

MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING  
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

March 3, 2016

Burbank, CA

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

Board President, Jon Alan Baker called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and Board Secretary, Sylvia Kwan, called roll.

Board Members Present

Jon Alan Baker, President  
Matthew McGuinness, Vice President  
Sylvia Kwan, Secretary  
Tian Feng  
Pasqual Gutierrez  
Ebony Lewis  
Robert C. Pearman, Jr.  
Nilza Serrano  
Barry Williams

Board Members Absent

Denise Campos

Guests Present

Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)  
Michael Hricak, Professor, University of Southern California (USC)  
Kurt Hunker, Graduate Architecture Program Chair, NewSchool of Architecture & Design (NewSchool)  
Mitra Kanaani, Professor of Architecture, NewSchool  
Charles Lagreco, Professor, USC  
Marvin Malecha, President and Chief Academic Officer, NewSchool  
Marc Neveu, Ph.D., Chair, Architecture Department, Woodbury University (Woodbury)  
Catherine Roussel, Career and Outreach Coordinator, Woodbury

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer  
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager Examination/Licensing  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)  
Justin Sotelo, Program Manager Administration/Enforcement  
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst  
Robert Carter, Architect Consultant

Rebecca Bon, Staff Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)  
Six members of the Board present constitute a quorum. There being nine present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

B. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Baker welcomed new Board member Robert C. Pearman, Jr. Doug McCauley administered the Oath of Office to Mr. Pearman.

Mr. Baker 1) announced that Board member Denise Campos has an excused absence from the day's meeting; 2) recognized the presence of representatives from the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)-accepted Integrated Path Initiative (IPI) institutions; and 3) advised that all motions and seconds shall be repeated for the record, and votes on all motions would be taken by roll-call.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

D. REVIEW AND APPROVE DECEMBER 10, 2015 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Baker asked for comments concerning the December 10, 2015, Board Meeting Minutes.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the December 10, 2015, Board Meeting Minutes.**

**Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.**

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Pearman abstained. The motion passed 8-0-1.**

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that the June meeting will be held in the Bay Area. He also updated the Board on the status of BreEZe and informed that staff is expected to begin work on implementing BreEZe during Release 3 in late 2016. Mr. McCauley also reminded the Board that it received a presentation on the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) review, linkage study, and subsequent Test Plan at the December 2015 meeting. He stated that the Board is now positioned to commence California Supplemental Examination (CSE) development, which is scheduled to take place in late 2016. Mr. McCauley reported that the Intern Development Program (IDP) has been streamlined from a three-year program into a two-year program, and will be renamed the Architectural Experience Program. He also highlighted notable enforcement statistics, including those concerning *age of pending cases* and *average days to close*, which, he reported, are performing well-below the five-year average. Mr. McCauley reported that additional enforcement data is included in the monthly report per Strategic Plan objective to develop new ways to portray data.

Mr. Baker observed a comparison of California candidate performance data versus national candidate performance data, which shows that California candidates generally score lower on the

ARE. Mr. McCauley indicated that California's multiple pathways to licensure are a factor that helps to explain that dynamic. Pasqual Gutierrez expressed a desire to explore the differences between candidates who pass the ARE after one or two attempts versus those who pass after several attempts. Nilza Serrano observed higher failure rates among California test takers in the Building Systems and Construction Documents divisions of the ARE. Ms. Serrano asked if the Board could do anything to assist students in better-preparing for the ARE. Ms. Serrano expressed the concern that potential licensees could be lost due to frustration with their degree of preparation for the ARE, and opined that students should be educated enough not to have to rely on study materials when they have already spent several years studying architecture. Mr. McCauley stated that part of the solution lies in NCARB's IPI. He stated that the integrated nature of IPI will go a long way toward addressing Ms. Serrano's concern. Tian Feng opined that the profession may need to provide a stronger helping hand, and suggested that AIACC have stronger outreach to students by developing continuing education (CE)-type seminars. Mr. McCauley advised the Board, as an examination provider, cannot engage in direct examination preparation services, as it could undermine the credibility of the examination. However, he informed that there are opportunities for the profession to engage in that kind of activity, citing AIA San Francisco's ARE Pact program.

Michael Hricak opined that ARE preparation is more cultural and behavioral than it is technical and educational. He spoke about USC's Not-Licensed-Yet program, which, he explained, creates a greater degree of structure for students pursuing licensure. Mr. Hricak opined that the IPI programs are a good step toward addressing ARE concerns because IPI programs allow candidates to test for the ARE during a time when they are better at taking tests than they will ever be. Ms. Serrano asked staff to collect data on how many ARE candidates in California attended institutions out-of-state. Mr. Baker opined that NCARB already has that data. Mr. Feng expressed a desire to provide AIA resources to students, to which Mr. McCauley stated that those resources can be explained through the Board's Liaison Program. Mr. Gutierrez stated that it would be good to know in which categories of the ARE schools perform weakest so that they know which knowledge points are most challenging for students. Mr. Baker noted that schools are incentivized to structure their programs in alignment with National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) criteria. He stated that schools must abide by the NAAB criteria, therefore, efforts to better-prepare students for the ARE might need to begin with NAAB.

Board members provided liaison reports on organizations and schools that were not reported on at the December 2015 meeting. Ebony Lewis reported on her contact with the USC, Citrus College, East Los Angeles College, and Los Angeles Valley College. Mr. Feng reported on his contact with the University of California, Berkeley, and with Diablo Valley College. Mr. Gutierrez expressed appreciation to the Board for issuing a letter addressed to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture; California Polytechnic State University, Pomona; and Woodbury in response to their issues, and advising that the Board is considering their concerns. He requested that staff add school-specific ARE performance data (versus national performance data) to the liaison talking points. Mr. Gutierrez also expressed a desire to share AIA's Emerging Professional Companion document with liaison contacts. Ms. Kwan reported on her contact with the Academy of Art University, California College of the Arts, College of Marin, and Cosumnes River College. She suggested that the Liaison Program requires liaisons to contact organizations and schools too frequently, and that, instead of initiating contact on a quarterly basis, perhaps contact on a semi-annual or annual basis is more appropriate. Mr. McCauley explained that because the Board recently shifted its Liaison Program reporting cycle to the spring and fall months of a calendar year, the perception that

liaisons are contacting their assigned organizations and schools too frequently is understood. He further explained that, initially, liaison reports were delivered on an annual basis to correspond with the December Strategic Planning session. Mr. McCauley indicated that reports can be given less frequently if the Board desires. He said the matter may be reconsidered at the next Strategic Planning session. Ms. Roussel stated that she appreciates the updates provided by Board liaisons and noted that, so long as there are important changes and new information concerning the profession, she would like to hear from the Board. Mr. Feng supported the idea of delivering liaison reports twice annually.

Barry Williams reported on his contact with College of the Sequoias. Mr. Hricak expressed his view that the Board's level of contact with organizations and schools is appropriate. He also expressed the need to address the issue of diversity among architecture students at the university level by beginning with efforts while those students are in elementary school.

Ms. Serrano observed that her conversations with schools as a public member of the Board may differ from conversations that schools have with architect members of the Board. She indicated that her conversation is more focused on issues of diversity at schools of architecture, which, she stated, stimulates the conversation in a positive way. Ms. Serrano also stated her belief that it is the Board's responsibility to help create conditions for more students of color to enroll in schools of architecture and to ultimately become licensed practitioners.

Marvin Malecha stated that he has no problem speaking to Board liaisons at any time, and suggested that contact at least twice annually is appropriate to discuss fundamental issues and the business of the Board.

F. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON LEGISLATION REGARDING ASSEMBLY BILL 507 (OLSEN) [BREEZE], BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTIONS 5536.22 (WRITTEN CONTRACT) AND 5550.2 (EXAM ELIGIBILITY – INTEGRATED DEGREE PROGRAM), AND SENATE BILL 1132 (GALGIANI) [INTERN TITLE]

Mr. McCauley updated the Board on Assembly Bill (AB) 507 (Olsen), the proposed legislation that will require annual submissions of a report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance regarding the BreEZe system. He reported that there are discussions between the DCA and the bill's author about restructuring it in a way that would provide the Legislature with metrics and other information it desires. Mr. McCauley reported that AB 507 remains in the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development (BP&ED).

Mr. McCauley also updated the Board on the submittal of two proposals to the Senate BP&ED for possible inclusion in the omnibus clean-up bill. He explained that the first proposal is an amendment to Business and Professions Code section (BPC) 5536.22 to clarify that the following elements are required in architects' written contracts with clients for professional services: 1) a description of the project, 2) the project address, and 3) a description of the procedure to accommodate contract changes. He informed that Senate BP&ED staff determined that this proposal is substantive, not clarifying, therefore, ineligible for the omnibus bill; it will need to be introduced in a separate bill during the next legislative cycle.

Mr. McCauley explained that the second proposal clarifies language regarding integrated degree programs that was added to the Architects Practice Act (Act) via the Sunset Review bill last year; the language specifically updates BPC 5550.2, which permits the Board to grant early eligibility

to take the ARE for students enrolled in an NCARB-accepted integrated degree program. He informed that the Senate BP&ED accepted this amendment with a minor revision requested by Legislative Counsel, that a bill number is pending, and that Board staff is working with Senate BP&ED staff to finalize the language.

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board of its Strategic Plan objective to monitor NCARB's position on the issue of creating a special title for candidates for licensure. He explained that a March 4, 2015 letter received from AIACC stated the organization's goal to "provide a means with which to formally recognize those committed to becoming California licensed architects," which, he noted, is contrary to action at the national level. Mr. McCauley further explained that NCARB determined that special titles for candidates are not appropriate. He also informed the Board NCARB's position is that, in order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, only one title is needed: "Architect." Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that, at its most recent meeting (December 2015), it voted to accept the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee's (REC) recommendation to "table the intern titling issue until AIACC presents a comprehensive proposal that has been reviewed and analyzed by Board staff." He indicated that AIACC's proposal was received by the Board on February 24, 2016, but it has not been reviewed by the REC and analyzed by staff. Mr. McCauley stated that AIACC-sponsored legislation, Senate Bill (SB) 1132 (Galgiani), was introduced on February 19, 2016, and advised the Board to take a position on this bill given its prior action. Mr. Baker inquired whether the Board should take a position on SB 1132. He asked if AIACC is willing to postpone moving the bill until the REC has time to evaluate the proposal as directed in the December Board action. Kurt Cooknick explained the late delivery of AIACC's proposal to the Board. Mr. Cooknick opined that the Board should move forward on the intern title issue despite NCARB's position on the matter. He stated that AIACC's proposal is reasonable and addresses all concerns that have been expressed by the Board. He agreed to delay SB 1132 until the REC has had time to consider it and so that it may be coordinated through the author's office as well.

Mr. Baker inquired about the timeframe the candidate is permitted to use the intern title, to which Mr. Cooknick indicated that such a component was discarded due to the perception that a timeline is confusing. Mr. Baker asked if candidates would be able to use the title once they have eligibility to test for the ARE, to which Mr. Cooknick replied in the affirmative. Mr. Cooknick clarified that AIACC is asking for the Board to provide the ability for candidates to legally use "Architect" in their title within the firm. He also stated that if a firm authorizes the use of the title "architect-in-training (AIT)," a candidate can use it until he/she is no longer affiliated with the firm; at that point the candidate is responsible for its use. Mr. Cooknick opined that individuals would not want to call themselves AIT for their entire career, which would provide motivation to complete the licensure process. Mr. Baker asked whether it is the firm's decision or the candidate's decision to use the AIT title. Mr. Cooknick replied it would be the firm's decision because the firm is putting AIT on instruments of service. Mr. Baker asked what would happen if the candidate leaves the firm and goes to another firm that has chosen not to authorize the use of AIT. Mr. Cooknick replied the candidate would then not be able to use the title. Mr. Baker asked who is responsible if there is a violation of the use of AIT, to which Mr. Cooknick replied that the individual would be held accountable in the same way that individual licensees are held accountable. Mr. Baker requested that AIACC clarify and elaborate on the enforcement mechanisms related to the use of AIT before it is presented to the REC. Mr. Cooknick explained that, if a firm chooses to use AIT as a designation for an individual who meets the qualifications, the firm could produce instruments of service with the individual's name and AIT on those instruments of service. Mr. Baker expressed his concern that once the

Board begins to regulate a title outside of that which it is currently mandated to regulate, enforcement mechanisms must be in place to manage the use of that title. Bob Carter recommended that AIACC further develop its proposal to include scenarios that illustrate how the use of AIT will be implemented and enforced. Mr. Baker pointed to the proposed language to modify the Act that says there are potential fines to be assessed. He opined it would be helpful for the Board to know to whom to issue a citation, especially because there is a lack of clarity about who will ultimately be responsible for the use of AIT: the firm or the candidate.

Matthew McGuinness reported that the REC has not yet had an opportunity to fully analyze AIACC's proposal, and noted that data suggests that only 12 percent of people surveyed would consider calling themselves an AIT. He asked for a more comprehensive proposal so that the REC may discuss the issue on a deeper level. Mr. McGuinness also expressed concern about AIACC's submittal of legislation without first considering the Board's input. Ms. Serrano asked why architects would not be responsible for AITs in the same way the legal profession requires attorneys to be responsible for the work of paralegals. Mr. Baker explained that the management of the AIT title and the architect who exercises responsible control of everything produced by unlicensed staff is different. Ms. Serrano expressed her view that the use of AIT would make her more comfortable as a consumer of architectural services.

Mr. Cooknick opined that one's use of AIT is a reflection of the strength of one's desire to be licensed. Mr. Feng recalled the discussion during the June 2015 Board meeting with Mr. Cooknick and Deborah Gerard, and noted that SB 1132 does not address concerns that were expressed by the Board. He stated that, in his view, no progress on the Board's enforcement concerns has been made. Mr. Cooknick explained that SB 1132, in its current form, is "as introduced" and is not the final product. He stated he feels that AIACC's proposed legislation and regulation activities are parallel efforts, and are not intended to undermine the Board in any way. Mr. Cooknick also stated that, in his opinion, he has not heard compelling reasons to be opposed to the legislation. He noted that 22 other jurisdictions are using some sort of paraprofessional title and have figured out the enforcement part. Mr. Cooknick cautioned the Board to not confuse NCARB's decision about no longer recognizing "intern" with the view that California is not able to use any other title. Mr. Baker clarified NCARB's position that it is not in the business of promoting a title for unlicensed people. Ebony Lewis noted that, in the medical profession, residents are called many names (e.g., interns, residents-in-training, physicians-in-training), and suggested considering other professions' structure and practice to better inform the Board's decision about paraprofessional titles in the architectural profession.

Mr. Williams stated that the REC is asking for a comprehensive proposal from AIACC that addresses the enforcement issue. He said REC needs to assess the proposal and identify elements that the REC would agree and disagree with. Mr. Pearman stated that although SB 1132 in its current form does not describe everything, the Board should know answers to key questions. Mr. Gutierrez recommended that AIACC consider the consequences of its proposal on firms, and opined there will be very little acceptance of AIT by firms in their marketing or business development material. Ms. Kwan requested from Mr. Cooknick specific examples of jurisdictions that use a paraprofessional title like AIT, to which Mr. Cooknick offered to include a list of jurisdictions in AIACC's proposal before it is reviewed by the REC.

- **Matthew McGuinness moved to table the issue of creating a special title for candidates for licensure until the REC has received and considered a comprehensive proposal from AIACC.**

**Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.**

Mr. Cooknick stated that unlicensed practice, with or without a paraprofessional title, is still unlicensed practice. He opined that individuals who have the AIT title are less likely to behave badly and more likely to pay fines because they would not want to jeopardize their opportunity to become licensed. Mr. Baker stated that the Board must consider the facts and identify enforcement mechanisms. Mr. Gutierrez again encouraged Mr. Cooknick to consider potential unintended consequences of AIACC's proposal on firms.

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.**

G. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB)

Mr. McCauley informed the Board that the 2016 NCARB Regional Summit will take place on March 11-12, 2016. He informed that, typically, NCARB Resolutions are introduced at this meeting for review and are voted upon at NCARB's Annual Business Meeting in June. Mr. McCauley stated that, as a member of NCARB's Procedures and Documents Committee, he has seen the initial draft resolutions. He advised there will likely be resolutions on: 1) the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect Program (BEFA), 2) military licensure, 3) emeritus status, 4) CE credit for IDP supervisors, 5) name change of IDP to a name that does not reference the word "intern" in model law, and 6) a mutual recognition agreement with New Zealand will be considered this year.

Mr. McCauley announced that the only contested position during the 2016 election cycle is for NCARB's Member Board Executive (MBE) Director position. He informed that individuals in the MBE position may serve three one-year terms and that, in his view, the incumbent, Kingsley Johnson Glasgow, has been very effective in this role. Mr. McCauley recommended endorsing Mr. Glasgow for the MBE Director position.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to support the identified slate of NCARB candidates and allow the Board's NCARB delegation to take additional action at the NCARB Regional Summit as appropriate.**

**Barry Williams seconded the motion.**

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.**

Mr. McCauley informed the Board that it should also take a position on Western Conference of Architectural Registration Boards (WCARB) candidates for office. The Board discussed each candidate for WCARB office.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to support the identified slate of WCARB candidates and allow the Board's NCARB delegation to take additional action at the NCARB Regional Summit as appropriate.**

**Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.**

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.**

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that it is required to have a contract with NCARB in order for NCARB to provide administration of the ARE to California candidates. He advised that the contract is “zero-cost” to the State of California as fees are paid for by candidates. Mr. McCauley stated that the current contract with NCARB expires on June 30 2016, and asked the Board to approve the contract with NCARB for ARE administration.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the contract with NCARB for ARE administration for fiscal years 2016-2019.**

**Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.**

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.**

Mr. McCauley informed the Board that the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) identified concerns regarding the burden on foreign architects relative to the completion of IDP. He indicated that NCARB proposed Resolution (2015-02) replaces the current BEFA Program in favor of a simplified alternative. Mr. McCauley explained that the new alternative, which becomes effective July 1, 2016, replaces the current BEFA requirements, eliminating the dossier review and the need to document seven years of credentialed practice in a foreign country. Instead, he explained, foreign architects will be required to document completion of the IDP experience requirements and successfully complete the ARE to obtain an NCARB Certificate. Marcus Reinhardt indicated that, per the Board’s request at its September 10, 2015 meeting, staff contacted NCARB for clarification about the application of the IDP requirement for foreign architects. He explained that, based on the clarification obtained from NCARB regarding BEFA changes, the Board then directed staff to contact NCARB (February 22, 2016 letter), requesting replacement or elimination of the IDP requirement for foreign architects and postponement of the July 1, 2016 implementation date. Mr. Baker informed that the concern is that foreign architects would be required to complete IDP and that, in his view, the biggest improvement in the process is that foreign architects now must complete the ARE, which was not a requirement before. Mr. McCauley asked the Board whether it believes that the positive benefits of the new proposal to streamline and remove the burden of the dossier review process outweighs the impact of documenting IDP. Mr. Baker opined that it does, and stated that he did not believe it is necessary for this issue to return to the PQC.

- **Tian Feng moved to support NCARB Resolution 2015-02 regarding the BEFA Program.**

**Matthew McGuinness seconded the motion.**

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.**

Mr. Gutierrez, a member of NCARB’s Licensure Task Force (LTF), updated the Board on LTF activities. He informed that LTF is now the Integrated Path Evaluation Committee (IPEC), which is tasked with overseeing the ongoing work of NCARB’s IPI. Mr. Gutierrez advised that



the second round of Request for Proposals (RFP) to invite schools to participate in developing IPI programs was released on January 22, 2016, and the proposals are due on April 7, 2016. He also advised that the RFP had been revised to no longer request demographic data, as that data is already collected by NAAB, and no longer requests data on the program cost to students. Mr. Gutierrez announced that the next IPEC meeting is scheduled for April 15-16, 2016, at which time the IPEC will review the RFPs. He reminded the Board that 14 schools were accepted into the inaugural launch of IPI: Portland State University; USC; Woodbury; NewSchool; University of Kansas; Clemson University; University of North Carolina, Charlotte; North Carolina State University; University of Cincinnati; Florida Technological University; University of Detroit, Mercy; Savannah College of Arts and Design; Drexel University; and Boston Architectural College. Mr. Gutierrez informed that a presentation is being developed by NCARB for delivery to the Association of College Schools of Architecture. Ms. Kwan asked how many schools have expressed interest in submitting RFPs for the second round. Mr. Gutierrez stated that most schools that have contacted the IPEC have expressed a “wait and see” position before deciding to commit.

The three California schools with an IPI program accepted by NCARB (NewSchool, USC, and Woodbury) were invited to the Board meeting to provide a presentation on their respective programs. Each school provided the Board with a presentation regarding its respective approach to integrate education, experience, and examination.

Ms. Roussel reported on Woodbury’s approach to program eligibility, program interest, application process, and program steps to completion. Ms. Kwan asked if the agreement between the firm and student will continue throughout the IPI program, to which Ms. Roussel replied that she did not yet know. Ms. Serrano asked that Woodbury not to use a student’s financial standing with the university as an eligibility factor for an IPI slot.

Charles Lagreco reported on USC’s IPI program and urged the Board to consider allowing all California school of architecture students to take the ARE earlier than it currently allows. Mr. Lagreco stressed that IPI programs should be inclusive, not selective. He also spoke about his interest in the aspect of integration of exam and experience, making the pursuit of licensure more relevant to the student. Mr. Lagreco stated that he expects about 10 to 12 students to participate in the IPI program each year.

Kurt Hunker reported on NewSchool’s IPI program. Mr. Hunker spoke about NewSchool’s unique position to implement its IPI program by scheduling coursework and internship components simultaneously. He indicated that the undergraduate IPI program is a six-year program, while the graduate IPI program is a four-year program. Mr. Hunker stated that he expects about 12 graduate students to participate in the IPI program each year.

#### H. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

Trish Rodriguez provided the Board with an update on the activities at the February 10, 2016 LATC meeting. Ms. Rodriguez reported that the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards is beginning its task analysis and has contacted each board to request the list of licensees for participation in their task analysis. She also reported that the Committee discussed re-licensure procedures and directed staff to research appropriate changes that allow an individual with an expired license, for more than three years but fewer than five, to pay incurred fees and retake the CSE without having to retake the Landscape Architect Registration

Examination. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the amendment would require not only changes to regulation, but also to statute. She advised that staff will work with legal counsel to present the issue to the Board at a future meeting. Ms. Rodriguez also reported that the Committee discussed related degrees, and recommended the item to be further discussed at the next Strategic Planning meeting in November 2016. Finally, she reported that the Committee considered the issue of California Code of Regulations section (CCR) 2620, as it relates to education and training credits. Ms. Rodriguez explained the 2010 Education Subcommittee's intention for candidates with education experience described in sections 2620(a)(1) and (a)(5) to need only two years as a licensed landscape contractor to meet the six-year experience requirement. She asked the Board to consider the Committee's recommendation to approve the proposed regulatory language to amend CCR 2620 to include this pathway into regulation.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the proposed regulation to amend CCR 2620, and delegate authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the regulation provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed.**

**Sylvia Kwan seconded the motion.**

**Members Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.**

I. CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into closed session to:

- 1) Confer with legal counsel on litigation regarding *Marie Lundin vs. California Architects Board, et al.*, Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Case No. 585824-164724;
- 2) Consider action on the Closed Session Minutes of the December 10, 2015 Board meeting;
- 3) Consider action on two Stipulated Settlements; and
- 4) Consider action on two Proposed Decisions.

J. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened open session.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.