



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

October 30, 2014

Sacramento, CA and Teleconference at Various Locations

#### Committee Members Present

Jon Baker, Chair (present at 10:10 a.m.)  
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice Chair  
Betsey Dougherty (present at 10:04 a.m.)  
Glenn Gall  
Kirk Miller  
Paul Neel  
Stephanie Silkwood  
Barry Wasserman

#### Committee Members Absent

Raymond Cheng  
Allan Cooper

#### Guests

Stan Braden, KTG Y Group  
Dennis Danahay, Danahay Architects  
Ben Kasdan, Young Architects Forum Director for Southern California,  
American Institute of Architects, California Council

#### Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer  
Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical  
Committee (LATC)  
Lily Dong, Supplemental Examination Analyst  
Jeffrey Olguin, Continuing Education Program Analyst  
Timothy Rodda, Examination/Licensing Analyst  
Douglas Truong, Special Projects Analyst, LATC

2420 DEL PASO ROAD,  
SUITE 105  
SACRAMENTO,  
CA 95834

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

[cab@dca.ca.gov](mailto:cab@dca.ca.gov)  
[www.cab.ca.gov](http://www.cab.ca.gov)

Committee Vice Chair Pasqual Gutierrez called the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

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

The PQ Committee reviewed the April 9, 2014 meeting Summary Report. Mr. Gutierrez requested an edit to page five, amending the first paragraph to read that the Task Force has not received any proposals.

*Glenn Gall made a motion to approve the April 9, 2014 PQ Committee meeting Summary Report with an amendment to page five.*

*Betsy Dougherty seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 8-0.*

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

Doug McCauley introduced this item and provided a brief background on this Strategic Plan objective. He advised that Mr. Gutierrez serves on the National Council of Architectural Boards' (NCARB) Licensure Task Force (LTF), which is charged with examining additional pathways to licensure. Mr. McCauley explained that he and Mr. Gutierrez discussed the potential for a school of architecture in Sacramento, possible models, and how the school could affect licensure requirements. He added that NCARB simultaneously began researching the potential of streamlining licensure components, and convened the LTF to analyze the issue. Mr. McCauley indicated that this is the most significant effort the Board has undertaken in the past 20 years. He informed that there is no shortage of licensing methodologies to analyze as potential models, including those used by other nations. Mr. Gutierrez informed the Committee on the work related to this issue being conducted by NCARB.

Mr. Gutierrez stated a Request for Information and Interest (RFI&I) was distributed to all National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredited schools of architecture in September with a due date of October 31, 2014. He stated seven submissions have been received, including one California school. Mr. Gutierrez explained that a subcommittee within the LTF is reviewing the submissions and will provide a report at the November 14-15, 2014 LTF meeting with a purpose of developing the content necessary for best determining communication and content packaging of a Request for Proposal (RFP) scheduled for distribution in January 2015. He indicated that feedback has suggested that clarification is needed in communicating to schools the proposed pathway is an additional pathway to licensure and not a replacement of the current methods. Kirk Miller expressed support for the work being done and believes this is a positive step forward.

Stephanie Silkwood asked if the Board would maintain an eight-year experience requirement. Mr. McCauley responded hypothetically there may be multiple pathways with different requirements – for instance a traditional (eight-year) pathway and a new integrative pathway. He added that there are a number of related issues to be considered, such as what happens if a candidate leaves the specific school program or state. He also stated that no other state board has indicated whether it will be reducing the eligibility point for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE). Ms. Silkwood expressed concern that there may be unintended consequences to the quality of candidate experience through the Intern Development Program (IDP). Jon Baker advised candidates would still need to work with firms to complete IDP; however, he is concerned schools may create a program to satisfy IDP hours separate from firms. He added that NCARB will be scrutinizing proposals in order to maintain the rigor of licensing. Mr. Gutierrez confirmed this and added that NCARB wants to maintain the integrity of education, experience and examination, and not displace actual work experience and knowledge learning.

Barry Wasserman opined academia will not want to lessen the credibility or strength of the academic programs, and the employment community will want to see holistic graduates. He also opined that multiple tracks may need to be developed and expressed concern there may be two levels of school created through this process. Mr. Baker asked for confirmation that schools will continue to be required to meet NAAB accreditation standards. Mr. Gutierrez confirmed this and added that candidates will also need to meet IDP and ARE criteria, in addition to the Board's requirements. He stated the Board's involvement with the proposal is to modify the eligibility point at which candidates may begin taking the ARE.

Mr. Gutierrez noted a discrepancy between the Board's Supporting Position Statement that was included in the Committee meeting packet and what was approved at the Board's September 10, 2014 meeting. He advised that the statement as presented indicates the Board "will" establish an earlier entry point, but clarified that the previous Board-approved statement implied only consideration of the concept, if appropriate. Mr. Baker commented that NCARB is supportive of allowing early ARE testing while attending school.

Mr. Baker asked what the next step in the process will be for NCARB. Mr. Gutierrez responded that after schools have submitted their respective response to the RFI&I an RFP will be developed. He added that when the RFP has been developed, the Board should analyze it with respect to California requirements and discuss potential implications.

**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**

Marccus Reinhardt presented an update on the Board's Occupational Analysis (OA) and explained the survey as part of the OA was sent to a sampling of practicing architects in July 2014. He stated the results were received and analyzed by the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES), which then met with subject matter experts (SME) who further analyzed the results ultimately leading to the development of a draft 2014 CSE Test Plan. He

also stated that a validation report is being prepared by OPES and will be completed in early November. He added that a presentation will be provided to the Board at its December 10-11, 2014 meeting. Mr. Reinhardt advised that Board staff and OPES are collaborating with NCARB on conducting a review of the ARE and the related psychometric process used to develop it. He added the final 2014 CSE Test Plan should be available in the second quarter of 2015.

Mr. McCauley mentioned that input from four focus groups consisting of architects and individuals from the design/construction-related professions was used in developing the OA survey. Mr. Gall inquired if owner and client feedback was included in the results of the focus group sessions. Mr. McCauley responded that NCARB focus group data regarding those parties will be used as there was insufficient time to survey those groups. He added that those additional focus groups will be included in a future OA.

#### **D. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Stan Braden stated the topic of licensure upon graduation is interesting, and he feels the program will allow people to more quickly become licensed. Mr. Braden inquired if the profession is losing architects. In response, Mr. Baker emphasized that the new NCARB program is an additional pathway, and will not replace existing programs/pathways. He agreed there is concern regarding the length of time to become licensed, and opined that students may find this discouraging. Ms. Silkwood encouraged Committee members to review *NCARB by the Numbers*, which contains information about the licensure process and profession.

Mr. Gutierrez offered what the overarching conversation was during the first meeting of the LTF meeting; he stated that perhaps the duration in timeline from graduation to licensure was extended because of the encumbrances in the process. He added that the LTF discussed whether the encumbrances could be examined and streamlined into a more efficient process that would not degrade or diminish the integrity of the criterion.

Mr. McCauley informed the Committee that the “three E’s” (education, experience, and examination) were not going to change and that all of the rigor in the licensing process would still remain. He added that even if a school had a program that guaranteed a candidate receiving licensure at the eight-year point, that it would be a significant improvement over what we have now where it takes on average approximately 12 years to receive licensure.

*Betsey Dougherty made a motion to adjourn the PQ Committee meeting.*

*Paul Neel seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 8-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 a.m.