

Minutes of the Meeting
State Board for Architecture
1411 Broadway; Regents' Room
New York, NY 10018

Present: Anik Pearson, Chair
Nicole Dosso, Vice Chair
Greg Canaras
Giuseppe Lauro
Fred Mosher, Jr.
Talisha Sainvil
Marcy Stanley
Jitendra Vaidya

Absent: Carol Bentel

Staff: Robert Lopez, Executive Secretary
Gina Sacco, Assistant in Professional
Education

Guests: None

August 7, 2024

OPEN SESSION

1. **Motion:** Stanley/Lauro: That the Board enter Executive Session.
2. The Board resumed the Open Session.
3. **Introductions:** Chair Pearson welcomed a new State Board staff member, Gina Sacco, to the meeting. Members of the Board introduced themselves to Ms. Sacco.
4. **Approval of Minutes:** **Motion:** Sainvil/Stanley: That the minutes of the May 15, 2024 meeting of the State Board for Architecture be approved. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
5. **Board Chair Report:** Chair Pearson brought up a recent example of illegal practice that she referred to the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary reviewed the typical process for an illegal practice complaint. Chair Pearson then described questions concerning permitting fees charged in New York City. The Executive Secretary suggested a future meeting may be warranted with stakeholders involved in construction in New York City to discuss areas of mutual interest. The Board agreed to take a group photo at the Board meeting.
6. **Board Office Report:** The Executive Secretary gave the Board Report. For the first time, New York has the highest number of total architects in the US. Thania Fernandez is OP's new Executive Coordinator for Professional Practice. The Board discussed A10543/S9849 and maintained its recommendation that design build can occur safely provided conditions in its white paper are maintained. Additionally, the Board discussed A10016/S8850 and understands that this legislation, if passed, may result in an unlevel competition between for-profit companies and not-for-profits and, may impact architects and those they protect in the future.
7. **Old Business:**
Experience/Education Review: The Ad Hoc Committee on Education/Experience consists of Vice Chair Dosso and Members Bentel and Canaras. The committee has met three times and discussed the current education and experience requirements in New York. Vice Chair Dosso updated the full Board on the questions raised by the Committee, and she shared a relevant

article included in the Board package from the Summer '24 *Oculus*. Key takeaways and questions that were brought forward for discussion by the Board are as follows:

- Do the criteria for each pathway to licensure reflect the practice of architecture today?
 - The criteria possibly result in two classes of architects – the overwhelming majority of candidates who pursue the traditional education, experience and exam route and those few candidates who just meet experience and exam requirements.
 - Could there be an education and exam path only to demonstrate competency, with no experience component? This approach would require curricular updates and coordination with other stakeholders, such as the NAAB, and may lead to multiple NAAB curriculum pathways.
 - Certain career pathways (government agency, academia, sustainability, elevator consulting, work under a PE/LA/Planner/Interior Designer, accessibility consulting) may be limited in how much experience may be used towards licensure.
 - There are more varied employment opportunities today with multiple career pathways geared toward design, technical, or various fields related to architecture. New York should add flexibility to the experience requirement to reflect these specializations taking place.
- How do NCARB's new Draft Competency Standards factor into the Board's review of education and experience?
 - How do we regulate a shift in mindset from a duration/time-based experience requirement to a competency-based one? NCARB's Research and Development (R&D) Task Force is currently examining this issue with the potential of national changes in 2027/28.
 - Licensure requirements should not include redundancy in measuring competency across education, experience and exams. A competency need only be demonstrated via one of the three E's.
- Does experience have to occur under an architect?
 - This requirement can cause a candidate to have to leave a position to gain acceptable experience under an architect in an architecture firm.
 - The Board discussed that valuable experiences that help candidates demonstrate competency will best prepare candidates for practice.
 - The Board discussed options ranging from no required experience under an architect in a diversified architectural practice to reducing the amount for those in an NAAB-accredited program to 1 year.
 - The Board discussed the possibility of discounting certain related experiences, i.e. 50% or 25% for work in a related area.

The Board agreed that a change in NAAB requirements would require the coordination of multiple stakeholders and may prove to be a difficult task. The Board was in favor of pursuing competency as a model; the answer to the "How" to prove competency will have to be coordinated with NCARB's efforts to not be too far removed from the national model. Potentially, a reduction in the amount of Category I experience was viewed favorably, however, the Board discussed challenges with the complete removal of experience under an architect in a diversified architectural practice. The Executive Secretary suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee continue its efforts but, ultimately, may need to coordinate its efforts with those of NCARB's R&D Task Force.

Women in Architecture Series: Chair Pearson gave an update on two upcoming events. On August 15th, there will be a session with staff from Alloy Development, and on September 25th, there will be an in-person event scheduled at Handel Architects.

2024 NCARB Annual Business Meeting (ABM): The Executive Secretary and Member Stanley gave a summary of the ABM's outcomes, including break-out sessions, Resolution votes, and Elections of NCARB's leadership. All were included in the Board package. Members were encouraged to attend NCARB's Draft Competency Standard webinar later in the afternoon if they had comments to share with NCARB.

8. **New Business:**

Future Endorsement Pathway: The Executive Secretary reviewed a proposed endorsement model for UK based upon the endorsement model for Canadian architects who do not pass the ARE. If New York were to consider such a model, it may permit New York to participate in the Mutual Recognition Agreement between the UK and NCARB. Board Members were unanimous in support of this proposal. Agreement on the proposed amendment and a schedule for the regulatory process will be determined after discussions with Department leadership.

2025 Meeting Dates: Dates for 2025 Board meetings were agreed to as follows: February 13, May 21, August 6, and November 6.

Disciplinary Spreadsheet: Executive Secretary provided an updated disciplinary summary spreadsheet of Regents actions taken against architects and informed the Board that this may be used as a resource for members when they are involved in a disciplinary matter. It is important to note, however, that all disciplinary cases are unique and a Board member's recommendation as to penalty should take into account all circumstances within the case itself.

ICOR Update: ICOR Members continue to work towards a practice overlap guidance document that will be voted upon in 2025 by the design Boards involved with ICOR (architecture, engineering, interior design, landscape architecture and land surveying).

Miscellaneous NCARB Items

- ARE Misconduct Case: The Executive Secretary shared NCARB's summary of a recent ARE misconduct case.
- Fees: a list of increased NCARB fees were shared with the Board
- MBE/MBC Summit: Member Canaras and the Executive Secretary have been approved to attend this meeting in October 2024.
- Regional Summit: Chair Pearson confirmed that she can attend this meeting in February/March 2025, pending travel approval.

9. **Other Board Member Topics for Future Meetings:** Conduct the feasibility of a stakeholder meeting of those involved in construction in New York City.

10. Motion: Sainvil/Lauro: Moved to adjourn. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting of the Board will be Wednesday, November 6, 2024, in NYC.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Lopez, RA
Executive Secretary

DRAFT

**Minutes of the Meeting
State Board for Architecture
1411 Broadway; Regents' Room
New York, NY 10018**

Present: Anik Pearson, Chair
Nicole Dosso, Vice Chair
Greg Canaras
Giuseppe Lauro
Fred Mosher, Jr.
Talisha Sainvil
Marcy Stanley
Jitendra Vaidya

Absent: Carol Bentel

Staff: Robert Lopez, Executive Secretary
Gina Sacco, Assistant Professional
Education

August 7, 2024

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. The Board conducted a practical exam. After scoring the candidate's performance, the Board determined that the candidate had not passed the exam and will not be recommended for licensure.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** Motion: Sainvil/Stanley: That the minutes of the May 15, 2024 meeting of the State Board for Architecture be approved. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
3. The Executive Secretary discussed restoration cases for architects who have surrendered their license or have had it revoked by the Board of Regents due to misconduct. He showed Board members the location of the OP Disciplinary Process on the Board Members' Only website, and provided important context for members when they are participants in a Peer Committee meeting. Restoration candidates must show compelling evidence that the misconduct will not recur and that the root causes of the misconduct have been addressed and satisfactorily dealt with. The Peer Committee must assess the applicant's fitness to practice, using criteria such as the applicant's demonstration of sufficient rehabilitation, re-education and remorse, in light of the gravity of the original misconduct.
4. The Executive Secretary reviewed the typical process for an architect who has a lapse in practice and who wants to re-register in New York, including a review of the continuing education requirements, the need for an automatic audit of continuing education, and possible disciplinary actions should an architect not complete the continuing education requirement.
5. Motion: Mosher /Vaidya: That the Board resume the Open Session. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Lopez, RA
Executive Secretary