

Professional Qualifications Committee
California Architects Board

April 9, 2014
Sacramento, CA



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

NOTICE OF MEETING

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

April 9, 2014
9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
1747 North Market Blvd.
Sapphire Room
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7220

The California Architects Board (CAB) will hold a Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee meeting as noted above.

AGENDA

- A. Review and Approve the October 23, 2013 PQ Committee Summary Report
- B. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Monitor, Analyze, and Encourage Initiatives for Schools of Architecture that Promote Curriculum in Health, Safety, and Welfare, and Additional Path to Licensure via CAB Liaisons, and Collaborate with Schools, as well as the Board, in a Series of Summits on Practice-Based Education
- C. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Promote Alternate Paths to Licensure in Order to Increase Accessibility into the Profession
- D. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Pursue a Regulatory Amendment to Implement the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) Rolling Clock Deadline Pertaining to Architect Registration Examination (ARE) Divisions Passed Prior to January 1, 2006
- E. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Conduct an Occupational Analysis of the Practice of Architecture in California, Review of the National Examination (ARE), and Linkage Study to Determine Appropriate Content for Ongoing California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Development

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

(Continued on Reverse)

- F. Update and Possible Action on 2014 Strategic Plan Objective to Seek an Exemption from Assembly Bill 186 Related to Waiver of CSE
- G. Discuss and Possible Action on 2014 National Architectural Accrediting Board's Accreditation Standards, First Reading (Second Draft)
- H. Discuss and Possible Action on Proposed Changes to NCARB Intern Development Program (IDP) Related to IDP Reporting Requirement

A quorum of Board members may be present during all or portions of the meeting, and if so, such members will only observe the PQ Committee meeting. Agenda items may not be addressed in the order noted above and the meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier than that posted in this Notice.

The meeting is open to the public and 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 Marccus Reinhardt at (916) 575-7212, emailing marccus.reinhardt@dca.ca.gov, or sending a written request to the California Architects Board, 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

The notice and agenda for this meeting and other meetings of the Board can be found on the Board's website: cab.ca.gov. For further information regarding this agenda, please contact Marccus Reinhardt at (916) 575-7212.

Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the California Architects 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

REVIEW AND APPROVE THE OCTOBER 23, 2013 PQ COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

The Committee is asked to review and approve the attached Summary Report for the October 23, 2013 Professional Qualifications Committee meeting.

Attachment

October 23, 2013 Professional Qualifications Committee Summary Report



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

SUMMARY REPORT

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

October 23, 2013

Sacramento, CA and Teleconference at Various Locations

Committee Members Present

Jon Baker, Chair
Betsey Dougherty
Pasqual Gutierrez
Kirk Miller
Alan Rudy
Stephanie Silkwood
Barry Wasserman

Committee Members Absent

Gordon Carrier
Raymond Cheng
Allan Cooper
Glenn Gall
Jeffrey Heller
Paul Neel

Guests

Richard Conrad
David Consaca, University of San Diego School of Law, Center for Public
Interest Law

Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Justin Sotelo, Examination/Licensing Analyst
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 (PQ) Committee meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

A. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE MAY 1, 2013 PQ COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

The PQ Committee reviewed the May 1, 2013 meeting Summary Report.

Betsey Dougherty made a motion to approve the May 1, 2013 PQ Committee meeting Summary Report.

Barry Wasserman seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0.

B. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE 2014 NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

Marcus Reinhardt introduced this item and said it is an objective from the 2013 Strategic Plan. Mr. Reinhardt stated that at the May 1, 2013 PQ Committee meeting, members made a recommendation to send the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) a letter commending it for comments made in the *NCARB's Contribution to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) 2013 Accreditation Review Conference*. He said the Board approved this recommendation at its June 13, 2013 meeting. He also said products of the NAAB 2013 Accreditation Review Conference were the *2014 Conditions of Accreditation (Conditions)* and the *Guide to 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Report (Guide)*. He asked the PQ Committee to provide a recommendation to the Board for comments to NAAB.

Doug McCauley advised the Committee that comprehensive design, a concern the Board previously raised with respect to accreditation standards, is addressed numerous times within the *Guide*. Messrs. McCauley and Wasserman agreed this is a positive movement by NAAB.

Kirk Miller raised a concern that the first draft of the *Conditions* lists an understanding of certain principles, such as Building Service Systems, as a requirement, and not application of those principles. He added there also appears to be a contradiction with the requirement of having an ability to complete technical documentation, but only an understanding of the items within the documentation. Pasqual Gutierrez noted that the *Guide* calls for programs and team members to be explicit about the expectations for student achievement in comprehensive design. Mr. Wasserman indicated that the documents are a guide as to what would be addressed with the accreditation standards, and not meant to be too explicit.

Mr. Baker said in terms of a draft document, the categories appear to be a result of the 2012 NCARB Practice Analysis, and added that NCARB is in the process of redefining the test specification of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) around these categorical areas. He noted many of the items in the *Conditions* and *Guide* are asking students to possess an understanding of those items. Mr. Wasserman explained that schools balance between comprehensive knowledge areas, and expressed concern that the requirements not be too weighted

in one area at the sacrifice of the others. He believes that the Intern Development Program (IDP) is detailed in order to cover topics that may not be covered sufficiently in academics.

Mr. McCauley agreed with Mr. Wasserman and cautioned that the degree program could extend past five years if all the elements of the IDP ability areas are addressed; however, he noted the *Conditions* explain the ability required items. Mr. Miller reiterated his concern and opined that architecture appears to be moving toward a general knowledge approach, and a reliance on other professionals for specific knowledge.

Mr. Baker opined that NAAB could be encouraged to include more specificity in the language for accreditation. He noted that at the ARE level, there is strong sentiment of moving away from the comprehensive design problem due to the difficulty with scoring engines. He added there could be more emphasis placed upon teaching comprehensive design in school or covering it through IDP. Mr. Wasserman opined there is too much knowledge required for comprehensive design than could be effectively taught in school. Ms. Dougherty stated she was encouraged by a significant paradigm shift in the NAAB integrative approach to design, and would not want to become buried in wordsmithing the approach.

Mr. Baker informed the PQ Committee there is a movement within the NCARB Licensure Task Force exploring the concept to develop a program that licenses a candidate upon graduating from a school. He explained that that IDP settings and ARE testing could be integrated into the educational program, and concluded this may influence the next accreditation evaluation. Ms. Dougherty expressed concern that a program of this type could increase the length of time it would take a candidate to graduate from school and would require internships to cover the IDP content areas.

Mr. Baker inquired as to the position of the PQ Committee regarding the *Conditions*. Mr. McCauley responded it appears that the members are showing general support for the document. Mr. Baker asked if this would then be presented to the Board. Mr. McCauley replied that due to the timing of when comments are due and the date of the next Board meeting, the Executive Committee would be reviewing the PQ Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Baker asked if any members had any further comments. Mr. Miller requested that a more specific definition of comprehensive design be provided. Mr. Wasserman asked for clarification on which document the PQ Committee would be commenting. Mr. McCauley responded that the *Conditions* would be the document on which the PQ Committee would be submitting comments. He added that the members have shown support for the document with additional clarification. Mr. Gutierrez responded that clarification is given within the *Guide* as to the level students are expected to achieve. Ms. Dougherty agreed and stated that the *Guide* should not be held to such specific requirements due to the changing nature of the profession. Alan Rudy agreed and noted high levels of specificity listed within the *Conditions* which he believed fully explained what was being required. He suggested that there not be anything added to the required level of specificity.

Alan Rudy made a motion to approve the NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation.

Betsey Dougherty seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0.

C. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PRESENT A RECOMMENDATION TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) ON CRITERIA FOR A “BROADLY EXPERIENCED DESIGN PROFESSIONAL” PATHWAY TO LICENSURE

Mr. Reinhardt presented this item and informed the PQ Committee that during the May 1, 2013 meeting, it discussed the alternate pathway methodology and made a recommendation that a framework for criteria be forwarded to NCARB for consideration. He said that staff forwarded the recommended framework for criteria to NCARB at its June 19-22, 2013 Annual Meeting. He also mentioned that on September 6, 2013, NCARB launched its Licensure Task Force to explore alternate methodologies for obtaining licensure. He then deferred to Mr. Gutierrez for further explanation of the Task Force.

Mr. Gutierrez stated he is a member of the Task Force, which was created to explore additional licensing pathways and consider how the three components of licensure (education, experience and examination) can be better integrated. He explained that the Task Force is composed of collateral organizations, educators, interns, new licensees, and board members from state architectural registration boards. He added that a goal is to explore alternatives that could reduce delays in licensure and how they may affect the educational process.

Stephanie Silkwood inquired if NCARB’s Broadly Experienced Design Professional program being worked on would be permanent or temporary. Mr. Gutierrez replied he was unsure and would be inquiring with NCARB on whether they foresee the program being temporary or permanent.

Ms. Dougherty inquired if there was any data on licensees who have come through an alternative pathway. Mr. McCauley responded there is currently no data since the program is a proposal and is not yet in effect. Mr. Baker noted there is not currently a program that exempts candidates from IDP, and this appears to be the focus of the Task Force. Mr. Gutierrez agreed and said there are candidates in the process of becoming newly licensed who are unable to use prior work experience due to IDP reporting requirements.

Ms. Dougherty inquired about the connection with the Rolling Clock and testing eligibility expiration for a candidate within California. Vickie Mayer clarified that the Rolling Clock only applies to divisions of the ARE passed, and eligibility as a California candidate requires at least one division be taken once every five years. She clarified, stating that if a candidate does not take a division once within a five year period, the candidate would lose their California eligibility, be required to reapply with the Board and be subject to IDP. Ms. Mayer concluded that with the proposed program, the candidate would be able to use their prior experience to satisfy IDP.

D. UPDATE ON THE 2013 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO DEVELOP A STRATEGY TO EXPEDITE RECIPROCITY LICENSURE FOR MILITARY SPOUSES AND DOMESTIC PARTNERS

Mr. Reinhardt reminded the PQ Committee that it had previously made a recommendation to pursue a regulatory change proposal exempting licensees called to active duty from paying accrued

renewal fees. He explained that after the May 1, 2013 PQ Committee meeting, staff spoke with legal counsel and was advised that the language within Assembly Bills 1588 and 1904 sufficiently covered the waiving of accrued fees and a regulatory change was unnecessary.

Mr. Miller inquired if NCARB would also be waiving fees for military personnel as well. Mr. Baker responded there was a temporary period of waiving fees, but was unsure if there was a permanent waiver in effect. Ms. Mayer added that this would be an NCARB decision regarding its own fees, and suggested staff could research whether or not NCARB waives accrued fees for active military personnel. Mr. Baker offered that a recommendation to ask NCARB to waive accrued fees could be made to the Board based upon staff research.

E. REPORT ON THE NCARB PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (IDP) RELATED TO EMPLOYMENT DURATION AND IDP ENTRY POINT

Mr. Reinhardt informed the PQ Committee that the Board previously considered two modifications to IDP at its June 13, 2013 meeting. He explained the first modification eliminates the minimum employment duration requirement and allows interns to earn IDP experience credit for valid work through the project work performed relative to an experience area. He further explained the other modification relates to the IDP eligibility date and modifies the entry point for participation in IDP to when an intern receives a U.S. high school diploma or equivalent. He said the Board voted to support those changes, which the NCARB Board of Directors approved at their September 19-21, 2013 meeting.

PQ Committee members voiced their approval of the decision.

F. REPORT ON THE NCARB 2012 PRACTICE ANALYSIS

Justin Sotelo summarized the discussion of the PQ Committee at the May 1, 2013 meeting with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES). He explained the information taken from the 2012 NCARB Practice Analysis will be applied to future examinations, and once the test specifications have been completed, the Board can apply the findings to the upcoming California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Occupational Analysis (OA). He added that staff will be providing the Board with an update on the status of the OA at the upcoming December 5-6, 2013 meeting, and the new OPES chief, Heidi Lincer-Hill, will be attending the meeting to address the Board's concerns and provide it with a presentation on the OA.

Mr. Miller inquired if there is data that shows the percentage of graduates of California accredited schools of architecture who become licensed as architects. Mr. McCauley responded the Board does not have data regarding this. Ms. Dougherty offered that schools would be the institutions who could have part of this information, but believed they would not have information on which of their graduates become licensed.

Mr. Baker noted that the new information systems NCARB has put in place allows for greater data combing to assist with statistical analyses of the candidate population. He offered as an example, a comparison of pass rates for candidates who have an accredited degree with those who do not. He stated the two groups have similar pass rates and added that the pass rate for those who complete IDP is lower than those who have not. Mr. Miller indicated that if this is

the case, NCARB could request accredited schools to send a list of graduates, and NCARB could then generate a statistic of those who graduate and then become fully licensed.

Mr. Miller inquired if statistics are available relative to the pass rates of the ARE and the CSE for candidates who graduated from the California accredited schools of architecture.

Mr. McCauley responded that this information is available on the Board's website.

Mr. Wasserman added this information only reflects information provided to the Board.

Mr. Miller further inquired if the pass rate was broken down by school. Mr. McCauley responded in the affirmative.

The meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

Agenda Item B

DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, AND ENCOURAGE INITIATIVES FOR SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE THAT PROMOTE CURRICULUM IN HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE, AND ADDITIONAL PATH TO LICENSURE VIA CAB LIAISONS , AND COLLABORATE WITH SCHOOLS, AS WELL AS THE BOARD, IN A SERIES OF SUMMITS ON PRACTICE-BASED EDUCATION

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective to monitor, analyze, and encourage initiatives for schools of architecture that promote curriculum in health, safety, and welfare, and an additional path to licensure via the California Architects Board liaisons; and collaborate with schools in a series of summits on practice-based education.

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) has been exploring new pathways to architectural licensing and, in September 2013, launched its Licensure Task Force (LTF) with the goal of exploring all potential avenues to licensure. One task assigned to the LTF was to analyze each essential component of licensure (education, experience, and examination) as a basis for exploring potential new pathways and determine where there may be overlap and opportunities for efficiencies to be realized. The LTF has met four times since September (most recently in March 21-22, 2014); its recommendations will ultimately be presented to the NCARB Board of Directors to consider for implementation.

For its February 26, 2014 meeting, the Board invited representatives from each of the California National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredited programs and discussed the issue of an alternate path to licensure model (i.e., licensure upon graduation). More specifically, the Board was provided with: an overview of such a model; reports from school representatives on their respective efforts with regard to licensure; presentations from NewSchool professor Mitra Kanaani (who introduced a new vision for architectural education) and Steve Altman (who outlined a proposal to establish the Sacramento College of Architecture, with a core mission of providing licensure upon graduation). Additional discussion also took place with regard to other current NCARB efforts and the development of a potential framework for an alternate path to licensure model.

Another component of this objective is to utilize the Board's liaison program and to further collaborate with schools on practice-based education. The liaison program is designed to ensure the Board exchanges information with key constituency groups and NAAB programs via Board members (liaisons) who then report back regularly to the Board.

Since the February 26, 2014 Board meeting, staff has conferred with the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee Chair Jon Baker on potential efforts to address this issue, which include the following:

- Continuing to closely monitor NCARB's efforts and staying apprised of the work of the LTF;
- Possibly modifying the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) eligibility point for candidates in order to allow for earlier testing; this could enable candidates/students to complete the ARE sooner (or by the time of graduation);
- Possibly asking The American Institute of Architects chapters located near schools for a commitment to connect with students during the early part of their first year and steering them through the licensure process; as part of this outreach effort, top area firms could be invited to address students and explain their practice and what they look for in interns; and
- Possibly awarding grants to California schools as an incentive to integrate licensure into education and promote health, safety, and welfare (would require legislation).

The PQ Committee is asked to discuss this objective and provide any additional direction or appropriate input.

Agenda Item C

DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PROMOTE ALTERNATE PATHS TO LICENSURE IN ORDER TO INCREASE ACCESSIBILITY INTO THE PROFESSION

Last year, the Board's 2013 Strategic Plan assigned the Communications Committee with an objective to develop methodologies that further promote the multiple pathways to licensure. At its December 5-6, 2013 meeting, the Board approved the Communications Committee recommendation to utilize directed mass mailings to the following groups:

- Presidents of community colleges with architecture or related programs
- Career centers at public and private colleges and universities
- High school career centers or programs
- Veterans Affairs counseling centers (added by the Board when approving the recommendation)

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan assigns an objective to the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee to promote alternate paths to licensure in an effort to increase accessibility into the profession. Staff is drafting the mass mailing letters, which are anticipated to be mailed to recipients in fall 2014.

The PQ Committee is asked to discuss the objective and provide any additional direction or appropriate input.

Agenda Item D

UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO PURSUE A REGULATORY AMENDMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS' (NCARB) ROLLING CLOCK DEADLINE PERTAINING TO ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION (ARE) DIVISIONS PASSED PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 2006

NCARB amended the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) Five-Year Rolling Clock provision with respect to ARE divisions taken and passed prior to January 1, 2006. These specific ARE divisions were previously exempt from the Rolling Clock, and with the amendment will expire on July 1, 2014, unless all remaining divisions of the ARE have been passed.

At its June 13, 2013 meeting, the Board approved the attached proposed regulatory language, which amends California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 120 (Re-Examination) to implement the Rolling Clock changes. The proposed amendment will not affect candidates who have passed all divisions of the ARE.

The Office of Administrative Law (OAL) published the Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations on February 14, 2014. A public hearing was held on April 1, 2014, and one comment was received; however, based on advice from legal counsel, the comment was determined as having no relevance to the regulation package. It is anticipated the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency will review the regulation package later this month. The regulation package will then be forwarded to OAL for final review and approval. Staff further anticipates the proposal will be filed with the Secretary of State in June 2014 with an effective date of July 1, 2014.

Attachments

1. CCR Section 120 Proposed Regulatory Language
2. Public Comment

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PROPOSED REGULATORY LANGUAGE

Article 3. Examinations

Amend Section 120 as follows:

Section 120. Re-Examination.

(a) ~~Prior to January 1, 2006, candidates for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) shall receive credit for each division passed and shall be required to retake only those divisions of the ARE previously failed.~~ Credit for divisions of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) passed prior to January 1, 2006 shall ~~be retained~~ expire on July 1, 2014 unless all divisions of the ARE have been passed and credited.

(b) Effective January 1, 2006, candidates for the ~~Architect Registration Examination (ARE)~~ shall receive conditional credit for each division passed and shall be required to retake only those divisions of the ARE previously failed or those divisions passed on or after January 1, 2006 for which the conditional credit has expired. Conditional credit shall remain valid for five years after the date the division was passed for which conditional credit was granted. Conditional credit shall become full credit only if the conditional credit is within its five-year period of validity and the candidate has passed all remaining divisions of the ARE. Candidates who have received full credit for all divisions of the ARE shall be deemed to have passed the ARE.

(c) A candidate who has failed a division of the ARE or who has failed to appear for a scheduled division of the ARE shall not be permitted to take any subsequent divisions of the ARE unless he or she has reapplied properly to NCARB or its authorized representative for the division(s).

(d) A candidate who has failed a division of the ARE shall not be permitted to reapply to NCARB or its authorized representative for that previously failed division within six (6) months after the date that the candidate last failed the division.

Note: Authority cited: Section 5526, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 5550, Business and Professions Code.

Rodda, Timothy@DCA

Subject: Article 3 - Section 120 - question

Importance: High

From: Vitale, Jim@DGS

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 10:35 AM

To: CAB@DCA

Subject: Article 3 - Section 120 - question

With regards to the pending proposed revisions, Section 120 (a) indicates that previously passed divisions of the ARE are good up to 2014 for those who have not yet completed all divisions.

If that is true, what of those of us who were licensed back when CAB dropped out of NCARB for a few years?

Many of us passed a combination of NCARB divisions together with the CAB divisions.

An amnesty was negotiated with NCARB upon CAB's return, allowing for the CAB divisions to be accepted in lieu of the NCARB divisions not taken.

(having served as a Supplemental Exam Commissioner for 10 years I can assure you that passers of our exams (oral and the CAB exam of 1987-89) exceeded the NCARB of the day (I took all 9, passing 6 with only 3 points limiting my passing all 9. The California sections, design and site planning required experience well beyond that gained in school and 3 years of experience.

Given that 8 of 9 passed were NCARB, but for one I should be denied?

Many of us lacked the funds to apply for the NACARB certificate at the time. The amnesty period was later sunseted.

Question: Those of us who have been in continuous practice since that time and now wish to obtain an NCARB certificate are unfairly being denied the opportunity to receive one without expending a major expense of time and dollars; this due to technical nuances in the CAB regs that allow for minimum qualifications to sit for the exam by completing 8 years of experience or a combination of education and experience vs an accredited degree (NCARB requirement).

Can CAB request NCARB to reopen the acceptance period under the original terms and conditions, there aren't many of us.

James V. Vitale, AIA, CASp

Senior Architect/Access compliance

Division of the State Architect

State of California » Department of General Services

700 North Alameda Street, Ste 5-500, Los Angeles, CA 90012

www.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/

Phone 213.897.1011

Fax 213. 897.0726

Email jim.vitale@dgs.ca.gov

Agenda Item E

UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO CONDUCT AN OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE IN CALIFORNIA, REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL EXAMINATION (ARE), AND LINKAGE STUDY TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE CONTENT FOR ONGOING CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE) DEVELOPMENT

The Board's 2014 Strategic Plan contains an objective to conduct an occupational analysis (OA) of architectural practice in California, a review of the national examination (ARE) development process, and a linkage study to determine the appropriate content for the ongoing CSE development.

Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 139 requires that an OA be conducted every five to seven years. The Board's most recent OA used to develop the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) was conducted in 2007. The primary purpose of the OA is to define current architectural practice in California based on a survey of the critical tasks, skills, and knowledge pertinent to an individual receiving initial licensure. The findings of the OA will be used to develop the content of the CSE and form the basis for determining "minimum acceptable competence" as it relates to safe practice at the time of initial licensure.

BPC 139 also requires boards and bureaus that use a national examination, such as the ARE, and one developed by the state to have a psychometric process review conducted along with a linkage study, which compares the knowledge, skills, and abilities tested for on the national examination with those of the state exam to avoid duplicity.

At its February 26, 2014 meeting, the Board approved an Intra-Agency Contract (IAC) agreement with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) to conduct the CSE OA, review of the ARE development process, and linkage study. The term of IAC is January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

Throughout March 2014 OPES conducted four focus group meetings as part of its preparation for developing the OA survey. Three of the focus group meetings involved building officials, engineers, land surveyors, landscape architects, and contractors. Another focus group meeting involved architects and was conducted over two days. OPES is currently analyzing the input that was

provided by the focus group participants. During April 2014, interviews with architect subject matter experts (SMEs) will be conducted in order to develop a preliminary list of job tasks and required knowledge. The list will be reviewed and revised by OA SMEs in May 2014. In June, OPES will construct and distribute a pilot OA survey for review by selected participants (to be determined by OPES and Board). The final web-based survey will be emailed to a representative sampling of licensees in July 2014. Additional target dates for the OA, ARE review, and linkage study are included in the attached IAC project plan.

Staff will address any questions Professional Qualifications Committee members may have regarding the Strategic Plan objective.

Attachment
IAC Project Plan

INTRA-AGENCY CONTRACT AGREEMENT (IAC) #70604
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
ARCHITECT
OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS
and REVIEW of ARE/LINKAGE STUDY
FISCAL YEARS 2013-14 and 2014-15

Project Objectives: *Identify critical competencies of Architects. Develop a description of practice and review of ARE/Linkage Study.*

Proposed Completion Date: March 31, 2015

Board Contact: Justin Sotelo
(916) 575-7216

OPES Contact: Raul Villanueva
(916) 575-7255

MAJOR PROJECT EVENTS - Project #1 Architect Occupational Analysis	TARGET DATE	RESPONSIBILITY
1. Review Background Information > Review past OAs > Review changes in Law & Practice > Identify emerging trends & considerations > Communicate upcoming OA to licensees > Collect licensee email addresses	March 2014	OPES OPES OPES/Board OPES/Board Board Board
2. Develop Job Content and Structure > Recruit SMEs for 2-day CA Practice Focus Group > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct CA Practice Focus Group > Transcribe and analyze Focus Group results > Recruit Stakeholders for 3 half-day Focus Groups > Provide list of Stakeholders to OPES > Conduct 3 half-day Stakeholder Focus Groups > Transcribe and analyze Focus Group results > Recruit SMEs for interviews > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Schedule and conduct interviews > Transcribe interview information > Develop preliminary list of tasks and knowledge	March 17-18, 2014 March 2014 April 7-10, 2014	Board Board OPES OPES Board Board Board Board Board Board OPES OPES OPES
3. Review Tasks and Knowledge > Recruit SMEs for 2-day workshop > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct first workshop with SMEs > Transcribe workshop results > Revise tasks and knowledge > Recruit SMEs for 2-day workshop > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct second workshop with SMEs > Revise tasks and knowledge > Review Preliminary results w/CAB	May 1-2, 2014 May 29-30, 2014	Board Board OPES/SMEs OPES OPES Board Board OPES/SMEs Board OPES/Board
4. Construct and Distribute Pilot Questionnaires > Develop demographic items and rating scales > Review OA pilot survey w/CAB > Prepare Web-based questionnaires for pilot study > Prepare text of letters for pilot study and final distribution (presurvey, survey, post survey) of questionnaire > Prepare announcement of OA in newsletter or other media > Email questionnaire for pilot study to selected participants > Download pilot questionnaire data files for analysis	June 2014 June 2014 June 2014 June 2014	OPES/Board OPES/Board OPES Board Board OPES/Board OPES

INTRA-AGENCY CONTRACT AGREEMENT (IAC) #70604

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

ARCHITECT

OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS

and REVIEW of ARE/LINKAGE STUDY

FISCAL YEARS 2013-14 and 2014-15

MAJOR PROJECT EVENTS - Project #1 (continued) Architect Occupational Analysis	TARGET DATE	RESPONSIBILITY
5. Construct and Distribute Final Questionnaires (OA) > Prepare draft of final questionnaire (OA) > Determine sampling plan (OA) > Provide master file for emails (OA) > Prepare final Web-based questionnaires (OA) > Email questionnaire invitations to selected participants (OA) > On-going review of responses and response sample > Distribute post survey email reminders (OA)	July 2014 July 2014	OPES OPES Board OPES OPES/Board OPES OPES
6. Data Analysis > Download final questionnaire data files (OA) > Convert and merge data files for analysis > Analyze demographics, task and knowledge ratings (OA) > Develop preliminary description of practice	August 2014	OPES OPES OPES OPES
7. Review Results of Occupational Analysis > Recruit SMEs for two 2-day workshops > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct 2-day workshop with SMEs > Conduct 2-day workshop with SMEs > Develop description of practice	September 4-5, 2014 September 18-19, 2014	Board Board OPES/SMEs OPES/SMEs OPES
8. Prepare Validation Report > Prepare draft of validation report > Prepare, print and submit final validation report	October 2014 November 2014	OPES OPES
9. Present OA findings to Board	TBD	OPES
MAJOR PROJECT EVENTS - Project #2 Review of ARE/Linkage Study	TARGET DATE	RESPONSIBILITY
1. Review Background Information > Review ARE Examination information > Review ARE Occupational Analysis > Review ARE Examination Administration Procedures	November 2014	Board OPES OPES
2. Review ARE Exams' Psychometric Quality > Evaluate Psychometric Quality of ARE Exams	Dec-2014	OPES
3. Linkage Study of ARE Exam Specifications and California OA Results Specifications > Recruit SMEs for one 2-day workshop > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct 2-day workshop with SMEs > Evaluate workshop findings	January 2015	Board Board OPES/SMEs OPES
4. Data Analysis > Analyze Linkage Study results	January 2015	OPES
5. Prepare Report of Results > Prepare draft report of ARE Review & Linkage Study > Prepare, print and submit final report	February 2015 February 2015	OPES OPES
6. Present findings to Board	TBD	OPES

Agenda Item F

UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2014 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO SEEK EXEMPTION FROM ASSEMBLY BILL 186 RELATED TO WAIVING THE CSE

Current law requires Department of Consumer Affairs' boards and bureaus to expedite the licensure of an applicant who: 1) supplies evidence that they are married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in this state under official active duty military orders; and 2) holds a current license in another state, district, or territory of the United States in the profession or vocation for which he or she seeks a license from the board.

Assembly Bill (AB) 186, introduced last year, would add Business and Professions Code section 115.6 and require the Board to provide a temporary 12-month license while staff processes the application for licensure. The bill would also require a candidate, upon a request from the Board, to furnish fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal background check.

At its June 13, 2013 meeting, the Board voted to oppose the bill unless amended and requested an exemption while noting the Board's support for the intent of the legislation. This action was based upon new information that indicated the Board would be required to waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) for individuals who meet the special criteria should AB 186 become law. The concept of waiving the CSE was deemed unacceptable by the Board since the CSE is a critical licensure component for the protection of public health, safety, and welfare (HSW) by assuring competence in seismic, energy efficiency, accessibility, and legal requirements, etc.

On June 25 and 27, 2013, Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, communicated the Board's position through correspondence sent respectively to Assemblyman Maienschein and Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee Chairman, Ted W. Lieu. The letters (attached) requested an amendment to provide an exemption from the bill's provisions. The Board's request for an exemption was again communicated on November 4, 2013, by a letter from Board President Sheran Voigt. Mr. McCauley contacted Assemblyman Maienschein's staff in January 2014 and received no response. On February 18, 2014, an additional letter (attached) from Ms. Voigt was sent to reiterate the importance of the CSE to the HSW of Californians. To date, the Board has not received a response.

AB 186 remains active in the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee Process and has not been amended since June 24, 2013. On March 20, 2014, the Landscape Architects Technical Committee voted to ratify its opposition to the bill. Board staff will continue to monitor AB 186 and report any further activity to the Board. No Committee action is required.

Attachments

1. AB 186 (Maienschein)
2. June 25, 2013 Letter to Assemblyman Maienschein
3. June 27, 2013 Letter to Chairman Lieu
4. November 4, 2013 Letter to Assemblyman Maienschein
5. February 18, 2014 Letter to Assemblyman Maienschein

AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 24, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 24, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 22, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 1, 2013

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2013–14 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 186

Introduced by Assembly Member Maienschein

(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Hagman)

**(Coauthors: Assembly Members Chávez, Dahle, Donnelly,
Beth Gaines, Garcia, Grove, Harkey, Olsen, and Patterson, and
V. Manuel Pérez)**

(Coauthors: Senators Fuller and Huff)

January 28, 2013

An act to ~~amend~~ *add* Section ~~115.5~~ of *115.6* to the Business and Professions Code, relating to professions and vocations, and making an appropriation therefor.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 186, as amended, Maienschein. Professions and vocations: military spouses: temporary licenses.

Existing law provides for the licensure and regulation of various professions and vocations by boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs. Existing law provides for the issuance of reciprocal licenses in certain fields where the applicant, among other requirements, has a license to practice within that field in another jurisdiction, as specified. Existing law requires that the licensing fees imposed by certain boards within the department be deposited in funds that are continuously

appropriated. Existing law requires a board within the department to expedite the licensure process for an applicant who holds a current license in another jurisdiction in the same profession or vocation and who supplies satisfactory evidence of being married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in California under official active duty military orders.

This bill would, in addition to the expedited licensure provisions described above, establish a temporary licensure process for an applicant who holds a current license in another jurisdiction, as specified, and who supplies satisfactory evidence of being married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in California under official active duty military orders. The bill would require the temporary license to expire 12 months after issuance, upon issuance of the expedited license, or upon denial of the application for expedited licensure by the board, whichever occurs first.

~~This bill would require a board within the department to issue a temporary license to an applicant who qualifies for, and requests, expedited licensure pursuant to the above-described provision if he or she meets specified requirements, except as provided. The bill would require the temporary license to expire 12 months after issuance, upon issuance of the expedited license, or upon denial of the application for expedited licensure by the board, whichever occurs first. The bill would authorize a board to conduct an investigation of an applicant for purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license, and would authorize a criminal background check as part of that investigation. The~~

This bill would require an applicant seeking a temporary license to submit an application to the board that includes a signed affidavit attesting to the fact that he or she meets all of the requirements for the temporary license and that the information submitted in the application is accurate, as specified. The bill would also require the application to include written verification from the applicant's original licensing jurisdiction stating that the applicant's license is in good standing. The bill would authorize a board to conduct an investigation of an applicant for purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license and would authorize a criminal background check as part of that investigation. The bill would require an applicant, upon request by a board, to furnish a full set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting the criminal background check.

This bill would prohibit a temporary license from being provided to any applicant who has committed an act in any jurisdiction that would have constituted grounds for denial, suspension, or revocation of the license at the time the act was committed. The bill would provide that a violation of the above-described provision may be grounds for the denial or revocation of a temporary license. The bill would further prohibit a temporary license from being provided to any applicant who has been disciplined by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction, or is the subject of an unresolved complaint, review procedure, or disciplinary proceeding conducted by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction. ~~The bill would require an applicant, upon request by a board, to furnish a full set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal background check.~~

This bill would authorize the immediate termination of any temporary license to practice medicine upon a finding that the temporary licenseholder failed to meet any of the requirements described above or provided substantively inaccurate information that would affect his or her eligibility for temporary licensure. The bill would, upon termination of the license, require the board to issue a notice of termination requiring the temporary licenseholder to immediately cease the practice of medicine upon receipt.

This bill would exclude from these provisions a board that has established a temporary licensing process before January 1, 2014.

Because the bill would authorize the expenditure of continuously appropriated funds for a new purpose, the bill would make an appropriation.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: yes. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. Section 115.6 is added to the Business and
- 2 Professions Code, to read:
- 3 115.6. (a) A board within the department shall, after
- 4 appropriate investigation, issue a temporary license to an applicant
- 5 if he or she meets the requirements set forth in subdivision (c). The
- 6 temporary license shall expire 12 months after issuance, upon
- 7 issuance of an expedited license pursuant to Section 115.5, or upon
- 8 denial of the application for expedited licensure by the board,
- 9 whichever occurs first.

1 (b) The board may conduct an investigation of an applicant for
2 purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license issued
3 pursuant to this section. This investigation may include a criminal
4 background check.

5 (c) An applicant seeking a temporary license pursuant to this
6 section shall meet the following requirements:

7 (1) The applicant shall supply evidence satisfactory to the board
8 that the applicant is married to, or in a domestic partnership or
9 other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces
10 of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in this state
11 under official active duty military orders.

12 (2) The applicant shall hold a current license in another state,
13 district, or territory of the United States in the profession or
14 vocation for which he or she seeks a temporary license from the
15 board.

16 (3) The applicant shall submit an application to the board that
17 shall include a signed affidavit attesting to the fact that he or she
18 meets all of the requirements for the temporary license and that
19 the information submitted in the application is accurate, to the
20 best of his or her knowledge. The application shall also include
21 written verification from the applicant's original licensing
22 jurisdiction stating that the applicant's license is in good standing
23 in that jurisdiction.

24 (4) The applicant shall not have committed an act in any
25 jurisdiction that would have constituted grounds for denial,
26 suspension, or revocation of the license under this code at the time
27 the act was committed. A violation of this paragraph may be
28 grounds for the denial or revocation of a temporary license issued
29 by the board.

30 (5) The applicant shall not have been disciplined by a licensing
31 entity in another jurisdiction and shall not be the subject of an
32 unresolved complaint, review procedure, or disciplinary
33 proceeding conducted by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction.

34 (6) The applicant shall, upon request by a board, furnish a full
35 set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal
36 background check.

37 (d) A board may adopt regulations necessary to administer this
38 section.

39 (e) A temporary license issued pursuant to this section for the
40 practice of medicine may be immediately terminated upon a finding

1 *that the temporary licenseholder failed to meet any of the*
2 *requirements described in subdivision (c) or provided substantively*
3 *inaccurate information that would affect his or her eligibility for*
4 *temporary licensure. Upon termination of the temporary license,*
5 *the board shall issue a notice of termination that shall require the*
6 *temporary licenseholder to immediately cease the practice of*
7 *medicine upon receipt.*

8 *(f) This section shall not apply to a board that has established*
9 *a temporary licensing process before January 1, 2014.*

10 SECTION 1. ~~Section 115.5 of the Business and Professions~~
11 ~~Code is amended to read:~~

12 ~~115.5. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (d), a board within~~
13 ~~the department shall expedite the licensure process for an applicant~~
14 ~~who meets both of the following requirements:~~

15 ~~(1) Supplies evidence satisfactory to the board that the applicant~~
16 ~~is married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union~~
17 ~~with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United~~
18 ~~States who is assigned to a duty station in this state under official~~
19 ~~active duty military orders.~~

20 ~~(2) Holds a current license in another state, district, or territory~~
21 ~~of the United States in the profession or vocation for which he or~~
22 ~~she seeks a license from the board.~~

23 ~~(b) (1) A board shall, after appropriate investigation, issue a~~
24 ~~temporary license to an applicant who is eligible for, and requests,~~
25 ~~expedited licensure pursuant to subdivision (a) if the applicant~~
26 ~~meets the requirements described in paragraph (3). The temporary~~
27 ~~license shall expire 12 months after issuance, upon issuance of the~~
28 ~~expedited license, or upon denial of the application for expedited~~
29 ~~licensure by the board, whichever occurs first.~~

30 ~~(2) The board may conduct an investigation of an applicant for~~
31 ~~purposes of denying or revoking a temporary license issued~~
32 ~~pursuant to this subdivision. This investigation may include a~~
33 ~~criminal background check.~~

34 ~~(3) (A) An applicant seeking a temporary license issued~~
35 ~~pursuant to this subdivision shall submit an application to the board~~
36 ~~which shall include a signed affidavit attesting to the fact that he~~
37 ~~or she meets all of the requirements for the temporary license and~~
38 ~~that the information submitted in the application is accurate, to the~~
39 ~~best of his or her knowledge. The application shall also include~~
40 ~~written verification from the applicant's original licensing~~

1 jurisdiction stating that the applicant's license is in good standing
2 in that jurisdiction.

3 (B) ~~The applicant shall not have committed an act in any~~
4 ~~jurisdiction that would have constituted grounds for denial,~~
5 ~~suspension, or revocation of the license under this code at the time~~
6 ~~the act was committed. A violation of this subparagraph may be~~
7 ~~grounds for the denial or revocation of a temporary license issued~~
8 ~~by the board.~~

9 (C) ~~The applicant shall not have been disciplined by a licensing~~
10 ~~entity in another jurisdiction and shall not be the subject of an~~
11 ~~unresolved complaint, review procedure, or disciplinary proceeding~~
12 ~~conducted by a licensing entity in another jurisdiction.~~

13 (D) ~~The applicant shall, upon request by a board, furnish a full~~
14 ~~set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal~~
15 ~~background check.~~

16 (e)

17 ~~A board may adopt regulations necessary to administer this~~
18 ~~section.~~

19 (d) ~~This section shall not apply to a board that has established~~
20 ~~a temporary licensing process before January 1, 2014.~~



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

June 25, 2013

The Honorable Brian Maienschein
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3098
Sacramento, CA 94249-0077

RE: AB 186 (Oppose Unless Amended) - Military Spouses

Dear Assemblyman Maienschein:

At its June 13, 2013 meeting, the California Architects Board (Board) voted to oppose AB 186 unless amended. The Board respectfully requests an amendment to provide an exemption from the bill's provisions.

The Board has already implemented legislation to temporarily waive the renewal fees and continuing education requirements of licensees during the time period they are on active military duty. The Board provides expedited reciprocity licensing to active duty members who are assigned to a station in California under official "active duty" military orders. The Board has also participated in an effort of the Department of Consumer Affairs to ensure that military veterans receive appropriate credit for their architectural experience to count toward licensure.

Although the Board unequivocally supports members of our nation's Armed Forces and initiatives that address the challenges facing military families, it cannot waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) requirement.

The CSE is a critical licensure requirement which all licensees in our state must complete, demonstrating competence in California's seismic, accessibility, energy, and legal requirements. The Board cannot waive the CSE requirement and simultaneously meet its mandate to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (916) 575-7232.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Douglas R. McCauley".

DOUGLAS R. McCAULEY
Executive Officer

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



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

June 27, 2013

The Honorable Ted W. Lieu
Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee
State Capitol, Room 2053
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: July 1, 2013 Hearing
AB 186 (Oppose Unless Amended) - Military Spouses

Dear Chairman Lieu:

At its June 13, 2013 meeting, the California Architects Board (Board) voted to oppose AB 186 unless amended. The Board respectfully requests an amendment to provide an exemption from the bill's provisions.

Supporting our military families is a critical public policy issue. At the national level, First Lady Michelle Obama has spearheaded a number of important initiatives on this topic.

In California, there have also been a number of actions that the Board has embraced and implemented. Such efforts include:

- Pursuant to AB 1588 (Chapter 742, Statutes of 2012), the Board temporarily waives renewal fees and continuing education requirements of licensees during the time period licensees are on active military duty.
- The Board also expedites reciprocity licensing to active duty members who are assigned to a station in California under official "active duty" military orders pursuant to AB 1904 (Chapter 399, Statutes of 2012).
- The Board has also participated in an effort of the Department of Consumer Affairs to ensure that military veterans receive appropriate credit for their architectural experience to count toward licensure.

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

Although the Board unequivocally supports members of our nation's Armed Forces and initiatives that address the challenges facing military families, it cannot waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) requirement.

The CSE is a critical licensure requirement which all licensees in our state must complete, demonstrating competence in California's seismic, accessibility, energy, and legal requirements. The Board cannot waive the

The Honorable Ted W. Lieu

June 27, 2013

Page 2

CSE requirement and simultaneously meet its mandate to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact the Board's Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, at (916) 575-7232.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sheran Voigt".

SHERAN VOIGT

President

cc: Members, Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee (BPED)
LeOndra Clark, Ph.D, Consultant, BPED
Amber Alexander, Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus
Mark Christian, The American Institute of Architects - California Council
Tracy Rhine, Department of Consumer Affairs
Board Members



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

November 4, 2013

The Honorable Brian Maienschein
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3098
Sacramento, CA 94249-0077

RE: AB 186 (Oppose Unless Amended) - Military Spouses

Dear Assemblyman Maienschein:

The California Architects Board (Board) has taken an Oppose Unless Amended position on your AB 186 and is requesting an exemption from the bill's provisions (similar to that being provided to the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists).

At our June 13, 2013 meeting, the Board received new information from legal counsel that AB 186 would force the Board to waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE), which tests for critical seismic safety, energy efficiency, and accessibility content. The CSE licensure requirement is very important in California as it protects the public health, safety, and welfare of our citizens. As such, ALL California Architects need to take and pass this examination. This is why our Board opposes AB 186 as it reads today.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact the Board's Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, at (916) 575-7232.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sheran Voigt".

SHERAN VOIGT
President

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



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

February 18, 2014

The Honorable Brian Maienschein
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3098
Sacramento, CA 94249-0077

RE: AB 186 (Oppose Unless Amended) - Military Spouses

Dear Assemblyman Maienschein:

As you know, the California Architects Board (Board) has taken an Oppose Unless Amended position on your AB 186 and is requesting an exemption from the bill's provisions (similar to that being provided to the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists).

AB 186 would force the Board to waive the California Supplemental Examination (CSE), which tests for critical seismic safety, energy efficiency, and accessibility content. The CSE licensure requirement is very important in California as it protects the public health, safety, and welfare of our citizens. As such, ALL California Architects need to take and pass this examination. This is why our Board opposes AB 186 as it reads today.

The Board's Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, telephoned your office in January and left a voice message, but never received a follow-up call.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Mr. McCauley at (916) 575-7232.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sheran Voigt".

SHERAN VOIGT
President

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

cc: G.V. Ayers, Committee Consultant, Senate Business, Professions, and
Economic Development Committee

Agenda Item G

DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE 2014 NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD'S ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FIRST READING (SECOND DRAFT)

The Board's 2013 Strategic Plan directed the Professional Qualifications (PQ) Committee to review and provide the Board with a recommendation for comments on the 2014 National Architectural Accrediting Board's (NAAB) Accreditation Standards.

At its May 1, 2013 meeting, the PQ Committee reviewed and discussed *NCARB's Contribution to NAAB 2013 Accreditation Review Conference* and recommended the Board send a letter commending National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) for its efforts. The letter was subsequently approved by the Board and delivered to NCARB President, Ronald Blicht, at the NCARB 2013 Annual Meeting held June 19–22, 2013.

At its October 23, 2013 meeting, the PQ Committee was asked to review and provide the Board with a recommendation for comments relative to the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation—First Draft*. The PQ Committee recommended that the Board approve the *First Draft* and send a letter to NAAB expressing support. Due to the December 1, 2013 deadline for comments, a letter was approved by the Board's Executive Committee and sent to NAAB on November 7, 2013.

The *2014 NAAB Accreditation Standards—First Reading (Second Draft of the Standards)*, attached, is a synthesized version of the comments provided to NAAB from August 29 through November 30, 2013. The following revisions and modifications were proposed since the *First Draft*:

- The continued absence of instructions and implied advice. This material continues to be refined out of the document is being captured in an advisory document that will be released with the final, approved edition of the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*;
- Revision and reordered the new perspectives;
- Refinement of the conditions on curriculum development and program self-assessment;
- Proposing to reinstate two Student Performance Criteria (SPC), eliminating Order Systems and Building Materials and Assemblies;

- Reorder of Realms C and D, while introducing a second SPC in Realm C. The new SPC is intended to describe the process-related skills that support the decision-making reflected in C. 1.; and
- A continued revision of the Conditions on Professional Degrees and Curriculum (II.2.2), which were intended to accomplish the following items: (1) inclusion of pre-professional or preparatory education completed at institutions other than those offering an accredited degree—intended to comprise of community college education, and (2) revision of the credit distribution table between general studies, professional studies, and optional studies to leave more discretion to the program in terms of how many professional studies credits are included in the curriculum.

The condition on international accreditation has been retained. NAAB is working with the leaders of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) to discuss this condition further during the ACSA Annual Meeting in April.

NAAB continues to work on the new format for the Architecture Program Report (ARP), along with a new format for the Visiting Team Report. The guidelines for preparing APRs will be released with the final, approved edition.

Following a review and discussion of the comments received, NAAB will make the final decision on the document in July 2014.

The PQ Committee is asked to review and provide the Board a recommendation for comments on the *First Reading*. The deadline for comments to NAAB is June 24, 2014.

Attachments

1. November 7, 2013 Letter of Support to NAAB
2. *2014 Conditions for Accreditation—First Reading*



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

November 7, 2013

Mr. Theodore C. Landsmark, M.Env.D., J.D., D.F.A. (Hon.), Ph.D., President
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

RE: *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* – First Draft

Dear Mr. Landsmark:

I am writing on behalf of the California Architects Board to convey our support of the first draft of the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*.

The Board has a long-standing interest in architectural education and takes the issue of accreditation standards very seriously.

At its recent meetings, the Board reviewed, discussed, and gave its support of the draft document, as written. We will also submit our letter of support to forum@naab.org, as requested in your invitation for comments.

The Board commends NAAB for its quality work and looks forward to reviewing the second draft in February 2014.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sheran Voigt".

SHERAN VOIGT
President

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

cc: Andrea S. Rutledge, CAE, NAAB Executive Director
Blakely C. Dunn, AIA, NCARB President/Chair of the Board
Michael J. Armstrong, NCARB Chief Executive Officer
California Architects Board Members

2014
Conditions for
Accreditation
First Reading

The National Architectural
Accrediting Board, Inc.



February 22, 2014

2014 Conditions for Accreditation – **First Reading** – February 22, 2014
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

First Reading Edition

© 2014 National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036
www.naab.org
All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

ACCREDITATION	5
HISTORY	5
NAAB Accreditation Documents.....	7
CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION.....	9
PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	9
Conditions for Accreditation	10
Part One (I): Section 1 – Identity & Self-Assessment	10
I.1.1 History and Mission:	10
I.1.2 Learning Culture	10
I.1.4 The Five Perspectives	11
I.1.5 Long-Range Planning:	12
I.1.6 Program Self-Assessment Procedures	12
I.1.7 Self-Assessment and Curricular Development	12
Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources	13
I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:.....	13
I.2.2 Physical Resources	13
I.2.3 Financial Resources	13
I.2.4 Information Resources:	13
I.2.5 Administrative Structure & Governance:	14
Part Two (II): Section 1 – Student Performance -- Educational Realms & Student Performance Criteria	16
II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria (SPC)	16
Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:	16
Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge.....	17
Realm C: Professional Practice.	18
Part Two (II): Section 2 – Curricular Framework.....	21
II.2.1 Regional Accreditation:	21
II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum:	21
Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education.....	24
Part Two (II): Section 4 – Public Information.....	25
II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees	25
II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures	25

2014 Conditions for Accreditation – **First Reading** – February 22, 2014
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information	25
II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs.....	25
II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates.....	26
Part Three (III): – Annual and Interim Reports	27
Appendix 1: Required Text for Catalogs and Promotional Materials	29
Appendix 2. Glossary.	32

First Reading Edition

ACCREDITATION

Accreditation is a voluntary, quality assurance process by which services and operations are evaluated by a third party against a set of standards established by the third-party with input and collaboration from peers within the field. In the U.S., accreditation of postsecondary institutions originated over a century ago. It is sought by colleges and universities and is conferred by non-governmental bodies. Today, voluntary accreditation is distinguished by five components, which also guide the NAAB's policies and procedures:

- It is provided through private agencies;
- It requires a significant degree of self-evaluation by the institution or program, the results of which are summarized in a report to the agency;
- A team conducts a visit;
- Recommendations or judgments about accreditation are made by expert and trained peers; and
- Institutions have the opportunity to respond to most steps in the process¹.

The U.S. model for accreditation is based on the values of independent decision-making by institutions, the ability of institutions to develop and deliver postsecondary education within the context of their mission and history, the core tenets of academic freedom, and the respect for diversity of thought, pedagogy, and methodology. These principles and practices have remained relatively stable over the past 70 years.

HISTORY

The first attempt to establish national standards in architecture education came with the founding of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) in 1912 and its adoption two years later of "standard minima," which schools were required to meet to gain ACSA membership. While these standard minima were in place, ACSA membership was equivalent to accreditation.

In 1932, the ACSA abandoned the standard minima and in 1940, the ACSA, The American Institute of Architects (AIA), and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) established the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)² and gave it authority to accredit schools of architecture nationally. The founding agreement of 1940 also announced the intention to create an integrated system of architectural education that would allow schools with varying resources and circumstances to develop according to their particular needs. This notion that the NAAB would "not to create conditions, nor to have conditions created, that will tend toward standardization of educational philosophies or practices," is considered the "prime directive" in the NAAB system today.

The foundation for the model for accreditation in architecture education that many know today was first outlined in a 1975 intercollateral report, *The Restructuring of the NAAB*. Today, the NAAB's accreditation system for professional degree programs requires a self-assessment by the accredited degree program, an evaluation of that assessment by the NAAB, and a site visit by a NAAB team of trained volunteers that concludes with a

¹ *The Handbook of Accreditation, Third Edition*. North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Higher Learning Commission (2003).

² These four organizations, along with the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) are referred to as the "collateral organizations" or "collaterals" within the architecture community.

recommendation to the NAAB as to the term of accreditation. The decision regarding the term of accreditation is made by the NAAB directors.

On October 22, 2011, the NAAB directors approved a new statement of the NAAB's vision, mission, and values. Developed after several months of review and consideration, the document is a contemporary expression of the NAAB's founding principles. It guides the work of the NAAB in all its activities. The text of that statement follows.

From the 1940 Founding Agreement:

"The ... societies creating this accrediting board, here record their intent not to create conditions, nor to have conditions created, that will tend toward standardization of educational philosophies or practices, but rather to create and maintain conditions that will encourage the development of practices suited to the conditions which are special to the individual school. The accrediting board must be guided by this intent."

Since 1975, the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* have emphasized self-assessment and student performance as central elements of the NAAB model. The directors have maintained their commitment to both of these as core tenets of the NAAB's criteria and procedures.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Values: The following principles serve as a guide and inspiration to the NAAB.

1. **Shared Responsibility.** The education of an architect is a responsibility shared by the academy and the profession in trust for the broader society and the public good.
2. **Best Practices.** The NAAB's accreditation processes are based on best practices in professional and specialized accreditation.
3. **Program Accountability.** Architecture degree programs are accountable for the learning of their students. Thus, accreditation by the NAAB is based both on educational outcomes and institutional commitment to continuous improvement.
4. **Preparing Graduates for Practice.** A NAAB-accredited degree prepares students to live and work in a diverse world: to think critically; to make informed decisions; to communicate effectively; to engage in life-long learning; and to exercise the unique knowledge and skills required to work and develop as professionals. Graduates are prepared for architectural internship, set on the pathway to examination and licensure, and prepared to engage in related fields.
5. **Constant Conditions for Diverse Contexts.** *The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* are broadly defined and achievement-oriented so that programs may meet these standards within the framework of their mission and vision, allowing for initiative and innovation. This imposes conditions on both the NAAB and on architectural programs. The NAAB assumes the responsibility for undertaking a fair, thorough, and holistic evaluation process, relying

essentially on the program's ability to demonstrate how within their institutional context they meet all evaluative criteria. The process relies on evaluation and judgment that, being rendered on the basis of qualitative factors, may defy precise substantiation.

6. **Continuous Improvement through Regular Review.** *The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* are developed through an iterative process that acknowledges and values the contributions of educators, professionals in traditional and non-traditional practice, and students. The NAAB regularly convenes conversations on critical issues (e.g. studio culture) and challenges the other four collateral partners to acknowledge and respect the perspectives of the others.

While the NAAB stipulates the conditions and student performance criteria that must be met, it specifies neither the educational format nor the form of student work that may serve as evidence of having met these criteria. Programs are encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, and methods and materials to satisfy these criteria.

The NAAB encourages innovative methods for satisfying the criteria, provided the program has a formal evaluation process for assessing student achievement and documenting the results.

Specific areas and levels of excellence will vary among accredited degree programs as will approaches to meeting the conditions and reporting requirements. The positive aspects of a degree program in one area cannot override deficiencies in another.

NAAB ACCREDITATION DOCUMENTS

There are five documents referenced with accreditation.

1. 2014 NAAB Conditions for accreditation
2. NAAB Procedures for Accreditation
3. NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports
4. Architecture Program Reports
5. Visiting Team Reports

The *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* define the standards that professional degree programs in architecture are expected to meet in order to ensure that students are prepared to move to the next steps in their careers including internship and licensure. This document was last revised in 2009; it will be revised again in 2019.

The *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* outline the procedures that programs and visiting teams must follow in order to ensure a uniform accrediting process. This document was last revised in 2012; it will be revised again in 2015 and subsequently at two-year intervals.

The *2014 Conditions for Accreditation* apply to all programs seeking continued accreditation, candidacy, continuation of candidacy, or initial accreditation beginning April 1, 2015.

NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports is a new document under development by the NAAB. The first iteration includes an introduction to and commentary on the preparation of the first draft of the *2014 Conditions*. It will later be revised to include instructions for preparing Architecture Program Reports (APRs). In subsequent years, beginning in 2016, it will be revised annually based

2014 Conditions for Accreditation – **First Reading** – February 22, 2014
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

on surveys and evaluations of the visit process. This document is advisory and nonbinding on the NAAB.

An APR is a self-analytical, narrative report prepared by the program in advance of a visit. Instructions and required templates for these reports will be provided by the NAAB in the *Guide* described above.

A Visiting Team Report is prepared by a NAAB visiting team at the conclusion of each visit. In these reports the visiting team affirms that materials have been presented or reviewed in accordance with the *2014 Conditions* and the *Procedures*. Instructions and templates for preparing these reports are found in the *Procedures*.

First Reading Edition

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

- **IDENTITY & SELF-ASSESSMENT:** The program must be defined and sustained through a robust network of policies, documents, and activities related to history, mission, culture, self-assessment, and future planning.
- **RESOURCES:** The program must have the human, physical, financial, and information resources necessary to support student learning in a professional degree program in architecture.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part One in two ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to “demonstrate, describe, or document.”
- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.

For instructions on how this material is to be presented in the APR and during the visit, see *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* and the *NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports*.

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY & SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must ~~also describe the its active role and~~ relationship ~~between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution within its academic context and university community.~~ This includes ~~an explanation of~~ the program's benefits to the institutional setting, ~~and~~ how the ~~institution benefits from~~ program as a unit and/or individual faculty members ~~participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverage opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.~~

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy³ that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-~~school~~-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide ~~and community-wide~~ activities.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and ~~that~~ is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

³ For additional information on the development and assessment of studio culture, see *Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture*, published by the American Institute of Architecture Students, 2008, *The Redesign of Studio Culture: A Report of the AIAS Studio Culture Task Force*, published by the American Institute of Architecture Students, 2002 and "Studio Culture Summit Report, published by the American Institute of Architecture Students, 2004.

- The program must document that institutional, college or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college or institutional-level.

I.1.4 the Five Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Leadership and Collaboration, and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for instilling, developing successful individual and promoting team dynamics, collaborative experiences and opportunities for leadership and collaboration roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders. This includes a description of how students are being

A.B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to: nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership; live and work engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed to address increasingly complex problems, engage a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth and dignity are nurtured and respected; understand diverse constituency, and provide value and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; understand pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges and their impact on architects; and, emerge as leaders in the academic and professional setting an improved future.

B. University Context. The program must describe its active role within its academic context and university community. This includes how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members develop multi-disciplinary relationships and leverage opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

C. Career Development, Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and alternative career paths for architectural graduates architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings. For a traditional setting this includes how students are prepared for the transition to internship and licensure; with an understanding of the requirements for registration in the jurisdiction in which the program is located; and with the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP). For a non-traditional setting this includes students' understanding of alternative roles for architects in the building industry (e.g., developer, owners' representative, program manager, or civic leader); in local and global communities.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach for developing young professional graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environmental and the natural

Comment [AR1]: Moved to History and Mission.

resources that are ~~offensively~~ significantly compromised by the act of building and settlement. ~~This includes not only individual courses that develop an understanding of climate, geography and other natural characteristics and phenomena, but also the laws and practices governing architects and the built environment as well as the ethos of sustainable practices constructed human settlements.~~

- E. **Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach to developing ~~young professionals~~ graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be a ~~responsible~~ professional member of society and to act on that understanding. ~~This includes the~~ The social responsibility ~~of architects lies in part in the belief that architects can create better places, and further that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to act ethically, social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to communicate honestly and with integrity, civic engagement to treat all persons with dignity positively influence the development, conservation or changes to the built and respect, and to nurture a commitment to professional and public service, natural environment~~

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement. ~~with a ratified planning document and / or planning process.~~ In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources to identify patterns and trends, so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision-making. ~~The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college and university.~~

I.1.6 Assessment

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing towards its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- ~~Identifies~~ Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success.

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement
- The program must demonstrate that an IDP Intern Development Program (IDP) Educator Coordinator has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Educator Coordinator position description and, regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the program's pedagogy requires physical resources, then available and how they support the program must demonstrate that it provides adequate physical resources that promote pedagogical approach and student learning and achievement consistent with that pedagogy.

Adequate Physical resources include, but are not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe what changes, the effect (if any, this makes to space) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resource requirements/resources.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature, and information, as well as appropriate visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architectural librarians and visual resource professionals who provide information services

that teach and develop the research, evaluative, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure, and identify key personnel, within the context of the program and school, college and institution.
- **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures ~~and~~. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

First Reading Edition

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE.** This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this part. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work
- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK.** This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education and access to optional studies.
- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION.** The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes and knowledge bases. In this section, programs will be required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs have indeed been met.
- **PUBLIC INFORMATION.** The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public regarding accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information concerning the accredited and non-accredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to “describe, document, or demonstrate.”
- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.
- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.
- A review of websites, links, and other materials.

For instructions on how this material is to be presented in the APR and during the visit, see *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* and the *NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports*.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria below. The knowledge and skills defined here represent those required to prepare graduates for the pathway to internship, examination and licensure, or to engage in related fields. The program must provide student work as evidence that its graduates have satisfied each criterion.

The criteria encompass two levels of accomplishment⁴:

- **Understanding**—The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain and/or interpret information.
- **Ability**—Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation.

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria (SPC): The NAAB establishes SPC to help accredited degree programs prepare students for the profession while encouraging educational practices suited to the individual degree program. The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Being broadly educated.
 - Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
 - Communicating graphically in a range of media.
 - Assessing evidence.
 - Comprehending people, place, and context.
 - Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.
- A.1 Professional Communication Skills: *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.
- A.2 Design Thinking Skills: *Ability* to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

⁴ See also *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. L.W. Anderson & D.R. Krathwold, Eds. (New York; Longman 2001).

2014 Conditions for Accreditation – First Reading – February 22, 2014
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

- A.3 Investigative Skills ~~and Applied Research~~: *Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.*
- A.4 Architectural Design Skills: *Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.*
- ~~A.5A.5~~ ~~Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.~~
- A.6 Use of Precedents: *Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.*
- ~~A.6~~ ~~Historical Traditions~~A.7 ~~History and Global Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions histories of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, political, economic, social, and technological ; socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.~~
- A.7.8 Cultural Diversity ~~and Social Equity~~: *Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication responsibility of this diversity on the societal roles architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and responsibilities of architects structures.*

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately

B.1 Pre-Design: *Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of ~~spaces~~spaces and their requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant ~~laws~~building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.*

~~B.2~~ ~~Accessibility: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards or other appropriate~~

- ~~jurisdictional requirements such as those of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI).~~
- ~~B.3B.2~~ Site Design: *Ability* to respond to site characteristics including ~~zoning~~urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ~~vegetation~~climate, building orientation, and watershed in the development of a project design.
- ~~B.4~~ ~~Life Safety~~B.3. Codes and Regulations: *Ability* to ~~apply design sites, facilities and systems consistent with the basic~~principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.
- ~~B.54~~ Technical Documentation: *Ability* to make technically clear drawings, ~~write~~prepare outline specifications, and ~~prepare~~construct models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.
- ~~B.5~~ Structural Systems: *Ability to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.*
- B.6 Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design, ~~which~~how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar ~~orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination systems, lighting systems, and acoustics; and an understanding of performance assessment tools.~~
- ~~B.7~~ Structural Systems: *Understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.*
- ~~B.8B.7~~ Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems ~~and associated assemblies~~ relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.
- ~~B.8~~ Building Materials and Assemblies: *Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components and assemblies based on their inherent performance including environmental impact and reuse.*
- B.9 Building Service Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems ~~such as~~including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.
- B.10 Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

Comment [AR2]: Moved to B.5

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design

solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Respond to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making: Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

Realm D: Professional Practice. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of building architecture and construction.
- ~~Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.~~
- Discerning the diverse/valuable roles ~~of architects~~ and ~~these key players~~ in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

CD.1 Stakeholder Roles In Architecture: *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect and other key stakeholders such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment; ~~and~~ Understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders

CD.2 Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams, identifying work plans, project schedules and time requirements, and recommending project delivery methods.

CD.3 Business ~~of Architecture~~ Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the ~~architectural practice such as a firm~~ including financial management and business planning, marketing, ~~negotiation, risk~~

- ~~management, human resources, practice typologies, firm culture, mediation and arbitration~~business organization, and entrepreneurialism.
- ~~C.4~~ ~~Non-traditional Forms of Practice: Understanding that the architect's capacity for collaboration, specialized architectural knowledge and business acumen can lead to diverse forms of practice and specialization.~~
- ~~ED.5~~ Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by ~~registration law, building codes and regulations, and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture~~ and professional service contracts, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.
- ~~ED.6~~ Professional Ethics: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the ~~formation~~exercise of professional judgment ~~regarding social, political and cultural issues~~ in architectural design and practice; ~~also includes an~~ and understanding ~~of~~ the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program ~~is~~ must be or ~~is~~ be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC);
2. Institutions ~~that are~~ located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency, may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit, written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that ~~also~~ uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch. or D. Arch. for a non-accredited ~~post-professional~~ degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of ~~such degree~~ these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified below. Every accredited program must conform to the following minimum credit hour requirements.

- **Bachelor of Architecture.** Accredited degree programs awarding the B. Arch. degree must require a minimum of 150 semester credit hours or the quarter-hour equivalent⁵, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies; all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the ~~same~~ institution that will grant the degree.
- **Master of Architecture.** Accredited degree programs awarding the M. Arch. degree may take three forms:
 - ~~Non-baccalaureate (NB): These are awarded by the institution after completing~~ Single Institution (SI): Candidates for this degree have

⁵ Programs that operate on the quarter system must multiply these totals by 1.5 to identify the approximate minimum credit requirements for their programs.

~~completed~~ at least 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter hour equivalent, of which at least 30 ~~credit hours~~ are taken at the graduate level; all of which are delivered ~~by or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the same institution. No baccalaureate degree is awarded prior to completion of the NAAB-accredited degree. The program nor is one required for admission. Coursework is a combination of undergraduate and graduate education. Combined undergraduate and graduate degree programs structured in this manner~~ must include general studies, professional studies, and optional studies.

- Preprofessional-plus: ~~These are awarded by the institution after completing~~ Candidates for this degree have completed at least 160 semester credit hours, or the quarter hour equivalent, of which at least 30 ~~credit hours~~ are taken at the graduate level and ~~require that students have earned~~ hold a preprofessional degree⁶ in architecture or a related field prior to admission to the graduate degree program. The graduate-level, academic coursework must include professional studies and optional studies.
- Nonpreprofessional degree-plus: ~~These are awarded by the institution after completing~~ Candidates for this degree have completed at least 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter hour equivalent, of which at least 30 ~~credit hours~~ are taken at the graduate level and ~~require that students have earned~~ hold an undergraduate degree from a regionally accredited institution prior to admission to the graduate degree program. The graduate-level, academic coursework must include professional studies and optional studies.
- **Doctor of Architecture.** Accredited degree programs awarding the D. Arch. degree must require an undergraduate baccalaureate degree (minimum of 120 undergraduate semester credit hours or the undergraduate-level quarter-hour equivalent) for admission. Further, the D. Arch. must require a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours; or the graduate-level quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies.

General studies, professional studies, and optional studies are defined as follows:

- **General Studies.** Courses offered in the following subjects: communications, history, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, foreign languages, and mathematics, either as an admission requirement or as part of the curriculum. ~~Architectural courses cannot be used to meet the NAAB general studies requirement.~~ These courses must be offered outside the academic unit that offers the NAAB-accredited degree and have no architectural content. Architectural courses cannot be used to meet the NAAB general studies requirement. In many cases, this requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree.

⁶ Preprofessional architecture degree: The term refers to architecturally-focused four-year, undergraduate degrees that are not accredited by the NAAB. These degrees have such titles as B.S. in Architecture, B.S. in Architectural Studies, B.A. in Architecture, Bachelor of Environmental Design, Bachelor of Architectural Studies, etc. The amount of architecturally-defined content in these programs may vary from institution to institution and will determine the length of time required to complete the subsequent NAAB-accredited program.

- **Professional Studies.** Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program. These are considered the core of a professional degree program. Student work from these courses is expected to satisfy the NAAB SPC (Condition II.1). The degree program has the flexibility to require additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. Further, the program may choose to provide co-curricular or extra-curricular learning opportunities to supplement or complement required coursework.
- **Optional Studies (Curricular Flexibility).** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum in order to allow students to pursue their special interests either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or courses offered within the department offering the accredited program, but outside the professional studies curriculum.

Table 1. Minimum Credit Distribution for NAAB-Accredited Degrees

NOTE: This table lists semester-credit minimum requirements. Programs that operate on the quarter system must multiply these totals by 1.5 to identify the minimum credit requirements for their programs.

<u>Minimum requirements</u>	B. Arch.	M. Arch. (SI)	M. Arch. (preprofessional plus)	M. Arch. (non-preprofessional plus)	D. Arch.
General (non-architecture studies)	45 credits	45 credits	Defined by baccalaureate required for admissions	Defined by baccalaureate required for admissions	Defined by baccalaureate required for admissions
Professional Studies (min)	40-45 creditsAs defined by the program	40-45 creditsAs defined by the program	40-45 creditsAs defined by the program	40-45 creditsAs defined by the program	40-45 creditsAs defined by the program
Optional Professional Studies (min.)	90-95 credits10	103-113 credits10	103-113 credits (incl. undergrad. study)10	103-113 credits (incl. undergrad. study)10	75-80 credits (graduate study only)10
Undergraduate credits (min)	150 credits	120-138 creditsAs defined by the program	120-138 creditsAs defined by the program	120-138 creditsAs defined by the program	120 credits
Graduate credits (min)	0 credits	30 credits	30 credits	30 credits	90 credits
Total credits (min)	150	168	168	168	210

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Conditions student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available ~~either online or on request.~~

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1 in catalogs and promotional media.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004 depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

~~In order to assist students and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, staff, faculty, and the public:~~

~~*IDP Guidelines*~~

~~*Certification Guidelines*~~

~~The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.~~

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents electronically available to the public:

All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative, Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012)

All NAAB responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012)

The most recent decision letter from the NAAB

The most recent *APR*⁷

The final edition of the most recent *Visiting Team Report*, including attachments and addenda

⁷ This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education- [in architecture](#). Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their [website/websites](#) to the results.

II.4.6. Admissions and Advising

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions
- Admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation, and advanced standing
- [Forms and process for the evaluation of pre-professional degree content](#)
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships
- Student diversity initiatives.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all [tuition, fees, books, general supplies](#), and [specialized materials that may be](#) required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART THREE (III): – ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit annual statistical reports in the format required by the *NAAB Procedures*.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports. The program must submit interim progress reports to the NAAB (See Section 11, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, 2012 Edition, Amended).

First Reading Edition

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees -- Required Texts for Catalogs
and Promotional Material

Appendix 2 Glossary

First Reading Edition

Appendix 1: Required Text for Catalogs and Promotional Materials

The following statement must be included, in its entirety, in the catalogs and promotional materials of all accredited programs and candidate programs.

“In the United States, most registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by institutions with U.S. regional accreditation, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted an eight-year, three-year, or two-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

“Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may require a preprofessional undergraduate degree in architecture for admission. However, the preprofessional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.”

This text is to be followed by the following information about each NAAB-accredited program:

[Name of university, name of academic unit] offers the following NAAB-accredited degree program(s) (If an institution offers more than one track for an M. Arch. or D. Arch. based on the type of undergraduate/preparatory education required, please list all tracks separately):

[Name of degree] (Prerequisite + total number of credits required)

In addition, the program is required to publish the year of the next accreditation visit for each accredited program. A sample follows:

SAMPLE TEXT FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS:

In the United States, most registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by institutions with U.S. regional accreditation, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted an eight-year, three-year, or two-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may require a preprofessional undergraduate degree in architecture for admission. However, the preprofessional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.

Any University, College of Art and Design, Department of Architecture offers the following NAAB-accredited degree programs:

- B. Arch. (150 undergraduate credits)
- M. Arch. (preprofessional degree + 42 graduate credits)
- M. Arch. (non-preprofessional degree + 63 credits)

Next accreditation visit for all programs: 2017

In addition to the previous text, all programs that have been granted candidacy status must include the following in its entirety:

“The NAAB grants candidacy status to new programs that have developed viable plans for achieving initial accreditation. Candidacy status indicates that a program expects to achieve initial accreditation within six years of achieving candidacy, if its plan is properly implemented. In order to meet the education requirement set forth by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, an applicant for an NCARB Certificate must hold a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the NAAB; the degree must have been awarded not more than two years prior to initial accreditation.”

This text is to be followed by the following information about each candidate program:

[Name of university, name of academic unit] was granted candidacy status for the following professional degree program(s) in architecture:

[Name of degree] (Prerequisite + total number of credits required) – Year candidacy was awarded, the year and purpose of the next visit and projected year of initial accreditation.

A sample follows:

SAMPLE TEXT FOR CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

In the United States, most registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by institutions with U.S. regional accreditation, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted an eight-year, three-year, or two-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may require a preprofessional undergraduate degree in architecture for admission. However, the preprofessional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.

The NAAB grants candidacy status to new programs that have developed viable plans for achieving initial accreditation. Candidacy status indicates that a program expects to achieve initial accreditation within six years of achieving candidacy, if its plan is properly implemented.

In order to meet the education requirement set forth by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, an applicant for an NCARB Certificate must hold a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the NAAB; the degree must have been awarded not more than two years prior to initial accreditation. However, meeting the education requirement for the NCARB Certificate may not be equivalent to meeting the education requirement for registration in a specific jurisdiction. Please contact NCARB for more information.

Anyplace University, School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture was granted candidacy for the following professional degree program in architecture:

M. Arch. (preprofessional degree + 45 graduate credits) – 2014.

Next visit for continuation of candidacy: 2016

Projected year of initial accreditation: 2020

Appendix 2. Glossary.

ACSA	Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
Access	The program must show that students, faculty or staff, have the ability to obtain or make use of something
AIA	The American Institute of Architects
AIAS	The American Institute of Architecture Students
APR	Architecture Program Report
APR-IC	Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy
APR-IA	Architecture Program Report for Initial Accreditation
ARE	Architect Registration Examination
Demonstrate	Illustrate and explain especially with many examples
Describe	The program must give an account of activity or set of processes in written form
Document	The program must convey evidence or proof through writing and then provide supporting materials or documentation of activity or policies
IDP	Intern Development Program
Must	Sets a minimum requirement; sets what is mandatory
NAAB	National Architectural Accrediting Board
NCARB	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

2014 Conditions for Accreditation – **First Reading** – February 22, 2014
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

NVTM	Non-voting team member
Shall	Sets a minimum requirement; sets what is mandatory
VTR	Visiting Team Report
VTR-IC	Visiting Team Report for Initial Candidacy
VTR-IA	Visiting Team Report for Initial Accreditation

NOTE: This appendix will be continually developed and expanded during the review and approval process for the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*.

First Reading Edition

Agenda Item H

DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NCARB INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (IDP) RELATED TO THE IDP REPORTING REQUIREMENT

During the March 7-8, 2014 NCARB Regional Summit, NCARB President Blake Dunn announced a potential change to the IDP reporting requirement known as the six-month rule.

The six-month rule requires interns to submit valid work experience in reporting periods of no longer than six months and within two months of completion. Any experience reported outside the two month submission window expires on a day for day basis and cannot be used for IDP credit.

This proposed change will allow interns to earn IDP credit for valid work experience not previously reported within the timeframe specified by the current reporting requirement. It would allow credit for intern experience that occurred up to five years beyond the current reporting requirements. Credit for experience beyond the reporting period would be valued at 50 percent for up to five years, after which any experience would be ineligible for credit.

On March 17, 2014, NCARB released a notice (attached) to Member Boards requesting input on the proposed change and providing a 90-day comment period, which ends on June 6, 2014. The NCARB Board of Directors will review submitted comments prior to voting on whether to approve the change at its June 18-21, 2014 meeting. If approved, the implementation of the change would become effective no later than January 1, 2015.

The PQC is asked to review the proposed change and provide its comments for consideration by the Board's Executive Committee and ratification by the Board.

Attachment

NCARB Notice Regarding Proposed Change to IDP Reporting Requirement

March 17, 2014

Dear Member Board Members and Member Board Executives:

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) is currently seeking Member Board comments on a proposed change to the Intern Development Program (IDP). This change specifically relates to the reporting requirement known as the “six-month reporting rule” for IDP credit. A detailed description of the proposed change is attached and is also posted on the Registration Board Section of the NCARB website.

Following this initial notice of the proposed change there will be a 90-day period for your Board to review and submit comments. We would greatly appreciate it if you would please take the opportunity to review the proposed change and provide your feedback. **The NCARB Board of Directors would like to hear from all Member Boards before they vote on the proposed changes.** To that end, please use the following questions as a guide when crafting your response:

- Does your Board agree, disagree, or have no position on the proposed change?
- If your Board disagrees, what are your concerns?
- Does your Board need more time to address the proposed change? If so, when do you expect to be able to provide us feedback?

All comments, including “no comments”, should be sent to the following address: mdp-comments@ncarb.org with a copy to khillegas@ncarb.org by 5:00 P.M. on Friday, June 6, 2014.

Blakely C. Dunn, AIA
President/Chair of the Board
El Dorado, Arkansas

Dale McKinney, FAIA
1st Vice President/President-Elect
Sioux City, Iowa

Dennis S. Ward, AIA
2nd Vice President
Florence, South Carolina

Margo P. Jones, AIA
Treasurer
Greenfield, Massachusetts

Kristine A. Harding, AIA
Secretary
Huntsville, Alabama

Ronald B. Blich, FAIA, FACHA
Past President
New Orleans, Louisiana

Christopher P. Williams, AIA
Director, Region 1
Meredith, New Hampshire

John R. Sorrenti, FAIA
Director, Region 2
Mineola, New York

Anne K. Smith, AIA
Director, Region 3
Savannah, Georgia

Terry L. Allers, AIA
Director, Region 4
Fort Dodge, Iowa

David L. Hoffman, FAIA
Director, Region 5
Wichita, Kansas

Gregory L. Erny, AIA
Director, Region 6
Reno, Nevada

Kathleen R. Nosbisch
Member Board Executive Director
Chester, Virginia

Lynn R. Axelroth
Public Director
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Michael J. Armstrong
Chief Executive Officer

Proposed Change to IDP Reporting Requirement

March 17, 2014

WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?

This proposed change will allow interns to earn IDP credit for valid work experience not previously reported within the timeframe specified by the reporting requirement. Currently interns must submit all experience in reporting periods of no longer than six months and within two months of completion of each reporting period. The proposed change would, *for the first time*, allow credit for intern experience that occurred up to five years beyond the current reporting requirements. Credit for experience beyond the reporting period would be valued at 50 percent for up to five years, after which any experience would be ineligible for credit.

WHY SHOULD THIS CHANGE BE IMPLEMENTED?

If adopted, interns will be able to earn IDP experience credit for valid work experience while still preserving the value of the Six-Month Rule. By preserving a 100 percent value for experience earned and reported within the reporting period, IDP participants will continue to be incentivized to comply with the reporting rule. In addition, this adjustment creates a parallel with the five-year rolling clock for honoring examination results, emphasizing a consistent position that activity along the licensure path maintains its value for five years.

The NCARB Board of Directors approved the following revisions to modify the IDP “Reporting Requirements” for Member Board comment:

Modify the IDP Guidelines, December 2013, page 9, Reporting Requirements, Paragraph 2 as follows:

“To earn full credit for experience, interns must submit all experience including supplemental experience in reporting periods of no longer than six months and within two months of completion of each reporting period.

- ~~• For each day past the two-month filing period, a day of acceptable experience will be lost at the beginning of the reporting period.~~*

Experience reported beyond the two-month filing period and up to five years after the date of the validated experience will be accepted at a reduced value of fifty percent (50 percent) toward the IDP requirements.

Rationale:

At the December 2013 Board of Directors meeting the Board engaged in a conversation about ways to improve the customer service experience regarding the IDP reporting rule. Currently, interns are only able to document experience in reporting periods of six months. The conversation was centered on ways to identify a reasonable and flexible solution to support the path to licensure while also continuing to endorse the value of timely reporting.

Proposed Changes to IDP Reporting Requirement

March 17, 2014

Page 2

In the nearly five years since the IDP Reporting Requirement was introduced, there has been significant compliance with this rule. Hundreds of thousands of intern experience reports have been submitted within the framework of this rule and a significant number of IDP stakeholders have reaffirmed that this rule is valuable and should remain intact. There are, however, a subset of customers that, for various reasons, have not complied with the rule and have lost experience hours as a result.

This proposed modification creates an alternative to allow the acceptance of hours for experience earned outside of the reporting requirement while still strongly incentivizing interns to comply with this rule. This modification caps the experience earned at a maximum of 5 years from the date of submission.

The NCARB Board will review comments from its Member Boards over the next 90 days, and place a formal vote on the change onto its June pre-Annual Meeting agenda. The timeline for implementation of this change, should it be approved, is anticipated to occur no later than 1 January 2015.