



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

SUMMARY REPORT

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

May 1, 2013

Sacramento, CA

Committee Members Present

Jon Baker, Chair
Raymond Cheng
Allan Cooper (arrived at 10:55 a.m.)
Betsey Dougherty
Glenn Gall
Pasqual Gutierrez
Stephanie Silkwood
Barry Wasserman

Committee Members Absent

Gordon Carrier
Jeffrey Heller
Kirk Miller
Paul Neel
Alan Rudy

Guests

Bob Holmgren, Supervising Personnel Selection Consultant, Department of
Consumer Affairs (DCA), Office of Professional Examination Services
(OPES)
Raul Villanueva, Personnel Selection Consultant, DCA, OPES

Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Timothy Rodda, Examination/Licensing Analyst
Jeffrey Olguin, Continuing Education Program Analyst

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

Committee Chair Jon Baker called the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

A. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE MAY 16, 2012 PQC SUMMARY REPORT

The PQC reviewed the May 16, 2012 meeting Summary Report.

Raymond Cheng made a motion to approve the May 16, 2012 PQC meeting Summary Report.

Betsey Dougherty seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0. (Allan Cooper not present at time of vote.)

***D. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PRESENT A RECOMMENDATION TO THE NCARB ON CRITERIA FOR A “BROADLY EXPERIENCED INTERN” PATHWAY TO LICENSURE**

Mr. Baker advised that at prior meetings, the Board had discussed the possibility of making a recommendation to the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) regarding a Broadly Experienced Intern pathway. Marccus Reinhardt then introduced Pasqual Gutierrez as the Committee member who initiated the discussion on the Broadly Experienced Intern pathway. Mr. Gutierrez explained there is currently a pathway for licensees to receive an NCARB Certificate without completing the Intern Development Program (IDP) called the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) program. Mr. Gutierrez said he is recommending a pathway be created for interns who have a wide array of experience, but are unable to document that experience through IDP because of the Six-Month Rule. He added the proposed framework as conceived, would require ten years of documented architectural experience and submission of a portfolio documenting 5,600 hours of evidence-based experience demonstrating fulfillment of the IDP Experience Categories and Areas. Doug McCauley noted the framework is similar to the Comprehensive Intern Development Program model formerly used by the Board.

Ms. Dougherty inquired if the intent was to circumvent the NCARB Six-Month Rule.

Mr. Gutierrez responded affirmatively and explained there is currently an exemption from the rule for licensees when documenting prior experience for IDP. He said no such exemption exists for candidates who want to document prior experience older than six months.

Mr. Baker indicated the proposed program is targeting those current and potential candidates who may have prior work experience that is currently unusable with the current IDP model.

Vickie Mayer added there are candidates previously exempt from the Board’s IDP requirement who must now complete IDP because they lost eligibility and need to reapply with the Board. She added there are also current new candidates who have worked in the field for several years, but are unable to document that experience due to the Six-Month Rule. Ms. Dougherty and Mr. Baker stated that completion of IDP by these individuals may be viewed as a discouraging barrier. Mr. Baker opined that if the Board were to develop a recommendation to NCARB regarding this process, an NCARB approved alternative pathway may come faster.

Barry Wasserman inquired about the completion of IDP Experience Categories and Areas and how prior experience would be credited toward fulfillment. Mr. Gutierrez responded that candidates would demonstrate completion and competence through documentation in a portfolio of the work performed within the IDP Experience Categories and Areas. Mr. Baker added that the process could include statements from previous employers as well. Mr. Wasserman noted that documenting the hours of work experience through previous employers could be challenging, but providing evidence could be used as an alternative.

Ms. Dougherty noted the Board should create multiple scenarios for NCARB to consider regarding this alternative pathway. Mr. Gutierrez suggested that within the scenarios, candidates must demonstrate completion and competence in the IDP Experience Categories and Areas. Messrs. Baker and Wasserman agreed and added that the scenarios should not be viewed as a burden to discourage candidates.

Ms. Dougherty inquired if candidates could interpret the pathway as a method of circumventing IDP. Mr. McCauley responded that the program should be viewed as an alternative for those candidates who may have experience, and not as a method of circumventing IDP. He added that there are measures that may be taken to ensure this, such as requiring a minimum number of years experience before a candidate could enroll in the program. Mr. Baker reiterated the program should not create any additional barriers for candidates. He stated the goal should be to get a framework to NCARB for review. Ms. Dougherty suggested possibly working with other states to gather support for this program.

Ms. Mayer inquired how candidates could provide documented experience from prior employers who cannot be reached. Mr. Gutierrez responded that through an evidence based or portfolio submission, the prior employers may not need to be contacted directly.

Mr. Baker noted the task of creating a framework and program will require cooperation with other states and NCARB. Mr. Baker inquired if staff could develop a framework. Mr. McCauley affirmed that staff could develop an outline, submit it to the Board for approval and provide it to NCARB at the next annual meeting in June.

Betsey Dougherty made a motion to have staff develop a proposed framework of criteria for the Broadly Experienced Intern pathway to be considered by the Board and ultimately NCARB.

Raymond Cheng seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0. (Allan Cooper not present at time of vote.)

B. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT AN AUDIT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION (ARE) AND THE CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE) TEST SPECIFICATIONS TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE CONTENT OF THE CSE

Mr. Reinhardt briefly introduced this agenda item. He explained that the Board has a Strategic Plan objective of reviewing the NCARB ARE which may be completed in conjunction with another

objective to conduct an Occupational Analysis (OA) for the ongoing development of the CSE.

Raul Villanueva from OPES presented this agenda item. He briefly explained OPES's mission and role in examination development, and noted that an OA is a fundamental component of developing a legally defensible examination. Mr. Villanueva added that the OA defines the basis, or content domain for an examination. He further explained an OA is typically conducted every five years, and identifies the critical tasks related to the practice; it defines the current practice of the profession.

Mr. Cooper inquired if frequency and criticality are addressed in the tasks of the OA. Mr. Villanueva affirmed that frequency and criticality, as well as the other aspects of Bloom's Taxonomy, are used.

Mr. Villanueva continued explaining the process of conducting an OA, such as identifying changes in the profession, law, and emerging trends in practice. He noted the OA seeks input from stakeholders of the profession in order to develop an accurate picture of entry level practice. Mr. Wasserman noted that it is critical to weigh responses accordingly so as not to skew results. Mr. Villanueva agreed and added that the meaningfulness of the input is used to develop job content and structure. He proposed using focus groups to ensure the current practice of architecture is analyzed and entry-level practice is defined. Mr. Villanueva stated the OA will be conducted online, and review of the data will be ongoing.

Mr. Villanueva described the areas of responsibility for the OA:

- OPES will be conducting a quantitative analysis and prepare preliminary findings.
- Licensees would review the findings and explain the meaningfulness and criticality of each task through workshops as subject matter experts.
- The Board coordinates a broad spectrum of participation in workshops as well as identifies stakeholders and stakeholder groups.
- OPES will provide the technical oversight, conduct workshops, analyze the results and develop a report based upon the findings.

Glenn Gall noted that architecture does not have an entry level; once licensed, an architect can practice any aspect of the profession. Mr. Villanueva stated that the use of rating scales as part of the OA will define the expectation of what an entry level licensee will need to know.

Mr. Villanueva continued, stating the goal is to ensure the OA focuses on California specific content. He added that this will help to eliminate the overlap between the ARE and CSE, and will help define the entry level knowledge required for practice.

Mr. Villanueva explained the review of the ARE is required by Business and Professions Code section 139, and ensures it complies with psychometric and legal standards. He advised the review consists of three steps: 1) psychometric review of the ARE; 2) linkage of examination content with the CSE OA results; and 3) identification of content evaluated and not evaluated in the ARE. Mr. Baker inquired if this process would duplicate the process of what NCARB has completed. Mr. Villanueva responded that the study is conducted for instate requirements. He added that the OA forms the legal defensibility for the CSE.

Mr. Wasserman hoped that an outcome for the study would be a defense of the profession and why architecture practice requires licensure. Mr. Gall inquired when the last OA was completed. Mr. McCauley responded the last was completed in 2007, and stated that the new OA would not be completed until NCARB has completed its Practice Analysis. Mr. Gall noted that NCARB has a different focus on examination content. Mr. Baker stated he wanted to ensure that California specific items are adequately covered, without duplicating content sufficiently covered on the ARE.

Betsey Dougherty made a motion to recommend the Board enter into a contract with OPES to utilize their standard process of conducting a review of the ARE and proceed accordingly based upon the outcome.

Allan Cooper seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Gall stated he was not clear on the definition of entry level qualification of the profession as part of the OA. Mr. Baker responded it was his interpretation that OPES must assess the profession and determine the level of knowledge of skills and abilities required for entry level practice. Mr. McCauley noted that the PQC could request clarification of the language as part of the OA. Mr. Gall stated the OA is a sample of daily work by practitioners, not a snapshot of entry level practice.

Glenn Gall made a motion to have OPES redefine the primary purpose of the OA as capturing architectural practice in California based on the critical tasks and knowledge related to current practice and not focus on entry level.

Raymond Cheng seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

C. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT AN OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE IN CALIFORNIA FOR ONGOING CSE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Baker stated there is a concern relative to the concept of “entry level” and a belief that the OA should be broad in its assessment of the profession. He added that the test specifications and examination content would be the appropriate area to address entry level components.

Bob Holmgren responded that an OA is used to develop a test plan for a licensure examination. Through the licensure examination, the determination is made on what constitutes minimum acceptable competence. He added that the end result of the survey sent to licensees is to get a broad description of the practice, collect empirical data on tasks and then determine what should be incorporated in the test plan. Tasks that are identified as completed very frequently and very important will be included as entry level.

Mr. Cooper noted the difference between entry level and minimally competent in the profession, and proposed using minimally competent in lieu of entry level. Mr. Holmgren responded the goal

of an OA is to develop a test plan for minimal competence. He reiterated that the questionnaire that would be answered by the stakeholders has a rating scale for the items. Mr. Baker inquired how involved OPES will be with the decision on what items will be asked. Mr. Holmgren responded that subject matter experts will be the ones making all determinations regarding content and acceptable questions.

Ms. Dougherty inquired whether OPES will be using the NCARB Practice Analysis as part of the analysis. Mr. Holmgren responded that the NCARB Practice Analysis would be reviewed to ensure minimal overlap of content by the ARE. He added the OA survey will have broad questions that could be narrowed for the development of the CSE.

Mr. Gall stated that including only newly licensed licensees in developing the OA, certain knowledge may be missing because they are unaware of all aspects of the profession. Mr. Holmgren responded that the survey is distributed to all practitioners, and it is through their participation that an accurate detail of the profession is obtained. He added that it would be beneficial to have Board support in obtaining or convincing practitioners to participate.

E. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO COMMENT ON THE NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD (NAAB) ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Mr. Cooper stated he endorses the work NCARB is advocating which is reflected in the meeting packet. He advised that it is important to include a metric against which IDP coordinators could be held. Ms. Dougherty inquired if there was a minimum standard for IDP coordinators. Mr. Cooper responded that there is not currently a standard that coordinators are held to, and he opined that is a problem. Mr. McCauley also noted that the detailed report provided by and effort put forth by NCARB is commendable. Mr. Cooper added that NCARB has identified a systemic problem that needs.

Allan Cooper made a motion to recommend to the Board it endorse the NCARB comments and position, and direct staff to draft a letter congratulating NCARB on the effort.

Betsy Dougherty seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

F. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO DEVELOP A STRATEGY TO EXPEDITE RECIPROCITY LICENSURE FOR MILITARY SPOUSES AND DOMESTIC PARTNERS

Mr. Reinhardt summarized Assembly Bill (AB) 1904 (Chapter 399, Statutes of 2012) regarding the expedition of reciprocal licensure for individuals who are married or in a legal union with an active duty member. He noted that staff has taken measures to expedite the process for these candidates and included information available on the Board website. He next summarized AB 1588 (Chapter 752, Statutes of 2012) regarding the waiving of renewal requirements while the licensee is called to active duty.

Mr. Baker inquired how much time is saved by expediting the reciprocal candidates. Mr. Reinhardt responded that the time may be reduced by several weeks. Mr. Gutierrez asked for an explanation of the process. Mr. Reinhardt explained that when staff receives an application with documentation indicating their marital or union status with a member of the armed forces called to active duty, that candidate receives priority when reviewing and processing the application.

Mr. Gutierrez inquired about the renewal requirements that would be waived as part of the law. Ms. Mayer stated that the renewal fee is accrued, but the delinquency fee and continuing education requirement are not. Mr. Baker inquired why the renewal fee would continue to accrue. Ms. Mayer responded that staff would verify whether the renewal fee accrues and report the findings back.

Mr. McCauley stated there is currently a bill being discussed that would grant a provisional license to practice. He noted this would potentially require a waiver of the CSE. Mr. Baker inquired how these candidates would be handled should they wish to make the temporary licenses permanent. Mr. Cooper added that the bill would work more for professions that do not have a supplemental examination. Mr. Baker suggested the Board monitor the status of the bill.

Ms. Mayer stated that with respect to AB 1588, the Board may specify what requirements are waived for renewal, upon discharge. She added the Committee may recommend to the Board that staff pursue regulations what the Board determines necessary upon discharge from active duty.

Jon Baker made a motion to recommend to the Board staff pursue a regulatory amendment that would exempt active duty military licensees from the requirement to pay the accrued renewal fees excluding the current renewal cycle fee.

Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

G. UPDATE ON PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR), TITLE 16, SECTION 121 (FORM OF EXAMINATION; RECIPROCITY) RELATIVE TO THE NCARB BROADLY EXPERIENCED FOREIGN ARCHITECT (BEFA) PROGRAM

Mr. Reinhardt provided the Committee with an update regarding the status of the pending regulatory proposal to amend CCR section 121. He explained that with the initially proposed language, candidates who were licensed in the United Kingdom would have been inadvertently excluded. He said at the March Board meeting, new language removing the exclusion of United Kingdom candidates was approved to move forward with the regulatory change. The public hearing for the proposed regulatory amendment is scheduled for May 9, 2013.

**H. UPDATE ON PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CCR, TITLE 16, SECTION 117
RELATIVE TO EXPERIENCE CREDIT FOR ACADEMIC INTERNSHIPS COMPLETED
AS PART OF THE NCARB INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

Mr. Reinhardt provided the Committee with an update regarding the status of the pending regulatory proposal to amend CCR section 117. He explained that the intent of the proposal is to align the Board's regulations with IDP changes pertaining to credit for academic internships. He stated that the modification to the proposal would align the Board's regulations with the November 2012 *IDP Guidelines* and that the public hearing for the proposed regulatory amendment was scheduled for May 9, 2013.

The meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

**Agenda items were taken out of order to accommodate guest speakers. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*