



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

July 14, 2015

Sacramento, CA and Teleconference from Boston, MA

Committee Members Present

Pasqual Gutierrez, Chair
Betsey Dougherty
Glenn Gall (Teleconference from Boston, MA)
Ebony Lewis
Kirk Miller
Stephanie Silkwood
Barry Wasserman
Barry Williams

Committee Members Absent

Tian Feng, Vice Chair
Jon Baker
Raymond Cheng
Allan Cooper
Paul Neel

Guests

Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice,
The American Institute of Architects, California Council
Raul Villanueva, Personnel Selection Consultant,
Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)
Marcus McCarther, Special Assistant to the Director,
Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager Examination/Licensing Unit
Lily Dong, California Supplemental Examination Analyst
Jeffrey Olguin, Examination/Licensing Analyst
Timothy Rodda, Examination/Licensing Analyst
Douglas Truong, 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 Pasqual Gutierrez called the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQ) meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

A. REVIEW AND APPROVE PQ COMMITTEE OCTOBER 30, 2014, SUMMARY REPORT

Mr. Gutierrez asked for an approval of the October 30, 2014, PQ meeting Summary Report.

Betsy Dougherty made a motion to approve the October 30, 2014 PQ meeting Summary Report.

Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

Committee Chair Gutierrez, members Dougherty, Gall, Lewis, Miller, Silkwood, Wasserman, and Williams voted in favor of the motion. Vice Chair Feng and members Baker, Cheng, Cooper, and Neel were absent. The motion passed 8-0.

B. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015–2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO COLLABORATE WITH CALIFORNIA’S NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD ACCREDITED PROGRAMS AT SCHOOLS AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) TO ESTABLISH AND PROMOTE AN "ACCELERATED PATH TO ARCHITECTURAL LICENSURE"

Doug McCauley recapitulated for the Committee members the effort at the national level of promoting a pathway that integrates licensure components into degree programs. He informed the Committee the Board discussed the concept for an additional structured pathway and that NCARB announced its endorsement of the concept on May 30, 2014. Mr. McCauley reminded the Committee that Mr. Gutierrez is a member of the NCARB Licensure Task Force (LTF), which is charged with examining the components of licensure to determine where there exists of an overlap in order to promote more efficient and effective pipeline into the profession.

Mr. McCauley also reminded the Committee that the LTF released its Request for Information and Interest (RFI&I) last year. He informed the Committee the RFI&I was sent to all National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredited schools of architecture. He shared with the Committee that approximately 35 schools responded to the RFI&I, including three California schools (NewSchool of Architecture & Design, Woodbury University and University of Southern California School of Architecture). Mr. McCauley added the LTF also released its formal Request for Proposal (RFP) on January 23, 2015 with a response due to NCARB on June 1, 2015.

Mr. McCauley remarked that the Board encouraged California schools to participate in responding to the RFP and adopted a Supporting Position Statement at its September 10, 2014 meeting to demonstrate its endorsement of the concept. Mr. Gutierrez informed the Committee that the LTF will be meeting on August 2–3, 2015 and indicated that NCARB may make an announcement on which schools are in alignment with the integrity of the concept by the end of August 2015.

Mr. McCauley acknowledged that there is a growing concern regarding the length of time it takes for candidates to become licensed. He suggested candidates should work with firms to complete Intern Development Program (IDP) sooner and schools should also help with this process. He informed the Committee the "three Es" were not going to change and that the rigor in the licensing process would remain consistent.

Mr. McCauley remarked that even if a school were to offer a program that guaranteed a candidate acquiring licensure at the eight-year point, it would be a significant improvement over what is illustrated in the 2015 *NCARB by the Numbers*, which indicates closer to a 12-year timeline.

Stephanie Silkwood inquired about the Architect Registration Examination eligibility point and whether it will be modified specifically for those in a particular program or in a more general manner. Mr. McCauley responded that it is among the questions being analyzed and will ultimately need to be addressed by the Board.

C. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015–2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT A REVIEW OF ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION (ARE) AND LINKAGE STUDY TO MEET REQUIREMENTS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 139 AND DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS POLICY ON LICENSURE EXAMINATION VALIDATION AND IDENTIFY AREAS OF CALIFORNIA PRACTICE FOR WHICH THE ARE AND CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE) ARE APPROPRIATE FOR ASSESSING CANDIDATE COMPETENCY, THUS ENSURING A VALID AND DEFENSIBLE EXAMINATION PROCESS

Marcus Reinhardt provided the Committee with a brief update on the Board's Occupational Analysis (OA) and explained this objective examines a part of the OA process. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that Raul Villanueva from OPES will be presenting this agenda item.

Mr. Villanueva presented an overview of the requirements detailed in Business and Professions Code section (BPC) 139, ARE review, and the Linkage Study. He stated BPC 139 mandates that licensure examinations used in California, whether developed by DCA or private entities, must conform to the requirements stated in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. He explained the Linkage Study must be done to ensure the CSE contents reflect critical aspects of California practice and added that the Linkage Study focuses on comparing the contents within the ARE with the description of practice defined by the OA. Mr. Villanueva informed the Committee that OPES convened a panel of California architects who served as subject matter experts (SMEs) to review the content that comprises ARE 4.0 and ARE 5.0 and compare it with the description of practice for California architects.

Mr. Villanueva advised the Committee that on July 16–17, 2015, another panel of SMEs will review each question in the CSE item bank to ensure the content is directly related to the tasks and knowledge as reflected in the CSE Test Plan. He added this will be the reclassification referenced in the relevant Strategic Plan objective.

Kirk Miller made an inquiry of a question asked in the OA, "*What is the highest level of education you have completed?*" He recommended that OPES should differentiate between professional and non-professional degrees when conducting the next OA. He added that California does not require a professional degree to acquire an architect's license, whereas other states boards do.

Barry Wasserman opined that the CSE is appropriate to assess candidate competency and he is confident it will benefit the newly-licensed to practice architecture with respect to the health, safety, and welfare of Californians.

The Committee unanimously expressed its confidence in the development of the CSE by OPES.

D. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015–2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO RECLASSIFY CSE ITEM BANK BASED UPON RESULTS ON 2014 OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS (OA) IN ORDER TO ENSURE ITEM CONTENT REFLECTS CRITICAL TASKS AND KNOWLEDGE RELATED TO NEWLY-LICENSED ARCHITECTS AS IDENTIFIED BY THE OA AND TO MAINTAIN RELEVANCE WITH CONTEMPORARY PRACTICE

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that this agenda item was largely discussed by Mr. Villanueva during his presentation.

E. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015–2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT REVIEW OF ARE TESTING ENVIRONMENT IN ORDER TO ENSURE SECURITY AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that a provision of the Board's contract with NCARB permits it (or its representatives) to visit and review an ARE administered at a testing center. He also informed the Committee that during a past similar review, an NCARB representative provided a presentation relative to examination development and administration. He added that ARE 5.0 will be released fall 2016, and suggested that would be a suitable time to conduct another review, allowing the participants to observe the delivery of ARE 5.0 alongside with ARE 4.0.

Mr. Gutierrez inquired about the process used by candidates for selecting a testing location. Mr. Reinhardt explained candidates make the selection through their respective NCARB Record at the time of scheduling.

Mr. Gutierrez also asked how NCARB selects testing locations for use in ARE administration. Ms. Silkwood and Mr. Reinhardt explained that NCARB and Prometric select the testing locations to administer the ARE based upon contractual requirements.

Mr. Wasserman inquired whether there were any complaints in general by candidates who have taken the ARE. Mr. Reinhardt responded the Board has not received any complaints. Ms. Silkwood joined the discussion and recalled a few of her colleagues had mentioned a few issues at one of the ARE testing locations, such as creaking floors, fluctuating room temperature, and computer display failures. She opined that NCARB has mitigated these issues by allowing

affected candidates to retake the ARE. She added that it appears NCARB has an effective complaint management system in place.

Mr. Reinhardt explained to the Committee that ARE 4.0 and 5.0 will be running concurrently from when ARE 5.0 launches (tentatively on October 1, 2016). Candidates may elect to take either ARE 4.0 or ARE 5.0 but may not alternate between versions while both are being administered. He added that those candidates already taking ARE 4.0 will be allowed to continue until July 1, 2018, when ARE 4.0 is discontinued. Mr. McCauley added that NCARB has been more open in terms of its communication about the transition from ARE 4.0 to ARE 5.0.

Ms. Dougherty voiced concern with the transition from ARE 4.0 to 5.0 and how it may affect candidates who either have not yet applied or are in the midst of taking the ARE. Mr. Reinhardt explained NCARB encourages candidates to take the exam once they are ready and not wait until ARE 5.0 is available. He added that NCARB has publicly announced that candidates could have several divisions of ARE 5.0 completed by July 1, 2018, depending on how strategically they test.

Ms. Silkwood shared with the Committee that under "My Examination" candidates will be able to visualize exactly which exams are needed to acquire credit under ARE 5.0, if they were to transition at any given moment.

F. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015–2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO EVALUATE THE PROFESSION IN ORDER TO IDENTIFY ENTRY BARRIERS FOR DIVERSE GROUPS

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that the 2015–2016 Strategic Plan includes an objective for the Board to identify entry barriers for diverse groups. He noted for the Committee that NCARB released its *NCARB by the Numbers*, which includes data on diversity within the profession. He advised the Committee that staff is working with NCARB, The American Institute of Architects, and National Organization of Minority Architects and utilizing 2010 US Census Bureau data in conducting research. He added that it is anticipated the data will be presented to the Committee at its next meeting.

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that NCARB's data suggests there is an increase in the number of women entering the profession and a greater racial diversity. He added there are also indications that women are starting the process earlier than men. He advised that some data gleaned from NCARB is presented on the related cover sheet in the meeting packet. Mr. Reinhardt asked the Committee for direction and input they may wish to provide.

Mr. Wasserman and Ms. Dougherty expressed their concern regarding whether the architecture profession is rather unfamiliar to younger generations. Mr. McCauley informed the Committee that the Communication Committee has begun its work on an objective of collaborating with approximate 20 high schools in California and encouraging them to include architecture in the curriculum subject areas.

Ms. Silkwood suggested to the Committee that staff also collect data on pay equity between men and women.

G. NCARB

***3. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON NCARB INITIATIVE OF A PATH FOR PROFESSIONALS WITH QUALIFIED EXPERIENCE BEYOND FIVE YEARS**

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that during its 2015 Annual Business Meeting (held on June 18–20, 2015), NCARB announced that it will commence work with Member Boards on developing a path to licensure for professionals who have qualified experience from more than five years ago (which exceeds the current IDP reporting requirement). He added that the purpose of this proposal is to create an approach to licensure that permits documentation of valid work experience that fulfills the spirit of IDP, but falls outside the limit of current IDP reporting requirements. Mr. Reinhardt noted this program is fundamentally similar to the Broadly Experience Design Professional Pathway previously proposed to NCARB by Mr. Gutierrez.

He added Board staff will be monitoring NCARB communiques for updates as they are released.

Betsey Dougherty made a motion to recommend the Board issue a letter of support to NCARB regarding its initiative of a path for professionals with qualified experience beyond five years.

Barry Wasserman seconded the motion.

Committee Chair Gutierrez, members Dougherty, Gall, Lewis, Miller, Silkwood, Wasserman, and Williams voted in favor of the motion. Vice Chair Feng and members Baker, Cheng, Cooper, and Neel were absent. The motion passed 8-0.

***2. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RESOLUTION 2015-02 REGARDING ALTERNATIVE FOR CERTIFICATION OF FOREIGN ARCHITECTS**

Mr. Reinhardt advised the Committee that during the NCARB 2015 Annual Business Meeting, Member Boards approved Resolution 2015-02, which discontinues the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect (BEFA) Program in favor of a simplified alternative for receiving an NCARB Certificate. He added that the effective date is July 1, 2016.

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that the Board accepts the NCARB Certificate issued through BEFA from foreign candidates pursuing reciprocity. He added the Board also provides them the option of the initial licensure pathway for those who do not wish to use the BEFA Program.

Mr. Reinhardt elucidated that in the past the Board did not accept the NCARB Certificate issued through BEFA nor have reciprocity with foreign countries, except Canada. He noted that there are only 12 individuals who have successfully completed the program.

Mr. Reinhardt advised the Committee that the new alternative for foreign licensees will replace the current BEFA Program's requirements, eliminating the committee dossier review and the need to document seven years of credentialed practice in a foreign country. Instead,

he added that foreign architects will be required to document completion of IDP experience requirements and successfully complete the ARE to obtain NCARB Certification.

Ms. Dougherty expressed her concern to the Committee regarding NCARB requiring completion of the ARE and IDP for foreign architects prior to being permitted to practice architecture in the United States. She opined this requirement will require talented international architects to joint venture with international companies in order to have their IDP experience endorsed by a US architect, and that would be an impediment for foreign architects.

Mr. Miller inquired whether there is any service that evaluates a foreign degree in architecture.

Mr. Reinhardt explained that NAAB administers the Education Evaluation Services for Architects, which evaluates the credentials of foreign educated and broadly experienced architects in comparison to the NCARB Education Standard. He added that if deficiencies are determined during the evaluation, the candidates must make up those deficiencies in an accredited program.

Kirk Miller made a motion to recommend the Board consider providing a means for review of, and amendment to NCARB Resolution 2015-02, removing the encumbrance of mandatory IDP and allowing for education equivalents and practice knowledge for foreign architects, and suggest the Board request the implementation date to be postponed.

Betsy Dougherty seconded the motion.

Committee Chair Gutierrez, members Dougherty, Gall, Lewis, Miller, Silkwood, Wasserman, and Williams voted in favor of the motion. Vice Chair Feng and members Baker, Cheng, Cooper, and Neel were absent. The motion passed 8-0.

***1. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RESOLUTION 2015-01 REGARDING ALTERNATIVE FOR CERTIFICATION OF BROADLY EXPERIENCED ARCHITECTS**

Mr. Reinhardt advised the Committee that the Board, at its March 12, 2015 meeting, took an "oppose unless amended" position on this resolution (2015-01) due to the elimination of NCARB Certificate eligibility for architects without post-secondary education. He noted that at the March 12–14, 2015 Regional Summit, the proposed resolution was extensively debated and Board President Jon Baker strongly advocated a revision be considered by NCARB leadership, so architects without post-secondary education would not be precluded from attaining the certificate. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that based upon the feedback received from membership, the NCARB Board of Directors unanimously voted at its April 23–25, 2015 meeting to present a revised draft of the resolution for consideration at the 2015 NCARB Annual Meeting. Mr. Reinhardt indicated the resolution was again amended at the Annual Meeting and subsequently failed to pass.

Mr. McCauley and Mr. Gutierrez recommended to the Committee to wait for a new proposal from NCARB and then the Committee could take a position.

The meeting adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate the schedule of a guest speaker. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*