



MEETING MINUTES PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 25, 2018
SACRAMENTO

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

Committee Chair Tian Feng, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and Barry Williams called the roll.

Committee Members Present

Tian Feng, Chair
Raymond Cheng
Glenn Gall
Sylvia Kwan
Kirk Miller
Stephanie Silkwood
Barry Williams
Michael Zucker

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

Committee Members Absent

Betsey Dougherty
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice Chair
Ebony Lewis

Members of the Public Present

David Curtis
Nicki Dennis-Stephens, Executive Vice President, The American Institute of Architects (AIA) California Council

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)
Vickie Mayer, Assistant EO
Marccus Reinhardt, Manager, Examination + Licensing

Timothy Rodda, Examination/Licensing Analyst
Lily Dong, California Supplemental Examination Analyst
Ryan Booth, Continuing Education Analyst

B. CHAIR'S REMARKS AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Feng welcomed members of the public in attendance and invited them to sign in if they wanted their name included in the meeting minutes as attending. He advised the public there would be an opportunity to address the Committee during the meeting for each agenda item.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

David Curtis orated a detailed description of his 30+ years of educational and work experience relative to architecture and residential design as historical background for explaining his present situation. Mr. Curtis explained to the Committee that after a long break he is seeking to become licensed in California. However, he expressed frustration with the licensure process including the computer-based testing format of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) Architect Registration Examination (ARE), which he claimed is ridiculously flawed. He also expressed his frustration with the ARE Rolling Clock and the (perceived) limited path to receive a license.

Mr. Curtis stated he received a 2016 letter from the Board requesting for him to enroll in the NCARB Intern Development Program (IDP). He informed the members of his refusal to complete IDP based upon his many years of experience as a residential designer. Sylvia Kwan advised him there is an alternative route with the NCARB Architectural Experience Program (AXP) Portfolio. Marccus Reinhardt provided some clarification regarding specifics of the AXP Portfolio for Mr. Curtis and advised he read the AXP Guidelines for more information.

Due to time constraints, Mr. Curtis was offered an opportunity to advance his comments at a future meeting and a Board staff member would contact him.

D. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON OCTOBER 18, 2017 COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Feng asked for comments concerning the minutes of the October 18, 2017 Committee meeting.

- **Kirk Miller moved to approve the October 18, 2017 Committee meeting minutes.**

Raymond Cheng seconded the motion.

Members Cheng, Gall, Kwan, Miller, Silkwood, Zucker, and Chair Feng voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Williams abstained. Members Dougherty, Guitierrez, and Lewis were absent.

The motion passed 7-0-1.

E. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2017-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO REVISE THE *CANDIDATE HANDBOOK* TO REDUCE CANDIDATE CONFUSION

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee of the requirement and process changes that have occurred since the release of the 2007 *Candidate Handbook*. He added that staff reimagined the entire handbook and it follows a logical order based upon current processes. He noted the *Licensure Handbook* (the new title) must still receive a peer review by AIA emerging professionals and must be further reviewed by the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA) Legal Affairs Division before it would be ready for consideration by the Board. Mr. Reinhardt explained the format and layout of the Handbook and walked the members through each section. He mentioned the material is more focused on how candidates today move through the present process.

Glenn Gall suggested the Handbook also be reviewed by architects with less than five years of licensed experience. He suggested the Handbook make it clearer about the how the continuing education requirement applies to licensees who must renew shortly after being issued an initial license. Mr. Reinhardt explained that staff notify such licensees when they apply regarding the requirement, but that it could be emphasized in the Handbook too.

Ms. Silkwood agreed with Mr. Gall's suggestions and recommended expediting the schedule for release of the Handbook. She also recommended additional clarification of the Board and NCARB roles. Additionally, Ms. Silkwood suggested clarification of the purpose for the NCARB Certificate, whether it is required in California, and why a candidate might want one. She asked the Handbook clearly inform candidates that the approved foreign education evaluation services accepted by the Board are not acceptable to NCARB. Ms. Silkwood stated the Handbook is also unclear as written regarding which paths require eight years and suggested clarification throughout the related section of the Handbook.

Ms. Kwan expressed her fondness of the graphical timelines used in the prior handbook and asked they be included in the new one. Mr. Reinhardt said staff will work on incorporating the graphical timelines into the current draft and discuss at a future meeting. Mr. Cheng agreed with Ms. Kwan that the graphical process timelines will help candidates choose the best path for themselves. Ms. Silkwood commented that it could be beneficial to note the NCARB-approved exceptions to the ARE Rolling Clock, such

as military duty and pregnancy. She mentioned that cross-referencing information in the sidebars would also be helpful.

Mr. Feng asked if there were plans to eliminate mentioning reciprocity in the new handbook. Mr. Reinhardt responded that staff could add a section about reciprocity for candidates coming from other jurisdictions. He added the DCA publication design team will work on the cover and final layout of the Handbook.

Mr. Miller proposed the idea of adding the three elements of becoming an architect: education, experience, and examination (also known as the three Es). He mentioned separating out the three elements and further describing each. He suggested rewriting the work experience path to avoid confusing candidates regarding the length of experience required by the Board. Ms. Kwan agreed with Mr. Miller's suggestion. Mr. Williams agreed with the structural change to the content and noted that keeping the three Es in order would be more helpful for candidates. Mr. Miller added his comment on how the design limitations chart is confusing and needs to be more specific and have a clearer title.

Mr. Feng stated the structure of the new handbook needs to follow the prior one. He summarized that it needs to touch on NCARB certification, reciprocity in California, and include updated graphical timelines. Ms. Silkwood said the graphical timelines should not hold up the release of the Handbook. Mr. Reinhardt informed the Committee the Handbook is meant to be a living document released in a digital format easily updatable as necessary. In unison the Committee expressed a desire for the revised Handbook to be presented at the next Board meeting (in December). Mr. Reinhardt reminded the Committee the Handbook was to be reviewed by emerging professionals, licensees, and Legal Affairs before a draft could go to the Board.

Mr. Cheng asked if a candidate would find a draft of the Handbook on the Board's website. Mr. Reinhardt explained that the information is on the website, but it's not in one publication. Mr. Feng added he would like to see the new handbook published online and downloadable in PDF format soon.

- **Raymond Cheng moved to revise the Handbook as discussed and provide a revised draft to the Board members for their consideration at its next meeting.**

Glenn Gall seconded the motion.

Members Cheng, Gall, Kwan, Miller, Silkwood, Williams, and Zucker voted in favor of the motion. Members Dougherty, Guterrez, and Lewis were absent.

The motion passed 8-0.

F. REVIEW AND DISCUSS EXAMINATION PERFORMANCE STATISTICS FOR THE ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION (ARE) AND CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE)

Mr. Feng informed the Committee that staff researched performance data of required licensing examinations including the CSE. Mr. Reinhardt provided an overview explanation of the handouts containing ARE 4.0 and 5.0 performance data. He clarified the ARE data is for individuals who attended accredited California schools regardless of the jurisdiction for which they were authorized to test. Mr. Reinhardt added ARE 5.0 launched on November 1, 2016, and NCARB provided 2016 and 2017 data with 2018 data not being released until early-2019. He explained the data for the CSE which dates from 2006 and shows the several years before it transitioned to a computer-based format. He added the computer-based format data is for administrations from 2013-2017.

Mr. Miller requested including the national pass rate for the ARE for comparison in future reports. Mr. Miller inquired whether performance data for reciprocity could be made available to the Committee. Laura Zuniga replied that the reciprocity data for the CSE could be made available for the next meeting. She informed the Committee that DCA's Office of Professional Examination Services will provide a presentation on the examination development process and testing at the December 13, 2018 Board meeting.

Michael Zucker asked whether there is data regarding retiring architects for each year available to review. Mr. Reinhardt responded the profession is stable and the number of architects over a 15-year span has stayed fairly consistent at more than 21,000 architects. Mr. Miller asked if there was a way to collect data related to the number of licensees who are currently practicing architecture. Ms. Zuniga said staff would research the feasibility of collecting the data. Messrs. Zucker and Feng suggested perhaps the data could be obtained through a voluntary means such as survey.

Ms. Silkwood asked whether the exam is getting harder based upon the statistics provided to the Committee. Ms. Zuniga responded it is difficult to ascertain because there could be other factors outside of the Board's control. Mr. Reinhardt agreed with Ms. Zuniga's explanation and added that he spoke with the examination developer who confirmed it is how individual items on the examination perform that measure its effectiveness of discerning who meets minimum competency. Mr. Gall said that previously there were anchor items (items with reliable performance statistics) on the examination used from one iteration to another. He opined the links between exams are not being developed as in the past. Mr. Reinhardt explained the examination developer analyzes the performance of each item on the examination to assess whether it is viable to continue its use as a question.

Mr. Feng opined that based upon the provided performance data the CSE seems less difficult as a computer-based examination than when it was administered in an oral format. Ms. Kwan explained that humans administering the oral format may be subjective whereas the CSE as computer-based is more objective. Mr. Gall expressed his concerns for the oversight of the development and review process. Ms. Mayer explained the Board obtains subject matter experts (SMEs) for each phase of exam development. Lily Dong added that the goal is to assemble an equal mix of newly licensed architects (those licensed five years or less) and those with greater experience as SMEs. She said each development workshop is comprised of different SMEs with some exceptions depending on the type of workshop.

Mr. Feng asked staff to clarify content focus for the CSE. Ms. Mayer stated the content follows the 2014 Occupational Analysis and CSE Test Plan. Mr. Feng also asked with what frequency are workshops held to develop examination items. Ms. Mayer responded that workshops are held every two weeks. Ms. Dong followed with a more detailed explanation of the examination development process including the length of time required to construct a new form of the CSE. Mr. Feng asked whether the Board reviews the latest iteration of the ARE when developing the CSE. Mr. Reinhardt replied that the ARE is reviewed during an occupational analysis which is done every five to seven years.

Mr. Feng asked how many reciprocity candidates are taking the CSE and seeking a license. Ms. Dong responded the number constantly fluctuates and added that it appears the Board is experiencing an increase in reciprocity applications. Mr. Reinhardt said last year the Board licensed nearly 700 architects. Mr. Feng requested the examination performance data for reciprocity candidates during the past five years with a side-by-side comparison of initial licensure (in-state) candidates. Ms. Mayer and Zuniga said staff would provide the data starting with the November 2018 Monthly Report. Mr. Miller mentioned that in the past, the Board collected data of candidates who failed the CSE on the first attempt but passed on the second. Mr. Reinhardt responded that such information is available no longer.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.