

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**
2 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
3 **DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING**
4 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,**
5 **ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS**

6
7 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

DRAFT

8
9 ***These Minutes have not yet been adopted by the Board***

10
11 **September 30, 2003**

12
13 By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provisions of
14 AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers
15 and Land Surveyors, (AELS) held a teleconferenced meeting September
16 30, 2003, at 10:00 a.m. at the Atwood Building, Suite 1500, Conference
17 Room, 550 W. 7th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, 99501.

18
19 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

20
21 Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
22 The Licensing Examiner called the roll.

23
24 Members present by teleconference and constituting a quorum of the
25 Board were:

26
27 Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chair, Mechanical Engineer
28 Robert Gilfilian, Civil Engineer
29 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
30 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
31 Robert Miller, Chair, Civil Engineer
32 Kimberly Mills, Public Member
33 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
34 Ernie Siemoneit, Mining Engineer

35
36 Not present for the teleconference were:

37
38 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
39 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member

40
41 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

42
43 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
44 Julie Adamson, Licensing Examiner
45

1 Joining the meeting at 10:25 a.m. was:

2
3 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
4 Joining the Public portion of the meeting was:

5
6 Jack Wilbur, P.E., President
7 Design Alaska, Inc.
8 601 College Road
9 Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

10
11 The Chair brought up the first item on the agenda:

12
13 **Agenda Item 1 – Arctic Course Criteria**

14
15 The Chair stated that several members have a noon commitment and
16 noted that two members would not be able to participate today. The
17 purpose of the meeting was to have a specific discussion about the Board
18 Approved Arctic Course criteria and to take action in executive session
19 on several applications that needed clarification or action. The Chair
20 stated that goal was to create criteria for evaluating the courses
21 including a generic curriculum that would apply to all disciplines. He
22 indicated that the Chair of the Subgroup on the Arctic Course was
23 Gardner, the Vice-Chair, and asked her to facilitate the discussion.

24
25 Gardner referred to an email that outlines the policy that determines why
26 an arctic course is required.

27
28 Peirsol mentioned that Jack Wilbur was present in her office and would
29 be attending the public portion of the meeting.

30
31 Gardner reviewed the emails that were circulated: an email from her
32 circulated this morning titled “Discussion in determining policy around
33 Arctic Requirement”, and in the middle of the page, bolded, “ Purpose
34 Statement: Arctic Criteria”. She discussed the policy statement and
35 asked whether the board should consider a take-home exam.

36
37 She elaborated that a take home exam would constitute an overview of
38 what a registrant should be aware of in terms of the arctic environment
39 as compared to a semester based course that would require students to
40 demonstrate a working knowledge of the arctic environment with respect
41 to design work.

42
43 Gilfilian mentioned Washington State Board offers a take home exam on
44 ethics, and his assessment that a take home exam should not be
45 supported because it does not demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the

1 topic. He added that he has reviewed Dr. Orson Smith's course, and
2 believes the course topics are adequate.

3
4 Siemoneit stated due to the special conditions in Alaska, the Board has
5 inserted educational requirements as part of the licensing requirements.
6 He did not think it would be unreasonable to expect testing of the subject
7 matter in the course.

8
9 Siemoneit and Gardner agreed testing should be required and that the
10 course should not be available as a take home exam.

11
12 Mills indicated a passing grade should be required.

13
14 The Chair gave a brief history of the course from the initial requirement
15 for a treatise to the current requirement. He indicated that the Board felt
16 the topic was narrow enough that they were finding many papers to be
17 too similar in content, and the Board moved to a semester based course,
18 a college level course.

19
20 Kalen joined the meeting at 10:25 a.m. and Miller identified the
21 participants and the discussion.

22
23 The Chair explained the Board changed the criteria of the requirement to
24 contain a curriculum and examination. He mentioned the regulation is
25 broad enough to accept an equivalent and that the Board has previously
26 accepted courses given in Canada as meeting the equivalent of the arctic
27 course requirement.

28
29 The Chair mentioned that a take home exam would limit the research
30 and exposure to the information to only answering the required
31 questions.

32
33 Iverson indicated he is registered in other jurisdictions and that he has
34 not found take home exams to provide a relevant basis for the content of
35 the materials he was tested on. He spoke in opposition of a take-home
36 exam.

37
38 Gardner agreed and spoke in opposition of a take-home exam.

39
40 Gilfilian indicated the web-based courses were taken by many applicants
41 nationwide and that accessibility was an important advantage.

42
43 Iverson agreed web-based courses offer opportunity for comity
44 applicants, in particular, and he has received favorable feedback by
45 candidates for this method of delivery in terms of mobility. He asked the

1 Board to decide whether the web-based course is adequate, or at least
2 comparable to the other courses.

3
4 Gardner asked the Board to decide about the take home exam issue first.

5
6 The Chair felt at a minimum, a web-based course would offer little
7 difference from a take home exam.

8
9 Iverson asked about the short courses held in Seattle.

10
11 Kalen stated he does not support take home tests.

12
13 Gardner was off line briefly and reconnected to the teleconference at
14 10:35 a.m.

15
16 Iverson asked if the continuing education value or university credit value
17 could be used to compare the web-based and the semester-based
18 university courses.

19
20 The Chair noted that the web based A680 course, that we refer to as a
21 short course, is about a 15 hour course in duration, which would
22 translate to 1 CE course. How do Board members feel about the length of
23 this course, in terms of meeting the minimum requirement?

24
25 Iverson indicated that he thought it the web-based (A680)course was a
26 little on the short side.

27
28 Gardner noted that the University of Washington course is also a short
29 course but the duration is a week long course of 35 hours.

30
31 The Chair mentioned he had supported the on-line course when it was
32 presented to the Board as a semester-based course several years ago. He
33 indicated it is his understanding the semester-based course (CE 603)
34 was dropped with the inclusion of the shorter web based course (CE
35 A680) in November 2002.

36
37 The Chair compared the different courses, all of which have a broader
38 and longer exposure to the course content than the short web-based
39 course (CE A680). He liked Iverson's concept of evaluating the
40 Continuing Education Units (CEU) and to have the requirements for all
41 courses equivalent. He explained CEUs are standardized and is
42 calculated based on the amount of instructional time.

43
44 The Board discussed the Northern Design Course. The Chair explained
45 the Board had been split on whether it was more appropriate for
46 architects than engineers, at the time the course was approved.

1 Although it was a split vote, the Board did approve the course with no
2 restrictions for disciplines.

3
4 The Board discussed base of knowledge and extent of learning for
5 semester-based learning versus week-long intensive sessions for short
6 courses, or web-based short courses.

7
8 Gardner suggested lecture, homework and exam were relevant criteria.
9 She explained she had noticed some of the final exam questions were
10 taken from the quizzes in the web-based short course and she would
11 prefer they were tested with unique questions.

12
13 The Board discussed if the total hours for courses included the 3-hour
14 final exams and decided they did not generally include the final exams in
15 the total hours.

16
17 Gardner discussed her own experience while taking the CE 603
18 semester- based arctic course. She indicated much of the time in class
19 covered case histories of what went wrong.

20
21 The Executive Administrator interjected a reminder to Board members
22 that the material they were covering was confidential material and of a
23 proprietary nature, for Board member use in evaluating the courses, and
24 should be destroyed or returned to the Juneau office.

25
26 Gardner and the Board discussed whether to focus on contact time with
27 the instructor, or on exams.

28
29 Iverson mentioned requiring a course equivalent to 3 CEU's would be one
30 solution.

31
32 Gardner wondered whether the homework and exam questions were
33 important criteria for the Board to approve a course, with no oversight
34 for compliance. She stated that the CEU standard is 10 hours for one
35 CEU unit.

36
37 Gilfilian supported 3 CEU's criteria as the minimum criteria for
38 approving the arctic course.

39
40 On a motion made by Gardner, and not seconded, it was RESOLVED to
41 make the Arctic Course equivalent of 3 CEU's.

42
43 The motion died for lack of a second.

44
45 The Chair asked for a straw poll before any motions were made.
46

1 Kalen supported the criteria.
2 Siemoneit suggested 3CEUs with an examination.
3 Iverson mentioned adding the criteria that Gardner and Gilfilian had
4 compiled.
5 McLane supported the criteria.
6 Mills agreed with the criteria.
7 Peirsol stated that she felt the meeting was called to get information so
8 they could make motions at the November meeting.

9
10 The Chair advised that this vote was on the criteria only and that the
11 Board could revisit this issue in November when the course providers
12 have an opportunity to meet the criteria or to develop the criteria to meet
13 the minimum requirements. If a course met compliance, the course
14 would be approved by the Board. He felt that tying the course with
15 credits or CEU's would give the Board more control. He also referred to a
16 letter from Benjamin Momblow, which makes the case for a less
17 expensive course.

18
19 **On a motion by Gardner, seconded by Kalen, it was**

20
21 **RESOLVED to establish the criteria for the minimum course**
22 **requirements for the Board Approved Arctic Course to include**
23 **a university course or its equivalent equal to three continuing**
24 **education units (CEUs) with an exam; or three university**
25 **credits with an exam.**

26
27 Discussion followed.

28
29 Gardner clarified that the arctic course should consist of 3 CEUs with
30 exam, or 3 credits at the University level, with an exam, or its equivalent.

31
32 **On an amendment to the motion, Iverson, seconded by Kalen, and**
33 **adopted, it was**

34
35 **Resolved to add the specific Arctic Criteria listed in the**
36 **handout from Gardner and Gilfilian.**

37
38 The following is an excerpt from the handout Gardner provided:

39
40 **Purpose Statement: Arctic Criteria**

41
42 **Minimum Course Requirements:**

43
44 **A Course must provide lecture, homework, and examination to the**
45 **Board's satisfaction that provides the applicant with an**
46 **introductory working knowledge of arctic design principles as it**

1 **relates to the major design areas of Architecture, Engineering, Land**
2 **Surveying and Landscape Architecture. Subject matter to include**
3 **but not limited to:**

- 4
- 5 ▪ **Arctic Climate and Geography**
- 6 ▪ **Heat Transfer Fundamentals**
- 7 ▪ **Arctic Building**
- 8 ▪ **Arctic Utilities**
- 9 ▪ **Geotechnical Fundamentals, or Frozen Ground and Arctic Roads**
- 10 ▪ **Building Foundations**
- 11 ▪ **Ice and Snow Engineering**
- 12 ▪ **Arctic Construction**
- 13 ▪ **Arctic Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering**
- 14 ▪ **Mechanical Engineering Issues**
- 15 ▪ **Electrical Engineering Issues**
- 16

17 Kalen asked for a vote on the amendment and there was no objection.

18

19 The Executive Administrator read the amended motion again.

20

21 **On a motion by Gardner, seconded by Kalen, and adopted**
22 **unanimously, it was**

23

24 **RESOLVED to establish the criteria for the minimum course**
25 **requirements for the Board Approved Arctic Course to include**
26 **the specific criteria listed in the handout and that the course**
27 **be a university course or its equivalent equal to three**
28 **continuing education units (CEUs) with an exam; or a three**
29 **credit university course with an exam.**

30

31 **The Chair asked if there was additional discussion and there was**
32 **none.**

33

34 **The Chair indicated that the motion passed unanimously.**

35

36 Siemoneit asked if the board should define the CEU standard.

37

38 The Chair responded that it should not be necessary.

39

40 Gardner asked if the Board must approve the courses again in May
41 2004.

42

43 The Chair indicated the Board should retain its policy to review courses
44 every two years, but suggested that this might be done in November of
45 this year instead of in May 2004.

1 The Chair asked staff to notify all the course providers of the Arctic
2 courses of the criteria that the Board just adopted.

3
4 The Executive Administrator asked if the Board felt that there was
5 sufficient lead-time for providers to respond.

6
7 Gardner indicated she currently has the arctic course materials
8 previously submitted and that suggested that staff should ask the course
9 providers to send in any new information on their courses.

10
11 The Chair reiterated there should be sufficient lead-time for providers.

12
13 The Chair asked staff to request that any recent student evaluation
14 forms be submitted to the Board as that information would be helpful to
15 the Board as they go through the review process.

16
17 Gardner indicated that she is interested in reviewing in-depth one
18 particular course in November that she has some concerns about, now
19 that she has reviewed the other courses.

20
21 Peirsol indicated the public member, Jack Wilbur, had departed, and
22 was no longer present in her office.

23
24 **On a motion by Iverson, seconded by Mills, it was**
25 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of**
26 **reviewing four applicant files.**

27
28 The Board went into executive session at 11:25 a.m. and Kalen departed.

29
30 The Board came out of executive session at 11:40 a.m.

31
32 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Iverson, and unanimously**
33 **approved, it was**
34 **RESOLVED to approve the following applications into the record:**

35

Pisonth Keyuravong	PE exam.	Chemical Engineering	Approved
Daigle, Sean	PE Exam	Civil Engineering	Conditionally approved, pending arctic.
McKamey, Michael G.	PE Exam	Civil Engineering	Approved
Fleming, Michael D.	Comity	Architect	Approved, pending arctic.

1 The Chair noted there were no objections.

2
3 **On a motion by Gardner, seconded by Mills, and unanimously**
4 **approved, it was**
5 **RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 11:45 a.m.**

6
7 Respectfully submitted:

8
9
10 _____
11 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
12

13
14 Approved:

15
16
17 _____
18 Robert Miller, Chair, Ph.D., P.E.
19 Board of Registration for Architects,
20 Engineers, and Land Surveyors
21

22
23 Date: _____
24
25
26
27
28