Rethinking Qualifying and Continuing Education for Appraisers

I. Setting the Stage

A. Introduction of the presenters

1. Richard Knitter – qualification background related to topic (see attached)

2. Craig Harrington – qualification background related to topic (see attached)

B. In this presentation our purpose is to present various perspectives about the future of education specific to the appraisal profession.

1. The presenters don’t necessarily agree on all the issues and the ways to resolve them. We think it’s good to be open-minded when presenting fresh ideas and have the freedom to think outside the box.

2. There is no intent to criticize our current education system. But there comes a point when an existing system shows its age and becomes less effective in addressing the needs and future direction of the profession.

3. Because of the lead time necessary to make changes, we need to start thinking about changes in education that may be implemented ten or more years from now.

C. The market ultimately determines—or at least greatly influences—the requirements for entry into a profession.

1. If the requirements are too onerous in connection to the outcome, then potential entrants to the profession will pursue other career endeavors—and we’ve heard many stories to suggest that this is a concern.

2. If the requirements are too minimal, the public’s trust is not served and the value of the appraiser’s credibility and professionalism will be diminished.

3. There is a balance between these two viewpoints that allows the profession to grow and sustain itself into the foreseeable future.

4. The presenters are aware that an educational system for appraisers must be forward thinking, yet practical, for the professional marketplace it serves.
II. Introduction

A. If you could remake the appraiser qualification criteria afresh, what would it look like? Let’s start with some suppositions for the discussion.

1. Our focus is education, but it is impractical to discuss education separate from the overall qualification criteria established by the Appraiser Qualifications Board (AQB) and adopted by the states.

2. The bottom line of the AQB qualification criteria is demonstrated competency.

   a. Demonstrated competency had two components:

      ▪ Education, and

      ▪ Experience

   b. The concept of demonstrated competency was included in the law enacted by Congress entitled the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA). Title 11 of the law addressed appraiser qualifications.

      The impetus behind the law was the financial crisis in the mid-1980s which had caused a record number of banks to fail. To save the banking system, Congress required banks to utilize appraisers who demonstrated competency and were subject to effective supervision.

      When the law talks about effective supervision, it is not referring to the relationship of supervisors and trainees. Effective supervision in this context was to be provided by states through licensing and certification. The intent was that appraisers must be competent to perform assignments for financial institutions (i.e., assignments involving federally related transactions).

      FIRREA was intended to circumvent future financial meltdowns in the banking system. Unfortunately that was not the case and it was amended by the Dodd-Frank Act in 2010. Nonetheless, the appraiser qualification requirements in FIRREA remained as-is after being amended by Dodd-Frank.

      Appraiser qualification criteria are simply one part of FIRREA and Dodd-Frank designed to maintain the integrity of the banking system. But appraiser qualification is the only part we can influence by offering ideas and suggestions.

3. Demonstrated competency was the desired outcome behind states requiring appraisers to be certified or licensed in the early 1990s.
B. Take a closer look at each of the two components that define demonstrated competency.

1. **Education** is the first component and it is divided into two categories:

   a. **Qualifying Education (QE):** This type of education is comprised of tested coursework that follows a curriculum leading to a state license credential.

      - QE is measured by a combination of seat-time and competency.
      - The curriculum topics and the required hours are set by the AQB.
      - An individual cannot test out of the required curriculum even if competency has been previously acquired in undergraduate or postgraduate courses.

   b. **Continuing Education (CE):** This type of education is fairly broad, but largely consists of seminars and courses designed to maintain and presumably enhance the appraiser’s skillset within their respective state license credentials.

      - CE is measured by seat-time.
      - CE has no “required” testing to assess whether the attendee has understood or retained the concepts and content presented in the seminar or course.
      - CE has stated learning objectives, but not stated competencies to achieve.

2. **Experience** is the second component of demonstrated competency and has one category in the current criteria:

   a. **Qualifying experience** – is experience that is connected solely to the individual’s application for state appraiser licensing credentials.

   b. There is no “continuing experience” required. The experience requirement is fulfilled after appraiser has attained his or her state license credentials.

C. Rethinking the requirements for demonstrated competency.

1. Education and experience are inextricably linked within demonstrated competency.

2. The path to demonstrated competency should evolve to deliver the desired outcome in the most effectual manner.

3. Proposition: To rethink qualifying and continuing education, we also need to rethink the experience requirement.
III. Rethinking the Relationship between Education and Experience

A. **Key question to address:** Has the value of qualifying experience outlived its practical usefulness?

1. This question must be evaluated in regards to outcomes. What is achieved by preserving qualifying experience as a requirement to license certification?

2. Can the experience component be better achieved through another means, such as education?

B. Let’s develop some foundation for the argument that “qualifying experience” may not be necessary or even beneficial for the intended purpose.

1. **Experience is a desirable attribute** and appraisers often identify their experience as a means to distinguish their skills and abilities to clients. However, *general* experience should not be confused with *qualifying* experience.

   a. AQB appraiser criteria are limited to addressing qualifying experience, namely that which happens prior to achieving a license credential.

   b. There is no continuing evaluation of experience after credentialing. All experience that occurs afterward is implied based on the number of years the appraiser’s license credentials have been active.

2. **Qualifying experience is difficult to measure** both from a quantitative and qualitative perspective.

   a. The predominant measure for qualifying an individual’s experience is based on the number of hours a trainee spends working on assignments. For a general certified appraiser that number is 3,000 hours.

   b. A secondary measure is for a state licensing agency to review work samples from a log submitted to qualify the experience. Interestingly, this is the only qualitative measure used to evaluate the applicant’s experience. The review of the sample appraisal reports, however, is problematic for a variety of reasons.

      ▪ The reviewer for the state may limit the review to USPAP compliance issues observed in the appraisal report samples.

      ▪ If the reviewer goes further and investigates methodology, the reviewer may not be qualified, or may not fully understand the methodology required for a specific assignment, particularly when a sample appraisal report involves a complex project or analytical method.

      ▪ Evaluating trainee competency is difficult because the submitted reports often have shared responsibility and may be signed by a supervisory appraiser.
c. The process of evaluating an individual’s qualifying experience is susceptible to inconsistencies and potential bias.

- Each state may use a different approach to evaluate an individual’s qualifying experience.
- Final judgment of the appraiser’s qualifying experience is often left to one person; the state’s reviewer, which may introduce subjectivity.

3. Qualifying experience presents a roadblock for individuals entering the profession.

a. An individual may have the required education, yet can’t enter the profession because the individual cannot find employment with an employer that is willing to provide the training and supervision as currently required by law.

- An individual may have a Master’s degree in finance and may exude every attribute that is desired for a new professional entering the field, yet without a willing employer to hire and train the person, the individual cannot begin their valuation career.
- Smaller firms often seek out family members for trainee positions rather than hire “outside” individuals who they perceive may be their future competition.
- Highly educated and ethical individuals may acquiesce and agree to be trained by firms that are using outdated or inappropriate analytical techniques and perhaps questionable business practices—and the individual will do this simply to break into the appraisal profession.

b. Other professions generally don’t require experience to enter their profession.

- Internships are often encouraged, and in some professions they are required. Even so, they are generally part of the qualifying educational component rather than a separate and defined requirement to qualify experience.
- Internships are less threatening to employers as there is no long-term commitment, and they have a different status as compared to hiring a trainee.
- Once established, internships are favorably viewed by employers and are often counted upon. We’ll revisit internships later in the presentation.

4. Can “bad experience” be undone?

a. The early experiences of an appraiser are critical and often become career-long habits. These experiences can be both positive and negative.

b. Training in improper methodology may be difficult to correct once it is ingrained.
C. Is education a viable alternative to qualifying experience? Let’s look at what a curriculum alternative to experience offers.

1. A methodical education curriculum has advantages over qualifying experience.
   a. Competency can be tested in an objective manner.
   b. Correct presentation of appraisal methodology and techniques is assured.
   c. Learning objectives or “competencies” connect to identifiable outcomes.
   d. A standardized program helps ensure consistent outcomes nationally.
   e. Broad access is available to all individuals and lessens the potential for discrimination on a number of fronts.
   f. Time-efficient and cost-effective.

2. More than any time in the past, education can be designed to present theoretical concepts and practical applications that emulate real-world experiences.
   a. Appraisal theory is best realized when it is combined with practical application of the academic concepts.
   b. Field experiences can be replicated within a classroom environment through the use of simulated case studies.
   c. In a simulated case study, class participants are given an appraisal assignment much like they would in a real-world setting. For example, the assignment might be an appraisal of a self-storage operation, or the valuation of the conservation easement that must follow IRS rules for noncash charitable contributions.
      ▪ Collaboration among class members working in teams can be a required component in the simulated case study.
      ▪ The interactive discussion among team members replicates the types of discussions that take place in an appraisal office environment.
      ▪ An instructor may assume the role of a supervisor to provide guidance and offer suggestions as needed for the simulated case study to progress.

3. Educational courses that incorporate practical applications and simulated case studies better address the missing component in current trainee experience.
   a. The experience component most often missed is; knowing what you don’t know. State licensing agencies have long stated that appraisers get into trouble by taking on assignments that are beyond their competency.
b. Simulated case studies, in particular, can incorporate disciplines to identify assignment characteristics that require advanced competency.

- The existing experience requirement for trainees struggles with this concept. More often the issue is ignored because both trainee and supervisor lack the knowledge and experience to identify what they don’t know.

- A key educational component is to identify various assignment characteristics within simulated case studies that require outside expertise or require the appraiser to withdraw from the assignment.

- For example, a simulated case study of a medical facility can identify aberrations in the typical assignment that require expertise beyond the capabilities of most newly certified general appraisers.

4. What about in-the-field experiences?

a. Field research or fieldwork is important, but there is nothing to prevent fieldwork from being incorporated into educational courses.

- Fieldwork involves collecting information outside of the classroom, laboratory, library, or office workplace.

- Much of today’s field research is oriented toward access of online data. A classroom participant can access online data in the same manner that an appraiser trainee would access data in an office environment.

b. Classroom projects may include field experiences such as direct observations under various settings, interviews of market participants, and learning how to effectively record field notes related to the fieldwork experiences.

c. Fieldwork encounters within a traditional trainee experience are not all positive.

- Direct observations in the field may be atypical or infrequent events.

- Direct observations are often qualitative rather than quantitative.

- Field research may lead to excessive dead ends and wasted time.

- Some of the above disadvantages will happen in an educational alternative to the traditional trainee experience. But simulated experience can better control certain disadvantages and thus enhance competency-based outcomes.

d. Fieldwork experiences that have control measures in place, and can be tested, may be better than traditional trainee field experiences. Control measures are simply more feasible in a classroom environment (e.g., simulated case study).
5. An education alternative may incorporate internships to enhance course-based fieldwork experiences.
   
a. In many professions internships are not required, but students pursue internships because they are invaluable to their resume and future job interviews.

b. Utilizing multiple internships throughout an educational curriculum allows an individual to see a number of different appraisal operations, including financial institutions, government agencies, and private firms both large and small.

c. Many universities set up networks for internships to promote good working relationships with government agencies and corporations where students are likely to be hired after graduation.

6. An education alternative to experience can be fast-tracked, whereas traditional experience requirements cannot.
   
a. Much, if not all, qualifying coursework is competency based and thus can have an exam option to test proficiency and learned skillsets.
   
   ▪ Some students may have attained advanced degrees in similar subjects and can test out of specific courses.

   ▪ For students with advanced degrees, their focus can be on taking the simulated case study courses (although some believe that even these courses may conceivably have a test-out option).

   ▪ If competency in a subject matter is the desired outcome, then in the majority of cases, competency can be tested through an exam, or series of exams.

b. Course exams that test competency are time and cost efficient. They reward participants who already are proficient in the learning objectives and desired competencies. Why force these students to retake material and fulfill seat-time hours when they already possess the required competence?

c. The opportunity to challenge course exams promotes the brightest and best participants to move forward at an accelerated pace. These are the very people we want to attract to our profession.

d. **A comment about exams:** Exams for qualifying education should be written from a perspective of testing competency based on the course objectives and course content.

   ▪ Presently, many exam questions are *diagnostic* in the sense that they serve little purpose other than to verify whether the student has read the course material and/or test their ability to attain and retain terms, concepts and formulas rather than analyze, synthesize and apply the concepts.
For students testing out of a course, a diagnostic test is antithetical to testing competency and therefore places the “competent” student at a disadvantage.

Some amount of diagnostic testing is acceptable, and even desirable, for quizzes taken by participants who are enrolled in a classroom setting, but all final exams should be heavily weighted toward testing competency.

If an individual fails a challenged exam twice, the course has to be taken. Obviously, multiple versions of the final exam should be required for each QE course, which is already an accepted standard.

A student testing out of a course should not receive the hourly credits that an individual receives for successful completion of the classroom course.

7. Is there a precedent for an educational alternative in lieu of experience?
   a. Yes, based on the AQB’s Real Property Appraiser Qualification Criteria and Interpretations of the Criteria that became effective January 2015.
   b. Practicum courses.
      - AQB criteria states that experience may not be substituted for education, and education may not be substituted for experience—but there is an exception regarding the latter.
      - The AQB exception allows for practicum courses approved by the AQB’s Course Approval Program (CAP) or state appraiser regulatory agencies.
      - Practicum courses can satisfy the experience requirement, but experience gained for work without a traditional client cannot exceed 50% of the total experience requirement under the existing program.
      - A practicum course must include the generally applicable methods of appraisal practice for the credential category.
         - Content includes, but is not limited to: requiring the student to produce credible appraisals that utilize an actual subject property; performing market research, containing sales analysis; and applying and reporting the applicable appraisal approaches in conformity with USPAP.
         - Assignments must require problem solving skills for a variety of property types for the credential category.
c. Why practicum courses are rarely, if ever, offered by educational providers.

- The problem is connected to the experience credits granted. It is based on actual classroom hours of instruction, and hours of documented research and analysis awarded based on the AQB’s practicum course approval process.

- For example, practicum coursework would require 1,500 classroom hours to meet 50% of the experience requirement for a certified general license.
  - Some master degree programs requires 30 semester credit hours. That is equivalent to about 900 classroom hours and 225 hours of documented projects outside the classroom.
  - The practicum alternative requires more education than a Master’s degree and yet only meets 50% of the experience requirement.

- Practicum courses, as presently conceived, are not a viable alternative to qualifying experience, but it could have possibilities (see point below).

- Practicum courses are analogous to what we have identified as simulated case study courses. Therefore the concept is workable, it is simply how the AQB credits the “experience hours” that presently makes it impractical.

d. The important point to make here is that the AQB has permitted education as a substitute for qualifying experience in its existing criteria.

IV. What Might the Future of Qualifying Education Look like?

A. The curriculum for qualifying education in this presentation is focused on two real property licensing credentials.

1. Certified Residential

2. Certified General

*Note: Due to time constraints of the presentation, the curriculum requirements for trainee appraiser and licensed residential credentials are not addressed.*

B. The curriculum structure

1. Overview of existing certification credentials

   a. **Certified Residential** – the existing standard requires 200 hours of qualifying education and 2,500 hours of experience.

   b. **Certified General** – the existing standard requires 300 hours of qualifying education and 3,000 hours of experience.
2. The new curriculum would need to, at a minimum, replicate the competency expected from both qualifying education and qualifying experience.

3. The new curriculum should be based on competency models for the various licensing credentials.

   a. There are various definitions for what constitutes a competency model. Therefore this may be the first task of the group that oversees the design of the new curriculum.

      ▪ In short, the competency model describes what an individual needs to know and be able to accomplish in order to execute their responsibilities effectively.

      ▪ A curriculum based on a competency model is not necessarily the same as competency-based education, which measures learning rather than time, although they may have similar attributes.

   b. Existing license certification requires a baccalaureate, so qualifying education is best patterned after a competency model that assumes this as the base.

      ▪ Existing education requirements were created when some license credentials did not require a bachelor’s degree.

      ▪ Subsequent updates to the criteria may have not kept pace with the revised base of a bachelor’s degree.

      ▪ For purposes of this discussion, a bachelor’s degree requires successful completion of a 4-year undergraduate academic diploma program of about 120 semester credits.

   c. Distinct advantages might be gained in having a curriculum that it is complimentary to university-style education. Therefore, what follows includes a discussion of semester credit hours.

   d. Example: The competency model for a certified general appraiser.

      ▪ The QE program may be set up for 30 to 60 semester credit hours.

      ▪ A 45 credit hour program at a college level would be the equivalent of 1,350 classroom hours and about 338 hours of documented projects outside the classroom.
e. A credentialing curriculum of 900 classroom hours and 225 hours of documented projects outside the classroom to meet the qualifying education requirement would be equivalent to a 30 semester credit hour college program.

- This might be a good starting point for the curriculum discussion.

- It could be fewer hours than suggested here, but one has to remember that the curriculum is inclusive of the existing experience requirement.

f. Determining the number of hours required for the new curriculum is a discussion that should include interested parties and public debate. Even so, here are some considerations to keep in mind.

- Universities are moving towards alternative credentialing, so “hours-based” education in lieu of experience shouldn’t be the only options.

- The best approach is to create the competency model first, and then design the curriculum that will achieve the competency model’s requirements.

- Begin with certified general as the basis for the first competency model as that will set the upper level requirements for the curriculum.

- The other license credentials such as certified residential and licensed residential can have their curriculum requirements positioned accordingly based on the competency model for certified general.

C. Observations for qualifying education curriculum.

1. Basic Appraisal Principles and Basic Appraisal Procedures.

a. These courses need to be extended and divided into multiple parts and perhaps renamed to Fundamentals of Valuation Theory.

b. The theoretical concepts of valuation should be thoroughly presented in this series of courses as it sets the foundation for everything that follows.

    - Basic Appraisal Principles and Basic Appraisal Procedures as they exist right now present too much content at a surface level for their 60-hour allotment.

    - One concern is that some essential concepts presented in these two courses are never revisited in later courses, including advanced courses. Therefore, some fundamental concepts are insufficiently developed or applied in the coursework.

    - The fundamentals series that replaces Basic Appraisal Principles and Basic Appraisal Procedures should be about 180 hours.
c. The proposed curriculum series, *Fundamentals of Valuation Theory*, must be broad-based such that individuals pursuing certified residential credentialing have an adequate understanding of valuation theory applicable to income-producing properties as well as other property types and markets.

- Residential appraisers can sometimes get into trouble in assignments involving land valuation, and even in residentially-improved properties, because they lack foundational concepts of income capitalization and understanding markets other than residential.

- As stated previously, *knowing what you don’t know* is a critical concept that must be specifically addressed.

d. All coursework that follows the fundamentals curriculum should reinforce and build on the established theory and concepts.

2. *Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP)*

a. The concepts behind the ethical rules and valuation standards should be incorporated into the curriculum series (such as *Fundamentals of Valuation Theory*), rather than requiring a separate 15-Hour USPAP course at this introductory stage of the curriculum.

b. Participants are better served to learn ethical concepts and standards of practice without needing to know where they are found in the USPAP document. There will be a time for that later in the curriculum when individuals are working on simulated case studies.

- A half-day session may be appropriate in the *Fundamentals of Valuation Theory* series to address key aspects of USPAP if it is deemed necessary to provide at least an introduction to USPAP early on.

- Spending several days on knowing USPAP "chapter and verse" is lost on individuals that are getting started in their credentialing curriculum.

c. The ideal positioning of a more in-depth USPAP course is prior to, or during, qualifying education offerings that are heavily application-oriented, such as simulated case study coursework.
V. What Might the Future of Continuing Education Look like?

A. Observations for continuing education curriculum.

1. A reasonable balance needs to be achieved between information-based offerings that receive CE credit and offerings that enhance valuation skillsets.

   a. Continuing education should largely have a purpose to enhance, strengthen and expand upon the theory and valuation applications previously presented in the qualifying education curriculum.

   b. There is a role for information-based seminars; however, license renewal cycles should limit the number of hours allowed for these types of seminars.

   c. Tests and exams should be incorporated into continuing education as much is possible and where it is feasible to do so.

      ▪ The exam for CE offerings may be very different than an exam for a QE course, but the exam should test competency in some manner.

      ▪ In a CE offering the time dedicated to the exam doesn’t need to be lengthy.

      ▪ Because of the nature and purpose of CE programs, there should no test-out option. In this case, seat-time is a viable measurement.

2. Certification in valuation disciplines and specialization.

   a. Under a new curriculum, qualifying education presents valuation techniques at a deeper level than what was previously possible, and continuing education curriculums should build on the foundation and become the pathway for specialized certifications.

   b. A continuing education curriculum opens the door to designing seminars and courses that focuses on specific areas of specialization. Completion of a particular CE curriculum can lead to a certification.

B. Continuing education’s minimum for required hours should be based on a two-year renewal cycle rather than an annual requirement.

1. The AQB’s annual requirement for continuing education is 14 hours. Some states require appraisers to complete the 14 hours of CE each year of a two-year renewal cycle, while other states permit the full two years for an appraiser to complete 28 hours of continuing education prior to renewal.

   ▪ Some states adjust their renewal interval to better suit their needs. For example, California has a four-year cycle with a requirement for 56 hours.
2. Having a consistent continuing education requirement across all states benefits course providers as well as appraisers.
   
a. Consistency is specific to state license renewal requirements that encourage appraisers to enroll in courses that are longer than 14 hours, such as enhanced 4-day courses.

b. States that allow continuing education to be attained over the entire renewal cycle give the appraiser options to enroll in advanced analytical courses and challenging applications-based courses.

c. Education providers have the potential of seeing greater attendance in advanced courses and may be encouraged to offer them more frequently.

C. The role of USPAP updates.

1. The recommendations presented in this section assume that a new edition of USPAP will continue to be released every two years.
   
a. Potential changes to the time interval for releasing new editions of USPAP is for others to address and debate.

b. At this time we have no opinion as to the advantage or disadvantage of changing the two-year time interval for USPAP editions.

2. To better understand the recommendations that follow, we need to provide a recent history of USPAP changes that provide the impetus behind offering a 7-hour update course for each renewal cycle.

3. Since the 2008-2009 edition of USPAP and continuing to the current 2014-2015 edition, appraisers have been required to take 28 hours of USPAP updates (i.e., 4 cycles x 7 hours = 28 hours).

4. During that same time, we have identified less than five changes to USPAP that impact the requirements that appraisers must follow.
   
a. Some may debate the actual number of changes depending on how they define an appraisal requirement or appraiser obligation.

b. For the purpose of this discussion, a change in an appraiser requirement qualifies if it is in the Rules or Standards of USPAP and is identified as something the appraiser “must do” or the appraiser’s work “must” conform to.
   
   ▪ Changes in the DEFINITIONS and the PREAMBLE sections of USPAP are generally affirmed in the Rules and Standards sections if the changes involve appraiser obligations or appraisal requirements.
c. An existing requirement that is edited for greater clarity or is modified to be consistent with other sections of USPAP does not constitute a change in requirements.

5. Let’s take a brief tour of the last four editions of USPAP with a focus on changes that have an effect on appraisal requirements.

a. In the 2008-2009 edition of USPAP there were no changes to the requirements that an appraiser must follow. The SUPPLEMENTAL STANDARDS RULE was deleted because it was redundant. There were minor edits to the SCOPE OF WORK RULE and report certifications, but these edits were for clarity and did not impact appraiser requirements.

b. In the 2010-2011 edition of USPAP there were two changes, one minor and one major.

   - The minor change was that a client no longer was required to have access to the appraiser’s workfile for a Restricted Use Appraisal Report. This is because every appraisal report must contain sufficient information to have intended users understand the report properly, therefore client access to a workfile for a Restricted Use or any other report format was not needed. This requirement has been in USPAP since 1987, so it is a minor change.

   - The major change required appraisers to disclose if they performed any service with regards to the subject property within the prior 3 years.

c. In the 2012-2013 edition of USPAP the primary change was that the disclosure of prior services must be added to the report certification.

d. In the 2014-15 edition of USPAP two changes were identified.

   - The revision of the reporting requirements deleted the Self-Contained Appraisal Report format, and amended the Summary Appraisal Report to Appraisal Report, and also amended the Restricted Use Appraisal Report to Restricted Appraisal Report.

   - STANDARDS 4 and 5 were retired because they were unnecessary and potentially a source of confusion for appraisers and clients. The appraiser’s obligations continues as before, but are now addressed in sections of USPAP specific to appraisal or other services where an individual is acting in the role of an appraiser. Even though the requirements existed in prior editions of USPAP, we’ll count this as a USPAP change affecting requirements.

6. We’ve heard of requests made to The Appraisal Foundation to stop changing USPAP. However in the last four cycles (i.e., 8 years), the changes to Rules and Standards affecting appraisal requirements or appraiser obligations have been few.
7. Recommendations for the USPAP update.
   a. The USPAP update is best presented as a two-hour program during each two-year renewal cycle. We assume the states would make this a requirement of license renewal.
   b. The change from a 7-hour course to a 2-hour program would fully meet the needs of addressing USPAP changes affecting appraiser obligations and appraisal requirements.
      - Significant changes can be fully explained in a two-hour program and the other edits can be itemized and explained much like the ASB does in their published Summary of Actions that covers USPAP changes and the rationale behind them.
      - The real-world applications presented in the current 7-Hour USPAP update course are generally restatements of FAQs and published Q&As. This is information appraisers can readily access for themselves without needing to devote seat-time in a continuing education course.
   c. The proposal offered here would reserve more time during the renewal cycle for an appraiser to take advanced courses that enhance skillsets.
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