



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

April 9, 2014

Sacramento, CA

Committee Members Present

Jon Baker, Chair
Raymond Cheng
Allan Cooper
Betsey Dougherty (arrived at 9:35 a.m.)
Glenn Gall (arrived at 9:35 a.m.)
Pasqual Gutierrez (arrived at 9:35 a.m.)
Kirk Miller
Paul Neel
Stephanie Silkwood
Barry Wasserman

Committee Members Absent

Jeffrey Heller

Guests

Umber Kazmi, Chief Executive Officer, Sacramento College of Architecture
Corrine Fishman, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Department of
Consumer Affairs, Board and Bureau Relations

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
www.cab.ca.gov

Committee Chair Jon Baker called the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

A. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE OCTOBER 23, 2013 PQ COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

The PQ Committee reviewed the October 23, 2013 meeting Summary Report.

Pasqual Gutierrez made a motion to approve the October 23, 2013 PQ Committee meeting Summary Report.

Barry Wasserman seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

B. 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 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 said the core issue is to create a new pathway to licensure, specifically an architecture program that culminates with not just a degree, but also licensure. He explained this would be accomplished by integrating the components of licensure into the degree program. Mr. McCauley continued, saying he and Mr. Gutierrez collaborated on a concept paper detailing a program that awards a degree and license upon graduation.

Mr. McCauley advised licensure upon graduation was simultaneously being considered by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). He added that NCARB has become more transparent, participatory, and strategic with their proposals, and offered *NCARB by the Numbers* as an example. This document, he added, shows the average time to become licensed has increased to 11 years. Mr. McCauley opined this may be due to the complexity of the licensure process, even though reforms and enhancements have been made to the Intern Development Program (IDP) and the Architect Registration Examination (ARE). Mr. McCauley asked Mr. Gutierrez, as a member of the NCARB Licensure Task Force, to inform the Committee on the work at NCARB.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that the Task Force had four meetings during the past year, and the outcome was the development of a framework for a letter of interest that will be sent to architecture schools, asking them to develop a program where students become licensed upon graduation. He added the Task Force has also worked on streamlining IDP as well as considering earlier admittance for candidates to the ARE. Mr. Gutierrez said the Task Force analyzed school programs for the possibility of integrating internship and examination. He said that the February 26, 2014 Board meeting included a summit where proposals were presented by California accredited schools. He also said that feedback was taken to the Task Force for discussion.

Allan Cooper inquired if the proposals would diminish the practice requirement. Mr. Gutierrez responded that the proposals would integrate practice with education and the Task Force felt the proposed criterion was sufficient.

Mr. McCauley said The American Institute of Architects (AIA), Central Valley chapter previously held several meetings discussing the establishment of a school of architecture in Sacramento. He added that unbeknownst to either the Board or AIA, an effort was already underway to establish a local school of architecture by Umber Kazmi with the Sacramento College of Architecture. Mr. McCauley then introduced Ms. Kazmi and asked her to provide the Committee with details regarding the College.

Ms. Kazmi stated two years ago an effort to establish a licensure upon degree program was pursued, and culminated in development of the Sacramento College of Architecture, which is scheduled to open this fall. She explained the school will integrate IDP throughout the curriculum and have an ARE testing center on site. She further explained each student will be attending an IDP lab and working on projects, which will be submitted to the building department and built by local contractors. Ms. Kazmi noted there will also be design studios where the creative aspect of the degree program would be covered, in addition to classes with a focus on health, safety and welfare. She concluded saying students will have the required IDP hours completed upon graduation.

Mr. Cooper inquired if general education courses would also be included in the curriculum. Ms. Kazmi responded the curriculum has been designed to meet National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB) and NCARB standards, which require general education courses. She added these general education courses would be tailored toward architectural practice and IDP. Ms. Kazmi continued, saying there are three degree programs: undergraduate; Masters of Architecture I (students with a non-professional degree), and Masters of Architecture II (students with a professional degree). She explained the graduate students will be managing project sites, while the undergraduates will be producing construction documents.

Betsey Dougherty asked if IDP hours would be recorded under licensed faculty. Ms. Kazmi responded saying the faculty and instructors will be licensed architects. She further explained students will be working for the school while in session.

Mr. Cooper asked if school would be in continuous session year round due to the amount of work required to complete IDP. Ms. Kazmi responded that while the curriculum would not be continuously in session, it would allow for summer options.

Mr. Gutierrez said when the Task Force was created its members had already formed an idea for how a licensure degree program would be structured. He added, however, as more meetings have been held and schools have presented their proposals, the Task Force is realizing it may be best to grant the schools autonomy. He advised NCARB's concern is the preservation of education, experience and examination, and how this could be accomplished by schools.

Mr. Baker stated the challenge of developing an adequate program could be undertaken by licensing boards. He mentioned the difficulty of consistently training students and setting

objective benchmarks for schools to meet. He added a framework could be developed for purposes of streamlining the process of approving a program and ensuring equitability.

Mr. Gutierrez noted this is uncharted territory. He added the framework that will hold it all together is the preservation of education, experience and examination and collaboration will be the binding force. Mr. Cooper expressed concern regarding the capability of faculty teaching at the proposed schools. Mr. Gutierrez said the solution from schools has been to develop partnerships with businesses.

Mr. McCauley said some potential initiatives the Committee could consider and advance are presented in the meeting packet. He identified monitoring the NCARB Licensure Task Force and staying apprised of its work. He further identified the necessity for modifying the five year entry point requirement to take the ARE if schools are working on licensure upon graduation.

Mr. McCauley suggested the Board could work with the AIA to develop a framework for schools. He explained the Board could mirror an award similar to the NCARB Prize, where an award is presented to a school of architecture. He said creating a grant would require legislation to award funds, but noted precedent with the Contractors State Licensing Board awarding grants to construction management programs.

Ms. Kazmi said the program she developed would allow students to begin taking the ARE after the third year. She addressed Mr. Cooper's concern regarding instructors' qualifications to teach saying the ideal approach would be creating a syllabus requiring content, but leaving the method to the instructor. Stephanie Silkwood inquired how the proposed school would integrate the IDP requirement of experience gained within the traditional practice of architecture. Ms. Kazmi advised that ideally all educators would be licensed, but it would be dependent upon availability. She added the IDP lab serves as a work setting and would be supervised by the department director or president of the school.

Mr. Baker questioned how IDP could be effectively completed in the educational environment. Ms. Kazmi responded that students will be working on real projects with the school acting as the client. Ms. Dougherty relayed her personal experience and opined the financial cost of education coupled with the time required to satisfy IDP seem unfeasible for students to complete in an education setting. Raymond Cheng and Mr. Cooper also expressed concern regarding the financial cost to students.

Mr. Gutierrez opined that for the licensure upon graduation to succeed, the current relationship mold between education and internship must change. He added that partnerships between schools and firms will be an invaluable resource where some firms may eventually use schools to help with actual projects.

Mr. Baker asked Ms. Kazmi if she would be willing to share information and the experience of creating this school with other institutions, in furtherance of collaboration among schools and establishing best practices. Ms. Kazmi answered that she has currently been attempting to speak with educators regarding the importance of licensure. Kirk Miller inquired how long it would take a student to graduate from the proposed licensure degree program. Ms. Kazmi replied that

students are anticipated to graduate in five years. Mr. Baker said combining the requirements for licensure may not fit into the window of a five year degree program.

Mr. Gutierrez stated the Task Force has not received any proposals, which are scheduled to be solicited in early 2015. He also voiced support for Mr. McCauley's listed efforts. He noted that placeholder legislation may need to be drafted to allow earlier entry to take the ARE. Mr. Gutierrez recommended the Board have more presence within schools regarding licensure, and develop an award instead of a grant to be awarded to an innovative educator who inspires licensure. Mr. Baker agreed with Mr. Gutierrez and added that the AIA should have a more involved role in promoting internships within schools, not necessarily promoting licensure. Mr. Gutierrez stated the Task Force will be making a recommendation to the NCARB Board of Directors in 2016. Ms. Silkwood said NCARB may need to clarify its IDP work setting definitions to encompass experience gained at the universities.

Ms. Kazmi asked for clarification regarding the role of the Board in allowing candidates to take the ARE. Vickie Mayer explained the Board sets the requirements for taking the ARE and vote to accept any changes.

Mr. Cheng inquired if students would be required to work for the school. Ms. Kazmi responded that students are not required to work for the school, but are required to log IDP hours.

Mr. Baker asked what direction members would like to recommend to the Board. Mr. Miller reiterated concern of shortening the licensure timeline and potentially reducing the quality of education and work received. Mr. Cheng added concern regarding the students' maturity level and knowledge required to practice. Messrs. Baker, Cheng and Miller agreed the proposed five year degree program may be insufficient to teach students all the required knowledge.

Mr. Wasserman expressed concern regarding the impact of these programs on the content within licensing examinations. Mr. Baker informed the Committee he is on the NCARB Examination Committee and the ARE will undergo modifications based upon a recently completed practice analysis. He explained the new version of the ARE will be restructured and encompass integrated questions and align the examination more with practice. Ms. Kazmi stated her program has reviewed the new ARE specifications and integrated it into the curriculum.

Mr. Baker opined the amount of time it takes to become licensed is discouraging to students and may correspond to fewer licensees. He anticipates that a licensure upon graduation program would encourage students to complete the licensure process. Glenn Gall expressed concern of the removal of barriers to licensure without assuring the value of licensure.

C. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PROMOTE ALTERNATIVE PATHS TO LICENSURE IN ORDER TO INCREASE ACCESSIBILITY INTO THE PROFESSION

Paul Neel described his personal experience with licensure process in England. He explained after three years of schooling students are awarded a degree, after which students who wish to become licensed must then do a year of internship, followed by two more years of education where a Bachelor of Architecture degree is awarded. He added students must take and pass a final examination to become licensed.

Mr. Neel distributed his proposed licensure timeline to Committee members for review, and explained the proposal was based upon current requirements. He added the proposal was developed to incentivize and keep students on the path to licensure.

Mr. Cooper complimented Mr. Neel on his effort and noted examinations are offered when the students would have studied the material, so it would be fresh in their minds. Mr. Neel stated the intent of his proposal was to overlap examinations with students encountering the material in school.

Mr. McCauley explained the Board's wish to explore outreach to community colleges and veterans reemployment centers. He asked if the Committee would authorize staff to draft letters explaining licensure and alternate pathways.

Glenn Gall made a motion directing staff to draft outreach letters explaining the licensure process and profession for Board approval.

Stephanie Silkwood seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

D. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PURSUE A REGULATORY AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS' (NCARB) ROLLING CLOCK DEADLINE PERTAINING TO ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION (ARE) DIVISIONS PASSED PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 2006

Marcus Reinhardt explained NCARB Member Boards passed a resolution whereby beginning on July 1, 2014 ARE divisions passed prior to January 1, 2006 will expire, unless all divisions of the ARE have been passed on or before June 30, 2014. He said the Board previously approved proposed regulatory language implementing this change at its June 13, 2013 meeting. Mr. Reinhardt stated the 45-day comment period ended on April 1, 2014, and one comment was received. He added staff consulted with legal counsel regarding the comment, and it was determined not relevant to the proposed regulatory amendment.

Ms. Dougherty inquired if this is the first time candidates would be impacted by the rolling clock. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee the five year rolling clock has been applied to examinations since 2006, and examinations began expiring in 2011. He added that candidates are informed of their rolling clock status through ARE Score Reports.

E. 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

Justin Sotelo presented an update on the Occupational Analysis (OA) and explained it is being conducted, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 139, to assist in

developing future content for the CSE. Mr. Sotelo summarized what has been completed to date and identified future work culminating in the OA survey being sent to select participants in July.

Mr. Baker inquired how the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) is ensuring a diverse perspective of the profession is being gathered. Mr. Sotelo explained that the OPES facilitator is reviewing questions used on prior OAs, contacting stakeholders throughout the state, and assembling information generated by the focus groups.

Mr. Gall asked if the focus groups were segregated. Mr. Sotelo clarified that three separate and homogenous focus groups were held consisting of the differing stakeholders – contractors, engineers, land surveyors, building officials, and landscape architects. Mr. Gall inquired why clients and owners were not approached, and opined those groups could offer a beneficial perspective. Mr. McCauley agreed with the value of owners and clients and said he would speak with OPES about including those groups in future focus group meetings. Mr. Gutierrez suggested other professional groups, such as attorneys, be contacted to obtain additional perspective and ensure professional maturity to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

Mr. Baker inquired if OPES reviewed the NCARB OA. Mr. Sotelo replied the facilitator did use the NCARB Practice Analysis and 2007 Board OA as reference.

Mr. Miller inquired if all California licensees will be contacted or will a sampling be used. Mr. Sotelo responded that a sampling of the profession based upon geographic area and numbers of years practicing.

Mr. Miller further inquired if the data gathered from the surveys could be collated into different aspects of the profession and compared for commonalities and differences of viewpoints. Mr. McCauley responded that it is not clear if this would be possible. Mr. Baker added this information, while interesting, may not be useful for the development of an examination.

Mr. Gall inquired how surveys will be disseminated. Mr. Sotelo responded the primary method would be via email. Mr. Wasserman cautioned that email may be overlooked, and was concerned whether a sufficient response would be met. Mr. Sotelo clarified that participants will be contacted in advance of the survey.

F. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO SEEK AN EXEMPTION FROM ASSEMBLY BILL 186 RELATED TO WAIVER OF CSE

Mr. McCauley explained this legislation would require the Board to issue a temporary license to military spouses and waive all requirements, including the CSE. He added the CSE is a critical component of licensure and it concerns the Board the bill would require a waiver. He informed the Committee that the Board has attempted to seek an exemption to the bill, but has not received a response. Mr. McCauley concluded, stating the bill has not taken any further action nor is set to be heard, since the Board has requested the exemption. Mr. McCauley noted the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists was granted an exemption for similar reasons.

G. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD'S ACCREDITATION STANDARDS, FIRST READING (SECOND DRAFT)

Mr. Reinhardt explained this agenda item addresses the revision of the *2014 NAAB Accreditation Standards* based upon comments NAAB received during the initial comment period, and the Committee is asked to provide comments on the First Reading (Second Draft).

Mr. Neel detailed issues he had with specific language being removed, worded unclearly, and requirements being eased (understanding versus ability). Mr. Cooper agreed with Mr. Neel's comments and included further concerns related to performance of students and generality of statements. He provided Mr. McCauley a list of his edits and concerns to the revised *2014 NAAB Accreditation Standards*.

Mr. Neel explained his prior experience working with these types of documents and the differing stages it goes through, from committee, to psychometrician and editor, and the final product. He opined this process may be why certain wording had been modified.

Mr. Baker noted positive modifications to the document in shifting from "understanding" to "ability" requirements, but also expressed concern there was not enough "ability" required. Mr. Wasserman cautioned about requiring too much "ability" as a majority of that is learned through IDP. He added that requiring "ability" in school may take away from other aspects.

Mr. Baker suggested Committee members forward specific edits to staff for consolidation. Ms. Mayer suggested including rationale behind key edits submitted.

H. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO NCARB INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (IDP) RELATED TO IDP REPORTING REQUIREMENT

Mr. Reinhardt reported NCARB has proposed a modification to the reporting requirement for IDP and has requested comments from Member Boards. He explained the modification would increase the IDP reporting period up to five years, but at half credit beyond the first six months. He noted this modification aligns IDP reporting with the ARE five year rolling clock.

Ms. Dougherty expressed her support for this modification.

Ms. Silkwood expressed concern with supervisors recalling experience that was gained up to five years prior. She then inquired if this would replace the Broadly Experienced Design Professional (BEDP) program. Mr. Gutierrez responded that the BEDP program would allow for even older experience to be used for those design professionals seeking licensure and would therefore still move forward.

Betsy Dougherty made a motion to recommend the Board support NCARB's proposed modification to the IDP reporting requirement.

Raymond Cheng seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10-0.

The meeting adjourned at 12:39 p.m.