

Professional Qualifications Committee
California Architects Board

October 30, 2014
Sacramento and Various Locations in California



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

NOTICE OF MEETING

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

October 30, 2014

10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105

Sacramento, CA 95834

The California Architects Board will hold a Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee meeting as noted above, and via telephone conference at the following locations:

Jon Alan Baker, Chair
Baker Nowicki Design Studio
624 Broadway, Suite 405
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 795-2450

Glenn Gall
Concord Hilton, Lobby
1970 Diamond Boulevard
Concord, CA 94520
(916) 452-7640

Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice Chair
HMC Architects
633 West 5th Street, 3rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 542-8300

Kirk Miller
577 Forest Street, Rear Patio
Oakland, CA 94618
(510) 652-0888

Raymond Cheng
6500 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90048
(323) 866-7884

Stephanie Silkwood
AIA Santa Clara Valley
325 South First Street, Suite 100
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 595-0192

Betsey Olenick Dougherty
Dougherty & Dougherty Architects
3194D Airport Loop
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
(714) 427-0277

2420 DEL PASO ROAD,
SUITE 105
SACRAMENTO,
CA 95834

916-574-7220 T
916-575-7283 F

cab@dca.ca.gov
www.cab.ca.gov

(Continued on Reverse)

AGENDA

Call to Order/Roll Call

- A. Review and Approve the April 9, 2014, PQ Committee Summary Report
- B. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Monitor, Analyze, and Encourage Initiatives for Schools of Architecture that Promote Curriculum in Health, Safety, and Welfare, and Additional Path to Licensure via CAB Liaisons, and Collaborate with Schools, as well as the Board, in a Series of Summits on Practice-Based Education
- C. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Conduct an Occupational Analysis of the Practice of Architecture in California, Review of the National Examination (ARE), and Linkage Study to Determine Appropriate Content for Ongoing California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Development
- D. Public Comment

Adjournment

A quorum of Board members may be present during all or portions of the meeting, and if so, such members will only observe the PQ Committee meeting, and not participate or vote. Agenda items may not be addressed in the order noted above and the meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier than that posted in this Notice.

The meeting is open to the public and accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting Marccus Reinhardt at (916) 575-7212, emailing marccus.reinhardt@dca.ca.gov, or sending a written request to the California Architects Board, 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

The notice and agenda for this meeting and other meetings of the Board can be found on the Board's website: cab.ca.gov. For further information regarding this agenda, please contact Marccus Reinhardt at (916) 575-7212.

Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the California Architects Board in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount. (Business and Professions Code section 5510.15)

Agenda Item A

REVIEW AND APPROVE THE APRIL 9, 2014 PQ COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

The Committee is asked to review and approve the attached Summary Report for the April 9, 2014 Professional Qualifications Committee meeting.

Attachment

April 9, 2014 Professional Qualifications Committee Summary Report



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

SUMMARY REPORT

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

April 9, 2014

Sacramento, CA

Committee Members Present

Jon Baker, Chair
Raymond Cheng
Allan Cooper
Betsey Dougherty (arrived at 9:35 a.m.)
Glenn Gall (arrived at 9:35 a.m.)
Pasqual Gutierrez (arrived at 9:35 a.m.)
Kirk Miller
Paul Neel
Stephanie Silkwood
Barry Wasserman

Committee Members Absent

Jeffrey Heller

Guests

Umber Kazmi, Chief Executive Officer, Sacramento College of Architecture
Corrine Fishman, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Department of
Consumer Affairs, Board and Bureau Relations

Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Justin Sotelo, Examination/Licensing Analyst
Timothy Rodda, Examination/Licensing Analyst
Jeffrey Olguin, Continuing Education Program Analyst

2420 DEL PASO ROAD,
SUITE 105
SACRAMENTO,
CA 95834

916-574-7220 T
916-575-7283 F

cab@dca.ca.gov
www.cab.ca.gov

Committee Chair Jon Baker called the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

A. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE OCTOBER 23, 2013 PQ COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

The PQ Committee reviewed the October 23, 2013 meeting Summary Report.

Pasqual Gutierrez made a motion to approve the October 23, 2013 PQ Committee meeting Summary Report.

Barry Wasserman seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

B. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, AND ENCOURAGE INITIATIVES FOR SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE THAT PROMOTE CURRICULUM IN HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE, AND ADDITIONAL PATH TO LICENSURE VIA CAB LIAISONS, AND COLLABORATE WITH SCHOOLS, AS WELL AS THE BOARD, IN A SERIES OF SUMMITS ON PRACTICE-BASED EDUCATION

Doug McCauley introduced this item and said the core issue is to create a new pathway to licensure, specifically an architecture program that culminates with not just a degree, but also licensure. He explained this would be accomplished by integrating the components of licensure into the degree program. Mr. McCauley continued, saying he and Mr. Gutierrez collaborated on a concept paper detailing a program that awards a degree and license upon graduation.

Mr. McCauley advised licensure upon graduation was simultaneously being considered by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). He added that NCARB has become more transparent, participatory, and strategic with their proposals, and offered *NCARB by the Numbers* as an example. This document, he added, shows the average time to become licensed has increased to 11 years. Mr. McCauley opined this may be due to the complexity of the licensure process, even though reforms and enhancements have been made to the Intern Development Program (IDP) and the Architect Registration Examination (ARE). Mr. McCauley asked Mr. Gutierrez, as a member of the NCARB Licensure Task Force, to inform the Committee on the work at NCARB.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that the Task Force had four meetings during the past year, and the outcome was the development of a framework for a letter of interest that will be sent to architecture schools, asking them to develop a program where students become licensed upon graduation. He added the Task Force has also worked on streamlining IDP as well as considering earlier admittance for candidates to the ARE. Mr. Gutierrez said the Task Force analyzed school programs for the possibility of integrating internship and examination. He said that the February 26, 2014 Board meeting included a summit where proposals were presented by California accredited schools. He also said that feedback was taken to the Task Force for discussion.

Allan Cooper inquired if the proposals would diminish the practice requirement. Mr. Gutierrez responded that the proposals would integrate practice with education and the Task Force felt the proposed criterion was sufficient.

Mr. McCauley said The American Institute of Architects (AIA), Central Valley chapter previously held several meetings discussing the establishment of a school of architecture in Sacramento. He added that unbeknownst to either the Board or AIA, an effort was already underway to establish a local school of architecture by Umber Kazmi with the Sacramento College of Architecture. Mr. McCauley then introduced Ms. Kazmi and asked her to provide the Committee with details regarding the College.

Ms. Kazmi stated two years ago an effort to establish a licensure upon degree program was pursued, and culminated in development of the Sacramento College of Architecture, which is scheduled to open this fall. She explained the school will integrate IDP throughout the curriculum and have an ARE testing center on site. She further explained each student will be attending an IDP lab and working on projects, which will be submitted to the building department and built by local contractors. Ms. Kazmi noted there will also be design studios where the creative aspect of the degree program would be covered, in addition to classes with a focus on health, safety and welfare. She concluded saying students will have the required IDP hours completed upon graduation.

Mr. Cooper inquired if general education courses would also be included in the curriculum. Ms. Kazmi responded the curriculum has been designed to meet National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB) and NCARB standards, which require general education courses. She added these general education courses would be tailored toward architectural practice and IDP. Ms. Kazmi continued, saying there are three degree programs: undergraduate; Masters of Architecture I (students with a non-professional degree), and Masters of Architecture II (students with a professional degree). She explained the graduate students will be managing project sites, while the undergraduates will be producing construction documents.

Betsey Dougherty asked if IDP hours would be recorded under licensed faculty. Ms. Kazmi responded saying the faculty and instructors will be licensed architects. She further explained students will be working for the school while in session.

Mr. Cooper asked if school would be in continuous session year round due to the amount of work required to complete IDP. Ms. Kazmi responded that while the curriculum would not be continuously in session, it would allow for summer options.

Mr. Gutierrez said when the Task Force was created its members had already formed an idea for how a licensure degree program would be structured. He added, however, as more meetings have been held and schools have presented their proposals, the Task Force is realizing it may be best to grant the schools autonomy. He advised NCARB's concern is the preservation of education, experience and examination, and how this could be accomplished by schools.

Mr. Baker stated the challenge of developing an adequate program could be undertaken by licensing boards. He mentioned the difficulty of consistently training students and setting objective benchmarks for schools to meet. He added a framework could be developed for purposes of streamlining the process of approving a program and ensuring equitability.

Mr. Gutierrez noted this is uncharted territory. He added the framework that will hold it all together is the preservation of education, experience and examination and collaboration will be the binding force. Mr. Cooper expressed concern regarding the capability of faculty teaching at the proposed schools. Mr. Gutierrez said the solution from schools has been to develop partnerships with businesses.

Mr. McCauley said some potential initiatives the Committee could consider and advance are presented in the meeting packet. He identified monitoring the NCARB Licensure Task Force and staying apprised of its work. He further identified the necessity for modifying the five year entry point requirement to take the ARE if schools are working on licensure upon graduation.

Mr. McCauley suggested the Board could work with the AIA to develop a framework for schools. He explained the Board could mirror an award similar to the NCARB Prize, where an award is presented to a school of architecture. He said creating a grant would require legislation to award funds, but noted precedent with the Contractors State Licensing Board awarding grants to construction management programs.

Ms. Kazmi said the program she developed would allow students to begin taking the ARE after the third year. She addressed Mr. Cooper's concern regarding instructors' qualifications to teach saying the ideal approach would be creating a syllabus requiring content, but leaving the method to the instructor. Stephanie Silkwood inquired how the proposed school would integrate the IDP requirement of experience gained within the traditional practice of architecture. Ms. Kazmi advised that ideally all educators would be licensed, but it would be dependent upon availability. She added the IDP lab serves as a work setting and would be supervised by the department director or president of the school.

Mr. Baker questioned how IDP could be effectively completed in the educational environment. Ms. Kazmi responded that students will be working on real projects with the school acting as the client. Ms. Dougherty relayed her personal experience and opined the financial cost of education coupled with the time required to satisfy IDP seem unfeasible for students to complete in an education setting. Raymond Cheng and Mr. Cooper also expressed concern regarding the financial cost to students.

Mr. Gutierrez opined that for the licensure upon graduation to succeed, the current relationship mold between education and internship must change. He added that partnerships between schools and firms will be an invaluable resource where some firms may eventually use schools to help with actual projects.

Mr. Baker asked Ms. Kazmi if she would be willing to share information and the experience of creating this school with other institutions, in furtherance of collaboration among schools and establishing best practices. Ms. Kazmi answered that she has currently been attempting to speak with educators regarding the importance of licensure. Kirk Miller inquired how long it would take a student to graduate from the proposed licensure degree program. Ms. Kazmi replied that students are anticipated to graduate in five years. Mr. Baker said combining the requirements for licensure may not fit into the window of a five year degree program.

Mr. Gutierrez stated the Task Force has not received a proposal with a program that concludes in fewer than six years, and expressed support for pilot efforts. He also voiced support for Mr. McCauley's listed efforts. He noted that placeholder legislation may need to be drafted to allow earlier entry to take the ARE. Mr. Gutierrez recommended the Board have more presence within schools regarding licensure, and develop an award instead of a grant to be awarded to an innovative educator who inspires licensure. Mr. Baker agreed with Mr. Gutierrez and added that the AIA should have a more involved role in promoting internships within schools, not necessarily promoting licensure. Mr. Gutierrez stated the Task Force will be making a recommendation to the NCARB Board of Directors in 2016. Ms. Silkwood said NCARB may need to clarify its IDP work setting definitions to encompass experience gained at the universities.

Ms. Kazmi asked for clarification regarding the role of the Board in allowing candidates to take the ARE. Vickie Mayer explained the Board sets the requirements for taking the ARE and vote to accept any changes.

Mr. Cheng inquired if students would be required to work for the school. Ms. Kazmi responded that students are not required to work for the school, but are required to log IDP hours.

Mr. Baker asked what direction members would like to recommend to the Board. Mr. Miller reiterated concern of shortening the licensure timeline and potentially reducing the quality of education and work received. Mr. Cheng added concern regarding the students' maturity level and knowledge required to practice. Messrs. Baker, Cheng and Miller agreed the proposed five year degree program may be insufficient to teach students all the required knowledge.

Mr. Wasserman expressed concern regarding the impact of these programs on the content within licensing examinations. Mr. Baker informed the Committee he is on the NCARB Examination Committee and the ARE will undergo modifications based upon a recently completed practice analysis. He explained the new version of the ARE will be restructured and encompass integrated questions and align the examination more with practice. Ms. Kazmi stated her program has reviewed the new ARE specifications and integrated it into the curriculum.

Mr. Baker opined the amount of time it takes to become licensed is discouraging to students and may correspond to fewer licensees. He anticipates that a licensure upon graduation program would encourage students to complete the licensure process. Glenn Gall expressed concern of the removal of barriers to licensure without assuring the value of licensure.

C. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PROMOTE ALTERNATE PATHS TO LICENSURE IN ORDER TO INCREASE ACCESSIBILITY INTO THE PROFESSION

Paul Neel described his personal experience with licensure process in England. He explained after three years of schooling students are awarded a degree, after which students who wish to become licensed must then do a year of internship, followed by two more years of education where a Bachelor of Architecture degree is awarded. He added students must take and pass a final examination to become licensed.

Mr. Neel distributed his proposed licensure timeline to Committee members for review, and explained the proposal was based upon current requirements. He added the proposal was developed to incentivize and keep students on the path to licensure.

Mr. Cooper complimented Mr. Neel on his effort and noted examinations are offered when the students would have studied the material, so it would be fresh in their minds. Mr. Neel stated the intent of his proposal was to overlap examinations with students encountering the material in school.

Mr. McCauley explained the Board's wish to explore outreach to community colleges and veterans reemployment centers. He asked if the Committee would authorize staff to draft letters explaining licensure and alternate pathways.

Glenn Gall made a motion directing staff to draft outreach letters explaining the licensure process and profession for Board approval.

Stephanie Silkwood seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

D. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PURUSE A REGULATORY AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS' (NCARB) ROLLING CLOCK DEADLINE PERTAINING TO ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION (ARE) DIVISIONS PASSED PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 2006

Marccus Reinhardt explained NCARB Member Boards passed a resolution whereby beginning on July 1, 2014 ARE divisions passed prior to January 1, 2006 will expire, unless all divisions of the ARE have been passed on or before June 30, 2014. He said the Board previously approved proposed regulatory language implementing this change at its June 13, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Reinhardt stated the 45-day comment period ended on April 1, 2014, and one comment was received. He added staff consulted with legal counsel regarding the comment, and it was determined not relevant to the proposed regulatory amendment.

Ms. Dougherty inquired if this is the first time candidates would be impacted by the rolling clock. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee the five year rolling clock has been applied to examinations since 2006, and examinations began expiring in 2011. He added that candidates are informed of their rolling clock status through ARE Score Reports.

E. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT AN OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE IN CALIFORNIA, REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL EXAMINATION (ARE), AND LINKAGE STUDY TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE CONTENT FOR ONGOING CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE) DEVELOPMENT

Justin Sotelo presented an update on the Occupational Analysis (OA) and explained it is being conducted, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 139, to assist in

developing future content for the CSE. Mr. Sotelo summarized what has been completed to date and identified future work culminating in the OA survey being sent to select participants in July.

Mr. Baker inquired how the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) is ensuring a diverse perspective of the profession is being gathered. Mr. Sotelo explained that the OPES facilitator is reviewing questions used on prior OAs, contacting stakeholders throughout the state, and assembling information generated by the focus groups.

Mr. Gall asked if the focus groups were segregated. Mr. Sotelo clarified that three separate and homogenous focus groups were held consisting of the differing stakeholders – contractors, engineers, land surveyors, building officials, and landscape architects. Mr. Gall inquired why clients and owners were not approached, and opined those groups could offer a beneficial perspective. Mr. McCauley agreed with the value of owners and clients and said he would speak with OPES about including those groups in future focus group meetings. Mr. Gutierrez suggested other professional groups, such as attorneys, be contacted to obtain additional perspective and ensure professional maturity to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

Mr. Baker inquired if OPES reviewed the NCARB OA. Mr. Sotelo replied the facilitator did use the NCARB Practice Analysis and 2007 Board OA as reference.

Mr. Miller inquired if all California licensees will be contacted or will a sampling be used. Mr. Sotelo responded that a sampling of the profession based upon geographic area and numbers of years practicing.

Mr. Miller further inquired if the data gathered from the surveys could be collated into different aspects of the profession and compared for commonalities and differences of viewpoints. Mr. McCauley responded that it is not clear if this would be possible. Mr. Baker added this information, while interesting, may not be useful for the development of an examination.

Mr. Gall inquired how surveys will be disseminated. Mr. Sotelo responded the primary method would be via email. Mr. Wasserman cautioned that email may be overlooked, and was concerned whether a sufficient response would be met. Mr. Sotelo clarified that participants will be contacted in advance of the survey.

F. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO SEEK AN EXEMPTION FROM ASSEMBLY BILL 186 RELATED TO WAIVER OF CSE

Mr. McCauley explained this legislation would require the Board to issue a temporary license to military spouses and waive all requirements, including the CSE. He added the CSE is a critical component of licensure and it concerns the Board the bill would require a waiver. He informed the Committee that the Board has attempted to seek an exemption to the bill, but has not received a response. Mr. McCauley concluded, stating the bill has not taken any further action nor is set to be heard, since the Board has requested the exemption. Mr. McCauley noted the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists was granted an exemption for similar reasons.

G. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD'S ACCREDITATION STANDARDS, FIRST READING (SECOND DRAFT)

Mr. Reinhardt explained this agenda item addresses the revision of the *2014 NAAB Accreditation Standards* based upon comments NAAB received during the initial comment period, and the Committee is asked to provide comments on the First Reading (Second Draft).

Mr. Neel detailed issues he had with specific language being removed, worded unclearly, and requirements being eased (understanding versus ability). Mr. Cooper agreed with Mr. Neel's comments and included further concerns related to performance of students and generality of statements. He provided Mr. McCauley a list of his edits and concerns to the revised *2014 NAAB Accreditation Standards*.

Mr. Neel explained his prior experience working with these types of documents and the differing stages it goes through, from committee, to psychometrician and editor, and the final product. He opined this process may be why certain wording had been modified.

Mr. Baker noted positive modifications to the document in shifting from "understanding" to "ability" requirements, but also expressed concern there was not enough "ability" required. Mr. Wasserman cautioned about requiring too much "ability" as a majority of that is learned through IDP. He added that requiring "ability" in school may take away from other aspects.

Mr. Baker suggested Committee members forward specific edits to staff for consolidation. Ms. Mayer suggested including rationale behind key edits submitted.

H. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO NCARB INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (IDP) RELATED TO IDP REPORTING REQUIREMENT

Mr. Reinhardt reported NCARB has proposed a modification to the reporting requirement for IDP and has requested comments from Member Boards. He explained the modification would increase the IDP reporting period up to five years, but at half credit beyond the first six months. He noted this modification aligns IDP reporting with the ARE five year rolling clock.

Ms. Dougherty expressed her support for this modification.

Ms. Silkwood expressed concern with supervisors recalling experience that was gained up to five years prior. She then inquired if this would replace the Broadly Experienced Design Professional (BEDP) program. Mr. Gutierrez responded that the BEDP program would allow for even older experience to be used for those design professionals seeking licensure and would therefore still move forward.

Betsy Dougherty made motion to recommend the Board support NCARB's proposed modification to the IDP reporting requirement.

Raymond Cheng seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

The meeting adjourned at 12:39 p.m.

Agenda Item B

UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, AND ENCOURAGE INITIATIVES FOR SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE THAT PROMOTE CURRICULUM IN HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE, AND ADDITIONAL PATH TO LICENSURE VIA BOARD LIAISONS, AND COLLABORATE WITH SCHOOLS, AS WELL AS THE BOARD, IN A SERIES OF SUMMITS ON PRACTICE-BASED EDUCATION

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee to monitor, analyze, and encourage (via the California Architects Board liaisons) initiatives for schools of architecture that promote curriculum in health, safety, and welfare, and an additional path to licensure as well as collaborate with schools in a series of summits on practice-based education.

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) has been exploring a potential additional pathway to architectural licensing upon graduation and, in September 2013, launched its Licensure Task Force (LTF). The NCARB Board of Directors (BOD) tasked the LTF with analyzing each essential component of licensure (education, experience, and examination) as a basis for exploring a potential new pathway and determining where there may be overlap and opportunities for realization of efficiencies. The LTF has met several times since September 2013 (most recently August 15-16, 2014) with the next meeting scheduled for November 14-15, 2014. The LTF plans to provide its recommendations to the NCARB BOD for consideration and possible implementation throughout its three-year assignment.

In furtherance of this objective, the Board, at its February 26, 2014 meeting, conducted a summit where it invited representatives from each of the California National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredited programs to discuss the issue of an additional path to licensure. Another component of this Strategic Plan objective is to utilize the Board's liaison program and collaborate further with schools on practice-based education. The liaison program is designed to ensure the Board exchanges information with key constituency groups and NAAB programs via Board members (liaisons) who then report back regularly to the Board.

The PQ Committee at its April 9, 2014 meeting and the Board at the June 12, 2014 meeting discussed the objective (and the potential efforts to address it). The PQ Committee provided its recommendations to the Board where it voted to request staff continue research into strategic initiatives for additional pathways. In the interim, on May 30, 2014, NCARB announced its endorsement of the concept for an additional, structured path leading to licensure. The additional path, licensure upon graduation from an accredited program, would integrate the internship and examination requirements into the years spent completing a professional degree in architecture.

Board Vice President Pasqual Gutierrez developed a confidential draft (which was approved at the September 10, 2014 Board meeting) of a Board position statement (attached) in support of an additional pathway to licensure that he subsequently presented to the LTF at its August 15-16, 2014 meeting. In addition, the LTF received input on the attached Request for Interest and Information (RFI&I), which was structured in such a manner as to allow the accredited programs autonomy and latitude in developing their responses by asking how the:

- Integrity of the three E's (education, experience, and examination) is preserved;
- Proposed program is aligned with their respective State Board's regulations; and
- Intern Development Program will be supported by participating strategic partnership firms.

The purpose of the RFI&I is to request and collect information from NAAB-accredited programs and to assess the interest level and readiness to design and develop an integrated path leading to licensure at graduation. NCARB released the RFI&I on September 9, 2014 and has asked for a response from programs by close of business on October 31, 2014. The formal Request for Proposal is planned for release to the NAAB-accredited programs in January 2015.

Attachment:

1. Additional Pathway to Licensure Supporting Position Statement
2. Request for Interest and Information for an Integrated Path to Licensure at Graduation



CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

Additional Pathway to Licensure Supporting Position Statement

California's examination and licensure requirements are more flexible than most other jurisdictions. Obtaining a license in California involves requirements that can be met in multiple ways with several possible entry points. Although each candidate's path to licensure may differ, all candidates will complete the process with the necessary knowledge, skills, and ability to be a licensed architect who practices in a way that protects the health, safety, and welfare of Californians.

The California Architects Board supports and encourages California schools of architecture to participate in formulating integrated curriculums of education, experience and examination that promote an additional pathway to licensure. The Board will monitor and analyze participating school proposals promoting licensure upon graduation and establish an earlier entry point eligibility to begin taking the Architect Registration Exam.

2420 DEL PASO ROAD,
SUITE 105
SACRAMENTO,
CA 95834

916-574-7220 T
916-575-7283 F

cab@dca.ca.gov
www.cab.ca.gov

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS

**NON-BINDING
REQUEST FOR INTEREST & INFORMATION
for an
Integrated Path to Licensure at Graduation**

Contact Information

Zerrin Sayar
Director, Administration
202.879.0504
zsayar@ncarb.org

Stephen Nutt, AIA, NCARB, CAE
Sr. Architect / Advisor to the CEO
202.879.0544
snutt@ncarb.org

Date of Issue:

September 9, 2014

Response Due Date:

October 31, 2014

Contents

Non-Binding Request for Interest & Information	3
Purpose	3
Background	4
Overview	5
NCARB Mission Statement	5
NCARB Vision Statement	5
Schedule	6
RFI&I	6
RFP	6
Request for Interest	7
A. School Information	7
B. Statement of Interest	7
C. Executive Summary	7
D. Current Program Description & Statistics	7
E. Participation and Support of Other Entities	7
Request for Information	8
Statement of Confidentiality	8
Commitment to Fairness and Transparency	8

Non-Binding Request for Interest & Information for an Integrated Path to Licensure at Graduation

Purpose

The purpose of this Request for Interest & Information (RFI&I) is to request and collect information from NAAB-accredited programs and to assess interest level and readiness to design and develop an integrated path leading to licensure at graduation encompassing the NCARB requirements of education, experience, and examination.

Individual academic institutions in collaboration with a licensing board will determine a variety of approaches as long as the specifications of the NAAB-accredited program (NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation), the completion of the Intern Development Program (IDP 2.0), and passing the Architect Registration Examination® (ARE® 5.0) prior to graduation are met. The alignment and sequence of those elements will be left to the discretion of the participating schools. The Licensure Task Force is seeking a wide variety of responses that provide a structured, yet flexible framework for students to complete the program and achieve licensure concurrent with graduation.

NCARB is aware that participation in such an integrated path may require sufficient time for a program to develop its approach, and may also require a licensing board to adjust its governing rules or laws to sanction successful candidates for initial and/or reciprocal licensure. Therefore, the RFI&I is the first step of a two-phase process that will be followed by a formal Request for Proposal (RFP).

Responses to this RFI&I are due by October 31, 2014. Your response to the RFI&I is not mandatory; however, it will help us better gauge the level of interest in the program and will be advantageous to a successful proposal. Once the RFI&I responses are compiled, reviewed, and evaluated, NCARB will provide feedback to each program in order to strengthen their future proposal. Your input will also help us produce and release a more responsive RFP.

The RFP, issued in January 2015, will remain open for approximately five months until June 1, 2015, to maximize the opportunity for participation and response. NCARB will announce the results and notify the programs selected to move forward in September 2015.

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited program are invited to respond to the RFI&I and the RFP. Those programs that are in candidacy status are also included. Institutions offering multiple programs are invited to submit one proposal for each degree path. Only those institutions that successfully integrate the education, experience, and examination criteria will be selected to move forward. There is no limit to the number of successful institutions qualified during the initial round.

Background

The paths to architectural licensure, with their elements of education, experience, and examination, can be enhanced as the profession and its preparatory tools evolve. Accordingly, in 2013, NCARB formed a Licensure Task Force (LTF), led by NCARB immediate Past-President Ronald B. Blich, FAIA, FACHA, NCARB and composed of representatives of our Member Boards, the Board of Directors, the emerging professional community including interns and recently licensed architects, educators, and the collateral organizations (ACSA, AIA, AIAS, and NAAB).

The composition of the Task Force is reflective of a diverse geographic and demographic perspective and is committed to pursuing an integrated pathway that integrates and enhances the education, experience, and examination components of licensure and requires a collaborative partnership between institutions offering NAAB-accredited programs, licensing boards, students, and firms.

Overview

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (“NCARB”) is a not-for-profit corporation 501(c)(6) comprising the legally constituted architectural registration boards of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands as its members. Each state and territory in the United States has a governmental authority that registers and regulates architects. Typically, the authority is vested in a State Board of Architecture comprised of architects and lay persons appointed to the board by the governor of the state. The state boards formulate the rules and policies of NCARB and elect NCARB’s officers and directors. The only members of NCARB are these boards of architecture.

NCARB Mission Statement

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards protects the public health, safety, and welfare by leading the regulation of the practice of architecture through the development and application of standards for licensure and credentialing of architects.

NCARB Vision Statement

NCARB is a diverse, high-performing team consisting of the Board, volunteers, and staff working in concert with our Member Boards to fulfill our mission. NCARB is universally recognized as the global leader of architectural regulation through its exemplary standards, credentialing requirements and reciprocal licensure processes, and consummate customer service. To that end, our strategic goals are:

- Facilitate Licensure: NCARB programs are catalysts for the early pursuit, achievement, and ongoing maintenance of professional licensure.
- Foster Collaboration: NCARB’s collaboration with collateral and related organizations leads to a sustained, action-oriented dialogue to identify and address significant issues that impact the profession and the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
- Centralize Credential Data: Active and ongoing participation by Member Boards in NCARB’s information systems provides the preferred platform for interns and architects to efficiently manage their credentials.

Schedule

The following schedule has been developed to promote an efficient process. Final dates may need to be adjusted depending on the number of responses and proposals received.

RFI&I

RFI&I Issued	September 9, 2014
Question & Answer Period (via e-mail)	September 22-26, 2014
RFI&I Responses due (via e-mail)	October 31, 2014
Announcement of Responses	December 2014

RFP

RFP Issued	January 7, 2015
Question & Answer Period #1	February 2015
Question & Answer Period #2	April 2015
Proposals due (via e-mail)	June 1, 2015
Announcement and Notification	September 2015

If you are unable to meet the deadlines associated with the initial round of submissions, a revolving schedule of future opportunities to submit proposals will be published at a later date.

Request for Interest

Schools that are interested in receiving the RFP in January 2015 are encouraged to submit a response to this RFI&I containing the following information:

A. School Information

- a. Name of Institution
- b. Contact Person
- c. Mailing Address
- d. Email
- e. Telephone

B. Statement of Interest

- Include a brief statement that you are interested in the concept of Licensure at Graduation and that you intend to submit a Proposal for consideration.

C. Executive Summary

- Provide a 1-2 page overview describing your intended approach and framework of the program you will be designing, in both graphic and narrative form.
- Explain how education, IDP, and ARE will be integrated and preserved.
- Briefly identify why your program is uniquely positioned to advance this integrated path.

D. Current Program Description & Statistics

- Program Mission
- Operational Model (i.e. public, private, for profit, etc.)
- Professional degree programs offered (BArch, MArch, DArch)
- Average number of graduates per year per professional degree
- Size and composition of faculty (please identify the number of licensed, tenure, adjunct, non-continuing, full-time, and part-time members)

E. Participation and Support of Other Entities

- Acknowledge that strategic partnerships between the institution, licensing board, and firms/practitioners are required in your response. (Your future proposal will require the submission of evidence that these partnerships have been arranged.)

Request for Information

Your feedback is critical to the thorough review and evaluation of our concept of licensure at the point of graduation. Your comments and concerns are welcome as we continue to explore this integrated pathway.

- In addition to receiving your statement of interest, the Licensure Task Force would welcome your input on the draft structure of the formal Request for Proposals. The outline of the RFP is provided below. Your comments will help the Council produce and release a comprehensive and responsive RFP. The RFP will require at least the following items:
 - Current program introduction
 - Proposed program description (curriculum map & description)
 - Support from the institution
 - Support from the profession
 - Support from the licensing board
 - Program implementation timeline
 - NCARB Requirements for monitoring the success of programs
 - Evaluation criteria

- If your institution is not interested in submitting a response, the Licensure Task Force would be very interested in hearing your concerns. Your views will be openly and honestly considered during our analysis of the responses.

Statement of Confidentiality

All information contained in this request is confidential in nature. All recipients of this RFI&I agree that this information may only be used internally and may not be shared with individuals outside the institution to which it is addressed.

Commitment to Fairness and Transparency

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards and its Licensure Task Force are committed to a fair, transparent, efficient, effective, and non-discriminatory evaluation process.

Agenda Item C

UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT AN OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE IN CALIFORNIA, REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL EXAMINATION (ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION), AND LINKAGE STUDY TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE CONTENT FOR ONGOING CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE) DEVELOPMENT

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective to conduct an occupational analysis (OA) of architectural practice in California, a review of the national examination (ARE) development process, and a linkage study to determine the appropriate content for ongoing CSE development.

Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 139 requires that an OA be conducted every five to seven years. The Board's most recent OA used to develop the CSE was conducted in 2007. The primary purpose of the OA is to define current architectural practice in California based on a survey of the critical tasks, skills, and knowledge for an individual receiving initial licensure. The findings of the OA will be used to inform the content of the CSE and form the basis for determining "minimum acceptable competence" as it relates to safe practice at the time of initial licensure.

BPC 139 also requires boards and bureaus that use a national examination and a state examination to conduct a psychometric process review, along with a linkage study. The linkage study compares the knowledge, skills, and abilities tested for on the national examination with those of the state examination to avoid duplicity.

At its February 26, 2014 meeting, the Board approved an Intra-Agency Contract (IAC) agreement with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) to conduct the CSE OA, review of the ARE development process, and linkage study. The term of the IAC is January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

Throughout March 2014, OPES conducted four focus group meetings as part of its preparation for developing the OA survey. Three of the focus group meetings involved building officials, engineers, land surveyors, landscape architects, and contractors. Another focus group meeting involved architects and was conducted over two days. OPES analyzed the input that was provided by the focus group participants. In April 2014, interviews with architect subject matter experts (SMEs) were conducted in order to develop a preliminary list of job tasks and required knowledge. The list was reviewed and revised by SMEs in May 2014.

In June 2014, OPES constructed and distributed a pilot OA survey for review by selected participants (jointly determined by OPES and the Board). The final web-based survey was distributed via email to a representative sample of licensees in early July; selected licensees had until July 18, 2014 to complete the survey. Approximately 1,500 licensees responded to the survey; the responses were reviewed by OPES and subsequently analyzed by SMEs during workshops held in September 2014. OPES is currently preparing the final validation report, which is expected to be completed soon. A representative from OPES will provide the Board with a presentation detailing the results of the OA at the December 10, 2014 Board meeting.

The next step will be to conduct the review of the ARE development process, with which NCARB is assisting by providing the necessary documentation and information. After the review has been conducted a linkage study will be conducted to reduce duplicity between the CSE and ARE. The final CSE Test Plan will be developed by the conclusion of the linkage study.

Agenda Item D

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Committee at this time.