

MINUTES
BOARD MEETING
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
DECEMBER 7, 2017
SACRAMENTO

A. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

Board President, Matthew McGuinness, called the meeting to order at 10:33 a.m. and Board Secretary, Tian Feng, called roll.

Board Members Present

Matthew McGuinness, President
Tian Feng, Secretary
Sylvia Kwan, Vice President (arrived at 10:54 a.m.)
Jon Alan Baker
Denise Campos
Pasqual Gutierrez (arrived at 11:55 a.m.)
Robert C. Pearman, Jr.
Nilza Serrano
Barry Williams

Board Members Absent

Ebony Lewis

Guests Present

Andrew Bowden, Member, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
Christopher Castrillo, Deputy Director, Office of Board and Bureau Services, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Mark Christian, Director of Government Relations, American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)
Glenn Gall
Jay Hyde, California Building Officials (CALBO)
Dustin Maxam
John Nicolaus, California Council of the American Society of Landscape Architects (CCASLA)

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer (EO)
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Alicia Hegje, Program Manager Administration/Enforcement
Brianna Miller, Program Manager, LATC
Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager Examination/Licensing
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst
Kristin Walker, Enforcement Analyst
Bob Carter, Architect Consultant

Bob Chase, Architect Consultant
Tara Welch, Attorney III, DCA
Bryce Penney, Television Specialist, DCA

Six members of the Board present constitute a quorum. There being seven present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

B. PRESIDENT'S PROCEDURAL REMARKS AND BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Mr. McGuinness 1) announced that the meeting is being webcast; 2) acknowledged that LATC member, Andrew Bowden, will be in attendance; 3) welcomed DCA Deputy Director, Christopher Castrillo, who will provide an update on the DCA during Agenda Item D; and 4) reminded members that votes on all motions will be taken by roll-call.

C. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT - UPDATE ON BOARD'S ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT, EXAMINATION, LICENSING, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

Doug McCauley announced that February 28, 2018, is the date scheduled for the next Board meeting, and that the remaining Board meeting dates for 2018 are being identified. He reported that the Board is in the preliminary stages of implementing the enforcement case management and licensing system known as BreZE. Mr. McCauley also reported that the Board is working with DCA's Office of Information Technology as well as SOLID's Organizational Change Management Unit on several key elements of the plan to implement BreZE. He advised that the Board's Sunset Review is approaching and that preparations are underway to submit the Board's Sunset Review Report to the Legislature. Mr. McCauley also updated the Board on its legislative proposal to amend the written contract provision. He explained that there is an opportunity to include provisions into a committee-sponsored bill. Mr. McCauley reported that only two other Boards in the nation have a similar written contract requirement (Ohio and Nevada) and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Task Force is interested in the potential for national written contract Model Law. He emphasized the Board's positive enforcement metrics as the Board continues to exceed departmental standards that were established through the DCA Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative.

Robert. C. Pearman, Jr. enquired about the status of the Board's Business Modernization Plan, to which Mr. McCauley reported that the Plan is currently with the DCA for review.

Mr. McGuinness observed that the continuing education (CE) metrics appear to have increased in recent months, to which Mr. McCauley explained that the increase can be partially attributed to: 1) CE requirement being relatively new, and 2) biennial dynamics (when license renewal applications are received by the Board).

Mr. Feng observed that the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) 5.0 pass-rates appear to be low in most divisions compared to the pass-rates of ARE 4.0. Mr. McGuinness enquired about Jon Baker's previous request for information about factors that may help the Board understand California candidate performance versus the national average. Mr. McCauley conveyed that NCARB has restrictions on its ability to provide certain data; however, Marccus Reinhardt reported that staff is in the process of obtaining candidate data (e.g., accredited degree, non-accredited degree, and experience only candidates) from NCARB, as previously requested.

D. UPDATE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS (DCA) – CHRISTOPHER CASTRILLO, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF BOARD AND BUREAU SERVICES

Mr. Castrillo, the new Deputy Director of the Office of Board and Bureau Services, updated the Board on a variety of recent developments at the DCA. He noted staffing changes at the DCA; reported the establishment of a departmental Pro Rata workgroup composed of DCA board executives to discuss potential improvements; and discussed several other subjects such as an annual meeting of DCA board presidents; the DCA Strategic Plan, which was released in July; upcoming Board Member Orientation Trainings; and the DCA Sexual Harassment Training requirements for 2017.

Mr. McCauley announced that Brianna Miller and Kristin Walker are currently participating in the DCA's Future Leadership Development Program, and observed that the culture of the DCA has shifted to a more client-service oriented organization in recent years.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

F. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2017 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. McGuinness asked for comments concerning the Minutes of the September 7, 2017, Board meeting. Barry Williams offered an edit on page 5, under Agenda Item F, to replace "California State Polytechnic University, Pomona" with "California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo."

- **Jon Alan Baker moved to approve the September 7, 2017, Board meeting minutes, with an edit on page 5 under Agenda Item F changing "California State Polytechnic University, Pomona" to "California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo."**

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Members Gutierrez, Kwan, and Lewis were absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 7-0.

G. ELECTION OF 2018 BOARD OFFICERS

Mr. McGuinness advised that, as Board President, he appointed himself and member Gutierrez to the Nominations Committee, charged with making a recommendation for a slate of officers for 2018. Mr. McGuinness explained the Board's nominating process and proposed the following slate of officers based on the qualifications and interests expressed by the members:

Sylvia Kwan, President
Tian Feng, Vice President
Barry Williams, Secretary

Mr. McGuinness also noted that Denise Campos has volunteered to serve as Secretary for 2018.

- **Robert Pearman moved to elect Sylvia Kwan for President, Tian Feng for Vice President, and Barry Williams for Secretary for 2018.**

The motion fell to the floor.

Ms. Kwan expressed a desire to hold a runoff election between Mr. Williams and Ms. Campos for Secretary. Mr. Baker expressed his view of the importance of maintaining a balance between public and professional members of Board officers. Mr. Williams accepted Mr. Baker's view and conceded the 2018 Secretary position.

- **Jon Alan Baker moved to elect Sylvia Kwan for President, Tian Feng for Vice President, and Denise Campos for Secretary for 2018.**

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Kwan, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Members Gutierrez and Lewis were absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

H. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2017 OCTAVIUS MORGAN DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

Mr. McCauley reviewed the history of the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award, which was established in 2000 to recognize volunteers who contribute to the Board and to grant a special award for distinguished service. He advised that members had previously agreed to pay for the awards from their own personal funds. Mr. McCauley reported that two individuals are nominated to receive the award for 2017: Norman Millar and Robert Peterson. He explained that Mr. Millar would receive the award posthumously for his influential Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) leadership at Woodbury University. Mr. McCauley also explained that Mr. Peterson has served as a commissioner for the Board's California Supplemental Examination (CSE) for over 20 years, has contributed approximately 700 hours of his time, and continues to support CSE activities by assisting in the recruitment of new licensees for examination development workshops.

- **Tian Feng moved to approve that Norman Millar and Robert Peterson be awarded the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award for 2017.**

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

Ms. Serrano expressed her desire for the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award recipients to continue to be geographically diverse.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Kwan, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Members Gutierrez and Lewis were absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

I. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) TRI-NATIONAL MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE BETWEEN CANADA, MEXICO, AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Reinhardt reminded the Board that it had been supportive of NCARB's past efforts to establish reciprocity with other countries, as well as the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architects Program. He advised that the goal of the *Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice* (Tri-National MRA) between the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities, Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certificación of Mexico, and NCARB, is to ensure the qualifications of Canadian, Mexican, and United States architects interested in pursuing licensure across borders are thoroughly vetted and the competencies and eligibility requirements are met. Mr. Reinhardt asked the Board to review the Tri-National MRA and consider granting the Board President authority to sign the *Letter of Undertaking* if it supports NCARB's efforts to foster the exchange of professional credentials in support of cross-borders practice with Canada and Mexico.

Mr. Feng asked about the difference between the Tri-National MRA and the previous MRA considered by the Board. Mr. Reinhardt explained that a MRA between the United States and Canada already exists, but this new Tri-National MRA would include Mexican licensing authorities.

Ms. Serrano asked if staff has a recommendation for the Board to consider. Mr. McCauley recommended the Board support the Tri-National MRA, as doing so would be consistent with the Board's prior actions. Mr. Baker observed that the Tri-National MRA includes language that allows jurisdictions to continue administering local examinations and, therefore, would not affect the Board's CSE requirements for licensure in California.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to grant the Board President authority to sign the *Letter of Undertaking* with respect to the *Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice* between NCARB, the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities, and the Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certificación of Mexico.**

Barry L. Williams seconded the motion.

Mr. Feng asked if the CSE would still be a licensing requirement should the Tri-National MRA be approved, to which Mr. Baker answered in the affirmative; Mr. Reinhardt advised that international candidates would need to travel to testing facilities in the United States to take the CSE. Mr. McGuinness asked if the CSE is offered in any other language than English, to which Mr. Reinhardt replied "no."

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Kwan, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Members Gutierrez and Lewis were absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

J. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REDUCING THE MANDATORY WAIT PERIOD TO RETAKE THE CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE)

Mr. Reinhardt reminded the Board that it previously directed staff to collaborate with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) and assess whether it would be psychometrically defensible to reduce the mandatory wait period to retake the CSE. He reported that OPES determined it would be possible to reduce the CSE wait period from the current 180-day requirement to a 90-day requirement. Mr. Reinhardt explained that implementation details are still being assessed, but that OPES estimates a 12 to 18-month timeframe to prepare the first CSE to be subject to this provision. He advised that staff is currently drafting a regulatory change proposal in anticipation of the Board's desire to move forward with implementation, and that a rulemaking package could be presented to the Board at its next meeting.

Mr. Baker inquired as to the implementation date of the wait period reduction, to which Mr. Reinhardt replied that OPES estimates the new requirement will be ready for implementation in spring or summer of 2019. Mr. Baker asked if it is possible to expedite the 90-day wait period's implementation. Mr. McCauley explained the logistics involved in implementing a new 90-day wait period (e.g., regulation changes), and advised the Board that the factors impacting the new wait period implementation date can be discussed during a closed session. Mr. Feng requested a more detailed description of what is required to implement a 90-day wait period, and opined it more important to ensure the quality and security of this process than the speed at which the Board can implement it.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to reduce the mandatory wait period to retake the CSE from 180 days to 90 days according to direction from OPES.**

Jon Alan Baker seconded the motion.

Mr. Baker asked that a detailed presentation about CSE forms and the requirements surrounding the Board's desire to reduce the mandatory wait period be placed on the next closed session agenda. Mr. McCauley agreed to organize such a presentation during closed session at the next Board meeting.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Kwan, Pearman, Serrano, Williams and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Members Gutierrez and Lewis were absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

K. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE (PQC) REPORT

Mr. Feng updated the Board on the recent activities of the PQC and reported that the Committee last met on October 18, 2017, to work on its assigned 2017-2018 Strategic Plan objectives.

Mr. Feng reported that:

1. Staff presented the PQC with recommended methods for improved compliance to be considered for inclusion into the report to the Legislature about the effectiveness of the CE requirement. The PQC supported staff's recommendations and a draft of the report is planned to be presented to the PQC at its next meeting;

2. Staff presented the PQC with proposals to reduce candidate confusion about the *Candidate's Handbook*. The PQC supported staff's proposals and a draft of the *Handbook* is planned to be presented to PQC at its next meeting; and
3. The PQC discussed the objective to collaborate with and support existing and emerging Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) programs to promote their success and made a recommendation to the Board which Mr. Reinhardt will present under Agenda Item K.2.

Mr. Reinhardt reminded the Board that, since the launch of NCARB's IPAL program in 2015, the Board has: 1) sponsored legislation to allow individuals to take the ARE early; 2) invited California IPAL programs to its meetings for progress reports; 3) mailed letters to architecture firms requesting participation and coordination with IPAL schools; and 4) published regular articles in the Board's newsletter, *California Architects*. He reported that the PQC made a recommendation to the Board directing staff to prepare a letter to NCARB requesting that it collaborate with The American Institute of Architects (AIA) and revive the Emerging Professional's Companion (EPC). Mr. Reinhardt noted that the purpose would be to allow firms the opportunity to use the exercises in the EPC on live projects in their respective office as a teaching tool for first and second year IPAL students. He added it is hoped this would address the problem of firms hiring these students who often lack exposure to professional practice.

Mr. Pearman inquired about the EPC, to which Mr. Reinhardt described the EPC as a guide with exercises that individuals would use to earn AXP credit. Mr. McCauley added that the EPC is an alternate way to accrue one's experience via exercises, and that AIA now owns the product. He also noted that NCARB is receiving feedback from architecture firms about how the IPAL program is working from their perspective; subsequently, NCARB is considering developing an IPAL guide for firms. Mr. McCauley suggested the Board may also want to support this effort. Mr. Pearman asked why the EPC's use was discontinued, to which Mr. McCauley opined the EPC was not utilized extensively. Messrs. Baker and Williams opined that if the EPC is revised to be more relevant today then it could be a positive resource for IPAL students and firms.

Ms. Kwan conveyed that IPAL-participating firms are concerned about having to pay IPAL students who may not yet be skilled enough to be productive. Mr. Baker spoke about his experience working with IPAL students employed at his firm. He noted that IPAL students are also learning more about the profession than they would if they did not participate in IPAL. Ms. Kwan opined that Mr. Baker's firm is more forward-thinking while other firms may not want to pay a college student who is not as productive as more experienced staff. Mr. Baker expressed hope that the idea of mutual responsibility to students between schools and firms will be more appreciated in the years ahead. The Board discussed the IPAL program, how the EPC would and would not be a useful tool, and the importance of young professionals learning how to express concepts effectively without the use of a computer. The Board decided to not act on PQC's recommendation to direct staff to prepare a letter to NCARB.

L. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BOARD'S DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES AND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR), TITLE 16, DIVISION 2, SECTION 154 (DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES)

Ms. Walker reminded the Board that its staff and the LATC staff have been working collaboratively to update the Board's and LATC's *Disciplinary Guidelines*. She advised that the Board previously: 1) approved revisions to the Board's and LATC's *Disciplinary Guidelines* and the proposed language to amend CCR sections 154 and 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines); and 2) authorized staff to proceed with the required regulatory changes to incorporate the revised *Guidelines* by reference. Ms. Walker reported that following the Board's approval of the *Guidelines*, legal counsel recommended additional substantive changes which were necessary prior to submission of the regulatory packages. She reminded the Board that it approved the recommended revisions to LATC's *Guidelines* at its September 7, 2017, meeting. Ms. Walker explained that Board staff reviewed legal counsel's recommendations as they relate to the Board's *Guidelines* and determined that substantive changes would also need to be made to the Board's *Guidelines* prior to submission of the regulatory package. Accordingly, she reported, staff updated the Board's *Guidelines*, as well as the proposed language to amend CCR section 154 to include the necessary revisions identified by legal counsel.

Tara Welch advised the Board that a few additional substantive changes should first be reviewed as it considers whether to approve recommended revisions to the Board's *Guidelines* which may also affect the LATC's and the proposed regulatory language to amend CCR section 154. The Board was asked to consider the following proposed revisions to Section 2 (General Considerations):

1. Delete the previously proposed item 9 under heading D (*Factors to be Considered*)
2. Remove redundant language contained under heading F (*Criteria for Rehabilitation*)

Mr. Baker inquired about heading E (*Substantial Relationship Criteria*) and the rationale as to why the crimes or acts specifically referenced involve only violations of the provisions of Chapter 3, Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code (BPC) and not other violations. Ms. Welch explained at the time CCR section 110 was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law, the Board decided to only reference those BPC violations, and that she would need to research the history of the regulation to fully understand why. She noted, however, that the *Disciplinary Guidelines* reflect the current wording of the regulation.

Ms. Welch continued with the changes for the Board to consider:

3. Revise the description of Section 5588 to read *Failure to Report Settlement or Arbitration Award* to clarify the nature of the violation

Mr. Baker asked why fines are not referenced in the *Disciplinary Guidelines*. Vickie Mayer explained that the *Disciplinary Guidelines* are for disciplinary actions; fines require citations, and a citation is a different mechanism to address a violation. Mr. Baker asked if fines should be referenced in the Board's *Disciplinary Guidelines*. Ms. Welch agreed with the suggestion that fines should somehow be referenced in the *Guidelines*. Ms. Mayer recalled that legal counsel in past years did not consider citations as a form of "discipline." The Board discussed the mechanisms of *Disciplinary Guidelines* versus citations and how fines are imposed. Mr. Baker opined that *Disciplinary Guidelines* and citations should be combined. Ms. Mayer explained that

citations are considered a different form of action taken by the Board for less severe violations, and she proposed adding clarifying language to that effect to the introductory pages of the *Disciplinary Guidelines*. Ms. Welch suggested a more comprehensive review of the *Disciplinary Guidelines* be conducted to explore the possibility of including citations; she also offered to research whether the Board has the authority to impose fines through the disciplinary process and present her findings to the Board at its next meeting.

Ms. Welch continued with the changes for the Board to consider:

4. Add a condition of probation requiring an ethics course to the minimum penalty for CCR section 160(f)(1)

Bob Carter explained that “informed consent” is defined in CCR section 160(f)(1) (Rules of Professional Conduct) and prohibits an architect from making any change in the scope or content of the work without prior written approval from the client.

Ms. Welch continued with the changes for the Board to consider:

5. In Section 4 (*Model Disciplinary Orders*), under *Revocation of License*, change the number of years prior to reapplying or petitioning the Board for reinstatement from three (3) to one (1) to conform to the Administrative Procedure Act
6. Add the term “renewal” in reference to fees under condition 5 *Maintain Active and Current License*
7. Remove language under condition 8 *Violation of Probation* to ensure appropriate due process
8. Change authority cited for Proposed Regulatory Language *Section 154. Disciplinary Guidelines* from “Section 11425.50(e)” of the Government Code to “Section 11400.20” as a more appropriate reference

Mr. McGuinness asked for a motion.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to accept the revisions reviewed by legal counsel and discuss the possibility of adding fines to the *Disciplinary Guidelines* at the next Board meeting.**

Sylvia Kwan seconded the motion.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Pearman, Serrano, Williams and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Member Lewis was absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 9-0.

M. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

Ms. Miller updated the Board on the recent activities of the LATC, and reported that the Committee last met on November 2, 2017, in Los Angeles. She also reported that the LATC discussed Strategic Plan objectives, and elected current officers to continue to serve in their positions in 2018. Ms. Miller also reported that the LATC is looking to improve its communications with interested parties, to which Ms. Kwan recommended extending the LATC’s electronic communications beyond email and Twitter to other social media platforms used by the Board (i.e., Instagram, Facebook).

Ms. Miller reminded the Board of its June 15, 2017, request for the LATC to closely align its initial and reciprocal licensure requirements and, where possible, mirror those of the Board (to include related degrees, non-related degrees, and an experience-only pathway). She reported that staff subsequently presented a draft Table of Equivalents to the LATC at its July 13, 2017, meeting; the Committee approved all pathways noted on the draft Table, including the related and non-related degrees and experience only pathways, and established an Education/Experience Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to define degrees related and unrelated to landscape architecture and the amount of education and experience credit appropriate for the proposed new pathways. Ms. Miller reported that the Subcommittee met on October 3, 2017, to develop recommendations for amendments to CCR section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) that define related degrees and non-related degrees (baccalaureate and associate) and experience-only pathways, and prescribe allowable credits for initial licensure. She reported that during its November 2, 2017, meeting, the LATC reviewed the Subcommittee's recommendations and expressed support for them, but elected not to adopt the Subcommittee's proposed lists of degrees designated as "related" for the related (non-accredited) four-year degrees and related two-year degrees. Ms. Miller advised that the LATC recommended for the Board's approval expanded pathways for initial licensure that include:

1. Related degrees (accredited architecture and civil engineering degrees);
2. Non-related baccalaureate degrees; and
3. An experience-only pathway.

Ms. Miller asked the Board to review the LATC's recommendations and consider the proposed amendments to CCR section 2620 that expand the pathways to initial licensure. Mr. Feng commended the LATC and staff for its work on this project. Mr. Pearman asked if core courses and fields of study are specified in regulation, to which Ms. Miller replied that they are not due to concern that core curricula varies from institution to institution. Mr. Bowden noted that any four-year degree would earn at least one year of credit, while degrees closely related to architecture and civil engineering would earn more years of credit. Mr. McCauley reported that OPES psychometricians and SOLID organizational development personnel were involved in the project, and that their involvement enhanced the project's validity and defensibility.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to adopt the proposed regulatory changes, direct the EO to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, authorize the EO to make any technical or non-substantive changes to the rulemaking package, notice the proposed language for a 45-day comment period, and, if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, adopt the proposed regulatory changes, if modified.**

Denise Campos seconded the motion.

Dustin Maxim and John Nicolaus thanked the Board and LATC for its attention to the subject of reciprocity for landscape architects.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Pearman, Serrano, Williams, and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Member Lewis was absent at the time of vote. The motion passed 9-0.

N. REVIEW OF FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that it is scheduled to meet next on February 28, 2018, in Sacramento.

O. CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into closed session to:

1. Consider action on the September 7, 2017, Closed Session Minutes; and
2. Deliberate on disciplinary matters.

P. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened open session.

Q. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:48 p.m.