

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD  
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

Hearing Date: October 12, 2010

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: California Supplemental Examination

Section Affected: Title 16, California Code of Regulations, Section 124

**Specific Purpose of the Regulation**

**§ 124 – California Supplemental Examination**

The existing regulation specifies that the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) shall consist of direct examination by an oral panel covering the practice or architecture.

This proposal would:

- 1) Amend the requirement that the examination be in an oral format. With the requirement of an oral format removed, the Board may utilize alternative formats with which to administer the CSE.
- 2) Detail the method to apply and reapply for the CSE. The administrative procedure pertaining to becoming eligible and retake the California Supplemental Examination is added for clarity.
- 3) Require a candidate who fails the examination to wait a fixed amount of time before being able to take the examination again. In order to avoid over-exposure of the examination and increase its defensibility, a wait time needs to be established.

The specific purpose of this proposal is to enable the format of the CSE to be modified to a more defensible format that can accommodate more candidates in a timely manner, clarify the procedures to apply and reapply for the CSE, as well as maintain the integrity of the examination by imposing a mandatory waiting period after a failed examination.

**Factual Basis/Rationale**

The Board is mandated to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. One of the ways the Board does this is by requiring all persons intending to become a licensed architect in California to take and pass the CSE. This examination tests or covers the practice of architecture as it relates to California specific laws, regulations, and environments. Currently, this examination is administered by panels of licensed architects directly examining architect applicants. In 2004, the Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee (JLSRC) recommended that the Board work with the Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Examination Resources to: 1) assess whether a written (supplemental) examination could maintain all standards of validity and test for minimum competency; and 2) report the findings to the JLSRC. Consequently, the Board conducted a study which resulted in a recommendation and approval to transition the CSE to a

written computer-based examination. The regulation will need to reflect this change in examination format.

In addition, the format study concluded that a written examination format for the CSE would provide the Board with a more defensible examination that would still maintain the integrity of the examination. This examination format would allow candidates to schedule examinations to best fit their schedules, and are anticipated to reduce staff travel times and administrative costs. The inclusion of administrative procedures pertaining to the new examination format were added for clarity, and inclusion of a mandatory wait time after a failed examination was also part of the recommendation of a written format so there would not be an over-exposure of the examination forms.

### **Underlying Data**

The Board relied on the following document in its proposal:

1. California Supplemental Examination Format Study.

### **Business Impact**

The proposed regulatory action will not have a significant adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with business in other states, because it affects only architect applicants.

### **Specific Technologies or Equipment**

This proposed regulatory action does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

### **Consideration of Alternatives**

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private person than the proposed regulations.