

MINUTES

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE AND INTERIOR DESIGN

The Ritz-Carlton Sarasota
1111 Ritz Carlton Drive
Sarasota, Florida 34236

July 30, 2003

Committee Meetings

July 30, 2003

9:00 a.m.

INTERIOR DESIGN COMMITTEE

Chair – Mary Jane Reeves

Call to Order

Ms. Reeves called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

MOTION: Mr. Gonzalez moved to approve the minutes of the May 22, 2003 Interior Design Committee Meeting.

SECOND: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Board Members Present:

Miguel Rodriguez
Ellis Bullock
Rick Gonzalez
Neil Hall
Stephen Schreiber
Mary Jane Reeves, Chair
Sharon Del Bianco
Joyce Shore
Kenneth Horstmyer
Garrick Gustafson
Roymi Membiela

Others Present:

Paul Martin, Board Counsel
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Government Analyst
Shelly Siegel, Past President IDAF
Heather Scholz
Rita Scholz, President IDAF

Nancy Bredemeyer, Indian River Community College
Gloria Ellinwood
Ann Wingate
Zenaida Young, Palm Beach Community College
Suzette Crosby, President Elect IDAF
Linda Calhoun
Julie Hargrove, Secretary IDAF
Bill Kobrynich,
Pat Johnston, Chair Internation
David Butler, Florida State University
Michael Wirtz
Trent Manausa
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Emory Johnson
Les Smith, Investigator
Steve Hefner, IDAF

Discussion

FIDER 4-year degree program – Sharon Del Bianco

Ms. Del Bianco commented that FIDER would no longer accredit two and three year programs. She continued by stating they will only accredit four year programs and backup information is available in the agenda as to why they are making the change. She stated that they conducted a survey and determined that basically one third of the states that have licensure requirements require four-year degrees.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if the two-year programs would fade out or will FIDER continue to re-accredit. Ms. Del Bianco replied each professional program that are currently accredited that do not culminate in a Bachelor Degree have until January 1, 2010 to comply with the new requirement. She continued by stating that as of January 1, 2004, all programs applying for accreditation must demonstrate curriculum that culminates in a Bachelor Degree.

Mr. Horstmyer asked if the four-year program allowed for liberal art and non-business courses. Mr. Bulter commented that four-year institutions allow approximately 15 elective credits in liberal studies of the required 60 credit hours. He commented that FIDER and non-FIDER have to accommodate business and professional practices. Mr. Butler commented that recent legislation allows two-year programs to award professional degrees. He commented that he hopes that universities would partner with these programs so two-year degrees do not fall by the wayside.

Mr. Bullock asked if the only way a two-year degree program could award a professional degree would be to partner with a University. Mr. Butler replied in the negative, he gave an example St. Petersburg Community College awards four-year degrees.

NCIDQ – Michael Wirtz

Bylaw change eliminating officer position of Executive Vice-President and adding Executive Director

Mr. Wirtz referred the board to the information in the agenda packet and commented that there was nothing for the board to be concerned with regarding this information. He commented that as Florida's delegate he would be voting in favor of this Bylaw change.

MOTION: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve the Bylaw change.

SECOND: Mr. Bullock seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

New Executive Director announced

Mr. Wirtz commented that Mr. Bostic resigned and the announcement was in the agenda packet. He commented that Mr. Kenney has a background in architecture and he has heard wonderful reviews regarding him.

Florida resolutions for annual meeting

Mr. Wirtz reviewed the resolution information with the board and asked for direction. The board had input regarding the resolutions.

Mr. Wirtz provided and reviewed for the board a copy of the NCIDQ April 3, 2003 test results. Mr. Wirtz reviewed the National information and commented that unfortunately, the way the report is written he could not provide Florida specific information.

Rental condominium and model home applicable building & fire codes – Sharon Del Bianco

Ms. Del Bianco requested that this information be placed on the agenda. She asked the architects if model homes have to adhere to commercial building codes. Mr. Rodriguez replied that a model center would but not a model home.

Letter to Department of Management Services & Florida Building Code regarding inclusion of Interior Designers in listing of design professionals – Sharon Del Bianco

Ms. Del Bianco referred the board to the addendum packet and asked the board to review the letters. She read the first draft letter for the audience. The first letter was in regards to Interior Designers being included in the definitions of the Florida Building Code. Ms. Siegel commented that there should be a code change to include Interior Designers in the definition of Design Professionals.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that she should include language that states Interior Designers are regulated by Chapter 481, Part I, Florida Statutes. He commented that the Florida Building Code addresses professionals regulated by Chapter 481, Part I, F.S. He commented that there is a period that allows for modification to the code which they call a glitch change stating that while the Code refers to professionals regulated under Chapter 481, Part I, F.S., it fails to mention Interior Designers.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that to have an individual appointed to the Florida Building Commission from the Interior Design community, they would need to address the Governor. Mr. Martin commented that professionals that make up the Commission are pointed out in the statute. Mr. Rodriguez commented that it would require legislative change. Mr. Rodriguez commented that he would include in the letter that “we believe we should be able to serve on the Technical Advisory Committee as they currently exist and recommend that an Interior Designer be recommended for inclusion on the Commission.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the letter should be addressed to Mr. Raul Rodriguez and copy Mr. Rick Dixon. Mr. Shalley commented that Mr. Dixon had discretion to hand pick individual for the Technical Advisory Committees (TAC).

Ms. Del Bianco read the draft of the second letter to the audience, which was in regards to the inclusion of Interior Designers in the Consultant Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA). Mr. Rodriguez commented that this would require a legislative change and address the letter to Mr. Ron Book. Mr. Shalley commented that CCNA is under Chapter 287.055, F.S.

IDAF Forum – Rita Scholz

Ms. Scholz commented that IDAF previously called all members to contact their legislature regarding the sweep of the trust fund. She commented that ASID has a new chapter, which they will have a North, South, and West. She commented that the West would be official October 1, 2003.

New Business

Mr. Wirtz commented that he was contacted by an individual regarding continuing education being offered and wanted to bring it to the board’s attention for investigation. Mr. Bulter commented that he has had some of the same questions. He continued by stating that there is a loophole for this type of course because they can submit an application for four hours of optional credit. He stated that this kind of continuing education is misleading because it can be valid in other states as self initiated study.

Old Business

Ms. Reeves presented Mr. Wirtz with an appreciation plaque.

Ms. Siegel commented that she recently denied four AutoCad courses and that she would like to see information provided to the schools letting them know that if they offer basic or beginning AutoCad courses they will not be approved by the board. The board discussed the need to know basic AutoCad, however, continuing education is considered life long learning and to build upon core competency. Ms. Reeves commented that basic AutoCad courses are offered in initial education and should not be considered continuing education. Ms. Johnson commented that there are upgrades in technology regarding AutoCad.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that there are probably people that have been practicing a longtime but AutoCad is basic education for some individuals.

Mr. Butler commented that a lot of courses out there are basic courses that are taught in initial education. He cautioned the board to be careful regarding the direction they go with approving and denying basic AutoCad.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that providers and courses were automatically approved at this last renewal. Mr. Rodriguez commented that he has concerns that there are re-approved courses that are stale. He continued by stating a great provider would update the course. Ms. Chastain commented that they should address the issue by updating the handbook. She commented that they would re-review the courses every two years upon approval of the course as opposed to the renewal of the licensee's cycle.

Adjourn

Ms. Reeves adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

ARCHITECTURE COMMITTEE

Chair – Ellis Bullock

Call to Order

Mr. Bullock called the meeting to order at 10:26 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Miguel Rodriguez
Ellis Bullock, Chair
Rick Gonzalez
Neil Hall
Stephen Schreiber
Mary Jane Reeves, Chair
Sharon Del Bianco
Joyce Shore
Kenneth Horstmyer
Garrick Gustafson
Roymi Membiela

Others Present:

Paul Martin, Board Counsel
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Government Analyst
Shelly Siegel, Past President IDAF
Heather Scholz
Rita Scholz, President IDAF
Nancy Bredemeyer, Indian River Community College
Gloria Ellinwood

Ann Wingate
Salia Loyon, Palm Beach Community College
Suzette Crosby, President Elect IDAF
Linda Calhoun
Julie Hargrove, Secretary IDAF
Bill Kobrynich,
Pat Johnston, Chair Internation
David Butler, Florida State University
Michael Wirtz
Trent Manausa
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Emory Johnson
Les Smith, Investigator
Steve Hefner, IDAF

Discussion

NCARB Annual Meeting Report – Miguel Rodriguez

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the NCARB Annual Meeting was held in San Antonio, TX in June. He continued by stating that none of the resolutions that Region 3 proctored were moved forward and there was considerable discussion regarding a committee reviewing travel reimbursement policy and board stipend policy. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the travel reimbursement policy and board stipend policy was referred to the Procedures and Documents Committee for review. He continued by stating that there was significant discussion regarding this issue and Mr. Jeff Huberman convinced the Region not to move forward with this issue. Mr. Rodriguez commented that he and others within Region 3 explained why and what the intent was for the resolutions to the other Regions. He commented that it was a disappointing meeting and essentially uneventful.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she was disappointed in the representation and presentation by the lead of Region 3. Mr. Bullock commented that the he was appalled that the delegate from Region 3 ignored the Region's request.

Incidental practice definition and construction administration design professional requirement discussion

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she attended the national meeting and noticed that other states are passing language regarding incidental practice definitions and construction administration definitions. She continued that she was wondering if they should consider setting parameters in Florida. Mr. Gonzalez commented that he finds it amazing that a civil engineer is required to certify a parking lot and an architect is not required to certify a building.

Mr. Bullock asked Mr. Martin what it would take to make it mandatory for architects to provide construction administration. Mr. Martin replied he did not believe they have authority to mandate that requirement. He commented that there was a growing prevalence among building officials especially since the adoption of the Building Code

to require more professional involvement regarding permitting construction. He commented they could require that, however, he did not feel they make it a requirement based on the board's statutes.

Mr. Manausa commented that in his efforts of rewriting the statutes, he was using the NCARB model law, which includes this requirement. Mr. Bullock commented that architects that carry errors and omission insurance have lower premiums when they perform construction administration.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the incidental practice issue may not be an issue that can be resolved. He continued by stating that the definition would be binding to this board not necessarily other professions, i.e. engineers. He commented that there were joint meetings held between Engineers, Building Code Administrators, and Architects to try and resolve the incidental practice and other issues, however, for some reason the meetings came to a halt.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that he would like to see a requirement for continued involvement by the design professional in the way of construction/contract administration. He commented that he would like to have a requirement that is not too burdensome. He commented that this Committee should determine if it is necessary and then discuss during the Rules Committee. He commented that he would like to see this in the Rule not in Statute because it would leave little room for interpretation.

Mr. Schreiber commented that there appears to be a basis for doing this. He continued by commenting it would be interesting to see how many complaints are filed based on lack of construction administration. Mr. Minacci commented that he recalled a licensed case where construction administration was listed in a contract.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that he felt clients would pay additional monies to have an architect involved in construction administration to avoid change orders, etc. He commented that the architect is the missing link in the process. Mr. Hall stated that in his county there are architects that specialize in construction administration. He commented that he was surprised that counties do not require construction administration from architects.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she did not feel they would be able to require this but could define it. Mr. Rodriguez felt they would have a strong case to require construction administration because it would enhance health, safety, and welfare. He commented that if there was a requirement it would have a residual effect and minimize plan stamping because the architect of record is required to contract construction administration.

Mr. Victor Lataovich comments were inaudible.

Mr. Martin commented that the use of an architect is mandated and that the client has to contract with the architect to provide construction administration and the use of other

professionals may not mandate this requirement for less cost. Mr. Martin asked if this would fall under client contract negotiations. Mr. Bullock replied that it was more an owner/seller than an owner/user. He commented that an owner that uses the building will require full services, however, an owner/seller say of a condominium, an architect is a financial burden. Mr. Manausa commented that it was a health, safety, and welfare issue that you sell to the legislature. He commented that as an architect if you have not gone out to the project during construction then you miss 90% of what the law is asking an architect to do.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that if this profession does this and the others do not follow suit then it is easy for the user to over the necessary requirement. Mr. Manausa commented that it was law that to build a building then you must use an architect.

Mr. Bullock asked if he felt that threshold inspectors would support this. Mr. Manausa replied in the positive. Mr. Rodriguez commented that a threshold inspector's requirement is narrowed to a specific structural component and does not address or include contract construction administration.

Ms. Del Bianco asked Ms. Chastain if they requested to revive the joint meetings with Engineers or just Building Code Administrators and Inspectors. Ms. Chastain replied the Building Code Administrators and Inspectors.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that it might be beneficial to perform a survey of Engineers and other professions to determine if and how this issue effects them. Ms. Membiela agreed with that comment and added that it might be beneficial to invite other entities to give presentations to our board. She continued by stating that it would be helpful to determine how to implement and what the pros and cons are. Mr. Gonzalez referred the board to the California Strategic Plan and commented that this was one of California's top 5 issues.

Mr. Rodriguez requested that Mr. Shalley put the question on the Friday Facts to get a consensus from the members regarding adding construction administration to the department's laws and rules.

California Architects Board 2003 Strategic Plan

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would love to have a strategic plan. She commented that she would like to request that California send an electronic version of their plan to work from.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that it appears the board would need to have a workshop to prepare and structure a strategic plan. Mr. Rodriguez commented that this is an event in itself not a workshop. He commented that they would need to budget for a retreat to work on the Strategic Plan. Ms. Reeves stated it should be done separately from the board meetings, for two days and facilitated by someone, not a board member. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) utilized someone from DCA and he did a decent job.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that they would have the retreat then the board would need to review the final product.

Mr. Hall commented that when you conduct and produce a strategic plan the entity is in control of its destiny. He continued by stating he did not feel that the board has control of its destiny. He commented that unless they are privatized he feels this may be a waste of time and effort. Ms. Membiela asked if the document had to be reviewed by the legislature. Mr. Rodriguez replied if there are issues in the document that require legislative change then yes it would, however, most issues can be resolved by rule changes. He commented that he felt a strategic plan would provide a road map for protection of health, safety, and welfare.

Mr. Gustafson asked if there were any other states that have strategic plans. Mr. Bullock replied they could get that information from NCARB. Mr. Hall commented that he felt that California was the most complete plan.

MOTION: Ms. Del Bianco made a motion that Mr. Schreiber check with NCARB and verify if other states have strategic plans and staff research funding for a retreat and a facilitator in 2003-2004 travel plan.

SECOND: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Pending decision on requiring NCARB's IDP for initial registration (California)

Mr. Rodriguez commented that California studies many different things within the profession. He commented that he felt that AIA should take IDP back. He commented that he would encourage disciplinary cases for architects that falsify IDP reports because it is similar to plan stamping. Mr. Rodriguez commented that there is a responsibility to the supervisor as a mentor to insure that the new or young architect is exposed to the materials for learning. He commented that as a supervisor if you sign off on an IDP form that the individual has performed certain duties, knowing they have not, then that supervisor has falsified the report.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that if you have a program out there that is utilized for licensure and it is not working then the program needs to be reviewed to make it work. He commented that it is not working under NCARB. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the IDP verification of knowledge has transferred.

Mr. Schreiber commented that the ARE is supposed to be the validation of the IDP. Mr. Rodriguez commented that ARE is testing learned education. Mr. Schreiber stated that it is suppose to be practice based testing. Mr. Rodriguez disagreed. He commented that there is a lot of subjective items there and the two should work together. Mr. Rodriguez commented that IDP is senseless as it operates today. He continued by stating that it is a good concept and it needs to be fixed.

Ms. Del Bianco asked if they were considering dropping NCARB's model. Mr. Rodriguez commented no but he was advocating change. He commented that individuals on the NCARB IDP Committee are having conversations about this as well.

For the Board's Information

Southern Conference/NCARB Report Austin, Texas– Miguel Rodriguez

Southern Conference/NCARB Spring Joint Regional Meetings St. Thomas, USVI – Miguel Rodriguez

Southern Conference/NCARB Financial Statements Year ending June 30, 2002

Letter to Arq. Pedro Alfaro, Jr. from Donna Ingram

Letter to Steven Ellinger regarding the Annual NCARB Audit

E-mail from Karen Owen – Regional Director's Report to the Region, Updated By-Laws, Updated Policy Manual

NCARB Member Board Requirements

The University of Kansas Wins \$25,000 NCARB Grand Prize

NCARB Travel to Regional Meetings and Annual Meeting/Conference

NCARB Makes IDP Enhancements in Response to 1999 Study

Richmond, Virginia Architect, Robert A. Boynton, FAIA, Elected President of National Architect Council

National Architect Council Welcomes New Board of Directors

New Business

No new business.

Old Business

No old business.

Ms. Membiela asked why there was more participation in the audience from the interior design profession than architects. Mr. Gonzalez replied that the interior designers were here to protect their interest. Ms. Membiela asked why there were not more architects. Ms. Reeves replied that the board was previously the Board of Architects, interior designers were added at a later date and they are here to protect their interest.

Mr. Hall reiterated Ms. Membiela's question, why are there not more architects in attendance at the meetings. Mr. Rodriguez replied that they as an organization hold meetings in conjunction with our board meetings. Ms. Membiela asked if the board did outreach to both professions to attend the meetings. Mr. Rodriguez replied that there would be more architects at tomorrow's meeting but they would be here for the wrong reasons.

Mr. Shalley commented that it was not excusable that architects are not in attendance. He commented that there is a bit of complacency within the profession. He continued by stating that he felt if the board offered continuing education for attending the board meetings, especially the discipline portion of the meetings, would be beneficial. Mr. Shalley stated there was no excuse. Mr. Martin commented that there is limited space

at the meetings and it increases cost to the board for audience attendance if it increases dramatically.

Mr. Shalley commented that he would encourage the board to agree or disagree if it is appropriate. He commented that AIA would handle logistics and possibly charge a minimal fee. He commented that they shouldn't have to bribe architects to attend they should attend anyway.

MOTION: Ms. Membiela moved that this committee evaluate options on how to encourage others to attend the board meeting so both professions are represented.

SECOND: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Adjourn

MOTION: Ms. Del Bianco moved to adjourn.

SECOND: Mr. Bullock seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

EDUCATORS TASK FORCE COMMITTEE

Call to Order

Mr. Gonzalez called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Board Members Present:

Miguel Rodriguez
Ellis Bullock
Rick Gonzalez, Chair
Neil Hall
Stephen Schreiber
Mary Jane Reeves
Sharon Del Bianco
Joyce Shore
Kenneth Horstmyer
Garrick Gustafson
Roymi Membiela

Others Present:

Paul Martin, Board Counsel
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Government Analyst
Lorraine Dunn-Glipsin, ASID and IDAF
Zenaida Young, Palm Beach Community College

Dr. Dennis Gallon, Palm Beach Community College
Dr. Harry Albertson, Executive Director, Florida Association of Community Colleges
Dr. Peter Magyar, Florida Atlantic University
Jerry Hicks, Board Consultant
Steven Hefner, ASID
Jill Smith, Seminole Community College
Nancy Bredemeyer, Indian River Community College
Jose Farinos, Indian River Community College
Gloria Ellinwood, ASID
Jerry Moore
Mr. Ann McGee, Seminole Community College
Don Payton, Seminole Community College
Shelly Siegel, Past President IDAF
Suzette Crosby, President Elect IDAF
Pat Johnston, International Academy of Design
Ann Wingate, IDAF
David Butler, Florida State University
Gail Griffen, Miami-Dade Community College
Bill Kornegay, Miami-Dade Community College
Bill Kobrynich, Art Institute of Ft. Lauderdale,
Julie Hargrove, IDAF
Les Smith, Investigator
Rita Scholz, ASID, IDAF

Discussion

Interior Design

FIDER's move to a 4-year degree program

FIDER Professional Standards 2002

FIDER Glossary

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the board discussed briefly during the Interior Design Committee Meeting. She continued by stating that FIDER would no longer accredit two-year degree programs as of January 1, 2004. She stated that they have 8 programs currently approved that do not culminate in a Bachelor's Degree and those programs will have until January 1, 2010 to comply. She commented that after January 1, 2004, all programs applied for accreditation must demonstrate a minimum of a Bachelor's Degree.

Dr. Harry Albertson with the Florida Association of Community Colleges commented for clarification purposes that he understood the FIDER change effects only accreditation. He understood that the board was considering a change that would eliminate the ability of a two-year degree graduate with four years work experience to sit for the examination. Ms. Del Bianco commented that the board has discussed that option. Ms. Reeves commented that the board has no say in who sits for the examination that is NCIDQ's determination.

Dr. Albertson asked the board what they were trying to adopt at this meeting. Ms. Del Bianco replied that they were not trying to adopt anything at this point but called the meeting to get feedback from the architecture and interior design Educators, accredited or not, regarding this issue. She continued by stating they have not had an open forum meeting since 1998.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the board's changes effect the practice and education and vice-versa. She continued by stating that the board is charged with licensing professionals. She commented that FIDER has indicated that on a national level the professionals favor a four-year degree. Ms. Del Bianco commented that the board has received information from ASID that all of the jurisdictions that have practice or title acts, approximately one third require a four-year degree. She continued by stating that FIDER has the two-year model and with that model no longer being updated or advanced the board has nothing that proves equivalency.

Dr. Albertson commented that this is an old issue and in 1993 the board submitted legislation to eliminate the two-year degree option. He continued by stating that it was an amendment to a bill that passed. He stated that the legislature became concerned and the legislative staff came back with a recommendation to reinstate the two-year option. He stated that the two-year option was very important. Dr. Albertson commented that the legislature passed another bill, which resulted in Chapter 481.2125, F.S. that requires every board proposing changes that effect educational requirements must work with the educational entities. He continued by stating they currently have 1,2,00 students enrolled in the interior design program.

Dr. Albertson commented that he was at a loss trying to determine what professional skill their students do not have because they are passing examinations and are competing salary wise with four-year degree students. He continued by that he has serious concerns about anything that effects the viability of the two-year degree programs because they are outstanding programs.

Dr. Dennis Gallon, President of Palm Beach Community College, thanked the board for allowing the Community Colleges an opportunity to be apart of this decision. He commented that he was there on behalf of the 6 programs and the students currently enrolled in the interior design programs. Dr. Gallon commented that he was representing all 28 Community Colleges and they support the 6 programs that offer the FIDER accredited programs. He commented that Community Colleges are the largest provider of interior design education and produce approximately 64% of the interior design graduates in this state for the past five years. He commented that Community Colleges have graduated 855 students and Universities have graduated approximately 488 students according to state data figures. Dr. Gallon commented that according to state data two-year degree graduates are gainfully employed and making approximately \$31,000 per year. He continued by stating that University graduates with a Bachelor's degree have an annual income of approximately \$27,000 per year, so that is less than the two-year graduates.

Dr. Gallon commented that if this recommendation were imposed then it would make the education requirement more difficult because many citizens do not have the ability to pick up and move to a University city. He continued by stating there are three Universities in the state that offers the Bachelor's Degree. He commented that the average student is approximately 33 years of age, they work part time, attend school part time, and have a family to provide for.

Dr. Gallon commented that reviewing the FIDER recommendation that it appeared that part of the reason for the recommendation was the liberal arts component of the Bachelor's Degree. He continued by stating that he appreciates the desire, however, the debate regarding what is the sufficient amount of liberal arts has been going on for years. He commented that according to the FIDER information they are requiring 30 hours of liberal arts. He commented that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) recommends 36 hours and the statute requires 36 hours of general education. Dr. Gallon commented that there was a difference of opinion as to what is the sufficient number of liberal arts or general education.

Dr. Gallon commented that their students are tested to insure that they have communication and computation skills necessary to do college credit work. He commented that there is no evidence that a four-year program is more beneficial than a two-year program and used nursing as an example. He commented that he would like the board and FIDER to realize that they have competent capable students graduating from the institutions to practice the profession.

Ms. Del Bianco read the NCIDQ pass rates statistics.

Dr. Ann McGee asked how the statistics where broken down if they were between Universities versus Community Colleges. Ms. Del Bianco responded that there was not a break down. Mr. Rodriguez commented that it is not and the board had this conversation at the last meeting because architecture does not differentiate between Universities or Community Colleges. Mr. Rodriguez commented that he was a product of the Community College system, receiving his Associate Degree from Miami-Dade Community College then transferred to the University of Miami for his Bachelor's in Architecture. He commented that regardless of how FIDER goes the board has statutes they must follow.

Mr. Rodriguez asked how would going to a four-year degree requirement in interior design be more detrimental or different than the system in place for architecture. Dr. Gallon replied that an Associate in Arts Degree guarantees that an individual can transfer to a University and have junior status. He continued by stating they are discussing an Associate in Science Degree and unless there is an agreement between the Community College and University there is no guarantee that the Associate Degree would transfer. Dr. Gallon commented that the credit requirements are that you must have 15 semester hours in the intended core, which means the other courses are professional courses. He commented that those courses in some cases are junior and senior level courses. He continued by stating they are preparing individuals to go into

the world to work and become employed citizens. Dr. Gallon stated unless there is an agreement between the Community College and the University stating those junior and senior courses are transferable then they would not transfer.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if they renamed or retitled the degree to an Associate in Arts if that would trigger a different general education requirement. Dr. Gallon replied that SACS states that an individual shall complete 36 credit hours, no more in a core. He commented that the student chooses what those additional hours would be in either architecture or interior design.

Dr. Albertson commented that many of the students do not have access to the three Universities that offer a Bachelor's in Interior Design Degree. He continued by stating he was not aware if those Universities offer the degree online. He commented that most students are working full or part-time and have families so access is a big issue.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if the market would draw students to the program over the implementation time frame. Dr. Albertson responded that it might. He commented that Community Colleges are driven to support what the needs are in the community.

Mr. Gustafson asked if the 6 accredited programs were at Community Colleges. Dr. Albertson responded that there is one accredited Community College, which was Seminole Community College. He continued by stating that there is a huge expense to have FIDER accreditation. Dr. Albertson stated that all of the institutions in Florida are SACS accredited. He commented that a lot of the requirements for SACS accreditation meets the FIDER accreditation requirements, i.e. the Interior Design Professors must have a Master's Degree.

Dr. McGee commented that 10% of the students already enrolled in Community College nationally have a Bachelor's Degree or higher. She continued by stating students are coming back for other skills or want to change their profession. She commented that if you specifically look at her program 30% of the students already have Bachelor's Degrees.

Ms. Dunn-Glispin commented why would any school, College or University, offer anyone courses that would not transfer. Ms. McGee commented that some Colleges are partnering with Universities to accomplish and overcome this issue. Ms. Griffen commented that some schools have slight variations in course definitions.

Mr. Butler commented that he is contacted three or four times per week by individuals that are not graduates from a FIDER accredited program and they are concerned that they will be denied the privilege to practice. He continued by stating FIDER are only standards that the board chose to live by years ago. Mr. Butler stated that the board decided in 1997 not to become an accrediting agency/body. He continued by stating if FIDER was no longer going to be a standard by which they developed the two-year provision, then someone is going to have to re-develop the two-year program. He stated

he does not see how that can be done without the board stepping in, which makes them an accrediting body.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the board must look at this as a health, safety and welfare aspect. She continued by stating this change would not prohibit the institution's graduates from practicing interior design residentially or in an office under a licensed profession. She commented that this would merely prohibit them from owning their own business or practicing commercial design. Ms. Del Bianco commented that she mis-spoke that an individual could be a design assistant not interior designer.

Mr. Gonzalez asked the audience if they have given thought on how to convert the degree from an Associate in Science to an Associate in Arts to give the student better choices to continue. Dr. Albertson commented that there are very strict guidelines and competencies that the schools must meet and feels they are the same as what FIDER has adopted. He commented that there is a common course number system that must be met because the Community Colleges are not senior level institutions they cannot have 3000 or 4000 course number sequence. He commented that the course is the same in competency as the Universities but have a different numbering sequence that begins with 2000. Dr. Albertson stated that Universities do not have to accept the course even though it has the same content. He commented that is the reason for the Associate in Science Degree programs that have to have an articulation agreement with the Universities. Dr. Albertson commented that with an Associate of Arts Degree when you take an English course at the Community College it is the same course that you would take at a University, therefore, there is guaranteed articulation with all Universities.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that cost is a factor for individuals because they can receive the same education for less money. Dr. Albertson commented that the legislature is aware of the articulation problem. Dr. Albertson commented that the competencies are the same from the Community College as the University. Dr. Albertson commented it costs the state and students approximately \$24,000 to receive a Bachelor's Degree and to receive an Associate's Degree the cost is \$9,100. He commented that there was an approximately \$14,000 difference and the Associate in Science graduates are doing as well in the work field as a Bachelor graduate.

Dr. Peter Magyar with Florida Atlantic University commented that Universities do react to the needs of the students. Tape inaudible.

Jose Farinos with Indian River Community College commented that they might be ignoring the fact to access the examination an individual must have four-years of practice in addition to the education for a total of six-years. He commented the issue might be if four-years of practice under a licensed individual is equivalent to two additional years of academic work. He commented that they all agree that it is desired to have as much education as possible. He commented that the mission of the Community Colleges is different than that of the Universities. He commented that the Community Colleges produce students with the same or very close number of credits in

the core knowledge and the same hours in the core of interior design as University graduates. He commented that the examination does not test for or addresses academics and he was wondering why it was an issue now. He commented that the architecture and interior design professions are different and separate. He commented that six years total is what allows an individual to sit for the examination.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that his analysis could go either way. She continued by stating sometimes two extra years in school is more valuable than doing the same details or tasks in the field. She commented that sometimes extra years in the field doing a varied experienced program are better than extra education. She stated that was hard to put your finger on. Mr. Farinos replied, agreed, and commented that a bad professor could be as bad as a bad boss.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that NCIDQ does not require an interior design degree to be eligible to sit for the examination. She continued by stating Florida requires an interior design degree to be eligible for examination and licensure. Ms. Del Bianco commented that NCIDQ is offering to IDCEC members an opportunity to take the examination for no charge.

Dr. McGee with Seminole Community College commented that there are 460 interior designer students, which says a lot for the popularity of the program. She commented that also says a lot for the public they are educating because individuals are coming back for a second or third careers as well as high school graduates. She commented that 64% of individuals being hired in the state are graduating from Community Colleges. She commented that reflects an incredible access point for the profession. She commented that the placement rate is very close to that of Universities.

Dr. McGee commented that the two years of education that the students receive is 55 hours in interior design and then 15 hours of liberal arts. She commented that the Universities receive 60 hours of interior design and then 30 hours of liberal arts, which is only difference of 15 hours of liberal arts. She asked the board to consider what the problem that is being addressed. She continued by stating that one of the things is where they are falling down in terms of their level of education. She commented the other problem would be what skills do the University graduates have that Community College graduates do not.

Dr. McGee commented that their interior design students and graduates redesigned 16 of the 22 room in the Ronald McDonald House. She commented that she was very proud of their students.

Mr. Butler commented the board should consider reaching out to Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC) regarding an intern development program. He commented that it might be a possibility to consider during that intern development program that they track education as well as the work experience. He commented that they might want to look into that program.

Ms. Patricia Johnston with the International Academy commented that she has Associate and Bachelor degrees to work with. She commented that she worked with the task force that took the language of FIDER out of the statutes because the Associate description was only referred to as a pathway to become a design assistant. She commented that the discussion about FIDER getting rid of the accreditation of the two-year program is not a discussion to be incorporated into the discussion of licensure of the two-year program in Florida. She commented that they are separate and the language was not consistent with a track towards state licensure. She commented that the issue is whether they drop the Associates degree in Florida. She commented that they should probably not use the language two-year or four-year degrees because everyone is fast tracking and finishing say in 18 months.

Ms. Johnston commented that the colleges and universities should try to determine how many students are taking and passing the NCIDQ examination. She commented that there is apparently no way to track this information unless the colleges and universities do it. She commented that the Rule 61G1-23.003 offers a problem because it reads, "the passage of an applicant of the NCIDQ examination will be used by the board in evaluating whether an applicant's institution meets the educational standards". She commented to be able to qualify the institution you would have to determine if they are producing students that pass the test.

Mr. Butler commented that Rule 61G1-23.003 is used if the institution is a non-FIDER and it still must have the same educational requirements and it's not an override.

Mr. Emory Johnson commented that in the past 13 years he has made 23 visits for accreditation for FIDER. He continued by stating he has a varied view point because he has visited a number of two-year programs both in the U.S. and Canada. He commented that some history as to why the two-year programs were included in the first place because the board grandfathered other interior designers that had not taken examinations. He commented at that time it was the right thing to do. He commented that they followed what was mandated by legislation. He continued by stating they were also required to include the two-year degree program at the time legislation passed. He commented that currently the statute requires licensure process in education, experience, and examination. He commented that the institutions in attendance today have a vested interested because they have students enrolled in the two-year degree programs.

Mr. Johnson commented that visiting both U.S. and Canadian schools that the number is well over 50% of all two-year students are studying interior design already have a four-year degree in another program. He continued by stating that if you look at the students enrolled in the Master's degree program in interior design they have a Bachelor's degree in some other program of than interior design.

Mr. Johnson commented that in terms in FIDER they are an evolving institution just like NCIDQ. He continued by stating that the NCIDQ has changed the examination from a two-part exam to six-part exam to a three-part exam, which mirrors the original two

exam. He commented that he would urge the board as they consider the two-year degree program to consider the practice act, which is educational experience that is substantially equal. He commented that looking at Rule 61G1 you would find that educational experience that outlines a four or five year educational experience for interior design. He commented that you will also find an outline for a two-year program and if you compare line by line you would be looking at very few additional hours. He stated did the board want the individuals to have additional education, of course they do.

Mr. Johnson commented that he could speak more clear today than he could years ago when drafting the practice act language in 1974. He commented that Community Colleges provide a point of entry but also the examination must be passed. He commented that the board, Community Colleges, and Universities should look at the language. He commented that there is a point of entry to have a profession. He commented that they knew when the language was passed to include the two-year programs that eventually they would have to do a language clean up and that time has come.

Dr. Albertson asked the board to communicate with the schools regarding the direction they plan to take. The board agreed.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the statute is the statute and they could only recommend change whether they support or not support the FIDER recommendation. Ms. Reeves commented that this was the first time the board had discussed this issue. Mr. Hall commented that the board was not and would not act on this issue without their input.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the Educator's Task Force consisted of Peter Magyar, Dennis Hector, Rodner Wright, David Butler, Jeanine King, Bill Kobrynich, and Pat Johnson. She continued by stating that they would meet with the Educator's once a year.

An audience member asked that a Community College representative be on the task force. Ms. Del Bianco agreed.

FIDER equivalency check sheet

Ms. Del Bianco commented that Mr. Butler has been reviewing and evaluating the interior design programs for equivalency. She commented that the Educator's Task Force should take charge and compile a checklist.

Mr. Butler commented that was a tremendous task and stated that they have had a difficult time crafting the language in three entities. He commented that they have clearly made NCIDQ the bottom line. He commented that FSU is held totally accountable for placement of students. He commented that it was difficult to track NCIDQ because they do not provide specific information. He commented that the professional standards set by FIDER is producing a cleaner report and is more

streamlined in accountability. He commented that the professional standards language is a one size fits all language if that is what the state or board chooses to do with the program. He commented that he feels the length of the program should be a Bachelor's program but he did not want to step on the two-year degree program's toes.

Mr. Butler agreed with Mr. Johnson that this is a work in progress. Ms. Del Bianco commented that she understood that FSU was offering Master's Degree online. Mr. Butler confirmed. He commented that the board should not be an accrediting agency.

NCIDQ Forum (different named programs & professionals attendees vote to remain titled interior designers)

Ms. Del Bianco commented that there are programs that are named something other than interior design. She commented that they looked at changing the names to interior architecture, human ecology, art and design but they decided to keep it simple.

Section IV Interior Design Technology – Joyce Butts, Florida Community College at Jacksonville

Rule 61G1-22.003 – Education Requirements for Interior Designers

Ms. Butts was not in attendance.

Architecture

Transfer credit evaluation, foreign degree evaluations and the NCARB blue cover

Ms. Del Bianco commented that they have had applicants that do not meet the requirements even after an EESA evaluation. She commented she was not sure if there was a clean way to transfer credits. Mr. Rodriguez commented that they must rely on the Universities to determine what credits can be transferred. He commented that the EESA evaluation is for foreign degrees, which determines that it is a Bachelor's Degree equivalent. Mr. Rodriguez commented that NCARB now writes the letter that they are equivalent. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the statute states the education should be NAAB equivalent and when EESA transferred this over to NCARB that verification quit coming. He commented that he understood that issue had been cleared up and they are placing on the evaluation that it is NAAB equivalent.

Dr. Magyar commented that in order to accept another institution's credit hours they must check for equivalency before accepting.

“Rolling window” time frame for NCARB post education license exam

Mr. Rodriguez commented that Florida has no set time frame. He commented that NCARB has been charged with researching the rolling window issue. Mr. Schreiber asked if he was referring to an applicant that has five-years to complete the examination. Mr. Rodriguez stated that Florida initially went with NCARB's ARE rolling window, which had no set time frame. He commented that after researching NCARB would probably come back with a set time frame.

Dr. Magyar stated that the student trend appears to be that they take the examination sooner than later. Mr. Schreiber stated that the ARE is not a post IDP requirement. Mr.

Rodriguez commented that he supports taking the test right upon graduation. He commented that he did not feel the rolling window would be less than five or seven years.

Both Professions

Student knowledge of jurisdictional requirements

Ms. Del Bianco asked the institutions if they were providing students with information regarding licensure requirements. Ms. Bredemeyer with Indian River Community College commented that this was a regular class handout.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the problem with licensed professionals is they not knowing the professional practice law. He commented that AIA has not done a good job with helping licensees with the profession practice act and knowing the ins and outs once they leave school. Mr. Hall commented that unlicensed practice is problematic with this profession. He commented that students want to make additional money on the side and they have not received licensure, which gets them in trouble. He commented that this is an issue with individuals that have been licensed for many years and let their license go only to find out upon reapplication they do not meet the requirements and they have continued to practice without a license.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that maybe the institutions could give the students extra credit for attending a board meeting. Mr. Rodriguez commented that as board members they should make themselves available to talk with the schools. Mr. Hall commented to Mr. Minacci to check with the schools and hold speaking engagements regarding the practice act.

Intern development programs and related “in-school” courses

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she wanted to let the Educators know that they have an interior design percentage allowance for experience received during attendance at school. Ms. Griffen with Miami-Dade Community College commented that they have a cooperative program that allows for elective credit for working in the field.

Experience completion requirement prior to licensure exam

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the statute says an architect must have one-year experience prior to examination but it does not say the years of experience must be post graduation. Mr. Hicks commented that he reviews examination applicants and verifies that they have a minimum of 235 value units verified by NCARB. Mr. Manausa commented that the hours are evaluated and if they meet that number of hours then they are eligible to begin taking the examination. He commented that the reality is they should require the individual to complete IDP before taking the examination. Mr. Rodriguez commented that they allow individuals to begin taking the examination whether the experience is pre or post graduation as long as they meet the one-year requirement, i.e. 235 value units as required by NCARB.

Mr. Schreiber stated that some students in other states could complete IDP and education on the same day. Mr. Manausa stated that this state requires one year prior to graduation and the rest after graduation.

Attendance of SNCARB Educator's bi-annual meeting & interest in NCIDQ similar meeting

Ms. Del Bianco commented that they had a good turn out for the bi-annual meeting. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the next meeting would take place in 2005.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she was wondering if there was interest at having an Educators forum at the NCIDQ meetings.

New Business

No new business.

Old Business

No old business.

Adjourn

Mr. Gonzalez adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

RULES COMMITTEE/WORKSHOP

Ms. Del Bianco called meeting to order at 3:25 p.m.

Call to Order

Rule Language Development Adopted – Ann Cocheu

61G1-11.005 – Probable Cause Determinations

61G1-23.010 – Responsible Supervising Control Over Architectural Practice in the Architect's Office

Mr. Martin reviewed the Rules report commenting that the modification to the Responsible Supervisor in Control Rule 61G1-23.010, F.A.C. went into effect July 3, 2003. He continued by stating that the amendments to the Probable Cause Panel Rule 61G1-11.005, F.A.C. went into effect July 13, 2003. He commented that the aforementioned rules have gone through the entire process and are complete.

61G1-12.004 – Disciplinary Guidelines; Range of Penalties; Aggravating and Mitigating Circumstances (noticed for publication in the July 11, 2003 Florida Administrative Weekly)

61G1-23, Responsible Supervising Control (the following were submitted for publication in the July 11, 2003 issue of the Florida Administrative Weekly)

23.025- Add/change rule reference to .015

23.030/060 – Modify to require licensed professional as qualifier

**23.040 – Responsible Supervisor in Control limiting Interior Designer to one office
61G1-26.001/002 – Individual Licensee Responsibilities/Business Responsibilities
– (noticed for publication in the July 11, 2003 Florida Administrative Weekly)**

Mr. Martin commented that rule notices had been submitted but the time had not been completed for adopting barring any objections for Rule 61G1-12, Disciplinary Guidelines.

Mr. Martin commented that the following rules language had been reviewed and approved by the board and submitted for noticing Rule 61G1-23.025, 23.030, 23.040, and 23.060.

REVIEW ANN's report in the addendum.

**Rule Language Status
61G1-16, Seal and Plans
16.003 – Change of title to “Use of Seal”**

Mr. Martin asked the board to verify that they wanted to move forward with the change of the title of this rule. Ms. Del Bianco confirmed that this was a change in the title not content. The board requested that Mr. Martin move forward.

**Rule Language Development for Consideration
61G1-12, Grounds for Disciplinary Proceedings
Add non-compliance with 61G1-16.004 Title Block; architect & interior design
61G1-17 Fees – review; individual, firm and dual
Plural name issue – last meeting we decided to set policy to grand-father existing companies & require multiple licensees for new application, is rule required.**

Mr. Martin asked the board about Rule 61G1-12, adding non-compliance with Rule 61G1-16.004 Title Block. Ms. Del Bianco commented that that was completed.

Mr. Martin asked the board about 61G1-17 Fees. Mr. Rodriguez commented that this rule was noticed to accommodate an increase in fees for privatization. Ms. Del Bianco suggested a sliding scale for the firm. Mr. Rodriguez asked how it was any cheaper to process from one firm to another.

Mr. Martin commented that all of the rules were noticed for development at the beginning of the year. He commented that they could consider these issues at the next meeting or the next if need be.

Mr. Martin asked about the plural issue and commented that in the minutes that the board decided to set a policy to grandfather existing firms. Mr. Martin asked if this was in reference to an individual qualifying more than one firm. They replied in the negative. The issue was if they have plural in the title i.e. architects, associates, group. Ms. Chastain commented that the board determined that associates was acceptable. Mr.

Minacci commented that he did not feel they needed a rule because they could discipline under misleading advertisement.

The board determined to stay as board policy for now.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that he would like to discuss an individual's name in the title of the firm should be required to be licensed. Mr. Bullock commented that the issue was architecture being in the title of the name. Mr. Martin commented that the statute does not require that architect or architecture be in the title of the name. Mr. Manausa commented that the firm identifies their services i.e. architect, architecture, etc. on the business stationery. Mr. Manausa commented that the firm could be XYZ firm as long as they identify that they are offering architecture services on their stationery statutorily they could not require architects or architecture in the firm name. Mr. Manausa commented that would require legislative change and he did feel that they would agree to limit a firm's ability to call themselves what they choose. Mr. Manausa commented that the rule requires that they use the language in any advertisement.

Mr. Shalley commented that impact would be tremendous impact to firms and did not see it as a public safety issue. Mr. Gonzalez commented that he had a problem with firm's names that sound completely different from what they do. Ms. Membiela commented that a firm has the right to position themselves as they see fit in advertising.

Rule Language Development Requested

61G1-12, Grounds for Disciplinary Proceedings

12.001 - Rule needs to consistently refer to both Architect and Interior Design

Mr. Martin referred the board to Rule 61G1-12.001 and confirmed that they were trying to accomplish consistency for both architect and interior design. Ms. Del Bianco asked the board if they should separate out the rule architect and interior design or group together. Mr. Rodriguez commented they should get the statute down first then write the rule to accommodate the statute format separate or together.

Mr. Minacci commented they should discuss disciplinary guidelines for violating an order of the board. Mr. Martin commented they should have a catchall rule. He commented they might want to consider a rule for violation of any of the board's rules. Mr. Minacci suggested a broad guideline. Mr. Martin stated he would draft language for minimal up to medium range then the board could review at the next meeting.

12.001 – add license number size requirement for signage – “adjacent & legible” language

Mr. Minacci commented that the rule required license numbers on all advertisements and stated that the board would like the license number be legible and not specific. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the adjacent was because someone placed the license number on the back of a sign. Mr. Minacci commented they should not be specific on sizes and use language like “legible and adjacent”. Mr. Martin referred to Rule 61G1-11.013 definitions, which include advertisement mediums, etc. Mr. Martin asked the

board if they wanted to be specific to construction site signs or all of them. The board would like to cover all of them even though the problem has been more specific to construction signs.

61G1-14, Architecture Examination

14.001 – Revise to examination administered by NCARB/Sylvan/test vendor

Mr. Martin commented that the current rule states that NCARB or the department will administer the examination. Mr. Martin suggested changing the existing text to read, “the examination should be prepared and administered by NCARB”.

61G1-18.002, Procedures for a Successor Architect Adopting as His Own the Work of Another Architect – Rules needs to consistently refer to both Architect and Interior Designer or create new rule.

Mr. Martin confirmed that they would like to have consistency. Mr. Rodriguez commented that architects have specific concerns and putting interior design in this rule might not make sense. He commented that they might want to have a rule specific for interior designer.

Ms. Reeves commented that there could be an issue when an architect adopts the work of an interior designer. Mr. Gonzalez commented that they should make a point that the successor architect gets a release from the architect or interior designer. Mr. Martin commented that could accomplish 95% of the goal by indicating the requirement of notification. He commented that the successor should notify the predecessor. Mr. Rodriguez commented that if interior design is included the language would work, however, Ms. Reeves brings up a good point regarding an architect adopting the work of an interior designer.

Mr. Martin suggested separating the rules in this case because an architect has the ability to adopt the work of both an architect and interior designer.

61G1-20, Interior Design Examination and Grading System

20.001, 002, 003, 006, & 007 – Revise NCIDQ exam information and administration

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she had a copy of the NCIDQ transcription plan indicating the parts of the examination. She provided Mr. Martin with verbiage from NCIDQ to assist cleaning up this rule. Mr. Martin was directed to remove the word department. Tape inaudible.

Discussion

Definition revisions

The board discussed the issue that there are definitions scattered through out the entire rule.

Mr. Manausa suggested that the board members go through the rule for definition duplication or necessity.

Ms. Del Bianco assigned rules to the board members to review the rules for definitions that are out order.

Rule 61G1-11 – Miguel Rodriguez
Rule 61G1-12 – Neil Hall
Rule 61G1-13 – Stephen Schreiber
Rule 61G1-14 – Rick Gonzalez
Rule 61G1-16 – Ellis Bullock
Rule 61G1-17 – Mary Jane Reeves
Rule 61G1-18 – Ellis Bullock
Rule 61G1-19 – none
Rule 61G1- 20 – Paul Martin
Rule 61G1- 21 – Mary Jane Reeves
Rule 61G1-22 – Joyce Shore
Rule 61G1-23 – Sharon Del Bianco
Rule 61G1-24 – Miguel Rodriguez
Rule 61G1-25 – Neil Hall

Ms. Del Bianco advised the board this should be in written form to Ms. Estes for the agenda.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the scope of the review was to look for anything out of order that is not consistent with that rule and/or should be in definitions or another section.

Firm names containing surname/s

Continuing Education rules required for advanced building code courses

Continuing Education Handbook Revisions (architect/interior design)

Ms. Del Bianco determined these items had been covered in the meeting previously.

New Business

Mr. Rodriguez commented that there were two items from the Probable Cause Panel that he would like the board to be aware of because they may need rule development to accomplish. He commented that the Panel would like to recommend to the board that they would like to implement a mentoring program. He commented that an example would be to work with an individual that has been disciplined for plan stamping. He commented that they would need to create a system that would possibly utilize an expertise witness and contract system that is in place now with the state. He commented that could develop a list of contracted expert witnesses that are asked to perform the mentoring and monitoring of the individual. He commented that the expense would be on the disciplined licensee. He stated that the intent was an honest effort to help an individual understand where they went wrong and assist them not to make the same mistake.

Mr. Bullock asked Mr. Rodriguez if this idea came particularly from a plan stamping case. Mr. Rodriguez replied in the positive. Mr. Bullock asked Mr. Rodriguez how they would monitor or mentor an individual when that is a function they do on the side and a

mentor can not be with them 24/7. Mr. Rodriguez replied that the thought is the mentor doing this would be aware of what goes on in that community and more likely to be aware of an individual plan stamping. Mr. Rodriguez stated they could also implement surprise visits. He commented that they would like this to be available across the board not just plan stamping.

Mr. Rodriguez stated this was a work in progress and would like to see it noticed for rules development. He commented that the current system does little or nothing to keep the violation from occurring. He commented that having someone involved or assist these individuals would be helpful. Mr. Rodriguez would like the board consider.

Mr. Hall commented that they should shame the people into submission. Ms. Del Bianco commented they should look at the newspaper. Mr. Gonzalez stated he saw an article in the newspaper and was very pleased. Ms. Del Bianco commented that the mentor program would take the burden off the board. Mr. Schreiber commented that Mr. Bullock brought up a valid point that plan stamping is done on the side. Mr. Martin commented that the monitoring or mentoring program would be helpful with the lack of supervisory control.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the other issue was certificates of authorizations are being renewed without a valid qualifier. He commented that the Panel recommends that the certificate of authorization not be renewed without an application reflecting a current qualifier. Mr. Rodriguez commented that there is an issue with the qualifier being null and void and the business license is still renewed and valid. Mr. Rodriguez commented that they would like to enter rule-making discussions to prevent renewals of certificates without a valid qualifier.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that he sees both sides that it is the individual's responsibility to know there are two licenses and do not blame the secretary for not renewing all of their licenses. He stated that they could be proactive and assist the licensees by changing the color of the paper.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that Mr. Martin made the Panel aware that there are other professions that have rules that instead of recommending probation that they recommend suspension but the suspension is stayed pending completion of probationary period. He stated that the benefits to that is if the person does not comply with the requirements of probation then the Panel is required to start the administrative process again. He commented that under this provision they could stay the suspension as long as they keep up with conditions of the probation and once the probation period expires some other action occurs. He commented that if the person fails to comply with probation then the license is suspended. He commented that they would need to write the rules to accommodate this.

Mr. Martin commented that the Construction Industry Licensing Board (CILB) has this procedure and it is very effective. He gave an example of how their process works. Mr. Rodriguez would like these noticed and use CILB's language to work from.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that he would try to draft language for the mentoring language. He requested that all of the rules be noticed so they could discuss at the next meeting.

Old Business

No old business.

Adjourn

MOTION: Mr. Gustafson moved to adjourn.

SECOND: Mr. Gonzalez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.