

California Architects Board

Executive Committee Meeting

November 24, 2015

Sacramento and Various Teleconference Locations in  
California





Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## NOTICE OF MEETING

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**November 24, 2015**  
**10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.**  
**(or until completion of business)**  
**California Architects Board**  
**2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105**  
**Sacramento, CA 95834**  
**(916) 574-7220**

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

*Jon Alan Baker*  
*BakerNowicki Design Studio*  
*731 Ninth Avenue, Suite A*  
*San Diego, CA 92101*  
*(619) 795-2450*

*Pasqual Gutierrez*  
*HMC Architects*  
*633 W. 5th Street, 3rd Floor*  
*Los Angeles, CA 90071*  
*(213) 542-8300*

The notice and agenda for this meeting and other meetings of the Board can be found on the Board's website: [cab.ca.gov](http://cab.ca.gov). For further information regarding this agenda, please see reverse or you may contact Mel Knox at (916) 575-7221.

### AGENDA

- A. Call to Order
- B. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda  
*(The Committee may not discuss or take any action on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting [Government Code Sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)]).*
- C. Review and Approve May 20, 2014 Executive Committee Meeting Summary Report
- D. Selection of 2015 Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Awardees to be Recommended to Board for Approval
- E. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Review, Leverage, and Evaluate Effectiveness of Board's Liaison Program to Build Stronger Relationships with Organizations

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 on Reverse)*

- F. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Increase Board’s Participation in National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
- G. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Annually Present Consumer Satisfaction Survey Data to Measure Performance and Identify Areas for Improvement
- H. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Collaborate with Department of Consumer Affairs’ Office of Public Affairs to Improve Outreach and Communication
- I. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Implement BreEZe, an Enterprise-Wide Licensing and Enforcement System, to Improve Consumer, Candidate, and Licensee Services
- J. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Analyze Fees to Determine Whether they are Appropriate
- K. Discuss and Possible Action on 2015–2016 Strategic Plan Objective to Complete Sunset Review Process and Implement Recommendation(s) to Comply with Legislature’s Directives
- L. Adjournment

*Action may be taken on any item on the agenda. The time and order of agenda items are subject to change at the discretion of the Executive Committee Chair and may be taken out of order. The meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier or later than posted in this notice. In accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, all meetings of the Executive Committee are open to the public.*

*Government Code section 11125.7 provides the opportunity for the public to address each agenda item during discussion or consideration by the Executive Committee prior to the Committee taking any action on said item. Members of the public will be provided appropriate opportunities to comment on any issue before the Executive Committee, but the Chair may, at his or her discretion, apportion available time among those who wish to speak. Individuals may appear before the Executive Committee to discuss items not on the agenda; however, the Committee can neither discuss nor take official action on these items at the time of the same meeting [Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)].*

*The meeting 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 Mr. Knox at (916) 575-7221, emailing mel.knox@dca.ca.gov, or sending a written request to the Board. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.*

*Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Board 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**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Roll is called by the Executive Committee Vice Chair, or in his absence, by a member designated by the Chair.

### **COMMITTEE MEMBER ROSTER**

Jon Alan Baker, Chair

Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice Chair

Tian Feng, Secretary

Sylvia Kwan

## **Agenda Item B**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Members of the public may address the Executive Committee at this time. The Committee Chair may allow public participation during other agenda items at their discretion.

## **Agenda Item C**

### **REVIEW AND APPROVE MAY 20, 2014 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY REPORT**

The Committee is asked to review and approve the attached Summary Report for the May 20, 2014 Executive Committee meeting.

Attachment:

May 20, 2014 Executive Committee Meeting Summary Report



Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
GOVERNOR

# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

## SUMMARY REPORT

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

May 20, 2014

#### Sacramento, CA and Various Teleconference Locations in CA

##### Committee Members Present

Sheran Voigt, Chair  
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice Chair  
Jon Alan Baker  
Chris Christophersen

##### Board Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer  
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)  
John Keidel, LATC Special Projects Analyst  
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst  
Justin Sotelo, Examination/Licensing Analyst

##### Guest Present

Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)

Committee Chair Sheran Voigt called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Three members of the Committee constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. There being four members present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

Mr. Voigt asked committee members, staff, and guests to provide introductions.

#### **A. Review and Approve November 5, 2013 Executive Committee Summary Report**

Mr. Voigt asked the Committee to consider approval of the November 5, 2013, Summary Report.

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

*Pasqual Gutierrez moved to approve the November 5, 2013, Executive Committee Summary Report.*

*Sheran Voigt seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 3-0-1 (Baker abstained).*

**B. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Seek Exemption from Assembly Bill 186 Related to Waiver of California Supplemental Examination**

Executive Officer Doug McCauley explained that Assembly Bill (AB) 186 is proposed legislation that would require several Boards to create a temporary license category to help spouses of members of the military become licensed. Mr. McCauley further explained that the bill is problematic for the Board because it would force the Board to waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) for these candidates for licensure. He informed the Committee that the Board's request for an exemption from the provisions of AB 186 has been accepted, and no action is required.

**C. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Promote Awareness of Value of CAB's Participation at National Level**

Mr. McCauley reminded the Committee that Board members' participation and collaboration with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) is critical because of the services and programs the Board utilizes from NCARB. Mr. McCauley reported that the Board has had success receiving approvals to travel to NCARB meetings, and was recently approved to attend both the Regional Summit in San Antonio, and the Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. He noted that efforts will continue to ensure out-of-state travel request approvals.

Mr. McCauley recommended that the Committee embrace the following four recommendations:

1. Publicize the Board's successful efforts with NCARB via the newsletter;
2. Continue to partner with AIACC to underscore the importance of NCARB;
3. Maintain a list of accomplishments via the Board's participation in NCARB; and
4. Stress with NCARB the importance of "mission critical" agendas.

Mr. Gutierrez endorsed all four recommendations, and recommended including in the newsletter a copy of NCARB's CEO report and other communiqué from AIACC.

Mr. McCauley recommended incorporating specific elements from NCARB's CEO report and other communiqué from AIACC. Mr. Gutierrez agreed.

*Chris Christophersen moved to propose to the Board that it adopt staff's four recommendations to promote awareness of value of the Board's participation on the national level, and add a fifth recommendation to incorporate elements and items from NCARB's CEO report and other communiqué from AIACC into the newsletter.*



*Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

**D. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Implement CAB's Liaison Program and Determine Future Focus for Organizations and Schools**

Mel Knox reminded the Committee that, at its December meeting, the Board identified three actions to incorporate into the Liaison Program:

1. Staff will distribute reporting requirement reminders for liaisons on a quarterly basis;
2. Staff will provide liaisons with talking points; and
3. Liaisons will collaborate with staff when communicating licensing information to candidates.

Mr. Knox informed the Committee that these directives were implemented in the first and second quarters of 2014. He directed the Committee's attention to the Liaison Responsibilities and Talking Points memoranda, as well as the appointment roster for the Committee's review.

Mr. McCauley opined that the only item which may require further action at this stage would be to send a second reporting reminder to Board member liaisons ahead of the upcoming Board meeting in June.

Mr. Gutierrez asked to include a fourth category of taking points regarding the Board's encouragement of additional paths to licensure. The Committee agreed with Mr. Gutierrez's suggestion.

**E. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Collaborate with National Licensing Bodies to Stay Relevant**

Mr. McCauley explained that objectives concerning "national licensing bodies" are about more than NCARB. He suggested adding the National Council of Examiners on Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) and the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) to the Board's Liaison Program. Mr. McCauley said doing so will enhance the Board's collaboration with national licensing bodies.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed with the idea of adding NCEES and CLARB to the Liaison Program. To broaden the Board's scope, he suggested adding international design professional organizations to the program as well; namely, the Australian Institute of Architecture, and United Kingdom-based Building Futures.

*Pasqual Gutierrez moved to recommend to the Board that it continue and enhance collaboration with national and international licensing and service organizations.*

*Jon Baker seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

**F. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Prepare and Submit Sunset Review Report**

Mr. McCauley described the Sunset Review preparation process and identified new elements in the 2014 Sunset Review Report from the prior Report four years ago. The Committee reviewed the draft Report, discussed its content, and made several suggested edits throughout the document.

*Chris Christophersen moved to approve the draft 2014 Sunset Review Report, as amended, and to present it to the Board.*

*Jon Baker seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

**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**

Mr. Knox updated the Committee on the Board's request for a budget reduction of \$400,000 beginning in fiscal year 2015-16. He reminded the Committee that the CSE transitioned to a computer-based format in 2011, which produced greater savings. Mr. Knox further informed the Committee that the Board's request is consistent with the Governor's efforts to promote responsible resource allocation. He reported that a negative budget change proposal will be prepared for submission to the DCA Budget Office in June 2014. Mr. Knox said he expects the request to be approved given that the Board is proposing to reduce its spending authority.

**H. Review and Approve Professional Qualifications Committee's Recommendation Regarding Proposed Changes to National Council of Architectural Registration Boards Intern Development Program Reporting Requirement**

Marccus Reinhardt informed the Committee that NCARB proposed a change to the Intern Development Program (IDP) reporting requirement known as the six-month rule. Mr. Reinhardt explained that the change allows candidates to submit and gain credit for work experience that otherwise would have been lost. He informed the Committee that the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) voted to support the change, as presented. Mr. Reinhardt asked the Committee to approve this PQC recommendation.

Mr. Gutierrez noted that the change is very close to the Broadly Experienced Design Professional exemption of IDP, because it allows an individual who can claim more credit to demonstrate 120 hours more than the required 5,600-hour requirement. Mr. Baker agreed with Mr. Gutierrez that this change is a good start toward a potential substitute for other NCARB programs (i.e., Broadly Experienced Architect, and Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect).

*Jon Baker moved to approve the PQC recommendation to support NCARB's proposed change to the IDP reporting requirement known as the six-month rule, and to present it to the Board for ratification.*

*Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 4-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

## Agenda Item D

### **SELECTION OF 2015 OCTAVIUS MORGAN DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDEES TO BE RECOMMENDED TO BOARD FOR APPROVAL**

The Board, at its September 2000 meeting, voted to establish an annual system for recognizing all of the volunteers who contribute to the Board and to grant a special award for distinguished service. The award was named the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award, after the first Board President. The following guidelines for the award have been approved by the Board.

**Purpose:** To recognize and thank our committed volunteers on their efforts.

**Criteria:** Volunteers who, over a period of time, have provided the Board with outstanding and dedicated service. Potential winners would be committee or task forces members, exam subject matter experts/commissioners, or others. Board members are eligible, provided they have served the Board five or more years in addition to their terms on the Board.

**Number of awards:** Three to five per year in order to spread the recognition.

**Selection process:** Board members and staff would nominate individuals. The names of those receiving awards would be announced at the December Board meeting.

**Award:** The Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award recipients would be sent an appropriate item of recognition and would be noted in the newsletter. Board members will purchase the item of recognition from their own monies if prohibitions are in place from making the purchase from Board funds (motion approved at December 5-6, 2012 Board meeting).

The following individuals have been recipients of the award:

2014 – Albert Okuma and Charles Smith  
2013 – Loangle Newsome and Linda Zubiate  
2012 – Victor Newlove, Roger North, and Roger Wilcox  
2011 – Denis Henmi, Phyllis A. Newton, and Richard R. Tannahill  
2010 – Wayne Holtan, Arlee Monson, and John Petrucelli  
2009 – Richard Cooling, Richard Dodd, Morris Gee, and Larry Segrue  
2008 – Chad R. Overway, Eric H. Jacobsen, and Bruce L. Macpherson  
2007 – John Canestro, Gerald Cole, and Michelle Plotnick  
2006 – Allan Cooper, Robert George, and Richard Holden  
2005 – Andrew Barker, Robert DePietro, and Paul Neel  
2004 – Jim Jordan, Larry Paul, P.K. Reibsam, and Merlyn Isaak  
2003 – Carol Tink-Fox, Jim McGlothlin, and Ron Ronconi  
2002 – Glenn A. Gall, Lucille M. Hodges, RK Stewart, and Richard T. Conrad  
2001 – George Ikenoyama, Fred Yerou, Richard Crowell, Jack Paddon, and Cynthia Easton  
2000 – Charles J. Brown, Mackey W. Deasy, and Barry Wasserman

Staff were asked to submit nominations for 2015 recipients to the Executive Committee for consideration. A list of recommended nominees will be provided prior to the meeting. The Executive Committee is asked to review the nominations and select recipients for this year's award

to be recommended to the Board at its December 10, 2015 meeting, and reconfirm that Board members will purchase the awards from their own personal funds.

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO REVIEW, LEVERAGE, AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE BOARD'S LIAISON PROGRAM TO BUILD STRONGER RELATIONSHIPS WITH ORGANIZATIONS**

The 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to review, leverage, and evaluate the effectiveness of the Board's liaison program to build stronger relationships with organizations.

The Board's liaison program is designed to ensure that the Board exchanges information with key entities. Liaisons are assigned to organizations and schools, and are responsible for 1) establishing and maintaining contact with these entities, and 2) biannually reporting back to the Board on their activities and objectives.

In 2014, the Board incorporated the following enhancements into the liaison program:

1. Staff distributes reporting requirement reminders for liaisons on a quarterly basis;
2. Staff provides liaisons with talking points; and
3. Liaisons will collaborate with staff when communicating licensing information to candidates.

An additional category of taking points regarding the Board's support of additional paths to licensure was also incorporated into the liaison program in 2014. Most recently, biannual reporting requirements were amended for liaisons to deliver their reports in the spring and fall months, in alignment with the academic calendar.

To enhance the ongoing effectiveness of the liaison program, staff recommends the development of a standardized summary template to be used by Board liaisons. The template will summarize each contact with their assigned organizations and schools, and solicit feedback in terms of how the relationship with each entity can be improved. The development and use of such templates could also assist with the liaisons' biannual reports to the Board. Staff suggests that this new component, along with the 2014 improvements noted above, be implemented for an additional year before making new assessments.

The Executive Committee is asked to discuss this objective and to provide a recommendation for the Board's consideration.

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO INCREASE BOARD'S PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS**

The Board's 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to increase the Board's participation in the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB).

The Board's participation with 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 (the request must be approved by the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency and Governor's Office). In this request, 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.

The Board's requests for out-of-state travel approval to participate in NCARB have been successful in recent years. Requests for travel to the Annual Meeting and Conference, Regional Summit, and NCARB committee meetings have generally been approved. In addition, the Board was able to secure appointments to NCARB committees for four Board members.

The Board raised the importance of NCARB participation in its Sunset Review Report. Participation in national issues became a cross-cutting issue noted during the Sunset Review process. One of the recommendations from the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee and Assembly Business and Professions Committee was to "pursue opportunities at which its Members and Officers can interact directly with their national peers, and provide a strong voice for California's unique perspective and needs." In addition, the Board was asked to report restrictions that prohibit it from attending meetings where its representation could significantly impact California's ability to ensure that national examinations or standards reflect California's needs and protect California licensees, candidates for licensure, and consumers.

This objective was also in the 2014 Strategic Plan. The Board approved a motion 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; and

5. Incorporate elements of NCARB CEO Reports and other NCARB communiqués, as well as American Institute of Architects reports into the *California Architect* newsletter.

Given the Board's accomplishments on this objective, staff recommends that the Board continue to monitor the results of efforts to participate and identify additional actions as necessary.



## Agenda Item G

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO ANNUALLY PRESENT CONSUMER SATISFACTION SURVEY DATA TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE AND IDENTIFY AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to annually present consumer satisfaction survey data to measure performance and identify areas for improvement.

The Board currently utilizes a general customer satisfaction survey for consumers who have filed complaints against architects/unlicensed individuals and individuals renewing or seeking a license to practice architecture in California. The survey (Attachment 1) is available on the Board's website and via link in all Board staff email correspondence. A majority (80%) of the responses to the survey between fiscal years (FY) 2012-2013 and 2014-2015 indicate that individuals were satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by the Board (non-applicable responses excluded). So far in FY 2015-2016, 90% of respondents indicate that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by the Board (non-applicable responses excluded). Additionally, the Board utilizes a Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) consumer complaint-specific survey (Attachment 2), which is made available to complainants once an enforcement case is closed.

Staff has noted that the Board's general customer satisfaction survey is perhaps too broad for the various categories of constituents the Board serves. Staff has identified potential improvements to the survey and has discussed with DCA Strategic Organization, Leadership, and Individual Development (SOLID) staff various enhancements; they are available to assist the Board in this endeavor. One of the specific improvements being considered is to develop other versions of the survey that are better tailored to the Board's various constituents. This change would allow the Board to collect more reliable survey data, and will in turn enable the Board to better assess its performance and identify potential areas for improvement.

Per the Strategic Plan objective, staff will annually provide data from the existing survey formats to the Board; however, staff will also work with DCA SOLID to make any necessary enhancements/improvements.

The Committee is asked to provide a recommendation for the Board's consideration.

#### Attachments:

1. Board Customer Satisfaction Survey
2. DCA Complaint Process Evaluation

## Customer Satisfaction Survey

The Board continually strives to provide the best customer service to consumers, candidates and licensees. Please answer the questions below regarding your most recent experience with the Board's staff. Thank you for taking the time to complete the Board's survey.

### Survey

1. Board staff is courteous when contacted by phone.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

2. Board staff assistance is efficient.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

3. Board staff assistance is accurate.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4. Board's Web site contains useful information.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

5. Board's Web site is organized so that information is easy to find.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

6. The processing of my application was timely.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

7. The processing of my application was accurate.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

8. The processing of my renewal was timely.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

9. The processing of my renewal was accurate.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

10. The processing of my name change or change of address was accurate.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

11. The complaint process was described fully and accurately.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

12. Overall, I was satisfied with the service I received from the Board.

Not Applicable  Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

#### Additional Comments

If you answered "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" with any of the statements above, please provide details of your experience and any suggestions for improvement.

Please tell us how we can improve our services, or what additional services we might provide.

Please tell us if someone was particularly helpful to you.

Please indicate the nature of your interaction with the Board

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Responses will assist the Board in improving and expanding our services for consumers, candidates, and licensees.

## Complaint Process Evaluation

Rate the following questions, using the scale:  
Very Poor, Poor, Good, Very Good

**How well did we explain the complaint process to you?**

- Very Poor     Poor     Good     Very Good

**How clearly was the outcome of your complaint explained to you?**

- Very Poor     Poor     Good     Very Good

**How well did we meet the time frame provided to you?**

- Very Poor     Poor     Good     Very Good

**How courteous and helpful was staff?**

- Very Poor     Poor     Good     Very Good

**Overall, How well did we handle your complaint?**

- Very Poor     Poor     Good     Very Good

**If we were unable to assist you, were alternatives provided to you?**

- Yes     No     N/A

**Did you verify the provider's license prior to service?**

- Yes     No     N/A

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your opinion matters to us and will help us improve our enforcement processes.**

**Please add any comments you wish to provide:**

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO COLLABORATE WITH DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS' OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS TO IMPROVE OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION**

The 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to collaborate with the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA) Office of Public Affairs (OPA) to improve outreach and communication.

Board staff met with the OPA on September 3, 2015, and again on November 17, 2015, to identify potential opportunities to collaborate. OPA recommended developing a more comprehensive communications plan to improve the Board's outreach and communication activities. OPA is available to facilitate the aforementioned plan's development.

This objective overlaps with the 2015-2016 Strategic Plan objective that directs the Communications Committee to partner with the Contractors State License Board (CSLB) to identify and implement best practices for educating consumers about the Board in order to improve consumer education efforts. At its October 21, 2015 meeting, the Communications Committee discussed CSLB's best practices and recommended that Board staff continue to collaborate with CSLB staff and leverage resources when feasible (i.e., provide Board materials to CSLB's Public Affairs Office for use during their outreach activities).

The Committee may wish to merge this objective with the Communications Committee's related objective and charge the Communications Committee with furthering its work to expand the Board's communications program.

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO IMPLEMENT BREEZE, AN ENTERPRISE-WIDE LICENSING AND ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM, TO IMPROVE CONSUMER, CANDIDATE, AND LICENSEE SERVICES**

The 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to implement BreEZe, an enterprise-wide licensing and enforcement system, to improve consumer, candidate, and licensee services.

The Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) has been working to design, configure, and implement BreEZe. This system supports DCA's highest priority initiatives of job creation and consumer protection by replacing aging legacy business systems with an industry-proven software solution that utilizes current technologies to facilitate increased efficiencies for DCA board and bureau licensing and enforcement programs. More specifically, BreEZe supports applicant tracking, licensing, license renewal, enforcement, monitoring, cashiering, and data management capabilities. Additionally, the system is web-based which allows the public to file complaints and search licensee information and complaint status via the Internet. It also allows applicants and licensees to submit applications, license renewals, and make payments online. BreEZe is being deployed department-wide via three separate releases. The Board is currently part of Release 3.

In June 2015, DCA informed the Board that, after Release 2 is completed, it will work with the Release 3 boards and bureaus with the California Technology Agency in preparing a project plan for the remaining boards and bureaus. DCA also informed that, prior to beginning work on Release 3, it will perform a formal cost benefit analysis after Release 2 is completed. DCA stated that part of this formal evaluation will include a gap analysis of all existing BreEZe functionality as delivered at the completion of Release 2, to the Release 3 boards and bureaus' business needs and current systems' functionality. It indicated that the cost benefit analysis/feasibility study will determine the strategy taken; and, if contractors are brought on board, a mix of contractors and state staff, or just state staff will be implementing Release 3. DCA anticipates the development of the Release 3 project plan to begin in mid-2016.

No action concerning BreEZe is required of the Committee or Board at this time.

### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO ANALYZE FEES TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEY ARE APPROPRIATE**

The Board's 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to analyze fees to determine whether they are appropriate.

Staff monitors the Board's budget, expenditures, revenue, and fund condition very closely with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Budget Office. The Board has had a strong tradition of frugality and staying within its budget. Each June Board meeting, the members are provided a budget update.

The Board has recently taken two different actions related to the Board's fees and fund condition (i.e., biennial license renewal fee increase and reduction of spending authority). The Board approved an increase of the renewal fee from \$200 to \$300 and a \$300,000 reduction in its spending authority, effective January 1, 2011 and July 1, 2015 respectively. These two actions were based on the advice and guidance of the DCA Budget Office staff and management.

The fee increase enabled the Board to keep its fund solvent for multiple years and maintain the fund balance within the Department of Finance's (DOF) recommended reserve range. Also of note, the renewal fee had not increased in the prior 20+ years. Additionally, other Board fees (Architect Registration Examination eligibility, California Supplemental Examination, reciprocity, etc.) have remained unchanged as there has been no demonstrated need to change them. The Board voluntarily reduced its spending authority \$300,000 beginning fiscal year (FY) 2015/16 with the submittal, and subsequent DOF approval, of a negative Budget Change Proposal (BCP). FY 2015/16 is the first FY the budget reduction has been applied to the Board's budget authority and will be applied ongoing. It should be noted that despite challenging State budget realities, a voluntary budget reduction was in the best interest of the Board and of the State of California due to the Board's reversion each FY.

Staff met with DCA Budget Office personnel to examine the Board's budget and fund condition and analyze whether its fees are appropriate in light of this Strategic Plan objective. During this meeting, it was determined by Budget Office staff that the Board's current fund condition is appropriate and that a budget or fee change is not recommended at this time. Budget Office staff also indicated that DOF would not recommend the Board make any adjustments at this time given the Board's current fund condition and its downward trend. Additionally, it was recommended that the Board re-assess this issue after the completion of FY 2015/16 due to the recent spending authority reduction as a result of the Board's negative BCP.

Based on the Budget Office assessment of the Board's fund condition, staff recommends no action at this time, but that the Board re-assess this objective after the conclusion of FY 2015/16.

The Committee is asked to provide a recommendation for the Board's consideration.

#### Attachment:

Analysis of Fund Condition

**0706 - California Architects Board  
Analysis of Fund Condition**

Prepared 10/7/2015

**2015-16 BUDGET ACT  
w/Workload\_Revenue**

	<b>ACTUAL 2014-15</b>	<b>Budget Act CY 2015-16</b>	<b>BY 2016-17</b>	<b>BY + 1 2017-18</b>	<b>BY + 2 2018-19</b>	<b>BY + 3 2019-20</b>
<b>BEGINNING BALANCE</b>	\$ 5,252	\$ 4,869	\$ 5,221	\$ 4,336	\$ 4,564	\$ 3,528
Prior Year Adjustment	\$ 24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$ 5,276	\$ 4,869	\$ 5,221	\$ 4,336	\$ 4,564	\$ 3,528
<b>REVENUES AND TRANSFERS</b>						
Revenues:						
125600 Other regulatory fees	\$ 6	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1
125700 Other regulatory licenses and permits	\$ 351	\$ 346	\$ 306	\$ 346	\$ 306	\$ 346
125800 Renewal fees	\$ 2,548	\$ 3,615	\$ 2,505	\$ 3,615	\$ 2,505	\$ 3,615
125900 Delinquent fees	\$ 38	\$ 73	\$ 38	\$ 73	\$ 38	\$ 73
141200 Sales of documents	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
142500 Miscellaneous services to the public	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
150300 Income from surplus money investments	\$ 11	\$ 11	\$ 11	\$ 14	\$ 11	\$ 11
150500 Interest Income From Interfund Loans	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
160400 Sale of fixed assets	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
161000 Escheat of unclaimed checks and warrants	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1
161400 Miscellaneous revenues	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1
Totals, Revenues	\$ 2,956	\$ 4,048	\$ 2,863	\$ 4,051	\$ 2,863	\$ 4,048
Transfers from Other Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfers to Other Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Totals, Revenues and Transfers	\$ 2,956	\$ 4,048	\$ 2,863	\$ 4,051	\$ 2,863	\$ 4,048
Totals, Resources	\$ 8,232	\$ 8,917	\$ 8,084	\$ 8,387	\$ 7,427	\$ 7,576
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
Disbursements:						
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8880 Financial Information System for California (State Operations)	\$ 3	\$ 7	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
1110 Program Expenditures (State Operations)	\$ 3,360	\$ 3,689	\$ 3,748	\$ 3,823	\$ 3,899	\$ 3,977
Total Disbursements	\$ 3,363	\$ 3,696	\$ 3,748	\$ 3,823	\$ 3,899	\$ 3,977
<b>FUND BALANCE</b>						
Reserve for economic uncertainties	\$ 4,869	\$ 5,221	\$ 4,336	\$ 4,564	\$ 3,528	\$ 3,599
<b>Months in Reserve</b>	15.8	16.7	13.6	14.0	10.6	10.6



### **DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO COMPLETE SUNSET REVIEW PROCESS AND IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COMPLY WITH THE LEGISLATURE'S DIRECTIVES**

The Board's 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Executive Committee to complete the Sunset Review process and implement recommendation(s) to comply with the Legislature's directives.

The Board's Sunset Review Report was submitted to the Legislature on October 31, 2014 and the hearing was held on March 18, 2015. The Board's written responses to the issues raised by the Legislature were due within 30 days of the hearing. The Board/Landscape Architects Technical Committee's (LATC) presentation at the hearing received positive feedback from the committees (the Senate and Assembly policy committees met jointly to conduct the hearing). Only two questions were asked regarding the: 1) process for determining content for the California Supplemental Examination (CSE), and 2) possible causes for the non-compliance rate on continuing education audits. The Board's responses were satisfactory to the committees and also received positive feedback.

On April 16, 2015, the Board submitted its written responses to the issues identified in the Sunset Review Background Paper to the Assembly Committee on Business and Professions and the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development (see attachment). The Board ratified the written responses at its June 10, 2015 meeting. Assembly Bill 177 (Bonilla), the bill that extends the Sunset date for the Board and LATC, was signed into law on October 2, 2015 and goes into effect January 1, 2016.

To continue to build on the Board's positive outcomes from the Sunset Review process, staff recommends that the Executive Committee consider the following suggestions:

1. Staff should review the Sunset Review Report and Sunset Background Paper and Responses and compile a list of recommendations and suggestions that were noted in the documents.
2. Staff should review the metrics in the report and identify opportunities, requirements, and improvements as to data collection.
3. Staff should monitor the Sunset Review process on an ongoing basis to identify any emerging cross-cutting issues.

At this meeting the Executive Committee is asked to consider staff's plan to address this Strategic Plan objective and take possible action.

Attachment:

Sunset Background Paper and Responses Submitted April 16, 2015

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
SUNSET BACKGROUND PAPER RESPONSES**

**ISSUE #1: TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS.** Should the Committees encourage travel to professional conferences or meetings that directly affect licensure of California licensees?

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Committees should encourage the Board to pursue opportunities at which its Members and Officers can interact directly with their national peers, and provide a strong voice for California's unique perspective and needs. The Board should inform the Committees of whether it continues to face travel restrictions that prohibit it from attending meetings where its representation could significantly impact California's ability to ensure that national examinations or standards reflect California's needs and protect California licensees, candidates for licensure, and consumers.

**The Board/LATC concurs with the Committees' recommendation. Participation in national affairs is critical for the Board and LATC. The national examinations save the Board and LATC literally millions of dollars by not having to replicate the national examinations. In addition, the Board relies on the Intern Development Program to ensure that candidates receive experience in crucial areas of practice.**

**The Board and LATC have had recent success on travel, with approvals to attend three key out-of-state national sessions. In addition, three recent sessions have been in California, where the Board was also able to participate. These approved trips for the Board were funded by our national nonprofit - the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), so no State funds were spent. The Board has not received approval to travel with State funds since 2010. LATC was approved to travel to the Annual Business Meeting of the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) in 2009 and 2014 with State funds, but CLARB does not offer "funded trips." LATC was denied the opportunity to attend a CLARB session that was held in California. Sending a Board member to the Annual Meeting costs a fraction of the Board's budget - approximately .0005.**

**The Board just participated in the NCARB Regional Summit on March 13-14 in Long Beach. At that meeting, the main proposal discussed would restrict existing reciprocity standards and prevent nearly 2,000 California architects from practicing in other states. California was the only state advocating to preserve the existing pathway. Through our efforts, we built a coalition to oppose the measure when it is up for a vote in June at the Annual Business Meeting. There is much more to be done to defeat the measure, but much of the effort takes place on-site at the meeting. In order to succeed, the Board must be in attendance with a strong delegation. This is because there are approximately 250 people in attendance from the 54 member jurisdictions, as well as NCARB executive staff and leadership from the American Institute of Architects, National Architectural Accrediting Board, Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture and American Institute of Architects - Students. Persuading a group of that size requires a delegation of at least four,**

**but a larger group has greater odds for success and also helps with succession planning so that new Board/LATC members can learn first-hand about the national associations and develop the relationships needed to protect California's interests.**

**The Board is in the process of submitting an out-of-state trip request to DCA to add two members in addition to the two that were previously approved. This will provide the Board a strong delegation to work to defeat the resolution.**

**The professions, via the American Institute of Architects - California Council and California Council of the American Society of Landscape Architects, understand the importance of participation and regularly and consistently support the Board's engagement in NCARB and CLARB. The Board appreciates that DCA and Administration have been approving some of the trips, and the Board encourages ongoing and increased support for the criticality of national issues.**

(Note: This was Issue #1 for LATC in the Sunset Background Paper.)

**ISSUE #2: PRO RATA.** What services does the Board receive for its share of pro rata?

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Board should advise the Committees about the basis upon which pro rata is calculated, and the methodology for determining what services to utilize from DCA. In addition, the Board should discuss whether it could achieve cost savings by providing some of these services in-house.

**The Board/LATC's share of the department's pro rata is calculated based on authorized position counts, licensing and enforcement record counts, prior year workload, and interagency agreements. The Board/LATC currently utilizes most of the pro rata services for efficiencies and cost savings. Centralized services are more practical and efficient particularly for smaller boards such as ours. Board/LATC staff would need special high-level expertise in certain administrative services to be effective. It would be difficult to achieve an "economy of scale" if the Board/LATC were to assume pro rata-related services. The Board/LATC has limited staff with diverse responsibilities, whereas DCA has teams of trained specialists with program-specific management.**

**Senate Bill 1243 (Chapter 395, Statutes of 2014) requires DCA to conduct a study and submit a report to the Legislature on its pro rata calculation of administrative expenses by July 1, 2015. The study will assess whether the pro rata system is the most productive, efficient, and cost-effective methodology and whether some of the services should be outsourced or charged on an as-needed basis. The study will also include consideration of whether the boards should be permitted to elect not to receive (and be charged for) certain administrative services. As part of the study, the Board/LATC has participated in a survey of its use of DCA's services. Based on the outcome of the study and the DCA's report to the Legislature, the Board/LATC will reassess its continued use of the DCA's pro rata services.**

(Note: This was Issue #4 for LATC in the Sunset Background Paper.)

**ISSUE #3: BREEZE IMPLEMENTATION.** The Board was supposed to be part of BreEZe's Release Three, which has now been delayed until at least 2016.

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Board should inform the Committees of any difficulties it foresees as a result of having to remain on its legacy system, and whether any additional stop-gap technological measures are needed until BreEZe is implemented. The Board should inform the Committees of how costs related to BreEZe will impact its fund condition.

**Substantial difficulties are foreseeable, as a result of having to remain on the legacy systems, due to numerous significant changes to the national Architect Registration Examination (ARE) and potential changes to other national programs. Board/LATC staff is conducting an assessment of the impact due to delayed implementation of BreEZe for Release 3 boards and bureaus and coordinating efforts with DCA to develop stop-gap measures that could involve significant modifications to the legacy systems.**

**The Board believes, however, that due to the changes to the ARE, the corresponding changes to the "business model analysis" that was prepared in preparation for BreEZe approximately five years ago, are so significant that the current delay and repositioning of BreEZe may actually be a strategic advantage. Had BreEZe actually rolled out with the ARE consisting of seven divisions, as it does now, it would be completely dysfunctional, as the ARE previously had nine divisions. To add further complexities, there are intricate new rules that place restrictions on candidates' eligibility, which would have further exacerbated the problems.**

**The Board/LATC routinely monitors its fund condition and works very closely with DCA's Budget Office. The Budget Office has provided the Board/LATC's fund condition projected to fiscal year (FY) 2016/17, which includes anticipated BreEZe costs. The Board/LATC and the Budget Office do not foresee an issue with the Board/LATC's fund condition based on the current projections for BreEZe costs. The Board's fund condition will have an 11-month reserve in FY 2016/17, the year the BreEZe program is planned to be implemented for the Board.**

(Note: This was Issue #3 for LATC in the Sunset Background Paper.)

**ISSUE #4: LICENSURE AND LICENSEE POPULATION.** Should the Board continue to explore ways to streamline the licensure process? Should the Board examine whether there is a shortage of licensed architects and capacity for architecture programs to train students?

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Board should continue to explore streamlined paths to licensure as a way to simplify the licensure process. The Board should continue monitoring the efforts of, and working closely with, NCARB, to ensure that any proposed changes to the licensure process do not affect competency or create reciprocity issues, and that California's needs are represented at the national level. The Board should monitor workforce capacity to determine if the demand for licensed architects is, and will continue to be, met.

**The Board concurs with the Committees' recommendations. There is an ongoing objective from the Board's 2014 Strategic Plan to collaborate with California's National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredited programs to establish and promote an Additional Path to Architectural Licensure (APAL). NCARB has taken a leadership role at the national level with the APAL; the Board is working with California schools and has hosted two summits (February 26, 2014 and March 12, 2015) to further those efforts.**

**NCARB has released its Request for Proposal (RFP), responses to which are due June 1, 2015. After a review of the RFPs, NCARB will provide an endorsement of those programs that conform to the programmatic requirements. The Board will continue its monitoring of NCARB and the national trends with respect to efforts for developing a streamlined licensure process.**

**Board staff will also coordinate with the Employment Development Department on conducting an analysis of the demand for architects and whether it will continue to be met in the long-term.**

**ISSUE #5: CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE).** The Board notes that it has examined its CE requirement due to recent legislation and changes to the NCARB Model Law, and continues to monitor its CE requirement to ensure reciprocity issues do not exist.

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Board should inform the Committees of why its failure rate for CEs is so high, and how it can reduce that rate. The Board should continue to monitor the trend regarding CEs at the national level.

**The Board concurs with the Committees' recommendation. Continuing education (CE) on disability access requirements is a relatively new (since July 1, 2009) requirement; audits were only required as of January 1, 2013. The statistics provided in the Board's Sunset Review Report represent the first year audits were conducted, and the first time licensees certified on their renewal application the CE requirement was fulfilled.**

**Prior to the commencement of audits, licensees submitted all relevant coursework provider documentation to the Board for review and acceptance before a license could be renewed (more than 20,000 records). The Board's audit failure rate is in fact comparable to other DCA entities that audit, which have averaged 13%.**

**The Board believes that two factors may help reduce the noncompliance rate. First, the deterrent effect of citations should improve audit results. The first group of citations was served in early 2015. Once those citations are adjudicated, practitioners will know that the Board takes strong actions against violations. In addition, the Board is coordinating with professional organizations for increased communication to licensees. Common noncompliance violations include: coursework taken after license renewal/audit notification; coursework taken more than two years prior to license renewal; deficient coursework (number of hours); failure to respond to audit in a timely manner; and, incorrect coursework taken and/or submitted. The Board will use this data in its communications efforts to assist architects in complying with this requirement.**

**The Board will continue monitoring, through NCARB, the national trends relative to CE initiatives and changes to the NCARB Model Laws.**

**ISSUE #6: INFORMATION SHARING.** The Board reports that it is unable to share relevant disciplinary information of its licensees with a national database due to information-sharing restrictions.

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Board should inform the Committees of the specific types of information it would like to disclose to NCARB, and provide the Committees with the specific code sections that prevent the Board from disclosing that information. The Board should also weigh the benefits of sharing disciplinary information to assist other regulatory entities against the individual privacy rights, and potential threats to those rights.

**The Board concurs with the Committees' recommendation.**

**The Board currently utilizes the NCARB Disciplinary Database by disclosing actions, such as Accusations and Statements of Issues, taken against licensees. Other NCARB Member Boards can view this information by securely accessing the database; additionally, prior to the Board issuing a license, the database is utilized to confirm whether disciplinary action has been taken against an individual in another state. A 2.0 version of the NCARB Disciplinary Database was recently launched and the Board continues to find that this is a useful tool.**

**Identifying information that is captured in the database includes: 1) an individual's full name; 2) State license number; and 3) the NCARB Record Number and/or Certificate Number (if an individual possesses either of these). Other identifying information that can be captured in the database is date of birth (DOB) and last four digits of Social Security Number (SSN). However, the Board cannot share DOB and SSN due to the Information Practices Act of 1977 (Civil Code section 1798 et seq.).**

**The Board will continue to weigh the benefits of sharing disciplinary information against the privacy rights of individuals.**



**ISSUE #7: COLLECTION OF FINES.** The Board notes that it is seeking ways to increase collection of fines, particularly in cases of unlicensed practice when it does not have the leverage of a license to incentivize payment.

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The Board should continue to explore ways to improve its enforcement efforts and collect fines. The Board should examine other agencies that are authorized to release SSNs to collection agencies, and whether there are any privacy or security issues that may arise if such information was transmitted. The Board should work with other licensing boards, such as the Contractors State Licensing Board, the Bureau of Real Estate, and the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, to determine the feasibility of sharing disciplinary information for purposes of leveraging other professional licenses as a way to achieve compliance; how such a system would operate; and what changes would be necessary.

**The Board/LATC concurs with the Committees' recommendations.**

**The Board currently has an ongoing objective from its 2014 Strategic Plan to “pursue methods to obtain multiple collection mechanisms to secure unpaid citation penalties” and is committed to continuous improvements with regard to all enforcement efforts.**

**The Board's fine collection success has averaged about 62% over the last three fiscal years, while other construction/design boards have averaged 37%.**

**Should the Board pursue authority to release SSNs to collection agencies, it would fully investigate whether there are any privacy or security issues that may arise. The Board has noted that the Respiratory Care Board is authorized to release SSNs to collection agencies via Business and Professions Code section 3778 (Chapter 586, Statutes of 2003); the Board is currently not aware of other agencies with similar authority.**

**As part of its Strategic Plan objective, the Board/LATC will research the feasibility of working with other licensing boards in sharing disciplinary information for purposes of leveraging other professional licenses. Other strategies the Board/LATC has utilized with regard to fine collection: Franchise Tax Board Intercept Program; payment plans; revised enforcement letters; etc. In addition, the Board is working with DCA to explore the possibility of establishing a collections unit in DCA to assist boards in collecting citation penalties.**

(Note: This was Issue #5 for LATC in the Sunset Background Paper.)

**ISSUE #8: CONTINUED REGULATION BY THE BOARD.** Should the licensing and regulation of architects be continued and be regulated by the current Board membership?

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: Recommend that the licensing and regulation of architects continue to be regulated by the current Board members of the California Architects Board in order to protect the interests of the public and be reviewed once again in four years.

**The Board/LATC concurs with the Committees' recommendation.**

(Note: This was Issue #6 for LATC in the Sunset Background Paper and the Board/LATC concur with that recommendation.)

**Note: as indicated on the cover memo, the following issue was unique to LATC.**

**LATC ISSUE #2: PATHWAYS TO LICENSURE.** Should the LATC consider ways to streamline its licensure process or make its licensure process more flexible to accommodate out-of-state applicants?

Legislative Staff's Recommendation: The LATC should continue to work closely with the Board to identify opportunities to initiate efficiencies in its licensure system, and consult with stakeholders to ensure that the path to licensure is efficient and effective. The LATC should also continue to discuss the possibility of expanding the definition of "education credit" to encompass a certain amount of licensed experience, and to consider granting education credit for degrees related to landscape architecture, while ensuring that licensees retain their competence and that consumers are protected by any changes in eligibility.

**The LATC concurs with the Committees' recommendation.** During this last reporting period, LATC has expanded its pathways to licensure to allow partial degrees, and architecture degrees to meet education requirements. The LATC is researching other related degrees that can meet the education requirement for licensure.

**Efficiencies in the licensure processes were improved by permitting candidates to take certain sections of the national exam upon graduation. On the horizon are changes to allow credit for teaching under a landscape architect. LATC will also work closely with the Board on its efforts on the Accelerated Path to Architectural Licensure.**

**In addition, the LATC has received license applications from candidates who are licensed in other states but do not meet specific California requirements, namely a degree in landscape architecture. The LATC is reviewing reciprocity requirements of other states to determine possible changes to improve efficiencies. Initial research revealed varying minimum standards across states including education only, experience only, varying degree types, and acceptance of reciprocity from other states. The LATC will work closely with CLARB to establish the minimum years of licensed experience to qualify to take the California Supplemental Exam in order to become licensed in California. The LATC will also work closely with other stakeholders to ensure that the path to licensure is efficient and effective.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Time: \_\_\_\_\_