USE OF P.E. DESIGNATION –
NOT LICENSED IN STATE IN WHICH COMPLAINT IS FILED

Case No. 01-3

Facts:
Engineer A is a safety engineer for a federal agency. He is responsible for independently overseeing the proper implementation of worker and nuclear safety programs in the agency’s facilities, which are located in many different states, including the state in which Engineer A is licensed, State Y. Engineer A is not required to be licensed by the federal agency, but has become licensed because of his personal commitment to the engineering profession.

Engineer A has never used his seal in the course of his employment. When Engineer A moves to State Z, he does not obtain an engineering license in State Z. Engineer A reads a newspaper account about LMN Engineering, a subcontractor to the federal agency in which he works, having a conflict of interest with the agency. Engineer A, acting on his ethical obligation to report violations of the NSPE Code of Ethics to a public authority, files a complaint against LMN Engineering. In the text of the complaint, Engineer A indicates that he is licensed in State Y but not licensed in State Z and signs the letter “Engineer A, P.E.”

Engineer A is thereafter notified by the State Z engineering licensure board that his use of the title “P.E.” in the letter is inappropriate because he is not licensed in State Z.

Questions:
1. Was it ethical for Engineer A to indicate in a State Z complaint letter, in which he had already indicated that he was not licensed in State Z, that he was a professional engineer?
2. Did Engineer A have an ethical obligation under the NSPE Code of Ethics to file a complaint in a state in which he was not licensed?

References:
Section II.1. - Code of Ethics: Engineers shall hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public.

Section II.1.e. - Code of Ethics: Engineers having knowledge of any alleged violation of this Code shall report thereon to appropriate professional bodies and, when relevant, also to public authorities, and cooperate with the proper authorities in furnishing such information or assistance as may be required.

Section II.3. - Code of Ethics: Engineers shall issue public statements only in an objective and truthful manner.

Section II.3.b. - Code of Ethics: Engineers may express publicly technical opinions that are founded upon knowledge of the facts and competence in the subject matter.
Discussion:
The use of appropriate engineering titles has long been an important issue within the engineering profession. Misuse of engineering titles has the effect of misleading and deceiving the general public, as well as diminishing the image and stature of qualified engineering professionals. In recent years, efforts have been undertaken to educate individuals and companies about the inappropriate use of engineering titles or references by many engineering organizations and state engineering licensure boards. State engineering licensure boards have also increasingly taken a stricter position on the use of the reference, “P.E.,” by licensed engineers not licensed in the state in which the reference is being used. In fact, some states have developed guidelines on appropriate use of the “P.E.” reference.

The NSPE Board of Ethical Review has had recent occasion to consider the use of appropriate engineering titles. For example, the Board has had three occasions to consider cases involving alleged misrepresentation of credentials or status. BER Case No. 90-4 involved the question of whether it was ethical for Engineer Z, a principal in an engineering firm, to continue to represent Engineer X as an employee of his Firm. Engineer X had been employed by Firm Y, a medium-sized engineering consulting firm controlled by Engineer Z. Engineer X was one of a few engineers in Firm Y with expertise in hydrology, but the firm’s work in the field of hydrology did not constitute a significant percentage of its work. Engineer X, an associate with the firm, gave two weeks notice of her intent to move to another firm. Thereafter, Engineer Z continued to distribute a brochure identifying Engineer X as an employee of Firm Y and list Engineer X on the firm’s resume.

In concluding that Engineer Z’s actions were not unethical, the Board noted that under the facts of the case, there was no suggestion that any of the brochures or other promotional material describe Engineer X as a “key employee” in the firm. Nor was there any effort or attempt on the part of Firm Y to highlight the activities or achievements of Engineer X in the field of hydrology. While the facts reveal that Engineer X was one of the few engineers in the firm with expertise in the field of hydrology, Engineer X was not the only engineer in the firm who possessed such expertise. In addition, it appeared that this area of practice did not constitute a significant portion of the services provided by Firm Y. Therefore, the Board concluded that the inclusion of Engineer X’s name in the firm’s brochure and resume did not constitute a misrepresentation of “pertinent facts.”

Importantly, however, in BER Case No. 90-4, the Board went on to note that “We must make clear that we are not condoning the failure of an engineering firm to correct material (brochures, resumes, etc.) which might have the unintentional effect of misleading clients, potential clients, and others. While we recognize the realities of firm practice and the logistical problems involved in marketing and promotion, we do believe it is important for firms to take actions to
expeditiously correct any false impressions which might exist.” The Board continued by noting that “we believe engineering firms that use printed material as part of their marketing efforts should take reasonable steps to assure that such written matter is as accurate and up-to-date as possible. In the case of marketing brochures and other similar materials, errata sheets, cover letters, strike-outs and, if necessary, reprints should be employed within a reasonable period of time to correct inaccuracies, particularly where a firm has reason to believe that a misunderstanding might occur. Firms that fail to take such measures run the risk of breaching ethical behavior.”

Later, in BER Case No. 91-9, the Board considered a case involving Engineer A, who misrepresented his educational credentials. In carefully considering earlier BER opinions, the Board again noted that the issue of falsification or misrepresentation of academic or professional qualifications is a core ethical issue because it goes to the heart of engineering ethics—the protection of the public health and safety through the establishment of rules of conduct that help to assure that the public receives the highest quality engineering services possible.

The Board has noted its deep concern over situations and circumstances in which an individual expressly or implicitly falsifies or misrepresents academic or professional qualifications to employers, clients, or members of the public.

More recently, in BER Case No. 97-8, Engineer A was licensed as a professional engineer in State B, the state in which Engineer A resided. Engineer A was about to retire from his full-time employment with ENG Co. As part of this transition and because Engineer A would no longer be engaged in the practice of engineering under his state’s law, Engineer A planned to discontinue his professional engineering license, which was paid for by his former employer. Engineer A planned to continue serving on several local governmental boards. Because of his association with and the pride he had for engineering, Engineer A wanted to continue to use the P.E. designation after his name on his board business card and on the board’s letterhead. Engineer A took pride in his longstanding status as a professional engineer and believed he would be giving professional engineering added recognition by including the reference on the letterhead, which included other individuals such as attorneys and architects. State B did not have a provision in its law addressing the issue of “inactive status.” In reviewing this issue, the Board noted that at first blush, the facts appeared to present a set of circumstances that would dictate an obvious result. It would appear on its face that an individual who has a close affinity with the engineering profession during his or her lifetime should be permitted to continue to use the P.E. designation after retirement. Once earned, it would seem unjust to deny one the right to call oneself a professional engineer (P.E.), particularly where the individual is seeking to enhance the recognition of professional engineers and professional engineering.

However, upon further examination, the Board deemed the issue to be more complex than first thought and raised the question of misrepresentation of credentials or status. The facts in BER Case No. 97-8 were quite different in degree than those involved in the earlier cases reviewed, and the Board noted that the facts did involve a degree, albeit slight, of misrepresentation. While
it was true that Engineer A had demonstrated the necessary qualifications to be licensed as a professional engineer, Engineer A made a conscious and intentional decision to cease maintaining his status as a professional engineer in his state. While the Board recognized and appreciated Engineer A’s desire to enhance the status and image of all professional engineers by indicating his professional status, they believed it was important that this status be represented in a manner that is above reproach, particularly because of the very public nature of Engineer A’s position on several local governmental boards. The Board concluded that at a minimum, Engineer A should have indicated his inactive or retired status next to the P.E. designation. To do otherwise would create a misleading impression that Engineer A was currently licensed under state law in the jurisdiction in which he resided, and this could potentially cause embarrassment to all professional engineers. There was nothing demeaning or derogatory for an engineer to provide this straightforward and simple clarification in his status. To do so would clearly be consistent with the letter and the spirit of the law and avoid any possible questions or doubts about any actions, however unintentional, to mislead or deceive anyone concerning Engineer A’s current status as an engineer. The Board concluded that it would be ethical for Engineer A to continue to use the P.E. designation after his name, as long as Engineer A indicated his inactive or retired status next to the P.E. designation, and as long as this was done in compliance with the state engineering licensing laws and regulations.

Turning to the facts in the instant case, the Board believes that the conclusion reached in BER Case No. 97-8 is partly applicable to the discussion in the present case. As noted earlier, the Board recognizes that state engineering licensure boards are becoming increasingly strict on the use of engineering titles and references. However, in view of Engineer A’s clarification in the body of his letter to the engineering licensure board concerning his licensure status in states Y and Z, and the fact that the complaint letter was sent to a limited group of individuals, the Board believes that Engineer A was not attempting to mislead or deceive the board or any other group or individual concerning his licensure status. Instead, the Board believes Engineer A’s actions were probably an oversight, or at worst, a misunderstanding of the law or requirements of State Z.

Therefore, the Board cannot conclude that Engineer A’s actions, although criticized by a state engineering licensure board, amount to a violation of the NSPE Code. At the same time, the Board must caution all engineering licensees on the need to be familiar with the technical requirements contained in applicable state engineering licensure statutes and regulations to avoid unintended violations of the law.

The NSPE Code of Ethics is a national code of ethics and this Board believes the NSPE Code obligates NSPE members to report ethical violations to the appropriate authorities in whatever jurisdiction the NSPE member observes the violation. This obligation is separate and apart from the obligation a professional engineer may have under state law.

As to the second question, Engineer A’s actions are fully consistent with the professional and ethical obligation to hold paramount the health, safety and welfare of the public. While this
obligation is codified in state laws, its application cannot be restricted within state boundaries. The NSPE Code of Ethics is a national code of ethics and this Board believes the NSPE Code obligates NSPE members to report ethical violations to the appropriate authorities in whatever jurisdiction the NSPE member observes the violation. This obligation is separate and apart from the obligation a Professional Engineer may have under state law.

Conclusions:
1. It was ethical for Engineer A to indicate in a State Z complaint letter, in which he had already indicated that he was not licensed in the State Z, that he was a professional engineer. However, Engineer A has an obligation to become familiar with the legal requirements contained in applicable state engineering licensure statutes and regulations to avoid unintended violations of the law in the future.

2. Engineer A did have an ethical responsibility under the NSPE Code of Ethics to file a complaint in a state in which he was not licensed.
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NOTE: The NSPE Board of Ethical Review (BER) considers ethical cases involving either real or hypothetical matters submitted to it from NSPE members, other engineers, public officials and members of the public. The BER reviews each case in the context of the NSPE Code and earlier BER opinions. The facts contained in each case do not necessarily represent all of the pertinent facts submitted to or reviewed by the BER.

Each opinion is intended as guidance to individual practicing engineers, students and the public. In regard to the question of application of the NSPE Code to engineering organizations (e.g., corporations, partnerships, sole-proprietorships, government agencies, university engineering departments, etc.), the specific business form or type should not negate nor detract from the conformance of individuals to the NSPE Code. The NSPE Code deals with professional services—which must be performed by real persons. Real persons in turn establish and implement policies within business structures.

This opinion is for educational purposes only. It may be reprinted without further permission, provided that this statement is included before or after the text of the case and that appropriate attribution is provided to the National Society of Professional Engineers’ Board of Ethical Review. Visit www.nspe.org and learn how to obtain volumes that include NSPE Opinions (or call 800/417-0348).