TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
Board Meeting Agenda
The William P. Hobby Jr. Bldg., Tower III, Room 102
333 Guadalupe Street
Austin, Texas
Thursday, February 21, 2019
9:00 a.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 the November 15, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes (Action) Debra Dockery

3. Executive Director Report (Information) Julie Hildebrand
   A. Summary of Executive Accomplishments
   B. Operating Budget/Scholarship: Presentation on 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2019 Expenditures/Revenues
   Report on Conferences and Meetings (Information) Julie Hildebrand
   A. NCARB Model Law Task Force – Nov 29
   B. Governor’s Appointee Training - New Board Members – Dec 18
   C. CLARB MBE Committee Meeting – Feb 4
   Report on Upcoming Conferences and Meetings (Information)
   A. NCARB Regional Summit/MBE Workshop – Mar 9-11
   B. 2019 Texas ASLA Annual Conference – Apr 24-25
   C. NCARB Model Law Task Force – May 24

4. Enforcement Cases (Action) Lance Brenton
   Review and possibly adopt Executive Director’s recommendation in the following enforcement cases:
   A. Registrant/Non-Registrant Cases:
      Cameron, John J. (#004-19A)
      Griffin, J. Scott (#121-18N)
      Herron, Doug (#033-18N)
      Hinkle, Darren H. (#280-18A)
      Pittman, Julian (#089-19A)
   B. CE Cases:
      Churchill, Stephen T. (#226-17I)
      Dang, Liem (#096-19A)
      Greer, Todd A. (#199-19A)
      Grossman, Kenneth M. (#010-19A)
      Haas, Stanley A. (#085-19A)
      Herman, Timothy M. (#193-19A)
      Lambert, Amy (#100-19A)
      Maclaine, Merissa A. (#086-19I)
TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
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Vasquez, Samuel, Jr. (#084-19A)
Wainscott, Mark A. (#009-19A)
Walker, Petter E. (#196-19L)
Yeatts, Gordon N. (#094-19A)

The Board may meet in closed session pursuant to TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. §551.071(1) to confer with legal counsel

5. Legislative Committee Update (Information) Bob Wetmore

6. Board Election (Action)
   Board Vice-Chair and Secretary/Treasurer Debra Dockery

7. Interior Design Qualification (CIDQ) Exam Eligibility Requirements (Information) Thom Banks

8. NCARB Continuing Education Guidelines (Information) Debra Dockery

9. Freedom by Design Service Projects (Information) Debra Dockery

10. Upcoming Board Meetings (Information) Debra Dockery
    Thursday, June 13, 2019
    Tuesday, August 13, 2019
    Tuesday, November 19, 2019

11. Chair’s Closing Remarks Debra Dockery

12. 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>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSA</td>
<td>Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>American Institute of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREFAF</td>
<td>Architect Registration Examination Financial Assistance Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASID</td>
<td>American Society of Interior Designers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLA</td>
<td>American Society of Landscape Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE</td>
<td>Architect Registration Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAT</td>
<td>Building Officials Association of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACB</td>
<td>Canadian Architectural Certification Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Council for Interior Design Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDQ</td>
<td>Council for Interior Design Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARB</td>
<td>Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARB</td>
<td>Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAA</td>
<td>General Appropriations Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>General Revenue Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDCEC</td>
<td>Interior Design Continuing Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEC</td>
<td>Interior Design Educators Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Intern Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIDIA</td>
<td>International Interior Design Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARE</td>
<td>Landscape Architect Registration Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>Member Board Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBM</td>
<td>Member Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAB</td>
<td>National Architectural Accreditation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCARB</td>
<td>National Council of Architectural Registration Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAG</td>
<td>Office of the Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAH</td>
<td>State Office of Administrative Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORM</td>
<td>State Office of Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAID</td>
<td>Texas Association for Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>Texas Accessibility Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>Texas Association of School Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPE</td>
<td>Texas Board of Professional Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxA</td>
<td>Texas Society of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSPE</td>
<td>Texas Society of Professional Engineers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEMS

1A. Call to Order
Ms. Dockery called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

1B. Roll Call
Ms. Walker called the roll.

Present Board Members
- Debra Dockery: Chair, Architect Member
- Michael (Chad) Davis: Vice-Chair, Landscape Architect Member
- Jennifer Walker: Secretary-Treasurer, Architect Member
- Robert (Bob) Wetmore: Architect Member
- Rosa G. Salazar: Registered Interior Designer
- Joyce J. Smith: Public Member

1C. Absences
- Charles (Chuck) Anastos: Architect Member
- Chase Bearden: Public Member
- Fernando Trevino: Public Member

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Wetmore) TO APPROVE THE EXCUSED ABSENCES OF CHARLES (CHUCK) ANASTOS AND CHASE BEARDEN. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

1D. Determination of a Quorum
A quorum was present.

1E. Recognition of Guests
Ms. Dockery acknowledged the following members of TBAE staff: Julie Hildebrand, Executive Director; Lance Brenton, General Counsel; Glenn Garry, Communications Manager; Glenda Best, Operations Manager; Christine Brister, Human Resources; Kenneth Liles, Finance Manager; Dale Dornfeld, IT Manager; Mike Alvarado, Registration Manager; Tony Whitt, Continuing Education Coordinator; Jackie Blackmore, License and Permit Specialist; Jessica Ramirez, License and Permit Specialist; Julio Martinez, Security Analyst; and Katherine Crain, Legal Assistant. The Managing Investigator, Jack Stamps, arrived at 9:30.

Additionally, the following guests were recognized: Jeri Morey, Architect from Corpus Christi; and Suzy Fields, Registered Interior Designer.
1F. Chair’s Opening Remarks

Ms. Dockery thanked the Board and welcomed the guests. She began by stating that she wanted to recognize some of the staff for the care and compassion they show to agency registrants. Ms. Dockery explained the story of Dan Masullo, an exam candidate who had, after many years, completed the three requirements for registration as an architect: education, the architectural experience program, and passed his exams. Tragically, after all his hard work, he died in a car accident. At the time of his accident, he had not yet finalized his registration. She complimented the registration staff and the Communications Director for reaching out to the Texas Society of Architects in order to have Mr. Masullo’s wall certificate and license awarded to his family at the New Architect Convocation in Fort Worth recently. Ms. Dockery described the event as a very moving ceremony. Two of Mr. Masullo’s brothers were there, and one of them spoke very movingly about his brother and how proud they were that after so many years he had realized his dream to become a licensed architect. Following this speech, the certificate was presented to the brothers and the entire audience gave a standing ovation. Ms. Dockery commended the Board staff for recognizing the importance of honoring Mr. Masullo, for seeing that situation through and caring enough to make it happen. She reiterated her appreciation for the care and compassion the staff shows to the Board and all the registrants.

Ms. Dockery welcomed the new Board members and said that she was glad they were on the Board. She stated that they would have an opportunity to introduce themselves after Public Comment.

1G. Public Comments

Ms. Dockery said that there were two individuals that signed up for Public Comment. First, Jeri Morey addressed the Board.

Ms. Morey stated that she had written a letter to the Board following Chad Davis’s suggestion and asked if the Board had an estimate on when she would get a response.

Mr. Brenton stated that he had not seen a letter and inquired when she sent it. She replied that she sent it months ago, but she could resend it.

Next, Ms. Dockery invited Suzy Fields to offer her public comment.

Ms. Fields had a disciplinary case before the Board on this date. She shared a short history of her education and work experience as a registered interior designer. She stated that she was at the Board meeting because she did not complete the continuing education hours that are required under the Board rules. She described her efforts to make up the hours after she was audited and stated that she had adopted internal controls to remind her to complete CE as required. She accepted full responsibility for her error. She stated that it was an oversight and she
hopes the Board can resolve this matter so she can continue her profession in interior design.

2. Introduction of New Board Members

Rosa G. Salazar, Registered Interior Designer
Ms. Salazar stated that she had been doing design work for about 15 years and currently lives in Lubbock, Texas. She said she graduated from Texas Tech University. Currently, she works for a small architectural group in Lubbock, where her practice focuses on healthcare and corporate projects. She said she was very pleased to have joined the Board.

Joyce J. Smith, Public Member
Ms. Smith stated that she was happy to be on the Board and looks forward to working on behalf of the State of Texas. She said that she is originally from North Carolina, graduated from North Carolina State and she is a Certified Public Accountant. Previously, she was a partner in a large local firm in Austin, Atchley and Associates. She continues to be a licensed as a CPA. Though she does enjoy traveling and not having to do a lot of work, she does a few tax returns with no fee, mainly for her family. She looks forward to contributing to the Board.

Ms. Dockery welcomed the new Board members, and each of the remaining Board members provided a short introduction to the new members.

3. Approval of August 21, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Walker) TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 21, 2018 BOARD MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. (Ms. Smith and Ms. Salazar abstained from voting as they were not at the August meeting.)

4. Executive Director’s Report

Ms. Dockery invited Ms. Hildebrand to deliver the Executive Director’s report.

4A. Summary of Executive Accomplishments

Ms. Hildebrand provided a report and explanation of Executive accomplishments as summarized on page 20 of the notebook.

Ms. Hildebrand continued by discussing the summary of Registration Department accomplishments, described on pages 21 and 22 of the Board materials. She emphasized the continued growth of active registrants as the most notable item in the summary. She also noted that, although the numbers have not yet been incorporated into the summary on page 22, registrant numbers have continued to increase in September and October.

Ms. Hildebrand continued by providing a report and explanation of the enforcement accomplishments as summarized on pages 23 and 24 of the notebook.
Ms. Dockery asked Ms. Hildebrand to identify the number of new registrants for each profession in future reports. Ms. Dockery remarked on the continued growth of new registrants, and that it would appear that the Board will soon have over 19,000 total active registrants.

Ms. Hildebrand discussed the final Fiscal Year 2018 revenues and expenditures as presented on page 25 of the Board materials. Ms. Hildebrand noted that the continued high growth in registration numbers had again resulted in higher revenues, and that interest was higher than expected, as previously discussed with the Board. To provide context with the adopted 2019 budget, Ms. Hildebrand noted that the Board has projected $3,049,220 in FY 2019 revenues, which is more than the budgeted projection for FY 2018 ($3,021,330) but less than what was actually collected ($3,140,258).

Ms. Hildebrand also shared that she had looked at the actual revenues for September and October FY 2019, and that those numbers were higher than what had been received in FY 2018. Once again, it could be that the Board will experience higher than expected growth in registrations and revenues.

Ms. Smith asked if the 2018 budget was available. Ms. Hildebrand explained that, normally, she presents information to the Board on the most recently completed quarter. Since the first quarter had not yet been completed, she had not included a report on actual 2019 revenues and expenditures but would have that information at the next Board meeting. She also stated that she will provide the most up to date information to Board members on request.

Ms. Dockery clarified that the Board had adopted the FY 2019 budget at the August Board meeting and that that information is on the Board’s website in the Board materials. Ms. Hildebrand stated she would send a copy to Ms. Smith.

Other notable items discussed by Ms. Hildebrand regarding the final report on the FY 2018 budget included the higher than expected expenditures for professional fees and services (due to required reimbursements for audits that were undertaken by third party agencies); lower than expected costs for Board travel (due to Board members’ relative proximity to Austin and funding of trips by the national council organizations); the financing of agency training (the funding of which was split between FY 2018 and FY 2019); an increase in costs over projections for IT upgrades (following a decision to incur these costs in 2018 instead of 2019 due to better than expected revenues); and a general effort in the future to really tighten the budget down and eliminate unnecessary padding.
Ms. Hildebrand also updated the Board on temperature control problems in the server room, which have cost the agency money for previous repair efforts as well as time lost due to servers shutting down. Ms. Hildebrand stated that this is an item that the agency may need to fund out of the fund balance. This would be consistent with the Board’s adopted policies. She stated that she would keep the Board apprised of further developments.

Ms. Hildebrand provided a report and explanation of the final FY 2018 budget for the Scholarship Fund, as contained on page 26 of the Board materials. Ms. Hildebrand and Ms. Dockery provided an explanation of the scholarship fund program and its history to the new members.

Mr. Davis added that the fund supports scholarships for architect applicants, and is funded by fees paid by registered architects, not landscape architects or registered interior designers.

Ms. Salazar inquired as to whether a scholarship program would be possible for interior designers. Ms. Hildebrand explained that it would require a change to the statutes by the legislature.

Ms. Hildebrand provided a report and explanation of Annual Financial Report included on page 27 of the Board materials. She stated that this document is submitted every year and reviewed by the Comptroller.

Mr. Davis emphasized for the new Board members that the agency had gone through three audits last year so he felt confident that it had been well-vetted.

Ms. Hildebrand provided an overview of the orientation that the new Board members recently attended. Both Ms. Smith and Ms. Salazar commented that they thought the orientation and training were great and they both learned a lot about the agency.

Ms. Hildebrand then provided an update to the Board on conferences and meetings.

Last September, Mr. Davis and Ms. Hildebrand attended the CLARB annual meeting. One topic of note was CLARB’s focus on “frictionless licensing,” which describes efforts to eliminate procedures and requirements for licensing that offer low return on the protection of the public, but impose high barriers.

Mr. Davis stated there was much discussion relating to various efforts to change the licensing laws in individual states. One trend that has been
observed is significant pushback against outright deregulation, with an emphasis instead on mobility of licensure.

Ms. Hildebrand then discussed the CIDQ meeting and shared her takeaways from a presentation that was given by Tara Koslov, an official from the Federal Trade Commission, the federal agency that helps to enforce antitrust laws. She was the staff member that was responsible for the FTC’s report on mobility of licensure, so it was good to hear her presentation on a topic which is an important consideration for this Board. Ms. Hildebrand also described a presentation which cited the potential benefits of licensure. This presentation focused on a Harvard study which showed that for minorities and women especially, licensure schemes tend to even the playing field and decrease biases in hiring practices. This is because licensure requirements can be viewed objective measurements of basic competence and that a license holder is able to show parity with other license holders in a way that may overcome bias.

Ms. Hildebrand stated that in September, Steve Ramirez filled in for Jack Stamps, and made a presentation to the Lower Rio Grande Valley AIA Conference. She said that Mr. Ramirez had done a great job and that she welcomes the training opportunity and increase in the capability of agency staff.

Mike Alvarado and Jackie Blackmore attended the NCARB Licensing Advisors’ Retreat in Santa Monica, CA. Ms. Hildebrand explained that the retreat provided a practical exposure to what is happening at NCARB and focused on how licensing advisors can help licensure candidates get through the process.

Ms. Hildebrand and Ms. Dockery attended the NCARB Member Board Chair and Member Board Executives Summit. Ms. Hildebrand explained that NCARB is trying to focus on new ways to support state boards through initiatives like the development of software solutions. Ms. Hildebrand also enjoyed a presentation to MBEs by a local architect, who described her day-to-day work activities. Ms. Hildebrand said that this was a valuable opportunity for non-architects to put themselves in the shoes of a registrant and consider how regulation interacts with their work.

Ms. Dockery shared her observations from talking with Board members from other jurisdictions. She stated that one takeaway is that the Board fortunate to have avoided some of the problems of other Boards. In some cases, this includes refusal by legislatures to provide funding for Boards to attend meetings to conduct Board business and maximum fines as low as $500, which negatively impacts those Boards’ ability to provide meaningful oversight and regulation.
Ms. Hildebrand provided an update of TBAE’s attendance at the TxA Annual Meeting. Ms. Hildebrand said that she was unable to attend the meeting because it conflicted with the CIDQ Conference. However, Mike Alvarado and Glenn Garry did attend. While there, they visited UT Arlington, where they met with the AIA Student Chapter and presented to students. They also made three presentations to TxA conference attendees, in addition to providing outreach at the TBAE booth.

The Board took a break at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened at 10:30 a.m.

Ms. Hildebrand directed the Board to page 47, which includes basic information about the upcoming legislative session and discussed her responsibilities during the session.

Mr. Davis commended Ms. Hildebrand for her calm leadership during the most recent legislative session. Drawing upon his experience as a Board member with previous legislative affairs responsibilities for ASLA, he stated that it was important for the agency, as well as other stakeholders, to remain levelheaded and to focus on providing useful information to legislators during the session.

Ms. Hildebrand assured the Board that she would be sharing legislative items with the Board members through monthly emails on bills, including updates on agencies going through Sunset hearings and SDSI agencies.

Ms. Hildebrand discussed highlights from the Annual Report on Trends for Fiscal Year 2018, included in the Board materials starting on page 48.

Ms. Hildebrand explained that the trend report is a visual interpretation of some of the data the agency is required to report as part of its status as an SDSI agency.

Ms. Hildebrand directed the Board to pages 49-51 which includes charts documenting the number of registrants broken down by profession and status over the years. She was happy to report that all three professions had seen growth in FY 2018.

Ms. Dockery requested that, in the future, numbers for new registrants be broken down between those who gained eligibility by reciprocity and examination.

Mr. Davis suggested that the agency conduct a survey to find out which firms are small businesses versus large businesses, so the Board members will have those statistics in case they are requested to testify in front of the legislature in the upcoming session. He felt that it was important for the legislature to have a good picture of the number of small businesses
Enforcement Cases

Review and possibly adopt ED's recommendation in the following enforcement cases:

7A. Non-Registrant Cases

Review and possibly adopt Executive Director's recommendation in the following enforcement cases:

**Garcia, Mario T. (#296-18N)** – Mr. Brenton stated that the Respondent had not yet returned the signed Notice of Violation, and therefore asked that the item be removed from the agenda. No action was taken on this matter.

**Vu, Anthony (#066-16N)**

Mr. Brenton provided a summary of this matter as described on pages 58 and 59 of the Board materials.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Wetmore/Smith) TO ENTER AN ORDER WHICH ADOPTS THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY OF $11,000 AS SET FORTH IN THE REVISED REPORT AND NOTICE OF VIOLATION DATED OCTOBER 17, 2018.

Mr. Davis asked, when the Board has a case in which a non-registrant has practiced architecture, or used a seal indicating that services were provided by a registered architect, whether the agency reports these matters to building owners. Mr. Stamps answered that staff does not always do so. Mr. Davis stated that it would be worthwhile for staff to...
inform building owners of such cases, to alert them that they may not have received the services which they had been expecting.

Ms. Hildebrand stated that she would discuss this issue with staff and determine when such notifications would be helpful, when they might be sent out, etc.

Ms. Dockery asked whether this case was turned over to the District Attorney in the relevant jurisdiction, since this case involved the use of a seal without permission.

Mr. Stamps stated that he had not done so. He noted that while the agency had had success in reporting John Hamilton to Tarrant County previously, that was the first time that a D.A. had accepted a case referred by the Board. Mr. Stamps surmised that this may have been due to the extent of Mr. Hamilton’s violations, as well as the fact that he continued to engage in those behaviors even after the agency had opened an investigation. However, with all other cases, the Board had had zero success in convincing prosecutors to take on cases referred by TBAE.

Mr. Brenton stated that he would welcome further guidance from the Board on this matter. He suggested that referral of a matter to a prosecutor before the Board had taken action in a case could make it more difficult for the agency to take administrative action, because a Respondent may refuse to cooperate or participate in the case. On the other hand, this risk should be balanced against the benefit to the public safety of referring a case to prosecutors.

Ms. Hildebrand suggested that this issue could be brought before the Board at a future meeting. Ms. Dockery stated that she was curious to know what the Board’s duty is if it has knowledge of potential criminal charges, and she would welcome any guidance from staff.

Ms. Dockery called for the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7B. TDLR Cases

Goelzer, Matthew (#404-18A)

Mr. Brenton provided a summary of this matter as described on page 60 of the Board materials.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Wetmore) TO ENTER AN ORDER WHICH ADOPTS THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY OF $1,000 AS SET FORTH IN THE REPORT AND NOTICE OF VIOLATION DATED AUGUST 30, 2018.
Ms. Smith noted that this was a case that followed a warning. She asked how the Board received complaints, and whether the Board ever actively monitored the practice of individuals who have previously violated the laws.

Mr. Brenton stated that, for TDLR cases, regardless of whether there had been a previous violation, nearly all complaints are received directly from TDLR. He also stated that practice monitoring is not generally imposed for violations of TDLR requirements, but that in some cases for more serious violations, the Board has imposed probated suspensions against registrants in which staff actively monitors a registrant’s practice.

Ms. Dockery called for the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7C.
CE Cases

The Board considered and voted upon the continuing education cases as a group, with the exception of one matter which required recusal.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Davis/Walker) TO ENTER ORDERS WHICH ADOPT THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES AS SET FORTH IN THE REPORTS AND NOTICES OF VIOLATION FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING CONTINUING EDUCATION CASES:

Fields, Suzy M. (#429-18I)
Gustin, Wesley (#417-18A)
Hagmann, Gregory G. (#459-18A)
Kohutek, Robert C. (#298-18A)
Massouh, Craig G. (#421-18A)
Munoz, Sylvia (#476-18I)
Slavik, William B. (#189-18A)

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Board then considered Case Number #428-18A, concerning David R. German.

Mr. Davis recused himself from consideration of this matter.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Walker/Wetmore) TO ENTER AN ORDER WHICH ADOPTS THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY OF $500 AS SET FORTH IN THE REPORT AND NOTICE OF VIOLATION DATED AUGUST 30, 2018. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Ms. Dockery stated that the next item was the establishment of committees for next year. She asked Jennifer Walker to Chair the Rules Committee and appointed Joyce Smith and Fernando Trevino to serve on the Rules Committee.

In addition, she appointed Rosa Salazar and Chase Bearden to serve with Bob Wetmore as Chair on the Legislative Committee.

Ms. Dockery identified the following dates for the 2019 Board meetings:

- February 21, 2019
- June 13, 2019
- August 15, 2019
- November 19, 2019

The Chair had no final remarks.

A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED (Walker/Davis) TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:40 A.M. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD:

DEBRA J. DOCKERY, FAIA
Chair, TEXAS BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS
Summary of Executive Accomplishments
February 21, 2019

Executive
1. I met with the Texas Society of Architects and the Texas Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects to discuss the 86th Legislative Session and have shared updates as needed with the representative for the Registered Interior Designers.
2. Glenda is managing the agency’s transition to CAPPS Recruit for hiring and managing employees. The time commitment will not be as intense as it was for CAPPS HR, but it will still require additional invested time.
3. The Governor extended the disaster proclamation for another 30 days. We will also extend the services that we are offering.
4. Rose Garza joined TBAE as a Registration Assistant and will serve as the agency’s receptionist.

NCARB
My work on the Model Law Task Force continues, including the review of and amendments to the model law and rules.

CLARB
I chaired the in-person meeting for the MBE Committee where we assisted staff in its work towards CLARB’s yearly initiatives.

CIDQ
1. TBAE was highlighted in the Council for Interior Design Qualification’s quarterly newsletter.
2. Thomas Banks, CIDQ Executive Director, will attend our February Board meeting to present information to the Board regarding exam eligibility requirements for the interior designer examination and a status update for CIDQ.
# Summary of Registration Department Accomplishments FY19

<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>Exam Applications Received</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Interior Designers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Applications Received</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Interior Designers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications Received</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Scores Received/Entered</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Registrations Issued</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Interior Designers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Registrations Issued</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Interior Designers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Registrations Issued</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Registrants</td>
<td>18,628</td>
<td>18,721</td>
<td>18,774</td>
<td>18,920</td>
<td>18,959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>13,157</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,208</td>
<td>13,229</td>
<td>13,253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Interior Designers</td>
<td>3,815</td>
<td>3,851</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architects</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE Audits Conducted</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE Audits Referred for Investigation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Scholarship Applications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Standing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Enforcement Accomplishments FY19

<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>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Closed by Investigations – Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Closed by Investigations – TDLR</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>Cases Closed by Investigations – Other</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Referred to Legal</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Days to Investigate</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notices of Violation by Legal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warnings from Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints Filed at SOAH</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Settlement Conferences Held</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No evidence to prove violation

* Criminal history provisional registration
Texas Board of Architectural Examiners  
Actual 2019 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019 Approved Budget</th>
<th>FY 2019 Expenditures as of 11-30-18</th>
<th>FY 2019 Percentage Earned/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>$ 2,752,000</td>
<td>$ 723,258</td>
<td>26.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Registration Fees</td>
<td>$ 124,000</td>
<td>$ 26,595</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Fee Payments</td>
<td>$ 134,000</td>
<td>$ 37,118</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
<td>$ 1,309</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$ 22,000</td>
<td>$ 13,965</td>
<td>63.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Draw on Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$ 13,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$ 3,049,220</td>
<td>$ 802,245</td>
<td>26.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>$ 1,629,381</td>
<td>$ 403,314</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Related Costs</td>
<td>$ 567,839</td>
<td>$ 137,733</td>
<td>24.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees &amp; Services</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 9,728</td>
<td>38.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Travel</td>
<td>$ 24,000</td>
<td>$ 3,996</td>
<td>16.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Travel</td>
<td>$ 19,000</td>
<td>$ 7,134</td>
<td>37.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
<td>$ 2,220</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$ 2,980</td>
<td>37.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Utilities</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 4,113</td>
<td>27.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 113</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWCAP Payment with Office Rental</td>
<td>$ 113,000</td>
<td>$ 28,250</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Leases--Copiers</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 1,792</td>
<td>19.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 3,278</td>
<td>65.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 26,000</td>
<td>$ 16,479</td>
<td>63.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fees--Employee Training</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 4,681</td>
<td>52.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$ 21,000</td>
<td>$ 12,910</td>
<td>61.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to GR</td>
<td>$ 510,000</td>
<td>$ 127,500</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Upgrades</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 15,645</td>
<td>26.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$ 3,049,220</td>
<td>$ 781,865</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess/ (Deficiency) of Rev over Exp.</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 20,380</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding for 8 months** 2,032,610  
**Excess Fund Balance** 780,504  
**Total Fund Balance** 2,813,114

Administrative Penalties Collected $ 22,516.66  
General Revenue Collected $ -
Texas Board of Architectural Examiners  
Fiscal Year 2019 Budget  
Scholarship Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2019 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2019 Actual Sept. 1, 2018--November 30, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Fund Beginning Fund Balance:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Beginning Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Fund Beginning Balance</td>
<td>59,827.98</td>
<td>59,827.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Beginning Scholarship Fund Balance</td>
<td>59,827.98</td>
<td>59,827.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,477.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>6,477.18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures-Scholarship Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,538.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,538.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess/(Deficiency) of Rev. over Exp.</td>
<td>59,827.98</td>
<td>58,766.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,827.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,766.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Scholarships Awarded: 15

Frequency per Fiscal Year—September 30, January 31, and May 31
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.

Respondent: 004-19A
Architectural Registration No.: 22352
Name of Respondent: John Jacob Cameron
Location of Respondent: Austin, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of 22 TEX. ADMIN. CODE §1.104(a)
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- John Jacob Cameron (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 22352.
- On August 10, 2018, Respondent signed, sealed and dated architectural plans which had been prepared by Gaslamp Design Studio, for the design and construction of a residential project located on Big Bend Drive in Austin, TX. Respondent did not participate in the supervision and control of the production of the plans by Gaslamp Design Studio.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By affixing his architectural seal to construction documents which were not prepared by Respondent or under his supervision and control, Respondent violated Board Rule 1.104(a).

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $5,000 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated December 20, 2018.
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: 121-18N
Respondent: J. Scott Griffin
Location of Respondent: Lakeway, TX
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- J. Scott Griffin (hereafter “Respondent”) is not and has never been registered as an architect in Texas.
- On October 10, 2016, Respondent prepared and issued a proposal to a potential client for “architectural design” and construction drawings for two residential properties on Druid Avenue in Houston, Texas. The contract called for Respondent to provide construction documents and “architectural plans,” including interior and exterior elevations, floor plans, and floor and ceiling joist framing plans. The proposal was submitted by “J. Scott Griffin: Architect/General Contractor.” Based on these and other representations, the client believed Respondent to be an architect.
- On or about January 10, 2017, pursuant to the proposal described above, Respondent issued construction documents for a residential project located on Druid Avenue in Houston, Texas.
- On or about October 12, 2017, Respondent used the title “architect” to describe himself on his LinkedIn webpage.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By engaging or offering to engage in the practice of architecture on a project despite not being registered as an architect, Respondent violated Tex. Occ. Code §1051.701 and 22 Tex. Admin. Code §1.123(c).
- By referring to himself as an “architect” on his LinkedIn webpage, Respondent violated Board Rule 1.123.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $3,000 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated August 29, 2018.
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.

Respondent: 033-18N
Name of Respondent: Doug Herron
Location of Respondent: Fort Worth, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of 22 Tex. Admin. Code §1.123
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Doug Herron (hereafter “Respondent”) is not and has never been registered as an architect in Texas.
- On or about February 2, 2015, in TBAE Case No. 031-15N, Respondent was issued a Warning, based on findings that Respondent had indicated on his firm’s website that the firm provided “Architectural Designs” despite not being registered to engage in the practice of architecture. Under the terms of the warning notice, Respondent was notified that any future disciplinary matter involving him would not be a first offense and would result in more severe disciplinary action.
- Respondent is associated with Gustin-Herron Architecture, PLLC, formerly known as Gustin-Herron Architects PLLC. On or about October 5, 2017, Respondent utilized a personal LinkedIn profile which indicated that he worked as an “architect” with the firm.
- Respondent states that he has made all efforts to comply with the Board’s investigation by bringing his LinkedIn webpage and third-party websites into compliance with the Board’s laws and rules.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By referring to himself as an “architect” on his LinkedIn webpage, Respondent unlawfully offered architectural services in violation of Tex. Occ. Code §§1051.701(a) and 22 Tex. Admin. Code §1.123.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $1,500 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated January 14, 2019.
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: 280-18A  
Respondent: Darren Hayes Hinkle  
Location of Respondent: North Richland Hills, TX  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Darren Hayes Hinkle (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 26067.
- On February 8, 2018, Respondent issued an architectural plan sheet for a project identified as “Yoga Studio” to the building official for the City of Southlake. According to Respondent, the plan sheet was submitted for the purpose of requesting preliminary feedback from the building official regarding code compliance issues prior to the client signing a lease for the space. However, Respondent failed to seal the plan sheet or indicate on the plan sheet that it was not for regulatory approval, permitting, or construction.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By failing to affix his seal or indicate on the plan sheets that they were not for regulatory approval, permitting or construction, Respondent violated Board Rules 1.101 and 1.103(b)(1).

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $1,000 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated October 31, 2018.
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: 089-19A
Respondent: Julian Pittman
Location of Respondent: Houston
Location of Project(s): Austin, TX
Date of Complaint Received: October 4, 2018
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Julian Pittman (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 25728.
- From May 1, 2018 through October 18, 2018, Respondent’s architectural registration was delinquent.
- On or about August 1, 2018, Respondent issued and sealed architectural plans for an assisted living facility identified as The Tradition -- Woodway located in Houston, 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.
- Respondent apologized and stated that this failure to renew his registration was due to a clerical error in his office and that it was corrected as soon as it was brought to his attention.

Applicable Statutory Provisions and Rules:
- By using the title “architect” and providing architectural services and sealing architectural plans 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $1,000 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated November 27, 2018.
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: 226-17I
Respondent: Stephen T. Churchill
Location of Respondent: Grapevine, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Stephen T. Churchill (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an interior designer in Texas with registration number 6691.
- 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 failing to complete the required continuing education hours within the continuing education period, Respondent falsely certified completion of CE responsibilities in order to renew his architectural registration.
- During the course of staff’s investigation regarding Respondent’s continuing education credits, Respondent failed to respond to two written requests for information.

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(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(f). 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 that an architect answer an inquiry or produce requested documents within 30 days of a request. Each violation is subject to a standard administrative penalty of $250 totaling $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $1,700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated April 28, 2017.
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: 096-19A
Respondent: Liem Dang
Location of Respondent: Houston, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Liem Dang (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 19224.
- 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated November 28, 2018.
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: 199-19A
Respondent: Todd Ashley Greer
Location of Respondent: Quitman, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Todd Ashley Greer (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 19494.
- On December 17, 2018, 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- On January 2, 2019, 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017, 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated January 11, 2019.
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: 010-19A
Respondent: Kenneth Marc Grossman
Location of Respondent: South Orange, NJ
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Kenneth Marc Grossman (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 24075.
- On May 15, 2018, 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- On August 7, 2018, Respondent replied that he could not locate his continuing education certificates.
- Subsequently, Respondent completed supplemental continuing education credits 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017, 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated October 31, 2018.
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: 085-19A
Respondent: Stanley Alan Haas
Location of Respondent: Martinsville, VA
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Stanley Alan Haas (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 7504.
- On June 16, 2018, 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, 2016 through December 31, 2016.
- On September 21, 2018, 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, 2016 through December 31, 2016, 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated October 31, 2018.
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: 193-19A
Respondent: Timothy Mark Herman
Location of Respondent: Fort Worth, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Timothy Mark Herman (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 24622.
- On September 17, 2018, 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- On December 8, 2018, 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017, 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated January 11, 2019.
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: 100-19A  
Respondent: Amy Lambert  
Location of Respondent: Georgetown, TX  
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Amy Lambert (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 19242.
- 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- Subsequently, she completed supplemental CEPH pursuant to Board Rule 1.69(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 1.69. The Board’s standard assessment for providing false information is $700.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated December 19, 2018.
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: 086-19I
Respondent: Merissa Anne Maclaine
Location of Respondent: Houston, TX
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Merissa Anne Maclaine (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered interior designer in Texas with registration number 11087.
- 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- 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:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated October 31, 2018.
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: 084-19A
Respondent: Samuel Vasquez, Jr.
Location of Respondent: Naples, FL
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Samuel Vasquez, Jr. (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 12598.
- 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- In addition to failing to complete the required continuing education hours within 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(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 1.69(f). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $1,200 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated October 31, 2018.
CASE NUMBER: 009-19

RESPONDENT: Mark Alton Wainscott

LOCATION OF RESPONDENT: Lewisville, TX

NATURE OF VIOLATION: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements

INSTRUMENT: Report and Notice of Violation

FINDINGS:

- Mark Alton Wainscott (hereafter “Respondent”) is a registered architect in Texas with registration number 18679.
- 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- 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:

- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $700 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated October 31, 2018.
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: 196-19L
Respondent: Peter E. Walker
Location of Respondent: Berkeley, CA
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Peter E. Walker (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as a landscape architect in Texas with registration number 524.
- 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- In addition to failing to complete the required continuing education hours within the continuing education period, Respondent falsely certified completion of CE responsibilities in order to renew his landscape 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 3.69(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 3.69(f). The standard administrative penalty assessed for this violation is $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- Enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $1,200 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated January 11, 2019.
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: 094-19A  
Respondent: Gordon Neal Yeatts  
Location of Respondent: Houston, TX  
Nature of Violation: Violation of Continuing Education Requirements  
Instrument: Report and Notice of Violation

Findings:
- Gordon Neal Yeatts (hereafter “Respondent”) is registered as an architect in Texas with registration number 7765.
- Previously, on February 13, 2014, in TBAE Case Number 110-13A, the Board entered an administrative penalty in the amount of $1,700 against Respondent based on findings of fact that he failed to complete his continuing education requirements for the 2013 audit period; falsely reported certified completion of his CE responsibilities; and failed to respond to two board inquiries.
- In the current matter, 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, 2017 through December 31, 2017.
- In addition to failing to complete the required continuing education hours within the continuing education period, Respondent falsely certified completion of CE responsibilities in order to renew his architectural registration.
- During the course of staff’s investigation regarding Respondent’s continuing education credits, Respondent failed to respond to two written requests for information.

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(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 1.69(f). 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 1.171 which requires that an architect answer an inquiry or produce requested documents within 30 days of a request. Each violation is subject to a standard administrative penalty of $250 totaling $500.

Action Recommended by Executive Director:
- The standard penalty for a first-time violation of these rules is $1,700. However, since Respondent has previously been subject to discipline for failure to comply with the continuing education requirements, he is subject to increased penalties under 22 Tex.
Admin. Code §§1.177(5) and 1.232(k). Therefore, the Executive Director recommends that the Board enter an Order which adopts the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended administrative penalty of $2,500 as set forth in the Report and Notice of Violation dated November 12, 2018.
Texas Board of Architectural Examiners

February 21, 2019
Exam Basics

The NCIDQ Exam consists of 3 separate sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam Name</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals (IDFX)</td>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>125*</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (IDPX)</td>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>175*</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>Hot Spot, Drag and Place, Fill in the Blank, Multiple Choice</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The IDFX and IDPX Exams each contain 25 ungraded pretest questions.*
Fall 2018 Statistics

EXAMS ADMINISTERED + PASSING RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IDFX</th>
<th>IDPX</th>
<th>PRACTICUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMS</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exam Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Applications Accepted</td>
<td>July 15 – Jan. 15</td>
<td>Jan. 16 – July 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Applications Reviewed</td>
<td>Nov. 15 – Feb. 15</td>
<td>May 15 – Aug. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Register</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Registration &amp; Scheduling</td>
<td>Jan. 3 – Mar. 31</td>
<td>July 1 – Sept. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations Administered</td>
<td>April 1 – 30</td>
<td>October 1 – 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligibility Paths

NCIDQ Examination Eligibility Paths

Specific education and work experience requirements exist to be eligible to sit for the NCIDQ Examination.

Education...

Official education transcripts must include a minimum of 60 semester or 90 quarter credit hours of post-secondary interior design coursework that encompasses a certificate, degree, or diploma from an accredited institution, for an application to be reviewed.

Interiors Design

BACHELOR or MASTER DEGREE

- CI/DA or Non-CI/DA

- + INTERIOR DESIGN DEGREE

Architecture

BACHELOR or MASTER DEGREE

- NAAB or CAAB

- Non-NAAB or Non-CAAB

Experience...

Hours must be earned and affirmed by a Direct Sponsor and/or Sponsor*

Up to 1,760 hours of interior design work experience, earned prior to graduation, may be included in overall work experience total.

3,520 WORK HOURS

(2 Years full time)

5,280 WORK HOURS

(3 Years full time)

7,040 WORK HOURS

(4 Years full time)

Meeting CIDQ’s education and work experience requirements does not guarantee that a candidate will meet their jurisdiction’s requirements to be a licensed/registered/certified interior designer. Individuals are reminded to check with their jurisdiction regarding those specific requirements.
Work Experience Requirements

• New Rules:

• All individuals, regardless of education, may earn up to 1,760 interior design work experience hours pre-graduation

• All interior design work experience hours must now be signed off on by either a direct supervisor and/or sponsor
Work Experience Requirements

• Direct Supervisor and/or Sponsor must meet at least one of the following three criteria:

  • NCIDQ Certified Interior Designer

  • State/Provincial Licensed/Registered/Certified Interior Designer in the US or Canada

  • State/Provincial Licensed/Registered Architect in the US or Canada who provides interior design services
Fundamentals (IDFX) Exam Blueprint

- Design Communication: 20%
- Programming and Site Analysis: 15%
- Human Behavior and Designed Environment: 15%
- Building Systems and Construction: 15%
- Furniture, Finishes, Equipment, and Lighting: 15%
- Construction Drawing and Specifications: 15%
- Technical Drawing Conventions: 10%
Professional (IDPX) Exam Blueprint

- Professional and Business Practices: 18%
- Project Coordination: 10%
- Codes and Standards: 16%
- Building Systems and Integration: 18%
- Product and Materials Coordination: 14%
- Contract Documents: 16%
- Contract Administration: 8%
Practicum Exam Blueprint

- Programming and Site Analysis: 15%
- Codes and Standards: 25%
- Contract Documents: 40%
- Building Systems and Integration: 20%
Practicum Exam

- 120 questions
- 4 hours
- 3 case studies
Case Studies

• Types of Case Studies
  • Small Commercial
  • Residential
  • Large Commercial
Case Studies

Case Studies Typically Include
Programming
Floorplan
Various schedules
Reflected ceiling plan
Mechanical plan
Elevations, sections, and
details
Small-Scale Commercial Case – Synergy Consulting

Project Description:
Sq. Ft: 2,545 SF [236.4 m²]

Synergy Consulting is moving their offices to an urban office building and the staff are reviewing various proposals based off of their needs. The reception door must have visual access to the main corridor and employees require 24 access to the suite using their electronic key.

The Human Resource Director will occupy Office 1. Due to the personnel files being stored in the office, they require a secure room.

The area of work is a commercial space on the fourth floor of a 15 story office building. All windows are inoperable.

Project Requirements:
A. Adjacency:
   • Primary Adjacencies
     o Reception Area & Conference Room
     o Office 4 & Open Office Area
     o Reception Area & Copy
   • Secondary Adjacencies
     o Office 2 & Brian
Item Types

• Drag and Place
  • Candidates “drag” tokens onto a plan and “place” them on a specific location

• Hotspot
  • Graphical multiple-choice item
  • Candidates “click” on a specific location

• Fill-in-the-Blank
  • Candidates type in a number
Practicum Item Types – Drag and Place

Select the correct dimension and place on the corresponding leader line to complete the universal design details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8” Minimum</th>
<th>6” Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[205 mm]</td>
<td>[152.4 mm]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25” Maximum</th>
<th>15” Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[635 mm]</td>
<td>[381 mm]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36” Maximum</th>
<th>11” Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[914.4 mm]</td>
<td>[280 mm]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9” Minimum</th>
<th>29” Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[230 mm]</td>
<td>[737 mm]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) elevation  
(b) plan
Practicum Item Types – Drag and Place

Select the correct symbol and place where needed to identify the door most appropriate for entering the reception space from the corridor based on the schedule provided in the exhibit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOOR FRAMES HARDWARE SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOOR TYPES**

A B C D E F

**FRAME TYPES**

A B C D E

**HARDWARE LEGEND**

MATERIAL LEGEND
Practicum Item Types – Hotspot

Place the target to identify the incorrect push/pull clearance on the floor plan.
Practicum Item Types – Hotspot

Place the target on the detail below that best represents the ceiling transition indicated by the section marker on the RCP exhibit.
Jurisdictional Registration
Regulatory Environment
INSIDE LOOK: THE NCIDQ EXAM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

1. PRACTICE ANALYSIS

During the practice analysis, a panel of interior design experts identifies the critical practice areas, tasks, and skills required to validate competencies.

2. DEVELOPING A TEST BLUEPRINT

Based on the practice analysis, we develop an exam blueprint that determines the number of questions in each practice area or task and the number of corresponding questions.

3. QUESTION DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION

Exam questions are developed and reviewed by NCIDQ-certified subject matter experts who are trained in exam development best practices.

4. PRETESTING EXAM QUESTIONS

CIDQ pretests all questions before including them as scored items on the exam. Pretest results are analyzed statistically to ensure the quality and reliability of the final exams.

CIDQ uses a leveling procedure to ensure that one test is not harder or easier than another.

5. EXAMINATION ASSEMBLY

For each exam administration, an appropriate number of questions from the exam blueprint are selected to form a balanced and fair test.

A committee of NCIDQ-certified exam experts works with testing experts to ensure exam uniformity and an appropriate balance of content.

6. REVIEW AND REVISION

The draft exams are again reviewed by the committee for technical accuracy and to ensure fairness in the exam process integrity.

7. PASSING SCORE

CIDQ works with our testing consultant to determine the passing score.

The passing score allows CIDQ to validate an individual candidate who is proficient independently in a manner that protects public health, safety, and welfare.

8. TEST ADMINISTRATION

Specific, consistent processes are in place for assembling, delivering, and scoring the exam.

Proctoring and testing security, administration, and evaluation processes are in place to ensure test integrity.

9. PSYCHOMETRIC ANALYSIS

After each exam administration, CIDQ conducts psychometric analysis studies to ensure the proper function of each question and of the test as a whole.

Psychometric analysis evaluates the quality of the exam using individual validity analysis and other studies.
I.C.O.R. (Interprofessional Council on Registration)
Immediate Preliminary Scoring

• Multiple choice exam (IDFX, IDPX) candidates will receive their preliminary scores soon after taking the exam.

• Final and official scores for all exams will be released 6-8 weeks after the exam.
International Administration

- This past October, all three sections of the NCIDQ Exam were offered in 79 countries around the world at all Prometric Test Centers.
- This global expansion began in 2017 with an administration in the Middle East.
Recently Launched – Jurisdiction Portal

CIDQ Certificate Holders + Jurisdiction Approved Candidate Search

CIDQ is only able to provide documentation for items it electronically has on file. Documentation (including educational transcripts and work verification forms) submitted prior to 2015 may not be in the individual’s record. In that case, you would need to contact the individual directly and ask that they supply any additional documentation directly to your jurisdiction. CIDQ is actively working to upload historical information for certificate holders, including educational transcripts and work verification forms, as available.

Member Boards are able to view an Active CIDQ Certificate Holder’s record, as on file with CIDQ. For individuals who are inactive CIDQ Certificate Holders, member boards will only be able to view the verification letter + wallet card. If the individual wishes to share additional information that CIDQ has on file with a specific member board, they must be an active CIDQ Certificate Holder. Active CIDQ Certificate Holders also have the option to share their record with multiple Member Boards for a small fee.

If the individual was approved by your jurisdiction, you will be able to see their contact and exam information.
Jurisdiction Portal

NCIDQ Certificate Holders + Jurisdiction Approved Candidate Search

- Control Number
- NCIDQ Certificate Number
- Email address

First Name
Last Name
Phone Number
City
Postal Code
Jurisdiction
Country

Search

Active NCIDQ Certificate Holders

Control Number
Email
Cert Number
Active Date
Expiration Date
First Name
Last Name
City
Jurisdiction
Postal Code
Phone Number

Inactive NCIDQ Certificate Holders

Control Number
Email
Cert Number
Active Date
Expiration Date
First Name
Last Name
City
Jurisdiction
Postal Code
Phone Number

Jurisdiction Approved Candidates

Control Number
Email
First Name
Last Name
City
Jurisdiction
Postal Code
Phone Number
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Jurisdiction Portal

**NCIDQ Certificate Holders + Jurisdiction Approved Candidate Search**

- Control Number
- NCIDQ Certificate Number
- Email address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cert Number</th>
<th>Active Date</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408343</td>
<td><a href="mailto:testx@1234.com">testx@1234.com</a></td>
<td>34028</td>
<td>Oct-31-2018</td>
<td>Oct-31-2019</td>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Demo X</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>12345</td>
<td>111-222-3333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdiction Portal

Verification Letter + Wallet Card

Dear NCIDQ Certificate Holder:

Congratulations on achieving NCIDQ Certification! New Certificate Holders receive their first year of Active Status free. Below you will find a wallet card to carry with you as you interact with colleagues and clients, showcasing your NCIDQ Certificate Status. By keeping your NCIDQ Certification in Active Status, you are entitled to these important benefits:

**Distinguish Yourself with the NCIDQ Appellation**
- Show your clients and colleagues that you are NCIDQ Certified by using “NCIDQ” after your name on your correspondence and marketing materials – you’ve earned it by being knowledgeable and committed to the health, safety, and welfare of occupants of the spaces you design.

**Promote and Verify Your Professional Certification**
- Market yourself to clients using our Active NCIDQ Certified Interior Designers database.
- Verify the status of your NCIDQ Certification to clients or employers – instantly!

**Build, Maintain, and Protect a Strong Profession**
- Become a part of the CDQ community by submitting your name to serve as a volunteer on a committee such as those that help write or review exam questions.
- Help to ensure that the NCIDQ Examination remains the standard for the profession by supporting our practice analysis and research efforts to inform and educated decision-makers about the exam and the profession.

The wallet card below may be used to verify your NCIDQ Certification status. Carry it with pride!

We are very grateful for your support, which enables us to keep the NCIDQ Examination current and protect the status of those like you, who have achieved this prestigious certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAM</th>
<th>DATE PASSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design Fundamentals Exam</td>
<td>Nov-05-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design Professional Exam</td>
<td>Nov-05-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Exam</td>
<td>Nov-05-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date Downloaded: November 7, 2018
# Jurisdiction Portal

Details – Contact Information, NCIDQ Certificate Status, Passing Exam Results

## Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Kimberly Demo X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>123 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>111-222-3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TestX@1234.com">TestX@1234.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NCIDQ Certificate Holder Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCIDQ Certificate Number</th>
<th>34028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Oct 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Date</td>
<td>Oct 31, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Exam Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design Fundamentals Exam</td>
<td>Nov-05-2018</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design Professional Exam</td>
<td>Nov-05-2018</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Exam</td>
<td>Nov-05-2018</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdiction Portal

Details – Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/University Country</strong></td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/University State</strong></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/University</strong></td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong></td>
<td>Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date</strong></td>
<td>May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Type</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Date</strong></td>
<td>May-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transcript** | Download

**Transcript Status** | Complete - Degree Awarded
### Work History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Name</th>
<th>Interior Design by Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Street Address</td>
<td>123 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer City</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Country</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer State</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Postal Code</td>
<td>12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Phone Number</td>
<td>222-333-4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Website</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Business</td>
<td>Interior Design Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Job Title</td>
<td>Junior Interior Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities While Employed</td>
<td>Conceptual/Schematic Design Design Development Construction Documents Programming Project Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Employment Start Date**: 2017-05-15 12:00:00
- **Employment End Date**: 2018-11-06 12:00:00
- **Average Hours per Week**: 50.0
- **Number of Weeks Worked**: 77.0
- **Total Hours**: 3,850.0
- **Type of Employment**: Direct Supervision
- **Supervisor/Sponsor Name**: My Supervisor
- **Supervisor/Sponsor Phone Number**: 222-333-4444
- **Supervisor/Sponsor Email Address**: mysupervisor@email.com

**Work Verification Form Upload**

[Download](https://example.com/work-verification-form.pdf)
Thank you!

Any questions?

Thom Banks
Executive Director, CIDQ
tbanks@cidq.org
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  December 3, 2018

TO:    Member Board Members and Executives

FROM:  Bayliss Ward
        Secretary, Board of Directors

RE:    Continuing Education Guidelines

We are pleased to present the attached proposed NCARB Continuing Education Guidelines and announce the commencement of a 120-day comment period ending on April 2, 2019, to solicit strategic feedback from our Member Boards. Your feedback can be submitted here.

BACKGROUND:
NCARB’s Model Regulations on continuing education were revised by a vote of the membership through resolution at the June 2018 Annual Business Meeting to align the previous Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW) Subject Areas and Topics with the six practice areas reflected in the AXP™ and ARE®. As part of the discussion of the resolution, Member Board Members and Executives expressed a need for guidance in understanding continuing education offerings in carrying out their audit duties for licensure renewal. The Board of Directors therefore directed the development of NCARB Continuing Education Guidelines.

PURPOSE:
The NCARB Continuing Education Guidelines have been developed with the Member Boards in mind, to enhance your understanding of acceptable continuing education (CE) topics, types of CE offerings by accredited providers, and current adult learning methods. The information provided here is presented to inform Member Board review in any audit process of CE for continued licensure.

The NCARB Continuing Education Guidelines are not presented as “provider guidelines.” Accreditors of continuing education programs develop their CE provider requirements.
PROCESS:
The FY19 Continuing Education Subcommittee (CESC) and the FY19 Education Committee (EDU Committee), in close collaboration with NCARB staff and AIA National Professional Development & Resources Managing Director Stephen Martin, have reviewed and approved these Continuing Education Guidelines. The CESC and the EDU Committee agreed the NCARB Legislative Guidelines, Model Law/Model Regulations and the American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) Standards for Continuing Education Programs should serve as model for this document. With authorization from the AIA Professional Development & Resources leadership, much of the text used in this document is reflective of information provided in the AIA Standards to avoid confusion or conflict in understanding the delivery of continuing education today.

STRATEGIC REVIEW by Member Board Members and Executives
The Board of Directors looks forward to receiving your strategic feedback on these Guidelines. We ask that your review consider if the information presented in the Guidelines:

• Clarifies acceptable subjects and topics that NCARB has identified to qualify as Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW)?
• Assists you in understanding continuing education programs that qualify for HSW credit?
• Assists you in your process/approach to evaluation of licensee’s continuing education submitted in support of an audit?

As noted previously, much of the text is in the proposed Guidelines is taken from NCARB’s Legislative Guidelines, Model Law/Model Regulations and the American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) Standards for Continuing Education Programs. Therefore, commenting on this document is not the appropriate vehicle to suggest edits or modifications to that language.
To assist you in your review, text has been highlighted as follows:

**AQUA Highlight**: Text is verbatim from the *Legislative Guidelines, Model Law/Model Regulations*. Changes to this text would require development of a resolution for vote by the membership. Please note that the Model Law Task Force is currently reviewing the language in the *Model Regulations*. Changes proposed by the task force may require edits to this language in the future.

**YELLOW Highlight**: Text is verbatim from NCARB’s standard introductory text included in all NCARB guidelines.

**MAGENTA Highlight**: Please note this information is included in the current edition of the NCARB *Education Guidelines* as an appendix.

HSW Topics listed by HSW Subject Area: The topics identified herein were included in the Sponsor’s Statement of Support for the 2018 resolution modifying the HSW Subjects Areas in *Model Regulations*. These topics include the same topics that were identified in previous editions of the *Model Regulations*. Some topics have been added, related to training supervisors and resilience in architecture. The topics and their relevance to HSW Subject Area are the results over two years of study by the CESC and the EDU Committee. They are not meant to be all inclusive or limiting. Each licensing board has the sole discretion in the acceptance of topics considered as HSW.

**RED Highlight**: Text is verbatim from the American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) *Standards for Continuing Education Programs*. The AIA has just completed a two-year review of their *Standard*. The revised *Standard* is being released on January 1, 2019. NCARB staff will continue coordination with the AIA’s Professional Development team to ensure our Guidelines are updated if AIA modifies their *Standards for Continuing Education Programs*.

**GREEN Highlight**: Text is adapted from the American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) *Standards for Continuing Education Programs*. Please be reminded the CESC and EDU Committee determined consistency in language was of utmost importance, therefore minimally modifying current acceptable descriptive text.
IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES
At its discretion, the Board of Directors may create or update guidelines based on the evolving needs of the Council and its Member Boards. Guidelines do not require a resolution or a vote of the membership.

HOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS
The proposed Continuing Education Guidelines are now open for a 120-day comment period. Our goal is to provide all Member Boards with ample time to review and provide feedback before the board takes final action at the April Board of Directors Meeting.

We highly encourage all boards to submit comments, even if the board would like to submit a “no comment.” It is important that we hear from every Member Board. Comments should be submitted via Survey Gizmo. The tool also provides an option to upload an attachment if the board would prefer to submit a letter.

The review and implementation schedule are as follows:

December 2 - April 2          Guidelines are open for comment
April 25 - 27, 2019          Board of Directors will review comments and take final action if appropriate

Questions should be directed to Director of Council Relations Josh Batkin at jbatkin@ncarb.org. We ask that you submit comments no later than April 2, 2019, so that the Board has time to review and consider before its meeting in late April.

Thank you in advance for your attention and continued engagement on this important matter.
# Continuing Education Guidelines

## Introduction
- About NCARB
- Registration (Licensure)
- What is Continuing Education?
- Who Should Use This Document?
- Why Do We Have Continuing Education?

## Health, Safety, and Welfare
### Continuing Education (HSW CE)
- Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW) Defined
- HSW Subject Areas
  - Practice Management
  - Project Management
  - Programming & Analysis
  - Project Planning & Design
  - Project Development & Documentation
  - Construction & Evaluation

## Learning Programs
- Types of Learning Programs
- Learning Objectives and Outcomes
- Continuing Education Compliance
  - Continuing Education Hour
  - Licensure Renewal
- Continuing Education Audits
The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) is a global leader in architectural regulation, dedicated to helping professionals reach their career goals, providing key data about the path to licensure, and protecting the public’s health, safety, and welfare. We are a nonprofit organization made up of the architectural licensing boards of 55 U.S. states and territories. While each jurisdiction is responsible for regulating the practice of architecture within its borders, NCARB develops and administers national programs for licensure candidates and architects. To accomplish this, NCARB develops and recommends national standards for the 55 licensing boards, who then issue licenses to applicants who meet their specific registration requirements.

Registration (Licensure)

Before an individual can officially be called an architect, they have to earn a license. Once they do, they’ll verify to their firm and community that they’re able to protect the health, safety, and welfare of those who live and work in the built environment. Each licensing board has its own set of requirements, but navigating them doesn’t have to be complicated. NCARB has developed a number of tools and resources to help candidates succeed in meeting their jurisdiction’s licensure requirements in education, experience, examination, and continuing education.

Note: This page will be updated by NCARB from time to time based the latest information.
INTRODUCTION

What is Continuing Education?

*NCARB Legislative Guidelines and Model Law/Model Regulations* defines continuing education (CE) as:

**Continuing Education (CE)**

Continuing education is post-licensure learning that enables a registered architect to increase or update knowledge of and competence in technical and professional subjects related to the practice of architecture to safeguard the public’s health, safety, and welfare.

The continuing development of professional competence involves a program of lifelong educational activities. Health, Safety, and Welfare Continuing Education (HSW CE) is the term used in this document to describe the educational subjects and topics that assist architects in achieving and maintaining quality in professional services protecting the public’s health, safety, and welfare in the built environment.
Member Boards that require architects to complete continuing education as a condition of license renewal. This document identifies:

- Subject areas that qualify as Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW)
- Acceptable types of continuing education programs
- Evaluation of programs for HSW content compliance in CE audits

This guide may assist Member Boards in their evaluation of CE documentation provided by architects in support of an audit. Member Boards may also use this document to identify topics the board may deliver to its licensees as a provider.

Architects who are required to complete CE as a condition of licensure renewal. This document will help the architect:

- Understand the national standards for continuing education programs
- Understand HSW subjects that are deemed acceptable by jurisdictional licensing boards

This document may assist architects in their selection of CE course subjects that meet the requirements of most licensing boards and many professional organizations.

CE providers developing courses for architects that are likely to be deemed acceptable by licensing boards as health, safety, and welfare topics. This document will help the provider:

- Understand the national standards for continuing education programs
- Understand jurisdictional licensing boards’ standards for HSW continuing education-qualified programs

CE accreditors reviewing courses for architects proposed by providers seeking acceptance by licensing boards as health, safety, and welfare topics. This document will help the accreditor:

- Understand the national standards for continuing education programs
- Understand jurisdictional licensing boards’ standards for HSW continuing education-qualified programs
Why Do We Have Continuing Education?

Continuing education programs focused on health, safety, and welfare are an integral part of the lifelong learning required to provide competent service to the public. HSW CE courses enable architects to maintain their professional competence.

The Practice Analysis of Architecture is conducted periodically with architects, supervisors, mentors, licensure candidates, and educators to define the knowledge and skills they must possess and the tasks they must be able to perform competently to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare. The results of the survey are used by NCARB to establish the requirements of the Architectural Experience Program® (AXP™), develop the Architect Registration Examination® (ARE®), and inform the continuing education needs of practitioners.

The profession of architecture is characterized by constant expansion of relevant knowledge, ongoing changes, and increasing complexity. Advancing technology, globalization of commerce, increasing specialization, proliferation of regulations, and the complex nature of business transactions have created a dynamic environment that requires architects to maintain and enhance their professional competence continuously.

Acknowledgements
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Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW) Defined

The *AIA Standards for Continuing Education Programs* (September 2018) defines Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW). AIA Standard 23 states:

Licensed architects and affiliated design professionals have, in their professional practice, a positive duty to protect the public’s health, safety, and welfare. Learning programs must address knowledge intended to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the occupants of the built environment, as defined below:

**Health:** Those aspects of professional practice that improve the physical, emotional, and social well-being of occupants, users, and any others affected by buildings and sites.

**Safety:** Those aspects of professional practice that protect occupants, users, and any others affected by buildings or sites from harm.

**Welfare:** Those aspects of professional practice that enable equitable access, elevate the human experience, encourage social interaction, and benefit the environment.

HSW Subject Areas

*NCARB Legislative Guidelines and Model Law/Model Regulations* define Health, Safety, and Welfare subjects as:

"*Health, Safety, and Welfare Subjects*"

Technical and professional subjects related to the practice of architecture that the Board deems appropriate to safeguard the public and that are within the following continuing education subject areas necessary for the proper evaluation, design, construction, and utilization of buildings and the built environment."
Learning programs must address one or more of the following subjects/topics that meet the definition of HSW on page six to be considered HSW CE:

**PRACTICE MANAGEMENT:** This category focuses on areas related to the management of architectural practice and the details of running a business.

Acceptable topics include, but are not limited to:
- Applicable Laws and Regulations
- Ethics
- Insurance to Protect Owner and Public
- Business Management
- Risk Management
- Information Management
- Design for Community Needs
- Supervisor Training

For additional information on knowledge, skills, and tasks related to Practice Management, please refer to:

- **AXP Guidelines:** Practice Management
- **ARE Guidelines:** Practice Management

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT:** This category focuses on areas related to the management of architectural projects through execution.

Acceptable topics include, but are not limited to:
- Project Delivery Methods
- Contract Negotiation
- Pre-Design Services
- Site and Soils Analysis
- Consultant Management
- Project Scheduling
- Quality Control (QA/QC)
- Economic Assessment
- Value Engineering

For additional information on knowledge, skills, and tasks related to Project Management, please refer to:

- **AXP Guidelines:** Project Management
- **ARE Guidelines:** Project Management
Learning programs must address one or more of the following subjects/topics to be considered HSW CE:

**PROGRAMMING & ANALYSIS:** This category focuses on areas related to the evaluation of project requirements, constraints, and opportunities.

Acceptable topics include, but are not limited to:
- Land-Use Analysis
- Programming
- Site Selection
- Historic Preservation
- Adaptive Reuse
- Codes, Regulations, and Standards
- Natural Resources
- Environmental Impact and Ecosystem Risk Assessment
- Hazardous Materials
- Resilience to Natural and Human Impacts
- Life Safety
- Feasibility Studies

For additional information on knowledge, skills, and tasks related to Programming & Analysis, please refer to:

- AXP Guidelines: Programming & Analysis
- ARE Guidelines: Programming & Analysis

**PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN:** This category focuses on areas related to the preliminary design of sites and buildings.

Acceptable topics include, but are not limited to:
- Building Systems
- Urban Planning
- Master Planning
- Building Design
- Site Design
- Safety and Security Measures
- Impacts, Adaptation and Mitigation of a Changing Climate
- Energy Efficiency and Positive Energy Design
- Sustainability
- Indoor Air Quality
- Ergonomics
- Lighting
- Acoustics
- Accessibility
- Construction Systems
- Budget Development

For additional information on knowledge, skills, and tasks related to Project Planning & Design, please refer to:

- AXP Guidelines: Project Planning & Design
- ARE Guidelines: Project Planning & Design
Learning programs must address one or more of the following subjects/topics to be considered HSW CE:

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & DOCUMENTATION:** This category focuses on areas related to the integration and documentation of building systems, material selection, and material assemblies into a project.

Acceptable topics include, but are not limited to:
- Construction Documents
- Materials and Assemblies
- Fixtures, Furnishings, & Equipment

For additional information on knowledge, skills, and tasks related to Project Development & Documentation, please refer to:
- *AXP Guidelines: Project Development & Documentation*
- *ARE Guidelines: Project Development & Documentation*

**CONSTRUCTION & EVALUATION:** This category focuses on areas related to construction contract administration and post-occupancy evaluation of projects.

Acceptable topics include, but are not limited to:
- Construction Contract Administration
- Bidding and Negotiation
- Post Occupancy Evaluation (POE)
- Building Commissioning

For additional information on knowledge, skills, and tasks related to Construction & Evaluation, please refer to:
- *AXP Guidelines: Construction & Evaluation*
- *ARE Guidelines: Construction & Evaluation*
Learning Programs

HSW CE learning programs should be developed by individuals or teams having demonstrated a verifiable expertise in the subject matter. Expertise may be demonstrated through practical experience and/or education. An architect holding an active license should be consulted in the development of HSW CE learning programs.

Learning program content should be unbiased, evidence-based, and focused on increasing knowledge. Learning programs are not sales or marketing events and should not promote or market products or services. Learning programs should only contain material relevant to the program learning objectives and desired outcomes during the instructional portion of the program.

Types of Learning Programs

Learning Objectives and Outcomes
LEARNING PROGRAMS

Types of Learning Programs

Learning programs should be developed according to accepted and sound adult learning theory. Architects gain knowledge and skills through many venues and resources. Acceptable types of programs include:

**Live in-person program**
Group participation in live learning with real-time interaction of an instructor or subject matter expert and built-in processes for attendance and interactivity. Learners are together in one or more groups with an instructor or subject-matter expert instructor.

**Live online program**
Live learning with real-time, two-way interaction between an instructor or subject-matter expert and learners that provides the required elements of attendance monitoring and engagement where learners are in a solitary rather than group environment.

**On-demand e-learning program**
An educational program completed at any time or in any place that best suits the learner online or via another device individually without the assistance or interaction of a real-time instructor.

**On-demand print/other program**
An educational program completed individually by reading materials in print or online and completing a summative assessment.

**Nano learning program**
A tutorial program designed to permit a participant to learn a given subject in a 15-minute or 30-minute time frame using electronic media (including technology applications and processes and computer-based or web-based technology) or in person. A nano learning program differs from a longer program in that it is typically focused on a single learning objective. Nano learning is not a substitute for comprehensive programs addressing complex issues but is typically highly targeted and needs-based. Nano learning programs are excellent for just-in-time tutorials.

**Blended learning program**
An educational program incorporating multiple learning formats.

All learning programs should employ instructional methods that clearly define learning objectives and outcomes, guide the architect through a program of learning, and include learner engagement opportunities within the program delivery.
LEARNING PROGRAMS

Learning Objectives and Outcomes

All learning programs should be based on relevant, well-formed learning objectives and outcomes that clearly articulate the professional competence that should be achieved by learners. Learning programs for architects should specify knowledge level, content, and learning objectives so that potential participants can determine if the learning outcomes are appropriate to their professional development needs. Knowledge levels consist of introductory, intermediate, advanced, and update.

ASSESSMENT

There are many methods or tools that are used to evaluate, measure, and document the academic readiness, learning progress, skill acquisition, or educational needs of learning program participants. The most commonly recognized assessments include:

Formative assessment: Methods used to conduct in-process evaluations of learner comprehension, learning needs, and academic progress during a lesson, unit, course, or learning program. Formative assessments help instructors and learners identify concepts they are struggling to understand, skills they are having difficulty acquiring, or learning standards they have not yet achieved so that adjustments can be made to lessons, instructional techniques, and academic support. Review questions are a formative assessment tool.

Pre-program assessment: A method of measuring prior knowledge that is given before the learner has access to the course content of the program. Pre-program assessments may be used to tailor content more appropriately to a learner’s needs and gaps.

Summative assessment: Test, portfolio, or other tools used to evaluate participant learning, skill acquisition, and achievement after a learning program. Outcomes of summative assessments are used to determine successful completion of a learning program.

The type of learning program determines the type of assessment. The most common form of assessment used in CE programs is summative. Summative assessments are typically required in the following learning programs:

- On-demand e-learning programs
- On-demand print/other learning activities
- Nano learning programs
- Blended programs where the primary component is on-demand learning activity

Live learning programs typically employ methods of formative assessment.

For details on how to develop learning programs, please refer to the accrediting organization’s provider guidelines.
Continuing Education Compliance

An architect’s field of employment does not limit the need for continuing education. All architects should participate in HSW CE programs that maintain and/or improve their professional competence.

Selection of HSW CE programs should be a thoughtful, reflective process addressing the architect’s current and future professional plans, current knowledge and skill level, and desired or needed additional competence to meet future opportunities and professional responsibilities.

While most jurisdictions have set mandatory continuing education hour (CEH) requirements, the objective of continuing education should be maintenance and enhancement of professional competence, not attainment of hours.

**Continuing Education Hour**

NCARB Legislative Guidelines and Model Law/Model Regulations define:

**Continuing Education Hour (CEH)**

One continuous instructional hour (50 to 60 minutes of contact) spent in Structured Educational Activities intended to increase or update the architect’s knowledge and competence in Health, Safety, and Welfare Subjects. If the provider of the Structured Educational Activities prescribes a customary time for completion of such an Activity, then such prescribed time shall, unless the Board finds the prescribed time to be unreasonable, be accepted as the architect’s time for Continuing Education Hour purposes irrespective of actual time spent on the activity.

**Structured Educational Activities**

Educational activities in which at least 75 percent of an activity’s content and instructional time must be devoted to Health, Safety, and Welfare Subjects related to the practice of architecture, including courses of study or other activities under the areas identified as Health, Safety and Welfare Subjects and provided by qualified individuals or organizations, whether delivered by direct contact or distance learning methods.
Each Member Board establishes their requirements for licensure renewal. Most boards require completion of continuing education as a condition for licensure renewal.

(NDARB Legislative Guidelines and Model Law/Model Regulations include the following model requirement:

**100.703 Renewal**

[The Board may require that each registered architect demonstrate continuing education by including the following provisions.]

Continuing Education Requirements. In addition to all other requirements for registration renewal, an architect must complete a minimum of 12 Continuing Education Hours each calendar year or be exempt from these continuing education requirements as provided below. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in non-renewal of the architect’s registration.

(A) Continuing Education Hours. 12 Continuing Education Hours must be completed in Health, Safety, and Welfare Subjects acquired in Structured Educational Activities. Continuing Education Hours may be acquired at any location. Excess Continuing Education Hours may not be credited to a future calendar year.

(B) Reporting and Record keeping. An architect shall complete and submit forms as required by the Board certifying that the architect has completed the required Continuing Education Hours. Forms may be audited by the Board for verification of compliance with these requirements. Documentation of reported Continuing Education Hours shall be maintained by the architect for six years from the date of award. If the Board disallows any Continuing Education Hours the architect shall have 60 days from notice of such disallowance either to provide further evidence of having completed the Continuing Education Hours disallowed or to remedy the disallowance by completing the required number of Continuing Education Hours (but such Continuing Education Hours shall not again be used for the next calendar year). If the Board finds, after proper notice and hearing, that the architect willfully disregarded these requirements or falsified documentation of required Continuing Education Hours, the architect may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the Board regulations.

Architects are responsible for compliance with all applicable state licensing bodies’ continuing education requirements, as well as requirements, rules, and regulations of other government entities, membership associations, and other professional organizations or bodies.

Some licensing jurisdictions require specific types of continuing education (i.e.: accessibility, sustainable design, state building codes, ethics, etc.). Architects should contact each appropriate entity to which they report to determine its specific requirements or any exceptions that body may have to this document.

For jurisdiction-specific continuing education requirements, please refer to NCARB’s Licensing Requirements Tool.
Many architect licensing board rules require audits of licensees’ compliance with continuing education requirements. The frequency and type of audit is determined by the licensing board. If selected for an audit, an architect may be required to provide evidence of completion of learning programs deemed acceptable to the architect licensing board. Types of documentation may include:

- A certificate or other verification supplied by the learning program provider
- AIA CES transcript
- For a college or university course that is successfully completed for credit, a record or transcript of the grade the learner received
- For college or university non-credit courses, a certificate of attendance issued by a representative of the university or college

Generally, a printed program agenda, program marketing materials, or an event program are considered insufficient evidence of participation in that program.
Good afternoon Julie and Debra,

I hope this email finds you well! I am reaching out about what we think is an exciting opportunity for the Texas board. In 2016, NCARB and the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) began an initiative to connect state Member Boards with their local AIAS Freedom by Design program. This initiative has provided an exciting opportunity for licensing boards to engage directly with the communities in which they serve, while mentoring the next generation of architects. NCARB is proud to be a financial supporter and we are also seeking the support of our member boards.

We have just been informed that students at Texas A & M University are embarking on a project to make the home of a quadriplegic more accessible for her and her service animal, and they are looking for engagement and support from the Texas licensing board.

The goal of the project is to add improvements to the home of a woman in College Station to be more accessible, as she is a quadriplegic and has an aging service dog. The students are planning to design and rebuild the client’s back porch to include ramps that are suitable for her needs and to complete an accessible path from the driveway to the back porch. Additionally, they are going to design a set of stairs so that the client’s aging service dog can climb into the bed.

We are reaching out to see if anyone on the board is able to assist the students with the project by providing guidance, mentorship or general support. There are several ways to get involved based on the availability of your board, and we are happy to discuss the options with you, along with a more detailed description about the student’s project goals.

We hope members of your board will consider working on this project. Please don’t hesitate to let me know if you have any specific questions and I would be happy to chat further about next steps.

Thank you!
Maureen

Maureen Hager  
Program Coordinator, Council Relations

NCARB LET’S GO FURTHER

National Council of Architectural Registration Boards  
1801 K Street NW Suite 700K  
Washington, DC 20006  
Direct: 202-879-0551  
Customer Service: 202-879-0520
Good morning Debra and Julie,

I hope you’re well. I am writing to share more news regarding the AIA Freedom by Design program. We have been informed by AIAS that another Texas project has been declared, this one at the University of Houston.

Students at the University of Houston are working with a non-profit, Tier 1 school to design and build a canopy for the student play area. This canopy would make the play area more accessible for the children and offer them added access to educational opportunities. As with the project I shared with you last week, the students are interested in engagement and support from the Texas licensing board.

We are reaching out to see if anyone on the board is able to assist the students with the project by providing guidance, mentorship, and general support. There are several ways to get involved based on the availability of the board, and we are happy to discuss the options with you, along with a more detailed description about the student’s project goals.

We hope members of the board will consider working on this project. Please don’t hesitate to let me know if you have any specific questions and I would be happy to chat further about next steps.

Thank you!
Maureen

Maureen Hager
Program Coordinator, Council Relations

National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
1801 K Street NW Suite 700K
Washington, DC 20006
Direct: 202-879-0551
Customer Service: 202-879-0520

Connect with us: www.ncarb.org
Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn

-NCARB Disclaimer-
The information contained in this email may be confidential and/or legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly
Good morning Debra and Julie,

I apologize for the recent influx of emails. AIAS send us projects on a rolling basis and we have 2 more that have just come in as of yesterday.

The project descriptions are below and our request to you is the same as it has been. We are reaching out to see if anyone on the board is able to assist the students with the project by providing guidance, mentorship, and general support.

1. Students at the University of Texas at San Antonio will be participating in a local event called “Barkitecture.” Participants construct a dog house that is auctioned off to the community. The proceeds go toward local pet shelters. Architecture students in the Freedom by Design program collaborate with Construction students to design and build the dog house.

2. Students at Prairie View A & M will be working with a local elementary school to design, construct, and paint a small outdoor pavilion that students can use and access while they are at school.

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or if you would like me to connect you with the local student director.

Thank you!
Maureen

Good morning Debra and Julie,

I hope you’re well. I am writing to share more news regarding the AIA Freedom by Design program. We have been informed by AIAS that another Texas project has been declared, this one at the University of Houston.

Students at the University of Houston are working with a non-profit, Tier 1 school to design and build a canopy for the student play area. This canopy would make the play area more accessible for the children and offer them added access to educational opportunities. As with the project I shared with you last week, the students are interested in engagement and support from the Texas licensing board.
We are reaching out to see if anyone on the board is able to assist the students with the project by providing guidance, mentorship, and general support. There are several ways to get involved based on the availability of the board, and we are happy to discuss the options with you, along with a more detailed description about the student’s project goals.

We hope members of the board will consider working on this project. Please don’t hesitate to let me know if you have any specific questions and I would be happy to chat further about next steps.

Thank you!
Maureen

Maureen Hager
Program Coordinator, Council Relations

National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
1801 K Street NW Suite 700K
Washington, DC 20006
Direct: 202-879-0551
Customer Service: 202-879-0520

Connect with us: www.ncarb.org
Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn

-NCARB Disclaimer-
The information contained in this email may be confidential and/or legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply to the sender and destroy all copies of the message.
Across the United States, there are large numbers of people who face challenges everyday due to a disability or accident. What is the solution? Inclusive design that takes everyone into consideration and allows for the best use of space.

AIAS Freedom by Design, the American Institute of Architecture Students community service program, utilizes the talents of architecture students to radically impact the lives of people in their community through modest design and construction solutions. From accessibility modifications to landscaping, emergency plan guides to signage; our priority is to improve the safety, comfort, and dignity of those around us.

AIAS Freedom by Design could not be where it is today without the continued support and guidance of the AIAS Board of Directors, AIAS Staff, and Students across North America.
FBD MISSION STATEMENT
AIAS Freedom by Design is a program of the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) that utilizes the skills and talents of architecture students in service to their community. AIAS FBD projects should better the community, promote skill building, and foster relationships.

FBD VISION STATEMENT
AIAS FBD empowers students to become owners in a process that radically impacts the lives of people in their communities through design and construction solutions.
SNAPSHOT OF THE FBD PROCESS

The process for each AIAS Freedom by Design team typically begins at the end of the spring semester. Each team should be compiling lists of potential projects, laying groundwork to seek out their official client in the following fall academic term following the AIAS Freedom by Design Orientation at Grassroots.

The first major step to establish an AIAS FBD program begins at the annual Freedom by Design Orientation track at AIAS Grassroots, attended by the FBD Director, or someone on the leadership team. During the orientation, FBD Directors gain valuable information on taking a project from start to finish, seei precedent from other schools and form close bonds with other FBD Directors around the nation. FBD Directors return to their campus to share what was learned at the orientation with their teammates and begin seeking possible clients. Chapters seeking NCARB Grant Funding should declare their projects before the deadlines listed on the AIAS website.

The second step is for the Director and the rest of the FBD team to review the FBD Manual as well as the FBD Project Scope and discuss what project level would best suite their chapter this semester. In addition, teams should also begin contacting potential clients, for instance: local hospitals, churches, occupational and physical therapists, veterans’ offices, and city and/or county housing agencies.

Once a team has identified potential clients, they should set up one or more site visits in order to meet with the client, gather information on the project such as constraints, take photos, etc. After the visit, chapters with multiple potential projects should compile a pros and cons list to help in the decision making process. Once the project has been selected, the FBD Director will meet with their team and mentors to discuss how to move forward. Following that meeting, the AIAS FBD team is encouraged to declare their project to the AIAS National Office. The team will then move into the pre-design phase of the project, often holding a design charrette, working with other members of the school and community as well as the client. Once the design is finalized, the team focuses on gathering volunteers, securing a building permit (if necessary), gathering materials and donations, and setting a schedule for the build. The final phase in the project is actually completing the build, which takes considerable coordination by the team and other volunteers.
The Design and Construction Mentors

Mentors are to be wise and trusted counselors for their mentees. A mentor’s knowledge, experience, encouragement, and skills offer guidance, advice, and small amounts of hands-on training. However, while a mentor can steer a mentee in the right direction to reach their potential, a mentor should not attempt to force change against the will of the younger leader or activist.

The Mentor Should Expect To:

- Provide guidance
- Create a positive counseling relationship and climate for open communication
- Help the team members identify problems and solutions.
- Lead the AIAS FBD team through problem solving processes
- Offer constructive criticism
- Share your own thought processes and availability with the team
- Solicit feedback from the team

Together the Mentor & the AIAS FBD team should:

- Identify roles the mentor can play to help the team achieve their goals
- Communicate on a regular basis
- Refer back to previous conversations to make sure that things have been done
- Set the agenda for each meeting

Where to Find a Mentor:

- If you are having trouble recruiting mentors, start by asking your AIAS Faculty Advisor for some help. They are often your eyes, ears, and voice when it comes to the faculty. Many Advisors know what other professors might be interested in supporting an FBD Program.
- Many students say that finding a Design Mentor is much easier than finding a Construction Mentor. The best way to recruit a Construction Mentor is often through your Design Mentor. Being active in the workforce, your Design Mentor should have contacts in the construction field. Ask them if they would be willing to give you contact information or reach out themselves.
Design Mentor Responsibilities

While working with the AIAS FBD Captain and AIAS FBD project volunteers, the Design Mentor has four main responsibilities:

1. Meet regularly with the team to review design progress and to verify appropriateness of proposed design.
2. Suggest additional training materials and secondary design concepts.
3. Provide guidance to enhance the team’s professional growth.
4. Confer, if needed, with the team and client.

Translating each of these responsibilities into actual activities with the AIAS FBD team will vary depending upon where the mentor resides and how busy their professional life is. Similarly, mentors must be conversant with the client, local accessibility codes and the principals of universal design which determine the project’s purpose, objectives, organization, and procedures.

Regular Meetings

With respect to scheduling regular meetings, ideally the Design Mentor will be available for in person meetings at least twice per month. While this may not always be feasible, the more often there is interaction, the greater likelihood exists for the mentoring relationship to mature and, in turn, positively influence the professional growth of the program’s members. Regular dialogue promotes open and continuous exchange of ideas and information. In instances when direct in-person meetings cannot be scheduled, alternative means of communicating should be pursued such as e-mail and/or telephone calls.

**PRO TIP:**

Design mentors must be licensed architects in the state your chapter resides in.

Design Mentors can be found by speaking to a faculty member at your school, by reaching out to your local AIA component, or by talking to former or current employers of team members, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANUARY 2019</th>
<th>JULY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 New Year’s Day (Closed)</td>
<td>04 Independence Day (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 86th Legislative Session Begins</td>
<td>05 TBAE Holiday (Skeleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 M.L. King Day (Closed)</td>
<td>04 Independence Day (Closed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEBRUARY 2019</th>
<th>AUGUST 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 CLARB MBE Comm. Mtg. Reston, VA</td>
<td>02 NCARB Licensing Advisors Summit – Minneapolis MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Presidents Day (Closed)</td>
<td>08 METROCON19, Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Board Meeting</td>
<td>13 Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 NCARB Regional Summit – Nashville, TN (Debra, Julie, Joyce)</td>
<td>27 LBJ’s Birthday (Skeleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 CLARB Board Meeting San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARCH 2019</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Good Friday (Skeleton)</td>
<td>02 Labor Day (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Texas ASLA Conference Irving</td>
<td>TBA 2019 LRGV-AIA Comm. Conference &amp; Expo - South Padre Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Personal Financial Statement Filing Deadline</td>
<td>25 CLARB Annual/Board Meeting – St. Louis, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 NCARB Model Law Task Force - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Memorial Day (Closed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Last day of Legislative Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRIL 2019</th>
<th>OCTOBER 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 TxA 2019 80th Annual Conference &amp; Design Expo - Galveston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Personal Financial Statement Filing Deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 TxA 2019 80th Annual Conference &amp; Design Expo - Galveston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY 2019</th>
<th>NOVEMBER 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Memorial Day (Closed)</td>
<td>11 Veterans Day (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Last day of Legislative Session</td>
<td>19 Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Thanksgiving Day (Closed)</td>
<td>28 Thanksgiving Day (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Day after Thanksgiving (Closed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNE 2019</th>
<th>DECEMBER 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07 CLARB Board Meeting Vancouver, BC</td>
<td>CLARB Board Meeting Reston, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Board Meeting</td>
<td>24 Christmas Eve (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Emancipation Day (Skele)</td>
<td>25 Christmas Day (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 NCARB Annual Business Meeting - Washington, DC</td>
<td>26 Day after Christmas (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Agency Holiday (Skeleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Agency Holiday (Skeleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 Agency Holiday (Skeleton)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 8, 2019 – 86th Legislative Session Begins