

# Executive Committee

## California Architects Board

May 20, 2014

Sacramento and Various Teleconference Locations in CA



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## NOTICE OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

May 20, 2014  
10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  
Sacramento, CA 95834\*

The California Architects Board (CAB) will hold an Executive Committee meeting as noted above, and via teleconference at the following locations:

*Sheran Voigt*  
2391 Meadow Ridge Drive  
Chino Hills, CA 91709  
(909) 590-4474

*Chris Christophersen*  
District Council 16  
2705 Constitution Drive  
Livermore, CA 94551  
(925) 245-1080

*Jon Alan Baker*  
BakerNowicki Design Studio  
624 Broadway, Suite 405  
San Diego, CA 92101  
(619) 795-2450

The agenda items may not be addressed in the order noted below and the meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier than that posted in this notice. The meeting is open to the public and is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting Mel Knox at (916) 575-7221, emailing [mel.knox@dca.ca.gov](mailto:mel.knox@dca.ca.gov), or sending a written request to CAB at the address below. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

### AGENDA

- A. Review and Approve November 5, 2013 Executive Committee Summary Report
- B. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Seek Exemption from Assembly Bill 186 Related to Waiver of California Supplemental Examination
- C. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Promote Awareness of Value of CAB's Participation at National Level

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)

(Continued)

- D. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Implement CAB's Liaison Program and Determine Future Focus for Organizations and Schools
- E. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Collaborate with National Licensing Bodies to Stay Relevant
- F. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Prepare and Submit Sunset Review Report
- G. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Pursue Negative Budget Change Proposal to Meet Requirements in Business and Professions Code Section 128.5
- H. Review and Approve Professional Qualifications Committee's Recommendation Regarding Proposed Changes to National Council of Architectural Registration Boards Intern Development Program Reporting Requirement

*The notice and agenda for this meeting and other meetings of the CAB can be found on the Board's website at [www.cab.ca.gov](http://www.cab.ca.gov). Any other requests relating to the Committee meeting should be directed to Mr. Knox at (916) 575-7221.*

*\* This location is being made available for greater public access to the teleconference, but a member of the Committee will not be present at this site.*

*Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the CAB in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount. (Business and Professions Code section 5510.15)*

## **Agenda Item A**

### **REVIEW AND APPROVE NOVEMBER 5, 2013 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT**

The Committee is asked to review and approve the attached Summary Report for the November 5, 2013 Executive Committee meeting.

Attachment:

November 5, 2013 Executive Committee Summary Report



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## SUMMARY REPORT

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

November 5, 2013

Sacramento, CA and Various Teleconference Locations

#### Committee Members Present

Sheran Voigt, Chair  
Hraztan Zeitlian  
Pasqual Gutierrez  
Jeffrey Heller (arrived at 2:06 p.m.)

#### Board Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer  
Bob Carter, Architect Consultant  
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst  
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager Examination/Licensing Unit  
Justin Sotelo, Examination/Licensing Analyst

#### Guests Present

Marie Cooley, Director, the California Council for Interior Design Certification (CCIDC)

Committee Chair, Sheran Voigt, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. Three members of the Committee constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. There being three members present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

#### **A. Review and Approve April 15, 2011, Executive Committee Summary Report**

Ms. Voigt asked the Committee to consider the approval of the April 15, 2011, Executive Committee Summary Report.

*Hraztan Zeitlian made a motion to approve the April 15, 2011, Executive Committee Summary Report.*

*Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

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

**B. Update and Possible Action on the 2013 Strategic Plan Objective to Participate in Sunset Review Process and Support California Council for Interior Designers Certification**

Doug McCauley provided an update on Senate Bill (SB) 308 (Chapter 333, Statutes of 2013), reminding Committee members of the Board's position of support for the extension of the sunset date, contract requirement, and open meeting provisions for CCIDC. He informed the Committee that the bill was signed into law and would become effective on January 1, 2014.

Mr. McCauley also stated that, with SB 308, CCIDC intended to clarify the definition of Certified Interior Designer (CID). He noted that the Board was not convinced that their examination did not sufficiently cover the expanded areas of practice to ensure the public health, safety, and welfare. Marie Cooley addressed the Committee and stated that CCIDC is very familiar with addressing public safety issues. Ms. Cooley spoke about the interior design examination (IDEX), its development, and codes.

The Committee determined that action on this item is not required. Mr. McCauley said Board staff will monitor developments for further legislation in 2014.

**C. Update and Possible Action on the 2013 Strategic Plan Objective to Promote the Awareness of the Value of CAB's Participation at the National Level**

Mr. McCauley told the Committee that out-of-state travel (OST) for the Board remains restricted due to the Governor's position that attending a National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Annual Meeting is not considered to be "mission critical," which is defined as:

- Enforcement responsibilities
- Auditing
- Revenue collection
- A function required by statute, contract, or executive directed
- Job-required training necessary to maintain licensure or similar standards required for holding a position
- Equipment inspection as required by a contract
- Meetings or training required by a grant or to maintain grant funding
- Litigation related (depositions, discovery, testimony)
- Requests by the Federal Government to appear before committees

He advised that mission critical does not mean travel to attend:

- Conferences, meetings or seminars (even those that historically have been attended or if a request has been made for your department or an individual to make a presentation)
- Networking opportunities
- Professional development courses
- Continuing education classes/seminars

Mr. McCauley explained that meeting “mission critical” standards for OST approval is an ongoing challenge. In past justification memorandums, he stated that Board staff had underscored the need for the Board to participate in critical NCARB sessions to preserve California’s influence in national policy setting; however, for the upcoming 2014 trips, staff’s new justification emphasizes the critical changes being made to Architect Registration Examination (ARE) 5.0 and their costly impact on the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). Consequently, Mr. McCauley announced that the Board’s request to attend the Western Conference of Architectural Registration Boards (San Antonio, Texas) and NCARB (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) meetings in 2014 were approved.

Mr. McCauley said Committee action is not required on this item and that Board staff will continue to communicate compelling justification for OST requests.

**D. Discuss and Possible Action on the 2013 Strategic Plan Objective to Continue Education with California Planning and Building Departments**

Mr. McCauley presented the 2013 Strategic Plan objective to continue education with California planning and building departments. The Committee discussed Past President Marilyn Lyon’s letter to planning departments, dated April 17, 2012, and concluded is still valid and applicable as written. Staff reported that the Board had not received any recent questions or concerns regarding the issue of unlicensed practice as addressed in the letter. Staff also reported that, to date, there have been no comments received to indicate a further problem on this issue and, as such, it is not clear that there is need for further action.

The Committee determined that the Board had taken the most direct approach and recommended Ms. Lyon’s letter be memorialized as a standard California Architects Board document on its website ([cab.ca.gov](http://cab.ca.gov)).

*Hraztan Zeitlian made a motion to recommend that the Board memorialize Past President Marilyn Lyon’s letter to planning departments, dated April 17, 2012, as a standard Board document on [cab.ca.gov](http://cab.ca.gov).*

*Jeffrey Heller seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

**E. Update and Possible Action on the 2013 Strategic Plan Objective to Review CAB’s Liaison Program and Determine Future Focus for Agencies and Schools**

Mel Knox presented the 2013 Strategic Plan objective to review the Board’s liaison program and determine future focus for agencies and schools. In recognition of the Committee’s desire for the Board’s liaison program to operate with greater efficiency, and, in an effort to limit the potential to communicate misinformation to the public during liaison speaking engagements, the Committee developed the following recommendations for the Board’s consideration:

- 1) Use quarterly reminders (to Board members from Board staff) regarding liaison reporting requirements;
- 2) Provide liaisons with bulleted points of information (talking points) in conjunction with the quarterly reminder prior to contacting assigned organizations; and
- 3) Require liaisons to collaborate with Board staff when outreach efforts involve communicating licensing information to candidates.

*Pasqual Gutierrez made a motion to propose the following recommendations for the Board's consideration: 1) begin the use of quarterly reminders to liaisons regarding reporting requirements, 2) provide liaisons with bulleted points of information in conjunction with the quarterly reminder prior to contacting assigned organizations, and 3) require liaisons to collaborate with Board staff when outreach efforts involve communicating licensing information to candidates.*

*Hraztan Zeitlian seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

#### **F. Update and Possible Action on the 2013 Strategic Plan Objective to Work with the Department of Consumer Affairs to Implement the BreEZe System**

Justin Sotelo provided an update on the 2013 Strategic Plan objective to work with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) in launching the integrated, enterprise-wide enforcement, case management, and licensing system known as BreEZe. Mr. Sotello explained to the Committee that BreEZe supports one of DCA's highest priority initiatives of job creation and consumer protection by replacing the aging legacy business systems [i.e., the Consumer Affairs System (CAS), Applicant Tracking System (ATS), and multiple "workaround" systems]. He further explained that BreEZe:

- 1) Will support all applicant tracking, licensing, license renewal, enforcement, monitoring, cashiering, and data management;
- 2) Is web-based and will enable the public to verify licensee information and complaint status, as well as file complaints online; and
- 3) Will also permit applicants and licensees to process applications, renewals and payments online.

There was no Committee action needed for this agenda item.

#### **G. Discuss and Possible Action on the 2013 Strategic Plan Objective to Develop a List of Potential Improvements to Streamline Candidates' Licensure Process**

Marcus Reinhardt presented the 2013 Strategic Plan objective to develop a list of potential improvements to streamline candidates' licensure process. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee that the matter surfaced in light of NCARB's recent implementation of *My Examination* and deployment of DCA's new BreEZe enterprise-

wide licensing system. He provided a list of potential improvements for the Committee's consideration.

*Pasqual Gutierrez made a motion to recommend to the Board that it approve the following list of potential improvements to streamline the licensure process for candidates:*

- *Work with DCA on customization (to the extent possible) of BreEZe to provide candidates with an application process this is easy to navigate and follow;*
- *Suggest efficiencies to NCARB when candidates are experiencing difficulty with an NCARB system, process, or program;*
- *Work with NCARB to provide greater clarity in the information communicated to candidates regarding the implementation of new policies and rules related to its programs;*
- *Support legislation aimed at streamlining the licensure process;*
- *Explore pilot programs to integrate licensing into education (i.e., licensure upon graduation);*
- *Align educational and work experience credit provisions in regulations with changes in the IDP; and*
- *Employ new technologies to communicate information to candidates relative to their individual Board record.*

*Hraztan Zeitlian seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

#### **H. Discuss and Possible Action on the Professional Qualifications Committee's Recommended Comments Relative to the National Architectural Accrediting Board's 2014 Conditions for Accreditation**

Mr. Reinhardt explained that the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee was advised that December 1, 2013, is the deadline for providing comments concerning the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation* to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB); therefore, due to time constraints, the Executive Committee was asked to consider the PQ recommendation, in lieu of the Board, for forwarding to NAAB. He stated that the Board would then, at its December 5, 2013 meeting, ratify the action taken by the Executive Committee.

Mr. Reinhardt asked the Committee to review and approve the PQ Committee recommendation to the Board and direct staff to draft a letter for forwarding to NAAB conveying its comments.

*Jeffrey Heller made a motion to support the first draft.*

*Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

DRAFT

## **Agenda Item B**

### **UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO SEEK EXEMPTION FROM ASSEMBLY BILL 186 RELATED TO WAIVER OF CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION**

Currently, boards and bureaus of the Department of Consumer Affairs are required to expedite the licensure of an applicant who: 1) supplies evidence that they are married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in California under official active duty military orders; and 2) holds a current license in another state, district, or territory of the United States in the profession or vocation for which he or she seeks a license from the board.

Assembly Bill (AB) 186, introduced last year, would add Business and Professions Code section 115.6 and require the Board to provide a temporary 12-month license while staff processes the application for licensure. The bill would also require a candidate, upon a request from the Board, to furnish fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal background check.

At its June 13, 2013 meeting, the Board voted to “oppose the bill, unless amended” and requested an exemption, while noting the Board’s support for the intent of the legislation. This action was based upon new information indicating the Board would be required to waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) for individuals who meet the special criteria should AB 186 become law. The Board deemed the concept of waiving the CSE unacceptable since it is a critical licensure component for the protection of public health, safety, and welfare (HSW) by assuring competence in seismic, energy efficiency, accessibility, and legal requirements, etc.

On June 25 and 27, 2013, Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, communicated the Board’s position through correspondence sent respectively to Assemblyman Maienschein and Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee Chairman, Ted W. Lieu. The letters requested an amendment to provide an exemption from the bill’s provisions. The Board’s request for an exemption was again communicated on November 4, 2013, by a letter from Board President Sheran Voigt. Mr. McCauley contacted Assemblyman Maienschein’s staff in January 2014 and received no response. On February 18, 2014, an additional letter from Ms. Voigt was sent to reiterate the importance of the CSE to the HSW of Californians. On March 20, 2014, the Landscape Architects Technical Committee voted to ratify its opposition to the bill.

Mr. McCauley was able to speak to the author’s staff in late April. He explained the need for the amendments and the author’s staff agreed to consider them and report back. More recently, on

May 12, 2014, correspondence (attached) from Ms. Voigt to Chairman Lieu was sent to request support for the Board's exemption at the June 2, 2014 hearing.

AB 186 remains in the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee and has not been amended since June 24, 2013. Board staff will continue to monitor AB 186 and report any further activity to the Board. No Committee action is required at this time.

Attachments

1. AB 186 (Maienschein)
2. May 12, 2014 Letter to Chairman Lieu

AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 24, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 24, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 22, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 1, 2013

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2013–14 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 186**

---

---

**Introduced by Assembly Member Maienschein**

**(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Hagman)**

**(Coauthors: Assembly Members Chávez, Dahle, Donnelly,  
Beth Gaines, Garcia, Grove, Harkey, Olsen, and Patterson, and  
V. Manuel Pérez)**

(Coauthors: Senators Fuller and Huff)

January 28, 2013

---

---

An act to ~~amend~~ *add* Section ~~115.5~~ of *115.6* to the Business and Professions Code, relating to professions and vocations, and making an appropriation therefor.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 186, as amended, Maienschein. Professions and vocations: military spouses: temporary licenses.

Existing law provides for the licensure and regulation of various professions and vocations by boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs. Existing law provides for the issuance of reciprocal licenses in certain fields where the applicant, among other requirements, has a license to practice within that field in another jurisdiction, as specified. Existing law requires that the licensing fees imposed by certain boards within the department be deposited in funds that are continuously

appropriated. Existing law requires a board within the department to expedite the licensure process for an applicant who holds a current license in another jurisdiction in the same profession or vocation and who supplies satisfactory evidence of being married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in California under official active duty military orders.

*This bill would, in addition to the expedited licensure provisions described above, establish a temporary licensure process for an applicant who holds a current license in another jurisdiction, as specified, and who supplies satisfactory evidence of being married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in California under official active duty military orders. The bill would require the temporary license to expire 12 months after issuance, upon issuance of the expedited license, or upon denial of the application for expedited licensure by the board, whichever occurs first.*

~~This bill would require a board within the department to issue a temporary license to an applicant who qualifies for, and requests, expedited licensure pursuant to the above-described provision if he or she meets specified requirements, except as provided. The bill would require the temporary license to expire 12 months after issuance, upon issuance of the expedited license, or upon denial of the application for expedited licensure by the board, whichever occurs first. The bill would authorize a board to conduct an investigation of an applicant for purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license, and would authorize a criminal background check as part of that investigation. The~~

*This bill would require an applicant seeking a temporary license to submit an application to the board that includes a signed affidavit attesting to the fact that he or she meets all of the requirements for the temporary license and that the information submitted in the application is accurate, as specified. The bill would also require the application to include written verification from the applicant's original licensing jurisdiction stating that the applicant's license is in good standing. The bill would authorize a board to conduct an investigation of an applicant for purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license and would authorize a criminal background check as part of that investigation. The bill would require an applicant, upon request by a board, to furnish a full set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting the criminal background check.*

This bill would prohibit a temporary license from being provided to any applicant who has committed an act in any jurisdiction that would have constituted grounds for denial, suspension, or revocation of the license at the time the act was committed. The bill would provide that a violation of the above-described provision may be grounds for the denial or revocation of a temporary license. The bill would further prohibit a temporary license from being provided to any applicant who has been disciplined by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction, or is the subject of an unresolved complaint, review procedure, or disciplinary proceeding conducted by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction. ~~The bill would require an applicant, upon request by a board, to furnish a full set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal background check.~~

*This bill would authorize the immediate termination of any temporary license to practice medicine upon a finding that the temporary licenseholder failed to meet any of the requirements described above or provided substantively inaccurate information that would affect his or her eligibility for temporary licensure. The bill would, upon termination of the license, require the board to issue a notice of termination requiring the temporary licenseholder to immediately cease the practice of medicine upon receipt.*

*This bill would exclude from these provisions a board that has established a temporary licensing process before January 1, 2014.*

Because the bill would authorize the expenditure of continuously appropriated funds for a new purpose, the bill would make an appropriation.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: yes. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

- 1 *SECTION 1. Section 115.6 is added to the Business and*
- 2 *Professions Code, to read:*
- 3 *115.6. (a) A board within the department shall, after*
- 4 *appropriate investigation, issue a temporary license to an applicant*
- 5 *if he or she meets the requirements set forth in subdivision (c). The*
- 6 *temporary license shall expire 12 months after issuance, upon*
- 7 *issuance of an expedited license pursuant to Section 115.5, or upon*
- 8 *denial of the application for expedited licensure by the board,*
- 9 *whichever occurs first.*

1 (b) *The board may conduct an investigation of an applicant for*  
2 *purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license issued*  
3 *pursuant to this section. This investigation may include a criminal*  
4 *background check.*

5 (c) *An applicant seeking a temporary license pursuant to this*  
6 *section shall meet the following requirements:*

7 (1) *The applicant shall supply evidence satisfactory to the board*  
8 *that the applicant is married to, or in a domestic partnership or*  
9 *other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces*  
10 *of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in this state*  
11 *under official active duty military orders.*

12 (2) *The applicant shall hold a current license in another state,*  
13 *district, or territory of the United States in the profession or*  
14 *vocation for which he or she seeks a temporary license from the*  
15 *board.*

16 (3) *The applicant shall submit an application to the board that*  
17 *shall include a signed affidavit attesting to the fact that he or she*  
18 *meets all of the requirements for the temporary license and that*  
19 *the information submitted in the application is accurate, to the*  
20 *best of his or her knowledge. The application shall also include*  
21 *written verification from the applicant's original licensing*  
22 *jurisdiction stating that the applicant's license is in good standing*  
23 *in that jurisdiction.*

24 (4) *The applicant shall not have committed an act in any*  
25 *jurisdiction that would have constituted grounds for denial,*  
26 *suspension, or revocation of the license under this code at the time*  
27 *the act was committed. A violation of this paragraph may be*  
28 *grounds for the denial or revocation of a temporary license issued*  
29 *by the board.*

30 (5) *The applicant shall not have been disciplined by a licensing*  
31 *entity in another jurisdiction and shall not be the subject of an*  
32 *unresolved complaint, review procedure, or disciplinary*  
33 *proceeding conducted by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction.*

34 (6) *The applicant shall, upon request by a board, furnish a full*  
35 *set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal*  
36 *background check.*

37 (d) *A board may adopt regulations necessary to administer this*  
38 *section.*

39 (e) *A temporary license issued pursuant to this section for the*  
40 *practice of medicine may be immediately terminated upon a finding*

1 *that the temporary licenseholder failed to meet any of the*  
2 *requirements described in subdivision (c) or provided substantively*  
3 *inaccurate information that would affect his or her eligibility for*  
4 *temporary licensure. Upon termination of the temporary license,*  
5 *the board shall issue a notice of termination that shall require the*  
6 *temporary licenseholder to immediately cease the practice of*  
7 *medicine upon receipt.*

8 *(f) This section shall not apply to a board that has established*  
9 *a temporary licensing process before January 1, 2014.*

10 SECTION 1. ~~Section 115.5 of the Business and Professions~~  
11 ~~Code is amended to read:~~

12 ~~115.5. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (d), a board within~~  
13 ~~the department shall expedite the licensure process for an applicant~~  
14 ~~who meets both of the following requirements:~~

15 ~~(1) Supplies evidence satisfactory to the board that the applicant~~  
16 ~~is married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union~~  
17 ~~with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United~~  
18 ~~States who is assigned to a duty station in this state under official~~  
19 ~~active duty military orders.~~

20 ~~(2) Holds a current license in another state, district, or territory~~  
21 ~~of the United States in the profession or vocation for which he or~~  
22 ~~she seeks a license from the board.~~

23 ~~(b) (1) A board shall, after appropriate investigation, issue a~~  
24 ~~temporary license to an applicant who is eligible for, and requests,~~  
25 ~~expedited licensure pursuant to subdivision (a) if the applicant~~  
26 ~~meets the requirements described in paragraph (3). The temporary~~  
27 ~~license shall expire 12 months after issuance, upon issuance of the~~  
28 ~~expedited license, or upon denial of the application for expedited~~  
29 ~~licensure by the board, whichever occurs first.~~

30 ~~(2) The board may conduct an investigation of an applicant for~~  
31 ~~purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license issued~~  
32 ~~pursuant to this subdivision. This investigation may include a~~  
33 ~~criminal background check.~~

34 ~~(3) (A) An applicant seeking a temporary license issued~~  
35 ~~pursuant to this subdivision shall submit an application to the board~~  
36 ~~which shall include a signed affidavit attesting to the fact that he~~  
37 ~~or she meets all of the requirements for the temporary license and~~  
38 ~~that the information submitted in the application is accurate, to the~~  
39 ~~best of his or her knowledge. The application shall also include~~  
40 ~~written verification from the applicant's original licensing~~

- 1 jurisdiction stating that the applicant's license is in good standing
- 2 in that jurisdiction.
- 3 (B) ~~The applicant shall not have committed an act in any~~
- 4 ~~jurisdiction that would have constituted grounds for denial,~~
- 5 ~~suspension, or revocation of the license under this code at the time~~
- 6 ~~the act was committed. A violation of this subparagraph may be~~
- 7 ~~grounds for the denial or revocation of a temporary license issued~~
- 8 ~~by the board.~~
- 9 (C) ~~The applicant shall not have been disciplined by a licensing~~
- 10 ~~entity in another jurisdiction and shall not be the subject of an~~
- 11 ~~unresolved complaint, review procedure, or disciplinary proceeding~~
- 12 ~~conducted by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction.~~
- 13 (D) ~~The applicant shall, upon request by a board, furnish a full~~
- 14 ~~set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal~~
- 15 ~~background check.~~
- 16 (e)
- 17 ~~A board may adopt regulations necessary to administer this~~
- 18 ~~section.~~
- 19 (d) ~~This section shall not apply to a board that has established~~
- 20 ~~a temporary licensing process before January 1, 2014.~~



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

May 12, 2014

The Honorable Ted W. Lieu  
Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee  
State Capitol, Room 2053  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 186 (Oppose Unless Amended) - Military Spouses

Dear Chairman Lieu:

The California Architects Board (Board) and Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) have taken an Oppose Unless Amended position on AB 186 and are requesting an exemption from the bill's provisions (similar to that being provided to the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists). We respectfully request your support for such amendments at the June 2, 2014 hearing.

AB 186 would force the Board and LATC to waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). The CSE tests for content in critical knowledge areas, such as seismic safety, accessibility, fire protection, and energy efficiency. It is the last requirement prior to licensure and is vital to our mandate to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of our citizens. Waiving the CSE would expose Californians to significant threats to their safety.

Accordingly, the Board and LATC reiterate the request for an amendment that provides an exemption from the bill's provisions.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact the Board's Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, at (916) 575-7502.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sheran Voigt".

SHERAN VOIGT  
President

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

cc: Members, Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development  
The Honorable Brian Maienschein  
Le Ondra Clark, Ph.D., Consultant, Senate Committee on Business, Professions and  
Economic Development  
Kayla Williams, Policy Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus

## **Agenda Item C**

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF VALUE OF CAB'S PARTICIPATION AT NATIONAL LEVEL**

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective to promote the awareness of the value of CAB's participation at the national level.

The Board's participation with National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) is crucial to fulfilling its statutory mission to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. NCARB's programs and products, particularly the Architect Registration Examination, and Intern Development Program, have a profound impact on the Board and its candidates. As such, the Board's participation in NCARB is vital.

The Board underscores the importance of its participation each year in its "out-of-state travel request" that is submitted each year to the Department of Consumer Affairs. In this document, the Board justifies the value of participating in NCARB and indicates specific objectives that are mission critical to the Board's programs. This year, for example, the Board was able to highlight the work of the NCARB's Licensure Task Force and how its work will shape the future of licensing. To further the objective of promoting the awareness of the value of CAB's participation at the national level, the Board may wish to:

- 1) Publicize the Board's successful efforts with NCARB via the newsletter
- 2) Continue to partner with The American Institute of Architects, California Council to underscore the importance of NCARB
- 3) Maintain a list of accomplishments via the Board's participation in NCARB
- 4) Stress with NCARB the importance of "mission critical" agendas

The Committee is asked to consider these points and make a recommendation to the Board.

## **Agenda Item D**

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO IMPLEMENT CAB'S LIAISON PROGRAM AND DETERMINE FUTURE FOCUS FOR ORGANIZATIONS AND SCHOOLS**

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to implement the Board's liaison program and determine future focus for organizations and schools. The purpose of this program is to ensure that the Board is able to effectively identify opportunities to collaborate, understand trends that might impact the Board's mission or objectives, and build partnerships that will enhance the Board's efforts in future initiatives.

At its December 5, 2013 meeting, Board members discussed the liaison program and identified the following actions to incorporate in the program to assist the members:

- 1) Staff will generate quarterly reporting requirement reminders for Board liaisons;
- 2) Staff will provide liaisons with talking points in conjunction with the quarterly reminders; and
- 3) Liaisons will collaborate with Board staff when outreach efforts involve communicating licensing information to candidates.

During the first quarter of 2014, and again in the second quarter, staff implemented the Board's directives and provided liaisons with their school and/or professional organization assignments, as well as key talking points to help guide their conversations in raising awareness about the Board's activities.

Attached, for the Committee's review, are the liaison responsibilities and talking points memorandums, and liaison appointments, last distributed on April 10, 2014. Liaisons have been reminded that they will deliver a report to the Board at its next meeting, on June 12, 2014.

The Committee is asked to discuss and consider possible further action concerning this 2014 Strategic Plan objective, if necessary.

#### Attachment:

Liaison Responsibilities and Talking Points Memorandums, and Liaison Appointments



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2014

TO: Board Member Liaisons

FROM: Mel Knox, Administration Analyst

SUBJECT: Liaison Responsibilities [Quarterly Reminder (Q2, 2014)]

The Board's Liaison Program is designed to ensure that we exchange information with key constituency groups. Your responsibility as a Board Liaison is to establish and maintain contact with these groups and report back to the Board on the organization's activities and objectives. You should inform your assigned organization that you are the Liaison and will be reporting on key Board initiatives as identified in our Strategic Plan. By engaging in these activities, we can better identify opportunities to collaborate, understand trends that might impact our mission or objectives, and build partnerships that will enhance our efforts in future initiatives.

Board Liaison assignments are attached, as are liaison talking points for Q2. If you have not done so at this stage, please make contact (via telephone) with your organizations, as Liaisons are expected to deliver a report at the next Board meeting, scheduled for June 12, 2014, in the Bay Area.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (916) 575-7221, or emailing [mel.knox@dca.ca.gov](mailto:mel.knox@dca.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

MEL KNOX  
Administration Analyst

2420 DEL PASO ROAD,  
SUITE 105  
SACRAMENTO,  
CA 95834

### Attachments:

1. CAB 2014 Professional Association & School Appointments
2. Liaison Talking Points Memorandum (Q2, 2014)

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)

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD**  
**2014 Liaison Program**  
**Professional Association & School Appointments**

<i><b>ORGANIZATION APPOINTMENTS</b></i>	
<b>American Council of Engineering Companies, California (formerly CELSOC)</b>	Doug McCauley
<b>American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>Associated General Contractors of California, Inc.</b>	Jon Baker
<b>Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA)</b>	Hraztan Zeitlian
<b>Board for Professional Engineers &amp; Land Surveyors (BPELSG)</b>	Doug McCauley
<b>California Building Officials (CALBO)</b>	Doug McCauley/Bob Carter
<b>Contractors State License Board (CSLB)</b>	Doug McCauley/Bob Carter
<b>Urban Land Institute</b>	Sylvia Kwan

<i><b>SCHOOL APPOINTMENTS</b></i>	
<b>Academy of Art University, San Francisco</b>	Sylvia Kwan
<b>California College of the Arts (CCA), San Francisco</b>	Sylvia Kwan
<b>California Polytechnic State University, Pomona</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>New School of Architecture and Design, San Diego</b>	Jon Baker
<b>Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCIARC), Los Angeles</b>	Jon Baker
<b>University of California, Berkeley (UCB)</b>	Sylvia Kwan
<b>University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)</b>	Hraztan Zeitlian
<b>University of Southern California (USC), Los Angeles</b>	Hraztan Zeitlian
<b>Woodbury University, Burbank</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD**  
**2014 Liaison Program**  
**Professional Association & School Appointments**

<b>Bakersfield College</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>Cerritos College, Norwalk</b>	Nilza Serrano
<b>Chabot College, Hayward</b>	Sylvia Kwan
<b>Citrus College, Glendora</b>	Hraztan Zeitlian
<b>City College of San Francisco</b>	Matt McGuinness
<b>College of Marin, Kentfield</b>	Sylvia Kwan
<b>College of San Mateo</b>	Matt McGuinness
<b>College of the Desert, Palm Desert</b>	Sheran Voigt
<b>College of the Sequoias, Visalia</b>	Chris Christophersen
<b>Cosumnes River College, Sacramento</b>	Fermin Villegas
<b>Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>Diablo Valley College, Pleasant Hill</b>	Sylvia Kwan
<b>East Los Angeles College, Monterey Park</b>	Sheran Voigt
<b>Fresno City College</b>	Chris Christophersen
<b>Glendale Community College</b>	Hraztan Zeitlian
<b>Los Angeles City College</b>	Nilza Serrano
<b>Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys</b>	Hraztan Zeitlian
<b>Mt. San Antonio College, Walnut</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa</b>	Sheran Voigt
<b>Rio Hondo College, Whittier</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>San Bernardino Valley College</b>	Pasqual Gutierrez
<b>San Diego Mesa College</b>	Jon Baker
<b>Southwestern College, Chula Vista</b>	Jon Baker
<b>Ventura College</b>	Nilza Serrano
<b>West Valley College, Saratoga</b>	Chris Christophersen



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2014  
TO: Board Member Liaisons  
FROM: Mel Knox, Administration Analyst  
SUBJECT: Liaison Talking Points (Q2, 2014)

Following are suggested "talking points," which may help guide your conversations in raising awareness about the Board's activities:

### EDUCATION

The Board is working in support of National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) efforts to integrate the components of licensure into degree programs.

### EXAMINATION

The Board is beginning the process of conducting its Occupational Analysis (OA). "OA" is a survey of the profession to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to safely practice architecture that are tested for on the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). The Board is also reviewing NCARB's OA for its Architectural Registration Examination (ARE) as part of the CSE development process. In addition, the Board is in the process of reviewing the procedures that govern how the ARE is developed. This is being done as part of a statutory mandate that boards must complete.

### ENFORCEMENT

The Board is seeking other tools to address unlicensed practice, such as "Infraction Authority." This tool enables the Board to issue on-the-spot citations.

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)

## **Agenda Item E**

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO COLLABORATE WITH NATIONAL LICENSING BODIES TO STAY RELEVANT**

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective to collaborate with national licensing bodies to stay relevant.

Agenda Item C addresses the Board's relationship with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). Over the last ten years, the Board has worked tirelessly to enhance its ability to collaborate with NCARB and has achieved positive results from these efforts. To further the Board's work with NCARB, the Board may wish to consider monitoring other national associations that serve licensing boards of design professions.

The Council of Landscape Architecture Registration Boards (CLARB) and National Council of Examiners on Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) are the national associations for licensing boards for landscape architects and engineers/land surveyors. Both organizations have a robust portfolio of programs, much like NCARB. Research and collaboration with these organizations would provide an opportunity to discover innovations and best practices that might be applicable to NCARB.

The Committee may wish to consider reviewing the activities of CLARB and NCEES to identify issues to bring forward to NCARB; their Vision and Mission Statements are provided as an attachment. One means to accomplish this would be to add these organizations to the Board's Liaison Program so there will be a designated Board member to lead the effort to connect with each organization.

The Board is asked to discuss and make a recommendation to the Board to fulfill this objective.

Attachment:

CLARB and NCEES Vision and Mission Statements



[Home](#) > [About CLARB](#) > [Mission and Goals](#)



**MISSION AND GOALS**

**LEADERSHIP & GOVERNANCE**

**RESEARCH**

**BECOME A VOLUNTEER**

**CONTACT CLARB**

### Mission and Goals

CLARB's mission is to foster the public health, safety and welfare related to the use and protection of the natural and built environment affected by the practice of landscape architecture.

To accomplish this mission, the organization provides programs and services to its members ([the state/provincial government agencies](#) that regulate the landscape architectural profession through the enforcement of [licensure laws](#)) that ensure consistency in competency of landscape architects and others involved in making decisions affecting the development and conservation of land by:

- Establishing and promoting standards for their professional competency and conduct, and examining and certifying their competency.
- Providing information and resources to those affected by the practice and regulation of landscape architecture thereby assuring that they are well informed, educated and empowered regarding the value and benefits of the licensed practice of landscape architecture.



## Vision, mission, and strategic plan

### Vision

The vision of NCEES is to provide leadership in professional licensure of engineers and surveyors through excellence in uniform laws, licensing standards, and professional ethics for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare and to shape the future of professional licensure.

### Mission

The mission of NCEES is to advance licensure for engineers and surveyors in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

This mission is supported through its member boards, board of directors, staff, board administrators, and volunteers by:

- Providing outstanding nationally normed examinations for engineers and surveyors
- Providing uniform model laws and model rules for adoption by the member boards
- Promoting professional ethics among all engineers and surveyors
- Coordinating with domestic and international organizations to advance licensure of all engineers and surveyors

### Strategic plan

In 2012, the NCEES board of directors adopted a strategic plan that describes several issues that represent challenges to maintaining an effective licensure process. The document specifies goals associated with each of the issues and describes strategies for achieving these goals.

[Strategic plan \(PDF\)](#)

[Strategic plan progress on goals as of May 2013 \(PDF\)](#)



## **Agenda Item F**

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT SUNSET REVIEW REPORT**

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective to prepare and submit the Board's 2014 Sunset Review Report.

The Sunset Review Report is due to the Legislature on November 1, 2014. Staff prepared a draft of the Report and is providing it to the Executive Committee for review and input.

The Committee is asked to complete an initial review of the draft 2014 Sunset Review Report, which will be presented to the Board at its June 12, 2014 meeting. The Board will then review the final draft of the Report at its September meeting.

The draft report is being finalized and will be provided under a separate cover.

## Agenda Item G

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PURSUE NEGATIVE BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL TO MEET REQUIREMENTS IN BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 128.5**

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to pursue a negative Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to meet requirements in section 128.5 of the Business and Professions Code.

After the February 2011 transition of the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) from an oral format to a written, computer-based version, the examination was administered with greater efficiency that directly contributed to a positive impact on the Board's reversion rate. At its September 12, 2013 meeting, the Board determined that its budget should reflect that efficiency and gave authority to the Executive Officer to proceed with a negative BCP to reduce its spending authority by \$400,000 for fiscal year (FY) 2015/16, and ongoing.

Subsequently, staff prepared a BCP Concept Paper, which is the first step in the process and an internal document which formulates the Board's intent to pursue the negative BCP in the fall. The Concept Paper was submitted to the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Budget Office on April 21, 2014. The next step will be for staff to prepare the negative BCP which is due to DCA in June. Below is a timeline of the major steps of the process.

#### **Timeline**

- Concept Papers submitted to DCA Budget Office for review (Mid-April)
- BCPs due to DCA's Budget Office (End of June)
- BCPs due to Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency (Beginning of August)
- BCPs due to Department of Finance (DOF) (Beginning of September)
- DOF approval of BCPs (Oct thru Nov)
- Inclusion of BCP in Governor's Budget (January 10th)

The Executive Committee is asked to discuss and consider possible further action concerning this 2014 Strategic Plan objective, if necessary.

## **Agenda Item H**

### **REVIEW AND APPROVE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PROPOSED CHANGES TO NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM REPORTING REQUIREMENT**

During the March 7-8, 2014 National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Regional Summit, NCARB President Blake Dunn announced a proposed change to the Intern Development Program (IDP) reporting requirement known as the "Six-Month Rule."

Currently the "Six-Month Rule" requires interns to submit valid work experience in reporting periods of no longer than six months and within two months of completion. Any experience reported outside the two month submission window expires on a day for day basis and cannot be used for IDP credit.

This proposed change will allow interns to earn IDP credit for valid work experience not previously reported within the timeframe specified by the current reporting requirement. It would allow credit for intern experience that occurred up to five years beyond the current reporting requirements. Credit for experience beyond the current reporting period would be valued at 50 percent for up to five years, after which any experience would be ineligible for credit.

On March 17, 2014, NCARB released a notice (attached) to Member Boards requesting input on the proposed change and providing a 90-day comment period, which ends on June 6, 2014. The NCARB Board of Directors will review submitted comments prior to voting on whether to approve the change at its June 18-21, 2014 meeting. If approved, the implementation of the change would become effective no later than January 1, 2015.

The Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee, at its April 9, 2014 meeting, reviewed the proposed change and voted to recommend the Board support it as presented. Staff advised the Committee members that because the deadline for submitting comments to NCARB is before the next Board meeting, the Executive Committee would be considering the recommendation on behalf of the Board. Later, at its June 12, 2014 meeting, the Board would then ratify the action taken by the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee is asked to review and approve the PQ Committee's recommendation to the Board and request that staff forward the supporting comments to NCARB.

#### Attachment

NCARB Notice Regarding Proposed Change to IDP Reporting Requirement

March 17, 2014

Dear Member Board Members and Member Board Executives:

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) is currently seeking Member Board comments on a proposed change to the Intern Development Program (IDP). This change specifically relates to the reporting requirement known as the “six-month reporting rule” for IDP credit. A detailed description of the proposed change is attached and is also posted on the Registration Board Section of the NCARB website.

Following this initial notice of the proposed change there will be a 90-day period for your Board to review and submit comments. We would greatly appreciate it if you would please take the opportunity to review the proposed change and provide your feedback. **The NCARB Board of Directors would like to hear from all Member Boards before they vote on the proposed changes.** To that end, please use the following questions as a guide when crafting your response:

- Does your Board agree, disagree, or have no position on the proposed change?
- If your Board disagrees, what are your concerns?
- Does your Board need more time to address the proposed change? If so, when do you expect to be able to provide us feedback?

All comments, including “no comments”, should be sent to the following address: [mdp-comments@ncarb.org](mailto:mdp-comments@ncarb.org) with a copy to [khillegas@ncarb.org](mailto:khillegas@ncarb.org) by 5:00 P.M. on Friday, June 6, 2014.

Blakely C. Dunn, AIA  
*President/Chair of the Board*  
El Dorado, Arkansas

Dale McKinney, FAIA  
*1st Vice President/President-Elect*  
Sioux City, Iowa

Dennis S. Ward, AIA  
*2nd Vice President*  
Florence, South Carolina

Margo P. Jones, AIA  
*Treasurer*  
Greenfield, Massachusetts

Kristine A. Harding, AIA  
*Secretary*  
Huntsville, Alabama

Ronald B. Blich, FAIA, FACHA  
*Past President*  
New Orleans, Louisiana

Christopher P. Williams, AIA  
*Director, Region 1*  
Meredith, New Hampshire

John R. Sorrenti, FAIA  
*Director, Region 2*  
Mineola, New York

Anne K. Smith, AIA  
*Director, Region 3*  
Savannah, Georgia

Terry L. Allers, AIA  
*Director, Region 4*  
Fort Dodge, Iowa

David L. Hoffman, FAIA  
*Director, Region 5*  
Wichita, Kansas

Gregory L. Erny, AIA  
*Director, Region 6*  
Reno, Nevada

Kathleen R. Nosbisch  
*Member Board Executive Director*  
Chester, Virginia

Lynn R. Axelroth  
*Public Director*  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Michael J. Armstrong  
*Chief Executive Officer*

## ***Proposed Change to IDP Reporting Requirement***

*March 17, 2014*

### **WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?**

This proposed change will allow interns to earn IDP credit for valid work experience not previously reported within the timeframe specified by the reporting requirement. Currently interns must submit all experience in reporting periods of no longer than six months and within two months of completion of each reporting period. The proposed change would, *for the first time*, allow credit for intern experience that occurred up to five years beyond the current reporting requirements. Credit for experience beyond the reporting period would be valued at 50 percent for up to five years, after which any experience would be ineligible for credit.

### **WHY SHOULD THIS CHANGE BE IMPLEMENTED?**

If adopted, interns will be able to earn IDP experience credit for valid work experience while still preserving the value of the Six-Month Rule. By preserving a 100 percent value for experience earned and reported within the reporting period, IDP participants will continue to be incentivized to comply with the reporting rule. In addition, this adjustment creates a parallel with the five-year rolling clock for honoring examination results, emphasizing a consistent position that activity along the licensure path maintains its value for five years.

### **The NCARB Board of Directors approved the following revisions to modify the IDP “Reporting Requirements” for Member Board comment:**

*Modify the IDP Guidelines, December 2013, page 9, Reporting Requirements, Paragraph 2 as follows:*

*“To earn full credit for experience, interns must submit all experience including supplemental experience in reporting periods of no longer than six months and within two months of completion of each reporting period.*

- ~~• For each day past the two-month filing period, a day of acceptable experience will be lost at the beginning of the reporting period.~~*

*Experience reported beyond the two-month filing period and up to five years after the date of the validated experience will be accepted at a reduced value of fifty percent (50 percent) toward the IDP requirements.*

### **Rationale:**

At the December 2013 Board of Directors meeting the Board engaged in a conversation about ways to improve the customer service experience regarding the IDP reporting rule. Currently, interns are only able to document experience in reporting periods of six months. The conversation was centered on ways to identify a reasonable and flexible solution to support the path to licensure while also continuing to endorse the value of timely reporting.

## **Proposed Changes to IDP Reporting Requirement**

**March 17, 2014**

**Page 2**

In the nearly five years since the IDP Reporting Requirement was introduced, there has been significant compliance with this rule. Hundreds of thousands of intern experience reports have been submitted within the framework of this rule and a significant number of IDP stakeholders have reaffirmed that this rule is valuable and should remain intact. There are, however, a subset of customers that, for various reasons, have not complied with the rule and have lost experience hours as a result.

This proposed modification creates an alternative to allow the acceptance of hours for experience earned outside of the reporting requirement while still strongly incentivizing interns to comply with this rule. This modification caps the experience earned at a maximum of 5 years from the date of submission.

The NCARB Board will review comments from its Member Boards over the next 90 days, and place a formal vote on the change onto its June pre-Annual Meeting agenda. The timeline for implementation of this change, should it be approved, is anticipated to occur no later than 1 January 2015.