

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

September 10, 2014

San Diego, CA

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

Board President Sheran Voigt called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and Board members began a tour of NewSchool of Architecture and Design facilities. At approximately 10:35 a.m., Board Secretary, Chris Christophersen, called roll.

Board Members Present

Sheran Voigt, President
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice President
Chris Christophersen, Secretary
Jon Alan Baker
Denise Campos
Tian Feng
Sylvia Kwan
Matthew McGuinness
Nilza Serrano
Hraztan Zeitlian (arrived at 10:45 a.m.)

Guests Present

Bastiaan Bouma, Executive Director, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC) San Diego Chapter
Andrew Bowden, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Member
Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, AIACC
Kurt Hunker, Graduate Architecture Program Chair, NewSchool of Architecture & Design
Mitra Kanaani, Professor of Architecture, NewSchool of Architecture & Design
Ashley Pourat, Center for Public Interest Law, University of San Diego
Len Zegarski, Undergraduate Architecture Program Chair, NewSchool of Architecture & Design

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marccus Reinhardt, Examination/Licensing Program Manager
Trish Rodriguez, LATC Program Manager
Justin Sotelo, Enforcement/Administration Program Manager
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst
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

Ms. Voigt thanked NewSchool of Architecture & Design for the meeting facilities. She also:

- noted that LATC member, Andrew Bowden is in attendance; and
- introduced new Board member, Denise Campos, who was sworn in by Executive Officer (EO), Doug McCauley.

Ms. Campos shared with the Board her professional background, noting that she hails from Los Angeles and was appointed by State Senate President pro Tem Darrell Steinberg. She informed the Board that she is a San Diego State University graduate where she double-majored in Political Science and Chicano Studies. Ms. Campos also said she works for Southern California Gas Company in Public Affairs, and will soon graduate from the Hispañas Organized for Political Equality 2014 Leadership Institute.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Kurt Hunker presented a brief history of NewSchool of Architecture & Design and spoke about its graduate programs and the school's vision to establish a broad range of design programs.

Len Zegarski spoke about the school's 1) undergraduate programs and regional accreditation status, 2) dual degree program in Madrid, Spain, and other study abroad opportunities available to students, and 3) plans to launch undergraduate programs in design that are not architecture.

D. APPROVE THE JUNE 12, 2014 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Voigt asked for comments concerning the June 12, 2014, Board Meeting Minutes. Tian Feng asked the Board to approve a modification of his statement on page 7, wherein he stated the Board should "not" be a part of Assembly Bill (AB) 2192 (Melendez). He also requested an acknowledgement that he volunteered to be the liaison to University of California, Berkeley (UCB); Diablo Valley College; and Chabot College for future liaison reports.

- **Hraztan Zeitlian moved to approve the June 12, 2014, Board Meeting Minutes as amended on page 7.**

Chris Christophersen seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

F.* 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 BOARD LIAISONS, AND COLLABORATE WITH SCHOOLS, AS WELL AS THE BOARD, IN A SERIES OF SUMMITS ON PRACTICE-BASED EDUCATION

Mitra Kanaani gave a presentation entitled “Changes to the Path to Licensure for Architecture.” Ms. Kanaani discussed what NewSchool of Architecture & Design is doing to address the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards’ (NCARB) changes to the Intern Development Program (IDP) and Architect Registration Examination (ARE). She spoke on 1) professional architecture degree goals and challenges, 2) new vision for architecture education, focusing on practice and renewal at all levels, 3) two-track licensure upon graduation proposal, and 4) importance of a more coherent and productive partnership between the profession and the academy. Ms. Kanaani asked the Board to modify the entry point restriction for candidates to begin taking the ARE, which is a necessary step, she said, for schools to implement a licensure upon graduation program.

Pasqual Gutierrez, a member of NCARB’s Licensure Task Force (LTF) which analyzes each component of the additional pathway to licensure initiative, reported that 123 National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)-accredited schools of architecture and 10 NAAB candidate schools have received Requests for Information and Interest (RFI+I) on their concept for a program that would lead to licensure upon graduation. He reported that schools have until October 31, 2014 to submit their response to the RFI+I, after which NCARB will provide feedback on how to best position their programs for responses to the Request for Proposal (RFP). Mr. Gutierrez said the RFP will become available in January 2015. He explained that the RFP, due on June 1, 2015, must be complete with detailed information and show collaboration with firms and the State board. He said some schools will be selected in September 2015 based on NCARB’s assessment that the “Three Es” (education, experience, and examination) are preserved and professional integrity is established. Those schools, Mr. Gutierrez said, will then be given authority from NCARB to launch their programs.

Matthew McGuiness asked how many schools are from California, to which Mr. Gutierrez responded ten California NAAB-accredited schools. Mr. Baker shared his understanding that, for schools to be authorized to proceed with their proposed licensure upon graduation program, they must have an endorsement by their State board. Mr. Gutierrez replied that, as part of the RFP, schools are required to provide evidence of collaboration with State boards and firms, as well as their fulfillment of and compliance with NAAB criteria. Mr. Baker asked if the Board must approve programs which will result in licensure upon graduation in California. Mr. Gutierrez said he was not certain if the Board will approve the program, but, he stated, the Board will be assured that the licensure upon graduation program fulfills criteria established by the Board. He said the Board will then determine when the ARE will become available to candidates based on program curriculum. Mr. Gutierrez explained that some programs may request access to the ARE in years three, four, or five. Mr. Baker asked if NCARB envisions State boards playing an active role or a passive role in the endorsement of those programs. Mr. Gutierrez reiterated that selected schools must demonstrate collaboration with their respective State boards.

Mr. Gutierrez clarified his remarks to say that the RFI+I is not a mandatory response, and that NAAB-accredited schools may submit the RFP without having submitted the RFI+I. He explained that the RFI+I simply exists to assist schools in preparation for submitting the RFP, and will enable schools to receive feedback from the LTF on how to best position their programs for a positive response. Mr. Zeitlian asked if the purpose of the RFP is for schools to propose a program for licensure upon graduation that is fewer than eight years. Mr. Gutierrez replied that schools will have complete autonomy as to how they choose to administer their licensure upon graduation program. He explained that the RFP is simply a detailed outline of a school's curriculum and establishes its readiness. Mr. Gutierrez advised the RFI+I and RFP process will allow NCARB to recognize schools' curriculums and to gauge curriculums' fulfillment of the "Three Es." He said if schools elect not to submit by the June 1, 2015 deadline, NCARB may establish a second-round RFP submittal date.

Mr. Feng inquired further about the role of licensing boards in the process, to which Mr. Gutierrez replied that the California Board regulates the point of eligibility to begin testing for the ARE. He explained that the California point of eligibility is five years, which may be altered as the Board deems appropriate. Mr. Gutierrez said that through the Board's liaison program, California schools of architecture have the opportunity to provide feedback to NCARB.

Nilza Serrano asked if the RFP process can be used as an opportunity by the Board to encourage schools of architecture to focus more on educating students in areas of professional practice that candidates seem to struggle with on the ARE. She suggested that if candidates are passing a particular division of the ARE at lower rates, then it may be attributed to either a lack of a candidate's understanding or effective preparation at schools. Mr. Gutierrez explained that many factors must be considered when assessing ARE pass rates. He noted, for instance, that building construction documentation is not taught in school, but, instead, is learned during IDP at firms. Mr. Gutierrez said, through this logic, one may argue that firms are not sufficiently preparing candidates. Ms. Serrano said that since schools of architecture are interested and excited about an additional pathway for licensure upon graduation, the Board may want to bolster a greater focus in those areas of instruction for the RFP. Mr. Gutierrez stated that, as liaisons to schools of architecture, the Board can express concern and, perhaps, suggest a refocus in those areas of practice while the RFPs are being developed.

Mr. Zeitlian inquired whether a final version of an RFI+I can be provided to liaisons to use to encourage schools to be involved. Mr. Gutierrez spoke of an issue of confidentiality with the RFI+I. He said specific content and criteria of the RFI+I may not be shared outside of the university.

Mr. Baker explained to the Board that the new ARE 5.0 will be more integrated than its preceding version, which, consequently, will be more challenging to teach to. He expressed optimism that a new examination structure will translate into a way of bridging the gap between education and a practice-based examination, focusing on a more integrated methodology to teach and test students than currently exists. Mr. Baker said that candidate instruction at schools and via IDP has potential to be improved substantially by the upcoming restructure of the ARE.

Sylvia Kwan recalled that Ms. Kanaani asked the Board to modify the sequence and timing of when candidates may begin testing for the ARE. She asked what is proposed as the earliest year a candidate may take the ARE, and if the upcoming ARE 5.0 will impact the student's ability to take the examination before he or she graduates. Mr. McCauley said that ARE 5.0 will be

directly correlated with the experience requirement. Mr. Gutierrez explained that if he were a university administrator who wanted to establish a successful licensure upon graduation program, he would 1) consider the phase-based ARE 5.0, 2) consider the overhauled IDP which will be an overlay of the ARE, 3) establish a consortium with professional practices to ensure that students are engaged in the information pipeline, and 4) identify an appropriate time in students' education to test for an ARE division.

Ms. Kanaani shared her view that the burden is on schools to appropriately consider NAAB and NCARB requirements when developing licensure upon graduation programs. She said it will be important for schools to counsel their students throughout the ARE testing process. Ms. Kanaani explained that NCARB has become the champion of the licensure upon graduation initiative in the United States, but, ultimately, NAAB is the body that validates a program. She said that the Board's role is to create conditions for a school's program to take effect. Ms. Voigt stated that the only condition the Board may create is determining how soon candidates are eligible to begin taking the ARE. Ms. Kanaani informed that the Massachusetts and Minnesota boards have already taken steps to allow their candidates to begin early testing for the ARE.

Mr. Baker stated that the Board must consider whether it needs to modify its five-year rule of eligibility, or leave the rule in place and have a different rule for candidates pursuing the additional path through an accelerated program. Mr. Gutierrez said the Board will need to spend more time considering every angle of a licensure upon graduation model because California is a state with multiple paths to licensure. He said one key question to consider is how to preserve the integrity of multiple paths while recognizing the additional path to licensure upon graduation that could call for early testing of the ARE. To further illustrate the point, Mr. Gutierrez posed the scenario of a candidate who enrolls in a licensure upon graduation program, takes and passes a division of the ARE, then decides to no longer participate in the program; the issue of credit for a division passed after the candidate leaves the program would need to be addressed.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that the Board will need to further consider the full complexities of this kind of additional path to licensure model before taking a position.

Ms. Serrano cautioned the Board about ensuring that students are not rushed to licensure through a system that fails to adequately protect the consumer. She reminded the Board that, though there is much enthusiasm for licensure upon graduation, the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare (HSW) is of paramount concern. Ms. Voigt reminded that interest in the concept of licensure upon graduation is rooted in the reality that students are withdrawing the licensure process due to the current system's duration.

To be better prepared for future internal discussions, Mr. Zeitlian suggested a motion to observe and research other State boards as they evaluate the additional pathway.

- **Jon Baker moved for staff to monitor the status of other state licensing boards (i.e., Massachusetts and Minnesota) as they evaluate the additional pathway, and report to the Board at its next meeting in December.**

Hraztan Zeitlian seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

Mr. Feng shared with the Board his conversation with the Chair of the Architecture Department at UCB, wherein it was stated that UCB was uncertain whether, policy-wise, they could endorse a “teaching to the test” approach.

Mr. McGuinness asked if the Board has any ability to affect the role firms have in preparing candidates for the ARE, given the recent proposed change to IDP which would reduce program hours. Mr. Baker said he believes the Board does not have a participatory role, as schools do a good job with connecting students with internships. However, he also said the role the Board has played as a participant is through the NCARB organization in having advanced the requirement that schools have IDP coordinators, resulting in better communication with students about the IDP. Mr. Baker said, as a consequence, the IDP is more integrated into students’ experience and regulatory boards across the nation were instrumental in getting those policies in place.

Mr. McCauley informed the Board that Mr. Gutierrez developed a draft of the Board’s position statement in support of an additional pathway to licensure. He said the draft was presented to the LTF at its August 15-16, 2014 meeting. Mr. McCauley asked the Board to ratify the Additional Pathway to Licensure Supporting Position Statement, and to modify the statement to indicate the Board’s intention to amend its regulations to allow for earlier ARE eligibility.

- **Hraztan Zeitlian moved to accept the Additional Pathway to Licensure Supporting Position Statement with an amendment indicating the Board’s intent to establish earlier ARE eligibility.**

Matthew McGuinness seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

Mr. Zeitlian asked for language in the Additional Pathway to Licensure Supporting Position Statement to be included in future liaison talking points. Mr. Gutierrez suggested that the key points in the statement that schools should consider important when considering their RFI+I should be crafted into a letter which liaisons may sign and send to their assigned schools. The Board expressed approval of the idea.

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

Mr. McCauley gave a status update of the negative Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to reduce the Board’s spending authority by \$400,000 for fiscal year 2015/16 and ongoing. He informed the Board that the BCP was submitted to the Department of Finance for approval on September 2, 2014, before it will be considered for inclusion into the Governor’s Proposed Budget.

Mr. McCauley reported that the Board’s number of *Twitter* followers has increased 30 percent since the June Board meeting.

Mr. McCauley reported that the Board is in the process of developing new forms of the CSE. He explained that an Occupational Analysis (OA) was recently conducted which included a survey for practitioners to identify 1) what they do, 2) how often they do it, and 3) how important those tasks are to protect the public HSW. Mr. McCauley explained that the data will be analyzed to develop the Test Plan, emphasizing the importance of the OA process to the quality of exams.

Ms. Kwan asked how many responses to the survey the Board received, to which Marccus Reinhardt answered 1,511 responses.

Mr. McCauley reported that the Board's Enforcement Program is performing better than those of its DCA counterparts, particularly as it concerns case aging statistics. He noted that the Board's case aging statistics are slightly higher than those from 12 months ago, explaining that disciplinary action now being taken as a result of the continuing education audits has inflated numbers. Mr. McCauley stated his expectation for case aging to return to normal levels within one year.

Mr. McCauley next provided an update on legislative items, reporting that Senate Bill (SB) 850 (Block) had been substantially amended to the degree that community colleges may not establish a new baccalaureate program if one already exists at a California public university. Ms. Kwan shared concerns about SB 850 expressed by Cosumnes River College (CRC) Professor of Architecture, John Ellis. She explained that since there is no college or university in the greater Sacramento area with an architecture degree program, this version of SB 850, in effect, prohibits CRC from participating. Ms. Kwan asked if, at this stage, there is anything the Board could do. Mr. McCauley replied that the Board could offer support to sponsors of legislation that enable community colleges to award baccalaureate degrees in architecture. Kurt Kooknick stated that AIACC is willing to entertain sponsorship of such legislation. Mr. McCauley said community college baccalaureate degree programs in architecture would present a more affordable option for students.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to work with AIACC to develop a proposal for community college baccalaureate degree pilot programs in architecture throughout the State of California.**

Jon Baker seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

Mr. McCauley reported that AB 186 (Maienschein), the military exemption bill, was passed by the Senate on August 27, 2014, and is on the Governor's desk after an amendment was made to exclude the Board and the LATC from its provisions. Mr. McCauley also reported that AIACC ultimately decided to drop AB 2192, the proposed legislation regarding peer review on exempt projects.

Mr. McCauley reviewed the draft 2014 Sunset Review Report and updated the Board on minor edits made to its administration, examination, and enforcement sections. Mr. Baker asked staff to ensure that Mr. Gutierrez's reappointment, which began in July 2014, is reflected in the Report.

- **Pasqual Gutierrez moved to approve the draft 2014 Sunset Review Report and delegate authority to the Board President, Vice President, and EO to make any additional or necessary changes to the Report prior to submittal to the Legislature.**

Chris Christophersen seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

G. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB)

The Board requested a copy of the official comments on NCARB proposals to overhaul IDP, Broadly Experienced Architect, and Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect programs, and chose to revisit the ratification of comments at the December Board meeting.

H. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR), TITLE 16, SECTION 120 (RE-EXAMINATION) AS IT RELATES TO WAITING PERIOD TO RETAKE ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Board that, in June 2014, NCARB changed its retake policy for the ARE. He explained that the change in policy has reduced the duration a candidate must wait before retaking a failed division of the examination from 6 months to 60 days, and up to 3 times in a running year from the date of the first attempt. Consequently, Mr. Reinhardt told the Board, it is necessary to pursue an amendment of California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 120 subsection (d) to implement the reduction in wait time for California candidates, if the Board so chooses. He also advised that staff recommends a proposed amendment to subsection (c) of CCR 120 to refer candidates to NCARB's *ARE Guidelines* for information regarding procedures after failing to appear for a division.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to approve the proposed regulations to amend CCR section 120, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and delegate authority to the EO to adopt the regulations and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.**

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

I. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CCR, TITLE 16, SECTION 109 (FILING OF APPLICATIONS) AS IT RELATES TO REFERENCE OF THE CURRENT EDITION OF IDP GUIDELINES

Mr. Reinhardt explained to the Board that NCARB recently changed the IDP reporting requirement, allowing interns to earn IDP credit for valid work experience that occurred up to five years previous to the current reporting requirements of six months. He informed the Board that approval is required to initiate the regulatory process to amend CCR section 109(b)(2), which will reflect NCARB's most recent revision of its *IDP Guidelines*.

- **Jon Baker moved to approve the proposed regulations to amend CCR section 109, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and delegate authority to the EO to adopt the regulations and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.**

Chris Christophersen seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

J. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

Trish Rodriguez provided the Board with an update on the activities which occurred at the LATC meeting held in Sacramento and various teleconference locations in California on August 27, 2014. She reported that the Committee:

1. Completed an OA and linkage study, and subsequently approved the Intra-Agency Contract Agreement with the DCA Office of Professional Examination Services for examination development.
2. Recommended Board approval of the draft 2014 LATC Sunset Review Report.

Ms. Rodriguez asked the Board to review and approve the draft 2014 LATC Sunset Review Report, which included the LATC's suggested edits made at its August meeting.

- **Hraztan Zeitlian moved to approve the draft 2014 LATC Sunset Review Report and delegate authority to the LATC Chair and EO to make any additional or necessary changes to the Report prior to submittal to the Legislature.**

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

K. CLOSED SESSION – DISCIPLINARY DECISIONS AND EXAM DEVELOPMENT ISSUES [CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126(C)(1) AND (3)]

There were no items considered under closed session.

L. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE

Mr. McCauley identified the following tentative dates for Board meetings in 2015:

- March 5, 2015 (note: this date may change to coincide with NCARB Regional Summit)
- June 10, 2015
- September 10, 2015
- December 10-11, 2015

Mr. Zeitlian requested that letters of introduction be sent to schools and organizations assigned to liaisons, and for respective liaisons to be carbon copied to those letters. He also asked for names of contact information for each school and organization be provided to the liaisons. Mr. Baker added that the liaison contact information should be included in the letter.

Mr. Baker informed the Board that the next NCARB Regional Summit will take place in Long Beach in March 2015. He asked for suggestions for the Region 6 Executive Committee, responsible for the planning of the Summit, to consider that would be educational and regionally relevant to NCARB visitors from other states. Ms. Serrano offered to assist with planning.

M. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

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