



## **MEETING MINUTES PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE**

APRIL 18, 2019

SACRAMENTO

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

Committee Chair Pasqual Gutierrez called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Vice Chair Barry Williams called the roll.

Five members of the Committee constitute a quorum; there being seven members present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

#### **Committee Members Present**

Pasqual Gutierrez, Chair

Barry Williams, Vice Chair

Raymond Cheng

Betsey Dougherty

Tian Feng (arrived at 10:08 a.m. departed at 12:00 p.m.)

Glenn Gall

Kirk Miller

Stephanie Silkwood

#### **Committee Members Absent**

No members of the Committee were absent from the entire meeting.

#### **Members of the Public Present**

No members of the public attended the meeting.

#### **Staff Present**

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)

Vickie Mayer, Assistant EO

Marccus Reinhardt, Manager, Examination + Licensing

Timothy Rodda, Examination/Licensing Analyst

Rikki Parks, California Supplemental Examination Analyst

## **B. CHAIR'S PROCEDURAL REMARKS AND COMMITTEE MEMBER INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

Mr. Gutierrez noted there were no members of the public present and requested staff provide introductions for the record.

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

No public comments.

## **D. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON OCTOBER 25, 2018 PQC MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Gutierrez asked for comments or edits concerning the minutes of the October 25, 2018 PQC meeting.

- **Raymond Cheng moved to approve the October 25, 2018 Committee meeting minutes.**

**Barry Williams seconded the motion.**

**Members Cheng, Dougherty, Gall, Miller, Silkwood, Williams, and Chair Gutierrez voted in favor of the motion. Member Feng was absent at the time of vote.**

**The motion passed 7-0.**

## **E. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2019-2021 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVES TO:**

### **1. AMEND EXISTING LAW REGARDING CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LICENSE RENEWAL TO REFLECT THE EVOLVING PRACTICE**

Mr. Gutierrez introduced this strategic plan objective. Ms. Zuniga advised the Committee that the Board does not have the authority to modify the current continuing education (CE) requirements, which is five hours of coursework in disability access requirements each renewal cycle without approval from the Legislature. Each member of the Committee in turn stated what they respectively recommended as a suggested expansion of the CE topics relevant to contemporary practice. Suggested topics included:

1. General health, safety and welfare
2. Sustainability and resiliency
3. Title 24 California Building Standards Code
4. Ethical and professional practice
5. Construction

6. Construction documents
7. Communication

The Committee subsequently turned the direction of its discussion toward the minimum and maximum required hours for renewal. Again, in turn, each member stated what they considered to be the minimum required CE hours in alignment with the Board's mandate of public protection. It was the consensus of the Committee that its final recommendation for minimum and maximum required hours be determined based upon comparative data collected on CE requirements for collateral professions and consideration of performance criteria.

The Committee provided its suggestions for amendments to the CE requirement framework such as:

1. Increase the required CE hours from 5 to 10-15 per license renewal period
2. Require licensees to satisfy hours in other topics, such as mandatory health, safety, and welfare
3. Allow for electives
4. Use a framework comparable to the one from The American Institute of Architects (AIA)
5. Expand the requirement for knowledge of the "Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)" to "Universal Design" for greater inclusivity

Marcus Reinhardt and Ms. Zuniga reminded the Committee that CE requirements must be considered with respect to the minimum competency standard for licensing authorities and not for professional development like the framework used by the AIA.

The Committee also held discussion upon the requirements for CE providers and ultimately decided to keep the existing requirements subject to the collection by staff of comparative data to better inform the decision-making process.

- **Raymond Cheng moved to direct staff to research the CE requirements (including those for providers) for collateral professions and other state boards of architecture.**

**Kirk Miller seconded the motion.**

**Members Cheng, Dougherty, Gall, Miller, Silkwood, Williams, and Chair Gutierrez voted in favor of the motion. Member Feng was absent at the time of vote.**

**The motion passed 7-0.**

## **2. PROVIDE LICENSEES THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT CONTINUING EDUCATION DOCUMENTATION ONLINE TO INCREASE EFFICIENCY IN LICENSURE RENEWAL**

Mr. Reinhardt informed members the subject of this objective is being considered by the Legislature and included within the Board's Sunset Review Bill (Senate Bill [SB] 608). SB 608 when signed into law would require the Board to promulgate regulations for implementation by January 1, 2023, that establish qualifications for courses and CE providers and permit CE providers, on behalf of licensees, to submit coursework documentation. The Committee discussed the objective and considered the benefits of an online option to submit CE documentation. Mr. Reinhardt explained the mechanics of the current CE process (including audits) and informed members there is no authority for approval of either courses or providers. Ms. Zuniga and Mr. Reinhardt advised the Committee that the Board is in the process of business modernization and staff are considering options for enterprise systems that would allow licensees to directly submit documents to their respective record for increased efficiency of the audit process.

There was no action requested of the Committee on this item.

## **3. CONDUCT AN OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSION TO REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE**

Mr. Reinhardt explained to the members the purpose of conducting an Occupational Analysis (OA), the recommended frequency at which an OA should be conducted, and the methodology used to conduct an OA. He advised the Committee that the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) stated it would be tentatively commencing its next Practice Analysis (another term for an OA) after the start of its fiscal year that begins in October. Mr. Reinhardt added that the associated report(s) from the NCARB analysis should be published a year later. He said based upon this information, the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) recommended the Board commence its OA after NCARB publishes its report(s). Mr. Reinhardt said OPES explained the basis for the postponement was to avoid making a comparison to the same Architect Registration Examination test plan used for the Board's prior OA; the net result of which would be no change or update to the CSE Test Plan.

Glenn Gall asked whether the Board would be inquiring with those who utilize the services of architects for their input into the OA. Mr. Reinhardt advised the Committee that based upon the input received from the prior OA, the Board would be conducting focus group meetings that would include other professions and clients of architectural services. Mr. Miller requested staff provide background information on the NCARB Practice Analysis process to assist the Committee and Board in developing the next OA; he also voiced a desired to review the OA survey questions. Ms. Zuniga stated the Board typically does not review the survey questions and she is not aware of any other board that does review them. Mr. Reinhardt said he would research with OPES, whether the Committee could review the survey questions. Ms. Zuniga mentioned to

the Committee that OPES could provide a presentation at a future meeting regarding the OA and the examination development process.

Ms. Silkwood suggested staff review the discussion from the prior OA and build on that input in the development of a strategy and include the utilization of a broader spectrum of professional focus groups. The Chair requested OPES provide the Committee with a detailed presentation at a time closer to when the Board commences its next OA.

There was no action requested of the Committee on this item.

#### **4. REVIEW AND AMEND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR), TITLE 16, DIVISION 2, ARTICLE 3, SECTION 117 (EXPERIENCE EVALUATION) AND RELATED REGULATIONS TO REFLECT CURRENT LICENSING REQUIREMENTS**

Mr. Reinhardt and Timothy Rodda explained the proposed regulatory changes for CCR section 117 to the members and clarified how the changes would reduce barriers to licensure and align the Board's requirements with contemporary practice. The Committee discussed replacement of prescriptive language found within a provision of CCR 117 that narrowly limits the academic majors permitted to receive educational experience credit for a degree in a field related to architecture. Members determined staff should seek guidance from DCA Legal for suggested language. Ms. Silkwood suggested the name of the Table of Equivalents be revised for greater clarity to candidates.

- **Barry Williams moved to recommend staff coordinate with DCA Legal to develop a refinement of the proposed regulatory amendment that will result in equity in the evaluation of degree fields related to architecture.**

**Kirk Miller seconded the motion.**

**Members Cheng, Dougherty, Gall, Miller, Silkwood, Williams, and Chair Gutierrez voted in favor of the motion. Member Feng was absent at time of vote.**

**The motion passed 7-0.**

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 1:39 p.m.