

Vermont Professional Engineers With Only Vermont Licensure

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		48.1%	103
No		51.9%	111
	Comment (optional)		46
	answered question		214
	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		49.5%	106
No		50.5%	108
	Comment (optional)		39
	answered question		214
	skipped question		0




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

		Response Percent	Response Count
1		100.0%	214
2		0.0%	0
3		0.0%	0
4		0.0%	0
5		0.0%	0
6-10		0.0%	0
>10		0.0%	0
answered question			214
skipped question			0









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

		Response Percent	Response Count
<1		3.3%	7
1-5		18.7%	40
6-10		13.6%	29
11-15		16.8%	36
16-20		9.8%	21
>20		37.9%	81
answered question			214
skipped question			0







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

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		62.1%	133
No		16.8%	36
Not Applicable		21.0%	45
answered question			214
skipped question			0

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

		Response Percent	Response Count
1-5		35.5%	76
6-10		6.5%	14
11-20		9.3%	20
21-40		6.1%	13
41-60		5.6%	12
61-100		7.9%	17
101-200		4.7%	10
>200		24.3%	52
answered question			214
skipped question			0

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

		Response Percent	Response Count
0		24.8%	53
1-20		13.1%	28
21-40		2.3%	5
41-60		3.7%	8
61-80		4.2%	9
81-100		51.9%	111
answered question			214
skipped question			0

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	58.4% (115)	41.6% (82)	197
\$40	30.9% (51)	69.1% (114)	165
>\$40	9.8% (16)	90.2% (148)	164
answered question			214
skipped question			0

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		9.8%	21
Negligible impact		31.3%	67
Moderate impact		43.5%	93
Severe impact		15.4%	33
answered question			214
skipped question			0

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

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		74.3%	159
No		25.7%	55
answered question			214
skipped question			0

11. Do you have any other comments?

	Response Count
	88
answered question	88
skipped question	126

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

1	Most of the CE (w/PDHS) have little to no depth while other CE topics have no PDHS do add value.	Jul 17, 2012 8:31 PM
2	As a professional there is a responsibility to continue to develop. Requiring continuing education credits is not necessary	Jul 17, 2012 8:25 PM
3	Not sure yet, see comment below	Jul 17, 2012 8:24 PM
4	Mandating something that should be part of being a good engineer isn't going to make a stagnant one any better.	Jun 1, 2012 10:31 AM
5	Has there been instances of unprofessionalism or something to precipitate this discussion other than the fact that the majority of other states require C. E.?	Jun 1, 2012 7:41 AM
6	What constitutes continuing education will be the important factor.	May 17, 2012 5:45 PM
7	It is valuable to continue learning and progressing in your chosen field.	May 17, 2012 4:45 PM
8	I have other credentials that require PDHs and they are not effective.	May 17, 2012 4:18 PM
9	CE courses I've seen are ineffective and only result in revenue to those offering courses.	May 17, 2012 3:17 PM
10	I have always wondered why this isn't a requirement. It will be important to find flexible ways on-line classes, etc to allow engineers to get required courses.	May 17, 2012 1:58 PM
11	I believe continuing education becomes more of a checklist item than something that adds value. The VSPE could better facilitate the maintaining of professionalism by making resources available.	May 9, 2012 11:38 AM
12	Unless solid statistics indicate VT practitioners are less competent than engineers in states requiring continuing ed, why add more complexity to a system that's working?	May 9, 2012 10:05 AM
13	But it can be done effectively through internet, google.	May 8, 2012 4:03 PM
14	Are there any statistics indicative of enhanced public safety or customer value in states with CE requirements?	May 8, 2012 4:01 PM
15	Continuing education should be on a voluntary basis.	May 8, 2012 3:28 PM
16	My education continues as a result of my work.	May 8, 2012 3:25 PM
17	Continuing education is inherent in professional work within field/specialty. I attend & teach at seminars in my field regularly. Basically I believe making this a requirement is a job/money making idea for someone.	May 8, 2012 2:47 PM
18	This raises the question of how much continuing education.	May 6, 2012 1:03 PM
19	All professions and skilled trades have continuing education requirements as do most occupational certification programs. Why engineers don't has always been a mystery to me.	Apr 20, 2012 10:15 AM
20	I believe that a person should continue to grow and learn as an engineer and the	Apr 17, 2012 12:50 PM

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

PDHs allow for a person to see what is transpiring in the area of the individuals professional expertise. However, I know other licensed professionals (medical, engineering, architecture, etc.) that have PDH credit requirements and how some of the PDH requirements are met is questionable. I think it is an individual responsibility to attain knowledge and continued learning to help protect and preserve the values to hold life and public safety paramount.

21	I believe that a person should continue to grow and learn as an engineer and the PDHs allow for a person to see what is transpiring in the area of the individuals professional expertise. However, I know other licensed professionals (medical, engineering, architecture, etc.) that have PDH credit requirements and how some of the PDH requirements are met is questionable. I think it is an individual responsibility to attain knowledge and continued learning to help protect and preserve the values to hold life and public safety paramount.	Apr 17, 2012 12:50 PM
22	As a profession engineer maintaining your license, an individual should feel compelled by the ethics of our profession to ensure that they are continuing to update themselves and "stay current" within the field of engineering. Another requirement is just a burden and additional expense on top of already busy schedules and overburdened budgets. I would recommend that if a continuing education requirement is adopted that Vermont, like several other states who require continuing education, also implement an active duty military member waiver for PEs who maintain a license in the state of Vermont but are serving in the Active Duty military.	Apr 16, 2012 10:15 AM
23	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
24	Adamant no. We already do enough to stay current.	Apr 10, 2012 3:50 PM
25	Should be left up to the individual's professional ethics to stay current, NOT at the behest of big brother or nanny state.	Apr 10, 2012 3:37 PM
26	No answer: Not sure. It depends on the number of hours and the nature of the courses.	Apr 10, 2012 3:24 PM
27	I don't think it's a good time to start requiring new thinkgs.	Apr 10, 2012 3:18 PM
28	No answer	Apr 10, 2012 3:17 PM
29	Adds burden to existing PEs but totally misses the goal.	Apr 10, 2012 2:24 PM
30	If it is those who already have a license should be exempted (grandfathered).	Apr 10, 2012 11:29 AM
31	MAINLY WHEN TECHNOLOGY, RULES, AND LAWS IN VERMONT AND THE NATION SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE FOR THE PLANNING, DESIGN OR CONSTRUCTION OF ENGINEERING PROJECTS WITHIN LICENSED DISIPLINES.	Apr 8, 2012 8:40 PM
32	While an engineer should keep up with the changes in his/her area of work, there is no guarantee that the additional CEU would be in that area. Also,	Apr 8, 2012 3:10 PM

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

Continung Education can be very expensive. ASCE courses cost about \$800 per CEU before expenses are considered. A 1.5 CEU course can cost \$2,500 or more. If 8 CUEs are required this could cost \$20,000. And have nothing to do with the work being done! My whole 4 years of undergrad at UVM between 1966 and 1970 only cost \$6,000 Total. I am not certain of the relationship between CEUs and PDHs so my response is equating 1 CUE to 1 PDH

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 33 | Good quality engineers already continue their education. Poor quality engineers 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. | Apr 8, 2012 5:24 AM |
| 34 | Nearly all of the professional development classes I have taken or seen offered have been of little educational or professional value. | Apr 6, 2012 3:51 PM |
| 35 | This same requirement is for land surveyors and now the info is repetitive. Considering this would require one taveling, the cost for transportation will add up. | Apr 6, 2012 3:23 PM |
| 36 | I have mixed feelings on this issue: i believe any good professional should be responsible for maintaining their own technical competence, which is specific to their practice, and which cannot be dictated by someone else. Competence should be voluntarily maintained by membership in technical societies, regular reading of technical literature and participation in conferences. Required continuing education suggests that licensed professionals can abdicate this responsibility, and is suggestive of an overall erosion in the standard of professional practice. | Apr 6, 2012 9:30 AM |
| 37 | As long as the requirements are not too onerous. | Apr 5, 2012 3:06 PM |
| 38 | As long as the requirements are not too onerous. | Apr 5, 2012 3:05 PM |
| 39 | I feel that continuing education credits drive up the cost for attending seminars and courses. Organizations holding these events take advantage of the continuing education credits and charge higher fees because they know it is a requirement and PEs have no other choice. | Apr 5, 2012 1:03 PM |
| 40 | See comments below | Apr 3, 2012 9:56 PM |
| 41 | Engineers maintain and enhance their knowledge/skills primarily through a variety of informal methods: learning from other engineers, working on problems/issues, reading from a variety of sources (including off the internet), preparing to give presentations or teach courses, attending conferences, etc. Making continuing education a requirement to maintaining licensure would be an additional bureaucratic burden without meaningful added value. Most of what we learn comes through sources other than traditional education courses. Continuing learning is something all practicing engineers do, but let us do it in our own way using whatever formal (AND INFORMAL) means we deem appropriate. | Apr 3, 2012 4:28 PM |

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

42	Cont.Ed will necessitate additions to OPR staff with attendant cost. Therefore, licensing fees will increase. As professionals we should maintain competency without being required to do so. Most of us already do so. I am also a LS. I've watched our license fee increase to \$400/2 yrs. and the quality of the cont.ed offerings has declined to the point that most are worthless. Cont. ed results in time away from work, costs to attend and no improvement in skill level.	Apr 3, 2012 10:12 AM
43	Your professional judgement and quality of work should determine your ability to conduct business.	Apr 3, 2012 8:22 AM
44	would be helpful to maintain a current view of the engineering world I support the effort.	Apr 2, 2012 8:16 PM
45	As long as it is a simple system based on the New Hampshire system. The New York system is way too strict and much more costly to gain PDHs.	Apr 2, 2012 7:24 PM
46	There is already too much unnecessary bureaucracy and regulation to administer. Besides in order to be competitive a firm needs to stay current this makes PD a critical component of success. Lets not add another layer on to what we are already doing.	Apr 2, 2012 1:25 PM

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

1	No! When assessed for value most CE don't have depth/applicability. they're just done to get PDHs. Yes, also since the general population are ignorant of the eng. profession.	Jul 17, 2012 8:31 PM
2	Yes, somewhat but is it worth the cost and effort?	Jul 17, 2012 8:24 PM
3	Add value - not necessarily credibility	Jul 17, 2012 6:59 PM
4	No necessarily.	Jun 1, 2012 7:41 AM
5	Common sense says that it will.	May 17, 2012 5:45 PM
6	CE courses I've seen are ineffective and only result in revenue to those offering courses	May 17, 2012 3:17 PM
7	Potentially, but only in a minor way...people thinking that states should have it but not asking 'how is this helping?'	May 9, 2012 11:38 AM
8	I think people only use PEs generally because they are required by statute & regulation to do so.	May 9, 2012 11:33 AM
9	Are clients hiring engineers from other states which require continuing ed rather than VT engineers? I don't think so.	May 9, 2012 10:05 AM
10	What's the evidence? What's the cost/benefit?	May 8, 2012 4:01 PM
11	Yes, but not by a requirement.	May 8, 2012 3:28 PM
12	Not necessarily.	May 8, 2012 3:25 PM
13	General public has no clue and probably doesn't care.	May 8, 2012 2:47 PM
14	Well, maybe.	May 6, 2012 1:03 PM
15	More often than not the people who do not see the value in PE licensure do not understand how difficult it already is to become licensed. Requiring PDHs will not change this.	Apr 18, 2012 12:18 AM
16	I believe the general public does not have any knowledge base to assess whether an engineer is credible or not. Let alone other professionals.	Apr 17, 2012 12:50 PM
17	I believe the general public does not have any knowledge base to assess whether an engineer is credible or not. Let alone other professionals.	Apr 17, 2012 12:50 PM
18	I believe the license of being a PE stands on it's own as a source of credibility & value. Again, a true professional is going to ensure they maintain their knowledge base and stay up to date with the technology and changing aspects of the engineering field. Obviously, continuing education has a value and should be available to profession engineers and even encouraged but requiring a minimum standard of "Credits" is going to result in a false sense of credibility. Just because I listen to a few PDH earning lectures or complete some CE credits online does not necessarily mean I am a better Engineer if my motivation is solely to meet the minimum requirement.	Apr 16, 2012 10:15 AM

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

19	But this value is not outweighed by my concern expressed in #1 above.	Apr 10, 2012 4:04 PM
20	Nobody cares as long as their projects are completed on time and under budget.	Apr 10, 2012 3:50 PM
21	Credibility perhaps. But value? How would you go about measuring these elements?	Apr 10, 2012 3:37 PM
22	Credibility, no. Value, yes.	Apr 10, 2012 3:26 PM
23	Probably	Apr 10, 2012 3:24 PM
24	No answer	Apr 10, 2012 3:17 PM
25	Requiring licensure of all engineers is the only way to improve credibility to the ...	Apr 10, 2012 2:24 PM
26	Engineering experience adds credibility.	Apr 10, 2012 11:29 AM
27	See above comment to Question #1.	Apr 8, 2012 3:10 PM
28	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
29	Any responsible engineer will spend time staying current in their profession out of necessity to remain competitive. Moreover, with code requirements constantly changing and new technologies being introduced all the time, any good engineer needs to take action to remain competent. We don't need the state mandating it.	Apr 6, 2012 3:51 PM
30	As long as the requirements are not too onerous.	Apr 5, 2012 3:06 PM
31	As long as the requirements are not too onerous.	Apr 5, 2012 3:05 PM
32	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
33	I do not believe that credibility will be added as internal or external "customers" make judgements on work performance and not classes attended. Depending on content, timing, and assessibility, they may add value to the engineering profession.	Apr 3, 2012 9:56 PM
34	Most people recognize that formal continuing education is only a small fraction of what engineers need to know and learn over time. Would someone think, "oh, this person took two days of classes last year; he must be qualified"? Nobody would think that. Would someone think, "this person did not take two days of classes; he must not be qualified"? Nobody would think that either. The absence or presence of taking continuing education courses is not a useful measure of whether someone is qualified to do engineering work capably or not.	Apr 3, 2012 4:28 PM

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

35	See above. The public has no idea whether or not a PE participates in cont. ed or, for the most part, what it is.	Apr 3, 2012 10:12 AM
36	I do participate in continuing ed. when available, but oppose being required to take course to maintain my license.	Apr 3, 2012 10:08 AM
37	Most of the seminars that provide contact hours for other states are not challenging as a professional. I obtain more information through reading.	Apr 3, 2012 8:22 AM
38	If engineers and engineering societies market the value, it will add credibility to the profession.	Apr 2, 2012 7:24 PM
39	There are many things about the engineering profession that detract from its credibility (# of times exam can be taken, minimal requirements to sit for exam, etc.) requiring continuing education barely scratches the surface. As most continuing education classes are structured to provide the credit with as little effort as possible, the majority of these classes are a joke at best. The entire profession needs attention and starting with continuing education is the least of the issues in my opinion. Given the reasons above I don't want to waste my time with running through the motions, or pay additional money for my trouble.	Apr 2, 2012 8:07 AM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

1	Open all learning as acceptable. ASME GDT cert doesn't qualify for PDHs. Neither does Microsoft's Excel or Word cert. But "Engineering Math" is 3 PDHs. Engineer's math skills are established in school, plus computers. A GDT or Microsoft certification is more valuable and useful (for example) and don't apply. This is why PDHs as currently implemented is ludicrous. Do the math!!	Jul 17, 2012 8:31 PM
2	I have been practicing engineering since 1958 and I plan to continue for at least 9 more years. I am up to date based on my consulting engineering practice.	Jul 17, 2012 8:27 PM
3	It would be desirable to create a category of retired professional engineers who no longer practice but would like to retain the title of PE. People in this category should still pay dues but not be subject to PDH.	Jul 17, 2012 8:13 PM
4	Retired but wish to maintain my Vermont license	Jul 17, 2012 8:04 PM
5	I maintain licensure for professional status, not as a requirement of my job. I have never stamped a print	Jul 17, 2012 7:14 PM
6	I don't think it's necessary for VT to have CPC requirements. Any engineer of any accomplishment will be licensed in neighboring states that require CPC. Therefore most engineers probably already have it that need it.	Jul 17, 2012 7:05 PM
7	I am a retired PE and enjoy keeping my PE. Don't want to take courses.	Jul 17, 2012 7:00 PM
8	In reality continuing ed credits end up being "scrambled for" at the last minute due to the day to day rigors of being a working PE. Thus they are rarely helpful and only disruptive.	Jul 17, 2012 6:53 PM
9	While I have maintained my license all these years as a credential, I have not actively engineered anything in a long time. I do feel there should be more rigorous standards to keep a license (for example proof of recent engineering work).	Jul 17, 2012 6:17 PM
10	Licensing is not a requirement of my position with the federal government and any PDH cost would be out of pocket. I would most likely let my license lapse.	Jun 1, 2012 10:31 AM
11	I hope that this survey is not just an exercise and that you have already made up your minds.	Jun 1, 2012 7:41 AM
12	PD requirements may vary, ie, PE's actively included in design vs other professional positions, such as project management or business development/operation.	Jun 1, 2012 6:31 AM
13	Q10 - If they're taught by a qualified individual, yes. If it's Bob from Accounting, no. Bringing us up to par w/everyone else is a fantastic idea! It's not like we don't run into similar technical challenges as other states. We should have similarly qualified individuals, especially as the industry evolves.	May 31, 2012 9:10 PM
14	I work for a gas turbine manufacturer in Indiana. I have always worked in a technical capacity -- FEA models of hot section rotating equipment -- and have continued to exercise my technical skills. For my job, I do not need a P.E. I have maintained it as a matter of pride but will probably have to drop it when those requirements come to fruition.	May 17, 2012 5:45 PM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

15	We do not need continuing ed.	May 17, 2012 5:02 PM
16	I adamantly do not support this!!	May 17, 2012 5:00 PM
17	Don't support PDHs and continuing education. Continuing education requirements typically result in people wasting time and money on seminars that are not applicable to their professional development needs.	May 17, 2012 4:58 PM
18	In-house: as long as they are related to a specific discipline.	May 17, 2012 4:45 PM
19	Only in the case that one compares in-house vs. non-accredited courses. If we want CE requirements, make those university courses, which have consistent stds.	May 17, 2012 3:17 PM
20	I am retired. Suggest VT PE's with >20 years licensed in VT be grandfathered in (Exempt from PDH).	May 17, 2012 3:09 PM
21	When I was licensed in New Hampshire, professional development was required. I saw little value in it and saw little good come from it.	May 17, 2012 2:59 PM
22	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
23	10. But you need to get some minimum technical criteria. 11. I would prefer you set the update criteria over a two or three year period. That is how they do my wife's CCRN. It might make more sense to do it every two in conjunction with the license. My firm does not have many PEs, so a flexible way to get credits will be important.	May 17, 2012 1:58 PM
24	If you work in field, PDH should not be required.	May 17, 2012 12:58 PM
25	Thanks for asking, this is the first communication I have gotten from VSPE in years.	May 11, 2012 9:21 PM
26	9. If required from a certified CE short course or such. I maintain CE via self study. 10. I think there should be a standard for documenting what was taught/learned, though; and a self study option. It's a difficult situation to navigate & compliance should have a way to recognize self-study CE rather than just certified professionally administered courses which are a "racket" like any other.	May 9, 2012 11:33 AM
27	In a competitive industry like engineering, the dominant firms are already investing in continuing education, and we don't need somebody telling us we have to.	May 9, 2012 10:05 AM
28	10. If performed by outside parties	May 8, 2012 4:21 PM
29	Engineers over 60 years old should be exempt from continuing education.	May 8, 2012 4:07 PM
30	Engineers from excellent universities know how to continue and stay up-to-date in their professions by engr journals and technical network searches.	May 8, 2012 4:03 PM
31	Too many difficulties associated with a simplistic model? What's the real	May 8, 2012 4:01 PM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

concern? Is there evidence of a problem?

32	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
33	Continuing education is the responsibility of every professional. However, the nature of engineering activity varies for each individual and requirements should not be dictated by a third party.	May 8, 2012 3:28 PM
34	9. In time, not money. Wasn't necessary for years, why now? Continuing education is part of the job and I submit need not be tracked & documented as is more an activity for academia. Please send results of this survey to Vermont P.E.s. Thanks.	May 8, 2012 2:47 PM
35	The arch. cont. education credits is a joke. The P.E. will be as well. Let's spend money on permitting and actual project review/inspections.	May 6, 2012 1:06 PM
36	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
37	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
38	I am in a unique position where I am registered as an Electrical Engineer in VT, but do not practice. Being a professional engineer enhances my position as a executive in Facilities Management--adds credentials and credibility--particularly working in the health care environment. I have maintained my registration for these reasons as well as the pride of being a registered engineer. Should this change go into effect I will most likely allow my license to expire and indicate as such on my CV.	Apr 25, 2012 3:55 PM
39	I believe that continuing education/PDH are a waste of time and money and should not be required. They will not elevate the profession. Requiring graduate education would probably have a larger impact on increasing credibility and value of PE's in Vermont.	Apr 20, 2012 9:10 PM
40	I work for the State of Vermont and will probably retire in the next few years, so the expense of continuing education to maintain my registration will all be an expense to me with no return. So, while I support continuing education the cost to me would be significant given that I will not be earning a regular living from my registration. In house training can be valuable but there would have to be some firm criteria on its content and extent, and qualification of instructors.	Apr 20, 2012 10:15 AM
41	10. Provided that the "course" material is approved by those that would have authority in such cases.	Apr 18, 2012 12:18 AM
42	While I understand the potential need and concerns involving the requirement of continuing education requirements for state license- I think we need to consider what the motivation behind continuing education really should be and whether	Apr 16, 2012 10:15 AM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

adding a requirement is necessary. As professionals can't we hold ourselves responsible for being ethically correct within our profession and in doing so staying up to date without the additional administrative and financial burden of adopting these requirements? I do not need a a few hours a year of required lectures to maintain my currency and relevance with my field. I would ask that if a continuing education requirement is adopted that Vermont, then we also implement an active duty military member waiver for PEs who maintain a license in the state of Vermont but are serving in the Active Duty military (other states with continuing education requirements do this- for example Missouri).

43	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
44	7. No answer Currently working on my MS in software engineering - education of this type should qualify for PDHs.	Apr 10, 2012 3:35 PM
45	As a temp in limited srvc position, I will give up the "active" lic. when required to show PDHs.	Apr 10, 2012 3:32 PM
46	6., 9., No answer: NA	Apr 10, 2012 3:29 PM
47	6. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 3:26 PM
48	9. I will be retiring fairly soon so there could be an impact on maintaining a license. 10. If they are equivalent to those that are not "in-house". Would "in-house" be available to other engineers that are not "in-house"? PDH would be good for staying current in a given field. Twelve hours might be difficult for some to schedule, and what would the cost be? Would the requirement be the same for senior engineers?	Apr 10, 2012 3:24 PM
49	I do not agree with instituting PDHs in VT!	Apr 10, 2012 3:18 PM
50	I gave up my L.S. license many years ago because of the requirement of CE. I lost too much valuable time & money going to CE sessions to hear instruction to do what I had been doing successfully for 20+ years! If you do institute CE, please include a grandfather clause to excuse practicing veteran PEs.	Apr 10, 2012 3:17 PM
51	Work experience is far more valuable than PDH. Many of the course offerings are essentially a waste of time.	Apr 10, 2012 3:03 PM
52	I have invented programs, and move the power industry into modern tech. world. I teach power engineers and present papers around the world. (This effort may sound good but totally misses the goal!)	Apr 10, 2012 2:24 PM
53	9., 10. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 2:08 PM
54	4. >30	Apr 10, 2012 2:04 PM
55	Why does VT take so long??	Apr 10, 2012 1:57 PM
56	6., 7., 9. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 1:56 PM
57	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?

58	5. No answer: Retired 2007 - formerly D&K/Randolph I'm retired but feel continuing education for PEs should be required. VT requires PDHs for attorneys.	Apr 10, 2012 12:34 PM
59	10. If minimum standards are established.	Apr 10, 2012 12:01 PM
60	9. Continuing education credits are required for other professional certifications I currently hold. 10. Unless they are deemed acceptable by certifying agencies (AIA, AEE, ASHRAE, etc.)	Apr 10, 2012 12:01 PM
61	6. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 11:59 AM
62	10. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 11:58 AM
63	6. No answer 7. No answer	Apr 10, 2012 11:56 AM
64	6. No answer: "NA" 7. No answer: "NA" 10. No answer VSPE should not be lobbying to change license requirements for engineers in the state of Vermont.	Apr 10, 2012 11:29 AM
65	IF MAJOR EFFORT OR HIGH COST IS REQUIRED THE RETIRED COMMUNITY OF PE'S MAY GIVE UP THEIR LICENSES. QUESTION 6 AND 7 DO NOT FIT A RETIRED PE THUS MY ANSWERS FOR THOSE QUESTIONS ARE NOT ACCURATE.	Apr 8, 2012 8:40 PM
66	My responses are somewhat colored by circumstance. I recently retired from the Federal Government where I was a civil engineer working on airport related development in the Miswest. Right or wrong, in the Fededal government we did not require even having an engineering license. As a retired person/engineer I would like to keep my license "just in case" and as a matter of pride, but if the PDH were instituted I would turn in my license.	Apr 8, 2012 3:10 PM
67	"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 equivlanet, 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
68	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
69	5. Retired 6. No answer 7. No answer 10. Must meet minimum standards or/and	Apr 6, 2012 3:53 PM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

be approved by board.

70	I had a Maine PE license but let it be retired because I neither practice in the state nor was interested in spending money on maintaining the required professional education units. If the state of Vermont is in need of more money for professional licenses, raise the rates.	Apr 6, 2012 3:51 PM
71	6. No answer 7. No answer 10. No answer	Apr 6, 2012 3:23 PM
72	5. It was (is), I am now retired. I am glad that PDHs are being considered.	Apr 6, 2012 2:19 PM
73	I would prefer that any courses be taught online (not require travel to Vermont) and assume the courses are needed because people are abusing their rights (doing shoddy engineering work). Course credit should also be allowed from accredited engineering schools. Thanks.	Apr 6, 2012 2:14 PM
74	I am the president of a firm with 23 employees in VT. We have 9 full time VT PE's. I want to know how much time and money it will cost us as a firm to keep up with 12 PDHs for 9 PE's every year. My concern is it could be quite costly if there are not sufficient opportunities for VT PE's to easily obtain PDH's. While I support continuing education - in fact we do most in house with our senior staff - I would not want to spend more than \$500 per year per PE to keep current. It's very difficult to keep up with PDH requirements and still maintain a profitable business in a fragile economy. Allowing our in-house technical sessions to count would be a BIG help.	Apr 5, 2012 3:06 PM
75	I am the president of a firm with 23 employees in VT. We have 9 full time VT PE's. I want to know how much time and money it will cost us as a firm to keep up with 12 PDHs for 9 PE's every year. My concern is it could be quite costly if there are not sufficient opportunities for VT PE's to easily obtain PDH's. While I support continuing education - in fact we do most in house with our senior staff - I would not want to spend more than \$500 per year per PE to keep current. It's very difficult to keep up with PDH requirements and still maintain a profitable business in a fragile economy. Allowing our in-house technical sessions to count would be a BIG help.	Apr 5, 2012 3:05 PM
76	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
77	Burlington, Montpelier, Rutland, White River Junction are about the only communities that could support PD classes in the state. Considering the number of disciplines that need to be served, this would be a challenge for engineers to attend, e.g. it is not simply the cost of the course, but the time of travel, lodging arrangements, and matching course offerings against a busy schedule and sometimes challenging weather. PDHs should be more than punching a ticket. If PDHs can be managed via the web, or closed circuit TV (as a number of universities have done), there may be some real potential.	Apr 3, 2012 9:56 PM
78	I do not believe requiring professional development hours would improve the engineering capabilities of Vermont PEs or help the safety of Vermonters. Many of the approved training hours that I have participated in are sales calls from equipment vendors and they do nothing to promote the integrity of VT engineers.	Apr 3, 2012 8:19 PM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

79	Continuous lifelong learning is imperative to any profession, especially engineering, which provide services that effect public health and safety.	Apr 3, 2012 6:16 PM
80	If PDH becomes a requirement, then we should be able to get "PDH credit" for: 1) attending a professional conference, 2) teaching courses, 3) watching webinars and other evidence of engineering work such as patents granted, publications written, etc. It is not fair to establish a new requirement for people to maintain a PE designation under a new (different) set of ground rules when they obtained the PE license under an old set of ground rules. When the rules change, for fairness, those who obtained the PE license under the old rules should be "grandfathered" to allow the continued maintenance of their PE designation without any additional continuing education requirement. If you are going to establish a new requirement, then it should apply only to new PE applicants. Overall, I believe this idea would cost extra money and institute an added administrative/bureaucratic burden without providing much value. Also, there are (lean) years when PEs and their employers cannot afford to attend formal education courses. The "education industry" is moving away from traditional ways of learning and staying abreast of new technologies.	Apr 3, 2012 4:28 PM
81	I believe that continuing education is an fundamental aspect of a profession.	Apr 3, 2012 1:41 PM
82	9. Time away from work, costs to attend and increased license fees for no benefit constitute a severe impact. 10. Question implies that PDH's will be required. The requirement for PDH's is yet another intrusion of government into private lives. Before even considering this there should be documented instances where it can be proven that mandatory cont. ed would have prevented the problem.	Apr 3, 2012 10:12 AM
83	I am a environmental PE working for the VT ANR. My job, although an engineering position, does not require a PE license. I do have the ability to take various continuing ed. courses through EPA and regional professional organizations (ITRC, NEWMOA, NEIPIC, etc.) however only when they are free, on-line, or the organization can provide food and lodging. The state does not reimburse travel or tuition expenses. I already consider an \$80 license fee excessive considering this is not required for my job, paid out of pocket, and I receive no benefit for being a PE other than 'professional pride'.	Apr 3, 2012 10:08 AM
84	The challenge for me, as project manager for Arch and Engineering, is that I don't engage directly in engineering. My role is to oversee the design of all technical disciplines, to understand the process of design and to QC the design. Having said that, I support the suggestion that VT requires PDH. My firm regularly conducts technical seminars, in which I could easily partake. The requirement will force me to re-engage the technical side of my profession.	Apr 2, 2012 8:16 PM
85	In other states the PDH requirement was voted in by academics and consultants who dominate the professional engineering boards. There is little or no impact on these two groups as they often participate in courses or seminars that would satisfy the PDH requirement, or they have a personal profit motive as the continuing education instructors. The rest of us are forced to pay out of pocket for these courses and the time away from work. If "local" instructors are barred from offering PDH courses I suspect the appetite for them will rapidly diappear.	Apr 2, 2012 7:58 PM
86	I do think that special vendor presentations that are education based, not sales	Apr 2, 2012 7:24 PM

Q11. Do you have any other comments?

based, should be acceptable. Engineering society meetings that have education components should be included as well. IE...Monthly ASHRAE meetings often have great speakers and educational components.

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 87 | In-house sessions should be done at risk of not being approved. Perhaps an approval process similar to NY's could be instated for in-house sessions. There should be criteria on these sessions, or some regulation of them at least. | Apr 2, 2012 3:57 PM |
| 88 | There are a number of professional organizations that provide professional development hours for technical sessions at conferences or other meetings. To minimize the extra costs of earning PDHs, and to encourage participation in professional organizations (which I beleive is also worthwhile), these sorts of PDHs should be eligable. | Apr 1, 2012 4:53 PM |