



# CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger  
GOVERNOR

## S U M M A R Y   R E P O R T

### PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

February 28, 2011

Ontario, CA

#### Committee Members Present

Jeffrey Heller, Chair  
Raymond Cheng (arrived at 11:25 a.m.)  
Alan Cooper  
Betsey Olenick Dougherty  
Glenn Gall  
Pasqual Gutierrez  
Kevin Jensen  
Kirk Miller  
Paul Neel (arrived at 12:15 p.m.)  
Alan Rudy  
R.K. Stewart  
Barry Wasserman

#### Committee Members Absent

Jon Alan Baker  
Gordon Carrier  
Christine Lampert

#### Guests

Harry Falconer, Intern Development Program (IDP) Director, National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)  
Anne Laird-Blanton, President, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)  
Robert Kitamura, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Gilbert Perez, Fulox

#### Board Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer  
Justin Sotelo, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit  
Marccus Reinhardt, Examination/Licensing Analyst

Committee Chair Jeffrey Heller called the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) meeting to order at 10:20 a.m.

**A. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS' (NCARB) INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (IDP) 2.0 PRESENTATION**

NCARB IDP Director Harry Falconer provided a presentation to the PQC regarding the recent and upcoming changes to IDP as a result of IDP 2.0. Mr. Falconer began with a brief review of the major changes to IDP, such as: the development of the Supervisor Guidelines; the electronic Experience Verification Reporting (e-EVR) system; additional opportunities to earn credit; the conversion of training units to hours; revised definition of “direct supervision”; revised eligibility dates; etc. Additionally, Mr. Falconer also discussed the studies and surveys that had been conducted in order to update IDP.

Mr. Falconer explained that the first objective was to align the program with NCARB’s most recent practice analysis. He continued by stating that the practice of architecture has experienced many changes with regard to technology. Mr. Falconer also added that some of their studies indicated that mentors and supervisors were not being fully utilized and that they were many times just signing off on experience.

Mr. Falconer next explained the e-EVR system and how this new method of reporting helped modernize IDP. He explained that the new system enabled candidates to accurately and promptly report their experience to NCARB. Mr. Falconer next discussed the implementation of the Six-Month Rule. He explained that the change was needed as a result of interns submitting experience all at one time, which was causing processing delays. Mr. Falconer also explained the revised definition of ‘direct supervision,’ additional opportunities to earn credit, and how the full time and part time duration requirement (in order to start earning credit) had become more flexible.

Mr. Falconer discussed the Supervisor Guidelines. He explained that the document included the roles and expectations of supervisors when working with their interns. Barry Wasserman inquired whether the Guidelines were online; Mr. Falconer indicated that they were available on NCARB’s website. Kirk Miller asked if the Guidelines indicate that a supervisor must review or assess the competency of an intern. Mr. Falconer responded that it is the supervisor’s role to ensure that work is being performed competently and completely before signing off on experience. R.K. Stewart asked whether there was auditing of IDP records to ensure that supervisors are signing off appropriately. Mr. Falconer stated that presently there was not a specific audit of experience verification; however, he indicated that there was a review to ensure that dates and times were in order.

Mr. Falconer next discussed the revised IDP eligibility dates for interns and explained how interns would be gaining experience sooner. Alan Cooper asked whether retroactive experience would be accepted; Mr. Falconer indicated that it would not be accepted. Mr. Falconer also explained that interns would be allowed to gain experience for specific work settings after obtaining a high school diploma.

Next, Mr. Falconer explained Supplementary Education and how the requirement had changed for interns. For example, he stated that there were studies conducted comparing core competencies

and that modifications were made to the number of hours required in specific categories. Ms. Dougherty inquired whether overtime would be allowed. She indicated that previously, she had an intern who reported more than 40 hours per week and it was initially rejected; however, after writing to NCARB, the experience was accepted. Mr. Falconer indicated that overtime or work over the required amounts would no longer be an issue. Mr. Miller asked why The American Institute of Architects' (AIA) learning courses were not allowed for core units, while NCARB monographs were allowed. Mr. Falconer indicated that that was something NCARB could review. Mr. Cooper inquired whether interns could be allowed to get double credit for completing the Emerging Professional's Companion (EPC) as part of their education; Mr. Falconer indicated that it would not be allowed.

Mr. Falconer next discussed the mentor's role. Mr. Cooper inquired whether the role of the mentor is often fulfilled by the supervisor. Mr. Falconer indicated that, more often, the role was being fulfilled by the supervisor; however, it was recommended that they be separate individuals. He continued that there were now more strict guidelines in terms of who the mentor could be and what the role of the mentor is.

Mr. Falconer next explained the practice analysis and how it ensures that IDP is current with the profession. Mr. Heller asked who developed the practice analysis and who participated in the survey. Mr. Falconer indicated that approximately 20 NCARB-approved individuals worked on the development of the practice analysis; however, he was unsure who they were exactly. He further added that the practice analysis survey was sent out to over 50,000 professionals.

Mr. Falconer continued by stating that the development of the next practice analysis, expected to take place in 2012, would include the participation of many professional organizations.

Mr. Falconer next explained the changes being made to the different work settings in terms of the description of settings and the hours required. Mr. Falconer added that the practice analysis dictated those changes and the overall structure of IDP. Mr. Cooper asked whether NCARB would be soliciting feedback from supervisors regarding the program; Mr. Falconer indicated that NCARB was creating a survey to obtain feedback.

Mr. Heller thanked Mr. Falconer for his presentation and invited members to comment and/or ask additional questions. Glenn Gall asked for clarification on how individuals were contacted for the practice analysis survey; Mr. Falconer indicated that several professional organizations were contacted for lists of architects, and those individuals were then contacted.

Kevin Jensen noted that the practice analysis surveys practitioners to find out about the current state of the profession, but asked if there was a mechanism to check whether the profession itself was at an acceptable level. Mr. Falconer indicated that he would have to research that inquiry. Mr. Jensen asked if anyone outside of the profession would be surveyed in the future. Mr. Heller indicated that it would be up to the individual boards or professional organizations to make recommendations to NCARB regarding these specific changes. Mr. Falconer added that focus groups would be used to look at these types of issues.

Mr. Cooper stated that as an educator, he would like to see NCARB revisit the prohibition on double credit for the EPC and other similar programs, as it benefits educational institutions to teach these programs. Mr. Falconer indicated that changes are being made to allow credit for certain components of those programs.

Mr. Stewart inquired whether there was a change in the demographics of the profession. Mr. Falconer responded that he did not have specific numbers with him. However, he indicated that there were more individuals enrolling in and completing IDP and that more people were testing. He also added that with the implementation of the Six-Month Rule, more interns have enrolled in IDP and have been recording their experience consistently.

Raymond Cheng asked whether there was a way to ensure that supervisors were up to date with their knowledge and imparting that knowledge to interns in an effective manner. Mr. Falconer responded that architects have a professional responsibility to stay up to date with current practice, and that it is both the licensee and intern's responsibility to share knowledge and be up to date with technology, etc.

Mr. Heller asked that staff compile the comments that were provided during the discussion so that NCARB could have a record of the Board's intent.

Pasqual Gutierrez commented that as a supervisor, his experience with interns and the IDP process has been very positive. He added that the components of IDP are essential to developing an experienced intern.

#### **\*D. UPDATE ON THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, CALIFORNIA COUNCIL'S ACADEMY FOR EMERGING PROFESSIONALS' 2011 ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION SUMMIT**

Doug McCauley reported that Board staff had met with members of the Academy for Emerging Professionals (AEP) in September 2010 regarding their proposed education summit. He stated that there was discussion regarding the benefit to students, the relationship with the Board, and the Board's prior efforts with regard to architectural education.

Anne Laird-Blanton then provided an update on the AEP's January 2011 planning meeting for the summit. She provided the names of the attendees and the organizations that they represented. She then stated that California needs to continue to supply licensed architects and that the majority of these professionals should be coming from California schools. She also added that the diversity of the State should be reflected in the profession.

Ms. Laird-Blanton then identified areas that the summit would be addressing, such as outreach to community colleges. She added that at the next planning meeting, there would be further discussion on who would be attending the summit, what would be addressed, and what future goals should be established. She also added that the summit would be addressing the perceived barriers to the profession and possible solutions to those problems.

Paul Neel stated that he had previous experience with educational outreach, specifically with high schools and community colleges. He stated that it was important to not only speak with students regarding the profession, but to also speak with counselors, and everyone else involved.

Ms. Laird-Blanton agreed, and indicated that speaking with counselors was one of their outreach goals.

Mr. Cooper stated that he would like to urge educators to participate in self-examination, and to try not to place blame on other institutions. He stated that not all educators are preparing students for the complexities of the profession. Ms. Laird-Blanton responded that it was not the intent of the summit to assign blame, but to reach a common goal of improving awareness of the profession.

Mr. Jensen noted that NCARB and other organizations have awards for academic achievement. He suggested that this could be a way of encouraging more development in academic curriculum. He also added that educational institutions should attempt to include more practice of architecture into the classroom.

Mr. Heller thanked Ms. Laird-Blanton for her presentation. He then noted that this issue was important to the Board and that it was looking forward to being involved with the summit.

## **B. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE COMPREHENSIVE INTERN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

In response to Mr. Falconer's presentation on IDP 2.0, the extensive discussion, and the noted major improvements and updates to the program, Mr. Gutierrez offered to make a motion regarding the Board's Comprehensive Intern Development Program (CIDP) to address this agenda item.

*Pasqual Gutierrez moved to recommend the suspension of CIDP and to make IDP the sole program for documenting intern experience for California candidates.*

*Betsey Dougherty seconded the motion.*

Mr. Stewart stated that he would like to get input from staff regarding the effects of CIDP. Mr. McCauley responded that there have not been a large number of California candidates who have completed CIDP and who have become licensed. Ms. Dougherty asked if there was a large number of individuals who applied before the requirement was implemented; Mr. McCauley indicated that there was a large number of applicants before the implementation date. Mr. Heller commented that when CIDP was first developed, it was an effort to improve the intern experience, that the changes to IDP mirror those efforts, and that that was a positive sign.

*Kirk Miller moved to amend the motion to recommend that the CIDP suspension coincide with the complete implementation of IDP 2.0, and that the suspension be re-evaluated after one year.*

*Alan Cooper seconded the motion.*

Mr. Cooper also stated that he would like to see a survey of IDP when the CIDP suspension is re-evaluated.

Mr. Stewart asked about potential impact to candidates and indicated that it seemed as though candidates could lose some credit. Mr. Falconer noted that CIDP records are not sent to NCARB. Marccus Reinhardt stated that IDP and CIDP are two separate programs, and that reporting for these programs is separate. He clarified that since the programs are separate, there would be no

loss of IDP credit. Vickie Mayer stated that candidates who are required to complete CIDP are also required to complete IDP.

Mr. Stewart also suggested that the Board remain engaged with NCARB regarding the future content of IDP.

Mr. Heller called for a vote on the amended motion.

*The motion passed 12-0.*

**C. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE MAY 22, 2009 PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT**

The PQC reviewed the May 22, 2009 meeting summary report.

*Kirk Miller moved to approve the May 22, 2009 PQC meeting summary report.*

*Kevin Jensen seconded the motion.*

*The motion passed 12-0.*

**\*E. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION**

Justin Sotelo presented this agenda item and provided an update on the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). He explained the process that the Board had undergone in transitioning the CSE from an oral to a computer-delivered format. He stated that the new CSE format was launched on February 1 and that the new examination consisted of two sections (Project Scenario and General). He further explained that the examination consisted of approximately 100 multiple-choice questions and some additional items for the purpose of pre-testing (nonscoreable items).

Mr. Cooper inquired whether there was a way to thank the oral examination commissioners for their hard work and dedication over the years. Mr. McCauley indicated that a certificate signed by the Governor was being provided to the commissioners thanking them for their service.

Ms. Mayer also added that there would be an article in the Board newsletter regarding the CSE transition. Mr. Miller stated that he would like to continue seeing examination pass rates provided in the newsletter.

**F. UPDATE ON CALIFORNIA'S CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE) REQUIREMENT**

Mr. Sotelo presented this agenda item. He explained that the final phased in implementation of the Senate Bill 1608 requirement took effect on January 1, requiring that all California architects complete five hours of CE on disability access requirements every biennial renewal cycle.

Mr. Cooper inquired as to what occurred with the bill that proposed a comprehensive CE requirement. Mr. McCauley explained that the bill had been vetoed by the Governor. Ms. Laird-Blanton then stated that she believed AIA would be proposing new CE legislation.

#### **G. UPDATE ON NCARB ACTIONS WITH REGARD TO CE**

Mr. McCauley presented this agenda item. He discussed the differences in CE requirements among the U.S. jurisdictions and explained that NCARB was working on a CE model with recommended standards for all states to follow. He further explained that this effort would provide uniformity among the states, which would in turn facilitate reciprocity.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

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