



Professional Qualifications Committee
April 18, 2019



NOTICE OF MEETING

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

April 18, 2019

**Sequoia Room
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 109A
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7220 (Board office)**

Professional Qualifications Committee Members

Pasqual Gutierrez, Chair
Barry L. Williams, Vice Chair
Raymond Cheng
Betsey Olenick Dougherty
Tian Feng
Glenn Gall
Kirk Miller
Stephanie Silkwood

The Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC or Committee) will hold a meeting as noted above.

AGENDA

10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

(or until completion of business)

Action may be taken on any item listed below on the agenda.

- A. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of a Quorum
- B. Chair’s Procedural Remarks and Committee Member Introductory Comments
- C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
The Committee may not discuss or act on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Board’s next Strategic Planning session and/or place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).
- D. Review and Possible Action on October 25, 2018 PQC Meeting Minutes
- E. Discuss and Possible Action on 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objectives to:
 - 1. Amend Existing Law Regarding Continuing Education Requirements for License Renewal to Reflect the Evolving Practice
 - 2. Provide Licensees the Opportunity to Submit Continuing Education Documentation Online to Increase Efficiency in License Renewal

(Continued on reverse side)

3. Conduct an Occupational Analysis of the Profession to Reflect Current Practice
4. Review and Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 2, Article 3, Section 117 (Experience Evaluation) and Related Regulations to Reflect Current Licensing Requirements

F. Adjournment

Action may be taken on any item on the agenda. The time and order of agenda items are subject to change at the discretion of the Committee Chair and may be taken out of order. The meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier or later than posted in this notice. In accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, all meetings of the Committee are open to the public. The Committee plans to webcast the meeting on its website at www.cab.ca.gov. Webcast availability cannot be guaranteed due to limitations on resources or technical difficulties. If you wish to participate or to have a guaranteed opportunity to observe, please plan to attend at the physical location.

Government Code section 11125.7 provides the opportunity for the public to address each agenda item during discussion or consideration by the Committee prior to it taking any action on said item. Members of the public will be provided appropriate opportunities to comment on any issue before the Committee, but the Committee Chair may, at their discretion, apportion available time among those who wish to speak. Individuals may appear before the Committee to discuss items not on the agenda; however, the Committee can neither discuss nor take official action on these items at the time of the same meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting:

Person: Timothy Rodda

Telephone: (916) 575-7217

Email: timothy.rodde@dca.ca.gov

Telecommunications Relay Service: Dial 711

Mailing Address:

California Architects Board

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105

Sacramento, CA 95834

Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the 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 Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of a Quorum

Roll will be called by the Professional Qualifications Committee Vice Chair.

Committee Roster

Pasqual Gutierrez, Chair

Barry Williams, Vice Chair

Raymond Cheng

Betsey Dougherty

Tian Feng

Glenn Gall

Kirk Miller

Stephanie Silkwood



BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS • CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834
P (916) 574-7220 | F (916) 575-7283 | www.cab.ca.gov



Agenda Item B Chair's Procedural Remarks & Committee Member Introductory Comments

The Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) Chair will review the scheduled PQC actions and make appropriate announcements. PQC members will then make their introductory comments, if any.

Professional Qualifications Committee Meeting
April 18, 2019
Sacramento, CA



BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS • CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834
P (916) 574-7220 | F (916) 575-7283 | www.cab.ca.gov



Agenda Item C Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

The Committee may not discuss or act on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Board's next Strategic Planning session and/or place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

Professional Qualifications Committee Meeting
April 18, 2019
Sacramento, CA



Agenda Item D Review and Possible Action on October 25, 2018 PQC Meeting Minutes

The Committee is asked to review and take possible action on the minutes of the October 25, 2018 PQC meeting.

Attachment

October 25, 2018 PQC Meeting Minutes (Draft)

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
Marcus 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.



Agenda Item E Discuss and Possible Action on 2019–2021 Strategic Plan Objectives to:

1. Amend Existing Law Regarding Continuing Education Requirements for License Renewal to Reflect the Evolving Practice
2. Provide Licensees the Opportunity to Submit Continuing Education Documentation Online to Increase Efficiency in License Renewal
3. Conduct an Occupational Analysis of the Profession to Reflect Current Practice
4. Review and Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 2, Article 3, Section 117 (Experience Evaluation) and Related Regulations to Reflect Current Licensing Requirements

Agenda Item E.1 Amend Existing Law Regarding Continuing Education Requirements for License Renewal to Reflect the Evolving Practice

The Board's 2019–2021 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Professional Qualifications Committee to amend the existing law regarding continuing education (CE) requirements for license renewal to reflect the evolving practice.

At its December 14, 2018 strategic planning session, the Board discussed expanding the CE requirements for license renewal to reflect the evolving practice of architecture. Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5600.05 requires licensees to complete five hours of coursework on disability access requirements within the previous two years prior to license renewal.

The Board members discussed expanding CE with the idea of evolving practice criteria paralleling the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). Architect members of these organizations are required to complete coursework each year to retain their membership. AIA members must complete 18 hours from registered AIA/Continuing Education Service providers each year. Of the 18 hours, 12 must be on the general topic of health, safety, and welfare. The USGBC requires Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Associates to complete 15 hours within two years of earning their credential. Of the 15 hours, 3 must be LEED specific while the remaining 12 must be on general topics related to green building such as education, project experience, authorship, and volunteering.

Staff determined through its research that licensees expressed the following opinions regarding the current CE requirements:

- Disability access laws do not change frequently enough to justify repeating this coursework every two years.
- The scope of the CE requirements is too narrow.
- There are more pertinent and evolving areas of practice on which to study.

The Committee is asked to discuss the objective and provide the Board a recommendation regarding contemporary professionally relevant CE topics reflective of the continually evolving nature of practice.



Agenda Item E.2 Provide Licensees the Opportunity to Submit Continuing Education Documentation Online to Increase Efficiency in License Renewal

The Board's 2019-2021 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) to provide licensees the opportunity to submit continuing education (CE) documentation online to increase efficiency in license renewal.

At its December 14, 2018 strategic planning session, the Board discussed the development of an online CE verification portal to reduce staff time and expense in verifying that CE requirements have been completed by licensees. Existing law currently requires only those licensees selected for an audit to submit their CE documentation directly to the Board either via hardcopy or email. As proposed by the Board, licensees would have an option to submit evidence of their compliance with the requirements through a secure online system. The Board set a goal to implement an online CE portal by the conclusion of the current strategic plan.

Staff determined through its research that implementing an online CE submission portal would be of great convenience for licensees. The ultimate result would be a reduction in the amount of paperwork, if not complete elimination of it, for licensees and staff, which ultimately would result in greater operational efficiency.

The issue is presently being considered by the Legislature relative to the Board's Sunset Review. Staff of the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development and Assembly Committee on Business and Professions recommend Business and Professions Code section 5600.05 be amended to allow: 1) CE providers to submit documentation on behalf of licensees; and 2) the Board to establish minimum criteria for CE and CE providers. Board staff will continue to work with legislative staff to develop the statutory language.

No action is requested of the Committee. Staff will address questions the members may have regarding this objective.



Agenda Item E.3 Conduct an Occupational Analysis of the Profession to Reflect Current Practice

The Board's 2019–2021 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Professional Qualifications Committee to conduct an occupational analysis (OA) of architectural practice in California to determine the appropriate content for the ongoing California Supplemental Examination (CSE) development.

Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 139 requires an OA be conducted at an interval of every five to seven years. The most recent OA used to develop the CSE was conducted in 2014. The primary purpose of the OA is to define current architectural practice in California based upon 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 section 139 also requires boards and bureaus that use a national examination, such as the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) Architect Registration Examination (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 an overlap of content.

Staff met with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) on March 14, 2019, to discuss the preparation of Intra-Agency Contract Agreements (IAC) for the OA and ARE Linkage Study. Based upon the information provided by NCARB regarding commencement of its next practice analysis, OPES recommended the Board begin our OA no earlier than fiscal year 2020/21 or after NCARB completes the development of its new test plan for the ARE.

No action is requested of the Committee. Staff will address questions the Committee members may have regarding this objective.



Agenda Item E.4 Review and Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 2, Article 3, Section 117 (Experience Evaluation) and Related Regulations to Reflect Current Licensing Requirements

The Board's 2019–2021 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Professional Qualifications Committee to review and amend CCR section 117 (Experience Evaluation) and related regulations to reflect current licensing requirements.

CCR section 117, also known as the Board's Table of Equivalentents (TOE), is the regulation that defines acceptable training and educational experience in architectural work and the equivalent to it. The TOE also establishes the amount of experience credit candidates will earn towards the eight-year licensure requirement.

In line with this Strategic Plan objective, staff coordinated with the Department of Consumer Affairs Legal Affairs Division to develop proposed regulatory language for the Committee's consideration that will:

- Allow increased training experience for candidates without a professional degree in architecture relative to the Architectural Experience Program (AXP)
- Align training and educational experience earned by students with contemporary professional practices
- Permit candidates to earn training experience from related professions prior to achieving ARE eligibility
- Allow training experience credit to those considered as independent contractors working with architects
- Update references to National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' AXP
- Remove obsolete and redundant language
- Streamline and reorganize the TOE

The Committee is asked to discuss the proposed regulatory amendments, including consideration of additional degrees related to architecture, and provide staff with input regarding the TOE.

Attachment

Proposed Regulatory Language to Amend CCR Section 117 (Experience Evaluation)

§ Section 117 Experience Evaluation

The Board's ~~e~~Evaluation of candidates' training and educational experience is based on the Board's Table of Equivalents as listed below.

The Table is comprised of ~~four~~two columns~~;~~; Column A lists the types of training and educational experience for which the Board may grant credit~~may be granted~~; Columns B ~~and C~~ specify~~specifies~~ the maximum credit that may be granted to a candidate for a specified category of experience~~who was determined by the Board to be eligible for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE), the California Supplemental Examination, or licensure prior to January 1, 2005 and who is active in the examination process or to a candidate who is otherwise exempt from the IDP/IAP requirement specified in Section 116(b). Column D specifies the maximum credit that may be granted to a new or inactive candidate who was determined by the Board to be eligible for the ARE on or after January 1, 2005 and who is subject to the IDP/IAP requirement.~~


TABLE OF EQUIVALENTS			
(a) Experience Equivalents:			
<i>Column A</i>	<i>Column B</i>	<i>Column C</i>	<i>Column DB</i>
	<i>Candidates Eligible Prior to January 1, 2005 or Otherwise Exempt from IDP/IAP Requirement</i>	<i>Candidates Eligible Prior to January 1, 2005 or Otherwise Exempt from IDP/IAP Requirement</i>	<i>Candidates Eligible January 1, 2005 or After and Subject to IDP/IAP Requirement</i>
	<i>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</i>	<i>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</i>	<i>Maximum: Credit Allowed <u>Granted</u></i>
<i>Experience Description</i>			

<p>(1) A professional degree in architecture, where the degree <u>from a</u> program has been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) or the Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB), or units toward such a degree.</p>	<p>5 years</p>		<p>5 years</p>
<p>(2) A professional degree in architecture, where the degree <u>from a</u> program has not been accredited by NAAB or CACB and the program consists of at least a five-year curriculum, or units toward such a degree.</p>	<p>4 years</p>		<p>4 years</p>
<p>(3) A four-year degree in architecture Baccalaureus Atrium (BA), Atrium Baccalaureus (AB), Bachelor of Science (BS), or units toward such a degree.</p>	<p>3-1/2 years</p>		<p>3^{1/2}-1/2 years</p>
<p>(4) A degree from a school/university <u>or</u> college which that has an NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited professional degree program in architecture, where and the degree could would be accepted for entry into a two-year NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited Master of Architecture program, or units toward such a degree.</p>	<p>3-1/2 years</p>		<p>3^{1/2}-1/2 years</p>
<p>(5) A <u>four-year</u> degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to architecture as defined in subsection (b)(6⁵), or units toward such a degree.</p>	<p>2 years</p>		<p>2 years</p>

(6) Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.	1 year		1 year
(7) (A) Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.	6 months		6 months
(8) (B) Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to architecture.	1 year		1 year
(9) <u>A post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture consisting of a Master, Master of Science, or Ph.D. degree, or units toward such a degree.</u>			1 year
(8 10) Experience under the direct supervision of an architect(s) licensed <u>or registered</u> in a United States jurisdiction shall be granted 100% credit.	5 years	3 years	5 8 years
(9 11) Certification by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) shall be granted a maximum of eight years credit upon receipt <u>in of</u> the Board office of the candidate's current and valid NCARB blue cover file, transmitted by NCARB.	5 years	3 years	8 years
(10) While a candidate is enrolled in a college or university, credit shall be granted:			
(A) 100% for experience obtained under the direct supervision of architect(s) licensed in the U.S.	1 year	or 1 year	1 year

<p>(B) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a registered civil or structural engineer and/or a licensed landscape architect licensed in a United States jurisdiction.</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>
<p>(C) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California licensed general building contractor.</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>
<p>(D) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California certified building official as defined in subsection (c)(7).</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>
<p>(E) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a foreign licensed architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country where the experience occurred.</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>
<p>(H12) Completion of NCARB's the Intern Development Architectural Experience Program (IDPAXP) of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards or the Intern Architect Program (IAP) of Canada shall be granted a minimum of three years credit, upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate's current and valid NCARB IDPAXP file transmitted by NCARB or documentation transmitted by a Canadian provincial architectural association, respectively.</p>	<p>2 years</p>	<p>3 years</p>	<p>58 years</p>



<p>(1213)(A) Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a registered civil or structural engineer, and/or a licensed landscape architect licensed <u>or registered</u> in a United States jurisdiction shall be granted 50% credit.</p>		<p>2 years</p>	<p>2 years</p>
<p>(B14) Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California licensed general building contractor shall be granted 50% credit.</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>
<p>(C15) Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California certified building official as defined in subsection (c)(76) shall be granted 50% credit.</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>
<p>(1316) Experience as a licensed <u>or registered</u> architect practicing in another U.S. jurisdiction with a verified record of substantial architectural practice shall be granted 100% credit.</p>		<p>8 years</p>	<p>8 years</p>
<p> (14)(A) A post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture consisting of a Master, Master of Science, or Ph.D. degree, or units toward such a degree, or</p>		<p>1 year</p>	<p>1 year</p>

(B 17) Teaching and/or research in NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited architectural curriculums shall be granted 100% credit only for those hours worked if verified by the college or university.		1 year	1 year
(15 18)(A) Experience under the direct supervision of an architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country where the experience occurred shall be granted 50% credit.	5 years	2 years	5 7 years
(B 19) Experience as a foreign licensed architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country with a verified record of substantial architectural practice shall be granted 50% credit.	5 years	2 years	5 7 years

(b) Education Equivalents:



~~“Education equivalents” shall mean Table categories (a)(1) through (a)(9), (a)(10)(A), (a)(11), (a)(13), and (a)(15)(A) and (B).~~

~~(1) For the purposes of this section, NAAB shall refer to the National Architectural Accrediting Board, and CACB shall refer to the Canadian Architectural Certification Board.~~

(~~2~~1) A “professional degree program” shall be defined as one of the following types of programs:

- ~~1.~~(~~A~~) Bachelor of Architecture, five-year program;
- ~~2.~~(~~B~~) Bachelor of Architecture for individuals with a prior degree;
- ~~3.~~(~~C~~) Master of Architecture, four-year undergraduate program in architecture plus a two-year graduate program in architecture;
- ~~4.~~(~~D~~) Master of Architecture, four-year undergraduate program in another discipline plus a three-year graduate program in architecture.

(~~3~~2) Where a candidate is seeking education equivalents for having obtained a professional degree or units towards such a degree from an NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited

program, ~~he or she~~ they shall be eligible for such credit if such program is or was accredited by NAAB or CACB either at the time of graduation or within two years after the date of graduation or termination of enrollment.

(~~4~~3) Credit allowed for units obtained without a degree shall only be computed within the categories of subsections (a)(1) through (5) or ~~(a)(149)(A)~~ of this section. No credit for units obtained under subsections (a)(6) ~~or through (78)~~ shall be recognized unless such units have been transferred to and accepted by a school within subsections (a)(1) through (5) of this section.

(~~5~~4) Academic units based on the categories specified in subsections (a)(1) through (5) or ~~(a)(149)(A)~~ of this section shall be evaluated up to the maximum allowed for that subsection. Where a candidate has not obtained a degree, the maximum credit allowed ~~for the categories contained in subsections (a)(1) through (5) or (a)(14)(A)~~ shall be six months less than the maximum credit ~~that would have been granted if the candidate had obtained a degree in indicated for~~ that category. Fractions greater than one-half of an academic year shall be counted as one-half of a year and smaller fractions will not be counted. 30 semester units or 45 quarter units ~~is considered to be equals~~ one academic year.

(~~6~~5) Degrees in a field related to architecture shall be evaluated under subsection (a)(5) and defined as the following: Architectural Design; Architectural Engineering; Architectural Studies; Architectural Technology; Building Science; City and Regional Planning; Civil, Mechanical, Structural, or Electrical Engineering; Construction Engineering; Construction Management; Environmental Design; Interior Architecture; Landscape Architecture; and Urban and Regional Design.



~~(7) (A) Experience obtained as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a licensed professional as defined in subsections (a)(8), (a)(12), and (a)(15)(A) or (B) while a candidate is enrolled in a college or university shall be allowed maximum credit for educational/training equivalents of 1 year as defined in subsections (a)(10)(A) through (E). A candidate who obtains experience under the direct supervision of a licensed professional as defined in subsections (a)(8), (a)(12), and (a)(15)(A) or (B) while enrolled in a college or university shall have his/her education and/or experience evaluated according to the method which provides the candidate the most credit.~~

~~(B) A candidate enrolled in a degree program where credit earned is based on work experience courses (i.e., internship or co-op programs) shall not receive more than the maximum credit allowed for degrees earned under subsections (a)(1) through (7).~~

~~(C) A candidate who is certified as having completed the requirements of IDP, as referenced in section 109(b)(2), based upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate's current and valid NCARB IDP file transmitted by NCARB, is exempt from the provisions of subsection (b)(7)(B) relating to maximum credit allowed for degrees where credit is earned based on work experience courses.~~

(~~8~~6) A candidate who possesses a degree and possesses units from more than one college or university shall have the degree evaluated first prior to evaluating additional education credits.

(97) A candidate with multiple degrees shall not be able to accumulate credit for more than one degree unless ~~he or she has~~ they have received one professional degree in architecture and one post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture as specified in subsection (a)(142)(A). Otherwise, the degree that receives the most credit as determined by subsection (a) shall take priority over any other degree.

~~(10) A candidate who possesses a professional degree and also possesses a post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture as specified in subsection (a)(14)(A) shall be granted one additional year credit for the post professional degree.~~

(118) Degrees from a foreign college or university shall be granted credit, as determined by the applicable category contained in subsections (a)(1) through (78). A transcript(s) certified by the college or university must be evaluated by NAAB or an educational evaluation service, approved by the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services, Inc. (NACES) equating the degree toward a comparable U.S. degree. Any cost of evaluation shall be the responsibility of the candidate. Professional degrees accredited by CACB shall be accepted by the Board and shall not require such an evaluation ~~be required to be evaluated by NAAB or an NACES education evaluation service equating the degree toward a comparable U.S. degree.~~

(129) Units from a foreign college or university shall be granted credit, as provided for in the applicable category contained in subsections (a)(1) through (5) upon submission of a transcript(s) certified by the college or university. These certified documents must be evaluated by NAAB or an NACES educational evaluation service equating the units toward a comparable U.S. degree. Any cost of evaluation shall be the responsibility of the candidate. Professional degrees accredited by CACB shall be accepted by the Board and shall not require such an evaluation ~~be required to be evaluated by NAAB or an NACES education evaluation service equating the degree toward a comparable U.S. degree.~~

(c) Training Equivalents:

~~“Training equivalents” shall mean Table categories (a)(8) through (a)(15).~~

(1) Candidates shall be at least 18 years of age or be the equivalent to a high school graduate before they shall be eligible to receive training credit for work experience.

(2) Except as provided below, work experience shall be granted training credit only when:

(A) The supervising professional is licensed in a United States jurisdiction or a Canadian province and the work experience is obtained or the project is located in a United States jurisdiction or Canadian province, or

(B) The supervising professional is licensed in a qualifying foreign country where the work experience is obtained or project is located.

Training credit shall be granted for work experience obtained under the authority of or on the property of the United States Federal Government when the work experience is obtained as or under the direct supervision of a licensed professional as defined in subsections (a)(810), ~~(a)(1213)(A)~~, and ~~(a)(1316)~~.

The term “qualifying foreign country” shall mean a foreign country whose standards and qualifications for issuing a license to practice architecture are equivalent to those required in this state.

(3) Employment shall be considered on the basis of a calendar month of 40-hour work weeks. Credit may be given for overtime.

(4) Every candidate shall earn at least one year of training credit for experience as or under the direct supervision of an architect(s) licensed in a United States jurisdiction granted at 100% credit or at least two years of experience under the direct supervision of an architect(s) registered in a Canadian province granted at 50% credit.

~~(5) Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(B) and (a)(12)(A) shall not exceed the two years maximum credit allowed for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a registered civil or structural engineer and/or a licensed landscape architect licensed in a United States jurisdiction. Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(C) and (a)(12)(B) shall not exceed the one year maximum credit allowed for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California licensed general building contractor. Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(D) and (a)(12)(C) shall not exceed the one year maximum credit allowed for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California certified building official. Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(E) and (a)(15)(A) or (B) shall not exceed the maximum credit allowed for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a foreign licensed architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country where the experience occurred. A candidate cannot exceed two years maximum credit in any combination under subsections (a)(10)(B) through (D) and (a)(12)(A) through (C).~~

~~(6)~~ Experience under the supervision of a “responsible managing officer”, “responsible managing employee”, “responsible managing manager”, or “responsible managing member” operating under a ~~corporate~~ contractor license shall qualify as experience under subsection (a)(~~1214~~)(B) and shall be verified by the responsible managing officer, responsible managing employee, responsible managing manager, or responsible managing member of that ~~corporation~~ licensed entity.

~~(7)~~ For the purpose of this section, a California certified building official shall be as defined by Section 18949.27 of the Health and Safety Code as an individual who is certified in accordance with or otherwise exempt from Chapter 7, Part 2.5 of Division 13 (commencing with Health and Safety Code Section 18949.25).

~~(8)~~ The entry point for ~~IDP-AXP~~ shall be as defined in NCARB's *Intern Development Architectural Experience Program Guidelines*, as referenced in section 109(b)(2).

~~(d) Practice Equivalents:~~

~~“Practice equivalents” shall mean Table categories (a)(8) through (a)(15).~~

~~(1) Practice credits for experience as a licensed architect, registered civil and/or structural engineer, California licensed general building contractor, licensed landscape architect, or~~

~~certified California building official may be accumulated only after initial registration, licensure or certification by a licensing authority of a political jurisdiction.~~

(28) A candidate verifying ~~his or her~~ their experience as an ~~licensed~~ architect, ~~registered~~ civil ~~and~~ or structural engineer, California ~~licensed~~ general building contractor, ~~licensed~~ landscape architect, or ~~certified~~ California building official may be accumulated only after initial registration, licensure or certification by a licensing authority of a political jurisdiction. The candidate shall submit each of the following:

(A) complete an ~~Completed~~ Employment Verification Form, as referenced in section 109, subsection (b)(3) (19C-12)(3/2006) ~~available from the Board on his or her own behalf,~~

(B) submit pProof of licensure, registration, or certification, and

(C) attach ~~Upon request by the Board,~~ a list of projects for the time period covered. ~~The list that~~ shall include:

(i) † ~~The names and addresses of the~~ for each clients,

(ii) † Type of projects,

(iii) e ~~Construction~~ costs,

(iv) † ~~Dates~~ each project was started and completed, ~~date of completion,~~ and

(v) all ~~A summary of the~~ services provided by the candidate.

~~(e) Miscellaneous Information:~~



~~(1) Independent, non-licensed practice or experience, regardless of claimed coordination or liaison with licensed professionals, shall not be granted credit.~~



~~(2) Training experience under subsections (a)(10)(B) through (D), (a)(12), or (a)(14) can only be accumulated after the candidate has obtained credit for at least the five years of educational equivalents as evaluated by the Board. Candidates who are certified as having completed the requirements of IDP as referenced in section 109(b)(2), based upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate's current and valid NCARB IDP file transmitted by NCARB, or IAP, as referenced in section 109(b)(2), based upon receipt in the Board office of documentation transmitted by a Canadian provincial architectural association, are exempt from this requirement for their IDP/IAP training units.~~

Note: Authority cited: Sections 5526, 5550 and 5552, Business and Professions Code.

Reference: Sections 5550 and 5552, Business and Professions Code.



BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS • CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834
P (916) 574-7220 | F (916) 575-7283 | www.cab.ca.gov



Agenda Item F Adjournment

Time: _____

Professional Qualifications Committee Meeting
April 18, 2019
Sacramento, CA