TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS  
Board Meeting Agenda  
The William P. Hobby Jr. Bldg., Tower III, Room 102  
333 Guadalupe Street  
Austin, Texas  
Thursday, June 8, 2017  
1:00 p.m. – Conclusion

1. Preliminary Matters
   A. Call to order  
   B. Roll call  
   C. Excused and unexcused absences  
   D. Determination of a quorum  
   E. Recognition of guests  
   F. Chair’s opening remarks  
   G. Public Comments

2. Approval of February 16, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes (Action)  
   Debra Dockery

3. Executive Director Report (Information)  
   Julie Hildebrand
   A. Summary of Executive Accomplishments (Information)  
   B. Review of Dismissed Complaints  
   C. Operating Budget/Scholarship Fund: Presentation on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Quarter 2017 Expenditures/Revenues  
   D. Legislative Update  
   E. Report on conferences and meetings (Information)  
      I. NCARB 2017 Regional Summit/MBE Workshop  
         \textit{Mar} 8-10  
      II. 2017 Texas ASLA Annual Conference – \textit{Apr} 25-27  
   F. Report on upcoming conferences and meetings (information)  
      I. NCARB Annual Business Meeting – \textit{Jun} 22-24  
      II. Building Officials Association of Texas (BOAT) Conference – \textit{Aug} 8-10  
      III. METROCON17 – \textit{Aug} 10-11

4. General Counsel Report (Action)  
   Lance Brenton  
   A. Proposed Rule for Adoption  
      Adoption of Proposed Rule 7.11, relating to enhanced contract and performance monitoring

5. Enforcement Cases (Action)  
   Lance Brenton  
   Review and possibly adopt ED’s recommendation in the following enforcement cases:  
   A. Registrant/Non-Registrant Cases  
      Cosme, Frank C. (#159-17A)  
      Garrison, David L. (#096-16L)  
      Keller, Michael R. (#112-16A)  
      McCrery, James C. (#029-17A)
The Board may meet in closed session pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. §551.071(1) to confer with legal counsel.
12. Chair’s Closing Remarks  Debra Dockery

13. Adjournment  Debra Dockery

NOTE:
♦ Items may not necessarily be considered in the order they appear on the agenda.
♦ Executive session for advice of counsel may be called regarding any agenda item under the Open Meetings Act, Government Code §551.
♦ Action may be taken on any agenda item.

NOTICE OF ASSISTANCE AT PUBLIC MEETINGS
Persons with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who need auxiliary aids or services are required to call (512) 305-8548 at least five (5) work days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREFAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDCEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCARB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSPE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS**  
**Minutes of February 16, 2017 Board Meeting**  
William P. Hobby Jr. Building, 333 Guadalupe Street  
Tower III, Room 102  
Austin, TX  78701  
9:00 a.m. until completion of business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEMS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Call to Order</td>
<td>Ms. Dockery called the meeting to order at 9:00 o’clock a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1B. Roll Call                 | Present Board Members  
Debra Dockery | Chair, Architect FAIA  
Sonya Odell | Vice-Chair, Registered Interior Designer  
Charles (Chuck) Anastos | Architect  
Michael (Chad) Davis | Landscape Architect  
Jennifer Walker | Architect  
Robert (Bob) Wetmore | Architect  
Chase Bearden | Public Member |
| 1C. Excused and Unexcused absences | Paula Ann Miller | Secretary-Treasurer, Public Member |
|                               | A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Anastos/Odell) TO APPROVE THE EXCUSED ABSENCE OF PAULA ANN MILLER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. |
| 1D. Determination of a Quorum | A quorum was present.                                                                         |
| 1E. Recognition of Guests     | Ms. Dockery acknowledged the following guests and members of TBAE Staff: Julie Hildebrand, Executive Director; Lance Brenton, General Counsel; Kenneth Liles, Finance Manager; Mike Alvarado, Registration Manager; Jack Stamps, Managing Investigator; Dale Dornfeld, IT Manager; Glenda Best, Operations Manager; Christine Brister, HR Program Specialist; Katherine Crain, Legal Assistant; Julio Martinez, Systems Analyst; Donna Vining, Texas Association for Interior Design; David Lancaster, Texas Society of Architects; and Jeri Morey, Corpus Christi Architect. |
| 1F. Chair’s Opening Remarks   | Ms. Dockery stated that one of the distinct pleasures of being the Chair of the Board is having the opportunity to sign the certificates of the newly registered design professionals. Each time she signs a certificate, she reflects on the perseverance of the individual in satisfying the rigorous requirements to becoming a registered architect, landscape architect or registered interior designer. Ms. Dockery stated that this spirit of
perseverance will serve these professionals well as they embark upon their careers.

1G. Public Comments

The Chair read the rules of providing public comment into the record for the benefit of the audience. She introduced Jeri Morey, a registered architect who requested to make a public comment.

Ms. Morey provided the Board with a scenario regarding her experience with the Texas Department of Insurance (hereafter “TDI”) and the windstorm rules and regulations. She was concerned that TDI required an engineer to redraw her work regarding windstorms and seal it. She stated that she contacted the Texas Board of Professional Engineers, and stated that TBPE did not want two seals on a page that included architectural design work and the engineer’s windstorm work. She believes that if this continues to happen in the future, it could create conflicts and that the Board may want to review this process.

2. Approval of December 1, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Bearden) TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 1, 2016 BOARD MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. (Mr. Anastos abstained from voting on the minutes because he was absent for the December 1, 2016 meeting.)

3. Executive Director’s Report

A. Summary of Executive Accomplishments

Ms. Hildebrand presented information regarding executive accomplishments as described on page 14 of the Board materials. In addition to the materials discussed on page 14, Ms. Hildebrand discussed committee assignments at the legislature, and the current post-payment audit by the comptroller’s office. Ms. Hildebrand stated that TBAE recently created a PSPA brochure in conjunction with the Land Surveying Board and the Professional Engineers Board. She also presented updated figures regarding the grandfathered registered interior designers and the September 1, 2017 deadline to complete the examination.

Ms. Hildebrand presented the Board with statistics from the Registration and Enforcement Departments as described on pages 15 and 16 of the Board materials. She stated that the agency had an increase in referral cases from Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (hereafter “TDLR”) and agency staff is conducting a review of the complaints in order to estimate future caseloads. Mr. Anastos requested that the Executive Director provide the Board with information on repeat offenses regarding TDLR violations. Ms. Hildebrand suggested that Mr. Stamps give a presentation to the Board on TDLR cases at the next Board meeting.
B. Operating Budget/Scholarship: Presentation on 1st quarter expenditures/revenues

Ms. Hildebrand presented information regarding the 2017 1st quarter operating budget as described on page 17 of the Board materials. She also provided an update on the Scholarship Fund, as described on page 18.

3. Report on Conferences and Meetings

A. NCARB Committee Summit – Dec 9-10

Ms. Hildebrand participated in the NCARB Committee Summit meeting and as a member of the Procedures and Documents Committee. She stated that only one resolution was presented at the meeting and that resolution will be brought before the Board in June.

B. 41st Annual Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards (FARB) Forum – Jan 26-29

Ms. Hildebrand attended the Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards (FARB) Conference in San Antonio. This was a collaboration of all regulatory boards across the country and was a good networking experience. Topics of discussion included the North Carolina Dental case and antitrust issues, appropriate licensure application questions, and best practices for strategic planning.

C. CLARB MBE Committee Meeting – February 4-5

Lastly, she attended the CLARB MBE Committee meeting in February. The Committee planned the annual meeting for the Fall and discussed how to engage Executives from other states to become involved in the committee.

3. Report on Upcoming Conferences and Meetings

A. NCARB Regional Summit/MBE Workshop – Mar 9-11

Ms. Hildebrand stated that she and Ms. Dockery will attend the NCARB Regional Summit Workshop in March.

B. 2017 Texas ALSA Annual Conference – Apr 25-27

Ms. Hildebrand stated that Texas ALSA will be in Austin this year and she plans on attending as well as Mr. Davis.

4. General Counsel Report

Mr. Brenton provided the general counsel’s report to the Board, as follows:

Proposed Rule for Adoption (Action)

Revise Rule 5.5 relating to definitions of “Actual Signature,” “Architectural Barriers Act” (add), “Authorship” (repeal), “Consultant,” “E-mail Directory” (repeal), “Interior Designers’ Registration Law,” and “Registrant.” Repeal Rule 5.34 relating to Fees
Mr. Brenton presented information on the proposed rule revision and repeal, as described on page 19 of the Board materials.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Anastos) TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO 22 TEX. ADMIN. CODE §5.5 AND §5.34 FOR FINAL ADOPTION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Draft Rule for Proposal (Action)**

Draft Rule 7.11, relating to enhanced contract and performance monitoring

Mr. Brenton presented information on the draft rule for proposal, as described on page 26 of the Board materials.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Anastos/Wetmore) TO APPROVE DRAFT RULE 22 TEX. ADMIN. CODE §7.11 FOR PUBLICATION IN THE TEXAS REGISTER, WITH AUTHORITY FOR THE GENERAL COUNSEL TO MAKE EDITORIAL CHANGES AS NECESSARY TO CLARIFY THE RULE AND BOARD INTENT AND TO COMPLY WITH THE FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE TEXAS REGISTER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**5. Enforcement Cases**

The Board considered the following enforcement cases:

**A. SOAH CASE**

TBAE vs. Robert “Bob” Sanchez (SOAH Docket No. 459-17-0272 and TBAE Case No. 151-14N)

Mr. Brenton presented a summary of the matter and the associated documents beginning on page 28 of the Board materials.

Ms. Dockery asked Mr. Brenton what would happen if the Respondent refuses to pay the administrative penalty. Mr. Brenton explained that the matter would be referred to the Office of the Attorney General for collection of the debt owed to the state. The Attorney General’s office would file a lawsuit in district court and get a judgment entered against the Respondent.

Mr. Bearden asked whether staff had attempted to determine whether Ms. Sanchez had engaged in similar behavior on other projects. Mr. Stamps stated that staff had researched whether other projects had been submitted by Mr. Sanchez for TDLR review, and did not find any.

Mr. Wetmore asked if the architect sued the Respondent over stealing his seal and Mr. Stamps answered in the affirmative.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Anastos/Bearden) TO ACCEPT STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION LOCATED ON PAGE 28 TO ADOPT THE ORDER OF THE BOARD IN SOAH DOCKET NO. 459-17-0272, TBAE VS. ROBERT “BOB” SANCHEZ, JR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
B. Registrant Cases

Estes, Lawrence C. (#004-17L)
Mr. Brenton presented a summary of this matter as described on page 38 of the Board materials.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Bearden/Walker) TO ACCEPT STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION OF A $1,000 ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY IN THE CASE AGAINST LAWRENCE C. ESTES (#004-17L). THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Nguyen, Tien Thu (#116-16A)
Mr. Brenton presented a summary of this matter as described on page 39 of the Board materials.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Wetmore/Davis) TO ACCEPT STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION OF A $5,000 ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY AND COMPLETION OF THE TEXAS ACCESSIBILITY ACADEMY WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THE BOARD’S ORDER IN THE CASE AGAINST TIEN THU NGUYEN (#116-16A).

Mr. Anastos asked whether the case involved a failure to submit plans or late submittal. Mr. Brenton responded that this was a matter involving a late submittal.

Mr. Bearden asked whether Mr. Nguyen had previously been required to complete the accessibility academy. Mr. Brenton replied that he had.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Spurgin, Louis K. (#121-16A)
Mr. Brenton presented a summary of this matter as described on page 40 of the Board materials. Mr. Brenton noted that this was a matter involving a late TDLR submittal rather than a continuing education violation.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Anastos) TO ACCEPT STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION OF A $2,000 ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY IN THE CASE AGAINST LOUIS K. SPURGIN (#121-16A). THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. CE Cases

Mr. Brenton stated that the Board would hear the following cases regarding continuing education violations and vote on them together.

Carrasco, Carmen (#059-16A)
Evans, James W. (#032-17A)
Faure, Matthew C. (#026-17A)
Haver, Joseph R. (#088-17A)
Laitkep, Jo Ann (#037-17I)
Terrill, Allen, Jr. (#036-17A)

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Anastos/Walker) TO APPROVE STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION AND PENALTIES FOR CASES #059-16A, #032-17A, #026-17A, #088-17A, #037-17I, and #036-17A. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Legislative Committee Update (Information)

Ms. Dockery requested that the Chair of the Legislative Committee give the report on the Committee’s meeting on February 15, 2017. Mr. Davis stated that the agency is monitoring several bills, including bills which were filed by Representative Springer (HB1120, HB1121 and HB1123) and address issues of accessibility, TDLR, and architectural training programs. The Committee also discussed HB1657 regarding the extension for grandfathered RIDS to take the exam. Mr. Davis emphasized that staff was doing a great job tracking the bills and the agency is poised and ready to respond to any requests by the Legislature.

Ms. Dockery asked whether RIDS who had given up their registration would be able to come back if the law changes. Ms. Hildebrand noted that, if an RID had allowed his or her registration to expire, he or she would be eligible to return to registered status if less than two years had passed.

7. Budget Committee Update (Information)

Ms. Hildebrand explained that Mr. Anastos served as the Committee Chair because Ms. Miller was absent from the meeting. She stated that the Committee reviewed the budget for FY16 and the first quarter of FY17. They also discussed how to build the budget for FY18. Ms. Hildebrand also reviewed the current environment in state government with bills being filed relating to zero-based budgeting and appropriations caps. Though these bills would not apply to TBAE as an SDSI agency, they should to a certain degree influence the agency’s budget decisions. Ms. Hildebrand also noted that the Governor had instituted a hiring freeze for appropriated agencies. The committee also discussed the fund balance and long term projects such as moving office locations.

Mr. Anastos stated that the committee would look to take an aggressive approach to planning for the next five years, especially in light of the possibility of losing grandfathered RID registrants and the impending retirement of the baby boomer generation.

Ms. Dockery reiterated the need for the Board to be proactive and responsive to emerging trends.

The Committee decided to present the FY18 budget to the Budget Committee and then to the full Board in June.
8. Board Election
(Action)

A. Board Vice-Chair and Secretary/Treasurer

Ms. Dockery held the Board election as follows:

Mr. Anastos nominated Chad Davis as Vice Chair. Ms. Dockery announced that the nominations for Vice Chair were closed.

Ms. Odell nominated Jennifer Walker as Secretary/Treasurer. Ms. Dockery announced that the nominations for Secretary/Treasurer were closed.

Ms. Dockery called for the vote and all board members were in favor of Chad Davis serving as Vice Chair.

Ms. Dockery called for the vote and all board members were in favor of Jennifer Walker serving as Secretary/Treasurer.

B. Board Committee Assignments

Ms. Dockery stated that she wanted the Board Committee assignments to remain in effect until June.

9. Upcoming Board Meetings (Information)

Thursday, June 8, 2017
Thursday, August 17, 2017
Wednesday, November 8, 2017

Ms. Odell noted that Ms. Dockery was selected as a 2017 inductee into the AIA College of Fellows. Ms. Odell stated that Ms. Dockery had worked tirelessly for the architectural profession, and that this was a well-deserved honor.

Ms. Dockery thanked Ms. Odell and the Board, and stated that she was overwhelmed and humbled to be included among the College of Fellows. Ms. Dockery said that one of the rewarding aspects of the application process was remembering the architects with whom she had worked on various committees.

The Board took a break at 10:18 a.m. and reconvened at 10:40 a.m.

11. Board Training on Rulemaking and State Action Immunity

Mr. Brenton made a presentation to the Board on the following matters:

The Rulemaking Process; Anti-trust laws; Sovereign Immunity; First Amendment of the Constitution (Free Speech); Due Process; Ex-Parte Communications; Failure to Follow Administrative Procedures; Exceeding Statutory Authority; and Ad Hoc Rulemaking. Mr. Brenton provided a general presentation on the law involved in these topics, and counseled the Board members that, if they had any questions on how these legal precedents applied to the Board, such issues could be addressed in executive session under the attorney client privilege.
Mr. Anastos asked whether a respondent had a constitutional right to speak to a Board member on a pending investigation. Mr. Brenton stated that such a communication could be an ex parte communication contrary to state law, and therefore would not protected under the First Amendment.

The Board took a break at 11:34 a.m. and reconvened at 11:37. The Board went into closed session at 11:38 a.m. to consult with the Board’s attorney as provided under Tex. Govt. Code Sec. 551.071 and adjourned the closed session at 12:42 p.m. The Board returned to open session at 12:43 p.m.

12. Adjournment

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Anastos/Davis) TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 12:43 P.M. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD:

________________________________________
DEBRA J. DOCKERY, FAIA
Chair, TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
Summary of Executive Accomplishments
June 8, 2017

Executive

- The Fiscal Management Division of the Comptroller of Public Accounts completed their in-office audit during the month of February. An exit interview was conducted with a few minor issues noted. However, a final report has not been issued. When such report is issued, I will share it with the full board.
- New Board Member appointments have not been made, but are expected to be made prior to the August Board Meeting.
- I’d like to recognize several employees for their service to the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. Katherine Crain has 15 years of service, Jack Stamps has 15 years of service, Glenn Garry has 10 years of service, Tony Whitt has 10 years of service and Nelly Clayton has 5 years of service.
- Please see the Legislative Update and my monthly Executive Director Updates for more details.

NCARB

I applied for and was selected to serve on the NCARB Experience Committee for the 2017 – 2018 fiscal year. Additionally, NCARB will be assembling a task force to conduct research into the future of architectural practice as impacted by technology and other factors, as well as how the future may require evolved approaches to regulation. I will keep abreast of the findings of the committee and share any relevant information with the board.
### Summary of Registration Department Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examination Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Applications Received</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Scores Received/Entered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>529</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examination Registrations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal Registrations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Registrations Issued</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Architects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,040</td>
<td>12,079</td>
<td>12,095</td>
<td>12,118</td>
<td>12,132</td>
<td>12,151</td>
<td>12,208</td>
<td>12,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Reg. Interior Designers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>3,558</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Landscape Architects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Active Registrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,134</td>
<td>17,169</td>
<td>17,165</td>
<td>17,199</td>
<td>17,214</td>
<td>17,241</td>
<td>17,303</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE Audits Conducted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE Audits Referred for</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates of Standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Enforcement Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Received and Opened</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Closed by Investigations – Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Closed by Investigations – TDLR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Closed by Investigations – Other</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Referred to Legal</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Days to Investigate</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notices of Violation by Legal</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Surrenders by Legal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplinary Action Entered by the Board</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warnings from Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints Filed at SOAH</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Settlement Conferences Held</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Voluntary Compliance – Non-registered business removed the word architect from their webpage.
### Texas Board of Architectural Examiners
#### Fiscal Year 2017 Budget With Servers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017 Approved Budget</th>
<th>FY 2017 Budget through 2-28-17</th>
<th>FY 2017 Percentage Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses &amp; Fees</td>
<td>2,617,560</td>
<td>1,299,863</td>
<td>49.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Registration Fees</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>44,933</td>
<td>56.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Fee Payments</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>70,220</td>
<td>58.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>95.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>170.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Draw on Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>93,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>2,915,962</td>
<td>1,420,801</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>1,526,423</td>
<td>748,582</td>
<td>49.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Related Costs</td>
<td>525,897</td>
<td>259,249</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees &amp; Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>7,248</td>
<td>28.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Travel</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Travel</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>9,087</td>
<td>45.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>5,034</td>
<td>38.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Utilities</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>46.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Leases--Copiers</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td>50.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,756</td>
<td>69.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fees--Employee Training</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>38.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>60.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWCAP Payment</td>
<td>65,142</td>
<td>51,232</td>
<td>78.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to GR</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Upgrades</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>9,548</td>
<td>23.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,915,962</td>
<td>1,405,906</td>
<td>48.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding for 8 months</strong></td>
<td>1,943,780</td>
<td>14,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>599,271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,543,051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Penalties Collected $40,577

General Revenue Collected $7,200
## Texas Board of Architectural Examiners
### Fiscal Year 2017 Budget
#### Scholarship Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Fund Beginning Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,627.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship Fund Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>68,455.86</td>
<td>68,455.86</td>
<td>51,627.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Beginning Scholarship Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>68,455.86</td>
<td>68,455.86</td>
<td>51,627.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenditures-Scholarship Payments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,828.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,828.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess/(Deficiency) of Rev. over Exp.</strong></td>
<td>68,455.86</td>
<td>51,627.12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Fund Balance**                      | 68,455.86      | 51,627.12                                     | 51,627.12               |

**Number of Scholarships Awarded**

34

**Frequency per Fiscal Year**——September 30, January 31, and May 31
85th Legislative Session

1. Prepared for and served as resource witness for the following House and Senate committee hearings:
   a. March 20 – House Licensing and Administrative Procedures Hearing on HB1123
   b. March 27 – House Business and Industry Hearing on HB1909 related to RID’s Entitlement to a Mechanic’s Lien of Real Property
   c. April 5 – House State Affairs Hearing on HB2926 (attendance only)
   d. April 10 – Senate Finance Hearing on SB1875 (attendance only)
   e. April 10 – House Licensing and Administrative Procedures Hearing on HB1120 and HB1657
   f. April 18 – Senate Business & Commerce Hearing for SB1932
   g. May 1 – House Licensing & Administrative Procedures Committee Hearing for HB3878
   h. May 18 – Senate Business & Commerce Hearing for HB1657

2. Worked with legislative offices on each bill, including a written response to inquiries from Representative Goldman’s office and drafting of proposed bill language

3. Worked with representatives from the professional associations to prepare for bill hearings and to respond to requests from legislators

4. Prepared and submitted Fiscal Notes to the LBB and Governor’s Office as requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 791</td>
<td>Allows board members to file personal financial statements by certified mail</td>
<td>Effective Immediately Remind board members in notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 253</td>
<td>Relating to investment prohibitions and divestment requirements for certain investments of public money</td>
<td>Effective Immediately No action needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 705</td>
<td>Relating to an exception from disclosure under the public information law for certain personal information of an applicant for an appointment by the governor</td>
<td>Effective Immediately Update Public Information P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 88</td>
<td>Relating to an unlawful employment practice by an employer whose leave policy does not permit an employee to use leave to care for the employee's foster child</td>
<td>Effective 9/1/17 Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 89</td>
<td>Relating to state contracts with and investments in companies that boycott Israel. Prohibits statewide pension funds (including ERS) from investing in companies that boycott Israel, and requires divesting from those companies. Also prohibits all state agencies from contracting with those companies.</td>
<td>Effective 9/1/17 Update P&amp;Ps and contract provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 252</td>
<td>Relating to prohibiting governmental contracts with a company doing business with Iran, Sudan, or a foreign terrorist organization</td>
<td>Effective 9/1/17 Update P&amp;Ps and contract provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 8</td>
<td>Relating to cybersecurity for state agency information resources</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update IT and Public Information P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 53</td>
<td>Relating to certain limitations on settlement agreements with a governmental unit</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor No action needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 91</td>
<td>Relating to a review of occupational licensing requirements and an applicant’s criminal history</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 462</td>
<td>Relating to the provision of notice of proposed rules by state agencies</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 501</td>
<td>Relating to personal financial statements filed by public officers and candidates, including the disclosure of certain contracts, agreements, services, and compensation in and the amendment of those statements</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remind board members in notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 776</td>
<td>Relating to the removal of certain information from personal financial statements filed by certain persons</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remind board members in notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1290</td>
<td>Relating to the required repeal of a state agency rule and a government growth impact statement before adoption of a new state agency rule</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1463</td>
<td>Relating to procedures for actions alleging failure to comply with certain standards to accommodate persons with disabilities</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1508</td>
<td>Relating to notice to applicants to and enrollees in certain educational programs regarding the consequences of a criminal conviction on eligibility for an occupational license</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1657</td>
<td>Extends affected RIDs test date from September 1, 2017 to September 1, 2027</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SB 2187)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate to registrants, Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1861</td>
<td>Relating to the confidentiality of certain information related to a computer security incident</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update IT and Public Information P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2463</td>
<td>Relating to requiring state agencies to develop written succession plans</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2783</td>
<td>Allows costs of litigation and reasonable attorney’s fees to be assessed in public information lawsuit if requested information is voluntarily released after an answer is filed</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3021</td>
<td>Relating to indemnification and duties of engineers and architects under certain governmental contracts</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3047</td>
<td>Relating to the meeting of a governmental body held by videoconference call</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update Open Meetings P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3107</td>
<td>Relating to the production of public information under the public information law</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update Public Information P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3433</td>
<td>Relating to the adoption by state agencies of rules affecting rural communities</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 73</td>
<td>Relating to leave policy and procedures for state employees</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 79</td>
<td>Relating to the production of public information available on a publicly accessible website</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update Public Information P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 255</td>
<td>Relating to contracts with and training for governmental entities and vendors, including purchasing and contract management training; authorizing fees</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 532</td>
<td>Relating to information collected about and purchases of information technology by governmental entities</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update IT and Public Information P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 533</td>
<td>Relating to governmental entity contracting and procurement</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 564</td>
<td>Relating to the applicability of open meetings requirements to certain meetings of a governing body relating to information technology security practices</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update Open Meetings P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 813</td>
<td>Relating to recovery of damages, attorney's fees, and costs related to frivolous regulatory actions by state agencies</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1215</td>
<td>Relating to the creation of a joint interim committee to study issues related to construction contracts</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Serve as resource for interim committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1440</td>
<td>Relating to the attendance by a quorum of a governmental body at certain candidate events under the open meetings law</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update Open Meetings P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1446</td>
<td>Relating to contested cases conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1831</td>
<td>Relating to an annual report on state programs not funded by appropriations</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1910</td>
<td>Relating to state agency information security plans, information technology employees, and online and mobile applications</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1932</td>
<td>Delegates the education and experience requirements for licensure to CIDQ</td>
<td>Sent to the Governor Communicate to schools, Update P&amp;Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 14</td>
<td>Reforms ethics requirements for public officials – reporting of state entity contracts on financial statements; amendments to financial statements; reporting of lobbyist expenditures</td>
<td>Referred to House Investigating &amp; Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1875</td>
<td>Amends the SDSI program generally including sunset and sunrise-style provisions, reporting requirements, audits, and oversight by the Legislative Budget Board</td>
<td>Referred to House State Affairs – Public Hearing on May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2926</td>
<td>Requires review of all state agency rules by legislative committees (only effective if constitutional amendment is approved)</td>
<td>Left on House Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1120</td>
<td>Requires compliance with TAS prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy; political subdivision will be fined for issuing a certificate in violation of TAS; plans and specs must be submitted to TDLR</td>
<td>Left on House Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1123</td>
<td>Requires continuing education for architects in the area of barrier-free or accessible design</td>
<td>Left Pending in LAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3878</td>
<td>Removes the criminal penalty for a title or standard of conduct violation of the RID law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1121</td>
<td>Requires architecture education programs to offer curriculum in accessible design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 844</td>
<td>Requires “active supervision” of occupational licensing agencies (rules, policies, and disciplinary action) by the Attorney General’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Pending in LAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to HEdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to B&amp;C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Rule 7.11 – Enhanced Contract and Performance Monitoring

Background

During the 2015 session, the Texas Legislature passed SB 20, which made a number of changes to state agency contracting laws. Among these changes is a requirement in Tex. Govt. Code §2261.253 that state agencies adopt a rule which establishes a procedure to identify contracts that require enhanced contract monitoring and submit information on such contracts to the agency’s governing body. Currently, the Board does not have a rule relating to contract management.

At the February meeting, the Board proposed new Rule 7.11, as described below. The proposed rule was published in the March 17, 2017 edition of the Texas Register (42 TexReg 1236). No comments were received on the proposed rule.

Proposed Rule

The proposed rule includes the following provisions:

- The rule requires the finance manager to complete a risk assessment for all contracts over $25,000, and authorizes the finance manager to complete a risk assessment for contracts of a lesser value.
- The rule identifies a number of factors to be considered in the risk analysis performed by the finance manager.
- If the risk assessment results in a determination that enhanced contract monitoring is appropriate, the contract will be reported to the Board at the first meeting following execution of the contract. The report will include the basis for determining enhanced contract monitoring is appropriate, any serious risks or issues identified with the contract, and staff’s plan for carrying out enhanced contract monitoring. Additionally, the Board will be provided status reports on the contract, as directed by the Board.

Attached for your consideration is a copy of proposed rule §7.11.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Board approve proposed 22 Tex. Admin. Code §7.11 for final adoption.
§7.11 Enhanced Contract and Performance Monitoring

(a) The Board will complete a risk assessment to identify procurement contracts for goods or services from a private vendor that require enhanced contract or performance monitoring.

(b) For all contracts with a value greater than $25,000, the finance manager will complete a risk assessment to evaluate whether enhanced contract or performance monitoring may be required. For contracts of a lesser value, the finance manager may complete a risk assessment to evaluate whether enhanced contract or performance monitoring is indicated. The risk assessment may consider the following factors:

   (1) total cost of the contract, including contract renewals;
   (2) risk of loss to the agency under the contract;
   (3) risk of fraud, waste or abuse;
   (4) scope of the goods or services provided;
   (5) availability of agency resources;
   (6) complexity of the contract;
   (7) business process impact of failure or delay;
   (8) vendor past performance; and
   (9) whether the vendor is a foreign or domestic person or entity.

(c) Contracts identified for enhanced contract and/or performance monitoring will be reported to the Board at the first regular Board meeting after the contract is executed. The report shall include:

   (1) the basis for the determination that enhanced contract or performance monitoring is appropriate;
   (2) any serious issues or risks identified with the contract, if applicable; and
   (3) the plan for carrying out the enhanced contract or performance monitoring.

(d) For any contract subject to enhanced contract or performance monitoring, the finance manager shall provide the Board with progress reports, as directed by the Board.

(e) This section does not apply to a memorandum of understanding, interagency contract, interlocal agreement, or contract for which there is not a cost.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise, and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 159-17A
Respondent: Frank Cruz Cosme
Location of Respondent: San Antonio, TX
Date of Complaint Received: January 24, 2017
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Frank Cruz Cosme (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 18098.
- From November 30, 2016 through January 24, 2017, Respondent’s architectural registration was delinquent.
- On December 6, 2016, Respondent issued sealed architectural plans for a project identified as “Sand Box” at 7280 UTSA Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas. At the time Respondent provided architectural services for this project, his registration was expired and he was not authorized to provide architectural services during this period.
- Respondent apologized and stated that the renewal notices had been sent to his email address at his former employer.
- Respondent is currently in good standing with the Board and is on active status.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By engaging in the practice of architecture when his registration was delinquent, Respondent violated Board Rules 1.82(c), 1.123 and 1.148(c).
- The Board may impose an administrative penalty upon Respondent based upon statutory criteria. TEX. OCC. CODE §§1051.451 & 1051.452.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty in the sum of $1,000.
Texas Board of Architectural Examiners
Summary of Proposed Enforcement Action

This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise, and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 096-16L
Respondent: David Lee Garrison
Location of Respondent: Plano, TX
Date of Complaint Received: July 21, 2016
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- David Lee Garrison (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered landscape architect in Texas with registration number 1825.
- On or about March 18, 2016, the city of Frisco, Texas received a plans submittal for a retailed project entitled “Bell Plaza & Bell Suites.” The submittal included a landscape plan that was sealed by a professional engineer, initials H.J. In response, the city requested a landscape plan to be prepared by a landscape architect.
- On April 13, 2016, H.J. met with Respondent and inquired whether Respondent would be willing to provide assistance in submitting a landscape plan for the project. Subsequently, on May 26, 2016, H.J. sent to Respondent a copy of the landscape plan that had been submitted to the city of Frisco on March 18, 2016.
- On May 28, 2016, Respondent signed, sealed and dated the landscape plan which had been prepared by H.J., for the project “Bell Plaza & Bell Suites.” This plan was identical to that which was originally submitted by H.J. prior to the involvement of Respondent on the project, with the exception of a minor addition of a tree and shrub planting diagram.
- The first time that Respondent saw the landscape plan was after it had been completely drawn by H.J. Respondent was not involved in any aspect of its development prior his review of the complete plan sheets, and Respondent is unable to provide documentation of frequent and detailed communication with H.J. indicating supervision and control of the work during the original preparation of the plans.
- On or about August 24, 2016, the Board received a response from Respondent. Respondent acknowledges that he received the landscape plan from engineer H.J. in AutoCAD and PDF on May 26, 2016. Respondent stated that he reviewed the plans and believed at the time that the landscape elements, quantities, and locations met the city’s requirements and did not require modification from the document he inherited.
- On April 28, 2017, the Respondent attended an informal conference at the Board’s offices. Board member Chad Davis, executive director Julie Hildebrand, general counsel Lance Brenton, and managing investigator Jack Stamps were in attendance. At the informal conference, the Respondent emphasized that he did not intend to violate the law or the Board’s rules, but acknowledged the violation and accepted the panel’s offer.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By affixing his seal, signature and date to a landscape plan not prepared by him or under his supervision and control, Respondent violated Board Rule 3.104(a).
Action Recommended by Executive Director:
• The Executive Director recommends, and Respondent is prepared to accept the imposition of an administrative penalty in the sum of $1,000.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 112-16A  
Respondent: Michael Roy Keller  
Location of Respondent: Buda, Texas  
Location of Project: Austin, TX  
Date of Complaint Received: August 24, 2016  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Michael Roy Keller (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 18068.  
- From November 30, 2014 through November 18, 2016, Respondent’s architectural registration was delinquent.  
- On or about July 20, 2016, Respondent issued and sealed architectural plans on six sheets (6) of construction documents for a residential remodel identified as “Garage Remodel and Existing Apartment” located in Austin, TX.  
- At the time Respondent provided architectural services for this project, his registration was expired and he was not authorized to provide architectural services during this period.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By using the title “architect” and providing architectural services and sealing plans for a residential remodel at a time when his certificate of registration was not in good standing, Respondent violated 22 Tex. Admin. Code §§1.82(b) and 1.123.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $1,000.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise, and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 029-17A
Respondent: James C. McCrery II
Location of Respondent: District of Columbia
Date of Complaint Received: June 28, 2016
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- James C. McCrery II (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 25865.
- On August 31, 2015, Respondent submitted an application for reciprocal registration as an architect in Texas. Respondent was required to complete registration requirements and pay a registration fee prior to becoming registered. Respondent did not respond to this request, and his registration was not approved at this time. Subsequently, after being notified of this investigation in June of 2016, Respondent resubmitted application materials. Respondent became registered as a Texas architect on September 8, 2016.
- On October 7, 2015, Respondent entered into a Contract for Services with the Diocese of Fort Worth and St. Philip the Apostle Catholic Church of Lewisville, Texas, to perform architectural services in the State of Texas. The scope of work was to provide Programming Master Planning Services and Conceptual Design Services for a future new church, rectory and parish hall for the new St. Philip the Apostle Catholic Church in Flower Mound, Texas. The contract and its exhibits contained descriptions of services to be provided as “architecture services” and the provider of the services as “the architect.”
- Respondent executed the contract in his capacity as a principal or officer of McCrery Architects, LLC.
- During the course of its investigation, the Board discovered that Respondent had violated Board rule 1.124(a) by failing to register his architectural business, McCrery Architects, LLC.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By engaging or offering to engage in the practice of architecture on a project prior to obtaining an individual architect registration in Texas, Respondent violated Tex. Occ. Code §1051.351(a) and 22 Tex. Admin. Code §1.123(c).
- By failing to register his architectural business with the Board, Respondent violated Tex. Occ. Code §1051.701(b) and 22 Tex. Admin. Code 1.124(a).

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends the imposition of an administrative penalty in the sum of $3,000.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 066-17A
Respondent: Charles A. Reibenstein
Location of Respondent: Dallas, TX
Location of Project: Dallas, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of TDLR Requirement
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Charles A. Reibenstein (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 6579.
- Previous History:
  - On January 7, 2009, the Executive Director issued a Warning to the Respondent based on findings that the Respondent failed to timely submit plans to TDLR for accessibility review.
  - On November 30, 2016, the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners (TBAE) received a referral from the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR) indicating that Respondent had failed to submit plans for a project known as “Building 800 Alterations” located in Dallas, Texas, to TDLR for accessibility review within 20 days of issuance as required by Texas Government Code §469.102(b). The plans and specifications were issued on May 31, 2016, and submitted to TDLR on July 21, 2016.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By failing to submit plans and specifications on a project for accessibility review no later than 20 days after issuance, Respondent violated §1051.252(2) of the Architect Registration Law and Board Rule 1.170(a).

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $1,000.
TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS  
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED  
ENFORCEMENT ACTION  

This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 118-16A  
Respondent: Mason Samuel Rogers  
Location of Respondent: Amarillo, Texas  
Location of Projects: Canyon, TX  
Nature of Violation: Violation of TDLR Requirement  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:  
• Mason Samuel Rogers (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 20323.  
• Previous History:  
  • On August 12, 2015, the Executive Director issued a Warning to the Respondent based on findings that the Respondent failed to timely submit plans to TDLR for accessibility review.  
  • On August 12, 2016, the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners (TBAE) received a referral from the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR) indicating that Respondent had failed to submit plans for a project known as “Imperial Taproom” located in Canyon, Texas, to TDLR for accessibility review within 20 days of issuance as required by Texas Government Code §469.102(b). The plans and specifications were issued on May 1, 2016, and were submitted to TDLR on July 13, 2016.  

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:  
• By failing to submit plans and specifications on a project for accessibility review no later than 20 days after issuance, Respondent violated §1051.252(2) of the Architect Registration Law and Board Rule 1.170(a).  

Action Recommended by Executive Director:  
• The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $1,000.
Case Number: 225-17I  
Respondent: Charlye Gallaher  
Location of Respondent: Keller, TX  
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation  

Findings:
- Charlye Gallaher (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered interior designer in Texas with registration number 10255.  
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.  
- Subsequently, she completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 5.79(g)(2).  

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of her online renewal that she was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 5.79. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.  

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 095-17A
Respondent: Valerie Joan Garrett
Location of Respondent: Portland, OR
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Valerie Joan Garrett (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 15938.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of her online renewal that she was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 1.69. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 160-17A
Respondent: Michael W. Grish
Location of Respondent: Austin, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Michael W. Grish (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 18594.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent failed to complete his continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- In addition to completing the required continuing education hours outside of the continuing education period, Respondent falsely certified completion of CE responsibilities in order to renew his architectural registration.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of his online renewal that he was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 1.69. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.
- By failing to timely complete the required continuing education program hours, Respondent violated Board Rule 1.69(b). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $1,200.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 165-17A  
Respondent: Barbara Lynch Hughes  
Location of Respondent: Lancaster, PA  
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Barbara Lynch Hughes (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 23925.
- On November 15, 2016, Respondent was notified by the Board that she was being audited for compliance with the continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- On February 16, 2017, Respondent replied that she had been working for her father’s architectural practice and the records were destroyed in preparing her father’s property for sale; therefore, she could not produce complete and accurate proof of her continuing education.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By failing to maintain a detailed record of her continuing education activities for the period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015, Respondent violated Board Rule 1.69. The standard administrative penalty imposed upon a registrant for failing to maintain a detailed record of continuing education activities for a period of five (5) years after the end of the registration period for which credit is claimed is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 099-17A
Respondent: Palmer Franklin King
Location of Respondent: Dripping Springs, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Palmer Franklin King (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 12905.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of his online renewal that he was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 1.69. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

**Case Number:** 040-16L  
**Respondent:** Paul W. Linehan  
**Location of Respondent:** Austin, TX  
**Nature of Violation:** Violation of Continuing Education Requirements  
**Instrument:** Report and Notice of Violation

**Findings:**
- Paul W. Linehan (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as a landscape architect in Texas with registration number 917.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent failed to complete continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.

**Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:**
- By failing to timely complete the required continuing education program hours during the audit period, but before his renewal period, Respondent violated Board Rule 3.69(b). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is **$500**.

**Action Recommended by Executive Director:**
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of **$500**.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 161-17I
Respondent: Kelie Ann Mayfield
Location of Respondent: Houston, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Kelie Ann Mayfield (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an interior designer in Texas with registration number 11327.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that she failed to timely complete her continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- In addition to completing the required continuing education hours outside of the continuing education period, she falsely certified completion of her CE responsibilities in order to renew her interior design registration.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of her online renewal that she was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 5.79(g). The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.
- By failing to timely complete the required continuing education program hours, Respondent violated Board Rule 5.79(b). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $1,200.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 097-17I
Respondent: Patricia Breann Nash
Location of Respondent: Houston, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Patricia Breann Nash (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered interior designer in Texas with registration number 11010.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- Subsequently, she completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 5.79(g)(2).

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of her online renewal that she was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 5.79. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED
ENFORCEMENT ACTION

This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 100-17A
Respondent: Mario Andres Pena
Location of Respondent: Laredo, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:

- Mario Andres Pena (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 20580.
- On October 18, 2016, Respondent was notified by the Board that he was being audited for compliance with the continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- On December 6, 2016, Respondent replied that he could not locate his continuing education certificates.
- Subsequently, he completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 1.69(g)(2).

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:

- By failing to maintain a detailed record of his continuing education activities for the period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015, Respondent violated Board Rule 1.69. The standard administrative penalty imposed upon a registrant for failing to maintain a detailed record of continuing education activities for a period of five (5) years after the end of the registration period for which credit is claimed is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:

- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 175-17A
Respondent: Hugh Jefferson Randolph
Location of Respondent: Austin, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Hugh Jefferson Randolph (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 14529.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent failed to complete continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By failing to timely complete the required continuing education program hours during the audit period, but before his renewal period, Respondent violated Board Rule 1.69(b). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $500.
TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
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This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 094-17A
Respondent: Frank B. Reedy
Location of Respondent: Dallas, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Frank B. Reedy (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 12554.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- Subsequently, he completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 1.69(g)(2).

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of his online renewal that he was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 1.69. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 078-16I
Respondent: Patricia Thompson Sheats
Location of Respondent: Fort Worth, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Patricia Thompson Sheats (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an interior designer in Texas with registration number 9363.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that she failed to timely complete her continuing education requirements for the audit period of January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.
- In addition to completing the required continuing education hours outside of the continuing education period, she falsely certified completion of her CE responsibilities in order to renew her interior design registration.
- During the course of staff’s investigation, Respondent failed to respond to two written requests for information.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of her online renewal that she was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 5.79(g). The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.
- By failing to timely complete the required continuing education program hours, Respondent violated Board Rule 5.79(b). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is $500.
- By failing to respond to two written requests for information within 30 days of staff’s requests, Respondent violated Board Rule 5.181 which requires a registered interior designer answer an inquiry or produce requested documents within 30 days of a request. Each violation is subject to a standard administrative penalty of $250.00 totaling $500.00.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $1,700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

Case Number: 089-17I  
Respondent: Albert Lee Tang  
Location of Respondent: Richardson, TX  
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Albert Lee Tang (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered interior designer in Texas with registration number 7282.  
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.  
- Subsequently, he completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 5.79(g)(2).

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of his online renewal that he was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 5.79. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of $700.
This document is an internal document relating to an uncontested case to be considered by the Texas Board of Architectural Examiners. This document is prepared to inform, advise and assist the Board in addressing this uncontested case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>207-17A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent:</td>
<td>Michael Duke Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Respondent:</td>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Violation:</td>
<td>Violation of Continuing Education Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument:</td>
<td>Report and Notice of Violation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings:
- Michael Duke Walker (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 15230.
- Based upon the results of a random continuing education audit, it was determined that Respondent falsely reported continuing education compliance to the Board for the audit period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.
- Subsequently, he completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 1.69(g)(2).

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By indicating at the time of his online renewal that he was in compliance with the Board’s mandatory continuing education requirements, Respondent provided the Board with false information in violation of Board Rule 1.69. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is **$700**.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The Executive Director recommends an administrative penalty of **$700**.
How to avoid TDLR referrals
By Jack Stamps Managing Investigator

I once got into some serious trouble with my first wife. I secretly made reservations, sent a dozen roses, and came home from work with a box of chocolates to celebrate our wedding anniversary. She was furious. I asked her what was wrong and she said I got the right day—but the wrong month! She got two dozen roses that year (in the correct month) and I learned a valuable lesson. I have been very careful with exact dates ever since.

You are probably asking what this has to do with your practice. Well, let me tell you. The advice I am about to give you could save you well over $300 (I’ll get to that later).

I have been working at TBAE for fifteen years, and during that time if I had a nickel for every TDLR late submittal referral I have received I could have retired to Bora Bora five years ago. When TDLR receives a Proof of Submission form that indicates plans were submitted for TAS review past the 20-day deadline, TDLR staff are obligated by statute to refer those cases to TBAE. They make that determination by simple math. Count the number of business days from the date construction documents issued for regulatory approval, permitting or construction on privately owned projects, or when construction documents are publicly posted for bids on government-owned projects to the date the construction documents are submitted to a RAS for TAS review. If the number exceeds 20 days, the referral is made. We get batches of up to 70 referrals at a time.

What percentage of these referrals do you think result in enforcement penalties? 50 percent? 25? Less than 10 percent of referrals ultimately result in an enforcement penalty. And why is this, you ask? Let’s go through the process.

We receive the referral, open an enforcement case on the registrant, and send a letter of notification and requesting a response. Quite often the response indicates that the registrant entered the wrong dates on the Proof of Submission form. The respondent submits the required documentation to prove compliance and sometimes enters into a detailed narrative explaining the mistake. Once confirmed, we dismiss the case and notify the registrant that he or she is off the hook.

We are required by statute to proceed with this process in each case, and are glad to do so. But it would be so much better if you, our registrant, would pay closer attention to the simple matter of entering the correct dates in this section of the form. It’s a simple mistake to make, and a simple one to avoid. Here’s how.

The entry in the “Date Construction Documents Issued” field should be the date you issued the construction documents for the purposes of regulatory approval, permitting or construction. (For publicly funded projects, enter the date the construction documents were publicly posted for bids.) This is the date that matters, because it starts the 20-day clock. The “Issued” date is rarely the date the construction documents were sealed, but often the sealing date is what ends up in that field. So that’s an easy mistake to avoid: simply remember to enter the issuance date, not the sealing date.

The “Date Construction Documents Submitted” field is the date you mailed or delivered the construction documents to the RAS. You must sign the form and enter the correct date of signature. Responses indicate these forms are often filled out by employees who make the errors. If another filled out the form for you, double check the dates—especially the “Issued” date—to avoid the hassle.

If closer attention is paid to these simple date entries, the number of referrals would decrease dramatically and my staff could spend more time investigating other cases in which the Board’s laws and rules have been violated.

Oh yeah, about that $300 savings I mentioned at the beginning of this article? I am guessing a good round number for hourly billing is $150. It appears to me, from reviewing tons of responses, that the average registrant spends at least two hours preparing and submitting a response to our investigations. That could be time well spent on serving a client with billable hours.

I hope this helps out, and I wish you all much success in 2017. And please don’t forget your wedding anniversary.
Directory of Public Policies and Position Statements

As amended by the Board of Directors
December 2016
D. Public Policy: Future of the Profession

With an obligation to the future of the architecture profession, architects must encourage, recruit, and inspire those who would become architects.

Supporting Position Statements

1. Architecture Awareness in Education

The AIA supports integrating the art and science of architecture into K-12 core curricula and post-secondary education. Course offerings should enhance the understanding of the built environment, and inspire creative and critical thinking about the importance of healthy buildings, sustainable design, and livable communities that positively impact quality of life.

(approved September 2015, through December 31, 2018)

2. Mentorship

The AIA supports its members in fulfilling their professional obligation to mentor emerging professionals as they advance throughout their career. Additionally, those members who supervise individuals engaged in the IDP shall reasonably assist in proper and timely documentation in accordance with that program.

(approved September 2015, through December 31, 2018)

3. Practice and Education Cultures

The AIA supports a professional practice environment (“office culture”) that encourages the essential values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation. The architectural design studio culture should promote these ideals as the foundation of degree education and extend these values broadly into a career in professional practice.

(approved September 2015, through December 31, 2018)

4. Pre-licensure Titling

The AIA supports the title of “intern” for students who are working in an architectural office while actively pursuing architecture degrees in programs accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), or studying in pre-professional programs.

AIA supports the title of “Architectural Associate” or “Design Professional” for those who 1) have earned a degree from a program accredited by NAAB, or who have met education/experience requirements in their jurisdiction AND 2) are participating in the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards’ Architectural Experience Program or are meeting their jurisdictions’ experience requirements.

(approved December 2016, through December 31, 2019)
Sec. 1051.701. REGISTRATION REQUIRED. (a) A person may not engage in the practice of architecture, or offer or attempt to engage in the practice of architecture, as defined in Section 1051.001(7)(A), (B), or (C) unless the person is registered as an architect under this chapter.

(b) A firm, partnership, corporation, or association, including a firm, partnership, corporation, or joint stock association engaged in the practice of engineering under Section 1001.405, may engage in the practice of architecture, represent to the public that the entity is engaged in the practice of architecture or is offering architectural services, or use the word "architect" or "architecture" in any manner in its name only if any practice of architecture or architectural service performed on behalf of the entity is performed by or through a person registered as an architect under this chapter.

Added by Acts 2001, 77th Leg., ch. 1421, Sec. 1, eff. June 1, 2003; Renumbered from Occupations Code Sec. 1051.301 and amended by Acts 2003, 78th Leg., ch. 331, Sec. 3.15, eff. Sept. 1, 2003.
Amended by:

Acts 2005, 79th Leg., Ch. 208 (H.B. 1573), Sec. 3, eff. September 1, 2005.
Sec. 1051.801. CRIMINAL PENALTY. (a) A person, whether acting independently or on behalf of the person's firm, commits an offense if, in violation of this chapter, the person:

(1) engages in the practice of architecture, or offers or attempts to engage in the practice of architecture;

(2) prepares architectural plans or specifications for and observes or supervises the construction, enlargement, or alteration of a building for another person; or

(3) advertises or puts out a sign, card, or drawing designating the person as an architect or architectural designer or uses another business or professional title that uses a form of the word "architect."

(b) An offense under this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than $250 and not more than $1,000. Each day of violation is a separate offense.

(c) In an action brought under this section, the board may be represented by a district or county attorney or by other counsel as necessary.

Added by Acts 2003, 78th Leg., ch. 331, Sec. 3.24, eff. Sept. 1, 2003.
(a) Architects duly registered in Texas are authorized to use any form of the word "architect" or the word "architecture" to describe themselves and to describe services they offer and perform in Texas.

(b) A firm, partnership, corporation, or other business association may use any form of the word "architect" or the word "architecture" in its name or to describe services it offers or performs in Texas only under the following conditions:

   (1) The business employs at least one Architect on a full-time basis or associates with at least one Architect pursuant to the provisions of section 1.122; and

   (2) The Architect(s) employed by or associated with the business pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of this section exercise Supervision and Control over all architectural services performed by nonregistrants on behalf of the business, or in the case of services rendered pursuant to section 1.122(e), exercise, at a minimum, Responsible Charge over all such services.

(c) No entity other than those qualified in subsections (a) and (b) of this section may use any form of the word "architect" or "architecture" in its name or to describe services it offers or performs in Texas.

(d) A person enrolled in the Intern Development Program (IDP) may use the title "architectural intern."

Source Note: The provisions of this §1.123 adopted to be effective February 27, 2001, 26 TexReg 1710.
MEMORANDUM

TO: NCARB Credentials Committee
FROM: Texas Board of Architectural Examiners
(Registration Board)
DATE: March 28, 2017
RE: Credentials Letter Form

We submit the names of the following individuals who will serve as our official delegates at the 2017 NCARB Annual Business Meeting, all of whom are duly appointed members of the board. (Do not include Member Board Executives and Board Attorneys as official delegates.) **Please place an asterisk (*) next to the delegate who is authorized to cast a ballot.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME &amp; DATE TERM EXPIRES</th>
<th>POSITION ON THE BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DEBRA DOCKERY* - Jan 31, 2017</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CORBETT &quot;CHASE&quot; BEARDEN - Jan 31, 2021</td>
<td>Public Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undersigned has been duly authorized by the vote of the board to execute and deliver to NCARB this document on its behalf.

[Signature]

JULIE HILDEBRAND, Executive Director

Type or Print Name & Title

Return this form to Ilinca Ciumac by **June 2, 2017**
(iciumac@ncarb.org)
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

RATED PERIOD: FROM: ____________________________ TO: ____________________________

NAME OF BOARD MEMBER: _______________________________________________________

INSTRUCTIONS: Each member of the Board shall rate the Executive Director on each evaluation item. The numerical ratings must be supported by comments giving rationale and as much objective evidence as possible. The Board Presiding Officer shall tally the scores and determine a composite Board numerical average for each item. The Executive Director and each Board member shall be given a copy of the Board’s composite evaluation. The results shall be discussed in executive session.

The following criteria shall be the basis for determining numerical ratings:

5 – Always
4 – Often
3 – Sometimes
2 – Seldom
1 – Never

Don’t Know or Not Applicable will not be scored.

PLACE APPROPRIATE NUMBER IN BLANK AND WRITE COMMENTS FOR EACH TOPIC:

OVERALL RATING ______

1. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
   a. Demonstrates an understanding of the Board’s Mission and Philosophy ______
   b. Understands the priorities for the Board ______
   c. Expresses vision and enables others to translate vision into action ______
   d. Develops goals and objectives for the agency ______
   e. Maintains long and short-range strategic planning processes ______
   f. Demonstrates a knowledge of external issues impacting the agency ______

COMMENTS: ________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
2. **EFFECTIVENESS**
   a. Organizes workload and personnel for maximum efficiency
   b. Anticipates future needs and acts to meet them in an orderly way
   c. Identifies better, faster or more efficient and less expensive ways to operate
   d. Anticipates problems and develops contingency plans

COMMENTS: 

---

3. **PROBLEM SOLVING**
   a. Searches for and recognizes appropriate solutions to problems
   b. Perceives the essentials of a problem
   c. Considers many options before making a decision
   d. Considers the long-term implications of current decisions

COMMENTS: 

---

4. **COMMUNICATION**
   a. Establishes and maintains an effective system of communication with stakeholders
   b. Speaks effectively in public and private, expressing ideas logically and correctly
   c. Fosters open communication and listens to understand others' perspective
   d. Maintains confidentiality and appropriately communicates sensitive information
   e. Prepares and submits timely and accurate state-required reports

COMMENTS: 

---

5. **PERSONNEL**
   a. Recruits and assigns best available personnel in terms of competence
   b. Develops and executes sound personnel policies and practices
   c. Develops recommendation for salary schedules within budgetary limits
   d. Conducts an effective staff evaluation and counseling program

COMMENTS: 

---
OVERALL RATING

6. DELEGATION
   a. Appropriately assigns tasks to subordinates
   b. Accepts responsibility for own actions and those of subordinates
   c. Fosters and values a diverse environment
   d. Hires and retains appropriate staff and conducts workforce and succession planning

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

OVERALL RATING

7. BUSINESS AND FINANCE
   a. Provides for appropriate involvement of Board in budget development
   b. Evaluates financial needs and recommends adequate financing of agency operations
   c. Ensures that funds are expended in accordance with the budget
   d. Maintains adequate accounting procedures and records
   e. Maintains accurate and proper accountability of agency's office, facilities, equipment and supplies
   f. Provides accurate and timely financial information to the Board

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

OVERALL RATING

8. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BOARD
   a. Prepares agenda and other materials in cooperation with the Chair
   b. Attends and participates appropriately in all meetings of the Board
   c. Orient newly appointed Board Members and provides training for all Board Members on an on-going basis
   d. Keeps Board informed on trends, issues, needs, and operation of the agency
   e. Appropriately refers matters to the Board for input or action
   f. Makes informed and accurate recommendations on matters requiring Board action
   g. Interprets and executes Board policies and direction

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
9. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COMMUNITY
   a. Develops cooperative relationships with professional registrants and organizations
   b. Develops cooperative relationships with legislators and other agency officials
   c. Works effectively with the public and media
   d. Resolves conflict in a way helpful to the agency
   e. Participates actively in national regulatory board associations

COMMENTS: _____________________________________________________________

   OVERALL RATING: __________

10. PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES AND DEVELOPMENT
    a. Leads by example with the Board's values
    b. Uses applicable professional standards and establishes procedures
    c. Identifies ethical dilemmas and takes action
    d. Follows through on commitments
    e. Displays honesty and is forthright with others
    f. Treats others with respect
    g. Exhibits the managerial courage to make difficult and hard decisions
    h. Receives feedback non-defensively
    i. Maintains health and energy necessary to perform duties
    j. Maintains neat appearance and is well groomed
    k. Pursues professional development by study, course work, conference attendance, and professional activities
    l. Supports and encourages development of staff through in-service education and other professional development programs

COMMENTS: _____________________________________________________________

   OVERALL RATING: __________
List one to three strongest areas of the Executive Director's performance during the past year?

1. 

2. 

3. 

List one to three areas most in need of improvement during the coming period?

1. 

2. 

3. 

SUMMARY COMMENTS: (Optional)

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Board Member
Provides a leadership role in the regulation of the practice of Architecture, Interior Design, and Landscape Architecture and in implementing the Board’s policies, mission, strategic plan, and legislative mandates.

- Demonstrates leadership, strategic planning skills, and considerable analytical abilities in assessing needed programs, priorities, and policies.
- Facilitates consensus, collaboration, and participation of Board Members, staff, and appropriate professional and government agencies.
- Ensures quality and timely submission of agency plans and legislative mandates and implementation of the Board directives.
- Informs Board Members of issues that should be considered during their deliberations.

Ensures agency accomplishes the agency goals and adheres to Board policies, state laws, and government regulations.

- Ensures agency staff and Board Members comply with Board policies, state laws, and government regulations in the performance of their official duties.
- Intervenes, as necessary, to correct identified problems.
- Notifies Board Members of serious breaches.

Maintains productive relationships with Board Members, staff, projects government officials, other agencies, and the media. Represents the Board at functions, legislative hearings and interviews.

- Maintains courteous, respectful relationships, and a climate of collaboration.
- Portrays a professional image at meetings, functions, legislative hearings, and interviews.
- Uses discretion in committing Board resources and in presenting Board positions.
- Provides accurate and appropriate information.
- Consults with Board Members and appropriate individuals before responding to inquiries for which answers appear to be unclear or possibly controversial.
- Is open-minded and tactful, and represents the agency in a positive manner.
- Provides effective counsel to the Board on potential and actual effects of Board policies, activities, and decisions.
- Monthly communications, as a minimum, with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board.

Demonstrates effective management and leadership skills. Uses considerable independent judgment and self-sufficiency in conducting work duties.

- Requires minimal supervision or oversight by Board Members.
- Maintains an agency climate that attracts, retains, and positively motivates staff and Board Members.
- Ensures prompt and thorough follow-through on Board directives.
• Continuously assesses the effectiveness of agency operations, seeking ways to increase productivity and quality of agency activities.
• Able to handle multiple work assignments simultaneously and to structure time appropriately to each assignment.
• Provides sufficient notice and explanation to Board Members if assignments cannot be completed as required.

Keeps abreast of government policies, programs, and procedures affecting the practice of Architecture, Interior Design, and Landscape Architecture and Board activities. Seeks appropriate and reliable sources of accurate information.
• Stays up to date on matters of concern to the Board, such as activities and pertinent reports of the Legislature, Governor, and other government agencies.
  ▪ Identifies when Board Members and other appropriate entities should be notified of issues, and takes appropriate follow-up action in a timely manner.

Responsible for agency administration. Provides leadership to agency staff and ensures staff conducts duties in a manner that is ethical, respectful, courteous, and quality oriented.
• Ensures effective hiring and management of agency staff, fiscal accountability, accuracy of agency documents, and adherence to state laws and regulations.
• Facilitates a work environment that is conducive to open communications, group problem solving, and team building.
• Ensures timely, objective, and fair performance evaluations of staff are conducted.
• Ensures staff activities are conducted in a clear, professional, and timely manner.
• Gives careful attention to content and tone of agency reports, speeches, correspondence, and policies.
• Notifies Board Members when technical assistance and expertise are needed that are not available through existing Board resources.

Responsible for agency administration. Provides leadership to agency staff and ensures staff conducts duties in a manner that is ethical, respectful, courteous, and quality oriented.
• Ensures effective hiring and management of agency staff, fiscal accountability, accuracy of agency document, and adherence to state laws and regulations.
• Facilitates a work environment that is conducive to open communications, group problem solving, and team building.
• Ensures timely, objective, and fair performance evaluations of staff are conducted.
• Ensures staff activities are conducted in a clear, professional, and timely manner.
• Gives careful attention to content and tone of agency reports, speeches, correspondence, and policies.
• Notifies Board Members when technical assistance and expertise are needed that are not available through existing Board resources.
Purpose
The purpose of this policy is the process to evaluate the executive director’s annual performance review.

References and related Resources or Statutory Authority
TBAE Human Resources Handbook, Revised June 2011
TBAE Policy SS-003 Employee Relations - Grievance Management
http://www.eeoc.gov/field/dallas/fepa.cfm

Scope
The TBAE Board Members, the Executive Director, the Manager of Operations the Human Resources Program Specialist

Policy
When both parties to the partnership set goals, make commitments to development and growth, and are accountable, the leadership ingredients are truly in place for excellence in the relationship and for excellence in performance throughout the agency.

It is the policy of the agency that one of the Board’s pivotal duties is to evaluate the executive director’s performance and review his or her compensation on at least an annual basis. Doing so requires the Board – usually through its Board members and in consultation with the executive director – to design a process for performance appraisal and to exercise a rigorous self-discipline in carrying it out. A fair and competent executive director evaluation requires choosing indicators to reflect various aspects of performance and a strong design for carrying out the overall appraisal process. Indicators should flow from the executive director’s job description, the executive director’s Board-approved goals and objectives, and the agency’s strategic plan.

Categories for performance evaluation may include:
- Strategic objectives and mission-based results.
- Public relations and communications.
- Human resources management.
• Fund development with the scope offered through the SDSI status.
• Effectiveness in working with the board and helping the board fulfill its roles.
• Planning.
• Management of fiscal and other resources.
• The executive director’s professional development.

The following list of elements for a strong performance appraisal process is recommended:
• Input from all of the individual Board members.
• Self-evaluation on the part of the executive director.
• Feedback at intervals.
• A rating system for the more concrete aspects of the executive director’s performance.
• A qualitative system for the more subjective aspects of the executive director’s performance.
• An open-ended discussion of professional development.
• An opportunity for formal dialogue with the executive director.
• Agreement on fair and reasonable compensation.

The evaluation process should include both written and oral components and conclude with an outline of performance goals for the following year. The Board, under the leadership of the Board Chair, briefs and then conducts a formal evaluation session with the executive director. A written report should follow for full Board review and inclusion in the executive director’s personnel file. While the primary purpose for appraising the executive director performance is to give constructive feedback, there are circumstances in which the negatives outweigh the positives and the Board must formally address unacceptable performance. At any point that an aspect of the executive director’s performance is considered unacceptable, the executive director should receive informal or formal feedback from the Board Chair. If the executive director believes the performance evaluation is based on prohibited discrimination may follow the procedures outlined in TBAE Policy SS-003, Employee Relations: Grievance Procedure.

The annual performance evaluation may be one of many steps that occur should the Board mandate improved performance or begin to consider dismissal as a possibility. In any such circumstances, the Board is wise to obtain legal and human resources management consultation. The initial goal is to produce performance improvement, and, failing that, a separation process that minimizes risk to the agency that is respectful to the executive director.

Procedures
The Chair will ask the Manager of Operations to distribute the evaluation form and the Executive Director’s written self-assessment to each Board member and the collection and tabulation of the completed evaluation forms prior to an executive session meeting.

Board Participation
All Board members are to participate in the evaluation by completing an evaluation form and are encouraged to further discuss and refine their views during an executive session meeting. The Board may call upon the Executive Director to participate in any portion of the executive session meeting.

Frequency and Timing
The evaluation will take place annually at approximately the same time every year (August). The Executive Director’s first evaluation will take place approximately six months after initial hire and
then annually after that. The Manager of Operations in coordination with the Board Chair will establish time limits for the processing of the Executive Director Performance evaluation which will allow payment of performance awards not later than September 1 each year.

**Evaluation Criteria**
The criteria to be used in the evaluation of performance will be those duties and responsibilities that the Board and the Executive Director mutually agreed upon. The criteria will be documented in an evaluation form prior to the commencement of the evaluation period so that the Executive Director understands what is expected for the coming year. The Executive Director must be on an approved performance plan for at least 120 days prior to the rating.

**Evaluation Period**
The evaluation of performance will typically be addressed to activities, events and accomplishments that took place during the most recently completed fiscal year.

**Executive Director Input**
The Executive Director will provide a written self-assessment to the Chair or full Board, organized in such a way that it follows the criteria in the evaluation form and includes any specific initiatives, projects or professional development objectives. The Executive Director may also include a statement of specific noteworthy accomplishments.

**Consensus**
The Board recognizes how confusing it can be to send mixed messages to the Executive Director. In order to act as a cohesive governing body and “speak in one voice,” the Board will strive to reach consensus about the evaluation ratings and messages. The individual comments and views may also be discussed in executive session, including discussion with the Executive Director.

**Communication**
The Board will meet with the Executive Director soon after the executive session to deliver the outcomes of the evaluation. The purpose of having both Board officers involved is to ensure accuracy in expressing the Board’s collective view. The results will also be provided in writing on the agreed upon evaluation form. The Executive Director shall be provided an opportunity to address the Board in an executive session regarding his or her final evaluation results, or submit a written response to the Board to be kept as an attachment with the written evaluation results.

**Confidentiality**
The discussions held during the executive session are to be kept confidential among those who attend the session. The written evaluation results will be kept in the confidential personnel file of the Executive Director, in accordance with Texas State law can be found [here](#).

**Compensation Determinations**
The evaluation results may impact the Executive Director’s compensation. Therefore, the annual review and determination of the Executive Director’s compensation will be decided at the same time as the evaluation.
Legal Advice
If the Board should ever need legal advice in connection with the evaluation process, it will seek counsel from the General Counsel. If conflicts of interest exist with that counsel, the Board will seek outside counsel, in accordance with law and its usual practice.

Review Cycle
Policies and procedures are reviewed at least every two years or updated as required to ensure they reflect current information and requirements. Policies and procedures are reviewed in consultation with staff, management, and agency regulatory bodies to ensure they accommodate and are reflective of the needs of our registrants, oversight agencies, and best practice guidelines.