



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## SUMMARY REPORT

### PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

October 23, 2013

Sacramento, CA and Teleconference at Various Locations

#### Committee Members Present

Jon Baker, Chair  
Betsey Dougherty  
Pasqual Gutierrez  
Kirk Miller  
Alan Rudy  
Stephanie Silkwood  
Barry Wasserman

#### Committee Members Absent

Gordon Carrier  
Raymond Cheng  
Allan Cooper  
Glenn Gall  
Jeffrey Heller  
Paul Neel

#### Guests

Richard Conrad  
David Consaca, University of San Diego School of Law, Center for Public  
Interest Law

#### Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer  
Marcus 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](mailto:cab@dca.ca.gov)  
[www.cab.ca.gov](http://www.cab.ca.gov)

Committee Chair Jon Baker called the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**A. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE MAY 1, 2013 PQ COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT**

The PQ Committee reviewed the May 1, 2013 meeting Summary Report.

*Betsey Dougherty made a motion to approve the May 1, 2013 PQ Committee meeting Summary Report.*

*Barry Wasserman seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 7-0.*

**B. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE 2014 NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION**

Marcus Reinhardt introduced this item and said it is an objective from the 2013 Strategic Plan. Mr. Reinhardt stated that at the May 1, 2013 PQ Committee meeting, members made a recommendation to send the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) a letter commending it for comments made in the *NCARB's Contribution to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) 2013 Accreditation Review Conference*. He said the Board approved this recommendation at its June 13, 2013 meeting. He also said products of the NAAB 2013 Accreditation Review Conference were the *2014 Conditions of Accreditation (Conditions)* and the *Guide to 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Report (Guide)*. He asked the PQ Committee to provide a recommendation to the Board for comments to NAAB.

Doug McCauley advised the Committee that comprehensive design, a concern the Board previously raised with respect to accreditation standards, is addressed numerous times within the *Guide*. Messrs. McCauley and Wasserman agreed this is a positive movement by NAAB.

Kirk Miller raised a concern that the first draft of the *Conditions* lists an understanding of certain principles, such as Building Service Systems, as a requirement, and not application of those principles. He added there also appears to be a contradiction with the requirement of having an ability to complete technical documentation, but only an understanding of the items within the documentation. Pasqual Gutierrez noted that the *Guide* calls for programs and team members to be explicit about the expectations for student achievement in comprehensive design. Mr. Wasserman indicated that the documents are a guide as to what would be addressed with the accreditation standards, and not meant to be too explicit.

Mr. Baker said in terms of a draft document, the categories appear to be a result of the 2012 NCARB Practice Analysis, and added that NCARB is in the process of redefining the test specification of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) around these categorical areas. He noted many of the items in the *Conditions* and *Guide* are asking students to possess an understanding of those items. Mr. Wasserman explained that schools balance between comprehensive knowledge areas, and expressed concern that the requirements not be too weighted

in one area at the sacrifice of the others. He believes that the Intern Development Program (IDP) is detailed in order to cover topics that may not be covered sufficiently in academics.

Mr. McCauley agreed with Mr. Wasserman and cautioned that the degree program could extend past five years if all the elements of the IDP ability areas are addressed; however, he noted the *Conditions* explain the ability required items. Mr. Miller reiterated his concern and opined that architecture appears to be moving toward a general knowledge approach, and a reliance on other professionals for specific knowledge.

Mr. Baker opined that NAAB could be encouraged to include more specificity in the language for accreditation. He noted that at the ARE level, there is strong sentiment of moving away from the comprehensive design problem due to the difficulty with scoring engines. He added there could be more emphasis placed upon teaching comprehensive design in school or covering it through IDP. Mr. Wasserman opined there is too much knowledge required for comprehensive design than could be effectively taught in school. Ms. Dougherty stated she was encouraged by a significant paradigm shift in the NAAB integrative approach to design, and would not want to become buried in wordsmithing the approach.

Mr. Baker informed the PQ Committee there is a movement within the NCARB Licensure Task Force exploring the concept to develop a program that licenses a candidate upon graduating from a school. He explained that that IDP settings and ARE testing could be integrated into the educational program, and concluded this may influence the next accreditation evaluation. Ms. Dougherty expressed concern that a program of this type could increase the length of time it would take a candidate to graduate from school and would require internships to cover the IDP content areas.

Mr. Baker inquired as to the position of the PQ Committee regarding the *Conditions*. Mr. McCauley responded it appears that the members are showing general support for the document. Mr. Baker asked if this would then be presented to the Board. Mr. McCauley replied that due to the timing of when comments are due and the date of the next Board meeting, the Executive Committee would be reviewing the PQ Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Baker asked if any members had any further comments. Mr. Miller requested that a more specific definition of comprehensive design be provided. Mr. Wasserman asked for clarification on which document the PQ Committee would be commenting. Mr. McCauley responded that the *Conditions* would be the document on which the PQ Committee would be submitting comments. He added that the members have shown support for the document with additional clarification. Mr. Gutierrez responded that clarification is given within the *Guide* as to the level students are expected to achieve. Ms. Dougherty agreed and stated that the *Guide* should not be held to such specific requirements due to the changing nature of the profession. Alan Rudy agreed and noted high levels of specificity listed within the *Conditions* which he believed fully explained what was being required. He suggested that there not be anything added to the required level of specificity.

*Alan Rudy made a motion to approve the NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation.*

*Betsey Dougherty seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 7-0.*

**C. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PRESENT A RECOMMENDATION TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) ON CRITERIA FOR A “BROADLY EXPERIENCED DESIGN PROFESSIONAL” PATHWAY TO LICENSURE**

Mr. Reinhardt presented this item and informed the PQ Committee that during the May 1, 2013 meeting, it discussed the alternate pathway methodology and made a recommendation that a framework for criteria be forwarded to NCARB for consideration. He said that staff forwarded the recommended framework for criteria to NCARB at its June 19-22, 2013 Annual Meeting. He also mentioned that on September 6, 2013, NCARB launched its Licensure Task Force to explore alternate methodologies for obtaining licensure. He then deferred to Mr. Gutierrez for further explanation of the Task Force.

Mr. Gutierrez stated he is a member of the Task Force, which was created to explore additional licensing pathways and consider how the three components of licensure (education, experience and examination) can be better integrated. He explained that the Task Force is composed of collateral organizations, educators, interns, new licensees, and board members from state architectural registration boards. He added that a goal is to explore alternatives that could reduce delays in licensure and how they may affect the educational process.

Stephanie Silkwood inquired if NCARB’s Broadly Experienced Design Professional program being worked on would be permanent or temporary. Mr. Gutierrez replied he was unsure and would be inquiring with NCARB on whether they foresee the program being temporary or permanent.

Ms. Dougherty inquired if there was any data on licensees who have come through an alternative pathway. Mr. McCauley responded there is currently no data since the program is a proposal and is not yet in effect. Mr. Baker noted there is not currently a program that exempts candidates from IDP, and this appears to be the focus of the Task Force. Mr. Gutierrez agreed and said there are candidates in the process of becoming newly licensed who are unable to use prior work experience due to IDP reporting requirements.

Ms. Dougherty inquired about the connection with the Rolling Clock and testing eligibility expiration for a candidate within California. Vickie Mayer clarified that the Rolling Clock only applies to divisions of the ARE passed, and eligibility as a California candidate requires at least one division be taken once every five years. She clarified, stating that if a candidate does not take a division once within a five year period, the candidate would lose their California eligibility, be required to reapply with the Board and be subject to IDP. Ms. Mayer concluded that with the proposed program, the candidate would be able to use their prior experience to satisfy IDP.

**D. UPDATE ON THE 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO DEVELOP A STRATEGY TO EXPEDITE RECIPROCITY LICENSURE FOR MILITARY SPOUSES AND DOMESTIC PARTNERS**

Mr. Reinhardt reminded the PQ Committee that it had previously made a recommendation to pursue a regulatory change proposal exempting licensees called to active duty from paying accrued

renewal fees. He explained that after the May 1, 2013 PQ Committee meeting, staff spoke with legal counsel and was advised that the language within Assembly Bills 1588 and 1904 sufficiently covered the waiving of accrued fees and a regulatory change was unnecessary.

Mr. Miller inquired if NCARB would also be waiving fees for military personnel as well. Mr. Baker responded there was a temporary period of waiving fees, but was unsure if there was a permanent waiver in effect. Ms. Mayer added that this would be an NCARB decision regarding its own fees, and suggested staff could research whether or not NCARB waives accrued fees for active military personnel. Mr. Baker offered that a recommendation to ask NCARB to waive accrued fees could be made to the Board based upon staff research.

**E. REPORT ON THE NCARB PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (IDP) RELATED TO EMPLOYMENT DURATION AND IDP ENTRY POINT**

Mr. Reinhardt informed the PQ Committee that the Board previously considered two modifications to IDP at its June 13, 2013 meeting. He explained the first modification eliminates the minimum employment duration requirement and allows interns to earn IDP experience credit for valid work through the project work performed relative to an experience area. He further explained the other modification relates to the IDP eligibility date and modifies the entry point for participation in IDP to when an intern receives a U.S. high school diploma or equivalent. He said the Board voted to support those changes, which the NCARB Board of Directors approved at their September 19-21, 2013 meeting.

PQ Committee members voiced their approval of the decision.

**F. REPORT ON THE NCARB 2012 PRACTICE ANALYSIS**

Justin Sotelo summarized the discussion of the PQ Committee at the May 1, 2013 meeting with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES). He explained the information taken from the 2012 NCARB Practice Analysis will be applied to future examinations, and once the test specifications have been completed, the Board can apply the findings to the upcoming California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Occupational Analysis (OA). He added that staff will be providing the Board with an update on the status of the OA at the upcoming December 5-6, 2013 meeting, and the new OPES chief, Heidi Lincer-Hill, will be attending the meeting to address the Board's concerns and provide it with a presentation on the OA.

Mr. Miller inquired if there is data that shows the percentage of graduates of California accredited schools of architecture who become licensed as architects. Mr. McCauley responded the Board does not have data regarding this. Ms. Dougherty offered that schools would be the institutions who could have part of this information, but believed they would not have information on which of their graduates become licensed.

Mr. Baker noted that the new information systems NCARB has put in place allows for greater data combing to assist with statistical analyses of the candidate population. He offered as an example, a comparison of pass rates for candidates who have an accredited degree with those who do not. He stated the two groups have similar pass rates and added that the pass rate for those who complete IDP is lower than those who have not. Mr. Miller indicated that if this is

the case, NCARB could request accredited schools to send a list of graduates, and NCARB could then generate a statistic of those who graduate and then become fully licensed.

Mr. Miller inquired if statistics are available relative to the pass rates of the ARE and the CSE for candidates who graduated from the California accredited schools of architecture.

Mr. McCauley responded that this information is available on the Board's website.

Mr. Wasserman added this information only reflects information provided to the Board.

Mr. Miller further inquired if the pass rate was broken down by school. Mr. McCauley responded in the affirmative.

The meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.