

**MINUTES FOR BOARD MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE,
INTERIOR DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL DESIGN**

October 21, 2015

Board Conference Room, 2080 East Flamingo Road, Suite 120, Las Vegas, NV 89119

Wednesday, October 21, 2015

Chairman George Garlock called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Roll Call: George Garlock, Chairman; James Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer; Kimberly Ciesynski; Greg Erny; John Klai; William Snyder; Sean Tanner; Larry Tindall; Nathaniel Waugh

Also in attendance: Gina Spaulding, Executive Director; Louis Ling, Legal Counsel; Monica Harrison, Laura Bach, and Ginger Hahn, staff

AGENDA ITEM 1 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

AGENDA ITEM 2 Approval of Consent Agenda

Consent agenda included the following:

- A. Approval of Agenda
- B. Approval of Minutes: August 19, 2015
- C. Secretary/Treasurer Report
 1. Nevada Architect, Registered Interior Designer and Residential Designer Licensing Statistics
 2. Wells Fargo Bank Statements
 3. September 2015 QR Statement
- D. Ratification of Reciprocal Licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm Name Approval Requests
 1. BHK Designs Inc.
 2. KC CAMIS, ARCHITECT
 3. BDG Nevada LLC
 4. ATLAS DESIGN LLC
 5. Slentz Design
 6. Kolbrook Design, Inc.
 7. YP Design, LLC
 8. C+TC Architecture & Interior Design Studio, Inc.
 9. RIM Architects (Nevada) LLC
- F. Firm Registration Approval Requests
 1. Jordan Knighton Architects, Inc.
 2. KAP PLANNING, INC.
 3. YWS Architects, LLC
 4. Interior Design Associates, Inc.
 5. Studio HBA LLC

6. DEZMOTIF STUDIOS
7. G&C Architecture and Engineering, Inc.
8. Architectural Civil Group LLC
9. Sechrist Design Associates, Inc.

Architects: Registration by Reciprocity

7303 Stanley L. Chiu	7326 Zoran Lozanovski	7338 Michael J. Lindstrom
7315 David A. Efaw	7327 Scott D. Magar	7339 Douglas L. McCord
7316 Eric A. Heldt	7328 Joel S. Tkach	7340 Dana E. Owyong
7317 Robert F. Dance	7329 James J. Wasserman	7341 Michael B. Schneider
7318 Eric M. Simonsen	7330 C. Brent Agnew	7342 Robert B. Woodruff
7319 Steven W. Brooks	7331 Michael Biermann	7343 Nathan T. Bisbee
7320 M. Steven Camp	7332 Jeffrey L. Cutberth	7344 Daniel R. Boyne
7321 Craig T. Chinn	7333 Mark A. Day	7345 Paul V. Gonzaga
7322 Dustin W. Eaton	7334 William K. Harden	7346 Richard G. Hofmeister, II
7323 Mark S. Schroeder	7335 Stanley J. Klemanowicz	7347 D. Alan Roberts
7324 Chad J. Slichter	7336 Steven A. Kolber	7348 William V. Latham, II
7325 Glen Selligman	7337 Ryan A. Lee	7349 Steven J. Platt

Board members requested agenda items 2F-3, 2F-4, 2F-7, and 2F-9 be pulled from the consent agenda.

Motion: Tindall moved to approve the consent agenda items 2A through 2F-2, 2F-5 through 2F-6, and 2F-8. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 2F-3 Firm Registration Approval Request: YWS Architects, LLC

Motion: Erny moved to approve the firm registration request for “YWS Architects, LLC.” Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

Erny asked for clarification of the percent of firm ownership. Spaulding explained that 99 percent of the ownership is held by the applicant in name and the remaining one percent is held by an S corporation that is owned entirely by the applicant.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 2F-4 Firm Registration Approval Request: Interior Design Associates, Inc.

Motion: Tindall moved to approve the firm registration request for “Interior Design Associates, Inc.” Motion seconded by Klai.

Erny recommended that the board deny approval of the firm registration request as there is another firm already practicing in Nevada with a very similar name. Tanner said the requested

firm name is too general. Spaulding said the board denies firm names that are too similar to an existing firm name due to possible confusion.

Vote: Ciesynski, Klai, and Tindall in favor. Erny, Garlock, Mickey, Snyder, Tanner, and Waugh opposed. Motion fails.

Motion: Erny moved to deny the firm registration request as it is too similar to an existing firm name and could be confusing to the public. Motion seconded by Waugh.

Vote: All in favor except Ciesynski, Klai, and Tindall. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 2F-7 Firm Registration Approval Request: G&C Architecture and Engineering, Inc.

Motion: Klai moved to approve the firm registration request for "G&C Architecture and Engineering, Inc." Motion seconded by Tindall.

Erny said the applicants failed to answer questions six and seven on page four of the original application. Harrison said the applicant resubmitted the page with the two questions answered.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 4 Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding the Application of Leonard Messina for Architect Reciprocal Registration

Spaulding reminded board members that it is board policy that reciprocal applicants for registration with disciplinary action be presented to the board for review and decision.

She said Messina had disciplinary action in the state of Delaware. Messina had attested to being in compliance with the Delaware board's continuing education requirement upon renewal of his certificate of registration. Messina was audited by the Delaware board, and it was found that he had not obtained the necessary continuing education credits in health, safety, and welfare. Messina completed the necessary continuing education credits and paid the required fine to the state of Delaware in a timely manner. Spaulding said Messina is now in good standing and disclosed the information to the Nevada board on his application.

Motion: Erny moved to approve the Messina's application. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 5 **Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding the Application of Brian Kite pursuant to NAC 623.280 and NAC 623.410**

Spaulding gave background information. Kite's base state is Nevada. He has allowed his registration to lapse twice. He was registered from February 1979 through December 1993 holding license number 1208 and from March 2000 through December 2010 holding license number 4381.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve Messina's application. Motion seconded by Klai.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 7 **Review and Decision Regarding Continuing Education Hardship Requests**

The board reviewed Jeffrey L. Isom's request for exemption from 2015 continuing education requirements for 2016 registration renewal.

Motion: Klai made a motion to approve residential designer #222-RD, Jeffrey L. Isom's request for exemption from the 2015 continuing education requirements for 2016 renewal. Tindall seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 8A-1 **Case No. 15-020N - In the Matter of Dylan Yorke and Streamline Concept Design & Drafting**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture and engaging in the practice of architecture for multiple projects located in Nevada without having a certificate of registration issued by this board.

Staff received information that the respondents had submitted plans to an architectural review committee which were then submitted as owner-builder to the building department. Further investigation revealed that the respondents had been providing architectural drawings for general contractors, individuals, and developers for 30 projects since 2013. Additionally, the respondents were advertising on their website, www.slccd.com, that they provide architectural services.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement and confession of judgment were negotiated. The settlement agreement incorporates a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$35,000, \$20,000 of which is stayed as long as the respondent remains in compliance with the terms and conditions of the settlement agreement and confession of judgment plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$2,000.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Erny moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 8A-2 Case No. 15-029N - In the Matter of Nathan Smith,
Michael Durant, and Smith Durant Business Architects**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a) and NRS 623.360.1 (b) by holding themselves out and advertising themselves in Nevada as architects without having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Staff received information that the respondents were advertising themselves as business architects on the website www.smithdurant.com. Further investigation revealed they were also advertising on Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter. The services they provide pertain to growing and networking businesses; however, by using the protected term "architects" they were conveying misleading information to the public.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a No Contest Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$3,000 which is stayed providing the respondents remain in compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,000.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Waugh.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 3A Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration:
Architect**

Klai swore in the following individuals as architects:

- 1. Somdeba F. Sawadogo.....7352
- 2. Keith D. Swenson.....7354

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individuals as architects. Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 3B Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration:
Registered Interior Design**

Mickey swore in the following individuals as registered interior designers:

1. Alexis A. Furrule.....225-ID
2. Melinda Sechrist.....226-ID

Motion: Tanner moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individuals as registered interior designers. Motion seconded by Waugh.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 3C Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration:
Residential Design**

Mickey swore in the following individual as a residential designer:

1. Rebecca Chiriboga.....338-RD

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individual as a registered interior designer. Motion seconded by Tindall.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Spaulding congratulated the new registrants and explained that the registration ceremony is an opportunity for them to meet their board and the board's staff. She urged the new registrants to contact the board office with any questions they have in the future. Spaulding stressed the importance of researching laws and rules in other jurisdictions prior to beginning the pursuit of any projects in those jurisdictions.

Eric Roberts of AIA Nevada congratulated the five new registrants and presented them each with a Certificate of Recognition on behalf of the AIA. Roberts said the AIA is available to the registrants to serve as a resource in their practices.

Garlock opened the floor to the new registrants for feedback regarding their paths to licensure.

Sechrist and Chiriboga complimented the staff on their dedication to assisting in the registration process.

Agenda Item 2F-9 Sechrist Design Associates, Inc.

Motion: Klai moved to approve the firm registration request for "Sechrist Design Associates, Inc." Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 6 **Presentation of Audit Results for Fiscal Year End 2015 –
Christy Andersen, CPA, Bradshaw, Smith & Co., LLP**

Christy Andersen, accountant for Bradshaw, Smith & Co., LLP, presented the Fiscal Year End 2015 audit results to the board.

Anderson reminded the board that this is the first year of implementation of the new accounting standard, *GASB 68*, as required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. She said that the impact on the NSBAIDRD's financial statements is a matter of change in the bookkeeping to show the Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada's (PERS) unfunded liability amounts. She gave background on *GASB 68* as follows:

In fiscal year 2015, GASB 68, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions requires the NSBAIDRD to report its proportionate share of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of Nevada (PERS) net pension liability, deferred outflows of resources, and deferred inflows of resources on the statement of net position. The new standard does not affect the amount employers pay to provide pension benefits. The standard only changes how pension costs are accounted for and reported in the financial statements. GASB believes the required changes will enhance accountability and transparency of governments that provide their employees with pension benefits.

Motion: Erny moved to accept the audit results for Fiscal Year End 2015. Motion seconded by Klai.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

The board discussed investing NSBAIDRD monies in order to offset bank fees. Spaulding said she would look into investment strategies and present the findings at a future board meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 8A-3 **Case No. 16-004N - In the Matter of Matthew Anderson**

The respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding himself out as being qualified to practice architecture and engaging in the practice of architecture for a project located in Nevada without having a certificate of registration issued by this board.

Staff received a reciprocity application from the respondent and a phone interview was conducted at which time the respondent admitted to preparing a proposal for a Nevada project he was contemplating. Bach requested and received a copy of the proposal and equipment floor plans.

The respondent was sent a Notice of Investigation/Notice of Charges concerning this project. The respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondent an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$4,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,000.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Klai moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 8A-4 **Case No. 16-005N - In the Matter of Randal J. Ehm and Ehm Architecture, Inc.**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture and engaging in the practice of architecture for a project located in Nevada without having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Staff received a reciprocity application from the respondents who were previously registered in Nevada in the year 2007. A phone interview was conducted at which time the respondents admitted to preparing a statement of qualification/proposal which he presented to the City of Henderson for a new convention center and farmer's market. A review of his website also found renderings of the Henderson project as well as some other Nevada projects.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Investigation/Notice of Charges concerning this project. The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement and confession of judgment were negotiated. The settlement agreement incorporates a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$13,500 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,200.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Tindall moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Garlock suggested that the NSBAIDRD notify the building departments that when soliciting proposals or qualifications that the requests should state that anyone applying must be registered in Nevada. Bach agreed.

AGENDA ITEM 8A-5 **Case No. 16-011N - In the Matter of Scott Lee and SB Architects**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture and engaging in the practice of architecture for a project located in Nevada without having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Staff received a reciprocity application from the respondents which indicated that they had been hired to design a custom residence in Henderson, Nevada. During the phone interview Bach

requested and received a copy of the respondents' proposal (dated February 25, 2015) and renderings. The respondents were previously registered in Nevada from 2007-2010.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Investigation/Notice of Charges concerning this project. The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$9,500 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,200.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Klai.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 8B Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Closure of Enforcement Cases

Bach recommended the following case for closure without disciplinary action:

16-003N

Motion: Klai moved to close the above-referenced case. Motion seconded by Tindall.

Vote: Garlock recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 8C Enforcement Report

Bach said that she would be researching if the production of kiosks falls under the practice of architecture. She said she will present her findings at a future board meeting.

Recently, NSBAIDRD has been receiving a number of inquiries regarding residential designers and what is included within the scope of their practice. Bach said she will be placing an article in the NSBAIDRD's next newsletter to clarify the role of a residential designer. The article will explain construction administration versus construction management. Bach said she will also write a letter concerning these issues to be mailed to all residential designers.

Agenda Item 9 Board Member Training Session – Louis Ling

Ling said there would be two formal hearings at the January 2016 board meeting. He told the board members what to expect during a formal hearing and advised them accordingly.

Agenda Item 10A Review and Possible Decision Regarding the Proposed Changes to NCARB's Internship Development Program Experience Portfolio Documentation Program

Spaulding gave background information on NCARB's proposed *Intern Development Program Experience Portfolio Documentation Method*. She reported that she had sent a letter to NCARB since the program was discussed at the NSBAIDRD's last board meeting in August. The letter asked NCARB to share comments from the other jurisdictions in order to help the NSBAIDRD make a more informed decision.

Background on NCARB's Proposed IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method

The Intern Development Program reporting requirement (known as the "six month rule") was implemented in July, 2010. At that point, no experience older than eight months could be reported and used to satisfy the IDP experience requirements. Last year, NCARB expanded the reporting of experience to allow 50% credit for experience up to five years in the past. Jurisdictions have expressed that there are individuals who have work experience that falls outside of the current reporting requirements, i.e. more than 5 years old. This proposed program is intended to provide a path for completing the experience requirement for those who:

- *left the profession and would like to come back*
- *did not document their IDP experience with NCARB*
- *did not pursue licensure in a timely fashion, e.g. project managers*
- *can otherwise meet licensure requirements including education and examination*

The NCARB Board of Directors agreed that a gap exists in its program. NCARB staff was directed to develop a concept that would allow individuals to submit experience that identifies proficiency in the IDP experience categories that fall outside of the current reporting requirement. Staff was given two directives:

- *Protect the traditional IDP path, or whatever the future program is called, as the preferred experience path.*
- *Develop a conceptual program that will not be overly complicated and financially burdensome.*

This concept was first introduced to NCARB's Board of Directors two years ago when NCARB's Broadly Experienced Special Project Team was launched. An outline for this program was developed through numerous discussions over the past year. NCARB staff presented research and presentations of a conceptual program to its board.

NCARB states that it learned some valuable lessons in the past year regarding introduction of new or revised programs. As a result, they sought initial reaction and feedback from their Member Board Members at NCARB's Annual Business Meeting through five workshops.

Over 175 member board members and member board executives attended the workshops. Feedback from the attendees was similar in nature at each session:

- *The concept of a program that will allow persons to document experience that falls outside of the current IDP reporting rules was supported.*
- *Attendees liked the concept that the current architect supervisor or a mentor will sign off on the experience. They noted this concept could be enhanced by adding a minimum number of years that the supervisor/mentor has known the applicant.*
- *The majority of attendees agreed that documentation of work product to demonstrate competency is better than documentation of hours. They noted that applicants may not be able to obtain actual work samples from previous employers. The program will need to define options for all applicants.*
- *They recommended that a robust supervisor/mentor training program to support this program be developed.*

NCARB would like to see engagement on this proposal through two very important steps:

- *member board 90-day comment period*

- virtual meetings with member board members to be held in early October

These steps are being taken because implementation of this program will require a change to the IDP Guidelines. Changes at this level require a vote by NCARB's Board of Directors.

NCARB would like to take action on this proposal before the end of 2015. They assured the jurisdictions that no NCARB Board of Directors vote will be taken until sufficient discussion and feedback has occurred.

NCARB's Proposed Program – IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method

Executive Summary

In August 2013, an NCARB multi-departmental team was formed to thoroughly analyze the need, identify options, and develop an approach for individuals to document valid work experience fulfilling the spirit of the IDP but falling outside the limits of current IDP reporting requirements. Currently, licensure applicants can earn full credit for experience reported within eight months, and 50 percent credit for experience earned beyond eight months and up to five years.

NCARB says it is committed to supporting the facilitation of licensure and its message that "experience is experience." There is a group of individuals educated, trained, and experienced in architecture who, for whatever life event occurred, did not pursue licensure. These individuals now want to join fully in the profession through licensure. They can meet their jurisdiction's education requirement, and they are willing to take the Architect Registration Examination (ARE); however they are negatively impacted by NCARB's current IDP reporting requirements.

NCARB's research team was asked to identify ways to be more inclusive of intern architects' path to initial licensure while ensuring the process is objective, attainable, sustainable, and defensible. The team leaders presented thoughts, concepts, and approaches to the NCARB board of directors at the December 2013; and April, September, and December 2014 meetings. In December the board directed the research team to develop proposed program elements and requirements, with the intent to engage the member boards at the 2015 Annual Business Meeting. These elements include the proposed audience, proposed eligibility requirements, and proposed programmatic details and processes:

Eligibility:

- work experience occurred outside of current IDP reporting requirement (i.e. older than 5 years)
- work experience that meets the current IDP requirements (tasks, etc.)

Documentation of Experience:

- work history, including role, project types, project descriptions, project budgets, etc.
- work product samples demonstrating competent performance of IDP tasks in each of the six practice categories

Certification/Affirmation of Competency:

- current architect supervisor
- architect mentor who is NCARB certified

Process:

- work samples of valid experience will be submitted through automated e- portfolio system to the supervisor or mentor

This program is being designed to provide a pathway for design professionals (e.g. project managers, project designers) who cannot complete the experience hours in the IDP experience areas based on their current employment role and responsibilities, though work experience performed beyond the limits of the reporting requirements would meet today's requirements.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

To participate, an applicant will need to validate that they have substantial past experience that meets the current requirements

of the IDP. The proposed approach requires detailed, verified documentation to support the claim that experience gained outside of the IDP reporting requirements has been completed competently and satisfies the current IDP requirements. Specifically, applicants will need to do the following:

- Document work history since graduation to present.
 - a. Include a brief description of projects (type, size, cost, duration, and role on projects).
- Document project work product to demonstrate acquisition of knowledge/skills and competent performance of the expected tasks.
 - a. NCARB will develop descriptions and a format for applicants to follow.
- Submit documentation to a current architect supervisor or mentor who is NCARB certified.

The applicant must be able to provide all required information and documentation for review and certification/affirmation of competence by their current supervisor or mentor.

ELIGIBILITY

The applicant must have:

- work experience that occurred outside of current IDP reporting requirement (i.e. older than 5 years)
- work experience that meets the current IDP requirements (tasks, etc.)

Rationale:

All persons participating in the IDP were required to comply with the IDP reporting requirements (known as the “six month rule”) as of July 1, 2010. There are individuals who have not reported experience in accordance with the IDP reporting requirement, but have substantial experience that is further in the past than the current IDP reporting requirement allows. While these individuals may currently be working in architecture or a related field, their current role and responsibilities will not allow them to perform tasks that are required by the IDP.

DOCUMENTATION OF EXPERIENCE

Each applicant will be required to provide detailed, verified documentation to support his/her claim that their experience gained outside of the IDP reporting requirements has been completed competently and satisfies the current IDP requirements.

The applicant will be required to document their complete work history. The information required will include:

- employer name
- employer address
- dates of employment
- position(s) held
- roles and responsibilities

Rationale:

The current architect supervisor or mentor certifying/affirming the competence of the applicant will have a “complete picture” of the applicant’s experience. This will allow for a more comprehensive look at and consideration of one’s overall experience.

The applicant will be required to list projects they are submitting to their supervisor to document satisfaction of the current IDP requirements: The information required will include:

- project name
- project type
- project size
- project budget
- project duration
- project description
- applicant’s role in the project
- identify relevant IDP practice areas (reason for inclusion)

Rationale:

The current architect supervisor or mentor certifying/affirming the competence of the applicant needs to have a “complete picture” of the projects the applicant is submitting in support of their prior experience. This will allow for a comprehensive and informed review and consideration of one’s experience in the practice areas defined by the IDP.

Spaulding said NCARB shared the information they received from its other jurisdictions. The information was provided to NSBAIDRD board members in the board meeting eBooks. Spaulding also said she attended NCARB’s feedback webinar. She recommended that the NSBAIDRD accept the *Internship Development Program Experience Portfolio Documentation Program*. She stated that the NSBAIDRD would not need to make any changes to existing statute in order to implement the program.

The board instructed Spaulding to submit a letter to NCARB in acceptance of the program.

AGENDA ITEM 10B Review and Discussion Regarding NCARB’s Integrated Path to Licensure

Spaulding said this item was placed on the agenda because she was approached by University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) concerning their interest in participating in the program. Spaulding asked the board if they would be willing to support UNLV in their efforts.

Background Information:

This program began in order to create a more structured experience for students by offering them the ability to complete the requirements for licensure at the time of graduation. Each selected school, accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), developed a proposal to restructure its academic program to allow students the opportunity to complete the Intern Development Program (IDP) and take each division of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) before graduation.

NCARB established a committee to guide the selected schools in the implementation process, work with registration boards to ensure that laws and regulations are in place for pre-graduation access to the ARE, and oversee the acceptance of schools into the program.

In 2014, 32 schools responded to NCARB’s Request for Interest and Information, indicating their intent to develop formal proposals. NCARB plans to solicit participation each year.

Each school that was chosen participate will implement the integrated path according to the schedule developed with their administration and faculty. Students will test in ARE (Architect Registration Examination) 5.0, a new version of the ARE, to be released in 2016. Integrated path students in each program will be part of an existing accredited degree program.

Mickey stressed the importance of measuring the success of this program by the professionals that it produces. He said that it is important to make sure that the program is not rushing the process and still producing quality architects.

The board discussed the matter further and instructed Spaulding to send a letter to Glenn Nowak, Graduate Coordinator of UNLV School of Architecture, supporting UNLV’s participation in

the program. Spaulding will recommend that Nowak request to view the proposals received by NCARB from the thirteen accepted schools. The board would like to view the draft of the proposal that UNLV will submit to NCARB and offer suggestions.

AGENDA ITEM 10C **Review and Possible Decision Regarding the Proposed Changes to NCARB's Education Standard**

Excerpt from a Memorandum Received from NCARB on October 8, 2015:

INTRODUCTION

The education requirement for NCARB certification is a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) or the Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB). There are two alternative means to satisfy the education requirement:

- *completion of the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) Program*
- *an EESA-NCARB education evaluation report stating satisfaction of the NCARB Education Standard.*

Both alternatives utilize the NCARB Education Standard as criteria by which certificate applicants are assessed.

The Standard is also used in the EESA-NCARB education evaluation report for foreign educated applicants pursuing initial licensure in the U.S. The Standard is regularly reviewed and updated from time to time in order to remain relevant to current practice and in alignment with the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

The proposal for modifications to the NCARB Education Standard was reviewed by the NCARB Board of Directors at the June Pre-Annual Board Meeting. The Board of Directors would now like feedback from our Member Boards prior to voting on these proposed changes. Comments will be received through January 12, 2016.

BACKGROUND

The NCARB Education Standard is the approximation of the requirements of a professional degree from a program accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). It includes general studies, professional studies, and electives, which together comprise a professional education in architecture.

The NCARB Education Standard is not the equivalent to the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. The NCARB Education Standard is prescriptive based and includes subject area definitions and semester credit hour requirements. The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation are performance based and include criteria by which student outcomes are reviewed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following the 2013 NAAB Accreditation Review Conference, the Conditions for Accreditation were revised

and updated in 2014. The FY15 Education Committee was charged with reviewing the NCARB Education Standard in order to confirm relevancy and alignment with the updated Student Performance Criteria (SPC) in the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

The committee, composed of education specialists and a representative from the NAAB, approached the charge by identifying misalignments between the subject areas of the Standard and the SPC of the Conditions, eliminating overlap between the two sets of requirements, and addressing SPC not currently covered in the Standard. This approach led to modifications, including nomenclature changes, reorganization and addition of subject area categories, merging of categories, and adjustments to semester credit hour requirements. The proposed changes include an update to the Standard's subject area and category definitions completed in collaboration with NAAB subject matter experts.

The board discussed the proposed changes to NCARB's Education Standard and agreed with NCARB's proposal. Spaulding will send a letter to NCARB in support of the proposed changes.

Agenda Item 10D FYI: NCARB CEO Update August & September 2015

Garlock said this information was provided for board members' information.

Agenda Item 10E FYI: NCARB Fast Facts July & August 2015

Garlock said this information was provided for board members' information.

Agenda Item 11 Residential Design Issues

Tindall reported that the only thing remaining to be done concerning the Nevada Residential Design Exam is updating the study guide. He thanked Mickey, Snyder, and Erny for the many hours they devoted to updating the exam.

Motion: Tindall moved to approve the new content of the Nevada Residential Design Exam. Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 12A Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Nevada Board Participation in CIDQ's Alternative Application Review Program (AARP) for Applicants Applying for Registration Pursuant to NRS 623.192.1(d)(3)

Ciesynski told the board that she would like to present a letter to the CIDQ Board of Directors asking them to make two small modifications to the AARP so that Nevada may utilize the program. She presented the letter as follows:

October 20, 2015

Attn: Board of Directors
Council for Interior Design Qualification
1602 L Street, NW Ste 200
Washington, DC 20036-5681

Re: Nevada Board Participation in the Alternative Application Review Program for Broadly Experienced Interior Design Candidates without a CIDA Degree

Dear CIDQ Board of Directors:

The Nevada Board has been considering the utilization of CIDQ's Alternative Application Review Program (AARP) as a mechanism to review non-accredited interior design degrees attained by Nevada registered interior design applicants. The objective of the review would be to determine whether the applicant's program of interior design is substantially equivalent to a CIDA accredited degree. Nevada's current process is outdated, cumbersome, and expensive for both the applicant and the Board. We have reviewed the AARP and find it to be very similar to the review process utilized by the Nevada Board. The Board would like to utilize the AARP Program with two small program modifications: the 10 years' work experience requirement would be amended to five years per Nevada law, and the applicant must have passed the NCIDQ examination in order to apply. Is CIDQ willing to review the educational background of Nevada's registered interior design applicants who have obtained a non-CIDA accredited degree and determine if the degree is substantially equivalent to a CIDA degree?

Upon completion of CIDQ's review of an applicant's education, the Nevada Board would need a letter of conclusion containing the following:

1. Full name of applicant and contact information
2. Date of birth
3. Whether the degree is substantially equivalent to a CIDA degree; and
4. NCIDQ Certificate Number

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need additional information to make your decision. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE, INTERIOR DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL DESIGN

Motion: Ciesynski moved to approve submittal of the letter to the CIDQ Board of Directors. Motion seconded by Tanner.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 12B FYI: CIDQ Executive Director Announcement

Ciesynski announced that CIDQ's executive director, Carol Williams-Nickelson, resigned on October 15, 2015. A new executive director will be chosen and announced in the near future.

Agenda Item 12C FYI: Q-Connection Newsletter September 2015

Ciesynski said this information was provided for board members' information.

Ciesynski added that she wanted to explain the candidate selection process for CIDQ's Board of Directors.

Among others, CIDQ's Nominating Committee includes one regulatory board member, CIDQ's past-president, and at least one Canadian delegate. The candidate selection process begins at the CIDQ Annual Meeting. During the meeting the president and president-elect attempt to identify leaders as possible candidates.

After selection, candidates are evaluated by CIDQ's Nominating Committee and then interviewed. Ciesynski said a large amount of time and effort is put into the selection process in order to ensure that the CIDQ Board of Directors is well-served.

AGENDA ITEM 13 Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Executive Director Succession

The board discussed the matter of filling the NSBAIDRD's executive director position upon Spaulding's retirement.

The board asked Harrison to become the executive director of the NSBAIDRD upon Spaulding's retirement. Harrison accepted.

Motion: Erny moved that Harrison become the NSBAIDRD's executive director upon Spaulding's retirement. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 14 Executive Director Report

Spaulding announced that the next board meeting will be held in Reno on January 13 & 14, 2016. Two formal hearings will be held on January 13 and the remainder of business will be conducted on January 14.

Spaulding said staff will be packing the office soon in order for it to be re-painted & re-carpeted at the end of the year. Brackets for monitors in the board room will be hung and some doors in the office will be replaced during that time.

Spaulding reported that the joint meeting with the California Architecture Board has not been solidified.

Renewal reminders were sent out on October 15, 2015 to almost 3,100 registrants.

The NSBAIDRD/AIA Continuing Education Seminar will be held on December 7, 2015 in Reno. Spaulding encouraged board members to attend if they had not already done so.

Spaulding reminded board members to book their flights to Atlanta, Georgia for the 2015 CIDQ Annual Meeting.

Spaulding said the Continuing Education Committee would meet on Wednesday, December 16, 2015 at 10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 15 Board Counsel Report

Ling had nothing to report.

AGENDA ITEM 16 Public Information Report

Hahn reported that on August 21, 2015 she attended an Emerging Professionals Young Architects Forum (EPYAF) event. EPYAF is the AIA Las Vegas forum for young architects, interns, & affiliated professionals. Klai, who co-sponsored the event, introduced Hahn to the attendees. Hahn said she encouraged the EPYAF members to contact her anytime they were in need of assistance on the path to licensure.

On September 21, 2015 Hahn attended and spoke to students at a "Welcome Back Reception" held for students of the UNLV School of Architecture. The event was hosted by the Las Vegas chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA). Garlock, Klai, Spaulding, and Harrison were also in attendance and of great support to Hahn.

There were approximately twenty students in attendance at the event. AIA Las Vegas presented their annual scholarships and awards to students. Hahn said she and Spaulding spoke to students concerning the Intern Development Program (IDP), Architect Registration Examination (ARE), and registration with the NSBAIDRD.

Hahn said that she and Harrison attended an information session at UNLV on September 28, 2015. Hahn spoke to approximately 25 students in the interior architecture & design program concerning registration requirements & and laws in the profession.

Two of Nevada's registered interior designers also spoke at the session. They focused on CIDO and professional development. Hahn said that one thing she felt was important to bring back to the board is the appreciation that both registrants had for Nevada's Registration Quiz. They said the quiz is an eye-opener to the importance of recognizing that each jurisdiction has its own laws.

Hahn reported that Glenn Nowak, graduate coordinator for UNLV School of Architecture, would be submitting an article for the next issue of *Focus* concerning IDP and the need for supervisors and mentors in the program. Nowak invited Hahn to speak with graduating students and active interns at the end of the current semester.

Erny suggested placing a recurring blurb in *Focus* requesting volunteers for IDP supervisors and mentors. He also suggested placing something similar on the NSBAIDRD website and on the registration renewal form for 2017. Spaulding, Snyder, and Klai agreed with the idea.

Hahn said the next issue of *Focus* would be sent out by November 30, 2015.

AGENDA ITEM 17 Elections of Officers

Chairman Garlock and Secretary/Treasurer Mickey expressed that they would like to remain in their current positions for another year in order to implement the transition of a new executive director in 2016.

Motion: Klai moved to re-elect Garlock as chairman and Mickey as secretary/treasurer. Motion seconded by Erny.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 18 Items for Future Agenda

- revisit NSBAIDRD's Strategic Plan
- discuss investment strategies for NSBAIDRD's monies to offset banking costs

AGENDA ITEM 19 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Chairman Garlock adjourned the meeting at 3:12 p.m.

Gina Spaulding, Executive Director

James Mickey, Acting Secretary/Treasurer