Endorses	Yes	137
SPTF 4	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a(1)	Endorses	Yes	138
SPTF 5	Charge UPLG Committee to amend *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a(3)	Endorses	Yes	138
SPTF 6	Charge UPLG Committee to move *Model Law* Appendix D into 130.10 and to review *Model Rules* Appendix F for incorporation into 230.40 and 230.60	Endorses	Yes	139
BOD 1	Amend FP 3C	Endorses	Yes	20
BOD 2	Approve POLC application of ECL-USA	Endorses	Yes	20
BOD 3	Amend FP 3B	Endorses	Yes	21

Convention Rules

- In accordance with NCEES *Bylaws* 6.05, Rules of Order, "The Council shall be governed by the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* when not in conflict with the *Bylaws*. The presiding officer shall rule on all questions pertaining to the *Bylaws* and rules of order in the conduct of the meetings. The President may appoint a parliamentarian to assist the presiding officer."
- Individuals who desire to address the annual meeting delegates shall approach a microphone and wait to be recognized by the chair. When recognized, they will give their name and the name of their member board or organization.
- Any delegate wishing to make additions or changes to the published agenda must email the addition to Chief Executive Officer Davy McDowell at dmcdowell@ncees.org or Chief Operating Officer Jason Gamble at jgamble@ncees.org no later than 8:00 a.m. (PDT) on Thursday, August 20.
- All main motions, except those made by a committee, a task force, or the NCEES board of directors, shall be in writing on the official motions form. The official motions form is on page 11 of this publication. It is also available for download at ncees.org/annual_meeting. NCEES staff will place a printed copy at each member board placard and email a copy to all registered meeting attendees prior to the start of business session 2.
- Motions proposed by committees, task forces, zones, and the board of directors do not need a second. Motions and amendments proposed by individuals/member boards do require a second.
- In all cases, the maker of the motion or resolution shall be entitled to speak first. The chair will then ask for those who wish to speak in favor and then those who wish to speak against the motion or resolution in alternating fashion. This procedure will continue until there are no persons desiring to speak on one side of the question, at which time debate will cease and the issue will be voted on.
- A delegate who moves to close debate must do so immediately upon recognition by the presiding officer. A delegate may not first make comments in favor or opposed to the motion on the floor and then move to close debate at the end of those comments.
- For contested offices, each candidate will be permitted to make a five-minute speech during business session 1. Immediately following the speech, each candidate will be given five minutes to answer questions from the floor.
- Where there is only one candidate for election, a ballot vote may be dispensed with and an election by acclamation shall be held. However, upon the request of a single member, a ballot vote will be conducted electronically.
- A consent agenda shall be presented to the delegates for adoption without debate. Upon request of a single member board, any item may be removed from the consent agenda for separate consideration and action by the Council.
- Voting on motions and the election of officers will be conducted using the electronic voting keypads placed at each board's placard. In accordance with NCEES *Bylaws* 6.02, Quorum and Voting, "Only Member Boards shall be entitled to vote. Voting shall be by Member Boards, with each board entitled to one vote."
- An associate member may serve as a member board delegate for voting purposes only when so designated by the board's chair through written, signed communication presented to NCEES staff prior to the opening session of the meeting. For boards that require authorization from the state, such designation may come from the agency director for that board.
- A majority vote of the member boards voting shall be required for affirmative action on all motions except for amendments to the *Bylaws*. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of member boards voting shall be required to adopt amendments to the *Bylaws*.
- Any *Bylaws* amendment that is adopted shall take effect immediately.
- Should any delegate have an emergency that requires early departure from the meeting, the delegate must notify a member of the NCEES staff before departing.

Provisions of the *Bylaws* Relating to the 2026 Annual Meeting

Section 3.01 Member Boards. A Member Board of NCEES shall be a State Board, as defined in Article 1, Section 1.02, which is a member of the Council. Acceptance of a Member Board shall be by majority vote of the Council. Member Boards shall pay fees as set forth in the *Bylaws*.

Section 3.02 Members. A Member of NCEES shall be a person who is a member of a Member Board.

Section 3.021 Associate Members. An Associate Member of NCEES shall be a designee of a Member Board, but not a member of a Member Board, who is appointed by the NCEES Board of Directors as an Associate Member of NCEES.

Member board administrators shall automatically be designated as Associate Members. Recommendations for other Associate Members shall be submitted by Member Boards to the Board of Directors and become effective upon appointment by the Board of Directors. Such appointments shall be reviewed annually by each Member Board and shall remain in effect until the Board of Directors is notified otherwise by the Member Board.

Associate Members shall have the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Council.

Section 3.022 Emeritus Members. An Emeritus Member of NCEES shall be a person who is a former member of a Member Board who is duly recommended by that Member Board and approved by the NCEES Board of Directors. Such appointments shall be reviewed annually by each Member Board and shall remain in effect until the Board of Directors is notified otherwise by the Member Board.

Emeritus Members shall have the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Council.

Section 3.05 Delegates. A Delegate shall be a Member or an Associate Member designated by a Member Board to represent it at meetings of the Council. A Member Board may have as many Delegates as it has members but may cast only the number of votes prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Any Delegate shall have the privilege of the floor. Only Delegates may make motions or propose amendments to motions.

Section 4.04 Elections and Terms of Office. The President-Elect shall be elected by the Council at each Annual Business Meeting in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. The President-Elect shall serve the Council for a period of three years. The first year shall be as President-Elect. The second year, without further election, the President-Elect shall become President, holding that office until a successor has been installed. The third year, without further election, the President shall become Immediate Past President. Any Member elected to the office of President-Elect shall be eligible to serve as President-Elect, President, and Immediate Past President, with full authority of the offices and board privileges. Past Presidents shall be ineligible for reelection as President-Elect of the Council.

The Treasurer shall be elected at the Annual Business Meeting every three years in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Treasurers shall not be eligible for reelection to the same office until at least one full term has elapsed. For the office of Treasurer, a partial term served shall not be considered a term for term-limit purposes.

Vice Presidents shall be elected at their respective Zone Interim Meeting every two years in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Vice Presidents from the Northeast and Southern Zones shall be elected in odd-numbered years. Vice Presidents from the Central and Western Zones shall be elected in even-numbered years. Vice Presidents shall not be eligible for reelection to the same office until at least one full term has elapsed. For the office of Vice President, a partial term served shall not be considered a term for term-limit purposes.

New members of the Board of Directors shall assume their duties at the conclusion of the Annual Business Meeting. Board members may continue to serve until the conclusion of the term of office to which they were elected even if their terms with Member Boards have ended.

Section 4.05 Qualifications. Any Member who is a citizen of the United States and a member of a Member Board sometime during the calendar year in which the nomination occurs is eligible to hold an elective office. Associate Members are not eligible to serve on the NCEES Board of Directors.

To be eligible for the office of President-Elect, a person shall be a licensed engineer or surveyor, shall have been a Member at least three years, and shall have attended at least two NCEES Annual Business Meetings.

Members of the current Board of Directors whose term on their Member Board has expired may run for President-Elect if

- They have obtained emeritus standing within the Council; and
- They have the approval of their Member Board; and
- It is their zone's rotation to elect a President-Elect; and
- They have been nominated by the zone.

The President-Elect shall not be from the same zone as the President.

To be eligible for the office of Treasurer, a person shall be a licensed professional engineer, licensed professional surveyor, or public member.

To be eligible for the office of Vice President, a person shall be a licensed professional engineer or surveyor and shall be from the zone that elects them.

Section 5.01 President. The President shall be the chair of the Board of Directors and shall preside over all meetings of the Board as well as the Annual Business Meeting of the Council. The President shall be an ex-officio member of all committees and task forces of the Council. The President shall perform all other duties ordinarily pertaining to the office of President. The President shall prepare and present to the Council at the Annual Business Meeting a report of the President's activities during the term of office.

The President shall appoint all members, chairs, vice-chairs, and consultants of the standing committees as defined in Article 7 of the *Bylaws*. The President shall also appoint all members, chairs, vice-chairs, and consultants of special committees and task forces unless specific action of the Council or of the Board of Directors names the personnel of the committee or task force. The President shall also appoint one member of the Board of Directors to serve as board liaison to each standing committee, special committee, and task force. The President shall appoint all official representatives of the Council to any other organizations. If needed during the annual meeting, the President shall appoint a Tellers Committee for the election of the President-Elect and/or Treasurer.

If the President is absent, the President-Elect will serve as the acting President in accordance with *Bylaws* 5.02. If both the President and the President-Elect are absent, the Vice President from the zone that will be nominating the next President-Elect will serve as the acting President. The acting President shall have all powers of the President while serving in this capacity.

Section 6.01 Annual Business Meetings. The Annual Business Meeting of the Council shall be held at the time and place selected by the Board of Directors.

Notice of the Annual Business Meeting shall be provided to each Member Board, Member, Associate Member, Past President, Emeritus Member, International Affiliate Organization, and Participating Organization not less than four weeks prior to each meeting.

The Board of Directors shall prepare a consent agenda for each Annual Business Meeting. Individual motions may be removed from the consent agenda upon request by any Member Board.

Section 6.02 Quorum and Voting. A quorum for the transaction of business at an Annual Business Meeting of the Council shall be Delegates from a majority of Member Boards. A majority of the Member Boards voting shall be required for affirmative action unless otherwise provided for in the *Bylaws*.

Only Member Boards shall be entitled to vote. Voting shall be by Member Boards, with each board entitled to one vote. An Associate Member may serve as a Member Board Delegate for voting purposes only when so designated by the Member Board's chair through written, signed communication presented to NCEES staff prior to the opening session of the meeting. For Member Boards that require authorization from the State, such designation may come from the agency director for that board.

Proxy voting shall not be permitted.

Section 6.05 Rules of Order. The Council shall be governed by the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* when not in conflict with the *Bylaws*. The presiding officer shall rule on all questions pertaining to the *Bylaws* and rules of order in the conduct of the meetings. The President may appoint a parliamentarian to assist the presiding officer.

The order of business for the Annual Business Meeting shall be established by the President and published as part of the meeting agenda prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Section 9.01 Budget Preparation. The Committee on Finances shall submit a recommended annual budget for review by the Board of Directors. The Committee on Finances will present the budget as part of its committee report for Council approval at the Annual Meeting.

The fiscal year shall begin on October 1 and extend through September 30 of the following calendar year.

Section 10.012 Inactive Status. Any Member Board in arrears in membership fees 90 days prior to the Annual Business Meeting shall be placed in an inactive status by the Board of Directors. Member Boards in an inactive status shall not be entitled to vote. Individual members of Member Boards may not hold office or serve on committees. Representatives of boards in inactive status may attend meetings of the Council and may have the privilege of the floor. To be reinstated to an active status and to all the rights and privileges pertaining thereto, an inactive Member Board shall pay all fees and assessments in arrears plus those that have accrued during such inactive status period.

Section 11.01 Nominations. A nomination for the office of President-Elect shall be presented to the Board of Directors by the respective zone Vice President as voted on by the respective zone at its Zone Interim Meeting. The order of rotation for President-Elect shall be Northeast Zone, Central Zone, Southern Zone, and Western Zone.

Member Boards may submit nominations for qualified Treasurer candidates in the third year of the outgoing Treasurer's term. These nominations shall be filed with the Chief Executive Officer not later than 60 days prior to the opening of the Annual Business Meeting.

Any Delegate shall have the privilege of making nominations for President-Elect and Treasurer from the floor. Such nominees from the floor must meet the requirements set out in Section 4.05 and be seconded by at least four Member Boards.

Section 11.02 Tellers Committee. The Tellers Committee shall consist of five members, including a chair and one representative from each zone. No member of the committee is eligible to serve as a teller for an election in which they are a candidate. The Tellers Committee will tabulate the results for all votes taken and report the results to the President.

Section 11.03 Voting. All elections shall be by ballot at the Annual Business Meeting. All elections shall be by a majority of votes cast unless otherwise stipulated by the *Bylaws*.

Section 12.02 Amendments. The *Bylaws* may be amended at any Annual Business Meeting by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Member Boards voting. Any amendment proposed shall be sent to a Special Committee on Bylaws by the President at the President's initiative or as requested based on action by the Council. Any amendments recommended by a Special Committee on Bylaws shall be submitted to all Member Boards at least 60 days prior to the date of the earliest zone meeting preceding the next Annual Business Meeting. Voting shall be by sections. All sections shall be considered in their proposed form, including punctuation and verbiage. Changes to the published amendments will not be permitted during the Annual Business Meeting. Copies of the proposed amendments to be voted upon shall be distributed in written form to Delegates at the Annual Business Meeting.

Section 12.021 Effective Date of Amendments. An amendment to the *Bylaws* shall become effective upon certification by the presiding officer at the Annual Business Meeting of a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Member Boards voting.

NCEES Official Motions Form

2026 NCEES Annual Meeting

Instructions

- Any delegate wishing to make additions or changes to the published agenda must email the addition to Chief Executive Officer Davy McDowell, P.E., at dmcdowell@ncees.org or Chief Operating Officer Jason Gamble, P.E., at jgamble@ncees.org no later than 8:00 a.m. (PDT) on Thursday, August 20.
- All main motions—except those made by a committee, a task force, or the NCEES board of directors—shall be in writing on this official motions form. NCEES staff will place a printed copy at each member board placard and email a copy to all registered meeting attendees prior to the start of business session 2. The electronic version of this form can be downloaded from ncees.org/annual_meeting.

Print name: _____ Member board: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Madam President, I request the privilege of the floor to make the following motion.

MOVE THAT:

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AAEES	American Academy of Environmental Engineers and Scientists
ABET	Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.
ACCA	Advisory Committee on Council Activities
ACEC	American Council of Engineering Companies
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AEI	Architectural Engineering Institute of ASCE
AIA	American Institute of Architects
AIChE	American Institute of Chemical Engineers
AIME	American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers
ANS	American Nuclear Society
ANSAC/ABET	Applied and Natural Science Accreditation Commission of ABET
AP	NCEES administrative policy
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
APEGA	Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta
APEGBC	Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia
APEGM	Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Manitoba
APEGNB	Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of New Brunswick
APEGS	Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan
ARPL	Alliance for Responsible Professional Licensing
ASABE	American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
ASEE	American Society for Engineering Education
ASHRAE	American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers
ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
ASPE	American Society of Plumbing Engineers
ASPRS	American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing
AUC	American University in Cairo
AUS	American University of Sharjah
CBT	Computer-based testing
CEAB	Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board
CESB	Council of Engineering and Scientific Specialty Boards
CIDQ	Council for Interior Design Qualification
CIE	Chinese Institute of Engineers (Taiwan)
CLARB	Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards
CLEAR	Council on Licensure, Enforcement, and Regulation
CLSA	California Land Surveyors Association
CPC	Continuing professional competency
CSBSR	Colonial States Boards of Surveyor Registration
E.I.	Engineer intern
E.I.T.	Engineer-in-training
EAC/ABET	Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET
EAP	NCEES examination administration policy
ECL-USA	Engineering Change Lab-USA
EDP	NCEES examination development policy
EES	Egyptian Engineers Syndicate
EPE	Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers
EPP	Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures
EPS	Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors
ETAC/ABET	Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET
EWB–USA	Engineers Without Borders USA
EWeek	DiscoverE Engineers Week
FE exam	Fundamentals of Engineering examination
FP	NCEES financial policy
FS exam	Fundamentals of Surveying examination
ICOR	Interorganizational Council on Regulation
IEA	International Engineering Alliance
IEEE-USA	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers-USA

IISE	Institute of Industrial and Systems Engineers
IPEA	International Professional Engineers Agreement
ISA	International Society of Automation
ITU	Istanbul Technical University
JPEC	Japan PE/FE Examiners Council
KPEA	Korean Professional Engineers Association
L.S.	Land surveyor
L.S.I.	Land surveyor intern
L.S.I.T.	Land-surveyor-in-training
MBA	Member board administrator
MBE	Member board executive
MLE	Model Law Engineer
MLS	Model Law Surveyor
MLSE	Model Law Structural Engineer
MSPS	Michigan Society of Professional Surveyors
NAE	National Academy of Engineering
NAFE	National Academy of Forensic Engineers
NCARB	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
NCEES	National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying
NCSEA	National Council of Structural Engineers Associations
NICET	National Institute for Certification in Engineering Technologies
NIEE	National Institute for Engineering Ethics
NSAE	National Society of Architectural Engineers
NSBE	National Society of Black Engineers
NSPE	National Society of Professional Engineers
NSPS	National Society of Professional Surveyors
PAKS	Professional activities and knowledge study
P.E.	Professional engineer
PE exam	Principles and Practice of Engineering examination
P.L.S.	Professional land surveyor
POLC	Participating Organizations Liaison Council
PP	NCEES professional policy
PS	NCEES position statement
P.S.	Professional surveyor
PS exam	Principles and Practice of Surveying examination
SaGES	Surveying and Geomatics Educators Society
SAME	Society of American Military Engineers
SCE	Saudi Council of Engineers
S.E.	Structural engineer
SELC	Structural Engineering Licensure Coalition
SEI	Structural Engineering Institute of ASCE
SFPE	Society of Fire Protection Engineers
SHPE	Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers
S.I.	Surveyor intern
S.I.T.	Surveyor-in-training
SME	Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration
SNAME	Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers
SPE	Society of Petroleum Engineers
SWE	Society of Women Engineers
TAMUQ	Texas A&M University at Qatar
TMS	The Minerals, Metals, and Materials Society
UESI	Utility Engineering and Surveying Institute of ASCE
UPLG	Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines

2025–26 NCEES Leadership

BOARD OF DIRECTORS/OFFICERS

President
Elizabeth Beckett, P.E.
Alaska

President-Elect
Samuel Wilson, DBA, P.E.
District of Columbia

Immediate Past President
Andrew Zoutewelle, P.L.S.
North Carolina

Treasurer
Karl Tonander, P.E.
New Mexico

Central Zone Vice President
Jason Suelter, P.E., S.E.
Nebraska

Northeast Zone Vice President
Azuanuka (Azu) Etoniru, P.E., P.L.S.
Massachusetts

Southern Zone Vice President
Chimin (Jimmy) Chao, P.E.
South Carolina

Western Zone Vice President
Aaron Blaisdell, P.L.S.
Washington

Secretary/Chief Executive Officer
Davy McDowell, P.E.
South Carolina

ZONE ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENTS

Central Zone
James Hollandsworth, P.E., P.S.
Michigan

Northeast Zone
Rosaleen (Rosey) Nogle, P.E.
New York

Southern Zone
Steven Twedt, P.E.
Mississippi

Western Zone
Scott Sayles, P.E.
Arizona

ZONE SECRETARIES

Central Zone
Colleen Scholl, P.E.
Wisconsin

Northeast Zone
Jeanne Nebre, P.S.
Maryland

Southern Zone
Linda Bergeron, P.E.
Louisiana

Western Zone
Perry Valdez
New Mexico

President's Report

Elizabeth Beckett, P.E.

The past year has been one of purposeful alignment between the Council's mission, its operational activities, and its long-term strategic direction. At the outset of my term as president, I outlined my priorities to strengthen the pipeline into the engineering and surveying professions, expand engagement with professional societies, and create purposeful mission initiatives. The work of the Council this year reflects a focused effort to advance these priorities.

Strengthening the pipeline

A central focus of this year has been strengthening the connection between education and licensure. While recruitment into engineering and surveying remains important, the greater challenge lies in ensuring that students and early-career professionals view licensure as an essential component of their careers. These efforts are intended to move licensure earlier into the professional lifecycle, shifting it from a post-graduation consideration to an expected milestone. To address this, the Council has

- Expanded engagement with academic institutions to reinforce the role of licensure in professional responsibility
- Continued investment in outreach initiatives through the NCEES Foundation and aligned organizations
- Emphasized the integration of the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) and Fundamentals of Surveying (FS) exams into the educational pathway and supported FE and FS exam preparation through the expansion of the interactive practice exams

Expand engagement with professional societies

Professional societies play a critical role in shaping professional identity. Increased engagement with these groups will reinforce the message that licensure is fundamental to professional practice. The Participating Organizations Liaison Council provided one venue for aligning our engagement with these groups, and we look forward to additional collaborations.

Mission initiatives

An increased emphasis was placed on internally driven mission initiatives this year. The establishment of a Mission Initiatives Task Force created a mechanism for identifying and advancing efforts that align directly with the Council's mission and complement the work of the NCEES Foundation by enabling the Council to take a more active role in advancing mission-related goals.

The task force provided recommendations to the board of directors, with areas of focus including

- Responding to external threats to licensure
- Strengthening the future workforce
- Partnering with mission-aligned external organizations
- Enhancing public awareness of the role of licensed professionals

Strategic plan development and implementation

One of the most significant accomplishments of the past year has been the development of a new NCEES strategic plan. The process was designed to be inclusive and forward-looking. Input was gathered from exam development volunteers, member board members and administrators, NCEES leadership, and stakeholders.

The resulting framework is organized around four strategic priorities:

- Safeguard public protection: To protect the public, NCEES will advocate for licensure with policymakers and defend against efforts to weaken or eliminate licensure.
- Champion licensure: NCEES will ensure tomorrow's licensees exist by expanding outreach to future engineers and surveyors and reinforcing the value of becoming licensed.
- Encourage mobility: NCEES will build trust and consistency across boards and expand mutual recognition and international mobility.

- Foster agility: Exams must remain relevant, defensible, and current to protect member boards from outdated standards claims. NCEES will continuously evaluate licensure pathways and support lifelong professional growth and upskilling.

The strategic plan establishes a structure for long-term progress and provides continuity across leadership cycles.

In closing

We must continue to modernize licensure processes in response to workforce and technological change, expand efforts to communicate the value of licensure to key stakeholders, further improve mobility and consistency across jurisdictions, and ensure that NCEES remains a resilient and adaptive organization.

I want to thank my fellow board members, committee and exam development volunteers, and NCEES staff for their dedication and professionalism. The strength of this organization lies in the collective commitment of its members to serve the public and the professions. Together, we are not only sustaining the value of licensure, we are shaping its future.

President-Elect's Report

Samuel Wilson, DBA, P.E.

It has been both an honor and a pleasure to serve as your president-elect this past year. The year has been informative and interesting, with unique challenges along the way.

I must start by acknowledging the hard work of the board of directors. The dedication and diligence of the board have been inspirational. I am grateful to President Elizabeth Beckett, P.E.; Immediate Past President Andrew Zoutewelle, P.L.S.; Treasurer Karl Tonander, P.E.; and our zone vice presidents for their leadership and collaboration. Their work has positioned us well for the year ahead. The staff of NCEES has been a pleasure to work with; their professionalism and dedication are outstanding. I especially applaud the work of Chief Executive Officer Davy McDowell, P.E., and Chief Operating Officer Jason Gamble, P.E.

The past year has been busy. There has been a great deal of learning and preparing to make certain that we are well positioned for the work we will undertake in 2026–27 to strengthen licensure, support our member boards, and advance the mission of NCEES to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of the public. I have attended meetings of the NCEES Committee on Education and Committee on Finances. Both committees have done excellent work. I have also been involved in outreach. I have spoken to college student groups on the benefits of professional licensure. I participated in MATHCOUNTS competitions and the DiscoverE Future City Competition finals.

Chief among the president-elect's duties is working with staff to develop committee appointments and charges for the next year. We will review the preliminary charges and finalize them after the annual meeting concludes. The responses to the committee preference survey were outstanding, and we have worked to develop committee assignments that align with the Council's goals and place volunteers on the committees they are most interested in serving on. The task was not easy, and I hope those who are not on committees this year volunteer for their zone committees and do not hesitate to fill out the survey next year. The number of volunteers who work together to advance the NCEES mission is outstanding.

The year ahead will present us with many challenges. Some of these challenges include ongoing concerns about increasing pressure on boards from legislative and deregulatory forces, incorporating emerging technologies in a safe environment that protects the public, and the increasing threat of bad actors using artificial intelligence to defraud the public by stealing licensee identities. We must confront our future dilemma—decreasing numbers of engineering students—and invest in the best ways to maintain sufficient numbers of qualified professionals to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In closing, I would like to thank all of you for your service on your state board and your belief in licensure and commitment to protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Board of Directors Action Items

Action items from the fifth meeting of the 2024–25 board of directors
August 18, 2025, New Orleans, Louisiana

- Approved minutes of the fourth meeting of the 2024–25 board of directors
- Approved appointment of emeritus and associate members
- Ratified transfer of $23,618 to the NCEES Foundation for use in the 2024–25 funding cycle
- Approved appointment of 2025–26 NCEES Foundation officers
- Approved co-signing the amicus curiae brief written by the American Council of Engineering Companies of California

Action items from the first meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
August 22, 2025, New Orleans, Louisiana

- Approved proposed resolution authorizing the CEO to execute contracts and other documents on behalf of the board and to select banks or other thrift institutions for the deposit of Council funds
- Approved appointment of emeritus members

Action items from the second meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
October 23–24, 2025, Catalina Island, California

- Approved minutes of the fifth meeting of the 2024–25 board of directors
- Approved minutes of the first meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
- Approved appointment of emeritus members
- Ratified ABET commission representatives for the term of August 1, 2026–July 31, 2027
- Approved Participating Organizations Liaison Council dues
- Approved International Affiliate Organizations dues
- Approved exam item replacement costs for 2025–26 as $4,267 for each computer-based testing item and approved $8.28 million in designated assets as replacement costs in the event of a total exam breach
- Approved slate of International Engineering Alliance delegates as presented, noting Brian Robertson II, P.E.; Marie Nebesky; and Patty Mamola, P.E., as additional attendees, with the president having the option to name one additional attendee
- Approved revisions to the *Zone Meeting and Continuity Guidelines* as presented with one amendment to keep zone leadership included as a responsible party in the development of the budget

Action items from special meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
December 2, 2025, Virtual

- Approved NCEES Procedure for Hiring a Lobbyist with noted modifications

Action items from the third meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
February 19–20, 2026, Washington, D.C.

- Approved minutes of the second meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
- Approved minutes of the December 2, 2025, virtual meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
- Approved appointment of emeritus members
- Approved audit report of the 2024–25 NCEES financial records
- Ratified NCEES Procedure for Hiring a Lobbyist
- Accepted the recommendation from the Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors to move forward with PS Geospatial exam development
- Approved sending up to two delegates to the International Federation of Surveyors World Congress meeting in Cape Town, South Africa, in June 2026, with a budget variance in the amount of $30,000 to cover associated expenses
- Approved the mission, vision, core values and strategic pillars as presented in the strategic plan
- Approved the proposed dates and locations for the 2028 zone interim meetings
- Approved proposed dates and location for the 2028 annual meeting
- Approved payment of a funding request in the amount of $25,000 to Engineering Change Lab-USA for participation in its corporate partnership program

- Reappointed Brian Hanson, P.E., and Sina Nejad, P.E., to a three-year term on the NCEES Foundation board of directors, pending their confirmation of interest, for the term October 1, 2026, through September 30, 2029
- Approved NCEES Foundation Board Member Selection Procedure with a noted modification
- Waived Financial Policy 6 for travel to the 2026 International Engineering Alliance and 2026 Federation of International Surveyors meetings
- Approved establishment of a steering committee regarding the Island Initiative to develop the insular summit and report back to the board with a proposed agenda and more detailed budget

Action items from the fourth meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
May 16–17, 2026, Columbus, Ohio

- Approved minutes of the third meeting of the 2025–26 board of directors
- Ratified modifications to the NCEES investment portfolio allocation
- Approved appointment of emeritus and associate members
- Allocated up to $346,852.65 from the discretionary outreach fund to increase the 2025–26 Foundation spending limit
- Approved revised Travel Policy with noted modification
- Added Insular Initiative (formerly known as Island Initiative) funding to the August 17, 2026, meeting agenda and invited members of the Insular Initiative Steering Committee to attend the meeting to present the proposal
- Placed any boards in arrears in an inactive status should membership fees not be paid or otherwise rectified 90 days prior to the annual business meeting, with inactive status to be removed once payment is received
- Approved application of Engineering Change Lab-USA to become a member of the NCEES Participating Organizations Liaison Council
- Approved committee and task force motions placed on the consent agenda
- Approved 2026–27 operating and capital budgets as presented in Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C of the Committee on Finances report
- Approved NCEES Committee on Awards recommendations for the 2026 NCEES national service awards as presented
- Accepted Mission Initiatives Task Force recommendation to present a board motion at the 2026 annual business meeting to amend Financial Policy 3B to make the current member board administrator funding to the annual meeting transferrable to a board staff member if the member board administrator is unable to attend
- Adopted consent agenda as approved for the 2026 annual meeting
- Adopted order of business as amended for the 2026 annual meeting
- Approved 2025–26 committee, task force, and officer reports for publication in the annual meeting *Action Items and Conference Reports*
- Approved Stanford Spokes funding request in the amount of $21,090
- Approved three board motions to present at the 2026 annual meeting

Approval of 2025 Annual Meeting Minutes

The 2025 NCEES annual meeting minutes are posted at ncees.org/annual_meeting.

Approval of 2026 Consent Agenda

Move that the Council approve the items identified in the consent agenda shown on page 3.

Board of Directors Motions

BoD Motion 1

Move that Financial Policy 3C be amended as follows:

FP 3 Travel Expenses

NCEES shall budget for and pay travel expenses for NCEES-funded meeting attendees as described below. NCEES shall also waive the registration fee for NCEES-funded attendees to the annual meeting and zone interim meetings but shall not pay the cost of optional functions that are not included in the registration fee. All authorized travel and reimbursements shall be in accordance with the NCEES travel policy. Unbudgeted international travel shall require authorization by the board of directors.

C. Zone interim meetings
   1. Members of the current NCEES board of directors
   2. NCEES past presidents to their respective zone meeting
   3. Members of the current NCEES Foundation board of directors to their respective zone meeting
   ~~3~~4. Zone assistant vice presidents and zone secretaries to their respective zone meeting
   ~~4~~5. A minimum of three funded delegates from each member board as specified by the respective member board. The delegates must be members of the member board or associate members. Boards must meet the *Bylaws* requirements for voting to receive the benefits of funded delegates.
   ~~5~~6. The designated MBA of each member board. When an MBA represents more than one board, the funding shall be for the designated MBA only and not for the assistant MBA or for member board staff. Member boards must meet the *Bylaws* requirements for voting to receive the benefits of a funded MBA.
   ~~6~~7. Zone service award recipients to their respective zone meeting

Financial impact

$8,300 for six Foundation board members to attend the zone interim meetings

Rationale

Funding members of the NCEES Foundation board of directors will ensure that a Foundation representative is available to provide a report at each zone meeting. It will also allow the Foundation board members to hear discussions at the zone meeting and make them available for answering any questions from the Council.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

BoD Motion 2

Move that the application of Engineering Change Lab-USA to become a member of the NCEES Participating Organizations Liaison Council be approved.

Financial impact

Less than $1,000 per year for annual meeting registration (POLC members pay own travel expenses, and POLC dues currently set at $0)

Rationale
Engineering Change Lab-USA meets the requirements for admittance to POLC: (from *Bylaws*, Section 3.04) "A Participating Organization shall be a society, institute, association, or organization of national scope whose membership is composed predominantly of engineers and/or surveyors engaged in work at the professional level and whose policies include advancement of professional ethics and standards and encouragement of licensure, and which actively supports the policies and objectives of the Council."

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

BoD Motion 3
Move that Financial Policy 3B be amended as follows:

FP 3 Travel Expenses
NCEES shall budget for and pay travel expenses for NCEES-funded meeting attendees as described below. NCEES shall also waive the registration fee for NCEES-funded attendees to the annual meeting and zone interim meetings but shall not pay the cost of optional functions that are not included in the registration fee. All authorized travel and reimbursements shall be in accordance with the NCEES travel policy. Unbudgeted international travel shall require authorization by the board of directors.

B. NCEES annual business meetings
   1. Members of the current NCEES board of directors, incoming vice presidents, nominees for the incoming NCEES president-elect and treasurer positions, and past presidents. Registration fees shall be waived for a guest of each.
   2. A minimum of three funded delegates from each member board as specified by the member board. Member boards must meet the *Bylaws* requirements for voting to receive the benefits of funded delegates.
   3. Member board members who are attending their first annual meeting and who have been appointed to their board within 24 months before the annual meeting
   4. ~~The designated m~~Member board administrator[s] (MBA[s]) ~~of each member board~~. When an MBA ~~represents more than one board~~ [is unable to attend], the funding shall be ~~for the designated MBA only and not for the assistant MBA or for~~ [transferable to another] member [of the] board['s] staff. Member boards must meet the *Bylaws* requirements for voting to receive the benefits of a funded MBA.
   5. Chairs of NCEES standing committees and task forces
   6. NCEES service award recipients and a guest. Registration fees shall be waived for a guest of each award recipient.
   7. Zone assistant vice presidents and zone secretaries
   8. The NCEES representative to the ABET board of delegates, the alternate NCEES ABET representative, and the commissioners on the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET, the Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET, and the Applied and Natural Science Accreditation Commission of ABET
   9. NCEES Foundation board of directors members

Rationale
Allowing substitutions if the MBA is unable to attend the annual meeting will ensure that boards are properly represented at the meeting.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Treasurer's Report

Karl Tonander, P.E., P.G.

As I finish my final year as treasurer, I look back on three years of great financial results and 12 years of great friendships. There is no doubt that NCEES has benefited from a combination of factors: excellent exam revenue, increasing ancillary revenue, and strong investment performance. As positive as those factors are, it is also important that none of them are taken for granted as the organization moves forward. A material drop in any of those three factors can have an immediate adverse impact, given the very modest budgeted margins of the organization. However, as mentioned in prior years' reports, there is ongoing hard work from many to ensure NCEES' success. In particular, NCEES Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Joe Scheving, CPA, and the Committee on Finances continue to put in effort to maintain our financial security.

Investments that reflect purpose and provide value

One of the topics that I have heard discussed frequently by meeting attendees during the past three years is the investments made by NCEES with the organization's available cash (cash that is not otherwise reserved for specific purposes as outlined in financial policies). When I speak of investment in this case, I am not referring to how the money earns more money, but rather where NCEES puts the money to work to reflect the purpose of the organization. Funds for these investments come from a few different budgetary line items but are primarily overseen by the NCEES board of directors and the NCEES Foundation.

Investments made into STEM programs at an elementary, middle, or even high school level, admittedly, have little direct tie to licensure. Rather, they are intended to broaden students' awareness of the engineering and surveying professions as well as to introduce the subject of public protection and public service. They provide a "light touch" to a large and diverse spectrum of students and are represented by programs such as DiscoverE.

On the other end of the spectrum is funding for efforts such as Engineering Change Lab-USA (ECL-USA) or the Alliance for Responsible Professional Licensing (ARPL). ECL-USA reflects a proactive engagement in shaping the future of the engineering profession, while ARPL includes both proactive and reactive management of concerns that could seriously impair a licensing board's ability to provide adequate public protection. These organizations represent multifaceted efforts involving several groups working together toward a common end goal. Thanks to our financial strength, NCEES acts as a collaborator as well as a leader for these efforts.

College-level investment, where there is the most direct tie to initial licensure, has been more of a challenge. This is especially true when trying to determine the return on these investments, which is often subjective. Many programs and organizations (including professional societies) have approached NCEES requesting investments that range from modest to eye-watering. Some are more of that same "light touch" as mentioned earlier, reaching out to large groups of people to remind them of the benefits of licensure. Others may only directly impact as few as 10–20 potential engineers or surveyors. The need to more fully vet most of these requests is where the NCEES Foundation plays a critical role. Dedicated to evaluating and prioritizing the value of a wide variety of funding requests, the NCEES Foundation can focus on the nuance that the NCEES board of directors may not otherwise have time to fully investigate.

When thinking specifically of the NCEES board, it seems to me that our favorite charity should be the NCEES Foundation. While not the only place to invest in our purpose, when facing the end of our fiscal year with remaining budget for initiatives, the NCEES Foundation is a natural place to turn. Having already completed a deep dive into the validity of the proposals and their applicability to the NCEES mission, the NCEES Foundation has been fortunate to receive far more requests than available funding would permit. Getting a little extra funding from the NCEES board of directors (from a Council-approved, existing budget) is a perfect way to press our purpose forward.

Better than balanced budget

Another topic that I have heard for nearly my entire tenure with NCEES has been whether the organization should have a $0 "balanced" budget. Most who have spoken to me know my opinion, but I will take this final opportunity to be clear—no, we need a budget that reflects a consistent positive balance. I personally consider the concept of a budget a mythical creation. It is a best guess, a projection, a "SWAG." Not that it does not reflect effort on the part of those who develop it, nor do I want to suggest that there are not benefits for building and monitoring a budget. However, the truth as I see it is that life is too dynamic to live or die by a budget, and a $0

balance leaves no room for any miscalculation or unforeseen circumstance. NCEES does have funds that could be available in an emergency shortfall situation, but that is not an environment where any business should choose to operate. Make no mistake, NCEES is a business. As our CFO will frequently share, a nonprofit does not mean that you do not have a positive bottom line; it simply means that you are there for a purpose that is considered beneficial to the populace and has been sanctioned by the government. Instead of taxes, they want you to invest in your mission for the good of all. I believe that NCEES' mission, with a cornerstone of public protection, is too important to risk on a $0 bottom line budget. The Committee on Finances agreed, and this year established goals on a reasonable budget bottom line that, while remaining modest, provides some buffer from the unforeseen.

Synchronous seat fee increases

Much of the side discussion following the recent zone interim meetings focused on the proposed automatic increases in exam costs to match the seat fees charged to NCEES and the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), which acts as a proxy for the other operational expenses experienced by NCEES. While the change to the exam pricing is proposed as automatic, it is more accurately thought of as being synchronous to our expenses. The proposed motion does not eliminate the possibility of exam fee price changes that supersede or alter the automatic increases, nor does it eliminate the charge for annual review of the budget and exam fees by the Committee on Finances. What it does is provide a path for stable balance sheets to continue for NCEES if there otherwise is not a clear consensus on change.

The motion that the Committee on Finances is putting forward in 2026 resulted from a recommendation the prior year from the Advisory Committee on Council Activities. Several mechanisms, timings, triggers, and formulas were considered, and the final recommendation of a change every two years using the combination of the seat fee and CPI-U was determined to provide the best transparency and the highest likelihood of success. Key factors in the decision include the following:

- The current NCEES exam fees are generally below (and in some cases substantially below) peer professional organizations.
- A predictable timeline would be better than random.
- Making a change every two years is most likely to result in manageable increases to consumers and minimal likelihood of adversity for the NCEES operating bottom line.

In closing

Fiscal year 2026 looks like another successful year. The budget proposed for fiscal year 2027 again includes healthy support for volunteer experience while maintaining a positive outcome. Ultimately, the bottom line reflects responsible spending and projects a positive bottom line without resorting to financial gymnastics. But there are headwinds. Further progress on revenue diversification will be necessary by NCEES to ensure sustainability as the economy and demographics continue to evolve. Seat fees for exams remain the single largest organizational expense, and focus will be required as NCEES prepares for the initiation of a new testing contract in January 2028. This is all to say that while it is not without challenges, the 2026–27 NCEES board of directors (and the new treasurer) should have a great launch pad and will also have my best wishes for the future.

Central Zone Vice President's Report

Jason Suelter, P.E., S.E.

This year, I was honored to complete my second year as Central Zone vice president, representing the member boards of the Central Zone. I had an exceptional leadership team with me this year in Assistant Vice President James Hollandsworth, P.E., P.S. (MI-PS) and Secretary Colleen Scholl, P.E. (WI). I am extremely grateful for their willingness to share their time with me and the zone.

Committee meetings

As the board of the directors liaison, my work centered around the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers, the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures, and the Structural Practice Task Force. All three groups were successful in completing their charge work, and I thank President Elizabeth Beckett, P.E., for the opportunity to serve.

Exam development committees

This year concluded my 15th year serving on the NCEES Principles and Practice of Engineering Structural exam development committee. Being involved in exam development provides a unique experience and an opportunity to give your time and knowledge for the greater good of your profession.

2026 Central Zone interim meeting

The member boards were all represented at the combined Central/Northeast Zone interim meeting in Columbus, Ohio. I would like to thank the Ohio State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Surveyors for their efforts in hosting this meeting.

Elections were held for the positions of Central Zone vice president, assistant vice president, and NCEES president-elect nominee. Special thanks to Jan Bostelman, P.E. (NE-PE) for her work leading the Nominating Committee during this process.

James Hollandsworth, P.E., P.S. (MI-PS), was elected Central Zone vice president, and Kimberly Kramer, Ph.D., P.E., S.E. (KS) was elected assistant zone vice president. I am confident the Central Zone will be in good hands under the leadership of Jim and Kimberly. I am honored to have been named the NCEES president-elect nominee from the Central Zone.

The Central Zone meeting ended with an invitation to the 2027 all-zone interim meeting to be held in Omaha, Nebraska.

2025–26 zone committees

I would like to recognize our Central Zone committee volunteers and thank them for their service. Their time and efforts allow our zone to operate while providing exceptional direction. A special thanks to our committee chairs, as their direction in guiding these committees provides an example for us all.

Awards Committee
Chair—Deveron Sanders, P.E. (MI-PE)

Leadership Development Committee
Chair—James Hollandsworth, P.E., P.S. (MI-PS)

Nominating Committee
Chair—Jan Bostelman, P.E. (NE-PE)

Site Selection Committee
Chair—Dean Ringle, P.E., P.S. (OH)

Future NCEES and Central Zone meetings

2026 annual meeting: Henderson, Nevada
2027 all-zone interim meeting: Omaha, Nebraska

2027 annual meeting: Verona, New York
2028 Central/Northeast Zone joint interim meeting: Maryland

In closing, I am extremely grateful to represent each member of the Central Zone as we work toward the common goal of the advancement of our professions. I look forward to seeing and welcoming you to our annual meeting in Henderson. Travel safe, and God bless!

Northeast Zone Vice President's Report

Azuanuka (Azu) Etoniru, P.E., P.L.S.

When I ran for the Northeast Zone vice president, there were three primary factors that motivated me: 1) an insatiable passion for the engineering and surveying professions; 2) safeguarding public health, safety, and welfare by promoting professional licensure and ensuring that licensed individuals meet and maintain professional competency in their fields of expertise; and 3) service to my professional colleagues and the public, informed by the adage that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

As the Northeast Zone vice president, I have had the privilege of serving as a member of the NCEES board of directors, where I have met incredible professional colleagues and NCEES staff who have mentored me and refreshed my passion for our professions during the past year. It is actually hard to believe that a year has already passed by since being elected, giving credence to the idea that time flies when you are having fun. It has been an engaging and busy year serving as Northeast Zone vice president and a member of the NCEES board of directors. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to serve the zone's member boards, and I thank Assistant Vice President Rosaleen (Rosey) Nogle, P.E., and Secretary Jeanne Nebre, P.S., for their assistance and collaboration.

When I attended my first NCEES Northeast Zone interim meeting in April of 2018, it was quite a daunting experience. I felt like a fish out of water. However, a few individuals welcomed me and made me feel comfortable. Looking back over the past year, I was reminded of that daunting first-time experience. So, I am particularly appreciative of the positive energy and enthusiasm that Assistant Vice President Nogle and Tracy Snyder, NCEES manager of member services, exhibit when they welcome and introduce new member board members to the ins and outs of NCEES and inform them of the resources they can avail themselves of. A heartfelt thank you, Rosey and Tracy!

It was my honor to appoint the following individuals to serve on key Northeast Zone committees during the 2025–26 year:

Awards Committee
Eric Greppo, P.E. (NY), chair
Dhruba (DJ) Biswas, P.E. (MD-PE)
Joyce Hastings, P.L.S. (MA)
Robert Kudlawiec, P.E. (PA)
Jeanne Nebre, P.S. (MD-PS)

Leadership Development Committee
Rosaleen (Rosey) Nogle, P.E. (NY), chair
Dhruba (DJ) Biswas, P.E. (MD-PE)
John Diebold, P.L.S. (VT-PS)
Shallan Fitzgerald, P.E. (MA)
Magdy Hagag, P.E. (NJ)
Barry Lucas, P.E. (DC)
Lisa Peterson, Ph.D., P.E. (PA)
Kimberly Powers, P.E. (ME-PE)
David Reinhold, P.E. (DE-PE)
Lesley Rosier-Tabor, P.E. (WV-PE)

Nominating Committee
Barry Lucas, P.E. (DC), chair
Jane Hardy (CT)
James Purcell, P.E. (NJ)
Windsor Tracy, P.L.S. (PA)
Jennifer Wootten (DE-PE)

Site Selection Committee
Sallye Perrin, P.E. (MD-PE), chair
Joyce Hastings, P.L.S. (MA)

Robert Kudlawiec, P.E. (PA)
Barry Lucas, P.E. (DC)
Jeanne Nebre, P.S. (MD-PS)

I would like to thank the Northeast Zone committee volunteers for their service this year, with a special thanks to our committee chairs for their leadership and incalculable devotion to duty.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank James Purcell, P.E., with special commendation, for his readiness to assume the role of the Resolutions Committee at the very last minute, crafting delightful and memorable resolutions, and for stepping in to present the Nominating Committee's report in the absence of the committee's chair. Kudos, Jim!

2026 Northeast Zone interim meeting

The member boards of the Northeast Zone met at the Central/Northeast Zone joint interim meeting in Columbus, Ohio, which was held May 14–16, 2026. My thanks to the Ohio board for their efforts in hosting this meeting, and Jason Suelter, P.E., S.E., Central Zone vice president, for his leadership and seamless coordination with the Ohio board. During the meeting, Jeanne Nebre, P.S., was elected to serve as Northeast Zone secretary for the 2026–28 term. Congratulations to Jeanne!

We congratulate Michael Brinkash, P.L.S., who received the Northeast Zone Distinguished Service Award at the interim meeting. Brinkash is an emeritus member and past president of the Pennsylvania board. He served as a member of the NCEES Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines in 2014–15 and as the Northeast Zone assistant vice president from 2023 to 2025. A strong advocate for professional licensure, an enthusiastic mentor for younger professionals in surveying, and a proven leader who engages well with others—thank you, Mike, for your exemplary service and leadership.

The meeting ended with an invitation to the 2027 all-zone interim meeting to be held in Omaha, Nebraska.

A look ahead

I look forward to continuing to serve the Northeast Zone in the year ahead, with a goal in mind to visit several member boards and gain their input on how to best engage NCEES in addressing their specific needs and interests. With emerging threats to licensure through deregulation efforts, my goal is to establish a task force in the zone to cooperate with NCEES and evaluate strategies for monitoring legislative efforts aimed at deregulating or weakening licensure's public protections within the states.

Southern Zone Vice President's Report

Chimin (Jimmy) Chao, P.E.

Thank you for the privilege of serving the Southern Zone. I have always enjoyed the comradery and rewarding working relationships with the engineering and surveying professionals in the South. This year, I have had the opportunity to have more in-depth interactions with our board members through board visits and committee assignments. It was truly a blessing that I could work with such a distinguished group of professionals.

I would like to thank my fellow zone officers, Steven Twedt, P.E., assistant vice president from Mississippi, and Linda Bergeron, P.E., zone secretary from Louisiana, for all of their support and work over the past year. I would also like to thank the chairs and zone committee members. They all did great work and made meaningful contributions to the success of the zone interim meeting and zone operations.

Member board visits

I was able to make several member board visits this year. The Florida surveying board was my first official visit. Board chair Michael Zoltek, P.L.S., hosted a dinner at his home for board members and staff, as this is his final year serving on the board. The board has experienced significant turnover recently. Andrew Getz, P.S., and Jim Sullivan, P.S., joined the board last year, and two new members—Jennifer Cannon and David Keith Cramer, P.L.S.—attended their first meeting during this session. Landon Cross, P.L.S., was recently reappointed to a four-year term on the board.

The Kentucky board visit was held in April. Board members serve four-year terms. They may be reappointed by the governor for a second four-year term. The board welcomed two new members: Michael Vickers, P.E., and Clint Goodin, P.E., P.L.S. Ryan Griffith, P.E., is the chair. Gregory Meredith, P.E., serves as vice chair, and James (Don) Pedigo II, P.L.S., serves as secretary.

I visited the Mississippi board on June 2–3, 2026, at its office location in downtown Jackson, Mississippi. The board is authorized to have nine members, consisting of six professional engineers and three professional surveyors. Members serve four-year terms. Currently, the board is experiencing significant membership changes. Three engineer members—Joseph Lauderdale, P.E.; Sarah Tracy, P.E.; and Dennis Truax, Ph.D., P.E.—have retired from the board. In addition, surveyor member Patrick Martino, P.L.S., has decided not to seek reappointment and will continue serving until the governor appoints a replacement.

2026 Southern Zone interim meeting

The Southern Zone met in San Juan, Puerto Rico, this year with 130 registrants and 40 guests. The Puerto Rico board has been working very hard to showcase their beautiful island and ensure everyone who attended had a memorable experience. The Puerto Rico board does not have any staff. All of the heavy lifting to host the event was done by its members with the support of Trish McAlister of NCEES. My sincere thanks to Antonio Medina-Delgado, P.E., the member board administrator (MBA) of the Puerto Rico board; Cesar Barreto Bosques, P.E., the chair of the Puerto Rico board; and the rest of the board for being such tremendous hosts for our zone interim meeting on April 23–25, 2026.

Rosachely Rivera Santana, Puerto Rico secretary of state, was originally scheduled to welcome all delegates. However, due to a scheduling conflict, Alondra Negrón López, assistant secretary of records and examining boards of the Puerto Rico Department of State, delivered a warm welcome in her place. The awards luncheon featured guest speaker José Izquierdo-Encarnación, P.E., who presented on infrastructure and maintenance concerns of Old San Juan. Guests also enjoyed two engaging tours: the City Art Museum Tour and the Old San Juan Walking Tour. The College of Engineers and Surveyors of Puerto Rico generously enhanced the event by providing music from Batucada for the welcome reception dinner on Thursday, as well as for the Noche Caribeña (Caribbean Night) dinner on Friday.

The Southern Zone recognized James Kelly, P.E., from Virginia with the Southern Zone Distinguished Service Award. Congratulations to Jim and thanks to him for all that he has done for NCEES, the Southern Zone, and the Virginia board. At the zone interim meeting, Don Pedigo, P.L.S., was elected zone secretary. I look forward to his leadership of the Southern Zone and working with him. Thanks to James Collins, P.E., of the Tennessee engineering board for leading the Engineering Forum; John Claytor, P.L.S., from the Virginia board for leading the Surveying Forum; Monica Gilmore, MBA of the Mississippi board, for leading the MBA Forum; and Bob

Herbert from Alabama for leading the Law Enforcement Forum. The forums all had good discussions, and I appreciate all their work in both preparation for and execution of the forums at the Southern Zone interim meeting.

While we enjoyed our time in Puerto Rico, we are looking forward to the all-zone interim meeting in Omaha, Nebraska, next year. Let us continue to do the best we can to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Southern Zone Standing Committees

Awards Committee (Three members for rotating terms of three years)
James Mattison IV, L.S., (GA), chair 2024–27
Michael (Blake) Collins, P.S. (MS) 2023–26
Vinod (Vinnie) Goel, Ph.D., P.E. (NC) 2025–28

Leadership Committee (AVP, an MBA, at least two members for rotating terms of three years)
Steven Twedt, P.E., (MS), Southern Zone assistant vice president, chair 2025–27
James Collins, P.E. (TN-PE) 2024–27
Christopher Green (FL-PS) 2025–28
Dennis Hoyle, P.E., P.L.S. (NC) 2025–28
Gregory Meredith, P.E. (KY) 2023–26
David Page, P.S. (OK) 2025–28
Pankaj Shah, P.E. (FL-PE) 2025–28
Peter Strub, P.E. (SC) 2025–28

Nominating Committee (a chair plus at least three 3 members)
Brenda Moore, P.E. (NC emeritus), chair since 2023
Joseph Breighner, P.L.S. (AL) since 2024
Gary Clark, P.L.S. (TN-PS) since 2025
Ricardo Garcia-Cana, P.S. (PR) since 2024
Kevin Shreiner, L.S. (VA) since 2024

Site Selection Committee (at least four members from separate boards)
Heather Richardson (AR MBA), chair since 2022
Raymond Burton, P.E. (VI) since 2025
Fred DeLeon Jr., P.E. (AL) since 2025
Coleen Johnson, R.P.L.S. (TX) since 2025
Don Pedigo, P.S. (KY) since 2023
Susan Richard, P.E. (LA) since 2025

Resolutions Committee (at least three members)
Jason Carder, P.E. (TN-PE) chair 2025
Lamberto (Bobby) Ballí, P.E. (TX emeritus) 2026
Timothy Bowes, P.L.S. (NC) 2025
Murry Cline, P.E. (AR) 2025

Western Zone Vice President's Report

Aaron Blaisdell, P.L.S.

Wow! What an amazing group of professional volunteers and staff. We began with the annual meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, and moved, without pause, into a full launch of in-person and virtual meetings. Topics varied widely and brought the very same passion from individuals as we expect to see within our zone. From the outset, the resourcefulness of our member board administrators, the drive from our board members, and the deep commitment of NCEES staff proved that the Western Zone is a force to take charge and reconcile and implement the hard changes that should be celebrated. Our motivations are clear. While each jurisdiction has its own history and requirements, the zone continues to recognize the value of a more uniform and consistent pathway for licensure applicants. Acknowledging the barriers that have existed in the past is now giving way to more intentional and streamlined application processes.

Below are the items discussed and voted on at our recent zone interim meeting, held April 30–May 2 in Bend, Oregon. I wish to acknowledge those Western Zone members in bold who hold leadership roles within our organization at the highest levels. They are truly the finest volunteers whom I have had the pleasure to work with as zone vice president.

Awards Committee

This committee had the hardest task in my eyes. They gathered the nominations from our zone membership for our zone awards. We have the elite working within our zone, and **Kayce Keane, P.L.S. (CO)** had the incredible task of leading this committee. Two individuals were acknowledged in Bend in May: Karen Purcell, P.E. (NV) and Marjorie Lund, P.E., S.E. (WA) each received the Western Zone Distinguished Service Award. This was truly a celebration for the Western Zone.

Leadership Development Committee

This committee followed their work in 2024–25 and created some unique and extraordinary presentations/discussions for our zone membership and those who connected to their quarterly 30-minute sessions. Assistant Vice President **Scott Sayles, P.E. (AZ)** guided this outstanding committee. Their presentations included topics ranging from leadership styles to most recently a presentation on the professional activities and knowledge study process by NCEES Chief Officer of Examinations Lehmon Dekle, P.E. Originally created when current President Elizabeth Beckett, P.E., was the assistant zone vice president, these sessions have become the foundation for future educational, knowledge, and on-boarding topics across all zones.

Nominating Committee

Chairperson **Christina Wong (CA**) and her committee brought forward names for the positions of Western Zone vice president and Western Zone assistant vice president. Both positions are for a two-year term, and those individuals are elected at the zone interim meeting during the even- or odd-numbered years as designated for each zone by the NCEES *Bylaws*. By a vote of the zone membership, **Scott Sayles, P.E. (AZ)** became the next vice president and **Jakki Carter, P.E. (OR)** the assistant vice president for the 2026–28 term.

Site Selection Committee

This year, **Jenn Gilbert (OR)** and the Oregon board managed one of the Western Zone's most impressive interim meetings. Her approach to organizing the venue was amazing. We look forward to seeing everyone next year at the all-zone meeting in Omaha, Nebraska. Our zone will then see the Utah board hosting in 2028. Washington state will be the site of the 2029 Western Zone interim meeting, so any attendees will need to keep their calendars open and trail maps handy.

Mobility Committee

Newly created in 2024, this ad hoc committee was asked to bring together information from all of our varied laws and rules within our jurisdictions. Under the leadership of **Karen Purcell, P.E. (NV)**, this group presented their findings on how we are aligned in reducing barriers to applicants wishing to practice. They also highlighted some of the challenges to overcome. Having everyone see the results in a tabulated, easy-to-understand format will allow us to work together to address these challenges.

Presentations

The topics presented in Bend this spring included the following:

- Colin Maynard, P.E., S.E., (AK) provided a presentation on legislation preparation.
- Brian Robertson II, P.E. (CO) provided a presentation on the dos and don'ts as a board member and the Interorganizational Council on Regulation practice overlap.
- NCEES Chief Officer of Examinations Lehmon Dekle, P.E., provided a presentation on the upcoming status of the Public Land Survey System exam and its first administration in fall 2027.

In closing

As I close my chapter as Western Zone vice president and liaison to many committees, I would like to thank all of the Western Zone representatives and volunteers who have demonstrated the true meaning of professionalism and duty through their service. I also want to thank the members of the Northeast, Southern, and Central Zones for their unwavering commitment to public protection and their assistance to the Western Zone in bringing forward the leaders and volunteers of tomorrow.

I want to thank the leadership of the board of directors for their focus, dedication, and courage to remove barriers that hold candidates from their next career path and their willingness to move initiatives forward to benefit underserved students, faculty, and professional organizations. It is with their vision and strength that we continue to challenge the normal, question traditions, and remove outdated policies and barriers. Their demonstration of fiduciary responsibility is clear and needs to be celebrated.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff of NCEES for their guidance, motivation, and candid feedback. They remain committed to the mission of NCEES and support each of our boards in their role in protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public regardless of jurisdictional, cultural, or legislative boundaries.

NCEES Foundation Chair's Report

Dale Jans, P.E.

Your Foundation has once again been hard at work soliciting and reviewing letters of interest and funding requests. Building on the strong foundation established in our inaugural year, we were encouraged by another outstanding response from organizations seeking support for impactful projects. The Foundation board of directors carefully evaluated each proposal and ultimately awarded $662,852.65 in funding to 18 organizations. The quality and diversity of the applications continue to demonstrate the meaningful difference the Foundation can make in advancing our mission and supporting the communities we serve.

Process

We invited interested parties to submit letters of inquiry (LOIs) from October 1, 2025, to February 1, 2026. We received 56 LOIs, representing nearly $3.4 million in funds requested. The Foundation board of directors met March 13, 2026, and identified 20 organizations to move forward to the full application phase.

Of those 20 organizations, 19 submitted their full applications by May 1, 2026. The board spent time reviewing the applications and met in Greenville, South Carolina, on June 18–19, 2026, to make the final awards.

A formal announcement of recipients will be made during the 2026 annual meeting.

Spending limit

The 2025–26 Foundation spending limit was $443,000. This amount was recommended by the Committee on Finances and approved by the NCEES board of directors during its May 2025 meeting. The NCEES board of directors contributed an additional $219,852.65 from its discretionary outreach funds to fully fund the approved projects.

Continuous improvement

As part of our commitment to continuous improvement, the Foundation board regularly reviews and enhances its processes and procedures to ensure effective and efficient operations. This year, we took an important step forward by implementing a grant management system that transitioned the application process to an online portal, creating a more streamlined and accessible experience for applicants and reviewers alike.

New donor options

In addition to the online donor portal available through our website at ncees.org/foundation, we have worked closely with our investment advisors to expand the ways individuals can support the Foundation. Donors may now contribute through gifts of appreciated stock or mutual funds, qualified charitable distributions, and planned giving vehicles, such as trusts and bequests. These additional giving options provide greater flexibility for donors to make a lasting impact in support of the Foundation's mission. More information about these opportunities will be shared at the annual meeting.

In closing

I would like to thank the members of the Foundation board for their enthusiasm and dedication to ensuring the best use of the funds available:

- Brian Hanson, P.E. (AK), Vice Chair
- Iarelis (Ia) Hall, P.S.M. (FL-PS), Treasurer
- Sina Nejad, P.E. (TX)
- Rita Perea, Ed.S. (IA)
- Paul Tyrell, P.E., P.L.S. (MA)
- Andrew Zoutewelle, P.L.S. (NC), Board Liaison

Chief Executive Officer's Report

Davy McDowell, P.E.

This past year, we have seen NCEES committees and task forces work diligently to provide updates to exam policies, model documents, position statements, and, of course, exams.

This report gives a good overview of our staff's efforts in fiscal year 2025–26, but the work of the Council continues. Some things are cyclical, like exams and committee work, and some things are new, like looking at how artificial intelligence may impact licensure and exam development. Managing our everyday responsibilities while moving the needle in outreach, advocacy, and technology is always a balancing act—and is only made possible by our hardworking staff and volunteers. NCEES is driven by the many volunteers who shape our organization's deliverables, and I want to emphasize their importance to our mission of advancing engineering and surveying licensure as I cover our progress for 2025–26.

NCEES strategic plan

The 2024–25 board of directors began discussing the need to establish core values for the organization, and a subgroup of the board came up with several potential options. But before fully moving forward with a presentation to the Council, we decided to revisit the NCEES vision since it is over 15 years old. As part of this review, President Elizabeth Beckett, P.E., felt it was time to take a thorough look at our strategic plan, which was last updated in 2013.

Our consultants in the strategic plan project, McKinley Advisors, interviewed key stakeholders across the spectrum of NCEES (members, associate members, past presidents, Foundation board members, committee chairs, and others from outside organizations). From those interviews and with input from staff, a questionnaire was developed that went out to members, exam development volunteers, and examinees. We collected nearly 2,000 responses.

After reviewing the questionnaire's results, the board of directors met with key staff and consultants before presenting the new strategic plan, including core values and an updated vision, to the Council at the 2026 zone interim meetings. More information on the strategic plan is also included in the president's report on page 15.

ABET Symposium

I had the privilege to present at the ABET Symposium on April 17 in Raleigh, North Carolina. Nearly 750 attendees—faculty members, deans, department chairs, ABET evaluators, industry representatives, and accreditation coordinators—attended the symposium that exists to help institutions deliver high-quality, relevant, and continuously improving education aligned with accreditation standards.

On the whole, schools are graduating technically capable engineers who may or may not fully understand their professional responsibility to the public and why licensure matters. My presentation focused on the educator and their role in bridging this divide. The way to remedy this issue is simply to add context to the curriculum that already exists. Professional engineers are not just solving problems; they are ensuring a minimum level of competency within the profession and workforce that ultimately protects the public. And that responsibility mindset starts in the classroom.

ASEE conclave

NCEES hosted the Chairs Conclave at the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) annual conference in Charlotte, North Carolina, on June 21. NCEES has been a long-time supporter of ASEE through attending and sponsoring a booth and other events at their annual conference, the Engineering Deans Council, and other ASEE initiatives. The conclave brought together engineering department chairs to exchange best practices and explore strategies for building strong, future-ready programs. Participants gained practical insights on how to promote pathways to licensure among both students and faculty.

Mission initiatives

NCEES has continued various outreach initiatives this year to promote licensure and reach the next generation of engineers and surveyors, including the FE Ambassador Program, FE and FS graduation honor cords, and Education Awards, as well as our sponsorships of programs and events like the iMAGINE Upstate STEAM

Festival, DiscoverE Future City Competition, and the National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS) Student Competition.

At the 25th annual NSPS student competition, held in conjunction with the NSPS spring business meeting in April, 24 teams with more than 220 surveying students competed in a monument hunt and various surveying exercises in the Washington, D.C., area, and three teams in both the baccalaureate and associate degree divisions were named winners. I never tire of witnessing the energy and enthusiasm young people bring to our professions, and it always highlights the important role outreach plays in our organization's mission.

Exam volumes

One of our organization's main objectives is to assist member boards with licensure processes, which includes providing exams that test accurately for minimal competence. Our staff had a chance to collect and assess the total exam volumes for 2024–25. Compared to 2023–24, there are several exams that saw a significant increase, as shown in the following table.

Exam	2023–24 overall volume	2024–25 overall volume	Percent increase
FE Civil	24,678	26,502	7%
FE Electrical and Computer	6,941	7,902	14%
FE Mechanical	12,337	13,672	11%
PE Electrical and Computer: Power	3,270	3,951	21%
PE Mechanical: Thermal and Fluid Systems	1,066	1,328	25%

These numbers reflect a focused effort on the part of our staff to restore and exceed pre-COVID exam volumes. We have also made strides in supporting prospective examinees through our new FE and FS interactive practice exams, which better represent the computer-based testing format of the real exams.

As we approach the final quarter of fiscal year 2025–26, NCEES is on pace to deliver over 100,000 total exams this fiscal year. From 2023–24 to 2024–25, we saw a 7 percent increase in the total volume of exams at 94,000. If the current 2025–26 projections hold, we will see a nearly a 10 percent increase from last year.

Advocacy

NCEES has continued monitoring legislation that is affecting engineering and surveying licensure and assisting member boards with important advocacy resources.

This year, several jurisdictions have experienced an active legislative session regarding bills aimed at deregulating licensure, including Alaska, Arizona, Florida, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming. The issues spanned from weakening or eliminating the member board's authority to creating an opt-out for biometric scanning required for exam security. Fortunately, we have seen some success in stopping or stalling these kinds of bills that ultimately threaten public safety.

NCEES has also been watching several court cases related to professional licensure, including *Crownholm v. Moore* (California) and *360 Drone Services v. Ritter* (North Carolina), which were landmark cases brought against our member boards by the Institute for Justice. Both cases hinged on the issue of whether occupational laws can constitutionally restrict the creation and dissemination of geographic data under the perceived protections of the First Amendment. NCEES was concerned that these cases were an attempt to undermine the boards' enforcement authority and expand unlicensed surveying practice by conflating it with freedom of speech.

In June, the U.S. Supreme Court denied petitions for a writ of certiorari for both cases. As a result, the lower court decisions in favor of the state licensing boards remain in effect and currently support the position that licensing requirements cannot be avoided by equating regulated professional work to protected speech rights. However, future litigation could revisit similar constitutional questions, and the legal landscape may continue to evolve through future court challenges.

In closing

As I have been saying at the outset of our State of the Council meetings, it has been a busy year at NCEES. My days have been filled with following legislative sessions, watching court cases, tracking exam volumes, attending Council meetings and national conferences, presenting licensure messages to faculty and students, and discussing common issues with our sister organizations and professions. Everyone I meet and work with is passionate about their profession and protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public. That passion is inspiring and makes my job all the more rewarding. With the new strategic plan, our vision is a little different, but the underlying principle of safeguarding the public is first and remains our highest priority.

Special Committee on Bylaws

Jon Wilbeck, Chair

ABSTRACT

The 2025–26 Special Committee on Bylaws was established to provide revisions to the *Bylaws* based on actions by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting and directions from the president.

The committee was assigned 12 charges. The committee held several meetings virtually to accomplish the task of addressing charges. In February 2026, emails were sent to NCEES members, associate members, and board administrators to inform them that the proposed amendments to the *Bylaws* were posted online at MyNCEES Board Resources. This notification was made in accordance with *Bylaws* Section 12.02, which requires member boards to be notified about proposed amendments to the *Bylaws* at least 60 days prior to the zone interim meetings.

Bylaws 12.02 states that voting shall be by sections and that changes to the published amendments are not permitted during the annual meeting. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the member boards voting is required to adopt amendments to the *Bylaws*.

The committee will present 15 motions. **The motions begin on page 39.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Review Bylaws *3.03 regarding International Affiliate Organizations nomination and approval by the Council. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The committee will present **Motion 1** as a result of this charge. Refer to this motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 2

Review Bylaws *3.04 regarding POLC nominations and approval by the Council. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The committee will present **Motion 2** as a result of this charge. Refer to this motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 3

Review revisions to Bylaws *3.07 as presented by the Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA) and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

To recap actions taken at the 2025 annual meeting related to this charge, *Bylaws* Section 3.07 was amended by Bylaws Motion 7, which passed on the consent agenda:

> **Section 3.07 Past Presidents**. Past Presidents of the Council who are not members of Member Boards shall be considered as honorary participants in the Council ~~eligible to serve on the committees, to~~ and have the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Council~~, to take part in discussions, and to perform all functions of Members except to hold office and vote~~.

ACCA Motion 3, which also passed on the consent agenda, charged this committee with incorporating the following change into *Bylaws* Section 3.07, and not unreasonably used the existing language of the section as its basis:

> **Section 3.07 Past Presidents.** Past Presidents of the Council who are not members of Member Boards shall be considered as honorary participants in the Council eligible to serve on the committees, to have the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Council, to take part in discussions, and to perform all functions of Members except to hold office and vote, unless to fulfill the provisions of Section 4.06 of the *Bylaws*.

Because of the changes made to this section in 2025 by Bylaws Motion 7 that removed language about past presidents holding office, this committee concluded that the changes proposed by ACCA Motion 3 are now unnecessary. Therefore, no amendments to *Bylaws* 3.07 are proposed.

Charge 4

Review revisions to Bylaws *4.04 as presented by ACCA and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

To recap actions taken at the 2025 annual meeting related to this charge, ACCA Motion 4 charged this committee with incorporating the following amendment into *Bylaws* Section 4.04:

> **Section 4.04 Elections and Terms of Office.** The President-Elect shall be elected by the Council at each Annual Business Meeting in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. The President-Elect shall serve the Council for a period of three years. The first year shall be as President-Elect. The second year, without further election, the President-Elect shall become President, holding that office until a successor has been installed. The third year, without further election, the President shall become Immediate Past President. Any Member elected to the office of President-Elect shall be eligible to serve as President-Elect, President, and Immediate Past President, with full authority of the offices and board privileges. Past Presidents shall be ineligible for reelection as President or President-Elect of the Council.

The committee will present **Motion 3** as a result of this charge. This motion includes the amendment noted above as well as two additional edits that the committee considered necessary. Refer to the motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 5

Review revisions to Bylaws *4.06 as presented by ACCA and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The proposed changes to *Bylaws* Section 4.06 are exactly as approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. The committee will present **Motion 4** as a result of this charge.

Charge 6

Review Bylaws *6.02 and consider whether the term* agency director *is appropriate or should be revised. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The committee will present **Motion 5** as a result of this charge. Refer to this motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 7

Review Bylaws *7.01 and consider whether member board administrators would be able to serve out their appointment to a committee if their employment with a member board ends. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The committee will present **Motion 6** as a result of this charge and Charge 8. Refer to this motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

In addition, the committee recommends a future committee be charged with proposing language addressing removal of a committee member whose conduct is unethical or reflects negatively on the Council.

Charge 8

Review Bylaws *7.01 and consider if concurrent service on a committee and the NCEES Foundation board of directors should be addressed. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The committee will present **Motion 6** as a result of this charge and Charge 7. Refer to this motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 9

Review Bylaws *7.05 and consider if representatives from the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE) and Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS) can be appointed as consultants to the Committee on Examination Audit in lieu of the chairs. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The committee will present **Motion 7** as a result of this charge. Refer to this motion's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

In addition, the committee recommends that a future committee be charged with making similar provisions related to EPE/EPS Committee representatives to the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) in *Bylaws* Section 7.08.

Charge 10

Review revisions to Bylaws *7.06 and 7.07 as presented by the EPP Committee and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

To recap actions taken at the 2025 annual meeting related to this charge, EPP Motion 8 charged this committee with incorporating amendments into *Bylaws* Sections 7.06 and 7.07 related to requiring at least 50 percent of each committee's members to have exam experience. Additionally, EPS Motion 1, which passed on the consent agenda, charged this committee with incorporating further amendments into *Bylaws* Section 7.07.

The committee will present **Motions 8–9** as a result of this charge and EPS Motion 1. The proposed changes to *Bylaws* Sections 7.06 and 7.07 are exactly as approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting with one additional change recommended for Section 7.06. Refer to these motions' rationales for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 11

Review the Bylaws *and propose revisions to replace the term* Member Board Administrator *with* Member Board Executive *throughout.*

The committee will present **Motions 10–15** as a result of this charge. Refer to Motion 10's rationale for discussion of the committee's efforts related to this charge.

Charge 12

Review Bylaws *Article 7 to determine if notification, quorum, and voting requirements should be added for standing committees. Propose amendments as appropriate.*

The Bylaws Committee discussed this charge at its committee meetings. Committees and task forces do not typically follow parliamentary procedures when they meet, and nothing in the NCEES *Bylaws* requires these entities to follow parliamentary procedures.

The committee considered the fact that it is not uncommon for committees to lose members at times, particularly in spring when the committee is continuing to work on their respective charges and finalizing motions and recommendations to the board of directors.

If quorum or other parliamentary requirements are added to committees, a committee may not be able to do its work if a quorum is not met and there is no mechanism to add committee members mid-term.

This committee recommends not instituting quorum or other parliamentary requirements for committees and task forces, and it proposes no motion as a result of this charge.

Respectfully submitted, the **Special Committee on Bylaws:**

Jon Wilbeck, Chair

Members
Rossana D'Antonio, P.E.
Gregory Meredith, P.E.
Lisa Peterson, Ph.D., P.E.
Jennifer Taylor, P.E.

Board liaison
Andrew Zoutewelle, P.L.S.

Staff liaison
Davy McDowell, P.E.

MOTIONS

Bylaws Motion 1

Move that *Bylaws* 3.03 be amended as follows:

Section 3.03 International Affiliate Organization. An International Affiliate Organization of NCEES shall be a legally constituted entity located outside the United States having a collateral and supportive position with the licensure of engineers or surveyors. International Affiliate Organizations are entitled to representation at Council meetings and, on approval of the presiding officer, may have the privilege of the floor. ~~Acceptance or removal~~ Conditional acceptance of an International Affiliate Organization ~~shall~~ may be made by the Board of Directors until formally accepted by majority vote of the Council. Removal of an International Affiliate Organization shall be by majority vote of the Council.

Rationale

The process described in *Bylaws* through which organizations become International Affiliate Organizations may create unnecessarily long delays since Council votes happen only at annual meetings. For example, if an organization petitions in September 2026 to become an international affiliate organization, it would not have an opportunity to become such until the next NCEES annual meeting in August 2027. Furthermore, given the same example, it could be argued that the newly accepted international affiliate organization would not be able to participate in and send its representatives to Council meetings until August 2028.

The proposed amendment would empower the NCEES board of directors to give conditional approval for an organization applying for International Affiliate Organization status, allowing the organization the opportunity to both participate in and send representatives to the next annual meeting. The motion keeps the Council as the sole entity able to remove an International Affiliate Organization.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 2

Move that *Bylaws* 3.04 be amended as follows:

Section 3.04 Participating Organizations. A Participating Organization shall be a society, institute, association, or organization of national scope whose membership is composed predominantly of engineers and/or surveyors engaged in work at the professional level and whose policies include advancement of professional ethics and standards and encouragement of licensure, and which actively supports the policies and objectives of the Council. Participating Organizations are entitled to representation at meetings of the Council and, on approval of the presiding officer, may have the privilege of the floor. ~~Acceptance or removal~~ Conditional acceptance of a Participating Organization ~~shall~~ may be made by the Board of Directors until formally accepted by majority vote of the Council. Removal of a Participating Organization shall be by majority vote of the Council.

Rationale
The rationale for Motion 2 is essentially the same rationale as described in Bylaws Motion 1, substituting Participating Organizations for International Affiliate Organizations.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 3
Move that *Bylaws* 4.04 be amended as follows:

Section 4.04 Elections and Terms of Office. The President-Elect shall be elected by the Council at each Annual Business Meeting in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. The President-Elect shall serve the Council for a period of three years. The first year shall be as President-Elect. The second year, without further election, the President-Elect shall become President, holding that office until a successor has been installed. The third year, without further election, the President shall become Immediate Past President. Any Member elected to the office of President-Elect shall be eligible to serve as President-Elect, President, and Immediate Past President, with full authority of the offices and board privileges. Past Presidents shall be ineligible for reelection or appointment as President or President-Elect of the Council except as allowed by Section 4.06 of the *Bylaws*.

The Treasurer shall be elected at the Annual Business Meeting every three years in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Treasurers shall not be eligible for reelection to the same office until at least one full term has elapsed. For the office of Treasurer, a partial term served shall not be considered a term for term-limit purposes.

Vice Presidents shall be elected at their respective Zone Interim Meeting every two years in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Vice Presidents from the Northeast and Southern Zones shall be elected in odd-numbered years. Vice Presidents from the Central and Western Zones shall be elected in even-numbered years. Vice Presidents shall not be eligible for reelection to the same office until at least one full term has elapsed. For the office of Vice President, a partial term served shall not be considered a term for term-limit purposes.

New members of the Board of Directors shall assume their duties at the conclusion of the Annual Business Meeting. Board members may continue to serve until the conclusion of the term of office to which they were elected even if their terms with Member Boards have ended.

Rationale
The committee suggests two changes in addition to that proposed by ACCA. The committee's position is that adding a provision specifying that past presidents shall also be ineligible for appointment as president aligns with the intent of the ACCA motion. In addition, the committee believes it is important to add a reference here to *Bylaws* Section 4.06, which is proposed to be changed to allow an immediate past president to serve the remainder of the president's term, in accordance with the 2025 ACCA motion.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 4
Move that *Bylaws* 4.06 be amended as follows:

Section 4.06 Vacancies. If a vacancy occurs in the office of President, the President-Elect shall succeed to the office of President for the completion of that term and subsequently serve the full one-year term that they were originally elected to serve as President. A vacancy in the office of President-Elect shall remain unfilled until the next NCEES Annual Business Meeting. At that time, the Council will elect a President from the zone of the

vacant President-Elect position. If the President and the President-Elect are unable to fulfill the President's term, the Immediate Past President shall serve the remainder of the President's term.

A vacancy in the office of Immediate Past President shall be filled by the most recent ~~available~~ receptive Past President.

A vacancy in the office of Treasurer shall be filled by the Board of Directors within 30 days; the selected individual shall fill the position until an election for a new full-term Treasurer is held at the next Annual Business Meeting.

A vacancy in the office of a Vice President shall be filled by that zone's Assistant Vice President.

Appointments by the Board of Directors shall be made in accordance with the required qualifications and limitations for duly elected members of the Board of Directors.

A quorum of the Board of Directors for filling of vacancies shall consist of six members except in the event of two vacancies, when five shall constitute a quorum.

Rationale
The Bylaws Committee received a charge to review changes to *Bylaws* Section 4.06 as presented by ACCA and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. This motion is exactly as proposed by ACCA. The amendment adds an additional mechanism to fill a vacancy in the office of president.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

_____

_____

_____

_____

Bylaws Motion 5
Move that *Bylaws* 6.02 be amended as follows:

Section 6.02 Quorum and Voting. A quorum for the transaction of business at an Annual Business Meeting of the Council shall be Delegates from a majority of Member Boards. A majority of the Member Boards voting shall be required for affirmative action unless otherwise provided for in the *Bylaws*.

Only Member Boards shall be entitled to vote. Voting shall be by Member Boards, with each board entitled to one vote. An Associate Member may serve as a Member Board Delegate for voting purposes only when so designated by the Member Board's chair through written, signed communication presented to NCEES staff prior to the opening session of the meeting. For Member Boards that require authorization from the State, such designation may come from the ~~agency director~~ member board executive for that board.

Proxy voting shall not be permitted.

Rationale
This proposed change harmonizes Section 6.02 with Charge 11. The committee believes the term *member board executive* is more specific and appropriate here.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

_____

_____

_____

Bylaws Motion 6

Move that *Bylaws* 7.01 be amended as follows:

Section 7.01 Standing Committees. The standing committees of the Council shall be the following: Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA), Awards, Education, Examination Audit, Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE), Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS), Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP), Finances, Law Enforcement, Licensure, Member Board Administrators (MBA), and Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG).

The structure and membership of all standing committees shall be commensurate with the charges unless otherwise provided for in the *Bylaws*. The composition of the committees should reflect the diversity of the Council membership.

A committee member may be appointed to serve on only one standing committee during any administrative year. A committee member cannot serve concurrently on a standing committee and on the NCEES Foundation board of directors.

Appointments shall limit the tenure on any one committee to a maximum of four consecutive years, including any time as chair, except that (1) an individual may serve for three years as an EPS Committee member, two additional years as the EPS Committee vice chair, and two additional years as the EPS Committee chair; and (2) an individual may serve for three years as an EPE Committee member, two additional years as the EPE Committee vice chair, and two additional years as the EPE Committee chair. The chairs of the EPE and EPS Committee shall have had experience in developing NCEES examinations before assuming the position of chair. This experience is defined as involvement in at least two of the following activities: item writing or review, participation on a cut score panel, involvement in a Professional Activities and Knowledge Study (PAKS) committee or on examination specification committees, or participation on an examination development committee. The ascension track to the chair shall also include psychometric training approved by NCEES. A committee chair appointment shall be limited in tenure to a maximum of two consecutive years on any one committee.

Members, Associate Members, Past Presidents, and Emeritus Members shall be eligible to serve on any committee or task force. ~~Committee members~~ Members and Past Presidents may continue to serve as committee members until the conclusion of the term of office to which they were appointed even if their terms with Member Boards have ended. Associate Members and Emeritus Members may continue to serve as committee members until the conclusion of the term of office to which they were appointed if the individual was eligible to serve at the time of their committee appointment.

Rationale

Regarding changes to this section related to Charge 8, a question was raised whether a person could serve on both a standing committee and the NCEES Foundation board of directors. Consultation with the NCEES board of directors indicated that, in general, a person should not be able to serve on both. Therefore, the committee is proposing language prohibiting a person to serve on both a committee and the NCEES Foundation board of directors.

Changes to this section related to Charge 7 arose in early 2025 when an appointed committee chair, who was a member board executive, left employment with their member board. Consequently, this individual did not meet the *Bylaws* definition of an associate member and could not continue to serve on this committee. This proposed change not only allows the determination of eligibility of member board administrators to serve on a committee to be made solely at the time of their committee appointment, but also does the same for other types of associate members—including, but not limited to, board investigation/law enforcement staff and assistant/deputy member board administrators—and emeritus members.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 7
Move that *Bylaws* 7.05 be amended as follows:

Section 7.05 Committee on Examination Audit. The Committee on Examination Audit shall consist of a chair and one member selected from each zone representing when possible private practice, academia, government, and industry. In addition, the President shall appoint as consultants the chairs of the Committees on Examinations for Professional Engineers and Examinations for Professional Surveyors (or their representatives, as designated by the chairs from among the committee membership). Other consultants shall be appointed as necessary.

This committee shall be responsible for an independent audit annually of the NCEES examination program.

This committee will report directly to the Board of Directors.

Rationale
In some situations, the EPE and EPS Committee chairs may not be the ideal consultant to the Exam Audit Committee. This change allows the EPE and EPS Committee chairs added flexibility to determine the appropriate consultant to the Exam Audit Committee. Also, allowing consultants to be appointed as necessary would give the committee the ability to perform its responsibilities in years when the committee's workload is large.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 8
Move that *Bylaws* 7.06 be amended as follows:

Section 7.06 Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers. The Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE) shall consist of a chair and three members from each zone. It shall supervise the preparation of examination specifications and be responsible for the content and scoring of all engineering examinations ~~in the fundamentals and principles and practice of engineering~~.

The committee, in the interest of uniformity and efficiency, shall prepare examination development procedures and shall review examination scores and make recommendations of minimum passing grades for examinations.

At least 50 percent of the committee members should be carryover members to provide continuity of the program. Additionally, at least 50 percent of the committee members should have exam experience as defined in Section 7.01 of the *Bylaws*.

This committee shall have the authority to recommend, in connection with its work, the appointment of consultants.

Rationale
The proposed amendments are exactly as approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting with one additional change proposed by the Bylaws Committee. In *Bylaws* Section 7.06, this committee proposes to change the phrase "all examinations in the fundamentals and principles and practice of engineering" to the phrase "all engineering examinations." This change would harmonize *Bylaws* Section 7.06 with the approved *Bylaws* Section 7.07 changes as set forth in EPS Motion 1 enacted at the 2025 annual meeting.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 9
Move that *Bylaws* 7.07 be amended as follows:

Section 7.07 Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors. The Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS) shall consist of a chair and three members from each zone. All members shall be professional surveyors. EPS shall supervise the preparation of examination specifications and be responsible for the content and scoring of all surveying examinations ~~in the fundamentals and principles and practice of surveying~~.

The committee, in the interest of uniformity and efficiency, shall prepare examination development procedures and shall review examination scores and make recommendations of minimum passing grades for examinations.

At least 50 percent of the committee members should be carryover members to provide continuity of the program. Additionally, at least 50 percent of the committee members should have exam experience as defined in Section 7.01 of the *Bylaws*.

This committee shall have the authority to recommend, in connection with its work, the appointment of consultants.

Rationale
The proposed amendments are exactly as approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 10
Move that *Bylaws* 3.021 be amended as follows:

Section 3.021 Associate Members. An Associate Member of NCEES shall be a designee of a Member Board, but not a member of a Member Board, who is appointed by the NCEES Board of Directors as an Associate Member of NCEES.

Member board ~~administrators~~ executives shall automatically be designated as Associate Members. Recommendations for other Associate Members shall be submitted by Member Boards to the Board of Directors and become effective upon appointment by the Board of Directors. Such appointments shall be reviewed annually by each Member Board and shall remain in effect until the Board of Directors is notified otherwise by the Member Board.

Associate Members shall have the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Council.

Rationale
MBA Motion 2 passed on the consent agenda of the 2025 annual meeting. The motion charged the Bylaws Committee with changing references to "member board administrators" to "member board executives" throughout the *Bylaws* and that NCEES staff make revisions to the *Manual of Policy and Position Statements*, *Model Law*, *Model Rules*, and all other NCEES publications after adoption in the *Bylaws*, for approval by the board of directors.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 11
Move that *Bylaws* 7.01 be amended as follows:

Section 7.01 Standing Committees. The standing committees of the Council shall be the following: Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA), Awards, Education, Examination Audit, Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE), Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS), Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP), Finances, Law Enforcement, Licensure, Member Board ~~Administrators~~ Executives (MB~~A~~E), and Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG).
[. . .]

Rationale
See rationale for Bylaws Motion 10.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 12
Move that *Bylaws* 7.02 be amended as follows:

Section 7.02 Advisory Committee on Council Activities. The Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA) shall consist of a chair and two members from each zone. At least one member shall be a professional engineer, one member a professional surveyor, and one member a member board ~~administrator~~ executive. The committee shall provide advice and briefing to the President and the Board of Directors on new policy issues, problems, and plans that warrant preliminary assessment of policy choices and procedures not as yet assigned to a standing committee or involving several existing committees. Consultants appointed to this committee shall have served on the Board of Directors.

The committee will act as principal advisor to the President and the Board of Directors on such specific non-recurring problems or plans as the President may explicitly assign to the committee. The committee shall review the *Manual of Policy and Position Statements*, in consideration of past and current action of the Council, and present any proposed revisions as needed.

Rationale
See rationale for Bylaws Motion 10.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 13
Move that *Bylaws* 7.08 be amended as follows:

Section 7.08 Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures. The Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) shall consist of a chair, two members selected from each zone, and the chairs of the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers and Examinations for Professional Surveyors (or their representatives) as consultants. In addition, the President may appoint other consultants as deemed necessary, including a member board ~~administrator~~ executive.

This committee shall be responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of the examinations and recommending policies, specifications, and procedures consistent with the trends in the engineering and surveying professions.

Rationale
See rationale for Bylaws Motion 10.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 14
Move that *Bylaws* 7.11 be amended as follows:

Section 7.11 Committee on Licensure. The Committee on Licensure shall consist of a chair and two members from each zone. At least two members of the committee shall be professional engineers, at least two members shall be professional surveyors, and at least one member shall be a member board ~~administrator~~ executive. Committee appointments shall strive to include those currently active in academia, private practice, industry, and government. In addition, the President shall appoint consultants as necessary.

The chair or a designee of this committee shall be a liaison to the Participating Organizations Liaison Council and to the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines and shall provide advice to the President and the Board of Directors.

The committee shall provide ongoing holistic review of the engineering and surveying licensure systems. It shall respond to licensure issues and concerns as they arise by developing and recommending licensure processes and amendments to position statements, the *Model Law*, and the *Model Rules* as necessary.

Rationale
See rationale for Bylaws Motion 10.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Bylaws Motion 15
Move that *Bylaws* 7.12 be amended as follows:

Section 7.12 Committee on Member Board ~~Administrators~~ Executives. The Committee on Member Board ~~Administrators~~ Executives shall consist of a chair, who shall be a member board ~~administrator~~ executive; at least two member board ~~administrators~~ executives from each zone; and two current Members or Emeritus Members. The committee shall arrange for the conference of ~~administrators~~ member board executives at the Annual Meeting and Interim Meetings of the NCEES zones. Throughout the year, the committee shall strive to provide close cooperation between ~~administrators~~ member board executives and to facilitate and assist any efforts by the Member Boards in addressing licensure processes and practices.

Rationale
See rationale for Bylaws Motion 10.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Committee on Finances

Kelly Fedele, P.E., P.S., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Finances was established under the NCEES *Bylaws* to study the financial needs of NCEES, to recommend sources of income, to recommend ways and means of securing adequate funds for the proper operation of NCEES, and to assist the board of directors in financial matters. The committee reviews the previous year's budget performance and recommends the next year's budgets, including the NCEES Foundation budget.

The committee was assigned nine charges, with one charge including seven sub-charges to be performed annually. The committee will present nine motions. **The motions begin on page 52.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. Review the results of the 2024–25 financial audit and the current financial condition of the Council.
b. Recommend NCEES 2026–27 operating and capital budgets for the NCEES board of directors to approve before presenting to the Council for final approval at the annual meeting.
c. Recommend an NCEES Foundation 2026–27 operating budget for the NCEES board of directors to approve before presenting to the Council for final approval at the annual meeting.
d. Using a five-year operational projection, recommend any potential transfers and/or contributions to the NCEES Foundation for the NCEES board of directors to approve before presentation to the Council for final approval.
e. Calculate a 2026–27 spending limit for the NCEES Foundation. Provide a recommendation to the NCEES board of directors for action at the May board of directors meeting.
f. Study the financial needs of the Council, recommend sources of income and ways and means of securing adequate funds for the proper operation of the Council, assist the board of directors in assessing the financial year's budget performance, and report these findings to the Council.
g. Review all financial policies. Determine if all are necessary or if changes are needed. Propose revisions as necessary.

2024–25 audit review

The committee reviewed and discussed the independent auditor's report to the board and financial statements for the 2024–25 fiscal year, noting that the auditors issued an unmodified opinion, with no errors or irregularities, audit adjustments, or material weaknesses identified in the audit report. In addition, all financial statement disclosures were neutral, consistent, and clear, with full management cooperation.

The committee also reviewed the February 2026 financial statements, noting that the year-to-date results are favorable to budget due to greater-than-budgeted exam-delivery volumes. Coinciding with the increase in exam volumes, Study Materials revenue is also greater than budget. In reviewing the February 2026 balance sheet, the committee noted that the Customer Prepayments account balance of $16 million is larger than typical, suggesting strong future exam deliveries.

2026–27 NCEES budgets

The committee reviewed the proposed operating and capital budgets for the 2026–27 fiscal year, noting that the proposed operating budget—after mission initiatives—projects a gain of approximately $2.2 million, or 4.9 percent of total operational revenue. Two primary points of discussion: First, the budget reflects the current, elevated exam-delivery volumes. Second, the current exam-delivery contract ends on December 31, 2027, and the financial considerations of a new contract were discussed. The committee did not recommend any changes to the proposed 2026–27 operating budget. The committee also discussed the capital budget and recommended no changes.

The NCEES operating budget and capital budget are included in **Appendices A–C** of this report. The committee will present **Motions 1–2** as a result of this charge.

Within the 2026–27 operating budget is a $100,000 contribution to the NCEES Foundation; this represents the final payment to NCEES from a copyright infringement settlement. The committee is presenting **Motion 3** to approve the $100,000 contribution to the Foundation.

2026–27 NCEES Foundation budget

The committee reviewed the 2026–27 NCEES Foundation budget; this budget is included within the 2026–27 NCEES operating budget. Per an expense agreement, NCEES is funding the Foundation's annual expenses up to $75,000 during a five-year term. The purpose of this agreement is to increase the Foundation's funds available for mission investments. The total budget amount for 2026–27 is $161,911, consisting of the $100,000 contribution, travel, and systems costs.

NCEES Foundation transfer

A transfer to the NCEES Foundation is considered an addition to the investment corpus and is not spent directly. Instead, the transfer is to increase the investment earnings on that corpus and, in turn, the funding capacity of the Foundation.

In evaluating a potential transfer to the Foundation, the committee studied two results: First, a five-year financial projection was developed to determine if a transfer was financially prudent. In developing the projection, considerations included exam volume trends, revenue diversification opportunities, and estimated future exam-delivery costs. Based on the work performed, the committee felt the financial results of the projection were adequate to ensure the Council's financial health with a transfer to the Foundation. Second, the committee reviewed the February 2026 Reserves Available for Mission Initiatives/Capital Projects balance, calculated according to Financial Policy (FP) 1C. Per that review, the committee felt there were sufficient funds to recommend a transfer. In determining the amount of the transfer, the committee discussed the importance of transferring corpus funds to the Foundation to create sufficient investment income to fund mission investment opportunities. After a review of the reserve provisions within FP 1C, including the result of Charge 4, the committee is presenting **Motion 4** to approve a transfer of 50 percent of the February 2026 Reserves Available for Mission Initiatives/Capital Projects, adjusted for the result of Charge 4, to the NCEES Foundation. This amount will equal $8.6 million. The remaining balance will be managed in accordance with FP 1.

The proposed NCEES Foundation contribution and transfer are included in **Appendices A–B** of this report.

NCEES Foundation spending limit

The committee reviewed the Foundation's investment balances over several quarters and the annual returns on investments during multiple years. The committee chose to calculate the 2026–27 spending limit for the Foundation by multiplying the December 31, 2025, balance by 4 percent and adding the contributions/donations received during the previous calendar year. The committee felt that using a 4-percent rate would provide funding for the Foundation while preserving and accelerating the growth of the market balance.

Based on the calculation process, the committee is recommending a Foundation 2026–27 annual spending limit of $968,000. The annual spending limit recommendation will not result in a motion, as it will be presented to the NCEES board of directors for approval, per the *NCEES Foundation Policy Manual*.

Financial needs study

The committee reviewed the financial condition of the Council through the following evaluations:

- 2024–25 audited financial statements and February 2026 financials, including the Reserve Statement
- 2026–27 proposed budgets—NCEES operating and capital, NCEES Foundation operating
- Five-year financial projection
- Revenue diversification opportunities
- Profit margin determinations
- Exam volume trends
- Exam-pricing mechanisms

Through these comprehensive reviews, the committee concluded that the overall financial condition of NCEES remains strong. The Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exams are delivering at an all-time high computer-based testing (CBT) level, the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) exams have transitioned well to CBT, Study Materials revenue reflects exam-delivery volumes, and Records and Credentials Evaluations activity continues

to grow. In addition, expenses are well-monitored. Like many organizations, NCEES experienced a significant unrealized gain to the investment reserves balance on September 30, 2025, due to growth in the market.

Exam revenue is a substantial portion of all revenue for NCEES and must generate enough positive income to ensure that short- and long-term resources are available to the Council. This income is used to fund programs and services that support the NCEES mission and provide value to the member boards.

As stated, the committee also reviewed the NCEES Reserve Statement and concluded that the Council currently has adequate reserve funds to satisfy the designations within FP 1C.

Financial policy review

The committee reviewed the financial policies and is recommending three amendments. There will be additional recommendations for policy changes related to specific charges.

Per a review of FP 1C, the committee is proposing language changes, as the word *reserve* is used for several different purposes and therefore could be confusing to the reader. In addition, the committee is proposing updated FP 1C language to reflect the current annual practice of the committee reviewing the reserve funds.

In FP 1D, the committee is recommending language to clarify that the NCEES board of directors can commit a maximum of $500,000 per year and that the total should be reflected in the annual budget. The language clarification ensures that multiyear commitments are not made.

The committee also is recommending the removal of a sentence in FP 6, which partially refers to administering an exam in a pencil-and-paper format.

The committee will present **Motions 5–7** as a result of this charge.

Charge 2

Monitor revenue and cost trends throughout the transition to computer-based testing for all examinations, including exam volumes and recovery rates.

While only a few exams—most notably the PE Civil and Structural exams—are being monitored post-transition to CBT, all exams are being monitored following the COVID-19 pandemic. Understanding these exam-delivery trends assists in projecting future exam volumes and exam revenue.

The committee noted that FE exams are currently delivering at an all-time high CBT level. The data suggests that the primary reason for the higher volumes is that more prior-year graduates are taking the exams. Examinee volumes for current-year graduates are also increasing. It is projected that PE volumes will increase in the near future because of the FE volumes and growing decoupling, or allowing licensure candidates to take the PE exam before meeting the experience requirement. Both the Fundamentals of Surveying (FS) and Principles and Practice of Surveying (PS) exams have experienced tremendous growth over the past four to five years.

The committee recommends continued monitoring of the exam volumes to determine the long-term impact of the current high FE volumes as well as the future PE volumes.

Charge 3

Develop a process and calculation for automatically adjusting future exam prices, using the 2024–25 Advisory Committee on Council Activities recommendation as a foundation. Consider models such as the Consumer Price Index and provide recommendations as appropriate.

The 2024–25 Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA) recommended that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) be used in the calculation of exam costs and ultimately in the determination of exam prices. For 2025–26, the Finance Committee was charged with developing a process for that to occur. In developing that process, the committee had four considerations:

- **Measurement categories:** While ACCA recommended using CPI as a measurement, the committee is recommending adding the annual increase of the exam-delivery contract, as exam-delivery costs are 37 percent of all 2026–27 budget expenses. With that, the committee weighted the CPI for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) at 60 percent and the exam-delivery contract at 40 percent when calculating the percentage increase.

- **Timing for adjustments:** Should the automatic exam price adjustment be based on a percentage-increase trigger or be time-based? For consistency purposes—and ease of implementation—the committee is recommending that the exam price change be based on time, every two years.
- **Process for approval:** Should the exam price adjustment be automatic and written into FP 6, or should there be formal approval by the board or Council vote? The committee is recommending that the exam price change occur automatically, without a board or Council vote.
- **Committee role:** What is the role of the Finance Committee in monitoring the automatic exam price adjustments? The committee is recommending that the Finance Committee perform a full cost review for all exams annually to determine that the automatic exam price change is reasonable in relation to the costs. If the committee determines that a modification to the automatic price change is needed, the committee could bring forth a motion to adjust.

In summary, two measurement categories—CPI-U and the exam-delivery contract—will be used to calculate a two-year cumulative percentage change; this percentage change will be applied to exam prices. The calculation will occur every two years in January, as of December 31. The exam price changes will occur automatically, without a formal vote by either the board or Council, and FP 6 language will be revised to reflect this. The Finance Committee will perform a full exam-cost review annually to ensure that the price adjustment aligns with the current exam costs. In the event a modification to the automatic adjustment is needed, the committee will bring forth a motion for that modification. Without a modification motion—or if the committee's motion fails—the automatic change will occur. The price change would become effective January 1 of the year following the measurement.

The committee recommends that the 2026–27 Finance Committee develop a schedule for the implementation of the automatic exam-pricing process.

The committee will present **Motion 8** as a result of this charge.

Charge 4

Review the calculation of the data breach reserve in accordance with FP 1 C.3 to assess its sufficiency. Recommend revisions as necessary.

The current FP 1C.3 data breach designation to the reserve funds is $6 million; this designation is to equal the anticipated costs of a data breach, including lost revenue during recovery, less insurance provisions. In determining the adequacy of this amount, the committee used data breach calculation resources to first calculate the potential liability in the event of a breach; the potential liability totaled $10.4 million. The committee then evaluated costs associated with additional insurance, beyond the current $5 million of insurance coverage. Weighing the potential liability amount, the current insurance coverage, the current FP 1C.3 designation amount, and the total of the FP 1C designations, the committee recommends lowering the FP 1C.3 designation to $5.4 million and maintaining $5 million of insurance.

The committee has no motions as a result of this charge.

Charge 5

Establish a budgetary goal for gain from operations, including mission initiatives, expressed as a percentage of total annual revenue. Provide a recommendation to the board of directors.

In determining an adequate budgetary gain from operations goal, the committee started with understanding the purpose of an annual operational gain: an annual operational gain is necessary to provide reserve funds to make current and future mission investments; without an annual operational gain, reserves begin funding operations, reserve balances decrease, and the ability to make mission investments diminishes. The committee reviewed operational gain data from several like-revenue, national nonprofit organizations over multiple years. Even with data within five years of a pandemic, the results showed consistent 6–12 percent operational gains from the organizations reviewed. The committee will recommend a 4–8 percent range as a budgetary goal for gain from operations to the board of directors.

Charge 6

Review the funding structure for all volunteer travel—with and without stipend—and evaluate whether a uniform approach should be adopted. Provide a recommendation to the board of directors.

Currently, the board of directors uses a credit card system for their travel, while non-board volunteers receive a travel stipend for attending exam committees, standing committees, zone and annual meetings, etc. During this review, the committee assessed the types of travel required of a board member and determined that, for ease of use and consistency, a credit card process fits the travel activities of the board best. The committee also felt the current travel stipend process provides convenience and efficiency for the non-board volunteers. This recommendation will be made to the board of directors.

Charge 7

Review FP 6 to determine whether exam pricing should be approved by the full Council or solely by the board of directors. Recommend revisions as necessary.

In accomplishing the work of Charge 3, the committee is recommending that an exam price adjustment be made to all exams every two years; these adjustments would be automatic, without approval by either the full Council or the board of directors. The Finance Committee will perform a full cost review on the exams annually to ensure that the exam prices align with the exam costs. In the event a modification to the automatic adjustment is needed, the committee will bring forth a motion to be approved by the full Council.

The committee has no motions as a result of this charge, as Charge 3 produced Motion 8.

Charge 8

Collaborate with staff to research alternative revenue sources. Provide recommendations to the board of directors.

According to the proposed 2026–27 budget data, exam revenue represents 71 percent of all NCEES revenue. To reduce the burden on exam revenue and exam prices, the committee worked with staff to develop alternative revenue opportunities to better diversify future revenue for NCEES. While several alternative revenue opportunities will be recommended to the board of directors, the committee focused on two. First, the development of PE and PS interactive practice exams (IPEs). Currently, FE and FS exams each have an IPE, with tremendous revenue results. With current FE and FS exam-delivery volumes at all-time high levels, the committee felt it was a perfect opportunity to develop an IPE for PE and PS exams. Second, the committee focused on firm services—developing and offering services that benefit professional firms. Further study on this topic is necessary and will be advanced with surveys, etc.; however, the committee felt that firm services could offer revenue opportunities and expanded mission advancement.

The committee has no motions as a result of this charge.

Charge 9

Review FP 3 and assess the feasibility of funding incoming committee and task force chairs to attend the annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.

NCEES funds current committee and task force chairs to the annual meeting. The committee assessed the funding of incoming committee and task force chairs to the annual meeting and determined that the value of the incoming chairs receiving exposure to annual meeting activities exceeded the cost of funding.

The committee will present **Motion 9** as a result of this charge.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Finances:**

Kelly Fedele, P.E., P.S., Chair

Members
Todde Folkerts, P.E., P.L.S.
Edward Hubner, P.E.
Joseph Jakubowski III, P.E.
James Kelly, P.E.
Michael Kidd, P.L.S.
David Martini, P.E.
Dennis Truax, Ph.D., P.E.
Christina Wong

Ex-officio member
Samuel Wilson, DBA, P.E.

Board liaison
Karl Tonander, P.E.

Staff liaison
Joe Scheving, CPA

MOTIONS

Finance Motion 1
Move that the adoption of the 2026–27 operating budget as shown in **Appendices A–B** be postponed to the end of the last business session.

Rationale
The committee proposes postponing consideration of the motion to take into account any subsequent actions adopted by the Council that may affect this budget.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 2
Move that the adoption of the 2026–27 capital budget as shown in **Appendix C** be postponed to the end of the last business session.

Rationale
The committee proposes postponing consideration of the motion to take into account any subsequent actions adopted by the Council that may affect this budget.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 3
Move to approve a $100,000 contribution to the NCEES Foundation.

Rationale
Based on the financial health of the organization, the $100,000 copyright infringement award is available as a contribution to the NCEES Foundation. These funds could be spent by the Foundation in 2027–28.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 4

Move to approve a transfer to the NCEES Foundation equal to 50 percent of the February 2026 Reserves Available for Mission Initiatives/Capital Project balance, adjusted for the $400,000 reduction in the FP 1C.3 non-exam breach designation recommended in Charge 4; the transfer will equal $8.6 million.

Rationale

Based on both the current Reserves Available for Mission Initiatives/Capital Projects balance and the results of a five-year NCEES operational financial projection, the transfer is available without negatively impacting the long-term financial health of NCEES. These funds would become part of the investment corpus of the Foundation and would not be available to be directly spent. Instead, they would be used to create investment income for the Foundation, which can be spent on mission investment opportunities.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 5

Move that Financial Policy 1C be amended as follows:

FP 1 Council Funds

C. ~~The r~~Reserve funds (current tangible assets plus tangible marketable long-term investments minus current liabilities) should be accumulated to and maintained at a level sufficient for each of the following:
   1. A ~~designated reserve~~ designation equal to a minimum amount of 50 percent of the annual operating budget
   2. An ~~designated~~ exam breach ~~reserve~~ designation equal to the computed cost of a probable or potential exam breach based on the current approved item replacement costs
   3. A data breach ~~reserve~~ designation equal to the anticipated costs of such an incident, including lost revenue during recovery, less insurance provisions
   4. A building ~~reserve~~ designation for long-range capital improvements and building system and/or component replacements

   ~~Reserve funds in excess of the reserves stated above may be designated by the board of directors for other NCEES mission advancement initiatives or capital projects.~~ If the reserve funds fall below the ~~reserve~~ designation levels stated above, the Council shall strive to correct the situation. ~~All reserves shall be reviewed annually by NCEES staff and presented to the board of directors and the Committee on Finances.~~ The Committee on Finances shall annually review the reserve funds and designation balances to ensure the long-term financial health of NCEES and to recommend a potential NCEES Foundation transfer to the board of directors for approval by the Council.

Rationale

The word *reserve* was used for different purposes, potentially creating confusion. The modified language also reflects the current annual practice of the Finance Committee reviewing the reserve and designation amounts.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 6
Move that Financial Policy 1D be amended as follows:

FP 1 Council Funds

D. TheNCEES board of directors shall have the authority to make discretionary contributions for funding requests to ~~outside~~ nonprofit organizations. The total amount of all discretionary contributions that the NCEES board of directors is authorized to ~~make~~ commit may not exceed $500,000 per fiscal year, although the disbursement may extend beyond the current fiscal year. Any funding above $500,000 total is required to be voted on by the full Council.

Rationale

The proposed language clarifies that the NCEES board of directors can commit a maximum of $500,000 per fiscal year.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 7
Move that Financial Policy 6 be amended as follows:

FP 6 Examination Prices

The Committee on Finances shall annually review all examination prices and propose any changes to examination prices for Council vote at the annual meeting. The current exam prices are as follows:

Examination	Price	Date Approved	Date Effective
FE	$225	8/22	1/24
FS	$225	8/22	1/24
PE	$400	8/22	1/24
PS	$375	8/22	1/24
PLSS	$325	8/23	1/25
PE Structural			
Vertical breadth section	$350	8/22	1/24
Vertical depth section	$350	8/22	1/24
Lateral breadth section	$350	8/22	1/24
Lateral depth section	$350	8/22	1/24

All examinees are required to pay NCEES directly.
~~Price includes exam development, scoring, and computer-based exam administration.~~

Rationale

The last sentence is not necessary and refers to scoring an exam in pencil-and-paper format.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Finance Motion 8
Move that Financial Policy 6 be amended as follows:

FP 6 Examination Prices
~~The Committee on Finances shall annually review all examination prices and propose any changes to examination prices for Council vote at the annual meeting.~~ Exam prices are adjusted automatically every two years. The percentage change will be based on a combination of 60 percent of the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers and 40 percent of the change in the exam-delivery contract cost for the preceding two-year period. These adjustments take effect without a formal vote. The Committee on Finances will review all exam prices annually and, as necessary, recommend modifications to the automatic adjustments for Council vote at the annual meeting. The current exam prices are as follows:
[. . .]

Rationale
Exam revenue is 71 percent of all revenue for NCEES and must generate sufficient resources for Council activities. The 2024–25 ACCA recommended an exam-pricing process to make the process more consistent, systematic, and timely. The Finance Committee further developed that recommendation.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, non-consent agenda

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Finance Motion 9
Move that Financial Policy 3B be amended as follows:

FP 3 Travel Expenses
NCEES shall budget for and pay travel expenses for NCEES-funded meeting attendees as described below. NCEES shall also waive the registration fee for NCEES-funded attendees to the annual meeting and zone interim meetings but shall not pay the cost of optional functions that are not included in the registration fee. All authorized travel and reimbursements shall be in accordance with the NCEES travel policy. Unbudgeted international travel shall require authorization by the board of directors.

B. NCEES annual business meetings
   1. Members of the current NCEES board of directors, incoming vice presidents, nominees for the incoming NCEES president-elect and treasurer positions, and past presidents. Registration fees shall be waived for a guest of each.
   2. A minimum of three funded delegates from each member board as specified by the member board. Member boards must meet the *Bylaws* requirements for voting to receive the benefits of funded delegates.
   3. Member board members who are attending their first annual meeting and who have been appointed to their board within 24 months before the annual meeting
   4. The designated member board administrator (MBA) of each member board. When an MBA represents more than one board, the funding shall be for the designated MBA only and not for the assistant MBA or for member board staff. Member boards must meet the *Bylaws* requirements for voting to receive the benefits of a funded MBA.
   5. Current and incoming ~~C~~chairs of NCEES standing committees and task forces
   6. NCEES service award recipients and a guest. Registration fees shall be waived for a guest of each award recipient.
   7. Zone assistant vice presidents and zone secretaries
   8. The NCEES representative to the ABET board of delegates, the alternate NCEES ABET representative, and the commissioners on the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET, the Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET, and the Applied and Natural Science Accreditation Commission of ABET
   9. NCEES Foundation board of directors members

Financial impact
With the various levels of annual meeting funding, the committee is estimating that six additional attendees will be funded as a result of this motion. The impact to the 2026–27 budget will be an addition of $13,680.

Rationale
It is important for incoming committee and task force chairs to receive exposure to the annual meeting activities before assuming chair responsibilities.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

APPENDIX A: OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY

		2026–27 Proposed Budget	2025–26 Approved Budget
INCOME			
Support Services Revenue		573,075	571,993
Examination Services Revenue		36,301,629	32,482,734
Member Services Revenue		8,909,794	8,339,462
	Total Income	45,784,498	41,394,189
EXPENSES			
General and Administrative		9,865,804	8,800,082
Meetings and Outreach Services		5,702,790	5,355,068
Examination Services		25,993,357	24,000,830
Member Services		1,991,914	1,607,557
	Total Expenses	43,553,865	39,763,537
NET OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)		**2,230,633**	**1,630,652**
Mission Initiatives		0	605,000
	Subtotal	2,230,633	1,025,652
NONOPERATING ITEMS			
Interest and Investment Income		1,471,055	1,591,676
Other Income		0	0
NET INCOME		**3,701,688**	**2,617,328**
TRANSFER			
Transfer to NCEES Foundation		8,600,000	9,400,000
CONTRIBUTION			
Contribution to NCEES Foundation		100,000	100,000

APPENDIX B: 2026–27 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

SUPPORT SERVICES REVENUE	
Member Board Fees	434,500
Participating Organizations Liaison Council (POLC) Fees	0
Annual Meeting Fees	62,200
Other Meeting Fees	41,375
Miscellaneous Income	35,000
Total Support Services Revenue	**573,075**
SUPPORT SERVICES OPERATING EXPENSES	
Officer/Staff Travel	
President	41,500
Past President	25,000
President-Elect	33,000
Central Zone Vice President	23,000
Northeast Zone Vice President	23,000
Southern Zone Vice President	23,000
Western Zone Vice President	23,000
Treasurer	22,000
Chief Executive Officer	33,000
Staff	24,500
International	142,500
Subtotal	**413,500**
Committee Travel and Expenses	
Advisory Committee on Council Activities	27,000
Bylaws Committee	11,500
Committee on Licensure	27,000
Finance Committee	36,000
Member Board Administrators (MBA) Committee	27,000
Law Enforcement Committee	27,000
POLC	19,000
Education Committee	33,000
Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines Committee	27,000
Ad Hoc Committees	99,000
Subtotal	**333,500**
Annual Meeting	
Staff Travel	55,088
Expenses	663,241
Publications	50,000
Award Recipient Travel	17,474
Awards and Presentations	11,510
Funded Delegate Travel	602,160
Subtotal	**1,399,473**
Board Presidents/MBA Assembly	0
MBA Meeting and Board Attendee	76,061
Zone Meeting Expenses	714,666
Meeting Registration Expenses	8,640
Promotion and Outreach	
Engineering Education Award	101,450
Surveying Education Award	155,700
Discretionary Outreach	500,000
Licensure Outreach	1,101,800
Marketing	898,000

Subtotal	**2,756,950**
Total Meetings and Outreach	**5,702,790**
GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE	
Personnel and Human Resources	
Salaries	4,912,027
Payroll Taxes (FICA)	332,888
Payroll Insurance (State)	2,500
Group Insurance	667,209
Employee Retirement Fund	429,466
Recruiting	44,380
Employee Development	154,497
Subtotal	**6,542,967**
Office	
Rent and Property Tax	5,100
Electricity	115,683
Water	7,759
Building Security	19,354
Building Maintenance	132,781
Cleaning and Ground Maintenance	187,452
Subtotal	**468,129**
Administrative	
Postage	3,321
Supplies	33,000
Credit Card/Bank Fees	12,882
Excise Tax	26,160
Foundation Operating Expenses	161,911
Administrative Printing	17,500
Strategic Planning	31,000
Noncapitalized Purchases	6,000
Subtotal	**291,774**
Technology Services	
Telecommunications	119,010
Cloud and Infrastructure	146,359
Software	385,600
Hardware, Equipment, and Maintenance	179,204
Subtotal	**830,173**
Insurance and Bond	
Travel	5,411
Building and Liability	14,952
Directors and Officers	25,821
Professional Liability	40,611
Workers' Compensation	10,199
Subtotal	**96,994**

APPENDIX B: 2026–27 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

Dues and Professional Fees	
ABET Dues and Meetings	21,500
Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards	10,500
Alliance for Responsible Professional Licensing	53,500
Other Memberships and Dues	16,800
Legal Fees	150,750
Audit and Payment Processing	91,225
Lobbying and Consulting	75,500
Other Professional and Consulting Fees	232,265
Subtotal	**652,040**
Depreciation and Interest	
Interest Expense	8,568
Amortization Expense	246,200
Equipment and Furniture Depreciation	315,915
Building Depreciation	413,044
Subtotal	**983,727**
Total General and Administrative Expenses	**9,865,804**
TOTAL SUPPORT SERVICES OPERATING EXPENSES	**15,568,594**
GAIN/(LOSS) FROM SUPPORT SERVICES	**(14,995,519)**
EXAMINATION SERVICES OPERATING REVENUE	
EXAMINATIONS	
Fundamentals of Engineering	16,451,700
Principles and Practice of Engineering	13,814,450
Structural Engineering	895,950
Fundamentals of Surveying	676,925
Principles and Practice of Surveying	825,550
Subtotal	**32,664,575**
STUDY MATERIALS	
Publication Sales	3,637,054
Subtotal	**3,637,054**
TOTAL EXAMINATION SERVICES OPERATING REVENUE	**36,301,629**
EXAMINATION SERVICES OPERATING EXPENSES	
EXAMINATIONS	
Fundamentals of Engineering	
Computer-Based Testing (CBT) Seat Fees	9,284,157
Contracted Services	700
Psychometric Consulting Services	267,375
Travel	441,464
Subtotal	**9,993,696**
Principles and Practice of Engineering	
CBT Seat Fees	5,564,451
Contracted Services	23,425
Psychometric Consulting Services	882,625
Travel	1,370,700
Subtotal	**7,841,201**
Structural	
CBT Seat Fees	405,700
Contracted Services	0

Psychometric Consulting Services	0
Travel	370,459
Subtotal	**776,159**
Fundamentals of Surveying	
CBT Seat Fees	387,071
Contracted Services	250
Psychometric Consulting Services	35,275
Travel	37,046
Subtotal	**459,642**
Principles and Practice of Surveying	
CBT Seat Fees	339,089
Contracted Services	1,400
Psychometric Consulting Services	56,875
Travel	231,537
Subtotal	**628,901**
Committee Travel and Expenses	
Examination Audit Committee Travel	14,629
Examination Audit Psychometric Services	16,044
Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) Travel	31,430
Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE) Travel	53,675
EPE Psychometric Services	15,194
Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS) Travel	31,764
EPS Psychometric Services	3,600
Subtotal	**166,336**
Examination Materials and Shipping	
Freight and Shipping	1,000
ADA Consulting Expense	464,892
Other Professional Fees	20,000
Meeting Registration Fees	8,640
Subtotal	**494,532**
Examination Development	
Principles and Practice of Engineering Development—Cut Scores	395,824
Fundamentals of Engineering Development—Cut Scores	327,900
Fundamentals of Surveying Development—Cut Scores	52,600
Principles and Practice of Surveying Development—Cut Scores	52,600
Subtotal	**828,924**
Total Examination Expenses	**21,189,391**
STUDY MATERIALS	
Publication Printing Expense	31,681
Digital Product Expense	300,000
Postage and Shipping Expense	10,390
Total Study Materials Expenses	**342,071**

APPENDIX B: 2026–27 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES	
Salaries (Direct)	2,653,546
Payroll Taxes (Direct)	202,297
Benefits and Retirement (Direct)	721,446
Credit Card Processing (Revenue Ratio Allocation)	826,572
Compliance and Security	58,034
Total Other Direct Expenses	**4,461,895**
TOTAL EXAMINATION SERVICES OPERATING EXPENSES	**25,993,357**
GAIN/(LOSS) FROM EXAMINATION SERVICES	**10,308,272**
MEMBER SERVICES OPERATING REVENUE	
Application Fees—Records	2,066,444
Transmittal Fees—Records	4,974,150
Application Fees—Credentials	1,792,000
Reevaluation Fees—Credentials	32,200
Continuing Professional Competency (CPC) Courses	45,000
TOTAL MEMBER SERVICES OPERATING REVENUE	**8,909,794**
MEMBER SERVICES OPERATING EXPENSES	
NCEES RECORDS/CREDENTIALS EVALUATIONS SERVICES EXPENSES	
Postage and Shipping	100
Travel/Audit—Credentials	3,500
Electronic Transcript Services	17,224
Total Records/Credentials Expenses	**20,824**
OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES	
Salaries (Direct)	1,300,921
Payroll Taxes (Direct)	98,908
Benefits and Retirement (Direct)	308,836
Credit Card Processing (Revenue Ratio Allocation)	204,925
CPC Course Development	57,500
Total Other Direct Expenses	**1,971,090**
TOTAL MEMBER SERVICES OPERATING EXPENSES	**1,991,914**
GAIN/(LOSS) FROM MEMBER SERVICES	**6,917,880**
OPERATION TOTALS	
TOTAL REVENUE	**45,784,498**
TOTAL EXPENSES	**43,553,865**
GAIN/(LOSS) FROM OPERATIONS	**2,230,633**
Mission Initiatives	0
GAIN/(LOSS) BEFORE NONOPERATING ITEMS	**2,230,633**
NONOPERATING ITEMS	
Interest and Investment Income	1,471,055
GRAND TOTALS	**3,701,688**
TRANSFER	
Transfer to NCEES Foundation	8,600,000
CONTRIBUTION	
Contribution to NCEES Foundation	100,000

APPENDIX C: 2026–27 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET

CAPITAL PURCHASES/LEASES	
Equipment	
Security Cameras	40,000
Building System Replacements (Scheduled)	50,000
	90,000
TOTAL	**90,000**

Advisory Committee on Council Activities

Christy VanBuskirk, P.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA) provides advice and briefing to the NCEES president and board of directors on new policy issues, problems, and plans that warrant preliminary assessment of policy choices and procedures not yet assigned to a standing committee or involving several existing committees.

ACCA used Basecamp to conduct the preliminary work on charges, held an organizational meeting through Zoom on October 1, 2025, held two virtual meetings through Zoom on November 19 and December 10, 2025, and met in person in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, January 16–17, 2026, to finalize the work to make recommendations to the Council.

The committee was assigned eight charges and will present 10 motions. **The motions begin on page 67.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. *Review all administrative policies, professional policies, and position statements in the* Manual of Policy and Position Statements. *Determine if each policy and position statement remains relevant and whether any are covered in other NCEES manuals. Propose revisions as necessary.*

All committee members were charged with reviewing these documents and bringing forth any suggested changes. ACCA reviewed Administrative Policy (AP) 3, AP 18, Professional Policy (PP) 2, and PP 5.

AP 3 Council Identification

AP 3 stipulates that all NCEES exams and other publications carry the title "National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying." The committee reviewed the policy and noted that many of the Council publications use the acronym "NCEES" in lieu of "National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying."

ACCA will present **Motion 1** to amend AP 3 to also allow the use of "NCEES" in publications.

AP 18 Council Support to Nominees for National Office

AP 18 limits Council support for nominees to national NCEES offices to providing addresses of NCEES members. The committee reviewed the policy and noted technology and communication evolve over time. Providing only addresses restricts other ways to effectively communicate with members.

ACCA will present **Motion 2** to amend AP 18 by striking "addresses" and adding "contact information" to reflect current practice.

PP 2 Uniform Qualifications for Licensure and PP 5 NCEES Model Law Designations

The committee reviewed PP 2 and PP 5 in conjunction with Position Statement 5.1 International Activities and Council-approved international mutual recognition agreements (MRAs).

The committee noted the following:

- PP 5 establishes Model Law Engineer and related designations to facilitate licensure by comity among U.S. jurisdictions.
- Council-approved MRAs operate through recognition of substantial equivalence between licensure and regulatory systems.
- The policies do not explicitly distinguish between Model Law designations (domestic comity) and MRAs (international recognition).

While the existing policies are internally consistent, the absence of clarifying language could lead to inconsistent interpretation regarding whether Model Law designations are prerequisites for recognition under MRAs.

The committee determined that targeted clarifying amendments are appropriate to confirm the following:

- NCEES has authority to execute Council-approved MRAs.
- Model Law designations are intended to facilitate domestic comity and are not prerequisites for recognition under MRAs unless required by statute or rule.

The committee will present **Motions 3–4** to amend PP 2 and PP 5 as a result of this charge.

Charge 2

Review Bylaws *4.04 and 4.05 to determine whether past presidents should be eligible to serve as NCEES treasurer. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed *Bylaws* 4.04 and 4.05 regarding the eligibility of a past president to be elected and serve as treasurer. *Bylaws* 4.04 only specifically precludes a past president from serving as president-elect; by default, a past president would be allowed to serve as vice president or treasurer. The committee discussed whether there were circumstances where a past president would continue to be eligible for any office, given the requirements for service on their member board during the year in which they are elected. Few past presidents are currently eligible. The committee determined that a past president should be ineligible to serve in any office.

The committee will present **Motion 5** to amend *Bylaws* Section 4.04. No changes to Section 4.05 were determined to be necessary.

Charge 3

Review Bylaws *12.02 and AP 8 to evaluate the current amendment approval process. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Per AP 8B, the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG) is generally charged with incorporating changes in *Model Law* and *Model Rules* approved by the Council at an annual meeting. The UPLG Committee is charged with reviewing the language for consistency and amending other policies and procedures that may be affected by the adopted changes. Under current procedures, UPLG presents the amendments to *Model Law* or *Model Rules* to the Council at a subsequent annual meeting for final adoption. At times, this results in a second debate regarding the underlying intent of the prior motion. ACCA recommends that the procedures be revised such that incorporation of the adopted changes to *Model Law* or *Model Rules* be performed administratively, if the original intent and meaning are not modified. UPLG would be charged with incorporating the language as adopted and would not be required to present final motions to Council; approval of the changes as recommended by UPLG would rest with the board of directors. Any changes to *Model Law* or *Model Rules* recommended by UPLG that have not been adopted by the Council will continue to be presented for adoption at an annual meeting.

Similarly, AP 8C requires that motions to amend exam prices in Financial Policy 6 that are presented at an annual business meeting by an entity other than the Committee on Finances require that the changes be presented to Council for a final vote at a subsequent annual meeting. This could lead to amending motions that would require reconsideration by the Finance Committee. ACCA recommends that no changes to an adopted motion be permitted.

Finally, per AP 8D, the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures is generally charged with incorporating changes in examination policies adopted by the Council at an annual meeting. ACCA recommends that a similar procedure to that proposed for *Model Law* and *Model Rules* amendments be used for these changes to be implemented.

ACCA will present **Motions 6–8** to revise AP 8 to modify the amendment approval processes. No changes to *Bylaws* 12.02, which addresses amendments to the *Bylaws*, are recommended.

Charge 4

Review the Bylaws *to determine whether ex-officio committee members should be granted voting rights. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The are two locations in the *Bylaws* that mention ex-officio members: Section 5.01 specifies that the president is an ex-officio member of all NCEES committees and task forces, and Section 7.09 specifies that the present-elect and treasurer serve as ex-officio members of the Finance Committee.

The committee researched the *Robert's Rules of Order* definition of "ex officio." The following guidance is provided in the FAQ section of the publication's website (robertsrules.com): "'Ex officio' is a Latin term meaning 'by virtue of office or position.' Ex-officio members of boards and committees, therefore, are persons who are members by virtue of some other office or position that they hold. […] The ex-officio member has all of the rights and privileges of membership, including the right to vote."

Historically the NCEES president's and treasurer's ex-officio memberships on committees have been advisory and nonvoting roles. The committee agreed that ex-officio committee members should not be granted voting rights, aligning with current practice.

ACCA will present **Motion 9** to incorporate nonvoting language for ex-officio members into the *Bylaws*.

Charge 5

Review Model Law *120.20 to assess whether citizenship requirements are adequately addressed and consider the inclusion of permanent U.S. residents. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed *Model Law* 120.20, which currently requires that all professional engineer, professional surveyor, and public members of a board be citizens of the United States and residents of the jurisdiction.

The committee reviewed survey responses from member boards regarding eligibility requirements for appointed board members. While a majority of responding jurisdictions require U.S. citizenship for board service, a meaningful minority operate under constitutional or statutory appointment frameworks that permit permanent residents to serve or that do not impose a nationality requirement.

The committee determined that modifying *Model Law* 120.20 to allow both U.S. citizens and permanent residents to serve on member boards reflects existing state legal structures while maintaining high standards for board governance.

ACCA will present **Motion 10** to amend *Model Law* 120.20.

Charge 6

Study member board use of pro tempore members and evaluate whether Model Law *should be revised to allow for pro tempore members in board composition. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Model Law 120.10 stipulates, "In the event of a vacancy on the board due to resignation, death, or for any cause resulting in an unexpired term, if not filled within three months by the governor, the board may appoint a provisional member to serve in the interim until the governor acts."

The committee does not believe that explicit acknowledgment of the term "pro-tempore members" should be incorporated into *Model Law*. Section 120.10 currently allows provisional members to serve.

No changes to the *Model Law* are necessary.

Charge 7

Review Model Law *120.60 to evaluate whether the authority to establish continuing professional competency requirements should be added as a board power. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Model Law 120.60 E stipulates, "The board shall have the power and authority to require a demonstration of continuing professional competency of professional engineers and professional surveyors as a condition of renewal or relicensure."

Section 120.60 already explicitly provides the authority to establish continuing professional competency requirements as a board power. The committee determined current *Model Law* language, while general, appears to cover the authority to establish continuing professional competency requirements.

No changes to the *Model Law* are necessary.

Charge 8
Review Model Law *120.60 to evaluate whether the authority to create examinations should be added as a board power. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Model Law 120.60 D stipulates, "The board may subject any applicant to such examinations as it deems necessary to determine the applicant's qualifications."

The committee noted "examinations" is a broad term (i.e., national exam, state-specific exam, ethics exam). Charge 8 refers to board powers to "create" examinations. The committee determined that current *Model Law* language, while general, appears to cover creating examinations.

No changes to the *Model Law* are necessary.

Respectfully submitted, the **Advisory Committee on Council Activities:**

Christy VanBuskirk, P.E., Chair

Members
Doyle Allen, L.S.
Scott Bishop, P.S.
Michael Jelen, P.E.
Jeffrey Jones, P.L.S.
James Purcell, P.E.
Dean Ringle, P.E., P.S.
Deveron Sanders, P.E.
Donna Sentell

Board liaison
Karl Tonander, P.E.

Staff liaison
Donna Moss

MOTIONS
ACCA Motion 1
Move that Administrative Policy 3 be amended as follows:

AP 3 Council Identification
All NCEES examinations and other publications shall carry the title "National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying" or "NCEES."

Rationale
This amendment allows the use of "National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying" or "NCEES" in NCEES examinations and publications.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

ACCA Motion 2
Move that Administrative Policy 18 be amended as follows:

AP 18 Council Support to Nominees for Public Office
Support for nominees to national NCEES offices is limited to providing ~~addresses~~ contact information of ~~the~~ NCEES members.

Rationale
This amendment allows the Council to provide contact information to reflect current practice and effectively communicate with members.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

ACCA Motion 3
Move that Professional Policy 2 be amended as follows:

PP 2 Uniform Qualifications for Licensure
NCEES promotes uniform standards for licensure based on education, experience, and examination.

NCEES promotes the assessment of qualifications of each applicant for licensure according to uniform standards as provided by NCEES examinations and by NCEES guidelines for evaluating education and experience.

Consistent with its mission to advance licensure, regulation, and professional mobility, NCEES may engage with foreign engineering and surveying regulatory bodies and execute Council-approved international mutual recognition agreements. Such agreements are intended to recognize substantial equivalence between licensure and regulatory systems and do not supersede the authority of individual licensing jurisdictions to determine licensure requirements under applicable law.

Rationale
This amendment clarifies NCEES authority to execute Council-approved international mutual recognition agreements and affirms that such agreements operate at the level of licensure system equivalence while preserving full jurisdictional authority.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

ACCA Motion 4
Move that Professional Policy 5 be amended as follows:

PP 5 NCEES Model Law Designations
The NCEES Records program requires the delineation of the requirements for Model Law Engineer, Model Law Surveyor, and Model Law Structural Engineer. These designations ~~may be used by state licensing boards to expedite~~ are intended to facilitate licensure by comity ~~applications~~ among U.S. jurisdictions. These designations are not intended to limit or condition licensure or recognition pathways established through Council-approved international mutual recognition agreements, which shall be implemented in accordance with their respective terms and applicable jurisdictional law.

The requirements for Model Law designations may only be amended after review by an appropriate standing committee or task force and ratification by the Council.

The designations are defined as follows: [...]

Rationale
This amendment clarifies that Model Law designations are intended to facilitate domestic interstate comity and are not prerequisites for recognition under Council-approved international mutual recognition agreements unless required by statute or rule.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

ACCA Motion 5
Move that a Special Committee on Bylaws be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Bylaws* 4.04:

Section 4.04 Elections and Terms of Office. The President-Elect shall be elected by the Council at each Annual Business Meeting in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. The President-Elect shall serve the Council for a period of three years. The first year shall be as President-Elect. The second year, without further election, the President-Elect shall become President, holding that office until a successor has been installed. The third year, without further election, the President shall become Immediate Past President. Any Member elected to the office of President-Elect shall be eligible to serve as President-Elect, President, and Immediate Past President, with full authority of the offices and board privileges. Past Presidents shall be ineligible for reelection ~~as President-Elect of the Council~~ to the Board of Directors.

Rationale
The language is added to clarify that a past president should be ineligible to serve in any office and reflects current practice.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

ACCA Motion 6
Move that Administrative Policy 8B be amended as follows:

AP 8 Motions
B. Any motion to amend the *Model Law* or *Model Rules* presented at an annual business meeting by an entity other than the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG) that is adopted by the Council shall be referred to the UPLG Committee for review and ~~revision of the language before it is presented for Council vote~~ refinement as necessary for consistency. The UPLG Committee shall prepare a revised *Model Law* or *Model Rules* document that includes the amendments and present it to the board of directors for adoption no later than the board's third regular meeting of the following fiscal year. Any amendments adopted by the board of directors shall become effective immediately. Any amendments not adopted by the board of directors shall be referred back to the UPLG Committee, which shall present the amendments, in the form of a motion, to the Council at the next scheduled annual business meeting.

Rationale
This amendment allows adopted changes to *Model Law* or *Model Rules* to be approved administratively if the original intent and meaning are not modified.

Board of directors' position
Does not endorse, non-consent agenda

Board of directors' rationale
While the board appreciates the desire for efficiency, the current process is intentionally deliberative. Motions affecting the *Model Law*, *Model Rules*, examination policies, and examination fees can involve technical, legal, financial, and administrative nuances that benefit from committee review and subsequent Council consideration. The board believes final action on these matters should remain with the Council. If a proposed

change is warranted, it should withstand committee review and return to the Council for a vote at the next annual business meeting.

ACCA Motion 7
Move that Administrative Policy 8C be amended as follows:

AP 8 Motions

C. Any motion to amend exam prices in Financial Policy 6 that is presented at an annual business meeting by an entity other than the Committee on Finances that is adopted by the Council shall be referred to the Committee on Finances for review and ~~revision~~ refinement of the language ~~before it is presented~~ as necessary for consistency. The Committee on Finances shall then present the amendment in the form of a motion for Council vote at the next scheduled annual business meeting. No changes to a published motion to amend exam prices that is presented by the Committee on Finances at an annual business meeting shall be permitted.

Rationale

This amendment states that motions to amend exam prices in Financial Policy 6 presented at an annual business meeting by an entity other than the Committee on Finances are not permitted.

Board of directors' position

Does not endorse, non-consent agenda

Board of directors' rationale

While the board appreciates the desire for efficiency, the current process is intentionally deliberative. Motions affecting the *Model Law*, *Model Rules*, examination policies, and examination fees can involve technical, legal, financial, and administrative nuances that benefit from committee review and subsequent Council consideration. The board believes final action on these matters should remain with the Council. If a proposed change is warranted, it should withstand committee review and return to the Council for a vote at the next annual business meeting.

ACCA Motion 8
Move that Administrative Policy 8D be amended as follows:

AP 8 Motions

D. Any motion to amend examination policies presented at an annual business meeting by an entity other than the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP), the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE), or the Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS) that is adopted by the Council shall be referred to the EPP Committee for review and ~~revision~~ refinement of the language as necessary for consistency in consultation with any other appropriate committee ~~before it is presented for Council vote~~. The EPP Committee shall then prepare revised examination administration or examination development policies that include the amendments and present them to the board of directors for adoption no later than the board's third regular meeting of the following fiscal year. Any amendments adopted by the board of directors shall become effective immediately. Any amendments not adopted by the board of directors shall be referred back to the EPP Committee, which shall present the amendments, in the form of a motion, to the Council at the next scheduled annual business meeting.

Rationale

This amendment allows adopted changes to examination policies to be approved administratively, if the original intent and meaning are not modified.

Board of directors' position
Does not endorse, non-consent agenda

Board of directors' rationale
While the board appreciates the desire for efficiency, the current process is intentionally deliberative. Motions affecting the *Model Law*, *Model Rules*, examination policies, and examination fees can involve technical, legal, financial, and administrative nuances that benefit from committee review and subsequent Council consideration. The board believes final action on these matters should remain with the Council. If a proposed change is warranted, it should withstand committee review and return to the Council for a vote at the next annual business meeting.

ACCA Motion 9
Move that a Special Committee on Bylaws be charged with incorporating nonvoting language for ex-officio members into the *Bylaws*.

Rationale
This amendment clarifies that ex-officio memberships on committees are advisory and nonvoting roles, which reflects current practice.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

ACCA Motion 10
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* 120.20:

120.20 Board Qualifications
Each professional engineer member of the board shall be a citizen of the United States or a permanent resident of the United States, be a resident of this jurisdiction, have been engaged in the lawful practice of engineering as a professional engineer, have been in responsible charge of engineering projects for at least five years, and be a licensed professional engineer in this jurisdiction.

Each professional surveyor member of the board shall be a citizen of the United States or a permanent resident of the United States, be a resident of this jurisdiction, have been engaged in the lawful practice of surveying as a professional surveyor, have been in responsible charge of surveying projects for at least five years, and be a licensed professional surveyor in this jurisdiction.

Each public member of the board shall be a citizen of the United States or a permanent resident of the United States and a resident of this jurisdiction and shall not be or have been a licensee.

Rationale
Survey responses from member boards indicate that while many jurisdictions require U.S. citizenship for board service, a meaningful minority operate under constitutional or statutory appointment frameworks that permit permanent residents to serve or do not impose a nationality requirement.

The committee determined that allowing both U.S. citizens and permanent residents to serve on member boards reflects existing state legal structures while maintaining high standards for board governance.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Committee on Education

Brian Robertson II, P.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Education serves in an advisory role for education issues related to ABET, requirements prior to initial licensure, continuing professional competency (CPC), and foreign degree or unaccredited program evaluation.

The committee was assigned nine charges that relate to the educator summit, several NCEES education-related documents, continuing education, and other engineering and surveying education-related issues. The committee met several times virtually and in person on January 5–6, 2026, in Corpus Christi, Texas, to discuss and address its charges.

The 2025–26 committee will present six motions. **The motions begin on page 75.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. *Review the NCEES* Engineering Education Standard *and* Surveying Education Standard. *Recommend revisions as necessary.*
b. *Review the* Continuing Professional Competency Guidelines. *Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee accomplished these recurring activities and engaged in a robust discussion of the two education standards and the *CPC Guidelines*. No further revisions are being proposed to either of the education standards themselves. The committee discussed the Credentials Evaluations policies that accompany the standards and identified some edits to simplify the first bullet point. This change will facilitate reviews for a broader range of degree programs and will reduce the burden on member board administrators who regularly request evaluation exceptions.

The committee will present **Motion 1** as a result of this charge.

Charge 2

Provide support to NCEES staff as needed in the development of an educator summit scheduled for summer 2026.

The committee reached out to NCEES staff to offer support. None was needed at that time, and the committee left the offer open for NCEES staff to request support from the committee in the future if necessary.

Charge 3

Review Model Law *130.10 B.2.a(3) and Appendix D to evaluate the potential inclusion of a degree from a program accredited by the Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET (ETAC/ABET). Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed the amended language in *Model Law* 130.10 B.2.a(3) adopted at the 2025 annual meeting for ETAC/ABET-accredited degrees and discussed providing parallel language in Appendix D, Section 130.10 B.3.a(1) and (3), which provides model language for jurisdictions that license professional structural engineers. The committee discussed whether fundamentally there should be any difference in this language and determined that Appendix D should be amended with parallel language.

The committee will present **Motion 2** as a result of this charge. Note: The motion's rationale contains details of how the amendments proposed in this motion would fit with the Structural Practice Task Force motions related to this appendix.

Charge 4

Draft a list of recommended professional development topics for NCEES to offer in its continuing professional competency program.

The committee discussed this charge over the course of several meetings and identified the following list of potential topics:

- Ethics
- Proper use of seals/protecting your seal
- Responsible charge
- Fraudulent marketing of professional services
- History of licensure, NCEES model laws and rules, NCEES committee service, etc.
- Artificial intelligence (AI) in engineering and surveying/maintaining responsible charge
- Defining engineering and surveying/overlapping practice

It also identified additional adjacent services NCEES may consider offering:

- Living AI databank—what practice is allowed state-by-state
- Clearinghouse for access to state-by-state laws and rules courses

The committee expressed concern when generating this list that NCEES "stay in its licensure lane" and not be seen as competing with its industry partners on technical CPC content. The committee also discussed potential concerns that this revenue stream may violate NCEES tax status.

Charge 5

Review Position Statement (PS) 2.8 for relevance and recommend any changes.

The committee affirmed the relevance of continuing professional competency and had a robust discussion about the differences in requirements and documentation across NCEES jurisdictions. The committee also recognized that some jurisdictions, such as Delaware and Nevada, include a "home rule" provision that does not appear in this position statement. The committee is proposing one minor edit for PS 2.8.

The committee will present **Motion 3** as a result of this charge.

Charge 6

Review Model Rules *240.30 C.2 to assess whether the noted methods of delivery for CPC courses remain relevant to member boards. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed this model rule and determined that some of the language was unnecessary.

The committee will present **Motion 4** as a result of this charge.

Charge 7

Review Model Rules *240.30 B to determine if a definition for* multiple licensee *should be added. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee discussed the definition of *dual licensee* (an individual who is licensed as both a professional engineer and a professional surveyor) and recognized that for jurisdictions that license engineers by discipline, this definition does not cover those professional engineers who are licensed in more than one discipline. The committee proposes adding a definition to include those individuals.

The committee will present **Motions 5–6** as a result of this charge.

Charge 8

Review Model Rules *240.30 J and evaluate the requirement for one-third of professional development hours (PDHs) in each discipline for dual licensees. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee discussed the intended outcome of the distribution of required PDHs for dual licensees and determined that the additional requirements for multidiscipline professionals are appropriate. While the committee recognizes most of the affected individuals are licensed in two related disciplines, the possibility of more than two disciplines exists and should be covered. As a result, the committee recommends removing the "one-third in each" formula and leaving it up to the individual's discretion for the appropriate distribution of those PDH hours as long as each area of practice is addressed.

The committee will present **Motion 6** as a result of this charge.

Charge 9

Consider whether the Committee on Education would benefit from having standing representatives assigned annually from the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) and the Surveying and Geomatics Educators Society (SaGES). Make recommendations to the board of directors.

The committee discussed the potential benefits and challenges to having a standing appointment from each of these societies representing educators in engineering and surveying. After discussion, including input from the committee's board of directors liaison, the committee concluded that the president-elect should retain full discretion to appoint consultants to any committee as necessary to provide expertise that may not be available from the NCEES members to address that year's particular charges. The anticipated value of having ASEE and SaGES represented permanently was outweighed by the relatively limited additional expertise they may provide above and beyond the expertise NCEES members already bring to the committee. No changes to the *Bylaws* regarding the composition of the Committee on Education is recommended.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2024–25 Committee on Education developed a draft for a proposed NCEES Engineering Technology Education Standard. This has not yet been presented to the Council for discussion and ratification. This committee recommends that a future committee be charged with completing that draft to support the review of education standards for engineering technology degree programs that are not accredited by ETAC/ABET. The NCEES Engineering and Surveying Education standards are critical for assessing the education record for individuals who have attended institutions (domestic and foreign) that have not attained ABET accreditation in engineering and surveying. A similar standard should now be adopted for engineering technology programs since the Council now recognizes a pathway for graduates of ETAC/ABET-accredited programs. The prohibition in the NCEES Engineering Education Standard from accepting engineering technology courses would be retained when assessing non-ABET engineering degrees.

The committee recommends that a future committee be charged with supporting better actualization of the international engineering agreements through outreach to each NCEES member jurisdiction and to enhance the acceptance and understanding of the Washington Accord and Sydney Accord education accreditation members. This may also include elevating the current NCEES position statement to a new NCEES policy.

One final point of discussion from this year's Charge 1 review included the general credit of one year toward work experience requirements for a master's degree. The discussion included concerns whether a thesis-based master's degree should be treated differently than a "professional" master's degree. The committee recommends that a future committee consider whether these different master's degree programs should be credited differently towards work experience for initial licensure qualification.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Education:**

Brian Robertson II, P.E., Chair

Members
Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
William (Davey) Edwards, Ph.D., P.L.S., L.S.
Ahmed Elaksher, Ph.D., P.E., P.L.S.
Karl Link, P.E. *(withdrew in November* 2025*)*
Shelley Macy, P.E.
Sallye Perrin, P.E.
Timothy Platz, P.S.
Zana Raybon

Consultants
George Murgel, Ph.D., P.E.
Gary Thompson, P.L.S.
Marlon Vogt, P.E.
Marlee Walton, P.E., P.L.S.

Board liaison
Samuel Wilson, DBA, P.E.

Staff liaison
Marie Nebesky

MOTIONS

Education Motion 1

Move that NCEES Credentials Evaluations Policies be amended as follows:

NCEES Credentials Evaluations Policies (*Engineering Education Standard*)

NCEES Credentials Evaluations will adhere to the following in conducting evaluations.

- Evaluations will be conducted on the following:
  1. Non-EAC/ABET-accredited bachelor's degree in engineering ~~from a non-U.S.-based program~~
  2. ~~Non-EAC/ABET-accredited b~~Bachelor's degree programs ~~in engineering, engineering technology, related science, or mathematics~~ only when coupled with a master's degree or doctorate in engineering

  Evaluations may be conducted on programs that do not meet these criteria if specifically requested by an NCEES member board. Such requests must come directly from the member board to help@ncees.org.

NCEES Credentials Evaluations Policies (*Surveying Education Standard*)

NCEES Credentials Evaluations will adhere to the following in conducting evaluations.

- Evaluations will be conducted on the following:
  1. Non-ABET-accredited bachelor's degree in surveying ~~from a non-U.S.-based program~~
  ~~2. U.S.-based, non-ABET-accredited degree programs in surveying~~
  ~~3~~2. ~~U.S.-based~~ B.S./B.A. programs for applicants that have met the "surveying core" program requirements

  Evaluations may be conducted on programs that do not meet these criteria if specifically requested by an NCEES member board. Such requests must come directly from the member board to help@ncees.org.

Rationale

The committee discussed the difference between domestic non-EAC/ABET-accredited degrees and those from programs based outside the United States and decided they should both be equally eligible for credentials evaluations under this policy. The committee further discussed the language in item 2 of the policies for engineering education credentials evaluations and decided that the language proposed to be stricken was unnecessary in the policy, allowing a wider range of degrees to be evaluated against the education standard. Similar rationale was applied to the policies for surveying education credentials evaluations.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Education Motion 2

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a:

Appendix D Model Language for Member Boards that License Structural Engineers
130.10 General Requirements for Licensure

B. Engineering
   3. Licensure as a Professional Structural Engineer
      a. Initial Licensure as a Professional Structural Engineer

      An applicant who presents evidence of meeting the applicable education, examination, and experience requirements as described below shall be eligible for licensure as a professional structural engineer.

      (1) Education Requirements

      (a) An individual seeking licensure as a professional structural engineer shall possess one or more of the following education qualifications:

      (i) A degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited bachelor's program

      (ii) A degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited master's program

(iii) A degree in engineering technology from an ETAC/ABET-accredited bachelor's program

(iv) A bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree in engineering from a non-EAC/ABET-accredited program. This individual's education must be shown to meet the NCEES *Engineering Education Standard*.

(b) The degree, or degrees, must include a minimum of 18 semester (27 quarter) hours of structural analysis and design courses and at least 9 of the semester (14 quarter) hours must be structural design classes.

(2) Examination Requirements

An individual seeking licensure as a professional structural engineer shall take and pass the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) examination and the NCEES Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) Structural examination, and any jurisdiction-specific examination.

(3) Experience Requirements

An individual seeking licensure as a professional structural engineer shall present evidence of completing one of the following:

(a) Four years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in an engineering program accredited by EAC/ABET

(b) Six years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in an engineering technology program accredited by ETAC/ABET

(~~b~~c) Three years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited engineering program and a master's degree in engineering that includes at least 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of structural engineering (in addition to the 18 hours noted above)

(d) Five years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in engineering technology from an ETAC/ABET-accredited engineering program and a master's degree in engineering that includes at least 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of structural engineering (in addition to the 18 hours noted above)

(~~c~~e) Three years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a master's degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited engineering program that includes at least 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of structural engineering (in addition to the 18 hours noted above)

(~~d~~f) Two years of acceptable structural engineering experience and an earned doctoral degree in engineering focused on structural engineering from an institution that offers EAC/ABET-accredited programs

(g) Four years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in engineering technology from an ETAC/ABET-accredited engineering program and an earned doctoral degree in engineering focused on structural engineering from an institution that offers EAC/ABET-accredited programs

A graduate degree that is used to satisfy education requirements cannot be applied for experience credit toward licensure. To be eligible for experience credit, graduate degrees shall be relevant to the applicant's area of professional practice. Experience credit for a graduate degree cannot be earned concurrently with work experience credit.

Rationale

These edits parallel the language amended and approved at the 2025 annual meeting for *Model Law* Section 130.10, adding two years of experience to each of the three degree categories for those licensure candidates with an ETAC/ABET-accredited degree.

The Structural Practice Task Force is also presenting two motions related to this appendix (SPTF Motions 4–5). The Committee on Education anticipates that, if Education Motion 2 and SPTF Motion 5 are both adopted, the UPLG Committee will update the edits shown here for ETAC/ABET degree programs to coordinate with the updated language in the task force motion. Specifically, the following edit would be required to the Section 130.10 B.3.a(3)(d) language shown above to accommodate both revisions: (d) Five years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in engineering technology from an ETAC/ABET-accredited engineering program and a master's degree in engineering ~~that includes at least 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of structural engineering (in addition to the 18 hours noted above)~~. The course of study for the master's degree shall include a minimum of 12 semester (18 quarter) hours of structural analysis, behavior, or design courses.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, non-consent agenda

Education Motion 3
Move that Position Statement 2.8 be amended as follows:

PS 2.8 Continuing Professional Competency
NCEES endorses the establishment of uniform continuing professional competency (CPC) requirements for licensed professional engineers and surveyors to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of the public by requiring licensees to remain competent within their profession. Uniform requirements benefit licensees by facilitating licensure renewal and supporting mobility across jurisdictions.

CPC should be focused on the advancement, extension, and improvement of the scientific knowledge and professional skills of the licensee and on the enhancement of professional ethics. CPC should be structured in a way that demonstrates compliance but also recognizes the autonomy and strong ethical standards of licensees.

Licensees are expected to meet the CPC requirements of the jurisdictions in which they have been granted a license by comity, reciprocity, or endorsement. Applicants for a license by comity, reciprocity, or endorsement who are licensed in a jurisdiction without equivalent CPC requirements should not be denied a~~n initial~~ license for that reason.

Because many engineers and surveyors are licensed in multiple jurisdictions, uniformity of CPC requirements among licensing jurisdictions that mandate CPC is imperative to simplify the licensure-renewal process, to enhance the mobility of licensees, to facilitate the recognition of CPC by multiple jurisdictions, and to ensure the viability of continuing professional competency. NCEES encourages licensing boards to follow the NCEES *Model Rules* as outlined in the NCEES *Continuing Professional Competency Guidelines* when adopting CPC requirements. NCEES encourages boards to allow their licensees to satisfy either the CPC requirements of the board or the NCEES CPC Standard. Doing so will promote licensure mobility, especially with boards whose CPC requirements differ from the *Model Rules*. Licensees are encouraged to use the NCEES CPC Registry to document their CPC activities; this may facilitate board reviews or audits.

NCEES encourages the efforts of professional and technical societies, educational programs, and industry in the development of continuing education opportunities to maintain and enhance the competency of engineers and surveyors.

Rationale
The committee recommends striking "initial" because this is referring to a comity application process, not an application for an initial license.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Education Motion 4

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 240.30 C:

240.30 Continuing Professional Competency (CPC)

C. Qualifying Activities

PDHs may be earned as follows:

1. Successful completion of college courses
2. Successful completion of short courses, tutorials, webinars, and distance-education courses ~~offered for documented individual or group study. The method of delivery can be through the following:~~
   ~~a. Face-to-face programs or live internet-based programs~~
   ~~b. Archived prerecorded programs or archived correspondence programs~~
3. Presenting or attending qualifying seminars, in-house courses, workshops, or professional or technical presentations made at meetings, conventions, conferences, or educational institutions
4. Teaching or instructing in 1 through 3 above
5. Authoring published papers, articles, books, or accepted licensing examination items
6. Active participation in professional or technical societies or in accrediting organizations
7. Obtaining a patent
8. Active participation in educational outreach activities pertaining to professional licensure or the surveying/engineering professions that involve K–12 or higher education students

Rationale

The committee did not see a reason to specify that courses may be presented for individual or group study, as there is no other option this would need to exclude. The committee did not see a reason to indicate the options of face-to-face or live internet and "on-demand" pre-recorded or correspondence programs. Especially in the post-COVID-19 era, the method of delivery for continuing education continues to evolve. Specifying particular methods of delivery in this model rule may constrain jurisdictions from adapting to newer forms of information delivery not currently contemplated.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Education Motion 5

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 240.30 B:

240.30 Continuing Professional Competency (CPC)

B. Definitions

Terms used in this section are defined as follows:

[. . .]

8. Dual Licensee—An individual who is licensed as both a professional engineer and a professional surveyor
9. Multidiscipline Licensee—An individual who is licensed in more than one professional discipline

Rationale

The committee recognizes that for those jurisdictions that license engineers by discipline, the definition of *dual licensee* does not suffice. The committee proposes adding the definition of *multidiscipline licensee* to include those individuals.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Education Motion 6

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 240.30 J:

240.30 Continuing Professional Competency (CPC)

J. Dual and Multidiscipline Licensees

The number of PDHs required per year shall be as stated in the NCEES *CPC Standard* and shall be taken in their areas of practice. ~~At least one-third of the PDHs shall be obtained in each profession.~~

Rationale

Adding the newly defined Multidiscipline Licensee to the title supports those individuals who are licensed in more than one discipline in jurisdictions that license by discipline. While most individuals are likely only licensed in two disciplines, the committee recognizes the possibility of some licensed in more. Rather than specifying the formula in *Model Rules*, the committee recommends requiring PDHs in each area of practice but allowing the licensee to determine the appropriate ratio to demonstrate maintaining minimum competence in each area.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures

Shannon Solberg Stanfill, Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) is responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of NCEES examinations and recommending policies, specifications, and procedures consistent with trends in the engineering and surveying professions. The first introductory meeting was held on September 19, 2025, as a virtual meeting via Zoom. At that meeting, EPP Committee members were briefed on the charges and asked about their interest on the specific charges, and subcommittees were assigned shortly after that meeting.

At the second meeting, held virtually on October 28, 2025, via Zoom, the committee split into subgroups to begin discussions about the charges given to the committee this year. The subgroups worked on their charges during a third Zoom meeting on November 12, 2025, and discussions continued into the new year. The fourth meeting was held in person on February 6–7, 2026, at The Whitley Hotel, Atlanta, Buckhead, Georgia. During that meeting, the subcommittees concluded their discussions and recommendations related to the charges, and the full committee finalized recommendations.

The committee addressed six primary charges for 2025–26. It has 18 motions for Council action. **The motions begin on page 82.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities

a. *Review all examination development policies (EDPs) and examination administration policies (EAPs) in the* Manual of Policy and Position Statements *for redundancy and clarity. Recommend revisions as necessary.*
b. *Review exam volumes regarding EDP 7 and provide recommendations to the board of directors as necessary.*

EAP and EDP review

The committee reviewed the EAPs and EDPs for clarity and consistency and proposed minor editorial changes in several policies, as reflected in **Motions 1–9**.

Exam volumes

The committee reviewed all exam volumes per EDP 7. Three exams were identified as having low numbers of first-time exam takers. Two presented low numbers for the first time. The third was moved for action by the 2024–25 EPP Committee.

Recommendation

The EPP Committee does not recommend any examination action at this time.

Rationale

Both of the two exams newly identified as having a low number of first-time exam takers have only experienced one administration with low volumes. Further data is needed prior to action. The third exam was addressed by the 2024–25 EPP Committee and does not need further action by EPP at this time.

Charge 2

Review EDP 7A to evaluate whether temporary suspension should be included as a potential recommendation for discontinuing an examination. Assess how a suspended exam might be reinstated. Recommend revisions as necessary.

The committee evaluated EDP 7A in conjunction with Charge 3's review of EDP 7G since EDP 7G relates to temporary suspension. The committee recognized the benefit of consulting the appropriate committee [Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE) or Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS)] as part of any exam discontinuation evaluation. The committee concluded that suspension

should be included as an additional potential recommendation before discontinuation of an examination. It also clarified and differentiated between the meanings of *probation* versus *suspension* to help state the purpose of those actions. For uniformity, suspension is also added to EDP 7E and 7F.

The committee then additionally worked on language to address how a suspended examination would be reinstated. This work resulted in adding a new EDP 8 titled "Reinstatement of a Suspended Examination."

These changes are reflected in **Motions 10–12**.

Charge 3
Review EDP 7G to identify any conflicts with EDP 7A. Recommend revisions as necessary.

EPP considered EDP 7G in conjunction with Charge 2's EDP 7A. When discussing the end-to-end process of discontinuation, the EPP Committee recognized that language from EDP 7G could be incorporated into 7A, thus eliminating the need for 7G.

Motion 13 relates to the deletion of EDP 7G.

Charge 4
Review EDP 4D, 5C, and 6B to assess whether the board of directors should have additional options beyond approving or rejecting the recommendation to approve the professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS) that initiates development of a new exam (for example, referring it back to a committee, approving in part, taking no action). Recommend revisions as necessary.

The committee assessed the process to add a new exam from the point in time that EPE or EPS reviews the new exam application to the point after a PAKS is reviewed and before the full exam is approved by the board of directors for development. It was noted that the EDP does not accurately reflect the full process and significant points in time that relate to viability, defensibility, and fiscal responsibility, specifically at the point in time after a PAKS but before the exam is developed for administration. EPP drafted language to reflect the pivotal post-PAKS decision points. Therefore, no change is made specifically to EDP 4D since the addition of the post-PAKS language provides the board of directors the information needed to make informed business decisions.

These changes are reflected in three motions so that each policy's Application Review section is uniform. See **Motions 14–16**.

Charge 5
Review EDP 8 and clarify the definition and intended use of the term format. *Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed EDP 8 regarding the intended use of the term *format* in respect to the notification stipulation to member boards for dissemination to applicants. The recommendation is to add a definition that takes the general term and adds the example that *format* means the general makeup of an examination.

This change is reflected in **Motion 17**.

Charge 6
Review EDP 12 based on actions taken at the 2025 annual meeting and delete as necessary.

As approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting, the Bylaws Committee is presenting a motion this year to establish the makeup of professionals on the EPE and EPS committees in the *Bylaws*, just as other committee makeup is also addressed in the *Bylaws*. EDP 12 also addresses the makeup of professionals on EPE and EPS; therefore, the language is redundant between bylaws and policy. EPP will present **Motion 18** to remove the language in EDP 12.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures:**

Shannon Solberg Stanfill, Chair

Members
Linda Bergeron, P.E.
Ryan Callaghan, P.E.
James Collins, P.E.
Cevin Imus, L.S.
Jennifer Kuether, P.E.
George Murgel, Ph.D., P.E.
Garth Thomas Jr., P.E.
Ronald Willey, Ph.D., P.E.

Consultants
Sean St.Clair, Ph.D., P.E.
Joseph Wichert, L.S.

Board liaison
Jason Suelter, P.E., S.E.

Staff liaison
Jason Gamble, P.E.

MOTIONS

EPP Motion 1

Move that Exam Development Policy 3A be amended as follows:

EDP 3 Engineering and Surveying Examinations and Formats

A. Fundamental of Engineering Examination
The Fundamental of Engineering (FE) examination shall be offered in the following practice areas and have supplied references:
1. Chemical
2. Civil
3. Electrical and Computer
4. Environmental
5. Industrial and Systems
6. Mechanical
7. Other Disciplines

Rationale

This corrects the name of an FE exam for clarity and consistency.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 2

Move that Exam Development Policy 3E be amended as follows:

EDP 3 Engineering and Surveying Examinations and Formats

E. Examination Items Banks
Examination items for all examinations shall be maintained either at NCEES headquarters or at an offsite testing service that is able to demonstrate insurance, bond, or reserve to cover the pecuniary liability for the items should the items be compromised, lost, or damaged by the testing service. Exam types below are defined in the *Exam Development Procedures Manual (EDPM)*.
1. At the time an exam development committee releases a linear, fixed-form (LFF) exam to be published, the exam item bank shall contain sufficient operational items to create three times the number of exam forms available to examinees in a testing window.
2. At the time an exam development committee releases a pool of items to be published for linear-on-the-fly testing (LOFT), the pool shall contain, at a minimum, the number of operational items required to create three unique, non-overlapping exam forms as defined in the *EDPM*. At the time of publishing, the exam item bank shall have sufficient operational items to create two additional pools of similar composition. Pool size shall be determined by the psychometric consultant per the criteria listed in the ~~NCEES *Exam Development Procedures Manual*~~ *EDPM*.

Rationale
This change is provided for clarity and consistency.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 3
Move that Exam Development Policy 3G be amended as follows:

EDP 3 Engineering and Surveying Examinations and Formats

G. Exam Preparation Material Development
Exam preparation material shall be developed for each NCEES examination. This material shall include a supplied reference handbook and ~~a~~ one or more practice exams on each major topic area sufficient to provide candidates with a sense of the structure, scope, and difficulty of the examination. The supplied reference handbook and practice exam shall be made available to candidates six months prior to the exam administration when an exam specification is changed and a minimum of three months prior to the exam administration during a standard exam administration year.

Rationale
This change is provided for clarity and consistency.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 4
Move that Exam Development Policy 4 A–C be amended as follows:

EDP 4 Addition of a New PE Examination or Reinstatement of a Discontinued PE Examination

A. Accreditation Requirement
No new examination shall be added or discontinued examination reinstated to the examination program unless there is an ~~EAC/~~ABET-accredited program in the discipline that offers an undergraduate degree program or a graduate degree program focused on the examination topic area.

B. Professional or Technical Society Requirement
No new examination shall be added or discontinued examination reinstated unless a national professional or technical society agrees to support the examination. All professional or technical societies that support examinations shall sign an agreement with NCEES delineating the responsibilities of both parties.

C. Member Board Requirement
Requests for new examinations or reinstatement of discontinued examinations shall be supported in writing by no fewer than 10 member boards who can each demonstrate a need for the examination in their jurisdiction by each providing a letter of support for the ~~new~~ examination in accordance with paragraph C.2 herein. A request older than four years must be resubmitted by the member boards.

1. Proof of Need and Estimate of Usage
Proof of need shall include evidence that knowledge areas and skills are not adequately measured in an existing examination and that additional knowledge areas and skills required are sufficient to support a new or reinstated examination. No new examination shall be added or discontinued examination reinstated to the examination program unless the estimate of usage conforms to NCEES policies and procedures. The estimate of usage shall include the methodology used to derive the estimate.
2. Letters of Support
All requests shall include proof of such need, an estimate of usage, and the impact on safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Rationale
This change clarifies and incorporates language for reinstatement of a discontinued examination.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 5
Move that Exam Development Policy 5A–B be amended as follows:

EDP 5 Addition of a New FE Examination or Reinstatement of a Discontinued FE Examination

A. Accreditation Requirement
No new FE examination shall be added or discontinued examination reinstated to the examination program unless there is an ~~EAC/~~ABET-accredited program in the examination topic area.

B. Member Board Requirement
Requests for new examinations or reinstatement of discontinued examinations shall be supported in writing by no fewer than 10 member boards who can each demonstrate a need for the examination in their jurisdiction by each providing a letter of support for the ~~new~~ examination in accordance with paragraph B.2 herein. A request older than four years must be resubmitted by the member boards.

1. Proof of Need and Estimate of Usage
Proof of need shall include evidence that knowledge areas and skills are not adequately measured in an existing examination and that additional knowledge areas and skills required are sufficient to support a new or reinstated examination. No new examination shall be added or discontinued examination reinstated to the examination program unless the estimate of usage conforms to NCEES policies and procedures. The estimate of usage shall include the methodology used to derive that estimate.
2. Letters of Support
All requests shall include proof of such need, an estimate of usage, and the impact of safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Rationale
This change clarifies and incorporates language for reinstatement of a discontinued examination.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 6
Move that Exam Development Policy 6A be amended as follows:

EDP 6 Addition of a New Surveying Examination or Reinstatement of a Discontinued Surveying Examination

A. Member Board Requirement
Requests for new examinations or reinstatement of discontinued examinations shall be ~~made~~ supported in writing by no fewer than 10 member boards who can each demonstrate a need for the examination in their jurisdiction by each providing a letter of support for the new examination in accordance with paragraph A.2 herein. A request older than four years must be resubmitted by the member boards.

1. Proof of Need and Estimate of Usage
Proof of need shall include evidence that knowledge areas and skills are not adequately measured in an existing examination and that additional knowledge areas and skills required are sufficient to support a new or reinstated examination. No new examination shall be added or discontinued examination

reinstated to the examination program unless the estimate of usage conforms to the NCEES policies and procedures. The estimate of usage shall include the methodology used to derive that estimate.

2. Letters of Support
   All requests shall include proof of such need, an estimate of usage, and the impact on safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Rationale
This is a consistency change to align EDP 6A with language already established in EDP 4C and 5B.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 7
Move that Exam Administrative Policy 1C be amended as follows:

EAP 1 Administration of Examinations
C. Candidate Admission
~~Approval of candidates applying to take NCEES examinations is by the individual member boards or their designated representative.~~ To be admitted to an NCEES examination, candidates will be required to create an account with NCEES.

Rationale
Jurisdictional requirements are set and maintained by each jurisdiction within statutes and rules. This leaves only the NCEES procedural requirement for exam candidates to create an account.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, non-consent agenda

EPP Motion 8
Move that Exam Administrative Policy 6 be amended as follows:

EAP 6 Requests for Special Examination Accommodations
NCEES must determine reasonable, fair, and equitable methods ~~to be employed~~ to administer examinations. All such accommodations shall comply with applicable federal and state laws and regulations. NCEES will review all requests for accommodation and make recommendations regarding the approval of the request.

Rationale
The amendment is proposed to eliminate extraneous wording.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 9
Move that Exam Administrative Policy 7D be amended as follows:

EAP 7 Release and Use of Examination Results

D. Structural Engineering Examination~~s~~ Sections
A section results notice shall be transmitted to the member board for each administration in which an examinee takes a section. Passing only one section shall not be sufficient for any licensure purposes. After an examinee has passed all sections, an examination pass notice will be transmitted to the member board to indicate that the examinee has passed the PE Structural examination.

Rationale
An amendment to the title is proposed to reflect that the PE Structural exam has sections.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 10
Move that Exam Development Policy 7A be amended as follows:

EDP 7 Discontinuing, Suspending, Combining, Renaming an Examination and Pertinent Requirements

A. ~~Discontinuation~~ Assessing the Viability of an Examination
If the population of first-time examinees from NCEES jurisdictions for any two consecutive administrations of an NCEES examination is not adequate to provide for accurate psychometric analysis and does not meet policies and/or guidelines of the Council, the EPP Committee shall review the viability of continuing the subject examination and, after consultation with the EPE or EPS Committee, shall make one of the following recommendations to the board of directors, which may include such actions as the EPP Committee deems appropriate:
1. Continue to prepare the examination.
2. Request the appropriate exam development committee and the supporting professional or technical society to prepare and submit a specific remedial action plan for increasing the number of first-time takers to a level that meets or exceeds the minimum candidate requirements within the time period specified by the EPP Committee.
3. Place the examination on probation, during which time the examination will still be administered under specified conditions. The EPP Committee shall specify the conditions of the probation, including a time frame for corrective action.
4. Place the examination on suspension, during which time the examination will not be administered.
~~4~~5. Discontinue the examination.

Rationale
These changes provide a continuum of actions that the EPP Committee, with the assistance of EPE or EPS, will use to select the appropriate recommendation based on the circumstances.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 11
Move that Exam Development Policy 7E–F be amended as follows:

EDP 7 Discontinuing, Combining, Renaming an Examination and Pertinent Requirements

E. Examination Item Bank Requirement
If an examination fails to have an adequate item bank as specified in paragraph E of EDP 3, including solutions and knowledges being assessed, the EPP Committee shall review the viability of continuing the examination ~~and~~. After consultation with the EPE or EPS Committee, the EPP Committee shall make one of the following recommendations to the board of directors, which may include such actions as the EPP Committee deems appropriate:
1. Continue to prepare the examination.
2. Place the examination on probation, during which time the examination will still be administered under specified conditions, and recommend specific remedial action that the EPP Committee deems appropriate. If the examination entity fails to provide sufficient data to successfully complete the next scheduled examination audit, the EPP Committee shall recommend appropriate action to the board of directors.
3. Place the examination on suspension, during which time the examination will not be administered.
~~3~~4. Discontinue the examination.

F. Examination Audit Requirement
If an examination fails to provide the Committee on Examination Audit with sufficient data to conduct an adequate audit for two consecutive audit cycles, the EPP Committee shall review the viability of continuing the examination ~~and~~. After consultation with the EPE or EPS Committee, the EPP Committee shall make one of the following recommendations to the board of directors, which may include such actions as the EPP Committee deems appropriate:
1. Continue to prepare the examination.
2. Place the examination on probation, during which time the examination will still be administered under specified conditions, and recommend specific remedial action that the EPP Committee deems appropriate. If the examination entity fails to provide sufficient data to successfully complete the next scheduled examination audit, the EPP Committee shall recommend appropriate action to the board of directors.
3. Place the examination on suspension, during which time the examination will not be administered.
~~3~~4. Discontinue the examination.

Rationale
These changes recognize that the EPE or EPS Committee should be consulted as part of any item bank or exam evaluation. The language also incorporates the remedial action of suspension after probation and as related to item bank or exam evaluations. This provides consistency and clarity.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 12
Move that an exam development policy on the reinstatement of a suspended examination be adopted as follows:

EDP 8 Reinstatement of a Suspended Examination

A. Request to Reinstate a Suspended Examination
If an NCEES committee, professional or technical society, or other suitable entity desires to have a suspended examination reinstated, it shall make a request to the EPP Committee.
The EPP Committee shall review the conditions of suspension to determine if the conditions have been satisfied.
If the conditions of suspension have been satisfied, the EPP Committee shall immediately forward the request for reinstatement to the EPE or EPS Committee along with a summary of the conditions of the suspension for the EPE or EPS Committee to review the request.
Member boards shall be notified that the suspended examination is being considered for reinstatement when the request for reinstatement is submitted to the EPE or EPS Committee.

B. Estimate of Usage
No suspended examination shall be reinstated to the examination program unless the estimate of usage conforms to NCEES policies and procedures. The estimate of usage shall include the methodology used for initial entry into the exam program.
C. Professional or Technical Society Requirement
No suspended PE examination shall be reinstated unless a national professional or technical society agrees to support the examination. All professional or technical societies that support examinations shall sign an agreement with NCEES delineating the responsibilities of both parties.
D. Committee Review
If the EPE or EPS Committee determines that the requirements for reinstatement have been met, it shall recommend to the board of directors that the examination be reinstated.
E. Board of Directors Review
The board of directors shall either approve or deny the EPE or EPS Committee's recommendation.
F. Notification to Member Boards
After approval by the board of directors, the member boards shall be notified of the reinstatement of any suspended examination to the exam program.

Rationale
Placing this section after EDP 7 will provide continuance of the action. Whereas EDP 7 addresses the distinction between suspension and discontinuation, the new EDP 8 will provide a pathway for reinstatement of a suspended exam.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, non-consent agenda

_____

_____

_____

_____

EPP Motion 13
Move that Exam Development Policy 7G be deleted.

EDP 7 Discontinuing, Combining, Renaming an Examination and Pertinent Requirements
~~G. Temporary Suspension of an Examination~~
~~If, upon the chief executive officer's recommendation and an EPE or EPS Committee evaluation, the board of directors determines that an examination does not meet the policies, specifications, and/or guidelines of the Council, the board of directors may temporarily suspend the offering of an examination in that particular practice area.~~

Rationale
The committee is incorporating the language from EDP 7G into 7A.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

_____

_____

_____

EPP Motion 14
Move that Exam Development Policy 4E–F be amended as follows:

EDP 4 Addition of a New PE Examination or Reinstatement of a PE Examination
D. Application Review
If the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE) determines that the proposed application meets the requirements, then it shall recommend to the board of directors that the process continues with a professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS). The board of directors shall either approve or reject the recommendation.

E. Post-PAKS Evaluation and Determination to Proceed

1. Review of PAKS Results

On completion of the PAKS, the EPE Committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the PAKS findings to determine whether the data supports the development of a new examination or exam modification. The review shall include but not be limited to the following:

a. Analysis of the specifications and all knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the PAKS
b. Evaluation of potential content overlap with existing NCEES examinations
c. Projected candidate volume and updated usage estimates
d. Scope and format of the proposed examination
e. Impact on safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public
f. Resource, cost, and operational implications for the exam program

2. Recommendation to the Board of Directors

Based on its review, the EPE Committee shall provide a written recommendation to the board of directors to either proceed with development of the proposed examination or discontinue further action on the proposed exam request.

3. Board of Directors Determination

The board of directors, at its next regularly scheduled meeting, shall review the EPE Committee recommendation and the PAKS results and shall either approve or deny the development of the proposed examination. No examination shall be developed or added to the NCEES exam program without explicit approval of the board of directors following this review.

~~E~~F. Notification to Member Boards

Member boards shall be notified one year in advance of the addition or reinstatement of any examination to the exam program.

~~F~~G. Requests to Divide an Existing Examination

Requests to divide an existing examination into multiple examinations shall be made to the EPE Committee. Requests shall include proof of such need in accordance with section~~s A–~~ C herein and follow the process outlined in sections D–F.

Rationale

The language in sections D–G reflects the points before and after a PAKS is developed so that both the EPE Committee and the board of directors can obtain, review, recommend, and make decisions at critical decision points.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 15

Move that Exam Development Policy 5D be amended as follows:

EDP 5 Addition of a New FE Examination

C. Application Review

If the EPE Committee determines that the proposed application meets the requirements, then it shall recommend to the board of directors that the process continues with a professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS). The board of directors shall either approve or reject the recommendation.

D. Post-PAKS Evaluation and Determination to Proceed

1. Review of PAKS Results

On completion of the PAKS, the EPE Committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the PAKS findings to determine whether the data supports the development of an examination or exam modification. The review shall include but not be limited to the following:

a. An analysis of the specifications and all knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the PAKS
b. An evaluation of potential content overlap with existing NCEES examinations
c. Projected candidate volume and updated usage estimates
d. Scope or format of the proposed examination
e. Impact on safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public
f. Resource, cost, and operational implications for the exam program

2. Recommendation to the Board of Directors
Based on its review, the EPE Committee shall provide a written recommendation to the board of directors to either proceed with development of the proposed examination or discontinue further action on the proposed exam request.
3. Board of Directors Determination
The board of directors, at its next regularly scheduled meeting, shall review the EPE Committee recommendation and the PAKS results and determine whether to approve or deny the recommendation. No examination shall be developed or added to the NCEES exam program without explicit approval of the board of directors following this review.

~~D~~E. Notification to Member Boards
Member boards shall be notified at least one year in advance of the addition or reinstatement of any ~~new FE~~ examination to the exam program.

Rationale
The language in sections C–E reflects the points before and after a PAKS is developed so that both the EPE Committee and the board of directors can obtain, review, recommend, and make decisions at critical decision points.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 16
Move that Exam Development Policy 6C–D be amended as follows:

EDP 6 Addition of a New Surveying Examination

B. Application Review
If the EPS Committee determines that the proposed application meets the requirements, then it shall recommend to the board of directors that the process continues with a professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS). The board of directors shall either approve or reject the recommendation.

C. Post-PAKS Evaluation and Determination to Proceed
1. Review of PAKS Results
On completion of the PAKS, the EPS Committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the PAKS findings to determine whether the data supports the development of a new examination or exam modification. The review shall include but not be limited to the following:
a. Analysis of the specifications and all knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the PAKS
b. Evaluation of potential content overlap with existing NCEES examinations
c. Projected candidate volume and updated usage estimates
d. Scope and format of the proposed examination
e. Impact on safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public
f. Resource, cost, and operational implications for the exam program
2. Recommendation to the Board of Directors
Based on its review, the EPS Committee shall provide a written recommendation to the board of directors to either proceed with development of the proposed examination or discontinue further action on the proposed exam request.
3. Board of Directors Determination
The board of directors, at its next regularly scheduled meeting, shall review the EPS Committee recommendation and the PAKS results and shall either approve or deny the development of the proposed examination. No examination shall be developed or added to the NCEES exam program without explicit approval of the board of directors following this review.

~~C~~D. Notification to Member Boards
Member boards shall be notified one year in advance of the addition or reinstatement of any ~~surveying~~ examination to the exam program.

~~D~~E. Requests to Divide an Existing Examination
Requests to divide an existing examination into multiple examinations shall be made to the EPS Committee. Requests shall include proof of such need in accordance with ~~paragraph~~ section A ~~of this policy~~ herein and follow the process outlined in sections B–D.

Rationale
The language in sections B–E reflects the points before and after a PAKS is developed so that both the EPS Committee and board of directors can obtain, review, recommend, and make decisions at critical decision points.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 17
Move that Exam Development Policy 8 be amended as follows:

EDP 8 Changes in Examination Procedures or Format
Member boards shall be notified one year in advance of any change in the examination administration procedures or any change in examination format, i.e., the general makeup of an examination as defined in the *Exam Development Procedures Manual*, that requires dissemination to applicants.

Rationale
This addition clarifies that member boards and applicants will have the benefit of one year's notification and preparation in the event that changes in the general makeup of an examination are made.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

EPP Motion 18
Move that Exam Development Policy 12 be deleted.

~~**EDP 12 EPE and EPS Committee Membership Qualifications**~~
~~The EPE and EPS Committees should include members of their current or past respective exam development committees.~~

Rationale
This committee makeup requirement has been placed in the *Bylaws* for consistency since all other committee makeup is addressed there. The committee makeup does not need to be reiterated in policy.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Committee on Law Enforcement

Tiffany Criswell, Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Law Enforcement was established under NCEES *Bylaws* 7.10. The committee considers and recommends methods for member boards to achieve more efficient and uniform enforcement of licensing acts necessary for greater interstate coordination.

The Committee on Law Enforcement was assigned 10 charges and will present two motions. **The motions begin on page 96.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. Review the 2025 Law Enforcement Program. Organize similar activities for the 2026 annual meeting.
b. Submit articles for inclusion in Licensure Exchange *related to law enforcement issues.*
c. Review the Investigation and Enforcement Guidelines. *Revise as appropriate.*
d. Review the Enforcement Exchange Instruction Manual. *Revise as appropriate.*

Law Enforcement Program

The 2025 Law Enforcement Program included a forum and workshop and was part of the NCEES annual meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana. One delegate per member board was funded to attend the forum and workshop; 85 individuals attended the forum, and 75 individuals attended the workshop.

The 2025 Law Enforcement Forum consisted of an interactive program that included updates on work-for-hire websites that offer engineering and surveying services and on Enforcement Exchange. Participants then took part in roundtable discussions of current law enforcement topics.

The 2025 Law Enforcement Workshop was a success. The program, Code Enforcement Officer Safety, was presented by Eric Hendrix from the Code Enforcement Officer Safety Foundation, who holds several certifications in code enforcement, training, and instructor development. The workshop emphasized officer safety, covering crucial applied techniques for operational awareness. Additional topics included contemporary scientific methods, scene management, evidence collection, observation skills, and effective de-escalation techniques.

The 2026 Law Enforcement Forum will be held Thursday, August 20, 2:00–4:30 p.m., as part of the annual meeting schedule of events. An interactive program is planned for board investigators, attorneys, members, and member board administrators. The forum will begin with discussion of current law enforcement issues affecting member boards and an Enforcement Exchange update. Participants will then take part in roundtable discussions of law enforcement topics provided during registration.

The Law Enforcement Workshop will be held Friday, August 21, 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m., as part of the annual meeting schedule of events. The workshop, Investigation 101, will consist of modules on the basics of the professions of engineering and surveying presented by licensees, helpful investigative tools and resources presented by investigative staff, and legal considerations from an attorney's perspective.

Licensure Exchange

The following articles were published, or are planned to be published, in *Licensure Exchange* in 2025–26:

- October 2025: "2025 Law Enforcement Program recap: Work-for-hire marketplace and enforcement staff safety focus" (Bob Herbert)
- December 2025: "Artificial intelligence in engineering and surveying: Determining proper and ethical usage for member boards and licensees" (Michael Sims, P.E.)
- February 2026: "Bias in regulatory investigations: Why neutrality is not optional" (Bret Biesenthal)
- April 2026: "Sorting signal from noise: Enforcement triage through a public member lens" (Clinton Campbell Jr., Ph.D.)

- June 2026: “The chainsaw needs a guard: A public member’s framework for AI in licensee work” (Chantell Cornett)
- August 2026: TBD

Investigation and Enforcement Guidelines
The committee reviewed the *Investigation and Enforcement Guidelines* and recommends revisions to accommodate the update of the title “member board administrator” to “member board executive,” which the Council will vote on as a Bylaws motion at the 2026 annual meeting. Within the *Guidelines*, certain references to “administrator,” are not specific to “member board administrator.” However, the committee decided that clarification could be helpful. In Section 4—Invalidating Exam Results (page 27), “administrator” should be revised to “testing administrator.” In Appendix E—Stipulation and Order (page 39), “board’s program administrator” should be revised to “board’s designee.” Other recommendations are addressed separately in Charges 2–3.

Enforcement Exchange Instruction Manual
The committee reviewed the *Enforcement Exchange Instruction Manual* and recommends no changes.

Charge 2
Review the Investigation and Enforcement Guidelines *to evaluate whether current guidance to member boards on handling and reporting sealed and/or expunged records is sufficient. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The 2022–23 Law Enforcement Committee recommended not to remove an expunged disciplinary action from an NCEES Record or Enforcement Exchange. Instead, it recommended that a comment be added to the NCEES Record or Enforcement Exchange to note that the disciplinary action was expunged, pursuant to a jurisdiction’s statute. This would allow other member boards to decide how to proceed based on their rules and laws.

The 2023–24 Law Enforcement Committee recommended adding a comment about an expunged disciplinary action in Enforcement Exchange. An update option (to include comments, supporting documentation, and action date) was added in the Violations and Penalties section of Enforcement Exchange to indicate any type of violation update, including expungements.

The committee recommends adding the following to Chapter 8—Enforcement Exchange of the *Investigation and Enforcement Guidelines*: “Violation updates, including sealed and expunged records, should be added to the Violations and Penalties section of Enforcement Exchange; updates should include comments, supporting documentation, and the action date. This allows other member boards to decide how to proceed based on their rules and laws.”

Charge 3
Develop guidelines to assist member boards in addressing work-for-hire websites offering engineering and surveying services. Guidelines should include considerations for investigations and enforcement actions as well as recommendations for individuals and licensees who may be impacted. Provide recommendations as appropriate.

In recent years, member boards have seen an increase in complaints regarding the fraudulent use of licensees’ names and seals on work-for-hire (freelance) websites such as Upwork, Fiverr, and Freelancer. These websites allow independent contractors (individuals and firms) to bid on projects that often require professional engineering or surveying services. Many of the contractors operate from foreign countries or out-of-state jurisdictions, making it difficult to locate them and making enforcement a challenge. Most boards lack the authority to pursue legal action against freelance websites.

When clients fail to receive deliverables or reviewing officials have questions, they contact the licensee listed on the proposal or work product. This contact frequently reveals that the licensee’s name or seal was used without their knowledge or authorization. Furthermore, such unauthorized work is often substandard, posing a threat to public health, safety, and welfare.

Investigations by member board enforcement personnel have revealed that some freelance websites appear to knowingly permit fraudulent activity by these contractors. Websites frequently ignore complaints about these violations, resulting in inaction and a failure to remove fraudulent users.

The committee determined that many member boards lack guidelines for investigating this fraudulent activity. NCEES does have model laws and rules in place covering the illegal practice of engineering and surveying:

- 150.30 Grounds for Disciplinary Action—Unlicensed Individuals
- 150.40 Disciplinary Action Procedures—Unlicensed Individuals
- 150.50 Criminal Offenses
- 160.90 Grounds for Disciplinary Action—Firms Not Holding a Certificate of Authorization
- 160.100 Disciplinary Action Procedures—Firms Not Holding a Certificate of Authorization
- 160.110 Criminal Offenses

Another option that member boards, complainants, and licensees have is to file a report with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). The FTC website states that it enforces federal consumer protection laws that prevent fraud, deception, and unfair business practices. In total, the FTC has enforcement or administrative responsibilities under more than 70 laws. Reports are shared with more than 2,800 law enforcers.

The FTC does not respond to each report individually or take action on behalf of individual consumers. The FTC uses the reports to investigate and bring cases against fraud, scams, and bad business practices.

The committee recommends adding the following information to Chapter 4–Investigation, Section 1–Investigative Procedures in the *Investigation and Enforcement Guidelines*:

Freelance websites
Freelance platforms host bids for engineering and surveying projects that can lead to complaints regarding unlicensed practice and fraudulent use of a professional engineer's or surveyor's name and seal. Upon completing investigations, the following actions are recommended:

- Forward findings (illegal practice and fraudulent use of a professional engineer's/surveyor's name and seal) to the following:
  - State Attorney General's Office, public protection departments and fraud units, or any other law enforcement agency with jurisdiction
  - Federal Trade Commission (The federal government's website to report fraud, scams, and bad business practices is ReportFraud.ftc.gov.)
- Provide formal closure: Notify the complainant and the affected licensee in writing and verbally. Explain the investigation's findings, applicable laws, and jurisdictional limitations. Advise that the matter has been referred to relevant enforcement agencies.
- Encourage reporting: Advise the complainant and affected licensee to file independent complaints with their State Attorney General's Consumer Fraud Protection Department and the Federal Trade Commission.
- Documentation: Maintain records showing that the licensee did not perform or authorize the work. This documentation may help protect the licensee against potential civil liability or legal claims.

The committee also recommends that NCEES

- Develop an online platform for member boards to report violations of unlicensed practice found on freelance websites. NCEES should periodically submit these reports to the FTC and other federal enforcement agencies.
- Collaborate with professional associations to develop consumer protection guidelines to facilitate the distribution of warnings across websites, social media, and newsletters, including a list of problematic freelance websites.
- Partner with NCARB and other professional/technical associations representing engineering and surveying to develop guidelines to combat freelance website fraud and advocate for legislation to curb freelance websites that ignore complaints of fraudulent activity.

Charge 4
Develop a topic and/or presentation for one virtual webinar during the 2025–26 fiscal year and work with staff to present as appropriate.

The committee will present a virtual webinar on June 16, 2026, from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. (EDT). It will be a presentation of artificial intelligence (AI) in engineering, including what technology is available, how to use AI software, and how investigators can use AI.

Charge 5

Review the Enforcement Exchange brochure and recommend revisions as necessary.

The committee reviewed the Enforcement Exchange brochure and provided to NCEES staff recommended updates to the brochure's statistical information. The committee also recommends that NCEES staff explore options for distributing the brochure: email to members, include in annual meeting materials, etc.

Charge 6

Review Model Law *130.10 A.1 to develop a clear definition of good character. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed *Model Law* 130.10 A.1, which provides requirements for licensure. One of the requirements to be eligible for licensure as a professional engineer or surveyor is to "be of good character and reputation." The committee developed a definition of "good character and reputation" and will present **Motion 1** to incorporate the definition in *Model Law* 130.10 A.1.

Charge 7

Review Model Law *150.10 A.3 to determine whether it sufficiently addresses disciplinary actions unrelated to professional practice. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed *Model Law* 150.10 A.3 and determined that it sufficiently addresses disciplinary actions unrelated to professional practice. The committee recommends no changes to *Model Law* 150.10 A.3.

Charge 8

Review Model Rules *240.15 to assess whether it adequately addresses rules of professional conduct. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed *Model Rules* 240.15, which address rules of professional conduct related to the public, employers and clients, and other licensees. The committee will present **Motion 2** to revise *Model Rules* 240.15 A.8.

Charge 9

Review member board sealing requirements and evaluate Model Rules *240.20 for adequacy. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee reviewed *Model Rules* 240.20 Seal on Documents. The committee recognizes that the recent increase in the use of fraudulent seals through work-for-hire websites and other means has created a need to update *Model Rules* 240.20. However, revisions to *Model Rules* 240.20 cannot be completed until additional security and identification measures beyond the licensee's seal are determined. The committee is recommending no changes to this *Model Rules* section at this time.

Charge 10

Develop guidelines to assist member boards in providing directions for revising drawings originally sealed by a professional engineer or surveyor who is no longer in responsible charge of the document. Provide recommendations as appropriate.

After review and deliberation, the committee believes that *Model Rules* 240.20 E–F clearly and adequately addresses this charge and provides member boards the direction they need in this matter. Additional guidelines are not recommended.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Law Enforcement:**

Tiffany Criswell, Chair

Members
Jakki Carter, P.E.
Roy Cepero
Carey Hardin, P.E.
Gary Kent, P.S.
Jason McLean
Tammy Rollins
Michael Sims, P.E.
Judith (Judi) Stapley

Board liaison
Karl Tonander, P.E.

Staff liaison
Bob Whorton, P.E.

MOTIONS

Law Enforcement Motion 1

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendment into *Model Law* 130.10 A.1:

130.10 General Requirements for Licensure

A. Eligibility for Licensure
To be eligible for licensure as a professional engineer or professional surveyor, an individual must meet all of the following requirements:
1. Be of good character and reputation by acting ethically with integrity, honesty, trustworthiness, and accountability
2. Satisfy the education criteria set forth by the board
3. Satisfy the experience criteria set forth by the board
4. Pass the applicable examinations set forth by the board
5. Submit five references acceptable to the board

Rationale

The recommended definition includes traits drawn from a study of various examples common to industry organizations.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Law Enforcement Motion 2

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 240.15 A.8:

240.15 Rules of Professional Conduct

A. Obligations of Licensees to the Public
8. Licensees who have knowledge or reason to believe that any person or firm has violated any rules or laws applying to the practice of engineering or surveying that involve a material discrepancy, error, or omission that may impact the health, safety, or welfare of the public shall report it to the board, ~~may~~ should report it to appropriate legal or regulatory authorities, and shall cooperate with the board and those authorities as requested.

Rationale
The committee recommends the amended language to assist licensees in assessing the juncture in which it is appropriate to report to the board or certain authorities. The amended language also provides for scenarios in which a licensee should or must report such actions. Finally, the committee found adding regulatory authorities differentiates the types of bodies available for reporting.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Committee on Licensure

Lance Kinney, Ph.D., P.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The committee is charged with providing an ongoing holistic review of the engineering and surveying licensure systems. It responds to licensure issues and concerns as they arise by developing and recommending licensure processes and amendments to position statements, the *Model Law*, and the *Model Rules* as necessary.

This year the committee met once in person in Seattle, Washington, and multiple times online to discuss the various charges and motions.

The committee was assigned eight charges and will present 10 motions. **The motions begin on page 103.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. *Continue the review of the NCEES engineering licensure model and NCEES Record.*
   i. *Continue to define and develop a checklist to track and identify key skills and competencies from graduation to first license.*
   ii. *Define the initial experience checklists and "stacking boxes" approach to minimum qualifications. Include engineering technology and related science degree paths.*
   iii. *Develop a framework for standing committees and key stakeholders to work with in future years.*
b. *Continue the review of the NCEES surveying licensure model and NCEES Record.*
   i. *Continue to define and develop a checklist to track and identify key skills and competencies from graduation to first license.*
   ii. *Define the initial experience checklists and "stacking boxes" approach to minimum qualifications.*
   iii. *Develop a framework for standing committees and key stakeholders to work with in future years.*

Charge 1 was a continuation of the work of the previous licensure task forces and 2024–25 Licensure Committee and the development of the experience reporting framework (previously referred to as a rubric). This profile model was presented and approved after much discussion and debate at the 2025 annual meeting and adopted as Position Statement 4.2. Also, the board of directors approved the publication of the accompanying reference document *Experience Record for Initial Licensure as a Professional Engineer*.

This year's committee reviewed the feedback from previous year's work with an eye toward any additions or refinements, as well as the development of a companion version of the profile for surveyors. A draft version of the profile was developed and discussed at the zone interim meetings and is included as **Appendix A** at the end of this report.

In addition, the committee reviewed the current engineering and future surveying profiles and how they align with the international standards and mobility guidelines (see Charge 8 discussion). NCEES is part of the International Engineering Alliance (IEA) and is reviewed against international standards on a regular basis. The committee discussed feedback and how to better align with international reporting standards and noted that IEA refers to a similar experience model using the term "professional competency profile." After discussion and review, the committee recommends using this terminology for the new NCEES model as well.

The Licensure Committee will present **Motions 1–2** in support of this charge.

Charge 2

Review Model Law *110.20 J–K to propose language that offers clear guidance on the use of digital signatures. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Many state boards have reported an increase in cases of alleged sealing fraud. Individuals and companies are finding new ways to leverage technology and the internet to produce fraudulent documents and have them appear to be sealed by legitimate professionals. There has also been an increase in online brokers for remote professional services, wherein a customer can contact a "professional" via their system and receive engineering or surveying work that is "sealed." In some instances, the work is fraudulent, with fake seals developed from

actual professionals or invented partially or from whole cloth. The committee has been charged with investigating potential methods to address this issue, either through clarification and guidance on the use of digital signatures and seals or through any other recommendations to address this issue.

The committee polled boards for their current language about digital signatures and seals, as well as any methods for solutions. The committee also reviewed the current NCEES *Model Law* and *Model Rules* to see if any language changes could be recommended to help close the loopholes being exploited. During this review, the committee determined that changes could be made to clarify and update the definitions of seals, signature, and digital and electronic seals. The committee recognizes that these changes will not resolve the issue of electronic or digital sealing fraud but will assist in clarifying the law and rule language around signing and sealing. The committee will present **Motions 3–4** to make these changes.

President Beckett reported that the Interorganizational Council on Regulation (ICOR) is also aware of sealing fraud and its impact across professions. The committee discussed ongoing ICOR efforts and encourages NCEES to continue to work with other organizations on a wholistic solution to address sealing fraud.

Based on this discussion, the committee formally recommends that

- NCEES continue to engage with ICOR on the future development of a solution for electronic document security
- The president task a working group with compiling a list of electronic/digital sealing best practices, including research into how other areas of practice (architects, etc.) address this issue

The committee also heard a presentation from Chair Kinney concerning a fundamental reevaluation of the basic purposes of sealing engineering and surveying work. This could involve changing from the current model of ink and paper or digital versions of ink/embossed seals to converting to a fully digital authentication system similar to that used for banking or other online transactions (for example, two factor authentication, public/private keys). The committee will continue to work with other internal NCEES committees and task forces and external organizations on this important security matter.

Charge 3

Review Model Law *140.30 to evaluate the feasibility of removing this provision from the* Model Law. *Recommend revisions as necessary.*

This section of *Model Law* refers to the issuance of duplicate certificates. Feedback from various jurisdictions shows that there are many different procedures and requirements for the issuance of duplicate certificates and that they are generally handled by internal administrative policies and procedures and not through regulations, rules, or laws. This section is currently in the NCEES *Model Law*, which should be a template for statutory authority. After discussion, the committee concluded that this type of administrative process is not appropriate for *Model Law* and should be handled on a jurisdictional basis. Therefore, the committee recommends removing this section from *Model Law*.

The committee will present **Motion 5** to make this change.

Charge 4

Review Model Rules *230.20 in its entirety and provide recommendations as appropriate, including*

a. Review Model Rules *230.20 A(6) and B(4) to determine if the provision for unlicensed supervision should be removed.*
b. Review Model Rules *230.20 A(7) to evaluate if sales experience should be removed.*
c. Review Model Rules *230.20 A(10) and B(11) to evaluate if research experience may only be gained by industry or government employees.*
d. Evaluate whether a section should be added to Model Rules *230.20 that allows member boards to project experience that will be gained by the applicant to allow for scheduling of a linear, fixed-form exam, which is only offered once a year in most cases.*

The committee was charged with reviewing several *Model Rules* subsections concerning experience. Each section will be addressed individually below.

Charge 4.a
Charge 4.a is related to unlicensed supervision of engineering or surveying experience. This topic was addressed through motions made last year by the committee and adopted by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. The current committee has no additional recommendations or motions at this time.

Charge 4.b
Charge 4.b is related to whether sales experience should be counted as a type of creditable engineering experience. The committee discussed scenarios in which an individual's job involves the sales of an engineering-related product or service but their education and training as an engineer are critical to the process or application of the product or services. These are considered to be valid examples of applicable engineering experience. However, the committee holds that sales experience must have a valid engineering component that demonstrates the application of engineering experience. The committee recommends a rewording of this section to clarify and emphasize the engineering component of sales experience.

The committee will present **Motion 6** to make this change.

Charge 4.c
Charge 4.c is related to research experience. Both the engineering and surveying subsections of this section list research experience as acceptable for licensure but have split them into separate rules for industry and government and for faculty members. After discussion, the committee sees no reason to have separate rules for similar areas of experience and recommends combining the language to clarify and streamline the rules.

The committee will present **Motions 7–8** to make this change.

Charge 4.d
Charge 4.d is related to potentially projecting or anticipating experience for applicants who intend to schedule a linear, fixed-form exam that is offered only once per year. In general, jurisdictions do not allow an applicant to anticipate earning qualifying experience. This is due to the inability to know if anticipated experience will be applicable, meet licensure requirements, and be of the appropriate quality and whether the applicant will actually be employed during the anticipated period. Therefore, the committee does not recommend any changes to permit the anticipation of experience in any situation.

During the discussion of this charge, the conversation transitioned to how and when experience is gained and reported and how decoupling of the exams from experience is implemented in different jurisdictions. (*Decoupling* refers to allowing licensure candidates to take the Principles and Practice exam before meeting the experience requirement.) In reviewing the *Model Law*, *Model Rules*, and exam policies, as well as data concerning the number of states that have decoupled the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) or Principles and Practice of Surveying (PS) exams from experience reporting, it has become clear that the decoupling process, in various forms, has become the norm. The decoupling model has been thoroughly evaluated and has demonstrated its effectiveness in practice, with approximately 36 jurisdictions decoupled for engineering and 30 decoupled for surveying. Other jurisdictions are currently considering decoupling as well. For those that do not formally decouple the exams for their jurisdiction, they have a process to accept exams for out-of-state applicants who have taken the exams via decoupling in another state. Additionally, in states that have not adopted this approach, a type of alternative work-around has emerged, where applicants apply and take the exams in another state.

Based on this discussion, the committee is recommending that *Model Rules* for engineers and surveyors be amended to make the decoupling model the norm. Note that this change is adding the decoupling model as the primary option in the *Model Rules* but does not preclude a jurisdiction from having a different process. The changes do *not* make decoupling mandatory and does *not* require any jurisdiction to make a change to its rules or statutes.

The committee communicated with the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) and the Committee on Member Board Administrators, and both are in support of this change.

The committee will present **Motion 9** to make this change.

Additional consideration
As part of its efforts to address Charge 4, the committee worked with the EPP Committee on a proposed change to Exam Administration Policy 1 concerning clarifying that NCEES does not approve exam applications. The Committee on Licensure supports EPP Motion 7.

Charge 5
Review Model Rules *230.30 to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating a seven-year period for required references. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee gathered information from various jurisdictions on their processes for gathering experience for licensure and if there were any limits or timeframes on reporting. Some require applicants to list all experience, others only require a minimum number of years to be reported, and others require a mixture of reporting and reference requirements. The committee did note that for some applicants—including comity applicants—who have an extensive licensure background, it does not seem necessary to list and provide references for all of their experience. In discussion with NCEES Records staff, they noted that they receive feedback and questions about the need to list extensive experience backgrounds and provide verifications and references for more than the minimum requirement for experience. While it does not seem to be appropriate to dictate a set maximum number of years to report in the *Model Law* or *Model Rules*, the committee does recommend that boards consider reviewing their application processes and putting some sort of limitation on experience reporting to streamline the application process while still allowing for the ability to determine suitability for licensure.

The committee, along with NCEES staff, felt that it was reasonable to lead by example and adjust the NCEES Record to provide for a limitation on the number of years of experience required to be reported, along with an option to add additional time as needed. Therefore, the Committee on Licensure recommends that NCEES staff require a maximum of 10 years of experience to be reported in the NCEES Record unless additional time is necessary to establish competency and eligibility for licensure.

Charge 6
Review jurisdictional practices regarding waivers of the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) examination and provide recommendations for corresponding Model Rules *and* Model Law *language as necessary.*

This charge asked the committee to broadly review waiver processes of the FE exam. The committee reviewed feedback from jurisdictions concerning FE waivers, showing that of 33 agencies that responded to a poll, 23 have some form of FE exam waiver, with a broad range of requirements. Most involve some kind of advanced education or additional experience requirements.

NCEES Past President Michael Conzett, P.E., reported that that the American Society of Civil Engineers has a report on barriers to licensure, and one topic included is concerns about requirements for licensure and the applicability of the FE exam in that process. As such, the committee took a broad look at potential situations where the FE exam may not be necessary to determine competency of an applicant for licensure.

The committee discussed various scenarios and evaluated the goals of the FE exam as they relate to assessing an applicant's fundamental skills and knowledge at the beginning of their career process and following initial higher education. As such, it seems logical that a board would not gain much information about the qualifications of an individual with a highly advanced educational background by requiring them to go back and take an exam focused on fundamental educational principles. Therefore, the committee believes that individuals with a doctoral degree in engineering that is acceptable to the jurisdiction's board should be allowed to register to take the PE exam and obtain a license without being required to take the FE exam.

The committee will present **Motion 10** to make this change.

Charge 7
Review member boards' statute language related to incidental practice and propose revisions to Model Law *as necessary.*

This charge relates to incidental practice—overlapping areas of practice for engineers and surveyors. In general, this has meant potential areas of practice overlap between professions (engineers and surveyors, engineers and architects, etc.) but could also apply to areas of overlap within a profession (for example, civil and environmental engineering overlap). The committee requested that state boards share any language they have concerning inter-

or intra-discipline incidental or overlapping practice. While some states do have such language, others do not, and the language can be in statute or rule and come in many different forms. The committee will continue to review the submittals to see if there is any commonality that can be applied to *Model Law* or *Model Rules*.

President Beckett reported that there is an ICOR Working Group focused on incidental practice and shared a copy of the *Practice Overlap Guidance* document, released in November 2025. This resource covers areas of practice by profession (engineering, architecture, interior design, landscape architecture, and surveying) as well as certain types of activities (for example, building analysis, contract documents, building design) and groups them into activities that are not regulated or have no overlap, areas of collaboration, and areas with practice boundaries. While the report uses the term *incidental practice* as a synonym or parallel to overlapping practice or scope of practice, this has not been made clear with a formal definition. In addition, some jurisdictions may view incidental practice as a type of de minimis area of overlap versus a significant practice encroachment. The committee has not yet had time to review the document thoroughly and make recommendations for *Model Law* or *Model Rules* changes.

Based on the information collected, the ICOR report, and ongoing efforts in this area, the committee recommends continuing this charge and that the ICOR Working Group develop and provide a definition of *incidental practice* to assist the work of the Committee on Licensure.

Charge 8
Review International Engineering Alliance mobility guidelines. Recommend revisions as necessary.

Based on the recent mutual recognition agreement (MRA) between NCEES in the United States and the Engineering Council in the United Kingdom as well as NCEES participation in the IEA, the committee was charged with reviewing international mobility guidelines and recommending changes to *Model Law*, *Model Rules*, or NCEES policies. The committee reviewed IEA documentation and its website, which contains information about the requirements for licensure in various international jurisdictions. President Beckett provided valuable information and insight into how the IEA works, NCEES' role in the IEA, and ongoing reviews and feedback concerning NCEES processes and procedures regarding mobility. NCEES is very active in the IEA as a participant, as a reviewer for other jurisdictions, and as a leader in the organization. In addition, Marie Nebesky, NCEES international engagement strategist, provided an overview presentation to the committee to give insight into IEA operations and NCEES' international efforts.

International mobility covers all aspects of licensure in a wholistic way—spanning education, experience, examinations or other practice assessments, and how the information is collected and reviewed. For example, the IEA model includes a Professional Competency Profile format for experience reporting. The committee is working to align NCEES experience reporting procedures with the international format (See Charge 1 and associated motions.)

As a central clearinghouse and point of contact on licensure issues writ large, the committee recommends that it be the primary committee to which issues related to international standards, international licensure issues, and IEA matters are referred. The committee also recommends that it be charged with reviewing the annual reports from the IEA and the International Federation of Surveyors and any applicable audit reports and making recommendations as necessary.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Licensure:**

Lance Kinney, Ph.D., P.E., Chair

Members
Wendy Amann, P.E.
David Beasley, Ph.D., P.E.
Michael Conzett, P.E.
Gene Dinkins, P.E., P.L.S.
David Gill, P.E.
William (Rick) Huett
Jeanne Nebre, P.S.
Karen Purcell, P.E.
Marlee Walton, P.E., P.L.S.

Board liaison
Elizabeth Beckett, P.E.

Staff liaison
Stef Goodenow

MOTIONS

Licensure Motion 1

Move that a position statement on experience reporting guidelines and definitions for professional surveying licensure be adopted as follows:

PS 4.3 NCEES-Recommended Experience Reporting Guidelines and Definitions for P.S. Licensing

NCEES supports focused and guided experience prior to licensure with a clear and common method for reporting and evaluation. The guidelines and associated definitions in the NCEES publication *Professional Competency Profile for Initial Licensure as a Professional Surveyor* provide a common format for reporting that allows an applicant to demonstrate progressive surveying experience and a depth of knowledge across multiple categories. The format supports various educational and experiential backgrounds as well as areas of surveying practice. The professional profile format provides applicants, reviewers, and employers with a better understanding of the requirements for licensure and standards to determine competency.

Rationale

The Committee on Licensure is proposing this position statement to establish support for member board use of the guidance publication *Professional Competency Profile for Initial Licensure as a Professional Surveyor*, developed this year by the committee. The publication is shown as **Appendix A** at the end of this report. The NCEES board of directors reviewed this document as part of the task force report at the board's May 2026 meeting.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 2

Move that PS 4.2 be amended as follows:

PS 4.2 NCEES-Recommended Experience Reporting Guidelines and Definitions for P.E. Licensing

NCEES supports focused and guided experience prior to licensure with a clear and common method for reporting and evaluation. The guidelines and associated definitions in the NCEES publication ~~*Experience Record*~~ *Professional Competency Profile for Initial Licensure as a Professional Engineer* provide a common format for reporting that allows an applicant to demonstrate progressive engineering experience and a depth of knowledge across multiple categories. The format supports various educational and experiential backgrounds as well as areas of engineering practice. The professional profile format provides applicants, reviewers, and employers with a better understanding of the requirements for licensure and standards to determine competency.

Rationale

The Committee on Licensure is proposing to revise the name of the referenced document to align with the term "professional competency profile" used by the IEA for a document with a similar function and purpose.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 3

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* 110.20 J–K:

110.20 Definitions

J. Signature—The term "Signature," as used in this Act, shall mean a unique name, mark, or writing made by the professional engineer or professional surveyor with the intention of verifying or authenticating a document.
Electronic or Digital Signature—The term "Electronic or Digital Signature," as used in this Act, shall mean ~~an electronic sound,~~ a unique symbol, process, or secure digital code ~~that uniquely identifies and authenticates the sender,~~ attached to or logically associated with an ~~electronically transmitted record~~ electronic document and executed or adopted by ~~a person~~ the professional engineer or professional surveyor with the intent ~~to sign the record~~ of verifying or authenticating the document.

K. Seal—The term "Seal," as used in this Act, shall mean a symbol~~,~~ or image~~, or list of information~~ adopted by the jurisdiction and applied by the professional engineer or professional surveyor, representing that the professional is in responsible control of the sealed document.

Rationale

This modification clarifies the language concerning the definition and purpose of a seal, signature, and electronic or digital signature and incorporates language moved from *Model Rules* 240.20 H in Motion 4.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 4

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 240.20 H–I:

240.20 Seal on Documents

~~H. Drawings, reports, and documents that are signed using a digital signature must have an electronic authentication process attached to or logically associated with the electronic document. The digital signature must be~~
~~1. Unique to the individual using it~~
~~2. Capable of verification~~
~~3. Under the sole control of the individual using it~~
~~4. Linked to a document in such a manner that the digital signature is invalidated if any data in the document is changed.~~

~~I~~H. A digital signature that uses a process approved by the board will be presumed to meet the criteria set forth in Section~~s~~ G ~~and H~~ above. Any hard copy printed from the transmitted electronic file shall bear the facsimile of the signature and seal and be a confirmation that the electronic file was not altered after the initial digital signing of the file. Any alterations to the file shall cause the facsimile of the signature to be voided.

Rationale

This modification removes language that has been determined to be related to the definition of electronic or digital sealing. Therefore, the language has been incorporated into changes proposed to *Model Law* 110.20 concerning the definition and purpose of a seal, signature, and electronic or digital signature.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 5
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with deleting *Model Law* 140.30.

~~**140.30 Issuance of Duplicate Certificates**~~
~~A duplicate certificate of licensure or enrollment document to replace any certificate or card lost, destroyed, or mutilated may be issued subject to the rules of the board. A fee established by regulation shall be paid for each issuance.~~

Rationale
This modification removes language that has been determined to be an internal administrative process handled by individual jurisdictions and not necessary for inclusion in *Model Law*.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 6
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 230.20 A.7:

230.20 Experience
A. As a Professional Engineer
In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice engineering, the following will be considered:
7. ~~Sales e~~Experience in sales must demonstrate ~~that~~ the application of engineering principles ~~were required and used in gaining the experience~~.

Rationale
This modification clarifies language related to experience in sales and aligns the format with other provisions in Section 230.20.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 7
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 230.20 A.9–10:

230.20 Experience
A. As a Professional Engineer
In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice engineering, the following will be considered:
9. Experience may be gained in engineering research ~~and~~ or design projects by ~~members of an~~ industry or government employees or by engineering faculty ~~where the program is approved by the board~~ members.
~~10. Experience may be gained in engineering research by industry or government employees.~~

Rationale
This modification streamlines language by combining two parallel sections concerning engineering research projects.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 8
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 230.20 B.10–11:

230.20 Experience
B. As a Professional Surveyor
In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice surveying, the following will be considered:
10. Experience may be gained in surveying research projects by ~~members of a~~ industry or government employees or by surveying faculty ~~where the program is approved by the board~~ members.
~~11. Experience may be gained in surveying research by industry or government employees.~~

Rationale
This modification streamlines language by combining two parallel sections concerning surveying research projects.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 9
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 230.40 B.2 and D.2:

230.40 Examinations
B. Approval of Applicant for Engineering Examinations
1. NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) Examination
a. An individual applying to take the FE examination may register with NCEES directly to take the FE examination or, if required, apply to the board for admission to the FE examination.
2. NCEES Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) Examination
a. ~~An individual will be permitted to sit for the PE examination upon satisfactorily fulfilling all requirements of the jurisdiction.~~ An individual applying to take the PE examination may register with NCEES directly to take the PE examination.
[. . .]
D. Approval of Applicant for Surveying Examinations
1. NCEES Fundamentals of Surveying (FS) Examination
a. An individual applying to take the FS examination may register with NCEES directly to take the FS examination or, if required, apply to the board for admission to the FS examination.
2. NCEES Principles and Practice of Surveying (PS) Examination and Public Land Survey System (PLSS) Examination
a. ~~An individual will be permitted to take the PS examination upon satisfactorily fulfilling all requirements of the jurisdiction, which may include additional exams referenced in Section 230.40 C.2.~~ An individual applying to take the PS or PLSS examination may register with NCEES directly to take the PS or PLSS examination.
[. . .]

Rationale
This modification prioritizes the exam registration process of decoupling for the PE, PS, and PLSS exams, which is the current exam process for a significant number of jurisdictions that allow individuals to take these exams before completing experience requirements.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Licensure Motion 10
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* 130.10 B.2.a(2):

130.10 General Requirements for Licensure
B. Engineering
2. Licensure as a Professional Engineer
a. Initial Licensure as a Professional Engineer
[. . .]
(2) Examination Requirements
(i) An individual seeking licensure as a professional engineer shall take and pass the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) examination and the NCEES Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) examination, and any jurisdiction-specific examination.
(ii) An individual with an earned doctoral degree in engineering acceptable to the board shall take and pass the PE examination and any jurisdiction-specific examination but will not be required to take and pass the FE examination.

Rationale
This addition provides for a modified pathway for licensure for engineering applicants with a doctoral degree in engineering. This pathway recognizes the advanced education and training required to obtain a doctorate in engineering and does not require taking and passing the FE exam, which is focused on assessment for recent baccalaureate graduates. The PE exam and any jurisdiction-specific examination would still be required.

Board of directors' position
Does not endorse, non-consent agenda

Board of directors' rationale
While the board recognizes that many jurisdictions already provide some form of FE waiver, those provisions vary widely. Adding a doctoral-degree exemption to the *Model Law* would reflect one of the least common current paths for exemption. The board believes the current *Model Law* pathway better supports consistent national standards for licensure and that it is more appropriate to defer this action for consideration as part of the wholistic licensing process reform currently underway.

APPENDIX A: PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY PROFILE FOR INITIAL LICENSURE AS A PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR

Applicant's Name: _____

Part 1: Summary of Surveying Work by Engagement
List and describe the individual surveying work engagements and a brief description (1–2 pages) of the general type of work you performed. This section is similar to a specific job description, including the type of projects or surveying work you personally performed. Repeat sections (adding additional pages as needed) to cover all engagements you wish to include.

For the purposes of this section, an "engagement" is a job position that you held at each individual employer or at a single employer if the job positions are significantly different.

- Engagement no.:
- From (date):
- To (date):
- Name of employer:
- Location:
- Supervisor's name:
- Brief description of surveying work performed:

[REPEAT THIS SECTION AS MANY TIMES AS NEEDED TO COVER REQUIRED EXPERIENCE]

Part 2: Summary of Surveying Work by Competency
Provide a detailed description of your overall surveying experience as it pertains to each competency. This section is not a summary per job or engagement as in Part 1—it is a description of your overall surveying experience across all engagements for each competency section. You will need to complete this section only once, regardless of how many engagements you have in Part 1. If you do not have any experience for a particular competency section, describe why not (for example, a competency section was not part of any of your job descriptions or assigned job tasks.) Please keep each competency summary to no longer than 1–2 pages.

Competency Section Definitions

Competency 1: Boundary Law and Legal Principles
1.1 Boundary Law: Describe in detail how you apply the law governing land ownership and boundaries. Examples include interpretation and preparation of deeds, plats, easements, and legal descriptions; understanding priority of calls; monumentation; principles of evidence; application of common and case law; sequential and simultaneous conveyance concepts; legal descriptions; evidence for the perpetuation of the U.S. Public Land Survey System (PLSS); knowledge of riparian and littoral rights; understanding subdivision law, recording statutes, and land title concepts; and ability to resolve conflicting evidence using legal hierarchy.

1.2 Application of Legal Principles: Describe in detail how you evaluate evidence, apply legal principles, and reconcile conflicts. Examples include weighing conflicting evidence, applying legal principles to factual situations, making reasoned boundary determinations, defending decisions ethically and technically, avoiding acting as an advocate while exercising judgment, researching for public/private record sources, and interpreting title reports and other legal documents.

Competency 2: Field Experience
2.1 Measurement Science and Geomatics: Describe in detail how you apply accurate, defensible measurements of the earth. Examples include distance measurement; angle measurement; elevation determination, coordinate systems and datums, error theory, precision versus accuracy, and uncertainty analysis; appropriate equipment application and best practices to perform in different surveying disciplines; data testing and reporting; and calibration and verification of instruments.

2.2 Field Data Collection and Evidence Evaluation: Describe in detail how you apply observation with professional judgment. Examples include conducting boundary, topographic, construction, route, utility, and

control surveys; locating and evaluating physical evidence; recognizing disturbed, missing, or unreliable evidence; applying procedural standards for retracement surveys and document field findings clearly and defensibly; reading and interpreting plans; performing field survey calculations, techniques, and activities; appropriately selecting, using, and applying GPS/global navigation satellite system (GNSS) methods; and establishing and applying monumentation standards.

Competency 3: Office Experience
3.1 Data Processing, Computation, and Analysis: Describe in detail how you turn measurements into defensible results. Examples include traverse computation and adjustment, least squares adjustments, area computations, coordinate geometry (COGO), GNSS processing and network adjustments, evaluation against applicable accuracy standards, quality control, and error and blunder detection.

3.2 Mapping, Drafting, and Visualization: Describe in detail how you provide clear communication of spatial information. Examples include preparation of plats, maps, and exhibits; application of cartographic theory; use of computer-aided design (CAD) and geographic information systems (GIS), including spatial databases and metadata; linework, annotation, symbols, utility nomenclature, and scale; and compliance with statutory and local mapping standards.

Competency 4: Ethics, Professional Responsibility, and Standards of Practice
4.1 Describe in detail how you fulfill the public trust obligation. Examples include adherence to state laws and rules of professional conduct, understanding the surveyor's role as a quasi-judicial professional, avoiding conflicts of interest, and applying recordkeeping and documentation standards.

Competency 5: Communication and Documentation
5.1 Describe in detail how you explain complex spatial and legal concepts. Examples include communicating findings to clients, attorneys, engineers, planners, and the public; writing clear legal descriptions and reports; explaining uncertainty and limitations honestly; and coordinating with multidisciplinary teams.

Competency 6: Project Management and Business Practices
6.1 Describe in detail how you deliver professional services effectively. Examples include scope definition and fee estimation; planning, scheduling, and resource allocation; risk management; client relations; invoicing and budgeting; understanding contracts and liability; and supervision of field and office staff.

Competency 7: Other Pertinent Information (optional)
7.1 Provide any other information that you believe is relevant to the attainment of competencies necessary for professional practice, such as specific jurisdictional requirements not presented above.

Committee on Member Board Administrators

Kathy Hart, Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Member Board Administrators (MBA) was established to provide close cooperation between administrators and to facilitate and assist any efforts by the member boards in addressing licensure processes and practice and to provide input on Council activities. The committee consists of at least two MBAs from each zone and two current members or emeritus members of member boards. The committee arranges the conference of administrators at the annual and zone interim meetings.

Members of the committee were assigned to subcommittees to work on individual charges and conducted several virtual meetings prior to the committee's meeting on January 19, 2026, in San Diego, California. Further, the committee distributed a questionnaire to ensure that all member boards were given the opportunity to fully engage and had a voice in the outcome from charges assigned to this committee.

The committee was assigned seven charges and will present four motions. **The motions begin on page 113.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. Mentor new member board administrators. Review the new-MBA orientation process.
b. Coordinate, develop agendas for, and provide leaders for all MBA meetings (annual meetings, MBA meetings, and zone meetings).
c. Submit articles for inclusion in Licensure Exchange.
d. Assist NCEES staff in developing programs for in-person MBA meetings as well as virtual webinars.

Charge 1a

The MBA Committee discussed the importance of a thorough onboarding of new member board administrators by NCEES. Because MBAs play such a critical role in implementing licensure laws, advising board members, and interacting daily with NCEES programs and staff, a comprehensive, in-person orientation would provide MBAs with a structured and efficient overview of NCEES operations, ensuring a shared understanding of purpose, expectations, and available resources. This orientation should be considered an essential professional development activity that supports effective governance, operational efficiency, and the shared mission of public protection.

The committee identified the following key benefits to such a program:

- Strengthens alignment between state boards and NCEES by reinforcing mission, structure, and strategic priorities
- Improves effective use of NCEES programs and services, including examinations, licensure mobility tools, credentials evaluations, and data resources
- Enhances administrative efficiency through clearer understanding of NCEES processes, staff roles, and communication pathways
- Supports informed governance by equipping MBAs to better advise board members on NCEES policy, voting matters, and initiatives
- Builds professional relationships with NCEES staff, improving collaboration and issue resolution
- Accelerates onboarding for new member board administrators

Well-informed MBAs contribute to consistent, effective licensure administration across jurisdictions. By gaining a comprehensive understanding of NCEES policies, procedures, and services, MBAs are better positioned to support examinations, licensure mobility, and regulatory best practices that protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Further, the committee emphasized the importance of member boards notifying NCEES immediately upon the resignation or new hire of a member board administrator to ensure that the MBAs can welcome and mentor the new MBA.

Therefore, the MBA Committee strongly recommends that all new MBAs be invited to visit NCEES headquarters for a formalized day-long, one-on-one orientation at the expense of the Council to ensure that this person is adequately prepared to fulfill the enormous responsibilities the MBA holds on behalf of their member board and NCEES. Further, the committee recommends that member boards' key staff and first-time members also be included in a program such as this.

Remaining Charge 1 activities
The committee coordinated with volunteers to ensure completion of the remaining activities related to this charge.

Charge 2
Review the NCEES Bylaws *and evaluate the feasibility of adding an MBA to the NCEES board of directors. Research governance models and organizational structures to support this consideration and provide recommendations as appropriate.*

Following extensive research, the surveying of member boards, and ample discussion, the committee determined that there is sufficient data and member board support to add an elected MBA member to the NCEES board of directors. Of the 30 responses received, 22 MBAs reported that they would be allowed to serve in such a position if they met the experience criteria and chose to do so. Eight of those responding reported that they either had restrictions or were unsure how their board would view this issue. This is a substantial pool of highly qualified MBAs to serve in such a position. Their collective knowledge, strategic perspective, and demonstrated advocacy experience would provide meaningful value when brought forward by an individual elected to fill an MBA position on the NCEES board of directors.

The value of this addition includes but is not limited to the following.

1. Administrative continuity and expertise
- Deep operational knowledge: Unlike state board members, who are often gubernatorial appointees with term limits, MBAs are typically long-term staff. They bring institutional memory and a deep understanding of the day-to-day mechanics of licensure, enforcement, and renewals.
- Process efficiency: MBAs are authorities in administrative law and state-level processes and procedures. Their presence on the NCEES board of directors ensures that national initiatives are logistically feasible to implement at the state level.

2. Regulatory alignment and harmonization
- Consistency across boards: NCEES is mobility focused. MBAs are the ones who manage applicants and can identify regulatory hurdles that a practitioner-only board might overlook.

3. Standardization of regulations
- Uniformity: MBAs can help synchronize state regulations with the national *Model Law* and *Model Rules*.

4. Effective legislative and policy advocacy
- Direct link to state government: MBAs often manage their board's relationship with the governor's office and state legislature. By serving nationally, they can provide a coherent network for supporting or opposing legislation that affects the professions of engineering or surveying across multiple states.
- Strategic information flow: MBAs act as a vital two-way bridge, bringing national trends back to their state board and providing NCEES with real-world data on how policies are actually working on the ground.

5. Professionalism and risk management
- Focus on public protection: MBAs are specifically trained in regulatory oversight and public safety. This helps NCEES stay aligned with its primary mission: protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public by advancing licensure for engineers and surveyors.
- Financial and fiduciary oversight: MBAs are accustomed to managing multimillion-dollar state agency budgets, bringing rigorous financial and administrative scrutiny to the national organization's operations.

6. Alignment with other national professional licensing councils

Organization	Profession	MBAs on BoD	Voting Status
NASBA	Accountants	1	Nonvoting
NCARB	Architects	1	Voting
NASCLA	Licensed contractors	1	Voting
NCSBN	Nursing	1+	Voting
FSMB	Doctors	1+	Voting
NAPB	Pharmacists	1+	Voting

The MBA Committee is presenting **Motion 1** as a result of this charge. The committee has used the term "Member Board Executive" in this motion in anticipation of adoption of Bylaws Motions 10–15, which relate to changing "member board administrator" to "member board executive" in the *Bylaws*.

Charge 3
Review and compare NCEES Continuing Professional Competency (CPC) Tracking against individual state requirements to assess the feasibility of universal adoption across jurisdictions. Provide recommendations as appropriate.

After thorough discussion, the MBA Committee concluded that the NCEES CPC Tracking service would most likely not be adopted universally across all jurisdictions because of the differences in statutes and rules. As with most issues regarding mobility, even if the member boards wanted to adopt NCEES CPC Tracking, the boards do not always have the authority to choose what their regulatory documents will dictate. It certainly can be aspired to but would most likely not be universally adopted. Therefore, the committee does not recommend a move toward universal adoption of the CPC Tracking service across jurisdictions.

Charge 4
Review Model Law *120.80 to determine if language regarding the retention period for applicant and firm information should be added. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Following discussion, the MBA Committee concluded that member boards should enter the number of years that reflects their individual state's retention policy.

The MBA Committee is presenting **Motion 2** as a result of this charge.

Charge 5
Review Model Rules *230.60 D.3 and evaluate the necessity of the deadline for destroying denied applications. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Following discussion, the MBA Committee concluded that the *Model Rules* should not include a timeframe and that member boards should enter the number of years that matches their individual state's retention policy.

The MBA Committee is presenting **Motion 3** as a result of this charge.

Charge 6
Review Model Rules *240.30 F and propose language to address the use of the NCEES CPC Tracking service. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

After thorough discussion, the MBA Committee concluded that the NCEES CPC Tracking service would most likely not be adopted universally across all jurisdictions because of the differences in statutes and rules. Therefore, the committee does not recommend adding language to *Model Rules* 240.30 to address the use of the CPC Tracking service.

On review of the questionnaire responses of all participating member boards, the majority of member boards are satisfied with the NCEES CPC Tracking service. The following two recommendations for changes were noted:

- Provide a start and end date to the activity
- Allow MBAs access to the licensees' NCEES CPC Tracking accounts in a view-only format

Other discussion involved potential ways for member boards to better advertise this free service to licensees, which included advertising the service during renewal periods and upon initial licensing.

Charge 7

Research and evaluate potential volunteer recognition initiatives, including practices from comparable organizations. Provide recommendations to the board of directors for implementing meaningful and sustainable recognition efforts that align with NCEES values and culture.

The MBA Committee recognized the value of implementing a committee impact award that recognizes the true value of a person's contributions, not their length of service. This award is intended to honor individuals who have made a substantial contribution to an NCEES standing committee or task force; it would be presented in addition to the service awards already given at the annual meeting banquet.

The MBA Committee is presenting **Motion 4** as a result of this charge.

Although outside the scope of Charge 7, the MBA Committee recommends that the Distinguished Examination Service Award not be presented at the annual meeting banquet and instead be presented at such event as the Council deems appropriate.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Member Board Administrators:**

Kathy Hart, Chair

Members
Monica Gilmore
Christopher Green
Amy Hall
Kyle Lazell
Mohammad (Dr. Q) Quereshi, Ph.D., P.E.
Lesley Rosier-Tabor, P.E.
Pankaj Shah, P.E.
Jessica Spoja
Perry Valdez
Jennifer Wootten

Board liaison
Azuanuka (Azu) Etoniru, P.E., P.L.S.

Staff liaison
Stef Goodenow

MOTIONS

MBA Motion 1

Move that a Special Committee on Bylaws be charged with incorporating the following amendments into the *Bylaws*:

Section 4.02 Board Membership. The Board of Directors shall consist of the President, the President-Elect, the Immediate Past President, the Treasurer, ~~and~~ the four zone Vice Presidents (one from each zone), and the Member Board Executive.

Section 4.03 Officers. Officers of the Council shall be the President, the President-Elect, the Immediate Past President, the Treasurer, the four zone Vice Presidents (one from each zone), the Member Board Executive, and the Chief Executive Officer as the Secretary.

Section 4.04 Elections and Terms of Office. The President-Elect shall be elected by the Council at each Annual Business Meeting in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. The President-Elect shall serve the Council for a period of three years. The first year shall be as President-Elect. The second year, without further election, the President-Elect shall become President, holding that office until a successor has been installed. The third year, without further election, the President shall become Immediate Past President. Any Member elected to the office of President-Elect shall be eligible to serve as President-Elect, President, and Immediate Past President,

with full authority of the offices and board privileges. Past Presidents shall be ineligible for reelection as President-Elect of the Council.

The Treasurer shall be elected at the Annual Business Meeting every three years in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Treasurers shall not be eligible for reelection to the same office until at least one full term has elapsed. For the office of Treasurer, a partial term served shall not be considered a term for term-limit purposes.

Vice Presidents shall be elected at their respective Zone Interim Meeting every two years in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws*. Vice Presidents from the Northeast and Southern Zones shall be elected in odd numbered years. Vice Presidents from the Central and Western Zones shall be elected in even-numbered years. Vice Presidents shall not be eligible for reelection to the same office until at least one full term has elapsed. For the office of Vice President, a partial term served shall not be considered a term for term-limit purposes.

The Member Board Executive shall be elected each year in the manner prescribed in the *Bylaws.*

New members of the Board of Directors shall assume their duties at the conclusion of the Annual Business Meeting. Board members may continue to serve until the conclusion of the term of office to which they were elected even if their terms with Member Boards have ended.

Section 4.05 Qualifications. Any Member who is a citizen of the United States and a member of a Member Board sometime during the calendar year in which the nomination occurs is eligible to hold an elective office. Associate Members are not eligible to serve on the NCEES Board of Directors, except as the Member Board Executive.

To be eligible for the office of President-Elect, a person shall be a licensed engineer or surveyor, shall have been a Member at least three years, and shall have attended at least two NCEES Annual Business Meetings.

Members of the current Board of Directors whose term on their Member Board has expired may run for President-Elect if

- They have obtained emeritus standing within the Council; and
- They have the approval of their Member Board; and
- It is their zone's rotation to elect a President-Elect; and
- They have been nominated by the zone.

The President-Elect shall not be from the same zone as the President.

To be eligible for the office of Treasurer, a person shall be a licensed professional engineer, licensed professional surveyor, or public member.

To be eligible for the office of Vice President, a person shall be a licensed professional engineer or surveyor and shall be from the zone that elects them.

To be eligible for the office of Member Board Executive, a person shall be a current employee of a Member Board and designated by the Member Board as its lead administrative official.

Section 4.06 Vacancies. If a vacancy occurs in the office of President, the President-Elect shall succeed to the office of President for the completion of that term and subsequently serve the full one-year term that they were originally elected to serve as President. A vacancy in the office of President-Elect shall remain unfilled until the next NCEES Annual Business Meeting. At that time, the Council will elect a President from the zone of the vacant President-Elect position.

A vacancy in the office of Immediate Past President shall be filled by the most recent available Past President.

A vacancy in the office of Treasurer shall be filled by the Board of Directors within 30 days; the selected individual shall fill the position until an election for a new full-term Treasurer is held at the next Annual Business Meeting.

A vacancy in the office of a Vice President shall be filled by that zone's Assistant Vice President.

A vacancy in the office of Member Board Executive shall be filled by the chair of the Committee on Member Board Executives, or if that person is unable to serve, a selected qualified member of that committee shall be appointed by the chair of the Committee on Member Board Executives.

Appointments by the Board of Directors shall be made in accordance with the required qualifications and limitations for duly elected members of the Board of Directors.

A quorum of the Board of Directors for filling of vacancies shall consist of six members except in the event of two vacancies, when five shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5.05 Member Board Executive. The Member Board Executive shall fully participate in all discussions and presentations at the Board of Directors meetings. Further, they shall bring forward issues identified and of concern to NCEES, Member Boards, and member board executives, as well as strategic initiatives for the betterment and advancement of NCEES. The Member Board Executive is a nonvoting member of the Board of Directors.

Section 7.12 Committee on Member Board Administrators. The Committee on Member Board Administrators shall consist of a chair, who shall be a member board administrator; at least two member board administrators from each zone, if available; and two current Members or Emeritus Members. The committee shall arrange for the conference of administrators at the Annual Meeting and Interim Meetings of the NCEES zones. Throughout the year, the committee shall strive to provide close cooperation between administrators and to facilitate and assist any efforts by the Member Boards in addressing licensure processes and practices.

Section 11.01 Nominations. A nomination for the office of President-Elect shall be presented to the Board of Directors by the respective zone Vice President as voted on by the respective zone at its Zone Interim Meeting. The order of rotation for President-Elect shall be Northeast Zone, Central Zone, Southern Zone, and Western Zone.

Member Boards may submit nominations for qualified Treasurer candidates in the third year of the outgoing Treasurer's term. These nominations shall be filed with the Chief Executive Officer not later than 60 days prior to the opening of the Annual Business Meeting.

Nominations for the Member Board Executive position shall rotate among zones as follows: Northeast Zone, Central Zone, Southern Zone, Western Zone. If a zone does not present one or more nominees in its designated year, the opportunity will move to the next zone in rotation, but at no time will a zone have back-to-back nominations. Nominations may be made by a Member Board, a member board executive, or self-nomination.

Any Delegate shall have the privilege of making nominations for President-Elect and Treasurer from the floor. Such nominees from the floor must meet the requirements set out in Section 4.05 and be seconded by at least four Member Boards.

Section 11.03 Voting. All elections shall be by ballot at the Annual Business Meeting unless otherwise stipulated by the *Bylaws*. All elections shall be by a majority of votes cast unless otherwise stipulated by the *Bylaws*.

Section 11.05 Election of Member Board Executive. Nominations for the Member Board Executive position must be submitted to the Chief Executive Officer no later than March 31 for a June 1 election by email ballot. The member board executive of each Member Board may cast a vote.

Rationale

Following extensive research included in this report, the MBA Committee determined that there is ample national data and member board support to add an MBA-elected member to the NCEES board of directors. To address prior member board concerns regarding a perceived conflict of interest, the MBA Committee chose to move forward with this position as a nonvoting position but emphasized that this board of directors position would have all other rights and privileges of the existing board of directors. Also, to address other prior concerns of member boards, the committee chose to provide thorough details for the creation of such a board of directors position, which are included in the proposed *Bylaws* amendments. The 69 member boards that compose the NCEES membership bring a substantial pool of highly qualified MBAs. Their collective knowledge, strategic

perspective, and demonstrated advocacy experience would provide meaningful value when brought forward by an individual elected to fill the Member Board Executive position on the NCEES board of directors.

The committee has used the term "Member Board Executive" in this motion in anticipation of adoption of Bylaws Motions 10–15, which relate to changing "member board administrator" to "member board executive" in the *Bylaws*.

Board of directors' position
Does not endorse, non-consent agenda

Board of directors' rationale
While the board values the perspective of member board administrators, it does not support this motion. The proposed amendments represent an unnecessary change to the current governance structure. The operation of the board would not change with a non-voting MBA, other than the MBA could be present during rare instances of executive session topics. In addition, the board has logistical concerns related to the limited pool of potential MBA candidates.

MBA Motion 2
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* 120.80 A–B:

120.80 Records and Reports

A. The board shall keep a record of its proceedings. The board shall also keep a record of all applications for licensure *[insert record retention policy]*, which shall show all of the following:
   1. The name, date of birth, and physical address of each applicant
   2. The date of application
   3. The place of business of the applicant
   4. Educational and other qualifications of the applicant
   5. Whether or not an examination was required
   6. Whether or not the applicant was rejected
   7. Whether or not a license was granted
   8. The date of the action by the board
   9. A declaration under penalty of perjury from each applicant that they will abide by the statutes and rules prescribed by the board, with the declaration becoming part of their application for licensure
   10. Any other information deemed necessary by the board
B. The board shall also keep a record of all applications of firms for a certificate of authorization *[insert record retention policy]*, which shall show all of the following:
   1. The name, date of formation, and business address of each applicant
   2. The date of application
   3. The name, physical address, and license number of the managing agent
   4. Whether or not the applicant was rejected
   5. Whether or not a certificate of authorization was granted
   6. The date of the action by the board
   7. A declaration under penalty of perjury from an officer and managing agent, if the officer is not the managing agent, that the applicant will abide by the statutes and rules prescribed by the board, with the oath becoming a part of its application for a certificate of authorization
   8. Any other information deemed necessary by the board

Rationale
This revision to the *Model Law* provides guidance to member boards who wish to include a prescribed time period for records retention that aligns with their state's record retention policy.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

MBA Motion 3
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Rules* 230.60 D:

230.60 Applications
D. Disposition of Applications
Applications may be approved, deferred for further information (such as additional experience, questionable references, or other reasons), or denied.
1. Approved applications—When an application is approved by the board showing that the applicant has met all requirements for licensure or certification required by the licensure act, the applicant shall be granted licensure or certification with notification by the board.
2. Deferred applications—Applications deferred for any reason shall be retained until such date as a proper remedy is presented or until *[insert deadline for responding to board's inquiry]*.
3. Denied applications—When an application is denied by the board, it shall be kept on file ~~for at least one year before being destroyed~~ *[insert record retention policy]*.

Rationale
This revision to the *Model Rules* provides guidance to member boards who wish to include a prescribed time period for records retention that aligns with their state's record retention policy. The "one-year" language should not be specified in the *Model Rules*.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

MBA Motion 4
Move that NCEES staff create a committee impact award to recognize individuals whose contribution to an NCEES standing committee or task force resulted in a significant, tangible impact in support of the NCEES mission and that staff present the award criteria and guidelines to the board of directors for approval prior to implementation. The award is intended to be offered annually to honor exceptional outcomes, leadership, and innovation, rather than length of service.

Rationale
This addition to the NCEES service awards provides an opportunity for all NCEES committee members to be recognized for mission advancement, significant contributions, innovation and problem solving, and leadership as well as initiative, collaboration and engagement, tangible outcomes, sustained or transferable value, and professional conduct. This award would not be focused on years of service to NCEES. Many member boards have term limits for board members, and they may not have the opportunity to serve more than a few years. However, they should be recognized for their impact. The same is true for other committee members; they may only serve a short period of time but may have made a significant impact.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines

Colin Maynard, P.E., S.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG) consists of a chair and members from each zone, with at least one member who is a surveyor. The committee promotes effective procedures for uniform comity by maintaining the *Model Law* and *Model Rules*. The committee incorporates revisions to *Model Law* and *Model Rules* language as a result of motions, suggestions, and comments from other NCEES committees, task forces, and member boards. The committee is empowered to recommend amendments that it feels may be necessary. It comprehensively reviews the *Model Law* and *Model Rules*, with the view of possible revision, at least once every five years.

The committee was assigned 16 charges and will present 13 motions. **The motions begin on page 122.**

CHARGES

Charge 1

Review Model Rules *220.10 C to determine if the reference to* Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised *should be removed. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

Many boards do not cite *Robert's Rules* as referenced in the *Model Rules,* and they do not strictly follow it, even if they have it in their rules. For example, they do not limit members to speaking only once on a motion, among other formalities. The book is literally 714 pages long.

One option UPLG considered was to reference *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised in Brief*. That is in an easier-to-read format and might be all that is needed. This version is only 200 pages long. However, the committee decided to give boards more flexibility.

A blanket reference that boards will use *Robert's Rules* when it is not followed may create unintended liability should they not follow those rules exactly. UPLG ultimately determined that eliminating this reference and merely stating that boards should establish ground rules for successful meetings was the proper course of action. The UPLG Committee will present **Motion 1** to make this change.

The committee recommends a future charge for UPLG or another committee to review the use of *must* versus *shall* for consistency and compliance with modern legal rulings.

Charge 2

Review revisions to Model Rules *230.20 A as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The 2024–25 Committee on Licensure was charged with determining whether amendments are needed to define acceptable experience when gaining qualifying experience in workplace situations where P.E. supervisors are not available. Its analysis of this charge resulted in a proposed addition of language to *Model Rules* 230.20 A, which was approved at the 2025 annual meeting.

The UPLG Committee reviewed this additional language and determined that it had no objection to this modification. However, the committee added the phrase "used as qualifying experience" to the provision and moved it to item 7, rather than adding it to the end of the list. This requires renumbering current items 7–15. The committee will present **Motion 2** to make this change.

During the discussion, the committee determined that modifications to *Model Rules* 230.60 were necessary to include both references and experience verifiers. The committee will present **Motion 3** to make this change.

Charge 3

Review revisions to Model Rules *230.20 A.6 as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The 2024–25 Committee on Licensure proposed a modification to *Model Rules* 230.20 A.6 to allow mentorship in addition to direct supervision to address situations when no licensed professional capable of providing oversight is in the engineer applicant's organization. After a thorough discussion of possible mentorship programs, the committee decided to accept the approved language. The committee will present **Motion 4** to make this change.

The committee recommends a future charge for the UPLG Committee or another committee to define mentorship or mentorship program requirements for engineers in the *Model Law* and/or *Model Rules* after a study of how those are currently being used in the various states that allow this method of supervision.

Charge 4
Review revisions to Model Rules *230.20 B as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The 2024–25 Committee on Licensure was charged with determining whether amendments are needed to define acceptable experience when gaining qualifying experience in workplace situations where P.S. supervisors are not available. Its analysis of this charge resulted in a proposed addition of language to *Model Rules* 230.20 B, which was approved at the 2025 annual meeting.

The UPLG Committee reviewed this additional language and determined that it had no objection to this modification. However, the committee added the phrase "used as qualifying experience" to the provision and moved it to item 5, rather than adding it to the end of the list. This requires renumbering current items 5–13. The committee will present **Motion 5** to make this change.

Charge 5
Review revisions to Model Rules *230.20 B.4 as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The 2024–25 Committee on Licensure had proposed a modification to *Model Rules* 230.20 B.4 to allow mentorship in addition to direct supervision to address situations when no licensed professional capable of providing oversight is in the surveyor applicant's organization. After a thorough discussion of possible mentorship programs, the committee decided to accept the approved language. The committee will present **Motion 6** to make this change.

The committee recommends a future charge for the UPLG Committee or another committee to define mentorship or mentorship program requirements for surveyors in the *Model Law* and/or *Model Rules* after a study of how those are currently being used in the various states that allow this method of supervision.

Charge 6
Review Model Rules *230.30 and evaluate if all employment periods should have references. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The 2024–25 Committee on Licensure motion adopted by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting charged the UPLG Committee with moving language from *Model Rules* 230.30 References to *Model Rules* 230.20 Experience to make it clear that the experience record requires the identity of a person or persons with direct knowledge of what occurred during each employment period. UPLG does not recommend that every employment period require a reference and has added language to the modification proposed via **Motion 2** to clarify that verifiers of qualifying experience, which may only be a portion of their total experience, must be identified. However, it is necessary to remove the moved language from 230.30 References, which is proposed in **Motion 7**.

Charge 7
Review revisions to Model Rules *230.30 A as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

An additional 2024–25 Committee on Licensure motion adopted by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting charged the UPLG Committee with incorporating amendments to *Model Rules* 230.30 A to more clearly state the expectations for and qualifications of references for engineers and surveyors. UPLG agrees with this change and will present it as part of **Motion 7**.

Charge 8

Review Model Rules *230.40 and recommend revisions as necessary to reflect that jurisdictions do not offer the Fundamentals of Engineering and Principles and Practice of Engineering examinations and to reflect that jurisdictions may provide engineering exams, not just surveying exams.*

The general language and format of *Model Rules* 230.40 A did not match 230.40 C, and **Motion 8** makes it clear that NCEES provides all examinations other than jurisdictional ones. Jurisdictional examinations are those examinations that the board has determined apply exclusively to the jurisdiction over which it exercises power.

Note that the UPLG Committee believes that the word *jurisdiction* should be replaced by *board* in 230.40 A.1–2 and in 230.40 C.1–2. UPLG discussed this previously and agreed on the following definition of *jurisdiction*: "The territory within which a court or government agency may properly exercise its power." UPLG further agreed that a territory cannot require anything. Rather, the board determines the requirements that apply to the jurisdiction.

The committee recommends a future charge for UPLG or another committee to investigate the use of the term *board* versus *jurisdiction*. The Council adopted definitions of the two terms in modifications to *Model Law* in 2008. Since that time, modifications to *Model Law* and *Model Rules* that included the two terms have been made. The committee believes that some provisions have used the incorrect term. The future committee should review the definitions of these terms and consider if they are used appropriately in the *Model Law* and *Model Rules*, adjusting as necessary.

Charge 9

Review Model Rules *230.40 H.2 and provide recommendations to address military orders and not just deployments as a condition of accommodation.*

Many military members get orders other than deployments that may make attending an already scheduled examination problematic. The UPLG Committee has added language to recognize these possibilities and provide members of the military additional rationales for postponing an examination. These changes are shown in **Motion 9**.

Charge 10

Review Model Rules *230.60 to determine if the reference to pencil-and-paper exams is still appropriate.*

Several jurisdictions still use pencil-and paper exams for jurisdiction-specific exams. This language may be eliminated in the future but is needed for now. The committee is presenting no motions related to this charge.

Charge 11

Review Model Rules *230.60 B to determine if NCEES should be the only source of foreign degree evaluations. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee recommends no changes currently. Some states accept other entities' evaluations of degrees, or they evaluate education themselves. If NCEES were set as the only provider of degree evaluations, the committee feels it would be too restrictive and would not be implemented by member boards. The committee recommends that the Committee on Education be charged with investigating how many boards are using other evaluation services, what standards those evaluation services are evaluating against, what certification of any evaluation services should perhaps be required, and whether boards have the jurisdiction to require a specific service. A future UPLG charge could arise out of that effort.

Charge 12

Review revisions to Model Rules *240.30 G.4 as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The UPLG Committee reviewed the motion from the 2024–25 Committee on Licensure adopted at the 2025 annual meeting. Rather than relying on listings on a renewal application by the licensees (which would not occur after the first renewal period), UPLG would grant this exemption to those individuals who have been granted Retired or Inactive status. UPLG is proposing **Motion 10** to incorporate that change into *Model Rules*.

Charge 13

Review Model Rules *240.30 B.8 and evaluate the definition of* dual licensee *to determine if it applies to specific disciplines within engineering and surveying as well. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee does not recommend a change at this time. The Committee on Education is addressing a similar charge this year, and the UPLG Committee recommends waiting until a Council decision is made on any motion that might arise from this work.

Charge 14

Review revisions to Model Rules *240.30 I as presented by the Committee on Member Board Administrators and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

In reviewing the language adopted at the 2025 annual meeting, the committee felt that "and Audit" was not needed in the section title and that the closing sentence ("If the licensee meets one of these three requirements, the board may consider the CPC requirement completed.") was redundant with the opening sentence ("To renew a license, an applicant must meet one of the following:"). The committee swapped the order of the list to place the jurisdiction's requirement before the NCEES *CPC Standard*, as shown in **Motion 11**.

Charge 15

Review revisions to Model Law *110.20 S as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The UPLG Committee reviewed the 2024–25 Committee on Licensure motion passed at the 2025 annual meeting and had no objection to its inclusion as passed. **Motion 12** will rectify the omission of surveying from the second sentence of the definition of Inactive Status.

Charge 16

Review revisions to Model Law *130.10 B.2.b as presented by the Committee on Licensure and approved by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The UPLG Committee reviewed this 2024–25 Committee on Licensure motion to add comity applications from licensees of foreign countries who are listed on the International Register to the *Model Law* list of acceptable comity applicants. UPLG believes that *Model Law* 130 B.2.b.1 already gives boards the authority to license individuals by comity who hold a license in a foreign country deemed equivalent to that jurisdiction's requirements. UPLG feels the additional language approved at the 2025 annual meeting is more appropriate to include in *Model Rules*. **Motion 13** adds the language to *Model Rules* 230.60 E.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines:**

Colin Maynard, P.E., S.E., Chair

Members
Steven Bishop, S.E.
Dhruba (DJ) Biswas, P.E.
Michael Clendaniel, P.E.
James (Mike) Coleman, P.E., P.S.
Kayce Keane, P.L.S.
Richard (Ric) Moore, P.L.S.
Samuel (Wes) Tripp III
Steven Twedt, P.E.

Consultants
Lance Kinney, Ph.D., P.E.
William (Rick) Huett

Board liaison
Aaron Blaisdell, P.L.S.

Staff liaison
Davy McDowell, P.E.
Jennifer Williams

MOTIONS

UPLG Motion 1

Move that *Model Rules* 220.10 C be amended as follows:

220.10 Board Operations

C. Rules of Order

~~The latest edition of *Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised* shall govern the normal proceedings of the board.~~ The board shall adopt written operating procedures governing the conduct of meetings of the board and its committees. Exceptions include hearings that may be disciplinary in nature.

Rationale

The UPLG Committee reviewed the charge and determined that reference to *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* was unnecessary. In its current state, *Robert's Rules* is over 700 pages and can be unwieldy for boards to follow. This amendment allows boards the flexibility to adopt their own written procedures, which could include *Robert's Rules* or any simpler systems.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 2

Move that *Model Rules* 230.20 A be amended as follows:

230.20 Experience

A. As a Professional Engineer[1]

In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice engineering, the following will be considered:

1. Experience must be progressive on engineering projects and must demonstrate an increasing quality and responsibility. Experience must be obtained in accordance with *Model Law* 130.10.
2. Only work of an engineering nature that follows graduation from a program that meets the criteria set forth in *Model Law* 130.10 B.2.a(1) is acceptable.
3. A graduate degree that is used to satisfy education requirements cannot be applied for experience credit toward licensure. To be eligible for experience credit, graduate degrees shall be relevant to the applicant's area of professional practice. Experience credit for a graduate degree cannot be earned concurrently with work experience credit.
4. Experience must be obtained in compliance with the licensure act.
5. Experience gained in the armed services must be of a character equivalent to that which would have been gained in the civilian sector doing similar work.
6. Experience should be gained under the supervision of a licensed professional engineer; if it is not, an explanation must be made showing why the experience should be considered acceptable. Experience gained under the technical supervision of an unlicensed individual may be considered if the appropriate credentials of the unlicensed supervisor are submitted to the board.
7. For each employment period used as qualifying experience, at least one individual familiar with the applicant's experience for that period must be identified.
8. Sales experience must demonstrate that engineering principles were required and used in gaining the experience.
9. Teaching experience must be in engineering or engineering-related courses at a junior-, senior-, or graduate-level in a college or university offering an engineering or engineering technology program that is approved by the board.
10. Experience may be gained in engineering research and design projects by members of an engineering faculty where the program is approved by the board.
11. Experience may be gained in engineering research by industry or government employees.
12. Experience must have been gained by the time of the application.
13. Experience in construction must demonstrate the application of engineering principles.
14. Experience must include demonstration of a knowledge of engineering mathematics, physical and applied science, properties of materials, and the fundamental principles of engineering design.

1~~4~~5. Experience must include demonstration of the application of engineering principles in the practical solution of engineering problems.
1~~5~~6. The board may deem professional experience acquired by applicants outside the United States to be equivalent to the minimum board requirements established by regulations for professional experience in that jurisdiction.

[1] Experience may be summarized as shown in Appendix A, Suggested Guidelines for Evaluating Progressive Engineering Experience. Appendix A is for reference only, and the language should not be adopted into the board rules.

Rationale
This addition makes it clear that the experience record requires the identity of a person, or persons, with direct knowledge of what occurred during each employment period.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 3
Move that *Model Rules* 230.60 A.4 be amended as follows:

230.60 Applications
A. Application Process
4. It is the responsibility of the applicant to supply correct contact information for all references and ~~to be sure~~ individuals used to verify experience. The applicant must ensure that the references and experience verifications are supplied as requested. If a reference or individual verifying experience fails to respond, this could delay the processing of an application ~~either until a reply is obtained or another reference is given~~.

Rationale
In addressing Charges 2 and 4, the committee determined that this change is also needed to incorporate verifications.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 4
Move that *Model Rules* 230.20 A.6 be amended as follows:

230.20 Experience
A. As a Professional Engineer
In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice engineering, the following will be considered:
6. Experience should be gained under the supervision or mentorship of a licensed professional engineer; if it is not, an explanation must be made showing why the experience should be considered acceptable. Experience gained under the technical supervision of an unlicensed individual may be considered if the appropriate credentials of the unlicensed supervisor are submitted to the board.

Rationale
This modification provides a pathway for certifying acceptable experience for certain individuals who are gaining qualifying experience in workplace situations where P.E. supervisors are not available within the applicant's organization.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 5
Move that *Model Rules* 230.20 B be amended as follows:

230.20 Experience
B. As a Professional Surveyor[2]
In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice surveying, the following will be considered:
1. Experience must be progressive on surveying projects and must demonstrate an increasing quality and responsibility. Experience must be obtained in accordance with *Model Law* 130.10.
2. Experience must be obtained in compliance with the licensure act.
3. Experience gained in the armed services must be of a character equivalent to that which would have been gained in the civilian sector doing similar work.
4. Experience should be gained under the supervision of a licensed professional surveyor or, if not, an explanation must be made showing why the experience should be considered acceptable. Experience gained under the technical supervision of an unlicensed individual may be considered if the appropriate credentials of the unlicensed supervisor are submitted to the board.
5. For each employment period used as qualifying experience, at least one individual familiar with the applicant's experience for that period must be identified.
~~5~~6. Teaching experience must be in surveying or surveying-related courses at a junior-, senior-, or graduate-level in surveying or surveying-related courses approved by the board.
~~6~~7. Experience related to property conveyance and/or boundary line determination must be demonstrated.
~~7~~8. Experience in the technical field aspects of the profession must be demonstrated.
~~8~~9. Experience must have been gained by the time of the application.
~~9~~10. Experience must include demonstration of the application of surveying principles in the practical execution of surveying tasks.
1~~0~~1. Experience may be gained in surveying research projects by members of a surveying faculty where the program is approved by the board.
1~~1~~2. Experience may be gained in surveying research by industry or government employees.
1~~2~~3. The board may deem professional experience acquired by applicants outside the United States to be equivalent to the minimum board requirements established by regulations for professional experience in that jurisdiction.

[2] Experience may be summarized as shown in Appendix B, Suggested Guidelines for Evaluating Progressive Surveying Experience. Appendix B is for reference only, and the language should not be adopted into the board rules.

Rationale
This addition makes it clear that the experience record requires the identity of a person, or persons, with direct knowledge of what occurred during each employment period.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 6
Move that *Model Rules* 230.20 B.4 be amended as follows:

230.20 Experience
B. As a Professional Surveyor
In evaluating experience that indicates to the board that the applicant may be competent to practice surveying, the following will be considered:

4. Experience should be gained under the supervision or mentorship of a licensed professional surveyor or, if not, an explanation must be made showing why the experience should be considered acceptable. Experience gained under the technical supervision of an unlicensed individual may be considered if the appropriate credentials of the unlicensed supervisor are submitted to the board.

Rationale
This modification provides a pathway for certifying acceptable experience for certain individuals who are gaining qualifying experience in workplace situations where P.S. supervisors are not available within the applicant's organization.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 7
Move that *Model Rules* 230.30 A be amended as follows:

230.30 References
A. For licensure an applicant must submit:
   1. As a professional engineer, ~~or professional surveyor, an applicant must submit~~ a minimum of five references~~, three of whom shall be professional engineers, professional surveyors, or other individuals deemed acceptable to the board,~~ who have personal knowledge of the applicant's engineering ~~or surveying~~ experience. ~~In addition, for each employment period, individuals familiar with the applicant's experience for that period must be identified. Engineering applicants must have professional engineer references, and surveying applicants must have professional surveyor references.~~ A minimum of three of the references shall be professional engineers.
   2. As a professional surveyor, a minimum of five references who have personal knowledge of the applicant's surveying experience. A minimum of three of the references shall be professional surveyors.

Rationale
The Committee on Licensure motion adopted by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting charged the UPLG Committee with moving language from *Model Rules* 230.30 References to *Model Rules* 230.20 Experience to make it clear that the experience record requires the identity of a person or persons with direct knowledge of what occurred during each employment period.

An additional Committee on Licensure motion adopted by the Council at the 2025 annual meeting charged UPLG with incorporating amendments into *Model Rules* 230.30 A to more clearly state the expectations for and qualifications of references for engineers and surveyors. This reordering of language accomplishes that clarification.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 8
Move that *Model Rules* 230.40 A be amended as follows:

230.40 Examinations
A. Classification of Engineering Examinations
   1. This jurisdiction shall ~~provide~~ require the following ~~examinations~~:
      ~~1~~a. NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) examination—The examination consists of subject matters in the fundamentals of engineering.

~~2~~b. NCEES Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) examination—The examination consists of subject matters in applied engineering.

2. This jurisdiction may ~~provide~~ require the following ~~examinations~~:

~~1~~a. Jurisdictional examinations—The examinations may include jurisdiction laws, procedures, and standards for the practice of engineering.

Rationale
These changes match the general language and format of *Model Rules* 230.40 A to 230.40 C and make it clear that NCEES provides all examinations other than jurisdictional ones.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 9
Move the *Model Rules* 230.40 H be amended as follows:

230.40 Examinations

H. Instructions for Examinees

1. Instructions provided prior to each examination will declare an examination to be open- or closed-book. Instructions will communicate what materials are allowed in the examination room in accordance with established NCEES policy.
2. Failure to Attend an Examination
   a. An applicant who fails to attend an examination for which the applicant has been scheduled will forfeit the fee paid for the exam, except in the case of illness, death in the family, or ~~military deployment~~ receipt of official military orders that prevent attendance, including but not limited to deployment, reassignment, or mandatory training. Refunds, if any, will be determined by NCEES or jurisdictional policies.
   b. Failure of an applicant to attend an examination for which the applicant has been scheduled to attend does not count as a failure of the examination.

Rationale
Many military members get orders other than deployments that may make attending an already scheduled examination problematic. This language recognizes these possibilities and provides members of the military additional rationales for postponing an examination.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 10
Move that *Model Rules* 240.30 G be amended as follows:

240.30 Continuing Professional Competency (CPC)

G. Exemptions

A licensee may be exempt from the continuing professional competency requirements for one of the following reasons:

1. New licensees by way of examination or comity shall be exempt for their first renewal period.
2. A licensee serving on temporary active duty in the armed forces of the United States for a period of time exceeding 120 consecutive days in a year shall be exempt from obtaining the PDHs required during that renewal period.
3. Licensees experiencing physical disability, illness, or other extenuating circumstances may apply for an exemption or an extension of time to obtain the credits, subject to the review and approval of the board. Supporting documentation must be furnished to the board.

4. Licensees who ~~list their occupation as "Retired" or "Inactive" on the board-approved renewal form and who further certify that they are no longer receiving any remuneration from providing professional engineering or surveying services shall be exempt from the PDHs required~~ have been granted Professional Engineer, Retired; Professional Surveyor, Retired; or Inactive status.

Rationale
The UPLG Committee reviewed the motion from the Committee on Licensure adopted at the 2025 annual meeting. Rather than relying on listings on a renewal application by the licensees (which would not occur after the first renewal period), this change grants this exemption to those individuals who have been granted Retired or Inactive status.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 11
Move that *Model Rules* 240.30 I be amended as follows:

240.30 Continuing Professional Competency (CPC)
I. Requirements for Renewal
To renew a license, an applicant must meet ~~either~~ one of the following:
1. ~~The requirements of the NCEES *CPC Standard*~~
~~2.~~ The requirements of [*insert jurisdiction name*]
2. The requirements of the NCEES *CPC Standard*
3. The requirements of the licensee's jurisdiction of residence, if that jurisdiction's CPC requirements are substantially equivalent to the NCEES *CPC Standard.*

Rationale
The edits shown are the edits approved at the 2025 annual meeting with a few exceptions: 1) "and Audit" is not included in the paragraph title for simplicity, 2) the first and second options are swapped to place the jurisdiction's requirement first, and 3) the end notice that one of the requirements must be met was removed to avoid redundancy with the first sentence.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 12
Move that *Model Law* 110.20 S be amended as follows:

110.20 Definitions
S. Inactive Status—Licensees who are not engaged in engineering or surveying practice that require licensure in this jurisdiction may be granted inactive status. No licensee granted inactive status may practice or offer to practice engineering or surveying in this jurisdiction unless otherwise exempted in this Act.

Rationale
This modification corrects the omission of surveying in the second sentence.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

UPLG Motion 13

Move that *Model Rules* 230.60 E be amended as follows:

230.60 Applications

E. Licensure by Comity

1. The board is authorized to review and evaluate the application of a comity applicant to determine if the applicant meets or exceeds the criteria to be licensed as a professional engineer or professional surveyor as defined in Section 130.10 of the *Model Law*.
2. The board is authorized to review and evaluate the application of a comity applicant listed on the international register of an authorized member of the International Professional Engineers Agreement (IPEA) or the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Engineers Agreement and may issue a license without further examination except as required to evaluate the applicant's knowledge of statutes, rules, and other requirements unique to this jurisdiction.
3. The board administrator is authorized to review and evaluate the application of a comity applicant to determine if the applicant meets or exceeds the criteria of a Model Law Engineer or Model Law Surveyor designated by NCEES. If the applicant meets or exceeds these requirements, the board administrator may issue a contingent license authorizing that individual to offer or provide engineering or surveying services in this jurisdiction. A list of all engineers issued contingent licenses will be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the board for formal approval by the board. A list of all surveyors who have been issued contingent licenses and who have passed the appropriate jurisdiction-specific examination will be placed on the agenda of the next meeting for formal approval by the board.

Rationale

Language in *Model Law* 130 B.2.b.1 already gives boards the authority to license individuals who hold a license in a foreign country. UPLG feels this addition is more appropriate to include in *Model Rules*.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

Structural Practice Task Force

Chun Lau, P.E., S.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

President Elizabeth Beckett, P.E., formed the Structural Practice Task Force this year to evaluate and strengthen the role of NCEES in the prevention of structural incidents that impact public safety. The task force reviewed the *Model Law* and *Model Rules* to address structural failure prevention and promote uniformity and mobility across jurisdictions.

The Structural Practice Task Force was assigned six charges and will present six motions. **The motions begin on page 135.**

Charge 1

Develop a definition of significant structures *for incorporation into* Model Law *and* Model Rules. *Provide recommendations as necessary*.

Twelve of the 17 jurisdictions that license structural engineers restrict the design of certain buildings or categories of buildings to licensed structural engineers. Two of those jurisdictions (Illinois and Hawaii) require that all structures (with very limited exceptions) be designed by licensed structural engineers (S.E.s). The remaining 10 jurisdictions have a variety of differing restrictions on which structures are required to be designed by licensed structural engineers. Some of those restrictions are defined in law, and some of those restrictions are defined in member board rules. Most of the jurisdictions refer to structures that are required to be designed by S.E.s as "significant structures," and some are referred to as "designated structures" or are defined in law but are not referred to as a separate group.

The task force carefully reviewed the definitions of significant structures currently in use by all 10 of the jurisdictions. The task force also considered *Significant Structures Model Recommendations and Commentary* (SSMRC), which was created by the Structural Engineering Licensure Coalition (SELC) and updated in 2025. The *SSMRC* has been used by several jurisdictions who adopted a partial practice model for S.E. licensing.

The definitions fall into four general categories: 1) Risk Category IV structures, 2) Risk Category III structures, 3) buildings above a defined height or size, and 4) certain types of bridges. Risk Category III and IV structures are defined by International Building Code and ASCE/SEI 7—*Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures:*

- Risk Category IV structures are generally considered to include structures that would place 5,000 or more lives at risk in the event of a failure. These structures are described as essential facilities, "the failure of which would inhibit the availability of essential community services necessary to cope with an emergency situation."
- Risk Category III structures are generally considered to be structures that would place 500 or more lives at risk in the event of failure. These structures are described as those that "house a large number of persons in one place, such as theaters, lecture halls, and similar assembly uses, and buildings with persons having limited mobility or ability to escape to a safe haven in the event of failure, including elementary schools, prisons, and small healthcare facilities."
- Building heights that are generally used to define significant structures are typically habitable buildings four stories or more in height, or more than 45 feet in height. Some jurisdictions also require any structure, habitable or not, above 100 feet in height to be designed by an S.E.
- Five jurisdictions require that some or all bridges, depending on size or complexity, be designed by S.E.s.

The model definition from NCEES would serve as a guide to jurisdictions that are considering requiring that some categories of structures be designed by S.E.s. The intent is for this definition to help develop more uniformity and consistency between jurisdictions. The task force recommends that this definition be added to language in NCEES *Model Law* for jurisdictions that would like to adopt a structural engineering licensing model with some practice restrictions.

The task force recognizes that many jurisdictions within NCEES will not require that certain types or categories of structures be designed only by S.E.s.

The task force will present **Motions 1–2** as a result of this charge.

Charge 2

Evaluate whether construction oversight, commissioning, critical analysis, and inspections of significant structures should be included within the definition of the practice of engineering in Model Law *110.20 A.3. Provide recommendations as necessary.*

Structural failures have repeatedly resulted in loss of life and major disruption to public infrastructure. Recent examples include

- August 1, 2007—The I-35W bridge collapse in Minneapolis killed 13, highlighting how minor design flaws can trigger catastrophic outcomes.
- March 15, 2018—A pedestrian bridge under construction at Florida International University (FIU) collapsed, killing six people.
- June 24, 2021—The partial collapse of Champlain Towers South in Surfside, Florida, claimed 98 lives.
- January 28, 2022—The Fern Hollow Bridge collapse in Pittsburgh injured 10 and reinforced the urgency of systematic evaluation of aging infrastructure.

These events underscore the essential role of engineering judgment in safeguarding the public and demonstrate that structural condition assessment and evaluation must be performed by licensed engineers.

An NCEES 2024–25 structures working group previously examined whether construction oversight, commissioning, critical analysis, and inspections should be included in the definition of the practice of engineering. After discussion, the working group unanimously decided not to recommend inclusion, noting that such services are often performed by contractors or special inspection agencies certified to perform this kind of work without requiring professional engineering licensure. Instead, the group recommended adding "condition assessment and evaluation of structures" to the definition to better protect public health, safety, and welfare.

After reviewing the previous work and discussions, the Structural Practice Task Force independently reached the same conclusion and developed the following position and recommendations.

Condition assessment and evaluation of structures should be explicitly included in the definition of the practice of engineering under *Model Law* 110.20 A.3. This addition enhances public safety, ensures accountability, and aligns engineering licensure with the evolving demands of infrastructure resilience. It also aligns the *Model Law* with current professional practice across U.S. jurisdictions.

The NCEES *Model Law* serves as the foundation for uniform licensure standards across U.S. jurisdictions, safeguarding the health, safety, and welfare of the public. While construction oversight and commissioning are often delegated to contractors or inspection agencies, the condition assessment and evaluation of structures require engineering judgment, specialized expertise, and the ethical obligations associated with licensure. Recent catastrophic failures, such as the FIU pedestrian bridge collapse (2018), the Champlain Towers South condominium collapse (2021), and the Fern Hollow Bridge failure (2022) demonstrate the critical need for licensed engineers to lead condition assessment and structural evaluation activities. The task force believes the following illustrate the importance of engineering judgment and specialized expertise.

1. Public Safety Imperative

Structural failures often stem from undetected deterioration, change in soil/geotechnical conditions, design flaws, or inadequate maintenance. Licensed engineers possess technical expertise to identify risks that non-engineering inspectors may overlook due to their technical background and experience. Thus, explicitly defining condition assessment as engineering practice ensures that evaluations are performed under the ethical and professional obligations of licensure.

2. Distinctive Engineering Judgment

Unlike routine construction inspections, condition assessment requires advanced knowledge of material science, load paths, review of capacity calculations, vulnerabilities and associated risk, general deterioration/corrosion and how their location and extent influence structural capacities, and structural monitoring. Condition inspection and evaluation also require better understanding of analytical methods such as finite element modeling, nondestructive testing and valuation, and sensor-based monitoring to interpret data and predict performance. These tasks go beyond compliance checks and demand professional engineering judgment.

Licensed engineers are trained and accountable to evaluate uncertainty, risk, and consequence in ways that certifications alone do not demand.

3. Accountability and Professional Responsibility
Licensed engineers are bound by codes of ethics and subject to disciplinary action by licensing boards. Including condition assessment and evaluation in the *Model Law* ensures accountability for decisions that directly affect public safety. This prevents reliance on third-party agencies whose certifications may lack the rigor of engineering licensure.

4. Alignment with Modern Infrastructure Needs
Aging infrastructure in the United States requires systematic evaluation to prioritize rehabilitation and replacement. Federal initiatives, such as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, emphasize resilience and proactive maintenance. The United States must assess and triage aging structures, often without recent design records, and evaluate emergent conditions after extreme events. Given that condition assessment and evaluation data are key in making these decisions, including condition assessment and evaluation in the practice definition aligns licensure standards with the real-world, front-line demands of resilience and risk management across jurisdictions. Explicitly recognizing condition assessment and evaluation as engineering practice aligns licensure standards with national priorities.

5. Bridge the Gap between the Definition and State of the Practice
The task force reviewed the definition of the practice of engineering used by several states and the District of Columbia and found that the majority of states already include "evaluation" in their definition of the practice of engineering, though many do not explicitly reference "condition inspection." Thus, national variation in definitions leaves critical safety decisions in some jurisdictions outside explicit engineering practice, undermining consistency and oversight for work that directly affects the public's health, safety, and welfare. A professional engineering license is already required for supervision of condition inspection and evaluation of structures such as bridges in the United States, while several states also mandate licensure for performing this work.

Comparative Perspective

Activity	Typical responsible personnel	Degree of engineering judgement required	Risk to health and safety of public if not done properly
Construction oversight	Contractors and inspectors	Low	Moderate
System commissioning	Contractors and agencies	Low	Low
Routine inspections	(Certified) Inspectors	Medium	Low to moderate
Condition assessment and evaluation	Licensed engineers	High	High to severe

Anticipated benefits include reduced catastrophic risk through consistent professional oversight of high-consequence evaluations, aligning with licensure obligations and public protection mandates. This could improve clarity for owners and agencies engaging in assessment services, while minimizing confusion about when professional engineer (P.E.) involvement is required across states.

Adding condition assessment and evaluation to the definition of engineering practice ensures that critical safety evaluations are performed by professionals with the requisite expertise, ethical obligations, and accountability. This change will strengthen public trust, reduce catastrophic failures, and align engineering licensure with the realities of modern infrastructure management.

The task force will present **Motion 3** as a result of this charge.

Charge 3
Review Model Law *130.10 and Appendix D to assess the need for distinct structural engineering licensure requirements separate from those for initial professional engineering licensure. Provide recommendations as necessary.*

The education and experience requirements for structural engineering licensures are unique from other engineering disciplines; therefore, the task force recommends amending *Model Law* Appendix D to address these specific needs.

In its deliberations, the task force consulted with the Committee on Education, which was also charged to review Appendix D. Both the task force and the committee proposed adding the following in their amendments to the Education Requirements section shown in Appendix D: "A degree in engineering technology from an ETAC/ABET-accredited bachelor's program." To avoid duplication, the task force agreed that the Education Committee should present that amendment as part of Education Motion 2, which addresses degrees from programs accredited by the Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET (ETAC/ABET).

Furthermore, Appendix D includes distinct structural engineering licensure requirements. The Council voted to move this language from Section 130.10 to its own appendix in 2018, but the task force concluded that it should be included with the model language for licensure requirements for professional engineers. The task force recommends moving the requirements from Appendix D into *Model Law* 130.10.

The task force will present **Motions 4–6** as a result of this charge.

Charge 4

Identify jurisdictions that reference the 16-hour structural exam and have not updated their language to reflect the current Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) Structural exam. Provide recommendations as necessary.

A survey was distributed to member board administrators to determine whether their board rules and regulations still refer to the PE Structural exam as a 16-hour format. Responses, shown in the table below, were received from 42 member boards. Forty indicated no reference to a 16-hour exam, while two member boards, Georgia and Michigan, responded yes. Georgia further reported that a rule amendment is in progress to remove the 16-hour reference and replace it with more flexible language. Michigan indicated its rules referenced the former SE-I and SE-II exams as a substitute for the PE exam.

Member board	Do your rules and regulations currently refer to the PE Structural exam as a 16-hour exam format?
Alabama	No
Alaska	No Response
Arizona	No
Arkansas	No
California	No
Colorado	No
Connecticut	No
Delaware PE	No
District of Columbia	No Response
Florida PE	No Response
Georgia	Yes—Rule amendment in process that removes the 16-hour reference and replaces it with a more generic reference that will not require change in the future.
Guam	No
Hawaii	No Response
Idaho	No Response
Illinois SE	No
Indiana PE	No Response
Iowa	No Response
Kansas	No
Kentucky	No

Louisiana	No
Maine PE	No Response
Maryland PE	No
Massachusetts	No
Michigan PE	Yes—Rule referenced both parts of the NCEES Structural Engineering examination, known as SE-I and SE-II as substitution for passing the PE exam.
Minnesota	No
Mississippi	No
Missouri	No
Montana	No—PE Structural exam is not an exam recognized by law.
Nebraska PE	No
Nevada	No Response
New Hampshire PE	No Response
New Jersey	No Response
New Mexico	No
New York	No
North Carolina	No
North Dakota	No
Northern Mariana Islands	No
Ohio	No
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	No
Pennsylvania	No
Puerto Rico	No
Rhode Island PE	No
South Carolina	No
South Dakota	No
Tennessee PE	No
Texas	No
Utah	No
Vermont PE	No Response
Virgin Islands	No Response
Virginia	No
Washington	No
West Virginia PE	No
Wisconsin	No
Wyoming	No

Recommendation
The task force recommends that NCEES staff follow up with the 13 member boards that did not respond to confirm that their board rules refer to the current PE Structural exam. The task force also recommends that the Michigan engineering board update its references to the legacy SE-I and SE-II exams to the current PE Structural exam.

Charge 5
Review and compare post-P.E. licensure requirements in jurisdictions that offer an S.E. credential. Provide feedback as appropriate.

A survey of post-P.E. Structural Engineer licensure boards, shown in the table below, identified inconsistencies in education, experience, and examination requirements among the four responding jurisdictions, with Alaska not responding.

Member board	Does your board issue S.E. licenses?	Does your board require structural engineer candidates to obtain a P.E. license prior to being authorized to take the PE Structural exam?	Was the minimum amount of professional experience required for obtaining the first P.E. license?	How many years of additional experience beyond the P.E. license is required to obtain an S.E. license?
California	Yes	Yes	72 months. Could be comprised of ABET BS degree (48 mos.) and 24 months of experience or a graduate degree (60 mos.) and 12 months of experience. Either way, needs to total 72 months minimum.	3 years (36 mos.) of structural engineering experience in responsible charge.
Georgia	Yes	Yes	4 years of a MS degree or 3 years.	No additional experience, but we do require the structural exam.
Guam	Yes	Yes	4 years	Must present evidence that you have practiced in the branch of structural engineering for a minimum of two (2) years after obtaining registration as a Civil Professional Engineer
Washington	Yes	Yes	8 years, with education equivalences for different degrees.	Have at least two years of progressive responsibility in structural engineering experience in addition to the eight years of engineering experience required to be registered as a professional engineer.

Member board	Which structural engineering exams has your board accepted? Please select all that apply.					
	NCEES 16-hour PE Structural exam (vertical and lateral) issued between April 2011–October 2023	The Western States 16-hour Structural Examination before 1998	A combination of NCEES SE I and SE II	A combination of NCEES SE II with Washington State SE III or with California SE III	NCEES PE Structural CBT exam (4 modules) since April 2024	Other (please specify)
California	X	X		X	X	
Georgia	X		X		X	Any PE Civil exam taken prior to 2011.
Guam	X				X	
Washington	X	X	X	X	X	

Recommendation

Given that three of the four jurisdictions with post-P.E. Structural Engineer licenses are in the Western Zone, the task force recommends that a working group of post-P.E. structural engineering licensure boards be formed within the Western Zone to review these differences and develop more-consistent requirements to facilitate comity and mobility.

Charge 6

Develop a white paper addressing post-P.E. licensure for structural engineers.

The task force developed a white paper to address post-P.E. licensure for S.E.s and, in doing so, has recommended a different pathway to structural engineering licensure. The proposed white paper is shown as **Appendix A** at the end of this report. The NCEES board of directors reviewed this document as part of the task report at the board's May 2026 meeting.

Respectfully submitted, the **Structural Practice Task Force:**

Chun Lau, P.E., S.E., Chair

Members
Sreenivas Alampalli, Ph.D., P.E.
Carl Josephson, P.E., S.E.
Stanley Postma, S.E.
Eric Wheeler, S.E.

Resource
Andrea Reynolds, P.E., S.E.

Board liaison
Jason Suelter, P.E., S.E.

Staff liaison
Jason Gamble, P.E.

MOTIONS

SPTF Motion 1

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendment into *Model Law* 110.20 A.3:

110.20 Definitions

A. Professional Engineer [. . .]
   3. Practice of Engineering—The term "Practice of Engineering," as used in this Act, shall mean any service or creative work requiring engineering education, training, and experience in the application of engineering principles and the interpretation of engineering data to engineering activities, including the engineering design of buildings, structures, significant structures, products, machines, processes, and systems, that potentially impact the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
   [. . .]

Rationale

Adding "significant structures" clarifies that engineering oversight is required for large or critical constructed works beyond traditional buildings and structures whose design and performance could impact the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

SPTF Motion 2

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendment into *Model Law* 110.20:

110.20 Definitions

T. Significant Structure—The term "Significant Structure," as used in this Act, shall mean a building or other structure that poses a substantial hazard to human life in the event of its failure. Engineering practice

associated with these generally requires consideration beyond routine specifications, manuals, and guidelines; advanced/complex analyses and advance testing (e.g., wind tunnel testing, non-linear or dynamic time history analyses) to understand their in-service performance; unique details; unique construction requirements; and/or specialized condition inspection and maintenance requirements to assure their safety. The following are types of Significant Structures:

1. Buildings and other structures that are designated as essential facilities:
    a. Buildings having emergency surgery or emergency treatment facilities
    b. Fire, rescue, ambulance, and police stations and emergency vehicle garages
    c. Designated earthquake, hurricane, or other emergency shelters
    d. Designated emergency preparedness, communication and operations centers, and other facilities required for emergency response
    e. Power-generating stations, water treatment facilities for potable water, wastewater treatment facilities, and other public utility facilities, including those required for emergency response
    f. Aviation control towers, air traffic control centers, and emergency aircraft hangars; buildings and other structures having critical national defense functions
    g. Water storage facilities and pump structures required to maintain water pressure for fire suppression
2. Buildings and other structures representing a substantial hazard to human life in the event of structural failure:
    a. Buildings and other structures whose primary occupancy is public assembly with an occupant load greater than 300
    b. Buildings and other structures containing elementary school, secondary school, or day-care facilities with an occupant load greater than 250
    c. Buildings and other structures containing adult education facilities, such as colleges and universities, with an occupant load greater than 500
    d. Institutional care facilities, detoxification facilities, nursing homes, and psychiatric hospitals (where residents are incapable of self-preservation) with an occupant load of five or more resident care recipients
    e. Correctional centers, detention centers, jails, prerelease centers, prisons, and reformatories
    f. Buildings and other structures containing quantities of toxic or explosive materials that are sufficient to pose a threat to the public if released
    g. Any other building or structure with an occupant load greater than 5,000
3. Other buildings and structures include the following:
    a. Buildings that are four stories or more in height and are normally occupied by people or that are over 45 feet in height above the lowest adjacent grade
    b. Structures exceeding 100 feet in height above average ground level
    c. Buildings that have a covered gross area of more than 200,000 square feet
    d. Piers and wharves that have a surface area greater than 10,000 square feet
    e. Any building that is designed using nonlinear time history or with special seismic energy dissipation systems
    f. Buildings and other structures with high lateral loadings including the following:
        i. Those subjected to ultimate design 3-second wind gust speeds equaling or exceeding wind speeds corresponding to approximately a 3 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years
        ii. Those that are in Seismic Design Category D and above
4. Bridges that require advanced levels of analysis or represent a substantial hazard to human life in the event of failure, including but not limited to the following:
    a. Bridge spans longer than 300 feet
    b. Bridges with aero-elastic instability or aero-elastic phenomena, those that require wind tunnel testing, or those designed for blast loading
    c. Bridge spans that are cable-stayed or suspension type or movable

Rationale

The task force recommends that this definition be added to language in the *Model Law* for jurisdictions that would like to adopt a structural engineering licensing model with some practice restrictions. The task force recognizes that many jurisdictions within NCEES will not require that certain types or categories of structures be designed only by structural engineers.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

SPTF Motion 3
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendment into *Model Law* 110.20 A.3:

110.20 Definitions
A. Professional Engineer [. . .]
3. Practice of Engineering—The term "Practice of Engineering," as used in this Act, shall mean any service or creative work requiring engineering education, training, and experience in the application of engineering principles and the interpretation of engineering data to engineering activities, including the engineering design of buildings, structures, products, machines, processes, and systems, that potentially impact the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
The services may include, but not be limited to, providing planning, studies, designs, design coordination, drawings, specifications, condition assessment and evaluation of structures, and other technical submissions; teaching engineering design courses; commissioning of engineered systems; performing surveying that is incidental to the practice of engineering; and reviewing construction or other design products for the purposes of monitoring compliance with drawings and specifications related to engineered works.
[. . .]

Rationale
Recent structural failures demonstrate that condition assessment and evaluation are high-risk activities requiring advanced engineering judgment rather than routine or special inspection. In the task force's opinion, construction commissioning, construction oversight, and routine inspections do not routinely require engineering judgment (see table below). Condition assessment and evaluation of structures, in contrast, involve interpreting deterioration, assessing load paths and capacity, and making structural decisions under in-service demands that directly affect public safety. While most jurisdictions already include evaluation within their engineering practice definitions, many do not explicitly reference condition assessment, creating inconsistency and gaps in public protection. This proposed change clarifies when P.E. involvement is required.

Activity	Typical responsible personnel	Degree of engineering judgement required	Risk to health and safety of public if not done properly
Construction oversight	Contractors and inspectors	Low	Moderate
System commissioning	Contractors and agencies	Low	Low
Routine inspections	(Certified) Inspectors	Medium	Low to moderate
Condition assessment and evaluation	Licensed engineers	High	High to severe

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

SPTF Motion 4

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a(1):

Appendix D Model Language for Member Boards that License Structural Engineers
130.10 General Requirements for Licensure

B. Engineering
3. Licensure as a Professional Structural Engineer
a. Initial Licensure as a Professional Structural Engineer
An applicant who presents evidence of meeting the applicable education, examination, and experience requirements as described below shall be eligible for licensure as a professional structural engineer.
(1) Education Requirements
(a) An individual seeking licensure as a professional structural engineer shall possess one or more of the following education qualifications:
(i) A degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited bachelor's program
(ii) A degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited master's program
(iii) A bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree in engineering from a non-EAC/ABET-accredited program. This individual's education must be shown to meet the NCEES *Engineering Education Standard*.
(b) ~~The degree, or degrees, must include a minimum of 18 semester (27 quarter) hours of structural analysis and design courses and at least 9 of the semester (14 quarter) hours must be structural design classes.~~ The individual shall have passed courses in the analysis, behavior, and design of structural elements and systems. The required coursework may be obtained from a combination of any of the following levels of education: bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree or their equivalent. The courses must include a minimum of 18 semester (27 quarter) hours and may include, but not be limited to, the following:
(i) Structural analysis courses, such as determinate and indeterminate structures and finite element methods
(ii) Structural design courses, such as structural steel, reinforced concrete, prestressed concrete, foundation, masonry, and wood engineering
(iii) Courses such as mechanics (statics and dynamics), mechanics of materials, properties of materials, and soil mechanics shall not be included in the minimum 18 semester hours (27 quarter) hours.

Rationale

The current model language is vague on what is considered "structural analysis and design courses." The task force's recommendation is to explicitly indicate what type of courses meet, or do not meet, this educational requirement. Furthermore, the task force recommends clarifying that the required coursework can be achieved from a combination of bachelor's, master's, or doctoral coursework.

Board of directors' position

Endorses, consent agenda

SPTF Motion 5

Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating the following amendments into *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a(3):

Appendix D Model Language for Member Boards that License Structural Engineers
130.10 General Requirements for Licensure

B. Engineering
3. Licensure as a Professional Structural Engineer
a. Initial Licensure as a Professional Structural Engineer
[. . .]

(3) Experience Requirements
An individual seeking licensure as a professional structural engineer shall present evidence of completing one of the following:
(a) Four years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in an engineering program accredited by EAC/ABET
(b) Three years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a bachelor of science degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited engineering program and a master's degree in engineering ~~that includes at least 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of structural engineering (in addition to the 18 hours noted above)~~. The course of study for the master's degree shall include a minimum of 12 semester (18 quarter) hours of structural analysis, behavior, or design courses.
(c) Three years of acceptable structural engineering experience after confirmation of a master's degree in engineering from an EAC/ABET-accredited engineering program ~~that includes at least 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of~~ in structural engineering ~~(in addition to the 18 hours noted above)~~
(d) Two years of acceptable structural engineering experience and an earned doctoral degree in engineering focused on structural engineering from an institution that offers EAC/ABET-accredited programs

A graduate degree that is used to satisfy education requirements cannot be applied for experience credit toward licensure. To be eligible for experience credit, graduate degrees shall be relevant to the applicant's area of professional practice. Experience credit for a graduate degree cannot be earned concurrently with work experience credit.

Rationale
The highest conferred degree in each option should have an emphasis in structural engineering to reinforce the education requirement. For *Model Law* Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a(3)(b), if the master's degree is from a non-EAC/ABET engineering program, the education coursework requirements are increased to be on par with ABET requirements. For Appendix D 130.10 B.3.a(3)(c), provided that an individual has an ABET-accredited degree, they satisfy the hour requirements.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

SPTF Motion 6
Move that the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines be charged with incorporating amendments to *Model Law* to move structural engineering licensure requirements from Appendix D to Section 130.10, taking into account any amendments to Appendix D adopted at the 2026 annual meeting, and with reviewing *Model Rules* Appendix F to determine if its structural engineering-specific language should move to Sections 230.40 and 230.60 as well.

Rationale
Model Law 130.10 provides model language for general licensure requirements for professional engineers. It currently does not include model language for licensure requirements for structural engineers. The model language that boards may adopt for structural engineering licensure is currently in *Model Law* Appendix D, and it should be included along with the model language for licensure requirements for professional engineers. Similarly, *Model Rules* Appendix F contains structural engineering-specific provisions that may be more appropriately incorporated into the main body of the *Model Rules*. Relocating relevant language into Sections 230.40 and 230.60 would align structural engineering requirements with other licensure and practice provisions, enhancing consistency and accessibility.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, consent agenda

APPENDIX A: POST P.E. LICENSURE FOR STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS

The need for structural engineering licensure is fueled by advances in technology, materials, and carbon-reduction strategies that lead to more performance-based designs that are increasingly creative, complex, and sophisticated.

Currently, 17 jurisdictions recognize licensure of structural engineers (S.E.s) separate from licensure of professional engineers (P.E.s). Some of these jurisdictions restrict the use of the title "Structural Engineer," while others restrict the practice of structural engineering for some or all structure types. As with P.E. licensure, S.E. licensure requires a combination of education, experience, and examination, but the specific path varies across jurisdictions. While these 17 jurisdictions have similar education requirements and require passing the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) Structural examination, there are currently five "post-P.E." jurisdictions that require an additional PE exam and greater experience, which can lead to unnecessary barriers, especially for experienced engineers.

The recommended approach to S.E. licensure is a stepped model that allows P.E.s to design most structures within a jurisdiction, while restricting practice to S.E.s for certain "significant structures." These structures are those that, should they fail, have a significant impact on public health, safety, and welfare. Jurisdictions may still choose to require additional experience. While a P.E.-first approach may be appropriate for new licensees, requiring a post-P.E. model for S.E. licensure is not recommended.

S.E. Licensure Models

The 17 jurisdictions that recognize S.E. licensure do so through a variety of approaches, as identified below from least to most restrictive. In addition, several jurisdictions maintain roster designations for professional engineers, some of which may require passing the PE Structural exam to obtain a Structural roster designation.

- Title Act—Restricts who may use the title "Structural Engineer" but does not restrict the practice of structural engineering.
- Partial Practice Act—Restricts the design of certain high-risk or critical structures to licensed S.E.s. The definitions of these structures vary by jurisdictions, and the types of restricted structures are often referred to as "significant structures" or "designated structures."
- Full Practice Act—Requires all structures (with very limited exceptions) be designed by a licensed S.E.

The following chart identifies the types of licensure models that are used in the 17 jurisdictions that license structural engineers:

Jurisdiction	Title only	Partial Practice Act	Full Practice Act
Alaska		X	
Arizona	X		
California		X	
District of Columbia	X		
Georgia		X	
Guam		X	
Hawaii			X
Idaho	X		
Illinois			X
Louisiana	X		
Nebraska	X		
Nevada		X	
Northern Mariana Islands		X	
Oklahoma		X	
Oregon		X	
Utah		X	
Washington		X	

Post-P.E. Structural Engineering Licensure

Currently, five jurisdictions (Alaska, California, Guam, Oregon, and Washington) have practice restrictions that utilize a post-P.E. pathway. Under this model, a licensee first obtains a P.E. license and then obtains two to three additional years of progressive experience before becoming eligible for S.E. licensure. The additional experience must be structural in nature, must be supervised by a licensed S.E., and may require exposure to significant structures.

Significant Structures

In the jurisdictions with partial practice restrictions, certain structures must be designed by a licensed S.E. These structures are referred to as "significant structures" or "designated structures" or are enumerated directly in statue or rule without a group label. The goal of these restrictions is to align the most safety-critical work with the more specialized licensure.

To promote uniformity, a definition for "significant structures" has been proposed by the Structural Practice Task Force for inclusion in *Model Law* so that jurisdictions adopting an S.E. licensure model with practice restrictions can do so consistently.

The definition maps to four general categories:
1) Risk Category IV structures
2) Risk Category III structures
3) Buildings above a defined height or size
4) Certain types of bridges

Risk Category IV and III structures are defined by International Building Code and *ASCE/SEI 7—Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures*.

The Path to S.E. Licensure

Similar to P.E. licensure, S.E. licensure rests on education, experience, and examination. Many jurisdictions that license S.E.s have additional requirements that differ across the jurisdictions. Key elements include the following:

- Education
  - Additional coursework focused on the analysis, behavior, and design of structural elements and systems is required.
- Experience
  - Two to three additional years of structural experience beyond the P.E. level is required.
  - Experience is often required to be progressively responsible, documented, and supervised by a qualified structural engineer (where licensed S.E. supervision is available).
  - In some cases, experience with significant structures is specifically emphasized.
- Examination
  - All jurisdictions require the PE Structural exam or accept a combination of legacy structural examinations (such as SE I, SE II, state-specific structural exams).

Based on the analysis above, the recommended S.E. licensure model is a Full or Partial Practice model that does not require a post-P.E. approach. Under the Partial Practice model, P.E.s may practice broadly, while licensed S.E.s are required for clearly defined significant structures—aligning licensure with public risk without imposing unnecessary barriers. These models advance public safety, regulatory clarity, and workforce sustainability while keeping the path to licensure practical and predictable.

The benefits include the following:

- Clear scope of practice: Transparent, risk-based thresholds for when S.E. licensure is required, minimizing ambiguity and administrative friction.
- Reduced barriers to advancement: Eliminates mandatory additional examinations that can delay careers, particularly for experienced engineers with relevant portfolios.
- Enhanced mobility and comity: Greater alignment with risk-based definitions (for example, IBC/ASCE categories), facilitation of cross-jurisdictional recognition, and smoother comity.
- Promote licensure: Maintains a strong pipeline for structural practice by allowing P.E.s to contribute broadly while reserving work on significant structures for S.E.s.
- Regulatory predictability: A uniform framework reduces confusion for applicants and member boards.

In short, a Full or Partial Practice S.E. licensure model without a post-P.E. mandate achieves the right balance: it addresses public-safety risks, removes unnecessary barriers for qualified engineers, and supports a healthy, mobile, and innovative structural engineering workforce.

Committee on Awards

Marlon Vogt, P.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Awards is charged with canvassing member boards for nominations for the service awards to be given at the annual meeting. These awards are the Distinguished Service Award, the Distinguished Service Award with Special Commendation, the Meritorious Service Award, the Meritorious Service Award with Special Commendation, and the Distinguished Examination Service Award. The committee is guided by NCEES Administrative Policy 12.

Meetings were held virtually via Zoom on September 23, 2025, and March 19, 2026.

The Committee on Awards was assigned two charges. The committee has no motions for Council action.

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. *Canvass member boards by October 1, 2025, for nominations for awards to be presented at the 2026 annual meeting. Nominations should be received no later than January 31, 2026.*
b. *Provide recommendations to the board of directors for awards to be presented at the 2026 annual meeting.*

In accordance with Charge 1, nominations for awards were solicited by October 1, 2025, and were received by January 31, 2026.

Nominations were as follows:
2 nominees—Distinguished Service Award
2 nominees—Distinguished Service Award with Special Commendation
2 nominees—Meritorious Service Award
0 nominees—Meritorious Service Award with Special Commendation
8 nominees—Distinguished Examination Service Award

The committee made individual ratings of the nominees, and these were forwarded to the chair for tabulation. The combined ratings were returned to the members for review. The committee held a virtual meeting on March 19, 2026, and reached agreement on the award recipients.

Recommendations to the board of directors were as follows:
2 nominees—Distinguished Service Award
2 nominees—Distinguished Service Award with Special Commendation
2 nominees—Meritorious Service Award
0 nominees—Meritorious Service Award with Special Commendation
3 nominees—Distinguished Examination Service Award

Charge 2

Review AP 12 to determine if a limit should be placed on the number presented annually for award. Recommend revisions as necessary.

The committee reviewed historical data regarding the number of awards presented in each category and debated the implications of limiting the number of awards presented.

It is the recommendation of the committee to not impose limits on the number of awards presented. No revisions to AP 12 are recommended at this time.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Awards:**

Marlon Vogt, P.E., Chair

Members
Robert Dorko, P.E.
Denn Manglona, P.E.
Christina Martin, P.L.S.
Sarah Tracy, P.E.

Board liaison
Andrew Zoutewelle, P.L.S.

Staff liaison
Patricia Sheppard

Committee on Examination Audit

Nicole Galavotti, P.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Examination Audit is responsible for an independent audit annually of the NCEES exam program.

The 2025–26 NCEES Committee on Examination Audit met in Greenville, South Carolina, on November 14–15, 2025, to conduct the annual independent audit of the NCEES exam program. The committee members, consultants, board liaison, and independent psychometric consultant addressed the committee charges as detailed in this summary report. Consultant Sean St.Clair, Ph.D., P.E., chair of the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers, could not attend the audit meeting and was represented by Ademola (Peter) Adejokun, P.E.

The committee had four charges. It has no motions for Council action.

CHARGES

Charge 1

Review all aspects of the NCEES exam development process for the examinations being audited to ensure that recognized and accepted psychometric standards for licensing purposes continue to be used and met.

This is a general recurring charge that is addressed through accomplishing the other charges of the committee. There were several comments made by the psychometric consultant that were discussed and clarified with Pearson. There were no significant findings of anything problematic with the exams or processes, and discussion resulted in some clarifying language being added to statistical reporting tables.

Charge 2

Review the exam audit findings from the 2024–25 audit cycle to ensure findings were appropriately addressed.

The committee found that all prior exam audit findings had been appropriately addressed except for one. The distractor rationale had not been provided for two items identified previously for the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) Industrial and Systems exam.

Charge 3

Audit the most recent administration of the following examinations for which sufficient performance data and analyses have been completed:

a. *Fundamentals of Surveying (item pools administered beginning July 2024)*
b. *PE Civil (five exams, item pools administered beginning April 2024)*
c. *PE Metallurgical and Materials (computer-based exam administered October 2024)*
d. *PE Structural (four computer-based depth exams, administered April 2024; two computer-based breadth exams, item pools administered beginning April 2024)*

Audits of the 13 exams listed were completed at the November 14–15, 2025, meeting. Findings were provided to the exam development committees for review and response. A meeting was conducted via Zoom on December 15, 2025, to review the findings.

At the time of the call, there were several minor unresolved findings to be addressed by the exam committees at meetings in early 2026. These will be reviewed as part of Charge 2 by the 2026–27 Exam Audit Committee.

Charge 4

Observe and/or receive reports from the following exam standard-setting studies in accordance with Exam Development Procedures Manual *1.5.7:*

a. *PE Architectural: (exam administered October 2026)*
b. *PE Environmental: (exam administered April 2026)*
c. *PE Structural: (exam administered April 2026; four depth exams only)*
d. *PE Control Systems: (exam to be administered April 2027)*

General findings for 2025–26 audit

In summary, the committee found no significant deficiencies or exceptions to the exam requirements based on the audit checklist. The noted findings are largely recommendations for improving processes and data evaluation, not deficiencies in the exam process itself. The audit of the four PE Structural depth exams identified items that fell outside the established metrics for difficulty, discrimination, and/or average examinee response time. It is believed that the transition from constructed-response items to 100 percent alternative item types may be a contributing factor. A professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS) has recently been completed and will soon be followed by new standard-setting studies for each of the four depth exams, which may help address these issues. Therefore, detailed item-level findings were not presented for these exams.

There were multiple discussions on the *Exam Development Procedures Manual*'s Exam Audit checklist question, "Are the items written by a sufficiently diverse group of individuals?" The definition of *sufficiently diverse* is unclear. Although the committee has identified the question, determining the answer is beyond the scope of the Exam Audit Committee. The committee understands that the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers and the Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors have recurring charges related to subject-matter expert (SME) diversity, but it would assist the Exam Audit Committee to have clearer audit requirements regarding SME diversity.

The number of exams audited this year was a challenge, but thanks to a determined committee with some experience going into the audit this year as well as NCEES staff support, the audit was concluded in the timeframe allotted.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Examination Audit:**

Nicole Galavotti, P.E., Chair

Members
Jason (Jay) Dixon, P.E.
Rosaleen (Rosey) Nogle, P.E.
Denise Ramsey, P.E.
Matthew Weeks, P.L.S.

Consultants
Timothy Rickborn, P.E., S.E.
Sean St.Clair, Ph.D., P.E.
Joseph Wichert, L.S.

Board liaison
Chimin (Jimmy) Chao, P.E.

Staff liaison
Donovan Colman, P.E.

Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers

Sean St.Clair, Ph.D., P.E., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers (EPE) supervises the preparation of exam specifications and is responsible for the content and scoring of all exams in the fundamentals and principles and practice of engineering. The committee, in the interest of uniformity and efficiency, prepares exam development procedures, reviews exam scores, and makes recommendations of minimum passing grades for exams.

The EPE Committee held virtual meetings on September 16, 2025; December 1–2, 2025; and January 30–31, 2026.

The EPE Committee was assigned six charges and is not presenting any motions.

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. Oversee the development and maintenance of necessary exam items for future Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) and Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) examinations in accordance with current exam development policies, to include monitoring the preparation and submission of all examinations in a timely manner as set forth by NCEES guidelines.

b. Conduct professional activities and knowledge studies as appropriate to update exam specifications.

c. Review the Committee on Examination Audit recommendations and implement any changes approved by the board of directors.

d. Review the pass rates and item performance for recent exam administrations.

e. Annually review exam development committee member data. Compare them with benchmarks as established by the Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers as part of its exam development volunteer diversity monitoring plan.

i. Annually review progress on data collection from target populations.

ii. Conduct a review of the NCEES Exam Development Volunteer Diversity Monitoring plan on a periodic basis. The time between reviews shall not exceed six years.

iii. Establish exam development committee membership benchmarks. Review and modify them as needed every five calendar years, in years that end in zero or five (for example, 2030, 2035, 2040).

f. Review the exam development procedures and recommend revisions as necessary to NCEES staff.

Due to a winter storm, the January 2026 meeting was moved from in person to virtual at the last minute. As such, some of the information typically presented during the EPE Committee meeting was distributed to attendees ahead of the meeting. There was a brief discussion about changes to the exam development volunteer diversity monitoring plan. Proposed changes to the plan have been made by staff, reflecting the current process agreed to by the EPE Committee in the past.

Charge 2

Examine the overlap between PE Structural breadth sections and PE Civil: Structural exam specifications to determine whether the PE Structural breadth sections adequately and independently support P.E. licensure. Provide recommendations as appropriate.

PE Structural breadth and PE Civil: Structural exam committee leaders compared and contrasted the material covered on the current PE Structural breadth (lateral and vertical) exams and the PE Civil: Structural exam and provided their findings to the EPE Committee. EPE members reviewed this information along with the 2007 and 2008 Structural Exam Task Force reports, the 2009 EPE Committee recommendations, and other information about how structural engineering proficiency has been tested over time.

After discussion, the EPE Committee recommends a task force be formed to further evaluate this charge and the potential implications, such as

- The impact on existing item bank content (with involvement of exam development committees)
- Licensure mobility

- Barriers to licensure
- Use of PE Structural breadth sections (two sections) only for P.E. licensure

The EPE Committee further recommends that the task force gather member board input as part of this effort regarding
- Discipline-specific versus general licensure
- Possible statute and rule revisions
- Historical exam usage

Charge 3

Review the Pearson white paper on the use of alternative item types (AITs). Provide recommendations and propose Exam Development Procedures Manual *(*EDPM*) revisions to NCEES staff as necessary.*

Pearson staff presented the AIT white paper to the EPE Committee at its December meeting. The committee members discussed the white paper and its recommendations, which included that exam committees should choose item types based on the exam's purpose and the specific content being measured rather than trying to hit a fixed quota of AITs. After deliberation, the EPE Committee determined that the appropriate item type should be selected by the subject-matter experts based on exam purpose, audience, and content.

The committee coordinated with the Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS) to develop modified *EDPM* language that gives flexibility to exam committees regarding the number of AITs required when developing pretest items for future exam forms and pools. This language will be incorporated into the next iteration of the *EDPM*.

The EPE Committee further recommends that NCEES staff (exam development engineers) take the data from the white paper for their specific exams and share it with the exam committees, emphasizing that
- Except for the PE Structural exam, there is no longer a push to develop AITs just for the sake of building the exam bank.
- Since AITs tend to be promoted from pretest to operational at a lower rate than multiple-choice, single-response items, exam writers should utilize AITs when they believe they are a better item format for the content being tested.

Charge 4

Review EDPM *requirements regarding pretest item quantities. Consider all exam formats NCEES currently uses. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee consulted with Pearson on the purpose of pretest items and the number of pretest items used by other high-stakes testing programs. Pretest items are incorporated into NCEES exams to expand and maintain item banks and to develop quality operational (scored) test items for future examinations. The committee reviewed the quantity of pretest items used on each NCEES engineering exam and determined that so long as examinees have sufficient exam time, the presence of pretest items does not disadvantage examinees and is a better approach than scoring new items without pretesting them.

The committee noted that the PE Structural depth exams that began administration in April 2024 contained a higher proportion of pretest items than other NCEES exams and that the per-item time provided was lower than other NCEES engineering exams. It was further noted that to address this, an additional hour of exam time has been incorporated into those exams beginning with the April 2026 administration and that new test specifications have been approved beginning with the April 2027 administration. Once these changes are implemented, the percentage of pretest items on the PE Structural depth exams will be similar to other NCEES PE exams, and examinees will have more per-item time on the PE Structural depth exams than on other PE exams.

The committee coordinated with the EPS Committee to make minor clarifications to *EDPM* language regarding pretest items but recommended no changes in concept.

Charge 5

Evaluate current exam development procedures to identify opportunities to expedite the process for launching new examinations. Recommend revisions as necessary.

The EPE Committee reviewed the current process for launching new examinations. The committee identified two potential opportunities that may expedite the process. These are summarized below, but the committee recommended no changes to existing exam development policies (EDP 4, 5, or 6) at this time.

- There may be opportunities to review the current member board support requirements and potentially streamline the paperwork. For example, one letter signed by 10 member boards may suffice as opposed to requiring 10 different letters from 10 member boards.
- Artificial intelligence tools could potentially expedite the professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS) and test development process (especially the first draft of new test items).

Charge 6

Review EDPM *1.7.5 to assess whether a standard-setting subcommittee should consist of three members from the EPE Committee and two members from the exam development committee. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The EPE Committee deliberated over the current and potential makeup of the decision-making subcommittee outlined in the *EDPM*. Currently, the subcommittee consists of two members representing the oversight committee and three members representing the exam development committee. The EPE Committee recommended *EDPM* language that would instead provide for three members representing the oversight committee and two members representing the exam development committee.

The EPE and EPS committees were each given this charge, but the two committees came to different conclusions. To avoid operating under different procedures for engineering and surveying exams, it is recommended that this charge be carried over and that next year's EPE and EPS committees be charged jointly with developing language acceptable to both committees.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Examinations for Professional Engineers:**

Sean St.Clair, Ph.D., P.E., Chair

Members
Ademola (Peter) Adejokun, P.E.
Manar Alsharaa, P.E.
Carmine Balascio, Ph.D., P.E.
Jan Bostelman, P.E.
Keith Brooks, P.E., P.L.S.
Jason Carder, P.E.
Christopher Duhamel, P.E., P.L.S.
James Hollandsworth, P.E., P.S.
Sondra Miller, Ph.D., P.E.
Colleen Scholl, P.E.
David Whitman, Ph.D., P.E.
Richard Willoughby, P.E.

Board liaison
Jason Suelter, P.E., S.E.

Staff liaison
Lehmon Dekle, P.E.

Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors

Joseph Wichert, L.S., Chair

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors (EPS) supervises the preparation of exam specifications, reviews item performance, monitors the training of exam development volunteers, and recommends changes to exam policies and procedures for the Fundamentals of Surveying (FS) and Principles and Practice of Surveying (PS) exams.

The committee held one virtual meeting via Zoom, held two in-person meetings at NCEES headquarters in Greenville, South Carolina, and performed additional work through the Basecamp collaboration website. Chair Joseph Wichert, L.S., served as a consultant to the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) and attended the EPP Committee virtual meetings and its in-person meeting held in Atlanta, Georgia. The chair also served as a consultant to the Committee on Examination Audit and attended the Exam Audit Committee virtual meeting and its in-person meeting held at NCEES headquarters.

The committee was assigned seven charges and will not present any motions.

CHARGES

Charge 1

Accomplish all recurring committee activities:

a. Oversee the development and maintenance of necessary exam items for future FS and PS examinations in accordance with existing exam development policies, to include monitoring the preparation and submission of all examinations in a timely manner as set forth by NCEES guidelines.

b. Conduct professional activities and knowledge studies as appropriate to update exam specifications.

c. Review the Committee on Examination Audit recommendations and implement any changes approved by the board of directors.

d. Review the pass rates and item performance for recent exam administrations.

e. Annually review exam development committee member data. Compare them with benchmarks as established by the Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors as part of the NCEES Exam Development Volunteer Diversity Monitoring plan.

i. Annually review progress on data collection from target populations.

ii. Conduct a review of the NCEES Exam Development Volunteer Diversity Monitoring plan on a periodic basis. The time between reviews shall not exceed six years.

iii. Establish exam development committee membership benchmarks. Review and modify them as needed every five calendar years, in years that end in zero or five (for example, 2030, 2035, 2040).

f. Review the exam development procedures and recommend revisions as necessary to NCEES staff.

NCEES staff presented a summary of the current exam statistics and trends to the committee for review. The committee analyzed this data and discussed the charges at the January in-person meeting. Both the FS and PS exams have sufficient bank items, and exam development work continues. A professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS) is not needed at this time for the PS exam, but one is ongoing for the FS exam. The Exam Audit Committee recommendations for the PS exam were focused on technical issues that are being addressed. The pass rate for the FS exam has been relatively stable, but there was a drop in the PS exam pass rate, which will be monitored. The volume of exam takers for both exams continues to increase. There was a discussion regarding the benchmarks for the NCEES Exam Development Volunteer Diversity Monitoring plan, and no new action is needed at this time. The benchmarks are scheduled to be reviewed in 2030.

Charge 2

Review the findings of the 2025 Surveying and Mapping Sciences Licensure Task Force report and make recommendations regarding a potential PS Geospatial exam.

The committee spent a significant amount of time on this charge. The committee reviewed the 2025 Surveying and Mapping Sciences Licensure Task Force recommendations, including the 11 original letters of support. A new request was sent to all member board administrators (MBAs) via the MBA Link Basecamp project to help clarify the proof of need and estimated usage. Twenty-five responses were received.

The committee reviewed Exam Development Policy 6.B, which specifies, "If the EPS Committee determines that the proposed application meets the requirements, then it shall recommend to the board of directors that the process continues with a professional activities and knowledge study (PAKS)." The committee noted, however, that a PAKS had already been completed for the exam when a divisional approach was being considered, so there is no need for a new PAKS at this time.

The committee then determined that the request for a new exam complied with the policy. After discussion of options available under existing policy and of the process being followed out of sequence, the committee voted to recommend to the board of directors that NCEES move forward with development of a PS Geospatial exam.

Although the committee determined that the request complied with policy (as noted above), members of the committee were concerned about the viability of the exam and its future use. Based on the responses received from the MBAs and a review of the initial request, the committee voted to send a memo to the board of directors to relay its recommendation, along with its concerns about the viability and future use of the exam.

The concerns of the committee include the following:

- The number of applicants may be insufficient due to uncertain examinee volume (the committee recommended the exam be given annually instead of semiannually to address this concern).
- Of the 25 responses to the MBA request mentioned above, 21 (84 percent) of the jurisdictions indicated they did not plan to use this exam for licensure.
- Many current state examinations include boundary, mapping, drainage, and incidental engineering related content.
- A PS Geospatial exam might lead to licensure mobility issues for professionals seeking licensure in states that do not recognize this exam.
- Implementing a new stand-alone license could be a challenge for many jurisdictions.
- Granting a PS license to professionals who have geospatial expertise but not boundary expertise may cause confusion for the public.

Charge 3

Review the Pearson white paper on the use of alternative item types (AITs). Provide recommendations and propose Exam Development Procedures Manual *(*EDPM*) revisions to NCEES staff as necessary.*

Pearson staff presented the AIT white paper to the EPS Committee at its December meeting. The committee members discussed the white paper and its recommendations, which included that exam committees should choose item types based on the exam's purpose and the specific content being measured rather than trying to hit a fixed quota of AITs. The committee reviewed the current requirement that 40 percent of all pretest items should be AITs and agreed the standard should be reduced.

The committee coordinated with the EPE Committee to develop modified *EDPM* language that gives flexibility to exam committees regarding the number of AITs required when developing pretest items for future exam forms and pools. This language will be incorporated into the next iteration of the *EDPM*.

Charge 4

Review EDPM *requirements regarding pretest item quantities. Consider all exam formats NCEES currently uses. Recommend revisions as necessary.*

The committee consulted with Pearson on the purpose of pretest items and the number of pretest items used by other high-stakes testing programs. Pretest items are incorporated into NCEES exams to expand and maintain item banks and to develop quality operational (scored) test items for future exams. The committee reviewed the quantity of pretest items used on each NCEES surveying exam and determined that as long as examinees have sufficient exam time, the presence of pretest items does not disadvantage examinees and is a better approach than scoring new items without pretesting them.

The committee coordinated with the EPE Committee to make minor clarifications to *EDPM* language regarding pretest items but recommended no changes in concept.

Charge 5

Evaluate current exam development procedures to identify opportunities to expedite the process for launching new examinations. Recommend revisions as necessary.

NCEES staff assembled the current policy and *EDPM* requirements and provided context to the committee. After review and discussion, the committee decided not to recommend any policy or procedure changes.

Charge 6

Review EDPM *1.7.5 to assess whether a standard-setting subcommittee should consist of three members from the EPS Committee and two members from the exam development committee.*

NCEES staff briefed the committee about the current *EDPM* requirements and provided feedback on why this change was being considered. After reviewing the data and current requirements, a lively debate ensued. The committee made a motion to recommend adopting the subcommittee makeup as outlined in the charge. The vote was a six-to-six tie, which meant the motion failed. After a follow-up discussion, the group decided not to have another vote. The committee members opposed to the change felt the current configuration worked well for surveyors.

After consultation with the EPE Committee (the EPS Committee met before the EPE Committee), the EPS Committee revisited the issue to see if there was a desire to match the EPE recommendation to change the makeup of the standard-setting subcommittee. Although the EPS Committee recognizes that the EPE Committee sees a need to change the composition of the standard-setting subcommittee, EPS opted not to change its position.

The EPE and EPS committees were each given this charge, but the two committees came to different conclusions. To avoid operating under different procedures for engineering and surveying exams, it is recommended that this charge be carried over and that next year's EPE and EPS committees be charged jointly with developing language acceptable to both committees.

Charge 7

Review the surveyor education classifications used in FS/PS performance evaluations to determine whether they accurately reflect the educational backgrounds of examinees. Make recommendations as appropriate.

NCEES and Pearson staff made a presentation to the committee covering the standards and issues related to this charge. After reviewing the data and appropriate policies and procedures, the committee decided no changes were necessary.

Respectfully submitted, the **Committee on Examinations for Professional Surveyors:**

Joseph Wichert, L.S., Chair

Members
Renee Clough, P.E., P.L.S.
Toynia Gibbs, P.L.S.
Brian Holbritter, L.S.
Coleen Johnson, R.P.L.S.
Kelly Katz, P.L.S.
Ginger Michalski-Wallace, P.S.
James (Don) Pedigo II, P.L.S.
Lisa Peterson, P.E., P.L.S.
Paul Santos, P.L.S.
Shane Terhune, P.L.S.
Paul Vogel, L.S.
James Wengler, P.L.S.

Board liaison
Aaron Blaisdell, P.L.S.

Staff liaison
Lehmon Dekle, P.E.

Mission Initiatives Task Force

Andrew Ritter, Chair

ABSTRACT

The Mission Initiatives Task Force was formed to evaluate NCEES partnerships, outreach, mission-aligned programs, and strategic responses to licensure challenges.

The task force met throughout the year virtually, using subcommittees for each charge, and met in person on January 5–6, 2026, in San Diego, California. The Basecamp project management website was used for regular communications.

The task force was assigned eight charges and is not presenting any motions.

CHARGES

Charge 1

Assist NCEES staff as needed with reorganizing the Participating Organizations Liaison Council (POLC) to improve structure and engagement.

The task force discussed the purpose of POLC and reviewed the list of member organizations. *Bylaws* Section 7.15 defines the group as serving in a consultative and advisory capacity for the Council, and member representatives should have the authority of their respective organizations to effectively communicate their position and policies related to licensure. It was noted that changes have been made in recent years to the POLC meeting agenda and format to try and increase engagement and dialogue between NCEES and the member organizations. However, these changes have not increased the overall effectiveness of the group.

Comprehensive changes are recommended to make the group a more valuable and effective resource to the Council. As such, the task force's recommendation is to sunset the group at a future date and establish a new group based on updated criteria for membership eligibility and representatives. Updated criteria should consider expanding beyond discipline-focused societies, reducing overlap, and ensuring designated participants represent the leadership of the member society, i.e., the president, president-elect, CEO, or appropriate substitute.

Charge 2

Identify new opportunities for collaboration with like organizations and evaluate the alignment of those and existing collaborative efforts with the updated strategic plan.

This charge was combined with Charge 4 due to their similarities. The full discussion appears under Charge 4.

Charge 3

Review current NCEES outreach initiatives and assess their connection to NCEES Foundation funding. Provide recommendations to improve coordination and impact.

There are three types of NCEES outreach initiatives, and all are budgeted separately. The board of directors' discretionary outreach budget is $500,000 and available to fund requests from outside organizations. In reviewing the list of past recipients, it is likely that many of them could be included in the work of the Foundation. However, the task force recommends continuing to budget these funds, as they allow the board of directors to support worthy projects that arise on short notice or may not fit the Foundation's requirements and/or schedule.

The mission initiatives outreach budget varies from year-to-year and is approved by the Council via adoption of the annual operating budget. Recipients and amounts are identified by the board of directors and designated for organizations and/or projects that align with the NCEES mission and vision. Recipients could have some overlap with the Foundation. However, the task force recommends continuing these funds since they are provided for very specific projects or programs that might not fall within the Foundation's parameters.

The Public Affairs outreach budget supports implementation of the Council's integrated marketing and outreach efforts. The amount varies from year-to-year based on the needs of the plan and is approved by the Council at

the annual meeting as a part of the overall operating budget. The integrated plan features a variety of tactics, to include things like conference exhibits, sponsorships, K–12 initiatives, and FE-focused initiatives, such as the FE Ambassador Program and graduation honor cords. As it relates to the Foundation, this budget is completely separate and operates on a different level than the Foundation and should continue to be separate.

The Foundation is only in its second year of operation and will continue to evolve with guidance from the board of directors. As the board finalizes its strategic planning process, it would be appropriate for the board to take into consideration how it would like to see the Foundation function. The Foundation is currently a reactive organization that reviews letters of inquiry and applications to determine if an organization or project should receive funding. Moving forward, it should be determined if the Foundation should grow into a more proactive organization and pursue donations and funding from like-minded sources outside of NCEES.

Charge 4

Propose new mission initiatives or revisions to existing efforts that align with the NCEES mission and current strategic plan. Provide recommendations to the board of directors for potential use of mission initiatives funding.

As noted above, the task force determined that this charge is very similar to Charge 2 and opted to combine the charges and address them together. Both charges focus on identifying opportunities that align with the NCEES mission and strategic plan while supporting future growth and relevance of the organization. The task force developed a list of potential initiatives and/or partners, with a focus on professional societies. The task force agreed that these societies present the most advantageous opportunity for mission initiatives because they work directly with licensed engineers and surveyors, as well as those preparing for licensure, and therefore provide a direct connection to the NCEES mission.

Mission initiatives typically require a substantial financial investment and time to develop and produce meaningful outcomes. To maximize effectiveness, the task force recommends that the president-elect, at the beginning of their term, review the list of professional societies to identify emerging needs expected during their term as president. This will provide sufficient time to establish partnerships, coordinate organizational requirements, and prepare for effective use of mission initiative funding and implementation during their term as president.

After careful and thorough review, the task force recommends funding the DiscoverE Future City Fellows Program as a new mission initiative for 2026–27. This program aligns with the new strategic plan to assist in building the pipeline to increase the number of licensed engineers and surveyors. This program effectively connects teams of undergraduate engineering and surveying students with a city partner to address critical issues such as sustainable infrastructure, climate adaptation, or urban mobility while maintaining a focus on standards, licensure, and career readiness. Participating students experience firsthand how standards and licensure underpin ethical decision-making and public protection, helping them understand licensure not as a procedural milestone, but as a professional commitment.

Charge 5

Identify proactive strategies to support member boards facing threats to professional licensure. Provide recommendations as appropriate.

The task force reviewed existing NCEES advocacy resources, including legislative tracking services and the Alliance for Responsible Professional Licensing (ARPL) toolbox. Through these discussions, the task force recognized that threats to professional licensure are, by their nature, largely reactive rather than proactive. NCEES does not have the ability or authority to influence lawmakers prior to the introduction of legislation; therefore, advocacy efforts must focus on responding to identified, real-time threats. As a result, the task force recommends proactive outreach and education efforts focused on member board administrators (MBAs) and professional societies, such as the American Council of Engineering Companies, the National Society of Professional Engineers, and the National Society of Professional Surveyors, to ensure awareness of NCEES advocacy resources available to support them when threats to licensure arise.

The task force further recommends that professional societies be a key focus, as they are often best positioned to engage lobbyists and advocacy professionals who can effectively address threats before they materialize into proposed legislation. These organizations will also play an important role in disseminating information to their affiliated state societies.

Potential outreach recommendations include educational webinars for MBAs, briefings or informational toolkits developed in coordination with professional societies, targeted presentations at NCEES or society meetings, and the creation of concise guidelines outlining available NCEES advocacy resources.

Charge 6

Provide recommendations to the board of directors regarding NCEES participation in international organizations, including potential engagement through liaisons or other means for both engineering and surveying.

The task force assessed current NCEES participation in international organizations and identified involvement in the international engineering community through membership in the International Engineering Alliance (IEA). NCEES representatives attend the annual conference, and additional support is provided for NCEES delegates to encourage participation in IEA leadership positions. The task force recommends continued involvement with IEA.

The task force found little to no NCEES participation internationally within the surveying community and believes the Council would benefit from involvement in the international surveying community. As such, the task force recommends annual representation at the International Federation of Surveyors (FIG) conference beginning in 2026. Representation should be consistent with that of the IEA meeting and provide priority for professional surveyors. FIG is one of the top global organizations for surveying professionals and features an active Young Surveyors Network. The meeting will provide NCEES with representation on the international stage and enable NCEES to build relationships that lead to enhancement of global licensure for surveyors. The task force presented a formal recommendation to the board of directors at the board's February meeting to provide funding for two surveyors to attend the FIG meeting in June 2026.

Charge 7

Collaborate with NCEES staff to evaluate the effectiveness of current outreach activities targeting students (K–12 and college) and professionals. Provide recommendations as necessary.

The task force discussed many NCEES outreach activities and determined that the overall program is effective in targeting and reaching students (K–12 and college), professionals, and the general public. Activities such as the conference exhibit program, FE Ambassadors, and the graduation honor cords are strong in their ability to engage with college students to deliver a value-of-licensure message. The DiscoverE Future City programs for middle and high school students are longstanding programs that effectively support building a strong pipeline of future engineers and surveyors. These efforts also support a positive reputation and brand experience for NCEES as well as provide collaborative opportunities with similar organizations and industry partners.

In its review of the NCEES Education Awards, the task force determined the awards have struggled to attract new participants for many years, despite many tweaks to the format and robust marketing and outreach efforts. As such, the task force recommends discontinuing the program beginning in 2027. The task force noted overlap between past award recipients and programs requesting and receiving funds through the NCEES Foundation and believes the Foundation is the proper source of funding for past participants going forward.

First awarded in 2009, the engineering award program has experienced a steady year-over-year decline in the number of participating schools. In 2025, the engineering award attracted only 21 submissions from 16 schools, all of which were repeat participants. For the surveying award, which was first awarded in 2016, the task force noted a similar year-over-year decline in entries that culminated in more potential awards than applicants in 2025.

Charge 8

Review the funded delegate program and its purpose. Propose changes as necessary.

The funded delegate program was created to ensure every member board has the ability to send a board member to attend the annual business meeting regardless of any state-level travel restrictions. Over the last 15 years, it has grown to include funding for first-time attendees, three member board members, MBAs, and a board enforcement staff person. Funding was also added for the MBA and three delegates from each board to attend their respective zone interim meetings.

The task force distributed a survey to member board members and MBAs to ask why funded delegate slots are not being used. The top answers for member board members were

- State restrictions on number of board members allowed to attend
- Board does not have enough members to use all of the slots
- Date conflict with the meeting

The top answers for MBAs not using funding were

- Inability to attend meeting
- Date conflict with meeting

When asked if changes should be made to the program, the overwhelming response was it is great and no changes were suggested. However, with respect to funding for the MBA, numerous responses requested that the funding be expanded to include a staff member from each member board and/or to make the funding transferable to a staff member if the MBA is unable to attend. Based on this information, the task force recommends adding a funded board staff position. In many cases, the official MBA is not involved in the day-to-day operations of the agency, and this will allow the person actually performing the traditional duties of the MBA to attend. It will also support those member boards with succession plans in place to allow their successor to attend with the MBA to promote a smooth transition and transfer of knowledge.

Respectfully submitted, the **Mission Initiatives Task Force:**

Andrew Ritter, Chair

Members
William Atkinson, P.E.
Marie Elizabeth (Maily) Cristi, P.E.
Marcus Hampton, L.S.
Christopher Knotts, P.E.
Laura Sievers, P.E.

Consultants
Timothy Bowes, P.L.S.
Dale Jans, P.E.

Board liaison
Elizabeth Beckett, P.E.

Staff liaison
Nina Norris

New Business

This section provides a place for notes about any new motions or resolutions introduced at the annual meeting.

Unfinished Business

After all other motions have been considered, the Council will address unfinished business. As part of unfinished business, the Committee on Finances will present the 2026–27 fiscal year budget for Council action.

Approval of Budgets

Move to adopt the 2026–27 proposed operating and capital expenditure budgets, which are shown in the Finance Committee Appendices A–C.

ncees.org | 200 Verdae Boulevard, Greenville, SC 29607 | 800-250-3196