

**Continuing Professional Development for VT Licensed Professional Engineers Survey**



**1. Do you believe that continuing education should be required to maintain licensure in Vermont?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		61.1%	154
No		38.9%	98
	Comment (optional)		23
	answered question		252
	skipped question		0

**2. Do you believe that continuing education will add credibility & value to the engineering profession in Vermont?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		61.5%	155
No		38.5%	97
	Comment (optional)		16
	answered question		252
	skipped question		0

### 3. In how many states do you hold a Professional Engineering License?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1		11.5%	29
2		10.7%	27
3		6.0%	15
4		7.5%	19
5		7.1%	18
6-10		18.7%	47
>10		38.5%	97
<b>answered question</b>			<b>252</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>0</b>

### 4. How many years have you been a licensed PE in Vermont?

		Response Percent	Response Count
<1		0.0%	0
1-5		0.0%	0
6-10		100.0%	252
11-15		0.0%	0
16-20		0.0%	0
>20		0.0%	0
<b>answered question</b>			<b>252</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>0</b>

### 5. Is the engineering firm that you work for located in Vermont?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		19.4%	49
No		75.8%	191
Not Applicable		4.8%	12
<b>answered question</b>			<b>252</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>0</b>

### 6. Approximately how many staff comprise the engineering firm that you work for?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1-5		25.8%	65
6-10		10.3%	26
11-20		14.7%	37
21-40		7.1%	18
41-60		6.7%	17
61-100		8.3%	21
101-200		6.0%	15
>200		21.0%	53
<b>answered question</b>			<b>252</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>0</b>

**7. Approximately what percentage of your workload is actively performed for projects located in the State of Vermont?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
0		31.7%	80
1-20		52.8%	133
21-40		2.4%	6
41-60		2.0%	5
61-80		1.6%	4
81-100		9.5%	24
<b>answered question</b>			<b>252</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>0</b>

**8. Currently, the Vermont Professional Engineering License renewal fee is \$80 every two years. Would you support the following bi-annual fee increase to cover the administrative costs that may be required to manage a continuing professional development program?**

	Yes	No	Response Count
\$20	58.1% (136)	41.9% (98)	234
\$40	20.3% (40)	79.7% (157)	197
>\$40	6.7% (13)	93.3% (181)	194
<b>answered question</b>			<b>252</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>0</b>

**9. How will the cost of obtaining 12 professional development hours (PDHs) impact you or your firm on an annual basis?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
No impact		34.5%	87
<b>Negligible impact</b>		<b>38.5%</b>	<b>97</b>
Moderate impact		18.7%	47
Severe impact		8.3%	21
answered question			<b>252</b>
skipped question			<b>0</b>

**10. Do you think “in-house” technical sessions should qualify as an acceptable PDH?**

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		<b>81.3%</b>	<b>205</b>
No		18.7%	47
answered question			<b>252</b>
skipped question			<b>0</b>

**11. Do you have any other comments?**

	Response Count
	74
answered question	<b>74</b>
skipped question	<b>178</b>

**Q1. Do you believe that continuing education should be required to maintain licensure in Vermont?**

1	As a professional there is a responsibility to continue to develop. Requiring continuing education credits is not necessary	Jul 17, 2012 8:25 PM
2	I've taken many accredited seminar/webinars and the best development I've received in my career is through reading/researching - which you don't get credit for	Jul 17, 2012 8:00 PM
3	A good engineer is always learning new things and keeping up with the latest new techniques and changes in the codes. Most courses offered are not relevant and are just a meaningless requirement. I would take courses and training specific to my discipline regardless of state requirements.	Jul 17, 2012 7:18 PM
4	I am torn. I guess yes because it is good to keep up with the industry, but what is acceptable education is the question.	Jun 1, 2012 10:18 AM
5	I think professionals understand the need for continued development without the requirement, but I do not have a strong objection to it.	May 31, 2012 9:51 PM
6	As long as the continuing education from other states are accepted.	May 31, 2012 7:44 PM
7	see #11	May 31, 2012 8:10 AM
8	Continuing education for practicing engineers happens "on the job."	May 17, 2012 4:49 PM
9	Many New England professionals are licensed in multiple states and both NH & ME require continuing professional development so it is being done anyway.	May 11, 2012 9:07 PM
10	Most continuing education programs that I have attended did not make me a better engineer. At least half were a complete waste of my time. Perhaps 10 total in the last 15 years were beneficial. With that being said, I fully expect this proposition to pass, and the next renewal I will tell you about all my C.E.	May 11, 2012 8:44 PM
11	Less correlation between CEU than related work for keeping professional capability.	May 8, 2012 4:26 PM
12	Licensed engineers should not need to take short courses to remain competent.	May 8, 2012 3:18 PM
13	It is essential if we want to increase our public value and corresponding fee!	May 8, 2012 2:05 PM
14	This raises the question of how much continuing education.	May 6, 2012 1:03 PM
15	It would further encourage professionals to advance. With the changing codes, it will provide more opportunities to learn and understand these changes.	Apr 14, 2012 10:44 AM
16	I think this is something that needs to be done carefully. My experience in NY was that maintaining your PE through continuing education required a significant financial investment which would be difficult for many small VT engineers to bear.	Apr 10, 2012 4:04 PM
17	Mandatory Continuing Education should be required only if Vermont can avoid the problems with limited resources for approval of course material (i.e. Practicing Institute of Engineering (P.I.E) in New York). I like the AIA approach.	Apr 9, 2012 9:12 AM
18	Good quality engineers already continue their education. Poor quality engineers	Apr 8, 2012 5:24 AM

**Q1. Do you believe that continuing education should be required to maintain licensure in Vermont?**

do not and would simply find ways to meet any continuing education requirements without actually improving their knowledge or skills. Too many continuing education events are of little worth to make them useful. Vermont could consider a self-reporting process instead, wherein a record of continuing education activities by each licensed engineer is maintained in a database by each engineer if there's a desire to create some track record.

19	Not sure, I don't have a problem with this as long as Vermont would accept the same hours that other states do and not have hours good only in Vermont.	Apr 6, 2012 2:30 PM
20	WHile I understand the reason for continuing education the probelm I have is that no credit is given to engineers like myself who are actively invoved in the engineering profession every day and really are not in need to accumulate continuing education hours. I think only engineers who are not activly participating in the engineering field should be required to accumlate CEU's	Apr 2, 2012 3:22 PM
21	Only if PE credits from other states are applicable and reciprocal.	Apr 1, 2012 8:10 PM
22	I am not aware of ANY correlation between required continuing education and improved professional engineering practice or ethics.	Apr 1, 2012 4:47 PM
23	Each credit should count toward each state in which a license is held. In other words, 12 credits per year should count toward the requirement in both Vermont and New York.	Mar 29, 2012 5:57 PM

**Q2. Do you believe that continuing education will add credibility & value to the engineering profession in Vermont?**

1	I think disciplines need to be more clearly distinguished that will add credibility	Jul 17, 2012 8:00 PM
2	see #11	May 31, 2012 8:10 AM
3	Provided the CE is focused on engineering skill development and ethics.	May 17, 2012 3:35 PM
4	Definitely should add value presumably the educational activities are relevant to expanding knowledge in current field(s) of practice.	May 17, 2012 1:17 PM
5	Most people outside of the profession are fooled into believing that C.E. actually works, so they will think I'm a better structural engineer for taking C.E.	May 11, 2012 8:44 PM
6	I feel this is more of a push from academia than real value added.	May 8, 2012 4:26 PM
7	See above	May 8, 2012 2:05 PM
8	Well, maybe.	May 6, 2012 1:03 PM
9	But this value is not outweighed by my concern expressed in #1 above.	Apr 10, 2012 4:04 PM
10	It requires engineers to stay abreast of current technology and trends.	Apr 9, 2012 9:12 AM
11	I have attended very many events that would qualify as continuing education. Few of them result in significant enough improvement of knowledge or skills to warrant being a requirement. The most useful education opportunities are the most expensive and least convenient; people who really want to improve already go to those. The least useful are often the least expensive and most convenient; people who just want to meet the requirement are likely to attend those, and we will have gained nothing in stature or quality.	Apr 8, 2012 5:24 AM
12	This depends on the class requirements.	Apr 6, 2012 2:30 PM
13	The engineering profession does have credibility in Vermont. However, our profession will be stronger by providing increased collaboration and educational opportunities.	Apr 4, 2012 11:36 AM
14	I don't see the benefit for civil and structural engineers. As professionals we have to keep current with the specifications in the areas where we practice. If we have the need to go into a different area it is our responsibility as a professional to become proficient. I don't believe that continuing education will go into the subjects in the depth required nor is there any guarantee that it would be available at the right time. Continuing education will not turn an unprincipled engineer into a good professional.	Apr 4, 2012 9:33 AM
15	The continuing education requirement is frankly a tol for providers to charge engineers a fee to take online courses simply to fulfill thier professional licensure renewals.	Apr 2, 2012 3:22 PM
16	See comment above.	Apr 1, 2012 4:47 PM

**Q11. Do you have any other comments?**

1	I am in support of PDH. However some state requirements, NY for instance, are onerous for those living out of state to the point of being unachievable without considerable expense. Please don't follow NY State's model.	Jul 17, 2012 7:23 PM
2	Current CEU training requirements for other states don't have reciprocity to other states. If VT imposes CEU requirements I will suspend my VT license	Jul 17, 2012 6:47 PM
3	PDHs have a very large impact particularly on small firms. The lost billable time and expense of the courses/seminars has a big impact and the benefit is minimal for experienced engineers.	Jul 17, 2012 6:43 PM
4	The requirement for continuing education credits is a growing trend in many states. in my opinion the time spent taking what are generally very superficial courses is wasted. These programs benefit CEC providers more than the public interest. I don't believe they make engineers better.	Jul 17, 2012 6:09 PM
5	Many states have this requirement. It should be of little impact to most that already live to this requirement in other states. It definitely assists in ensuring currency in this profession.	Jul 17, 2012 6:05 PM
6	Q10 - Up to a maximum, say max 6 hours can be "in-house" of hte total 12 hours required.	Jun 1, 2012 10:23 AM
7	"In-house" technical sessions provide an unfair advantage to larger firms and reduce the courses offered elsewhere.	Jun 1, 2012 10:18 AM
8	Please be consistent with NCEES recommendations.	Jun 1, 2012 10:17 AM
9	What adds credibility & value to the engineering profession is quality individuals performing consistently excellent work. Cont. ed. has become an industry to turn profit & drive membership in organizations rather than enhance the engineering profession.	Jun 1, 2012 7:38 AM
10	good luck!	Jun 1, 2012 7:16 AM
11	I am not renewing. I do not work in Vermont any longer.	Jun 1, 2012 6:29 AM
12	Use best practices for continuing education by reviewing what other states required. Florida's requirement for rules, laws, etc. Every renewal period is excellent - most P.E.'s do not know what really constitutes plan stamping. Contact me with questions or suggestions mchow@metrocdengineering.com	May 31, 2012 9:42 PM
13	Keeping track of various states requirements is burdensome.	May 31, 2012 9:06 PM
14	For those licensed in many states there should be no restrictions on where the PDH was obtained as long as it pertains to the field of engineering. Laws + ethics from any state should be acceptable and credit for patents as well. Proof of credits should only be produced on an audit basis.	May 31, 2012 9:03 PM
15	If the technical sessions can be accredited the same and other sources of PDH credit (for Q10), I am a strong believer in continuing education, both on the technical side and on the topic of professional ethics. I think that you should require that engineers licensed in the state of Vermont take from 12 to 15 hours of certified, professional, discipline specific, technical hours, and at least 1 hour	May 31, 2012 8:10 AM

### Q11. Do you have any other comments?

of ethics instruction, each year. It is my experience that in-house "training" often takes the form of a 45 minute lunch and learn presentation with the topics quite frequently being on the elementary side. The lunch and learn classes are usually offered for all employees to attend - which is good on its own merit - but by nature of the casual mix of attendees - even engineering issues cannot be addressed due to the varied background of the class. Yet my working experience has also been that there is little budget for engineering employees to regularly leave the office and attend an outside training function of true rigor and merit - such as an ASME Training Class, say, on Pressure Vessel Design; something I did a few years ago which was indeed rigorous and though provoking, but also expensive and time consuming as I was out of the office for a week dedicated to training. Thankfully I have recently (last few years) found that the quality of correspondence study has dramatically improved during the last 7 to 10 years, with what appears to be a recent spike in quality during the last 3 to 5 years. There are now many correspondence study opportunities including ethics classes which I have found to be of great value. It is my opinion that practicing engineers can get all of the training hours needed each year through correspondence or on-line training. Still there is expense; thankfully once again, I work for an employer who supports me with this effort. Call me if you would like more feedback.

16	In house technical sessions are very important in order to keep up with technology.	May 31, 2012 7:34 AM
17	I adamantly do not support this!!	May 17, 2012 5:00 PM
18	At most, continuing education for P.E.s should reside within the P.E.'s "home state," and should apply to other states by comity. Continuing education requirements for multiple state P.E. boards is very impractical for engineers working in multiple states and is unnecessary.	May 17, 2012 4:49 PM
19	In-house credits only if they are backed up with sufficient documentation to prove they are acceptable.	May 17, 2012 3:35 PM
20	Already do 36 hrs./3yrs. for NYS & others. So no impact. Get with it!	May 17, 2012 3:32 PM
21	Allow out of state engineers to use their home state continuing education hours to apply to Vermont.	May 17, 2012 3:32 PM
22	A PE should keep up to date on the progress and changes made within his/her specialty.	May 17, 2012 2:49 PM
23	Continuing education credits from other states should be credited so that engineers don't have to duplicate course work for each state they are licensed in.	May 17, 2012 1:59 PM
24	It is not a cost issue...Time is not important. PDH courses often have little to do with one's area of practice and are of marginal value.	May 17, 2012 1:49 PM
25	The biggest issue is credit management. For instance one member of my firm has to maintain credits for NY PE, LEED AP commissioning provider. VT needs to find a way to align for instance with NY so if a course is accepted by NY it is by VT.	May 17, 2012 1:17 PM

**Q11. Do you have any other comments?**

26	10. Absolutely. CHA provides in house training for 250 professionals.	May 11, 2012 8:53 PM
27	6. This includes architects and other engineering disciplines. 10. The "in-house" programs are very practical and are geared toward improving the engineers on staff. Presenters can be quite candid without fear.	May 11, 2012 8:44 PM
28	Part of the responsibility of being a "professional" engineer is to keep yourself current and up to date within your areas of practice. To codify that and make it a "rule" is an insult to the profession.	May 9, 2012 11:27 AM
29	I currently must obtain continuing education hours in several other states, so adding this requirement to VT would have minor impact.	May 9, 2012 11:17 AM
30	1.) I am licensed in 40+ states and to be honest my need to stay current with technology outweighs any requirement for PDHs. 2.) Most PDHs are a joke. I pass with no effort and does not make me a better engineer. Thank you.	May 9, 2012 11:14 AM
31	A5 states - most require 15 hrs/yr.	May 9, 2012 11:11 AM
32	I would recommend adopting reasonable guidelines for items qualifying as acceptable CE credits, primarily technical sessions/seminars in the engineers area of practice. Several states have gone overboard in the CE requirements such as allowing only board pre-approved courses or having to go through specific organizations such as ACI or ASCE which are normally very costly.	May 9, 2012 11:05 AM
33	Continuing education is a gimmick w/little or no redeeming value (there are exceptions). With budgets and time constraints, freeing up this valuable time is often difficult.	May 9, 2012 10:51 AM
34	Cont. ed is not an issue as other states I have PE in require PDH. Be sure program matches up with national model.	May 9, 2012 10:23 AM
35	9. I get plenty through normal work efforts. I feel strongly all should continue education through (?), conf., seminars, peer discussions, etc. But do not feel CEU requirements add value to the profession.	May 8, 2012 4:26 PM
36	Question 10 is very important to allow, it saves the engineering firm money to help educate staff.	May 8, 2012 4:05 PM
37	In these tough financial times many small firms like the one that I formally belonged to are having a difficult time just staying afloat. To impose this additional cost burden on them & their engineers will only add to the challenge of keeping their doors open.	May 8, 2012 3:30 PM
38	I currently need continuing education for other states and it has become a scam for online courses that I learned nothing from but satisfy a requirement.	May 8, 2012 3:18 PM
39	Having been attending professional development courses for other states licensure, the class material, in my opinion, is not worth the added time or cost: no added value.	May 8, 2012 2:50 PM
40	Do not make PDHs specific to Vermont. My continuing education credits in NYS must be accepted by VT.	May 8, 2012 2:49 PM

**Q11. Do you have any other comments?**

41	Please do not require special classes or requirements just for VT so that one class will apply to all states. Thank you!	May 8, 2012 2:18 PM
42	It is imperative that we move in this direction!	May 8, 2012 2:05 PM
43	Where did the 12 PDHs come from? How about 6? 10. In-house might be okay with a little control such as approval of the instructor and/or approval of the outline.	May 6, 2012 1:03 PM
44	I'm licensed in states that require 30 PDH/2 yrs.	May 6, 2012 1:00 PM
45	No	Apr 29, 2012 2:47 PM
46	PDH's are not necessarily appropriate for all PEs. However, engineering students are typically encourage to pursue life-long learning, but that can be achieved by participating in professional organizations such as IEEE.	Apr 27, 2012 2:13 PM
47	Continuing Education, while positive in concept, has become ineffective. The goal of continuing technical learning has become lost under the rules and regulations that vary among all states, and have served primarily to benefit the companies and universities that provide the "approved" courses.	Apr 22, 2012 3:52 PM
48	It should be the responsibility of a PE to educate themselves in the field that they practice. I see far too many PDH courses offered in things that don't apply to the work PEs perform, and that PEs take just to get credits. By taking them, it doesn't make that PE any better at the work they do, and only supports the companies providing the course.	Apr 21, 2012 1:25 AM
49	"In-house" technical sessions provided by vendors should qualify as acceptable PDH credits. Compare this with AIA 'Lunch and Learn' credits.	Apr 18, 2012 12:02 AM
50	I think requiring PDHs is good, but shouldn't be cumbersome to manage for engineer or board.	Apr 17, 2012 10:51 PM
51	The other states I am currently registered, 12 hours are required, and neither have increased the fees much if any. The records should be maintained by the applicant and an additional question should be added to the application as to whether the 24 PDH's (for 2 years) were attained. You should allow carry over from year to year. If you want to control the types of seminars/webinars, please generally accept seminars from reputable organizations (ASCE, AISC, AIA) to keep cost down for everyone. It can be policed by random review of applicants records. Most organizations already maintain records of all the participants in the seminars so documentation is relatively easy.	Apr 14, 2012 10:44 AM
52	I need to know more about what would be considered an acceptable PDH to effectively weigh in on this survey.	Apr 10, 2012 4:04 PM
53	6. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 3:28 PM
54	6. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 3:26 PM
55	I do not believe CEUs will increase our credibility and suggest this be left to personal choice and motivation.	Apr 10, 2012 12:43 PM

**Q11. Do you have any other comments?**

56	9. Will probably do more out of state work	Apr 10, 2012 12:42 PM
57	I have been required to have cpd for many years now and I have never seen any responsible engineer that I could say was any smarter or better qualified due to Continuing Professional Development.	Apr 10, 2012 12:12 PM
58	I suggest you allow holding an officers position (local or national) for a professional organization be credited for professional development education. In-house technical sessions need to be non-proprietary sessions (i.e. not promoting any products or services) that are approved in advance for credit. If continuing education is required, Vermont should post a list of all approved courses by topic, presenters (and contact info) and estimated costs on-line for access by everyone needing continuing education.	Apr 9, 2012 9:12 AM
59	"In-house" sessions cost the company money, so at least there's the likelihood that the firm would only do ones that actually provide value. How was the value of 12 PDH determined? I would think a value of 8, which is one full day equivalent, makes more sense. I know PEs in other states (e.g., NY) who were challenged enough to find qualifying PDHs that they could not meet the quote in a year and let their licenses lapse (they worked under an industrial exemption) - which would we prefer...active PEs or lapsed PEs? Consider our location - quality PDHs are not found within an hour's drive often. I have driven to Maine and Connecticut for useful educational workshops because they were not offered in our remote, rural state. I chose to do those, so I made a financial decision. If PDHs are required, I will face that expense without choice, whereas I fear (I know) that many PEs will simply attend local, less useful sessions to meet the PDH requirement, giving them an economic advantage through lower costs to their businesses.	Apr 8, 2012 5:24 AM
60	10. No answer I don't have a problem with continuing education, and I do occasionally take courses of interest. However, I feel 12 PDHs/year is too much, and will result in me taking any class just to fill requirements. It also seems to needlessly add bureaucracy. I see no reason for why this is necessary. Please provide evidence of malpractice issues you intend to alleviate.	Apr 6, 2012 4:04 PM
61	10. No answer - depends on who would be doing the in-house training.	Apr 6, 2012 3:45 PM
62	I work for a large firm and I am licensed in many states. NY requires pre-approval for all PDH which is burdensome, even on larger firms.	Apr 6, 2012 3:18 PM
63	Professional development is critical in ensuring competency and aptitude. How a program is implemented is equally important. There are jurisdictions that are making it too difficult to maintain the professional registration due to the stringency of their PDH program, e.g., New York. It is just too time and cost prohibitive. By not having the registration means we can't work in the specific state that requires the P.E. for a project. That's lost opportunity for us and the state. Also, the cost of the PDH's has become outrageous. Most can be completed online (which is good) and yet it is still very expensive. The same with renewals. Most states have electronic renewal and yet registration fees continue to rise for administrative purposes.	Apr 6, 2012 3:18 PM
64	NY fees are much higher!	Apr 6, 2012 3:10 PM

**Q11. Do you have any other comments?**

65	Florida goes to the extreme in its limited use of PDHs. If you do go to PDHs, if attendance at seminars by organizations including ASCE/BSCE/NEWEA etc. counts towards PDH, then having PDHs is very attainable over the course of the 2 years between renewals. NH system is very good.	Apr 6, 2012 2:23 PM
66	CE is a waste of time & money. Working professionals are unduly burdened.	Apr 6, 2012 12:00 PM
67	*10 I did not give a direct yes or no answer, because over the years, I have found some in-house technical sessions to be very worthy, but others were marginal or next to useless. I think that the agency or company should submit prior to the sessions to see if the material justifies recognition for PDHs. 11 I would hope that PDHs earned for one state would also be useable in Vermont.	Apr 5, 2012 6:29 PM
68	Continuing education, as first envisioned, made some sense, in that because other Professions do it, PEs should do it also. It has become a racket, both for the CE providers and the State Boards. Most PEs look for a program or educational experience that will directly benefit them by adding to their knowledge base. Unfortunately, what most do is to take whatever is cheapest and most available. They wind up getting more from the social aspect of the group meeting than anything else. For those who use online services, they don't even get that. Because I am licensed in multiple jurisdictions, and their various renewal dates, I have to maintain a CE schedule that requires attendance almost quarterly. I normally average over 20 hours per year. Why 12? Why not 15 hours in accordance with the Model Law and most other State Boards?	Apr 5, 2012 4:52 PM
69	In my opinion this requirement will only have a minimal impact on the professional development of engineers. The vast majority of engineers will always be proactive and stay on top of the latest technologies, codes and standards in their field anyways.	Apr 5, 2012 8:47 AM
70	In-house technical sessions should qualify as acceptable PDH's with some conditions. Please consider only making this a portion of the PDH's eligible for credit.	Apr 4, 2012 11:36 AM
71	note - answers to questions 6 and 7 are required, however i do not work for an 'engineering firm' per se. The responses provided are attributed to the company that i work for.	Apr 3, 2012 3:55 PM
72	No	Apr 3, 2012 9:10 AM
73	Requiring continuing education is unnecessary, and reduces the meaning of "professional." Professionals that are interested in improving their practice will seek continuing education on their own and will select venues most appropriate to their needs, interests, and business goals. Mandated education leads to professional to take unnecessary and needless courses simply to satisfy an arbitrary requirement. The result is a waste of money and resources that could otherwise be used in a much more productive and effective manner. As a professional engineer licensed in 15 states, many of which required continuing education, I see absolutely no benefit to the public, my employer, my career, or the profession by requiring professionals to meet an arbitrary standard. It is a unnecessary distraction of performing our roles as public stewards and employees of professional organizations. Perhaps Vermont should try a different and more appropriate approach to license renewal that actually addresses the	Apr 1, 2012 4:47 PM

**Q11. Do you have any other comments?**

individual's character, ethics, and project performance, and promotes the standards of our profession.

74

Would like to make sure that any PDHs can be used to satisfy multiple states' continuing education requirements.

Mar 31, 2012 9:01 PM