ABSTRACT
The Advisory Committee on Council Activities (ACCA) provides advice and briefing to the president and the board of directors on new policy issues, problems, and plans that have not been assigned to a standing committee or that involve several existing committees. ACCA conducted an organizational meeting at the 2014 annual meeting in Seattle, Washington, and held face-to-face meetings in December 2014 in San Antonio, Texas, and in January 2015 in San Diego, California, to finalize its recommendations to the Council.

ACCA was assigned 11 charges, has 9 motions for Council action, and has several recommendations for consideration by the board of directors. The motions begin on page 66.

TEXT
Charge 1
Evaluate the results of the 2014 annual meeting videography to determine how and if NCEES should live-stream future annual meetings, record them to post online after the meeting, and the potential value for taking either action.

This charge is to follow up on ACCA’s recommendation from past years. The original charge was to look at various forms of remote participation at NCEES meetings for members who have an interest in attending the meeting but may not have the funding, time, or ability to travel.

At the 2014 annual meeting, NCEES hired a videographer to record portions of the entire meeting, as well as to conduct a number of formal interviews that could be used throughout the year and potentially in an electronic version of the annual report. Snippets of these recordings were used to create a marketing piece that captures the essence of the meeting (business and social); it will be used to promote future meetings, especially to those members who have never attended.

The first part of the charge was to evaluate the possibility of live-streaming the annual meeting versus making a video recording. With live-streaming, remote viewers would see the business session presentations and speakers via cameras stationed throughout the meeting room. Remote audience participation would be available only via chat communication with responses to vetted questions or comments from a designated person at the meeting, not necessarily in real time. ACCA determined that debate participation and remote voting are unfeasible for implementation at this time. With video recording, the sessions would be recorded and videos posted online after the meeting concludes. These recordings would most likely be of the report presentations, speakers at the podium, and speakers at microphones on the floor. Recordings could be edited for succinctness and relevance to improve the listening experience.

The main benefit of live-streaming is that participants would be observing in real time. This would allow them to feel more involved, even though the ability to interact is limited. The benefits of video recording are that the sessions could be edited to take out dead space and to focus on relevant topics. NCEES could also use them in promotional and marketing materials. Finally, video recording costs are typically less than live-streaming costs.

Recommendation
At this time, live-streaming the annual meeting business sessions with remote participation has an unfavorable benefit-to-cost ratio. Therefore, ACCA feels that continuing efforts to provide remote or distance attendance of the annual meeting is not currently warranted. This may need to be revisited as technology and user needs change or if attendance at the annual meeting decreases.

However, recording the annual meeting’s business sessions would be valuable to corroborate minutes and motions of the meeting. It may also help in developing materials to enhance the image of the professions and
to promote the importance of attending the annual meeting. Therefore, ACCA recommends that NCEES should continue to make an audio recording of the business sessions, which it has done for many years, with consideration given to a video recording of these sessions and other annual meeting activities.

**Charge 2**

*Study the issue of structural engineering practice and its method of regulation, summarizing the current approaches to structural engineering regulation. Engage the structural engineering community, and make recommendations for revisions to the Model Law and Model Rules, if deemed appropriate.*

Over the past few years, several organizations representing the structural engineering community have proposed that the practice of structural engineering relating to certain types of structures be regulated with a higher level of qualifications than that which is currently reflected in the laws and rules of most licensure jurisdictions. Their position is based on the premise that engineers addressing certain structures, generally termed “significant” or “essential,” require a higher level of expertise due to the structures’ complexity and high potential for harm in the event of failure. Such failures can result in significant loss of life, carry large financial impacts, and erode the public trust in engineering. Therefore, the organizations deem that significant structures present a greater threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public, and they propose that engineers offering services associated with such structures be regulated to ensure that they possess and demonstrate a higher level of expertise.

Based on the current licensure systems of a few states, several approaches for imposing the higher level of regulation have been proposed. Some favor the formation of separate structural licensure systems, similar to the system used in Illinois. Others have proposed that discipline-specific licensure be employed, similar to the system used in Hawaii. Still others have recommended the addition of special recognitions or licenses to a generic P.E. license, similar to the approach used in Utah and Washington. There are also those who believe that the higher-level qualifications are unnecessary and the generic licensure approach used by most states that prohibits engineers from practicing in areas “in which they lack competence” provides adequate protection.

The debate over the need for a different approach and the nature of that approach has been ongoing for several years. In 2013, at the request of professional organizations that represent the structural engineering community, NCEES charged ACCA to consider the issue and determine if NCEES should officially engage in the debate. In early 2014, ACCA conducted a survey of the member boards to get a sense of the Council’s desire in this regard. Based on results of the survey, ACCA made a motion at the 2014 annual meeting that NCEES charge a committee to study the issue, with the ultimate goal of making recommendations for modifications to the Model Law and Model Rules, if appropriate. The motion was approved, and ACCA received this charge as a result.

**Current Model Law and Model Rules**

The current Model Law and Model Rules employ the generic licensure approach, which is used by most of the licensure jurisdictions in the United States. Under generic licensure, all types of engineers are licensed as P.E.’s, with no reference to discipline if they satisfy a common level of qualifications, and they are restricted to practice only in their area of expertise. Under the generic approach, structural engineers would be bound to address only structures that they are qualified to address. Also under this approach, the only regulatory means of prevention of catastrophic failures (which represent the concern of the structural community) would be the adequacy of the common qualifications and the promise of licensed engineers to personally restrict their practice to the areas of expertise that they possess or perceive to possess. The structural engineering community regards the common level of qualifications to be inadequate for the structures in question and believes the generic approach is not proactive enough, given the ramifications of failure.

**Current regulatory approaches**

The practice of structural engineering in the United States is regulated by essentially five different approaches. These are briefly described as follows:

- **Generic P.E. Licensure**: The most common approach today is the use of generic licensure. This is also the approach currently reflected in the Model Law and Model Rules. In this approach, structural engineers are, as are all types of engineers, licensed as a P.E. without reference to discipline under a common level of qualifications and are bound to practice only in their area of expertise.

- **Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title**: Some jurisdictions regulate generically but impose additional requirements that must be satisfied to allow the licensee to use the title “structural engineer” or “S.E.” The practice of structural engineering is regulated generically, but the use of the title is specifically...
restricted. This approach provides a higher level of regulatory assurance by confirming to the public which structural engineers have demonstrated the higher level of qualifications needed for significant structures.

- **Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title and Restricted S.E. Practice:** Some jurisdictions license structural engineers under the current generic P.E. system but impose additional requirements to obtain a separate S.E. title and regulate the practice of structural engineering. In this case, not only is the use of the title “S.E.” restricted, but certain restrictions are also imposed as to who is allowed to practice structural engineering relative to significant structures. This approach has two variations:
  - **P.E. Plus S.E.:** Individuals first obtain a P.E. license by satisfying the common level requirements for education and experience and passing one of the standard NCEES Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) exams. They then obtain the S.E. designation by meeting additional requirements (generally gaining additional experience in structural engineering related to significant structures) and passing the 16-hour NCEES Structural Engineering (SE) exam. Such individuals are authorized to practice engineering in both a generic sense and in the restricted areas of structural engineering. This variation is already in place in some jurisdictions.
  - **S.E. Only:** Individuals meet the common level requirements and any additional requirements required for structural engineering and pass only the 16-hour SE exam. These applicants directly receive the S.E. designation without having to take one of the standard PE exams. Such individuals would be authorized to practice only structural engineering. This variation is not actually used by any jurisdictions at this time but is included here because the structural community has expressed interest in it as a possibility to eliminate the need for pure structural engineers to have to take both the PE exam and the SE exam.

- **Discipline-Specific Licensure:** Some jurisdictions license by discipline and include structural engineering as a separate type of license. With discipline-specific licensure, licensees are titled consistent with the discipline in which they are licensed. For example, a structural engineer is designated an S.E., a civil engineer a C.E., and a mechanical engineer an M.E. Licensees are also restricted to practice only within their designated discipline, which is specifically defined by the jurisdiction’s statutes and rules. In this case, structural engineers are specifically restricted based on the definition of structural engineering.

- **Separate S.E. Licensure:** One state regulates the practice of structural engineering via statutes and rules that are completely separate from those regulating other disciplines of engineering. In this case, an S.E. license is required to practice structural engineering, regardless of the nature of the structure.

The following provisions are also reflected in the regulation of structural engineering in many of the U.S. jurisdictions. Each provision will need to be considered if the Council decides to modify the Model Law and Model Rules for structural engineering.

- **Competency Standards:** The competency standards (education, experience, and examination) used to regulate structural engineers at the higher level vary somewhat from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. However, the current Model Rules includes a definition titled Model Law Structural Engineer (MLSE). This definition reflects a set of licensure standards (including the relatively new 16-hour SE exam) that satisfy the requirements for structural engineering in all (or nearly all) of the licensure jurisdictions in the United States. The designation is currently used to expedite the approval of comity licensure applications for S.E.’s (a similar definition, Model Law Engineer, is provided to expedite comity licensure for P.E.’s), and it would seem appropriate for use in regulating the practice of structural engineering at a higher level.

- **Thresholds:** Many jurisdictions that regulate structural engineering separately do so only in relation to significant structures such as schools and hospitals or to essential structures such as those related to national defense, emergency response, etc. Structures over a certain height or buildings of a certain size or occupancy or with floors over a certain number are also usually included. The definitions of these thresholds vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but the concept should be included if the Council decides to modify the Model Law and Model Rules in relation to structural engineering.

- **Grandfathering (or License Continuation):** Most jurisdictions grandfather or continue existing licensees who practiced engineering under a past set of standards and do not impose the new standards on these individuals going forward. However, in the case of structural engineering, jurisdictions that have added new structural engineering designations do require practicing structural engineers to demonstrate their experience and qualifications before granting them the new S.E. designation or license.
Analysis
Of the approaches described above, ACCA considered the first three for possible implementation by NCEES. These are Generic P.E. Licensure, Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title, and Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title and Restricted S.E. Practice.

ACCA rejected Discipline-Specific Licensure from further consideration because it has not been embraced by NCEES in the past. The trend toward specialization and the splintering of engineering into many subdisciplines would also complicate licensure and reduce mobility under a discipline-specific model. The committee also rejected Separate S.E. Licensure because the committee considered it unlikely that a proposal for separate practice acts for structural engineering would be embraced by NCEES or the governing bodies of the various licensure jurisdictions.

Generic P.E. Licensure represents the “do-nothing” alternative because this is the approach currently reflected in the current Model Law and Model Rules. Although most U.S. jurisdictions use the generic approach, the committee is sympathetic to the need for structural engineering practice associated with significant structures to be subject to a higher level of regulation. Members agreed that a more proactive approach than generic licensure should be considered given the threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public posed by such structures. They also felt that the number of jurisdictions currently employing a higher level of regulation for structural engineers (11, including title and practice acts) is significant enough to warrant consideration for a change to the Model Law and Model Rules. The current provisions in these states vary significantly; before more states adopt new provisions, the Model Law and Model Rules should be revised to provide guidance. Consequently, the focus of the committee moved to the remaining approaches: Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title and Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title and Restricted S.E. Practice.

The Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected Title approach maintains generic licensure but adds title protection for structural engineers. Title protection would provide the public with a means to ensure that the qualifications of the structural engineer are adequate for the project they are considering; however, it provides only an indirect means of safeguarding the public by virtue of the state-regulated title and state-maintained roster. The public would still have to understand the difference between a P.E. and a P.E. with S.E. designation when selecting a structural engineer. A P.E. without the S.E. designation would not be explicitly prohibited from designing significant structures, provided the structures fall within the licensee’s area of expertise. The determination of a P.E.’s area of expertise would be the only means of ensuring that the proper qualifications are in place, and such a determination would be made largely by the P.E. proposing to perform the structural engineering work. The committee decided that S.E. title protection alone is insufficient to address the public health, safety, and welfare threat that exists for significant structures.

The committee will present Motion 1 to implement the Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title and Restricted S.E. Practice approach. This approach not only protects the S.E. title but also regulates the practice of structural engineering; thus, it better safeguards the health, safety, and welfare of the public relative to structures with an elevated level of threat. While it is essentially discipline-specific licensure for one segment of the engineering profession, it still maintains a connection with generic licensure. The provisions can be embedded in the statutes and rules of most of the jurisdictions.

The committee also recommends that the approach include both variations described above: the P.E. Plus S.E. and the S.E. Only. If an individual is content to restrict his or her practice to only structural engineering, he or she should not be required to take both the PE and SE exams and maintain both licenses.

Related provisions
If the Council approves the recommended approach for incorporation into the Model Law and Model Rules as presented in Motion 1, the committee recommends that other related provisions be addressed as follows:

- **Competency Standards:** Specific competency standards (education, experience, and examination) will need to be established for the new Model Law and Model Rules requirements. The committee recommends that the standards reflected in the Model Rules definition of Model Law Structural Engineer (Model Rules 210.20 B3) be adopted for this purpose.

- **Thresholds:** The definitions of significant and essential structures, which would set the threshold for the imposition of the higher-level competency standards, could be left to the individual jurisdictions, but NCEES should develop a definition for the Model Law and Model Rules for the sake of promoting uniformity. The exact definition should be developed by reviewing the threshold definitions of jurisdictions that currently...
regulate structural engineering. Establishing such a definition was considered outside the scope of this charge. ACCA has included development of this definition as part of Motion 1.

- **Grandfathering (or License Continuation):** The grandfathering of current practitioners upon implementation of new requirements is normal practice by licensure jurisdictions, and the committee recommends that any new requirements for the regulation of structural engineering to be on a forward-looking basis, with all currently licensed engineers that practice structural engineering being granted the new S.E. designation after a demonstration of their experience and qualifications.

**Charge 3**

Consider what, if any, actions can be taken to ensure that modifications to the NCEES model governance documents are subsequently adopted and implemented by member boards. Provide recommendations for appropriate action.

ACCA concluded that NCEES cannot ensure implementation of modifications to the model governance documents by all jurisdictions because NCEES member boards are not obligated to comply with any of the Model Law or Model Rules provisions. However, NCEES was founded on principles of uniformity, mobility, and comity. ACCA therefore believes that the Council as a whole should continue to develop and promote its model governance documents in order to encourage nationwide uniformity and advance professional licensure of engineers and surveyors.

ACCA feels that NCEES can undertake the following endeavors to support broader adoption of model governance document provisions:

- Educate new members on the history and purpose of the NCEES model documents.
- Promote public and legislative awareness.
- Encourage active and informed participation at zone and annual meetings, conferences, committee meetings, etc.

When the Council approves revisions to the model governance documents, those changes reflect the standards and statutes that the majority of member boards agree have merit for implementation and should strive to implement. For NCEES to be the recognized leader in developing and establishing licensing standards, member boards need to seek to implement those standards and encourage their state legislatures to adopt similar language. However, uniformity should not be an effort to find the lowest common denominator relative to standards; it should be an ongoing recognition of the need to advance the licensure qualifications for engineering and surveying in order to safeguard the public health, safety, and welfare.

At its face-to-face meeting, ACCA decided to recommend that the president-elect charge the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG) with reviewing the introduction to the Model Law and consider adding a similar introduction to the Model Rules to emphasize the purpose and the importance of implementing the Model Law and Model Rules. After its meeting, ACCA learned that the UPLG Committee is already proposing such language this year as part of its review of the two model documents, so it is not making this recommendation.

**Charge 4**

**Reevaluate the requirement that a past NCEES treasurer be included as a member of the Nominations Committee, and provide recommendations.**

ACCA recognizes that past treasurers are known to all zones, do not necessarily represent a specific zone, and have served on the NCEES board of directors. ACCA believes that having a past treasurer on the Nominations Committee provides the committee with a valuable resource. Therefore, it recommends no related changes to the Bylaws, which currently requires a past NCEES treasurer be part of the Nominations Committee.

**Charge 5**

Given the requirements contained in the Bylaws for the nomination and election of Council officers, consider the need for the Nominations Committee to continue as a standing committee.

ACCA discussed that the current practice as stipulated by Bylaws 11.04, Election of Vice Presidents, is that the four zone vice presidents are elected by their respective zones. The zones then file the names of the incoming
zone vice presidents with the NCEES chief executive officer. The Nominations Committee includes this information in its conference report.

In addition, Bylaws Article 11 provides for the election of the NCEES president-elect and treasurer. The president-elect serves three years on the board of directors: as president-elect and then as president and immediate past president. This office rotates by zone; candidates may be nominated by the respective zone or may be nominated from the floor at the annual meeting. For the office of NCEES treasurer, any zone may nominate a candidate for the position; a candidate may also be nominated from the floor at the annual meeting.

ACCA concluded that the role of the Committee on Nominations is merely to forward nominations made by others as described above and to serve as tellers. It therefore believes that the committee should be eliminated as a standing committee. Further, ACCA recommends the Bylaws be modified to allow for the president to appoint a Tellers Committee if needed (e.g., to count votes of the Council when there is a contested election).

ACCA will present Motion 2 to charge a Special Committee on Bylaws with proposing an amendment to remove Section 7.12, Committee on Nominations, from the NCEES Bylaws and to amend Article 11, Elections, to update the related language about the process used to elect national officers. The motion is also for the Special Committee on Bylaws to make provisions in the Bylaws for a Tellers Committee to be formed when there is a contested election. The language should state that the Tellers Committee should be appointed by the president, that it should consist of a past NCEES treasurer and the current secretary-treasurer from each zone, and that no candidate would be eligible to serve on it.

charge 6

Consider if NCEES should reestablish an affiliate member status that would be available to foreign partners that have been approved to offer NCEES examinations or other groups as designated by NCEES. Provide recommendations as appropriate.

ACCA discussed and recognized the increasing importance of developing relationships with international organizations that are advancing licensure in the engineering and surveying professions. The NCEES Bylaws currently precludes these organizations from establishing membership within NCEES. Therefore, a new member category would be required to allow for this affiliation. ACCA recommends for all new agreements with foreign partners that offer NCEES examinations to stipulate that those partners become International Affiliate Organization members of NCEES.

Accordingly, ACCA will present Motion 3 to charge a Special Committee on Bylaws with proposing amendments to the Bylaws to create an International Affiliate Organization membership category. This would allow membership for foreign partners that have been approved to offer NCEES examinations. NCEES may also choose to approve other international stakeholder groups engaged in the engineering or surveying professions to become members as International Affiliate Organizations.

Charge 7

Review the Manual of Policy and Position Statements, reflecting upon past and current action of the Council, and present policy revisions to the board of directors for approval before submitting them to the Council for ratification at the annual meeting.

ACCA reviewed this document as directed. It consists of the following sections: Administrative Policies (AP), Examination Development Policies (EDP), Examination Administration Policies (EAP), Financial Policies (FP), Professional Policies (PP), and Position Statements (PS). Because other standing committees are reviewing examination and financial policies, ACCA focused on the Administrative Policies, Professional Policies, and Position Statements. ACCA’s review resulted in the following findings and proposed revisions:

- ACCA received a communication from the Committee on Examination Policy and Procedures (EPP) concerning perceived issues and inconsistencies between AP 4, Past Examinations, and EDP 13, Security of Examination Material. After review and discussion, ACCA decided to propose changes to AP 4 to clarify that old exam items no longer used in exams may be used in practice exams developed by NCEES. Also, ACCA understands that EPP will propose a revision to EDP 13 clarifying that exam items still in use within exams shall not be used for any purpose outside the NCEES exam program. Accordingly, ACCA will present Motion 4.
ACCA noted inconsistencies between PP 5, PS 17, and Model Rules 230.60 F, all of which are titled Expedited Comity Licensure. Based on this review and discussion, ACCA decided to propose revisions to PP 5 and PS 17 to include structural engineers and professional surveyors, similar to their inclusion in Model Rules 230.60 F. Accordingly, ACCA will present Motion 5.

During its review of PS 2, Certification of Engineers, ACCA noted that the position statement makes no reference to certification of surveyors. Because the surveying profession also has various specialty certification programs, ACCA decided to propose Motion 6 to include professional surveyors in the position statement.

Recommendations
ACCA reviewed and discussed PS 31, Commissioning of Engineered Systems, which stipulates that the commissioning of engineered systems falls under the practice of engineering and must be performed under the responsible charge of a professional engineer. The definition under Model Law 110.20 A5, Practice of Engineering, changed from the August 2013 edition to the August 2014 edition as a result of a motion at the 2014 annual meeting. With this change in the Model Law, the “commissioning of engineering works, products, and systems,” which was previously included, is now no longer specifically included in the definition of the practice of engineering. ACCA reviewed and discussed the inconsistency between PS 31 and the new definition in Model Law and decided that it is unclear whether the removal of commissioning of engineered systems from the practice of engineering was intentional. Therefore, ACCA recommends that the president charge the appropriate committee or task force to review this matter and propose a solution to resolve the inconsistency.

ACCA also recommends that the president charge a committee to review Bylaws 7.02 with regard to paragraph 2, which is where this biennial charge comes from. The charge language to present the ACCA changes for ratification by the Council after approval by the NCEES board of directors is not in line with the current process of presenting the motions for the board to take a position on before the Council votes on them.

Charge 8
Review Model Rules 260.20, Grandfathering of Model Law Engineers and Model Law Structural Engineers. Consider whether this language should be moved to the definitions of Model Law Engineer and Model Law Structural Engineer and if surveying should be included.

ACCA reviewed this section of Model Rules and concluded that this provision would be better if it were moved and combined with Model Rules 210.20 B, where Model Law Engineer, Model Law Surveyor, and Model Law Structural Engineer are defined. ACCA noted that the grandfathering provision does not currently address Model Law Surveyors and deemed that it would be appropriate to revise the provision to include that designation. ACCA also discussed and agreed that it would be more appropriate to refer to this provision as a continuance of Model Law Engineer, Model Law Surveyor, and Model Law Structural Engineer status as opposed to a grandfathering process. ACCA will present Motion 7 to charge UPLG with incorporating these changes.

Charge 9
Develop a position statement that reflects the education standard defined in the Model Law Engineer 2020 and Model Law Structural Engineer 2020 definitions (as defined prior to removal from Model Law and Model Rules) regarding future education standards for professional engineering licensure. The position statement should further include the Council’s desire to work with appropriate organizations/bodies to effect a change to ensure the continued health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Charge 9 resulted from passage of the Oklahoma board motion at the 2014 annual meeting. In developing the proposed position statement shown in Motion 8, ACCA kept its focus on the specific directives of the Oklahoma motion and stayed strictly to the charge. ACCA believes that moving the provisions relating to additional education requirements from the Model Law and Model Rules to the position statement should resolve the apparent confusion about the date of implementation, which was the stated concern behind the Oklahoma motion. Instead of including an effective date of 2020, the position statement instead simply states “in the future.”

Having a position statement that addresses the future education requirements is consistent with the NCEES mission and vision statements. NCEES has the responsibility on behalf of the public to look to the future and recommend changes to the licensure process that will safeguard the health, safety, and welfare as reflected in the NCEES strategic plan and the vision and mission statements. The vision statement states the following: “The
vision of NCEES is to provide leadership in professional licensure of engineers and surveyors through excellence in uniform laws, licensing standards, and professional ethics in order to safeguard the health, safety and welfare of the public and to shape the future of professional licensure [emphasis added].” Through the new position statement, NCEES is meeting/addressing this obligation by promoting education requirements for licensure in the future.

Having such a position statement will also provide the means for the Council to maintain the conversation about the future qualifications for engineering licensure. In addition, developing the position statement is consistent with NCEES’ established processes that use careful deliberation of licensure-related issues and recognizes the related work that NCEES has accomplished over the past 15 years. Education is a complex issue that deserves such deliberation, and the position statement will serve as the platform for it.

**Charge 10**

*Review and consider revising or deleting AP 11, Sponsored Activities for Annual Business Meeting.*

ACCA reviewed AP 11, which states, “The host member board may make arrangements for sponsored activities and souvenirs for the annual business meeting. However, NCEES will not acknowledge sponsorship in programs and other meeting literature.”

ACCA discussed that this policy does not reflect current practice. In the past, NCEES provided small amounts of money to state boards to purchase souvenirs to distribute at the registration desk during annual meetings; however, it stopped doing this many years ago. ACCA also understands that member boards no longer make arrangements for sponsored activities, mainly due to the coordination and staffing burden placed on the host board. Additionally, many state boards are restricted from accepting money, which sometimes resulted in NCEES having to pay for whatever was planned in years past.

Currently, NCEES plans and pays for all meeting-related activities and souvenirs, with no involvement from the host board. In consideration that arrangements and payment for sponsored activities and souvenirs are not done in accordance with AP 11, ACCA will present Motion 9 to modify AP 11 so that it reflects current practice.

This motion will not change informal responsibilities associated with the host board, such as recruiting board members to deliver invocations as needed during the meeting and working with NCEES staff to coordinate field trip workshops of interest within the area.

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

Dennis Truax, Ph.D., P.E., Chair

**Members**

- Gene Dinkins, P.E., P.L.S.
- Von Hill, P.S.
- Robert Krebs, P.E., L.S.
- Randall Long, P.E.
- Jon Nelson, P.E.
- Leonard (Len) Neugebauer, P.E., L.S.
- Roy Shrewsbury, P.S.
- Marlee Walton, P.E., P.L.S.

**Board liaison**

- David Widmer, P.L.S.

**Staff liaison**

- Donna Moss, PHR

**Consultant**

- Gregg Brandow, Ph.D., P.E., S.E.
MOTIONS

ACCA Motion 1
Move that the Generic P.E. Licensure Plus Protected S.E. Title and Restricted S.E. Practice approach as defined under Charge 2 of the ACCA report be incorporated into the Model Law and Model Rules and that the appropriate committee or task force be charged to develop specific language for that purpose, including the Thresholds definition as described under Charge 2. Further, move that the language be presented to NCEES for approval before being charged to the UPLG Committee for final incorporation into the Model Law and Model Rules.

Rationale
This approach not only protects the S.E. title but also regulates the practice of structural engineering, and thus better safeguards the health, safety, and welfare of the public relative to structures with an elevated level of threat. While it is essentially discipline-specific licensure for one segment of the engineering profession, it still maintains a connection with generic licensure, and the provisions can be embedded in the statutes and rules of most jurisdictions.

ACCA also recommends that the approach include both variations described in its report: the P.E. Plus S.E. and the S.E. Only. If an individual is content to restrict his or her practice to only structural engineering, he or she should not be required to take both the PE and SE exams and maintain both licenses.

Board of directors' position
Endorses, non-consent agenda