

**STRATEGIC PLANNING/RETREAT
STATE BOARD OF TECHNICAL PROFESSIONS
September 20, 2008**

MEETING The Strategic Planning/Retreat meeting of the South Dakota State Board of Technical Professions was held on Saturday, September 20, 2008 at 8:37 a.m. in the board office in Rapid City, SD; Executive Director Mark Humphreys presided.

ATTENDEES: Chairman, Dale Jans; Vice Chairman Randy Bacon; Secretary Jeffery Hazard; Hani Shafai; Leonard Neugebauer; and David Stafford. Also present was Special Assistant Attorney General Catherine Duenwald.

STAMPS Discussion by Neugebauer regarding the size of stamps/seals. Neugebauer suggested the Board consider preparing a guideline document regarding certifying and sealing documents. Neugebauer offered to spearhead preparing a rough draft for the Board's review and suggestions. When finalized, this guideline document would then be available on our website. Some of the suggested topics are:

1. The significance and purpose of why we certify, sign, seal, and date documents;
2. Who must certify, sign, seal, and date documents;
3. What documents must be certified, signed, sealed, and dated; and
4. What must be included in the certification.

The Board discussed the procedure of stamping each page. Board discussed the pros and cons of stamping each page. A suggestion was made to have a statement identifying all page numbers on the signature page that are included in the certification, i.e. "pages __ through __ are included in this certification".

Hazard suggested part of the outcome of this meeting should be a list of things the Board needs to address legislatively; one item being revising the portion of the law dealing with seals, i.e. allowing for variation in the two inch seal diameter and should be eliminating reference to electronic stuff, because in five years everything is going to be electronic.

Neugebauer brought up SDCL 36-18A-45(4) regarding to removing computer generated seals from drawings transmitted electronically. (Hazard pointed out that this statute is not in the law at this time.)

Humphreys discussed stamp design with the Board as follows:

Design - Board agreed that anything is acceptable for border and inner circle stamp design. Staff to update seal examples on board website.

Diameter – Board agreed that the diameter of stamp will need to have the statute changed to allow for minimum of one inch and maximum of two inches in diameter. Humphreys will need to rewrite statutes/rules to allow and obtain approval by legislation.

Usage – Board agreed that usage of stamps should be on each plan sheet and on the cover sheet of specifications. Stafford to provide board with more input regarding this subject.

Electronic – Board agreed that we should not be referencing technology, as it is forever changing.

GENERAL RULE FOR EXPERIENCE: 20:38:15:01

Applied to PE - Humphreys discussed with Board how to calculate experience credit for work before going to college; experience credit for work during academic year while attending college; and experience credit for work during the summer while enrolled in college. While attending college they can achieve a maximum of one year credit for work in their field, calculated as follows: up to half-time credit during academic year while attending college, for a maximum of six months of academic experience credit; and up to half-time credit for work during the summer, for a maximum of six months of summer credit. A maximum credit for experience before graduating from college shall not exceed one year. Board agreed that this rule needs to be re-written, as it is very vague. The Board also discussed was whether or not they should accept an ABET accredited technology degree.

Applied to LS – Humphreys discussed with Board how to calculate experience credit, as outlined above. The example of a non-school trained applicant with less than eleven years of experience prior to college, who then obtains a college degree, was discussed. Neugebauer and Bacon stated they agree that experience gained prior to schooling is to be taken into consideration for time counted on a case-by-case basis, and the maximum one-year rule of experience prior to a college degree does not apply in this case. Board agreed that this rule needs to be further discussed and possibly re-written, due to vagueness.

Hazard suggested, depending on our budget, to hire someone, legal counsel or whomever, to take a look at our Blue Book statutes and rules, compare them with model law, and come up with something that makes more sense. The Board agreed that this is another subject that needs to be addressed. Stafford proposed modify the rules to re-sort and re-edit some of the paragraphs in such a way that it cleans up our act for the land surveyors, and at the same time makes the other paragraph apply just to the engineers, the architect already stands alone anyway, and what do we do with the landscape architects and petroleum guys? Humphreys states we already require a CLARB record for landscape architects. Humphreys reviewed the resolve of the Board as the general rule as follows:

1. Rearrange and rewrite the rule; and
2. Look at moving most of this rule to apply to the professional engineer only. This rule does not apply to the land surveyor. The land surveyor experience is already stated out. We do not want general experience at all; and want specific experience only specific to their discipline. Humphreys will draft revisions and move sections of this general rule to the specific profession it governs.

EXAM CANDIDATES FROM OTHER STATES WITH 3 FAILS Humphreys discussed this topic in length at the board meeting on September 19, 2008. Humphreys stressed to the Board that our Blue Book states we may require additional education. The Board discussed considering limiting the number of fails an exam candidate can have when taking any particular exam. Neugebauer stated we need to consider the total number of times an exam candidate has taken an exam, including all states, not just taken in South Dakota. Per Neugebauer, we need to know the total number of times an exam candidate has taken each test and where. Humphreys stated he thinks this topic will be discussed by NCEES and ELSES at the meeting he is attending October 15-16, 2008 in Clemson, SC.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF LICENSURE WITHIN OUR PROFESSIONS

Humphreys stated that the national average for both licensed graduates of architects and engineers is only approximately twenty percent. The Board agreed that we want to promote registration in our State. A lot of promotion should be done through the colleges. Jans is promoting licensure at SDSU in October when he addresses the senior design class. Hazard stated he feels we need to take the steps necessary to allow architect exam candidates to start taking there ARE as soon as they graduate with their professional degree so they can do it while it is still fresh in their mind. Stafford stated he does not agree with Hazard's position; however, he does agree that we should allow our applicants to follow NCARB Model Law, and we should align ourselves with NCARB Model Law, which is promoting, not all sections, but some sections to be taken earlier. Humphreys reminded the Board that this issue was NCARB Option One and Option Two. After much discussion at past board meetings, and because of our rules, the Board opted for Option Two. Stafford proposed that the Board align ourselves with NCARB's Model Law. Hazard and Neugebauer stressed that we need to work through the associations and our website to improve communications to encourage licensure within our professions.

BETTER COMMUNICATION WITH OUR CONSTITUENTS


Hazard suggested we have more communication with our constituents than annually. Humphreys and the Board mentioned that we need to encourage constituents to check out our website, as it is a very good source of information. Stafford and Hazard suggested we send an email tickler to all licensees with email addresses numerous times a year reminding them to check out our website and possibly including links to association websites. Board encouraged all members and Executive Director to attend association meetings. Stafford suggested we send an email tickler several times a year, possibly bi-monthly, reminding licensees to check out our website. Hazard and Jans suggested hiring an outside marketing consultant. Duenwald suggested asking Kolden if the state agency public relations department could assist us in this effort. Humphreys to provide board members with a link to the Iowa template guide for building officials. Neugebauer pointed out that it is a guide document, not rules or law, but a very good guide document. Stafford agreed to take the lead on this action item.

Stafford brought up the problem of the two pages of exemptions. It should be about exposure to people to life safety hazards rather than just about square footage.

REVIEWING OUR RULES FOR THE POSSIBILITY OF ALLOWING CPEES EQUIVALENCY FOR IN-STATE DEGREES AND ABET MASTERS ABET will now accredit both Bachelor and Master Degrees at the same school. Shafai and Humphreys to report back to Board after their respective meetings at NCEES and CPEES, and Humphreys one-on-one discussion with Dr. Mott.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS, STATUE CHANGES, WATCHDOG & HB1107 Humphreys discussed. Design Professional Coalition (DPC) has a lobbyist. Individuals we need to be in contact in Pierre are Lori Schultz, Gail Boddicker, John Childs, Dan Painter, and Don Jacobson. Neugebauer mentioned he is supposed to attend the DPC meetings representing our Board.

Motion by Stafford and seconded by Hazard, the meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.



Mark Humphreys, Executive Director

Submitted by Mary Ann Myers, Secretary SDBOTP