

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

March 12, 2015

Long Beach, CA

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

Board President Jon Alan Baker called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and Board Vice President, Pasqual Gutierrez, called roll.

Board Members Present

Jon Alan Baker, President
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice President
Tian Feng, Secretary
Denise Campos
Sylvia Kwan
Ebony Lewis
Matthew McGuinness
Barry Williams

Board Member Absent

Nilza Serrano

Guests Present

Andrew Bowden, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)
Mark Donahue, Undergraduate Comprehensive Design Coordinator, Academy of Art University
Bruno Giberti, Associate Department Head, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo(Cal Poly San Luis Obispo)
Michael Hricak, Professor, University of Southern California
Kurt Hunker, Graduate Architecture Program Chair, NewSchool of Architecture and Design (NewSchool)
Mitra Kanaani, Professor of Architecture, NewSchool
Atlas Umber Kazmi, Professor, American Board of Architecture (ABA)
Sarah Lorenzen, Chair of Architecture, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (Cal Poly Pomona)
Todd Lynch, Professor, Department of Architecture and Urban Design, University of California, Los Angeles
Norman Millar, Dean, School of Architecture, Woodbury University (Woodbury)
Marc Neveu, Ph.D., Chair, Architecture Department, Woodbury
Ashley Pourat, Center for Public Interest Law, University of San Diego

Christine Theodoropoulos, Dean, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo
Sheran Voigt, Past President, California Architects Board

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, LATC
Justin Sotelo, Program Manager, Administration/Enforcement
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst
Robert Carter, Architect Consultant
Rebecca Bon, Staff Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs

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

B. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Mr. Baker welcomed two new Board members - Ebony Lewis and Barry Williams.
Doug McCauley administered the Oath of Office to Ms. Lewis and Mr. Williams.

Mr. Baker recognized former Board member, Sheran Voigt, who served on the Board from 2006 until 2014. Ms. Voigt also served as Board President in 2013 and 2014.

Mr. Baker also:

- recognized LATC member, Andrew Bowden in attendance;
- announced that the meeting will be webcast;
- advised the Board that all motions and seconds shall be repeated for the record; and
- announced that representatives from schools of architecture are in attendance and that school reports will be provided under Agenda Items H.2 and H.3.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Atlas Umber Kazmi identified herself and announced her presence to represent the ABA and Adroit School of Architecture (Adroit).

Kurt Cooknick expressed a desire for the Board to include the issue of intern titling in its strategic planning discussions. He also stated that AIACC wishes to discuss the issue with the Board when appropriate. Mr. McCauley informed Mr. Cooknick that all Board members received a copy of AIACC's letter regarding intern titling, dated March 4, 2015. He advised that the matter may be discussed as it relates to the Board's Strategic Plan (under Agenda Item F), but noted it is not formally agendaized. Therefore, Mr. McCauley advised the Board that substantive policy considerations concerning intern titling may not be discussed at this meeting.

D. APPROVE DECEMBER 10-11, 2014 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Baker asked for comments concerning the December 10-11, 2014, Board Meeting Minutes.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to approve the December 10-11, 2014, Board Meeting Minutes.**

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, McGuinness, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Members Lewis and Williams abstained from voting. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 6-0-2.

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Mr. McCauley announced the next Board meetings will be held on June 10, 2015 in San Diego, September 10, 2015 in San Francisco, and December 10-11, 2015 in Sacramento.

Mr. McCauley spoke about the new department-wide business system known as BreEZe, and its effect on the Board's budget. He reported that BreEZe's implementation is ongoing, currently in phase two of a three-phase process. Mr. McCauley advised that BreEZe will bring to the Board additional operating costs, but those precise costs are unknown at the present time.

Mr. McCauley reported that Board members were sent Liaison Program reminders in February. He explained to new Board members that the Liaison Program is an important tool used by the Board to conduct environmental scans to understand ongoing developments in the marketplace, and inform the Strategic Planning process.

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that it is in the early stages of its latest California Supplemental Examination (CSE) development process. He advised that an Occupational Analysis (OA) was completed and focus groups were conducted. Mr. McCauley reported that the Board is now in the process of conducting a review of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) and a linkage study. He informed the Board that a panel of subject matter experts will soon convene to commence the linkage study.

Mr. McCauley spoke about the importance of the Board being proactive in its communications about the CSE to promote an efficient licensure process. He reported that in January 2015, he delivered outreach presentations alongside the Board's Examination/Licensing Analyst and in conjunction with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) Internship + Education Manager, Martin Smith. Mr. McCauley also reported on recent interactions with AIACC's Academy for Emerging Professionals. He advised that important topics were discussed, including the issues of intern titling and overhauling the current eight-year licensure model.

Mr. McCauley spoke about the Board's enforcement program and announced that the unit closed a record 44 cases in the month of February.

Mr. McCauley spoke about the Sunset Review process and informed the Board that the Sunset Review hearing will be held on March 18, 2015. He reviewed topics that are expected to be discussed at the hearing, and outlined suggested responses to issues concerning 1) out-of-state

travel, 2) pro-rata, 3) BreEZe, 4) licensure issues, 5) restrictions regarding the Board's use of the NCARB disciplinary database information sharing in reciprocity, and 6) citations. He noted these topics will likely be reflected in the Board's written response to the Legislature.

- **Denise Campos moved to 1) authorize the President and Vice President to work with the Executive Officer to prepare the final Sunset Review responses, 2) convey the responses to the Legislature at the March 18, 2015 hearing, 3) memorialize the responses in writing within 30 days of the hearing, and 4) ratify the responses at the June Board meeting.**

Matthew McGuinness seconded the motion.

Ms. Kwan inquired about the committee that will be conducting the Sunset Review hearing. Mr. McCauley indicated that the presentation will be provided to a joint meeting of the Assembly Committee on Business and Professions and Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development. Mr. McGuinness asked for an update on the BreEZe system, to which Mr. McCauley noted that this will be a topic for DCA's component of the Sunset Review hearing. He explained that more information about BreEZe will become available after the hearing, but the Board remains in "phase 3" of the roll-out. It is unclear at this time how DCA will execute the implementation.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. McCauley presented legislative items and suggested a position of support for proposed AIACC legislation concerning professional architectural corporations. Mr. Baker expressed discomfort about the Board taking positions on matters which have not been formally introduced to the Legislature and assigned a bill number. Mr. McCauley, therefore, suggested updating the Board on AIACC's proposed legislation at the June meeting.

F. REVIEW AND APPROVE DRAFT 2015-2016 STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. McCauley explained why the Board chose to adopt a two-year Strategic Plan model at the December 2014 Strategic Planning session. He indicated that the goal was to better enable the Board to identify more robust forward-thinking objectives.

Mr. McCauley identified new objectives of the Plan, including Goal 1 - evaluate the profession in order to identify entry barriers for diverse groups, Goal 2 - monitor legislation requiring architects of record to perform construction observation, and; and review the Board's OA to identify marketplace trends that impact consumer protection, Goal 3 - recruit an additional architect consultant for succession planning purposes, and monitor NCARB action on the intern titling effort to ensure appropriate consumer protection, and Goal 6 - objective to analyze fees to determine whether they are appropriate.

- **Matthew McGuinness moved to approve the draft 2015-2016 Strategic Plan.**

Denise Campos seconded the motion.

Ms. Kazmi asked why California’s non-National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)-accredited architecture programs are excluded from Goal 1’s objective of collaboration with schools to establish and promote an “accelerated path to architectural licensure (APAL).” Mr. McCauley explained that the Board is reflecting NCARB’s national efforts on this initiative. Mr. Gutierrez explained that the objective was designed to allow the Board to focus on national elements of the conversation, rather than state or local elements. He also explained that a deeper discussion concerning her query will take place under Agenda Item H.

Mr. Feng asked for further clarification of Ms. Kazmi’s question, to which Ms. Kazmi explained that, in her view, the Board should consider collaborating with non-NAAB-accredited programs, including Adroit. Mr. Gutierrez reiterated that the objective’s purpose is to allow the Board to focus on the national conversation concerning APAL.

Dean Norman Millar noted that UC Berkeley’s undergraduate programs in architecture are non-NAAB-accredited, while the university’s graduate programs in architecture are NAAB-accredited. He advised that many non-accredited programs are recognized as legitimate pathways into NAAB-accredited programs.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Baker suggested waiting until the June 2015 meeting for the Board to discuss the issue of intern titling and its incorporation into the Strategic Plan. He said that by then NCARB may release the findings from the Future Title Task Force.

G. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB)

Mr. McCauley discussed proposed changes to the Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards bylaws, and resolutions that will be acted upon at the 2015 NCARB Regional Summit.

Mr. McCauley explained that Resolution 2015-A would remove provisions concerning minimum alternatives to NCARB’s education requirement for its Broadly Experienced Architect Program. Messrs. Baker and Gutierrez opined that the proposed amendments are contrary to the spirit of California’s “multiple pathways” approach to licensure. Mr. Feng expressed a desire to know how other jurisdictions feel about the proposed amendments before taking a position. Mr. Millar encouraged the Board to defend its beliefs pertaining to degree requirements and licensure. Mr. Baker suggested the Board take an “oppose unless amended” position on the resolution, and gauge other boards’ opinions about this resolution. Todd Lynch, a member of the public, added his support for an oppose position. Mr. Gutierrez stated that the Board’s rationale for a potential position to oppose NCARB’s proposal would be the exclusion of a significant percentage of California’s licensed architects from the Broadly Experienced Architect program.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to oppose, unless amended, Resolution 2015-A.**

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. McCauley explained that Resolution 2015-B would remove the current experience requirement for certification of foreign architects. He further explained that the Resolution would stipulate that foreign architects must 1) document completion of the Intern Development Program (IDP), and 2) pass the ARE; the same standard used for the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect (BEFA) program. Mr. Baker opined that the Resolution is sensible and supportable.

The Board discussed the matter of requiring foreign practitioners to take the ARE. Mr. Baker explained that the United States has regulatory, environmental, and legal requirements of which foreign individuals must demonstrate an understanding before providing services. He noted that a foreign individual would need to satisfy CSE requirements in addition to the ARE if that individual desired to practice in California. Mr. Gutierrez shared that the ARE is now completely restructured and tests the application of knowledge in a way that the previous version, ARE 4.0, did not. Mr. McGuinness agreed that a foreign architect should first pass the ARE if he or she desires to practice in the United States. Mr. Baker noted there is time available to explore NCARB's reasoning behind the proposed language for Resolution 2015-B.

Mitra Kanaani, a member of the public, recalled reviewing several hundred foreign architect applications through the Education Evaluation Services for Architects. She indicated that these applications are typically deficient in understanding United States law and regulations. Ms. Campos expressed her support for the requirement for foreign architects to take and pass the ARE, but questioned the removal of provisions concerning the BEFA program, specifically a requirement for interviews to be conducted in English without the assistance of a translator. Ms. Lewis also expressed concern about the potential lack of translation services for individuals who may need assistance during testing.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to watch Resolution 2015-B.**

Barry Williams seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. McCauley explained that Resolution 2015-C would amend the current bylaws to create a public member position on the NCARB Board. He noted that California sponsored a similar NCARB resolution in the past.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to support Resolution 2015-C.**

Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

No discussion or action was taken on proposed amendments to the Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards Bylaws and candidates for elections.

H. ACCELERATED PATH TO ARCHITECTURAL LICENSURE (APAL)

Mr. Gutierrez updated the Board on the national APAL initiative. He also announced that representatives from schools will now deliver presentations on their proposals. Mr. Gutierrez indicated that the Board's regulations currently allow candidates to take the ARE when they have completed five years of education and/or experience, or a combination thereof. He asked the schools to identify the proposed examination eligibility point in the schools' APAL programs.

Mr. Millar and Marc Neveu provided the Board with a detailed presentation that outlined two curricula Woodbury is considering implementing. Presented were an integrative six-year Bachelor of Architecture (BArch) program and a corresponding four-year Master of Architecture (MArch) program. Mr. Millar proposed to make the ARE available to students in year four of the BArch program, and after year two of the MArch program.

Kurt Hunker presented NewSchool's vision for APAL and also outlined four-year and six-year architecture programs. Mr. Hunker explained that his proposal should remain flexible enough to absorb upcoming changes to the ARE.

Ms. Kwan asked about the breadth of students' experiences at firms during summer months. Mr. Millar advised that it would ultimately depend on the student and the firm. He indicated that the goal is to have direct engagement between Woodbury's career counselors and faculty, and architecture firms to gauge the curriculum's strength. Mr. Millar noted further discussion about the subject is needed. Mr. Neveu pointed out that Ms. Kwan's concern would still be valid if students completed IDP post-graduation. Ms. Kwan asked if Woodbury's proposed MArch program represents four years of additional studies after the BArch program is complete. Mr. Millar explained that the three-year program is designed for individuals who did not complete a "4+2" program in architectural studies. Mr. Neveu noted that the three-year MArch, which Woodbury would have as a four-year degree to facilitate APAL, is still shorter than if a candidate completed a three-year degree and completed IDP afterward.

The Board discussed the current state of the profession in California, including the lack of gender and racial balance, and spoke about the level of collaboration between the Board and schools that may be needed as schools coordinate and implement their proposed APAL programs.

Mr. Millar asked why NCARB is leading the effort to develop APAL programs in California. Mr. Baker explained it would be problematic for individual jurisdictions to do so independently, noting that reciprocity issues would then become more complex. He noted that NCARB's leadership is necessary for APAL to be developed in a way that all jurisdictions participate in the process and accept the degrees/experience for licensure.

Ms. Kazmi provided the Board with a detailed presentation about the ABA and Adroit. She alleged that Board staff does not know who sets the cut score and writes examination items for the ARE. Ms. Kazmi explained that ABA is a pilot program that was established as an alternative to NAAB's accreditation system. She spoke about ABA's mission, objectives, internal structure, and examination system. During the presentation, Ms. Kazmi stated that her students believe only 10% of professional architectural skills are learned through NAAB-

accredited degree programs according to a survey she conducted. She asked why the Board is supporting an accreditation system that does not appear to work. Ms. Kazmi also criticized ARE examination content as inappropriate and unnecessary. She noted that California is one of several states in the nation that does not require a candidate for licensure to possess a NAAB-accredited degree, and asked the Board to support ABA's alternative licensing pathway.

Mr. Baker provided clarity on what appeared to be several misstatements made by Ms. Kazmi during her presentation. He stated that information about who sets the cut-off score and who writes exam questions are available. Mr. Baker informed that ARE writers are all practicing architects. He also informed that the examination's cut-off score is set by the Committee on Examination under NCARB supervision. Mr. Baker stated that external examination development consultants help to establish scientific criteria for examination items, and explained that, on the whole, highly experienced and talented people volunteer their time to create the ARE. Mr. Millar also commented that there appeared to be several misleading facts in Ms. Kazmi's presentation.

Ms. Kazmi contended that schools of architecture may not need dual accreditation systems. She informed the Board that accreditation fees cost schools approximately \$100,000 per year, and suggested bringing that cost down by taking it out of students' tuition.

Ms. Kwan told Ms. Kazmi that the profession is naturally progressing toward APAL and asked if Adroit would consider following the same path as all other schools while focusing on its unique approach to architectural education. Ms. Kazmi advised that Adroit is preparing its students for success on the ARE 5.0. She questioned the validity of current exams, and the content of curriculum currently being taught to architecture students.

Mr. Feng asked for clarity about the distinction between ABA and Adroit. Ms. Kazmi explained that ABA is a non-profit entity with a mission to create a new examination and establish a new accreditation system, while Adroit is a private for-profit school. She also explained to the Board that ABA, as an Internal Revenue Code 501(c)(6) organization, may accredit schools of architecture in the same way NAAB accredits schools. Ms. Kazmi acknowledged that ABA is not authorized to issue accreditation by the United States Department of Education.

Ms. Campos asked if Adroit students understand that ABA's accreditation system is different from the proposed APAL programs. Ms. Kazmi responded that prospective students are informed that Adroit is not NAAB-accredited, and that licensure in California - as well as in 14 other states - is possible. She informed the Board that her students are told that to practice in any other state, they must complete a NAAB-accredited graduate program.

Mr. Feng asked if ABA is authorized to accredit schools of architecture nationwide, to which Ms. Kazmi answered in the affirmative. Mr. Baker explained that NAAB's validation comes from licensing boards' acceptance of its accreditation as evidence of a quality degree program. He stressed that ABA's mission to create a new examination and to be recognized by licensing boards is a major undertaking. Mr. Baker explained that several years of complex work will be required by ABA to demonstrate to the Board that its accreditation is valid and ensures that students, upon completion of licensure requirements, can provide services to consumers in a manner that protects the public health, safety, and welfare. He expressed support for the idea of creating a new school of architecture, but echoed Ms. Kwan's suggestion of first establishing credibility within the existing system before attempting to reform it. Ms. Kazmi opined it is

possible to create a new accreditation system in her timeframe of two to five years. Mr. Baker believed it unrealistic to expect a licensing board to issue someone a license to practice architecture and provide services to consumers without ABA first having a track record or a convincing demonstration that it is a successful accrediting program.

Ms. Kazmi advised that her purpose is to introduce the program and to gauge the Board's view of ABA as an improved path to licensure. She stated that the Board's options are to either continue graduating people under the current system who do not have sufficient knowledge, or to consider a new accreditation option that exists in ABA.

Ms. Kwan stated there is no problem with wanting to reform the current system, but she encouraged Ms. Kazmi to work to improve the current system from within. Ms. Kazmi stated that she has been doing this work for 10 years and, therefore, does understand the current system.

Mr. Gutierrez thanked Ms. Kazmi for sharing her vision and ideas with the Board.

- **Pasqual Gutierrez moved to take a watch position on the Adroit School of Architecture.**
- **Tian Feng moved to ratify the position communicated by the EO to the Adroit School of Architecture in the letter dated February 2, 2015.**

Rebecca Bon advised the Board to first address Mr. Gutierrez's motion. She also advised that there typically is no need to ratify a letter.

Matthew McGuinness seconded Pasqual Gutierrez's motion.

Ms. Campos expressed discomfort with Adroit's use of the term "License Upon Graduation" (LUG) in its marketing materials, and stated that it misleads the consumer. Ms. Kazmi disagreed. Mr. Baker noted that Adroit's use of LUG is misleading because APAL programs are not yet approved and only state boards license architects. He explained that, in fact, no school may offer "licensure upon graduation" because state boards have not yet authorized APAL programs to do so; it is simply a concept being explored at this stage. Mr. Gutierrez reiterated that Adroit students will not be precluded from earning a license to practice architecture in California because the State does not require a degree from a NAAB-accredited program.

Mr. Baker advised Ms. Kazmi to avoid making promises to prospective students about Adroit's ability to issue a so-called LUG until the school can deliver them. He also expressed discomfort with the conflict of interest that appears to exist between ABA and Adroit. Ms. Kazmi clarified that LUG is Adroit's marketing tagline.

Members Gutierrez, Campos, Kwan, and McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. President Baker was opposed. Members Feng, Lewis, and Williams abstained from voting. Member Serrano was absent. The motion failed 4-1-3.

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that its Supporting Position Statement for an additional pathway to licensure was adopted in September 2014. He recommended amendments to the document title and subsequent amendments within the Statement text concerning references to APAL. Mr. Gutierrez read the Statement with proposed amendments.

- **Matthew McGuinness moved to approve the amendments to the Supporting Position Statement.**
Denise Campos seconded the motion.

The Board continued discussions with the public about participating APAL school proposals that will be submitted to NCARB, and the logistics of changing the early entry point for eligibility to begin taking the ARE.

Members Gutierrez, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Feng was opposed. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 7-1.

I. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR), TITLE 16, SECTION 109 (FILING OF APPLICATIONS) AS IT RELATES TO THE REFERENCE OF THE CURRENT EDITION OF INTERNSHIP IN ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM

Marcus Reinhardt advised the Board that its regulations currently reference an outdated edition of the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authority (CALA) *Internship in Architecture Program (IAP) Manual*. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Board that approval is required to initiate the regulatory process to amend CCR section 109(b)(2), which would update the regulation's CALA *IAP Manual* reference to the most recent January 2012 edition.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to approve the proposed regulations to amend CCR section 109 provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and delegate authority to the EO to adopt the regulations and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.**

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

J. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CCR, TITLE 16, SECTION 109 (FILING OF APPLICATIONS) AND SECTION 111 (REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS) AS IT RELATES TO THE REFERENCE OF THE REVISED APPLICATION FOR ELIGIBILITY EVALUATION

Mr. Reinhardt advised the Board that section 115.4 of the Business and Professions Code now requires the Board, on or after July 1, 2016, to expedite or, when applicable, assist the initial licensure process for a candidate who supplies satisfactory evidence to the Board they have served as an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States and were honorably discharged. He directed the Board's attention to changes in the Application for Eligibility Evaluation, which include (but are not limited to) updating the name of the application in regulation, and standardizing language and layout to meet current web accessibility standards. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Board that approval is required to incorporate these changes into CCR sections 109(b)(3) and 111.

Mr. Baker clarified that the proposed regulatory changes do not exempt veterans from taking the CSE, but they do allow veterans' applications to be expedited.

- **Matthew McGuinness moved to approve the proposed regulations to amend CCR sections 109 and 111 provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and delegate authority to the EO to adopt the regulations and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.**

Denise Campos seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

K. UPDATE ON FEBRUARY 10-11, 2015 LATC MEETING

Trish Rodriguez briefed the Board on the activities of most recent LATC meeting held at Cal Poly Pomona. Ms. Rodriguez reported that the draft LATC Sunset Review Report was approved at the prior LATC meeting in September, and that an update concerning the Report was provided to the LATC at its February meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez also reported that the LATC was presented with draft *Disciplinary Guidelines*, and staff will collaborate with Board staff to prepare a regulatory package designed to update those guidelines. She noted the regulatory package and draft *Disciplinary Guidelines* are anticipated to be presented to the Board at its June meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez reported that the LATC received an update on 2015 Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards election nominations. She informed the Board that the Office of Professional Examination Services presented the LATC's linkage study results Ms. Rodriguez also reported that the LATC was directed to appoint a work group to review its UC Extension Certificate programs.

Ms. Rodriguez reported that the LATC discussed Strategic Plan objectives, including those of expanding eligibility requirements to allow credit for teaching under a licensed landscape architect, and reciprocity requirements of other states to determine possible changes to California requirements to improve efficiencies. She informed the Board that the LATC met for a second day to conduct its Strategic Planning Session.

L. CLOSED SESSION – DISCIPLINARY DECISIONS AND EXAM DEVELOPMENT ISSUES [CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126(C)(1) AND (3)]

The Board went into closed session to consider possible action on the:

- Closed Session Minutes of the December 10, 2014 Board meeting; and
- Proposed enforcement decisions and stipulations.

M. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE

Mr. McCauley announced that the next Board meetings will be held on June 10, 2015 in San Diego, September 10, 2015 in San Francisco, and December 10-11, 2015 in Sacramento.

N. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Baker asked for a motion to adjourn.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to adjourn the meeting.**

Barry Williams seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent. The motion passed 8-0.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.