# State Board of Accountancy November 19, 2024

3 4 5

1

2

## BOARD MEMBERS:

7

9

Michael D. Ocker, CPA, Chair - Absent Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs

10 Keri A. Ellis, CPA

11 Monique M. Ericson, CPA, Office of Attorney General

12 Michael Gaizick, CPA

13 John J. Grater, CPA

14 Benjamin Holland, CPA, Vice Chair

Chandra "Dolly" M. Lalvani, CPA - Absent 15

Charles A. O'Brien, CPA 16

17 John Petchel, Public Member

18 Sheri L. Risler, CPA

19 20

### BUREAU PERSONNEL:

21 22 23

24

25

26

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel Michael Merten, Esquire, Board Counsel

Ashley P. Murphy, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison

Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor

Miranda Murphy, Board Administrator 27 28

Marc Farrell, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,

Office of Chief Counsel, Department of State

Amanda Richards, Fiscal Supervisor, Bureau of Finance and Procurement, Department of State

Tamie Laudenslager, Fiscal Management Specialist, Bureau of Finance and Procurement, Department of State

Jennifer Jumper, Fiscal Management Specialist 2, Bureau of Finance and Procurement, Department of State

Ivan Garcia, Legal Extern

38 39 40

### ALSO PRESENT:

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Jennifer Cryder, CPA, MBA, Chief Executive Officer, Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants

Amanda Slezak, Esquire, Kane, Pugh, Knoell, Troy & Kramer LLP

Mark Koscinski, Assistant Professor of Accounting Practice, Moravian University

# State Board of Accountancy November 19, 2024

ALSO PRESENT: (cont.)

Peter Calcara, Member, Government Relations Section Council, American Society of Association Executives

Thomas Ostrowski, CPA, Pennsylvania Society of Tax & Accounting Professionals

Erin Badstuebner, Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc.

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908

\*

2 State Board of Accountancy
3 November 19, 2024

\* \* \*

[Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at 9:00 a.m. the Board entered into Executive Session with Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, to have attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations. The Board returned to open session at 10:30 a.m.]

11 \*\*\*

[Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, informed everyone the meeting of the State Board of Accountancy was being held in a hybrid format, both in-person and by livestream teleconference, pursuant to Act 100 of 2021, which requires boards to use a virtual platform to conduct business when a public meeting is held. He noted the meeting was being recorded and voluntary participation constituted consent to be recorded.

Mr. Rouse also noted the Board entered into Executive Session with Board Counsel to have attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations.]

\* \* \*

The State Board of Accountancy Meeting was held

- 2 on Tuesday, November 19, 2024. Sheri L. Risler, CPA,
- 3 Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at
- 4 10:34 a.m.
- 5 \*\*\*
- 6 Roll Call

9

- 7 [Sheri L. Risler, CPA, Acting Chair, requested a roll
- 8 call of Board members. A quorum was present.]
  - \*\*\*
- 10 | Introduction of Attendees
- 11 [Sheri L. Risler, CPA, Acting Chair, also requested
- 12 | an introduction of attendees.]
- 13
- 14 Approval of Minutes
- 15 ACTING CHAIR RISLER:
- The first order is for us to approve the
- 17 minutes from the September 19, 2024 Board
- 18 Meeting.
- 19 Is there a motion to adopt those
- 20 minutes?
- 21
- 22 MS. ELLIS:
- So moved.
- 24 MR. HOLLAND:
- 25 Second.

6 ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 1 2 Any discussion? Roll call, please. 3 4 Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; 5 Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler, 6 7 aye. [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from 8 voting on the motion.] 10 11 Report of Prosecutorial Division 12 [Ashley P. Murphy, Esquire, Board Prosecution 13 Liaison, presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 14 24-55-000152.] 15 \* \* \* MR. ROUSE: 16 17 Regarding the Consent Agreement at item 2 18 on the agenda, Case No. 24-55-000152, after 19 discussion in Executive Session, I believe 20 the Chair would entertain a motion to adopt 21 the Consent Agreement. 22 ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 23 Is there a motion to adopt the Consent 24 Agreement at item 2 on the agenda, Case No. 25 24-55-000152?

7 1 MS. ELLIS: 2 So moved. 3 MR. HOLLAND: 4 Second. 5 ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 6 Any discussion? Roll call, please. 7 Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; 9 Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland, 10 aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler, 11 aye. [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from 12 13 voting on the motion. That is the Matter of BPOA v. Patrick J. Walsh, Case No. 24-55-000152.] 14 15 16 [Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor, 17 presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 23-55-18 015591.] 19 MR. ROUSE: 20 Regarding the Consent Agreement at item 3 21 on the agenda, Case No. 23-55-015591, after 22 discussion in Executive Session, I believe 2.3 the Chair would entertain a motion to adopt 24 the Consent Agreement. 25 ACTING CHAIR RISLER:

8 Is there a motion to adopt the Consent 1 2 Agreement at item 3 on the agenda, Case No. 3 23-55-015591? 4 MS. ELLIS: 5 So moved. ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 6 7 Second? 8 MR. HOLLAND: 9 Second. 10 ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 11 Any discussion? Roll call, please. 12 Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; 13 14 Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland, 15 aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler, 16 aye. [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from 17 18 voting on the motion. That is the Matter of BPOA v. 19 Kenneth W. Fry, Case No. 23-55-015591.] \* \* \* 20 21 [Timothy A. Fritsch, Esquire, Board Prosecutor, 22 presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 23-55-23 018522.] 24 MR. ROUSE: 25 Regarding the Consent Agreement at item 4

9 1 on the agenda, Case No. 23-55-018522, after 2 discussion in Executive Session, I believe 3 the Chair would entertain a motion to adopt 4 the Consent Agreement. 5 ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 6 Is there a motion to adopt the Consent 7 Agreement at item 4 on the agenda, Case No. 23-55-018522? 8 9 MS. ELLIS: 10 So moved. MR. HOLLAND: 11 12 Second. ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 13 14 Any discussion? Roll call, please. 15 16 Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; 17 Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland, 18 aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler, 19 aye. 20 [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from 21 voting on the motion. That is the Matter of BPOA v. 22 EM Salfi PC, Case No. 23-55-018522.] 23 24 [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, introduced new Board members, Dolly Lalvani (absent), and 25

```
10
   Michael Gaizick.
1
2
        Mr. Gaizick provided a summary of his
3
   professional background.]
 4
5
   Report of Board Counsel - Motions to Deem Facts
     Admitted and Enter Default
6
7
   MR. ROUSE:
              Item 5 on the agenda is a Motion to Deem
8
9
              Facts Admitted and Enter Default in the
10
              Matter of BPOA V. Howard Charles Lapensohn,
              Case Nos. 22-55-002511, 23-55-002189, 23-
11
              55-003899, 23-55-010637, & 24-55-000538.
12
13
                    After discussion in Executive Session,
14
              I believe the Chair would entertain a
15
              motion to deny the Motion to Deem Facts
16
              Admitted.
17
   ACTING CHAIR RISLER:
18
              In the Matter of BPOA V. Howard Charles
19
              Lapensohn, Case Nos. 22-55-002511, 23-55-
              002189, 23-55-003899, 23-55-010637, & 24-
20
21
              55-000538 at item 5 on the agenda, is there
22
              a motion to deny the Motion to Deem Facts
23
              Admitted?
2.4
   MS. ELLIS:
25
              So moved.
```

1 MR. HOLLAND: 2 Second. 3 ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 4 Any discussion? Roll call, please. 5 6 Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; 7 Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland, 8 aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler, 9 aye. 10 [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from voting on the motion.] 11 12 13 MR. ROUSE: 14 Item 6 on the agenda is a Motion to Deem 15 Facts Admitted and Enter Default in the 16 Matter of BPOA V. Emmanuel Moses, Case No. 22-55-0015528. 17 18 I believe the Chair would entertain a 19 motion to grant the Motion to Deem Facts 20 Admitted and to direct Board Counsel to 21 prepare the Adjudication and Order in 22 accordance with the discussions in 23 Executive Session. ACTING CHAIR RISLER: 24 25 In the Matter of BPOA V. Emmanuel Moses,

```
Case No. 22-55-014428 at item 6 on the
1
2
               agenda, is there a motion to grant the
 3
              Motion to Deem Facts Admitted and to direct
 4
              Board Counsel to prepare the Adjudication
 5
               and Order in accordance with the discussion
              in Executive Session?
 6
7
   MS. ELLIS:
8
              So moved.
9
   MR. HOLLAND:
10
               Second.
   ACTING CHAIR RISLER:
11
12
              Any discussion? Roll call, please.
13
14
              Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye;
15
              Gaizick, abstain; Grater, nay; Holland,
16
               aye; O'Brien, nay; Petchel, aye; Risler,
17
               aye.
18
   [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from
19
   voting on the motion. John Grater and Charles
20
   O'Brien opposed the motion.]
                               * * *
21
22
   Report of Board Counsel - Final Adjudications and
23
     Orders
24
   MR. ROUSE:
25
               Item 7 on the agenda is BPOA v. Michael R.
```

<u>Bull</u>, Case No. 23-55-002633. Item 8 in the <u>Matter of the Petition for Reinstatement of Certified Public Accountant License of John M. Swirsding, Case No. 23-55-015071.</u>

Those matters are not ready yet, so I believe they will be tabled for today.

\* \* \*

Report of Board Counsel - Citation Appeal

9 MR. ROUSE:

2.3

2.4

Item 9 on the agenda is a Citation Appeal in the matter of the Citation issued to Jeffrey Alan Meyer, Case No. 23-55-018817.

Regarding item 9, after discussion in Executive Session, I believe the Chair would entertain a motion to direct Board Counsel to prepare the Board's Final Order in accordance with the discussions in Executive Session.

#### ACTING CHAIR RISLER:

Regarding the Citation Appeal of <u>Jeffrey</u>

<u>Alan Meyer</u>, Case No. 23-55-018817, at item

9 on the agenda, is there a motion to

direct Board Counsel to prepare the Board's

Final Order in accordance with the

discussions in Executive Session?

MS. ELLIS:

2 So moved.

3 MR. HOLLAND:

4 Second.

5 ACTING CHAIR RISLER:

6 Any discussion? Roll call, please.

7

9

10

1

Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler,

11 aye.

12 [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from 13 voting on the motion.]

14

15 Report of Board Counsel - Regulations

16 | [Marc Farrell, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel, Office of

17 Chief Counsel, Department of State, referred to the

18 Regulatory Status Report, noting the Board continues

19 to have two open regulations, including Act 41

20 licensure by endorsement at 16A-5517 and the general

21 revisions package at 16A-5519.

Mr. Farrell stated the general revisions package remains the one of most urgent priority and continues

24 to work on that with the goal of having it published

25 as final sometime in 2025. He noted having a

discussion with Board Counsel regarding measures that they may take or consider as far as recognizing credit.

2.4

Mr. Rouse noted prior Board discussion concerning § 11.16(c) and allowing the Board to extend credits for matters that are beyond the applicant's control.

Mr. Holland thanked Mr. Farrell for all of his hard work and asked whether there was any way to expedite this process to help keep Pennsylvania competitive. He noted it seems that every contiguous state to Pennsylvania has the 30-day window, and they may be one of the last states in the nation to approve this. He mentioned there are situations like this where it can get to the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC) more quickly.

Mr. Holland commented that the Board acted on this in 2023 and will not take effect until 2025. He noted they have to work within their existing regulations to grant candidates the 30-month time frame.

Mr. Farrell stated the department has about 110 pending regulatory packages for all 29 boards of commissions. He noted hiring two additional regulatory counsel to only work on regulation in

2023. He reported that they are making progress on the pile that existed, noting this regulation is at the top of the priority list.

Acting Chair Risler thanked Mr. Farrell for his honest answer and Mr. Holland for asking the question that the Board has been asking for quite some time and putting it on the record.

Mr. Holland mentioned the importance of making Pennsylvania more competitive and keeping their pipeline active.]

11

12 Appointment - Bureau of Finance and Procurement

13 | Annual Budget Presentation

14 | [Tamie Laudenslager, Fiscal Management Specialist,

15 Bureau of Finance and Procurement, Department of

16 | State, presented the Annual Financial Report. She

17 referred to the licensee population over the

18 | last seven years. She noted the first biennial

19 review showed a total of 29,506 licensees and 28,583

20 | in the current biennial review, showing a decrease of

21 923 licensees.

4

5

6

9

10

22

2.3

24

25

Ms. Laudenslager addressed the breakdown of licensee class. She noted the Board's renewal period is in December of odd years, and 2009 was the last time the Board had a fee increase. She reported no

changes in the out years as far as renewal fees.

2.4

Ms. Laudenslager discussed revenue on a biennial basis and noted the bulk of revenue comes from renewals and applications at 95.5% of revenue. She also noted the Board receives revenue from other categories but is not a consistent form of revenue. She noted the total biennial revenue for this period.

Ms. Laudenslager noted expenses can hit the Board through timesheet-based charges, direct charges, and licensee population. She also noted expenses are calculated on a biennial period and reported on the estimated costs in the prior biennial period and in the current biennial period.

Ms. Laudenslager stated the increase in expenses for this period is due to a new information technology (IT) system for the legal department, the move from Penn Center to Thea Drive, and the Pennsylvania Licensing System (PALS) modernization.

Ms. Laudenslager addressed expenses and revenue, noting the Board's beginning balance, revenue with expenses, and the biennial balance.

Ms. Laudenslager stated expenditures are exceeding revenue with the current budget and recommended a fee increase.

25 Acting Chair Risler asked whether the figure is

truly restrictive or available funds that could be used in the future, so the Board may not have to increase fees. She commented that the Board has significant funds available that they have not been able to use and should not decide on increasing fees just so revenue exceeds expenses.

Ms. Richards addressed how the move to Thea Drive and computer upgrades affected the budget. She explained that there are one-time costs associated, but there will be maintenance costs throughout the life of the system that are figured in.

2.3

2.4

Ms. Richards referred to the move to Thea Drive, where the rent increase was picked up by all of the boards going forward and not just a one-time actual cost for that move. She reported more fees will also be associated with the maintenance of the new legal system for the legal IT system.

Ms. Richards referred to the availability of the amount, noting it is available to the Board and is put back into the restricted account to use at a later time. She explained that expenses exceeding the revenue is depleting that available balance, where there will be nothing available at some point if they do not increase fees.

Ms. Richards informed Board members that BFP

looks at application costs first and then renewal fees when considering a fee increase if increasing application fees does not cover the deficit.

2.3

2.4

Acting Chair Risler commented that new candidates who do not necessarily work for a large firm have to pay those application fees themselves and suggested increasing renewal fees but also waiting until after next year's results come in and then reevaluate it again.

Ms. Richards explained that a regulatory package takes over two years to get through the process and recommended starting the process now because the fee increase would not start until 2027 or 2029.

Mr. Petchel asked whether the Board is making any kind of returns on the restricted funds?

Ms. Richards explained that there is no return on the restricted funds.

Mr. Rouse believed there is a statutory requirement that when expenses exceed revenues over a two-year period that the fees must be increased by regulation. He explained that BFP provides projections of what it would look like if the Board increased only the application fees and what it would look like if the Board increased application and biennial renewal fees.

Mr. Rouse explained that BFP works with the Board administrator because the numbers may suggest that not all license categories may require a fee increase or not all applications will require a fee increase depending on how much it costs to process an application.

2.4

Ms. Laudenslager offered to provide different scenarios of the fee increases in the spring and any alternatives, including incremental increases over a period of time.

Mr. Petchel commented that a better understanding of what the available restricted funds may be used for would help in the assessment and whether the \$6 million is the correct level for the Board.

Mr. Holland mentioned that as long as the funds remain restricted internally, committed or assigned for the Board of Accountancy, he agreed with Acting Chair Risler to just continue to monitor this.

Acting Chair Risler noted it would be beneficial to get that analysis in April because they are showing two years of deficits, and it would not go into effect for two years. She noted the importance of being proactive and knowing how the money could be used and whether it is enough or too much.

Ms. Laudenslager offered to provide the

```
1 information when they present the proposed fee
2 package in the spring.
```

Ms. Richards asked whether there are restrictions on the use of the funds.

Mr. Rouse noted that he would have to check the CPA-Law and offered to get back to her.

7

8

9

10

11

12

3

4

5

6

Ms. Richards stated it is used for the Board if they are traveling or have legal costs that would be associated with the Board, along with Board administrative costs. She noted funding is not allowed.]

13

14 Report of Board Chair

15 [Sheri L. Risler, CPA, Acting Chair, encouraged Board

16 members to review the requirements of the Sunshine

17 Act and Gift Ban Policy.]

18

19 Report of Acting Commissioner

20 | [Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of

21 | Professional and Occupational Affairs, informed Board

22 members that a vendor was selected for replacement of

23 PALS, and System Automation will be implemented at

24 | the end of 2025.1

25

\* \* \*

1 Report of Board Administrator - No Report

2 \*\*\*

- 3 Report of Committees
- 4 [Sheri L. Risler, CPA, Acting Chair, noted Mr.
- 5 Holland and Mr. Ocker have to revisit the
- 6 Board committee schedule. She noted she and Ms.
- 7 Ellis are leaving after this meeting, and many
- 8 responsibilities need to be allocated to other Board
- 9 members.1
- 10 | \*\*\*
- 11 Review of Program Sponsor Applications
- 12 MR. ROUSE:
- The Application of Susquehanna Health
- 14 Foundation was reviewed in Executive
- 15 Session. I believe the Chair would
- 16 entertain a motion to grant the Program
- 17 | Sponsor Application of Susquehanna Health
- 18 Foundation at item 13 on the agenda.
- 19 ACTING CHAIR RISLER:
- 20 Is there a motion to grant the Program
- 21 Sponsor Application of Susquehanna Health
- 22 Foundation at item 13 on the agenda?
- 23 MS. ELLIS:
- 24 So moved.
- 25 MR. HOLLAND:

```
23
              Second.
1
2
   ACTING CHAIR RISLER:
 3
              Any discussion? Roll call, please.
 4
 5
              Claggett, aye; Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye;
              Gaizick, abstain; Grater, aye; Holland,
 6
 7
              aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye; Risler,
8
              aye.
9
   [The motion carried. Michael Gaizick abstained from
10
   voting on the motion.]
11
12
   Miscellaneous/Correspondence
13
   [Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed
   items 32, 33, 26, and 27 because they deal with the
14
15
   issues that the Oregon Board and the California Board
   are addressing regarding the Competency-Based
16
17
   Experience Pathway exposure draft and the exposure
18
   draft on proposed amendments to the Uniform
19
   Accountancy Act. He noted prior Board discussion
20
   concerning the exposure draft regarding the CPA
21
   Competency-Based Experience Pathway, and Ms. Cryder
   discussed the exposure draft for proposed amendments
22
23
   to the Uniform Accountancy Act.
24
        Jennifer Cryder, CPA, MBA, Chief Executive
```

Officer, Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public

25

Accountants, reported that a number of states have introduced legislation to change their licensure pathways. She noted that Ohio is moving legislation and believe it will be done before the end of this calendar year, Texas is moving legislation, along with a couple of other states.

2.3

2.4

Ms. Cryder estimated that 10 states will be moving legislation on the licensure pathway as described in the Uniform Accountancy Act exposure draft in early 2025. She noted it is adding a second pathway to licensure based on the exam, a bachelor's degree in accounting, and two years of experience. She mentioned that many states are not even waiting for the comment period to conclude as it relates to that Uniform Accountancy Act (UAA) exposure draft.

Ms. Cryder reported that states already moving legislation are not including the competency framework in that legislation and are seeing a divergence across the profession of whether states will adopt that competency framework. She noted that a couple of state boards of accountancy have submitted comment letters to the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) on the competency framework saying that they

are not supportive of it, are not interested in regulating, including that framework, and do not intend to adopt it. She provided examples.

2.3

2.4

Ms. Cryder believed there to be incredible momentum across many states to start changing licensure and a variety in terms of which states will adopt the competency framework and which will not. She reported on pushback on the competency framework in the comment letters that are being submitted.

Ms. Cryder noted that regulators are concerned about regulating against those competencies. Firms and candidates are concerned about the burden of evaluating, tracking, and reporting on those competencies, and many individuals are saying the two years of experience should be sufficient.

Mr. Rouse referred to the webinar regarding the CPA Competency-Based Experience Pathway and mentioned the bachelor's plus the two years of experience, where part of the experience was one year would be competency-based experience, which would include professional competencies and technical competencies and then the other part would be general experience. He believed it was not clear what the competencies were and whether or not the competencies were actually creating an unnecessary barrier to entering

the profession.

2.4

Ms. Cryder mentioned that the question of undue barrier is exactly what the profession is wrestling with, and the Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants (PICPA) feel like it is an undue burden and barrier to licensure and are not supportive of the competency framework in their advocacy.

Mr. Holland commented that the Commonwealth should be a leader in this regard and noted a former Illinois Board member looked at whether there was any statistical significance between candidates with 120 credit hours taking the exam versus 150 credit hours and determined that to be insignificant. He did not believe the numbers for Pennsylvania would be any different. He mentioned, when the CPA Law gets reopened, the issue will be substantial equivalency versus automatic mobility.

Ms. Cryder stated both of those issues are decision points and will have to be decided as they go through the legislative process. She noted that PICPA will begin drafting legislation in 2025 based on the positions that PICPA has taken and will be introducing an amendment to the CPA Law advocating for those changes with legislators and certainly

intend to work closely with the State Board of Accountancy to make sure that their advocacy is reflective of the perspectives of the regulators.

2.3

Ms. Cryder again noted PICPA will not advocate for the competency framework but will advocate for the addition of a second licensure pathway based on exam, bachelor's degree in accounting, and two years of experience without the competency framework. She stated PICPA also intends to advocate for automatic mobility.

Ms. Cryder noted the UAA exposure draft continues to define mobility based on substantial equivalency and the PICPA believes that is not in the best interest of the profession and instead intend to advocate for automatic mobility with certain guardrails.

Mr. Holland stated it does not seem like the regulators and the industry in general is opposed to an apprenticeship model, but the problem is that they are kind of in between, where they have to either stick with what they have or move entirely like other professions have to an apprenticeship model.

Mr. Holland noted that the competencies on paper are subjective but the question is how to properly regulate that, where they are becoming overtly

- regulatory versus simply checking the box. He
  believed that they have to go to a full
  apprenticeship model or not and is why there is
- 4 pushback, where they are saying they do not have the 5 infrastructure or ability to do that.

- Ms. Cryder noted PICPA feels it is in the best interest of Pennsylvania to line up with other large states that are not implementing the framework because they state consistency from state-to-state is in the best interest of the profession.
- Acting Chair Risler agreed that they should not have competency as part of the framework going forward, noting the importance of retaining their CPAs in Pennsylvania. She mentioned that there are different sizes and shapes of accounting firms and different lines of practice and stated educating individuals within those practices on how they have to evaluate the competencies will be very subjective.
- Mr. Rouse stated the exposure draft at item 32 on the agenda talks about proposed amendments to Section 5 and Section 23 of the Uniform Accountancy Act.
- Mr. Rouse noted Section 5 is regarding certification and the additional pathway to licensure that includes a bachelor's degree and two years of

experience, where breaking that down gets into item 32, which was the exposure draft regarding the competency-based experience pathway, because one of the years of experience they were recommending would be based on competency and then the other year would be based on general experience.

2.3

Mr. Rouse referred to the UAA amendments at Section 23 of the Uniform Accountancy Act, which is trying to provide a way for substantial equivalency of licensees to continue if the licensees received their license through a pathway that was part of the UAA at the time that they were licensed.

Mr. Rouse noted that item number 32 relates to item 33, and the competency part seemed like an unnecessary barrier and noted the high standard set for being a CPA because it is a significant achievement. He noted the current system has candidates with their experience being verified by someone who is licensed as a CPA and wondered if the competency-based model was inconsistent with CPA evolution. CPA evolution is based on the understanding that CPAs can work in a lot of different environments.

Mr. Rouse mentioned that the competency model may be kind of inflexible, where CPA evolution is

- supposed to reflect that CPAs can be seen in a

  lot of different places, so their experience can be

  very different and should the verifier that is

  supervising the person be based on where they
- 5 are working and what is required in the place they 6 are working.
- Mr. Holland noted the competency framework

  8 exposure draft deadline is December 6 and the UAA is

  9 December 30.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Mr. Rouse mentioned breaking down Section 5 of the UAA and asked how the Board feels about a bachelor's degree plus two years of experience with no reference to how many credit hours they need in order to meet the education requirement.
- Mr. Gaizick commented that he would be supportive of the 120 and believed as long as they have experience and the pathway is there that it will make them more competitive.
- Mr. Rouse provided an example of why he likes
  the bachelor's degree and not having a reference to
  the credits.
- Acting Chair Risler asked for feedback on
  whether it should be two years of education or one
  year of education and the competency.
- 25 Mr. Petchel provided an example equated with the

discussion, noting someone working with a really good accounting firm and with people mentoring them that the credits would be sufficient with that type of a background, and they cannot replace the experience with a couple more courses.

2.4

Mr. Holland commented that an applicant with 120 credit hours and two years of experience or a candidate with 150 credit hours and one year of experience with all things being equal that most employers will pick the former with 120 credit hours and two years of experience.

Ms. Ericson referred to the option of having a bachelor's/master's and one year of experience as opposed to a bachelor's plus two years of experience.

Mr. Holland noted that if it is 150 plus one that it should be a master's degree, which has more significance in terms of overall competency.

Acting Chair Risler agreed, noting that taking focused credits in accounting courses helps individuals pass the CPA exam and also helps to focus on the profession, but the law did not require that and sounds like they are adding another element, where it is one year if they get a master's degree in accounting.

Mr. Holland agreed, if it is the 150 credits, it

needs to be a master's degree specifically concentrated in accounting.

2.4

Ms. Cryder noted they are not advocating for the pathway that currently exists to switch the 150 to a master's degree, because they want to provide as many options and pathways as possible to licensure.

Ms. Cryder mentioned that some students will keep the 150-credit hour pathway as an option, especially students bringing college credits in from high school or career changers, where they may be further along the path toward 150 but not pursuing a master's degree. She noted that changing the law to put a master's degree in there that it would put a barrier up for career changers or students bringing in credits from high school.

Acting Chair Risler agree but noted it is sort of contrary to the competency question of what are those extra credits that they are bringing in from a transfer student, where they are going with the competency but not really, where the credits are not within the competency of CPA.

Mr. Rouse asked whether the Board wanted to make a comment regarding the proposed amendments to Section 5 and Section 23 of the UAA.

Acting Chair Risler commented that the Board

should respond but did not think they have vetted all
the options sufficiently at this point to decide on a
comprehensive response and Board members agreed. She
noted Chair Ocker and Ms. Lalvani are not present,
and their voices would be beneficial and suggested
having a special meeting before the date.

Acting Chair Risler believed hearing that the Board is supportive of the bachelor's degree and two years of work experience during the discussion but also heard discussion on competencies.

Mr. Holland noted PICPA is representing the industry and suggested having a work session to have further discussion.

2.3

2.4

Ms. Cryder referred to Section 23 in the UAA exposure draft regarding the determination of mobility based on substantial equivalency and suggested the Board spend some time discussing that section also.

Ms. Cryder mentioned that PICPA has not submitted their responses but noted it will support the licensure pathway of exam, bachelor's, two years with no competency framework. She noted PICPA's response on the UAA exposure draft will say the same thing again, where they like the second pathway but will advocate for automatic mobility

instead of the mobility based on substantial equivalency as outlined in the UAA.

2.4

Ms. Cryder stated PICPA intends on advocating for a mobility fix that is not in alignment with UAA.

Mr. O'Brien asked whether PICPA's position would require amendments to current state law in at least some states as relates to automobility because some state laws require substantial equivalency be established in the code.

Ms. Cryder explained that the licensure pathway and mobility fix will take statute changes in almost every state. She noted that implementing automatic mobility is a statute change in Pennsylvania and intend to advocate for both of the changes together.

Ms. Cryder mentioned that many states are looking at automatic mobility and predicted there will be a critical mass of states that move to that, and a lot of states will diverge from the UAA the same as they would diverge from UAA. She noted that automatic mobility speaks to inbound mobility, noting it does not help Pennsylvania CPAs go practice in other states but does allow licensees from other states to practice in Pennsylvania based on their out-of-state license.

Ms. Cryder explained that the trick is getting

- 1 that critical mass of other states to adopt automatic
- 2 | mobility also so that Pennsylvania CPAs can practice
- 3 | in other markets. She noted the importance of
- 4 | Pennsylvania moving with all of the other states on
- 5 the mobility fix, noting a critical mass of states
- 6 | will try to adopt automatic mobility and diverge from
- 7 | what AICPA and NASBA call for in the UAA model
- 8 language.
- 9 Mr. O'Brien asked whether large and bordering
  10 states have expressed that they would not support the
  11 concepts that they are discussing.
- 12 Ms. Cryder explained that some other states have
- 13 gone on record saying that they will absolutely
- 14 pursue automatic mobility and not support the
- 15 determination of mobility based on substantial
- 16 equivalency as outlined in the UAA and provided an
- 17 example. She noted Florida, New York and some other
- 18 state boards of accountancy have gone on record
- 19 saying that they will not adopt the competency
- 20 framework, which is where automatic mobility becomes
- 21 even more important.
- Mr. O'Brien agreed that the Board needs more
- 23 time and further discussion to understand the issues
- 24 and counterarguments.
- 25 Mr. Rouse noted that having a special meeting to

address item 32, which is the exposure draft on the amendment to the Uniform Accountancy Act, would need to take place before December 30. Board members will contact NASBA to see if a representative could also attend the meeting. Acting Chair Risler suggested sending Board members options of December 6

2.3

2.4

or on other dates.

Ms. Cryder informed Board members that PICPA is not trying to be the first mover or reckless when talking about introducing legislation on behalf of licensees in any of their advocacy steps.

Ms. Cryder mentioned that PICPA looks at how fast other states are moving and is thinking that they should start the process quickly in Pennsylvania, because it will take a long time to get implemented in the regs. She noted PICPA does not want to see Pennsylvania lose talent to surrounding states and is why they are looking at introducing in 2025.

Mr. Rouse noted items 32 and 33 will be getting a date to be determined for further discussion that will be open to the public, along with a representative from NASBA in attendance.

Mr. Holland asked whether there was a way to encourage the public and representatives of firms to

be a part of that discussion.

2.4

Ms. Cryder informed Board members that she would use PICPA's resources to share that meeting date when available.

Mr. O'Brien suggested the Communication Committee communicate directly to licensees.

Acting Chair Risler explained that the Communication Committee of the Board has never functioned in that way and focuses solely on the newsletter but could consider that in the future. She also explained that there are a lot of rules and things would need to be reviewed by various levels within the government.

Mr. Rouse mentioned that as part of their process with the Sunshine Act that they post things in a newspaper of local circulation and on the Board's website, where information is always posted as far as what is going on with the Board.

Mr. Rouse requested information concerning the Oregon and California Board.

Ms. Cryder stated both boards are planning on doing the licensure pathway that includes two years with no competency framework and planning on doing automatic mobility. She also noted Texas and Ohio are doing that and by the end of the calendar year

that they will see at least 10 states. She mentioned that a lot of the large states and geographic border states will move far more quickly than Pennsylvania.

Acting Chair Risler noted items 28 and 29 were provided in the Board's package regarding NASBA information about CPA exam results, Candidate Care Report and Enforcement Report as well as NASBA's Annual Report at item 30. She noted an earlier discussion concerning board committees and finance projection at item 34.

Acting Chair Risler noted 2025 and 2026 Board meetings are on the agenda and provided in Board materials.

Mr. Rouse referred to item 31, NASBA to automatic, noting it to be part of the discussion about the automatic mobility.]

\* \*

2.4

[Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at 12:29 p.m. the Board entered into Executive Session with Ronald K. Rouse, Esquire, Board Counsel, to have attorney-client consultations and for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations on items 14 through 25 on the agenda. The Board returned to open session at 1:35 p.m.]

\*

```
39
1
   [Sheri L. Risler, CPA, exited the meeting at
2
   1:35 p.m.]
3
4
   [Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of
5
   Professional and Occupational Affairs, and Michael
6
   Gaizick, CPA, did not vote on the following motions.]
7
8
             VICE CHAIR HOLLAND ASSUMED THE CHAIR
                              * * *
9
10
   Review of Requests - Review of CPA Examination Files
11
   MR. ROUSE:
12
              Item 14 on the agenda is a Review of CPA
13
              Examination Files in the Matter of Jennifer
14
              Dominjon. That matter is tabled.
                                                   We
15
              expect it to come back for the next Board
16
              meeting.
17
   Review of Requests - Review of Requests for Waiver of
18
19
     CPE Requirements
20
   MR. ROUSE:
21
              Item 15 on the agenda is a Request for
22
              Waiver of CPE Requirements for Jamie Nicole
2.3
                             I believe the Chair would
              Schlotterer.
2.4
              entertain a motion to grant the Waiver of
25
              CPE Requirements for Jamie Nicole
```

Schlotterer as discussed in Executive

2 Session at item 15 on the agenda.

3 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:

4 Is there a motion to grant the Waiver of

5 | CPE Requirements for Jamie Nicole

6 Schlotterer as discussed in Executive

7 Session at item 15 on the agenda?

8 MS. ELLIS:

9 So moved.

10 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:

Is there a second?

12 MR. O'BRIEN:

13 Second.

14 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:

15 Any discussion? Roll call, please.

16

17 Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; Grater, nay;

18 Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye.

19 | [The motion carried. John Grater opposed the

20 motion.

21 \*\*\*

22 Review of Requests - Requests for Extension of

23 | Examination Credits

24 MR. ROUSE:

25 | Items 17, 20, 21, and 22 on the agenda. I

41 believe the Chair would entertain a motion 1 2 to grant the Extension of Examination 3 Credits for items 17, 20, 21, and 22 on the 4 agenda. 5 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND: 6 Is there a motion to grant the Extension of 7 Examination Credits for items 17, 20, 21, 8 and 22 on the agenda? MS. ELLIS: 9 10 So moved. VICE CHAIR HOLLAND: 11 12 Is there a second? 13 MR. O'BRIEN: 14 Second. 15 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND: 16 Any discussion? Roll call, please. 17 18 Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; Grater, aye; 19 Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye. 20 [The motion carried unanimously. Item 17 was Julia 21 Fair; item 20, Abigail Friedman; item 21, Alec 22 Olszewski; and item 22, Noah Saba.] 23 24 MR. ROUSE: 25 Items 16, 18, 19, and 23 on the agenda.

1 believe the Chair would entertain a motion

2 to deny the Extension of Examination

3 Credits for items 16, 18, 19, and 23.

4 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:

5 Is there a motion to deny the Extension of

Examination Credits for items 16, 18, 19,

7 and 23 on the agenda?

8 MS. ELLIS:

9 So moved.

10 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:

Is there a second?

12 MR. O'BRIEN:

13 Second.

14 VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:

Any discussion? Roll call, please.

16

17 Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; Grater, aye;

Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye.

19 | [The motion carried unanimously. Item 16 was Syed

20 Hussain; item 18, Faifal Bhatti; item 19, Amelia

21 Rank; and 23, Nuo Chen.]

22

23 | Correspondence

24 MR. ROUSE:

25 Items 24 on the agenda is the Foreign

```
Credentials Service of America. I believe
1
2
               the Chair would entertain a motion to grant
 3
               the Request of Foreign Credentials Service
               of America to be added to the Board's list
 4
 5
               of approved foreign credential evaluation
 6
              providers.
7
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
               Is there a motion to grant the Request of
9
              Foreign Credentials Service of America to
10
              be added to the Board's list of approved
11
              foreign credential evaluation providers?
   MS. ELLIS:
12
13
              So moved.
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
14
15
               Is there a second?
16
   MR. O'BRIEN:
17
              Second.
18
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
19
              Any discussion? Roll call, please.
20
2.1
              Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; Grater, aye;
22
              Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye.
23
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
                               * * *
24
25
   MR. ROUSE:
```

```
44
1
               Items 25 on the agenda is World Education
2
              Services. I believe the Chair would
3
              entertain a motion to grant the Request of
              World Education Services to be added to the
4
5
              Board's list of approved foreign credential
6
              evaluation providers.
7
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
               Is there a motion to grant the Request of
9
               World Education Services to be added to the
10
               Board's list of approved foreign credential
              evaluation providers?
11
   MS. ELLIS:
12
13
              So moved.
14
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
15
              Is there a second?
16
   MR. O'BRIEN:
17
              Second.
18
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
19
              Any discussion? Roll call, please.
20
21
              Ellis, aye; Ericson, aye; Grater, aye;
22
              Holland, aye; O'Brien, aye; Petchel, aye.
23
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
                               * * *
24
25
   Adjournment
```

```
45
 1
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
 2
                   I will entertain a motion to adjourn
 3
                   the meeting.
 4
   MS. ELLIS:
 5
                   So moved.
 6
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
 7
               Is there a second?
 8
   MR. O'BRIEN:
 9
               Second.
   VICE CHAIR HOLLAND:
10
11
               We are adjourned for this meeting.
12
                                * * *
13
    [There being no further business, the State Board of
14
   Accountancy Meeting adjourned at 1:43 p.m.]
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Board of Accountancy meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Board of Accountancy meeting.

CERTIFICATE

Erin Badstuebner,

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

		•	47
1 2		STATE BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY REFERENCE INDEX	
3 4		November 19, 2024	
5 6 7 8 9	TIME	AGENDA	
	9:00 10:30	Executive Session Return to Open Session	
10 11	10:34	Official Call to Order	
12 13	10:36	Roll Call/Introduction of Attendees	
14 15	10:37	Approval of Minutes	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	10:37	Report of Prosecutorial Division	
	10:46	Report of Board Counsel	
	11:01	Miscellaneous - Appointments - Bureau of Finance and Procurement Annual Budget Presentation	
24 25	11:25	Report of Board Chair	
26 27	11:26	Report of Acting Commissioner	
28 29	11:27	Report of Committees	
30 31 32 33 34 35 36	11:27	Review of Program Sponsor Applications	
	11:29	Miscellaneous/Correspondence	
	12:29 1:35	Executive Session Return to Open Session	
37 38	1:35	Review of CPA Examination Files	
39 40	1:36	Review of Requests	
41 42	1:41	Correspondence	
43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	1:43	Adjournment	