

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

ARCHITECTURAL LICENSING BOARD

TEL. NO. (860) 713-6135

-MINUTES-

AUGUST 29, 2014

The six hundred and eighty sixth Special Meeting of the Architectural Licensing Board, held on August 29, 2014, was called to order by Chairman Mr. S. Edward Jeter at 9:06 AM in Room No. 117 of the State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.

**Board Members**

|                 |                    |              |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Present:</b> | David H. Barkin    | Board Member |
|                 | Carole W. Briggs   | Board Member |
|                 | Robert B. Hurd     | Board Member |
|                 | S. Edward Jeter    | Chairman     |
|                 | Pauline S. Morales | Board Member |

**Board Members**

**Not Present:** None.

**Vacancies:** None.

|                        |                   |   |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| <b>Others Present:</b> | Robert M. Kuzmich | Department of Consumer Protection (DCP) |
|                        | Diane Harp Jones  | AIA/CT                                  |
|                        | Bruce Spiewak     | AIA/CT                                  |

*Note: The administrative functions of the Boards, Commissions, and Councils are carried out by the Department of Consumer Protection, Occupational and Professional Licensing Division. For information, contact Richard M. Hurlburt, Director, at (860) 713-6135 or Fax (860)-706-1255.*

**Agency Website:** [www.ct.gov/dcp](http://www.ct.gov/dcp)

**Division E-Mail:** [dcp.occupationalprofessional@ct.gov](mailto:dcp.occupationalprofessional@ct.gov)

## **1. New Business**

1A. Discussion concerning NCARB's Proposed changes to the IDP, BFA, and BEFA Programs as required to finalize the Board's positions on the same for written submission to the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) by September 5, 2014.

The Board discussed, in detail, their responses to NCARB's E-Mail request from Ms. Katherine E. Hillegas, CAE, Director, Council Relations, dated June 23, 2014. The Board's reconciliation of the issues postured is specified below.

### **Intern Development Program Changes**

#### **Phase 1 - Streamlining the IDP:**

(A) Does your Board agree, disagree, or have no position on the proposed change to focus solely on the required, or "core" hours, to complete the program?

(B) If your Board disagrees, what are your concerns?

(C) Does your Board need more time to address the proposed streamline change? If so, when do you expect to be able to provide us feedback?

(D) Do you believe your Board will adopt the proposed change if approved?

The Board **disagrees** with this proposed change. They believe that the time of internship in an Architect's Office should be maintained at three (3) years. There is much to learn that is not necessarily noted in the core hours and seeing a project from interview to occupancy permit is most valuable to understanding the knitting together of all of the pieces of the work. This process gives a better idea of client's needs, consultant's needs, and contractor's needs, among other things.

In addition, the Board believes supervised, "non-core" time served by an Intern is a valuable contribution towards he/she becoming a competent architect ultimately able to practice on their own. Further, they also believe that all supervised time is essential towards an Intern's ability to better serve the public's health, safety, and welfare and to decrease this time would be in error.

#### **Phase 2 - Overhaul the IDP:**

(A) Does your Board agree, disagree, or have no position on the proposed change to align the required programmatic experience areas with the phases of contemporary practice?

(B) If your Board disagrees, what are your concerns?

(C) Does your Board need more time to address the proposed overhaul change? If so, when do you expect to be able to provide us feedback?

(D) Do you believe your Board will adopt the proposed change if approved?

The Board **agrees** with this proposed change.

### **Broadly Experienced Architect Changes Proposed for Discussion**

(A) Does your Board agree, disagree, or have no position on the proposed change to the requirements for certification through the BEA program?

(B) If your Board disagrees, what are your concerns?

(C) Does your Board need more time to address the proposed change? If so, when do you expect to be able to provide us feedback?

(D) Do you believe your Board will adopt the proposed change if approved?

The Board **agrees provided the below concerns are accomplished.**

The proposed change effectively puts the responsibility for determination of the candidate's completeness of education to a National Standard and, essentially, to the Member Board doing the review. The Board recommends that the minimum standard for supervised work experience (as correlated to the achieved degree) be applied to all the Member Boards prior to acceptance by NCARB and issuance of a Certificate. The minimum standards would be set by NCARB in consultation with the Member Boards

### **Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect Changes Proposed for Discussion**

(A) Does your Board agree, disagree, or have no position on the proposed change to the requirements for certification through the BEFA program?

(B) If your Board disagrees, what are your concerns?

(C) Does your Board need more time to address the proposed change? If so, when do you expect to be able to provide us feedback?

(D) Do you believe your Board will adopt the proposed change if approved?

The Board **agrees provided the below concerns are accomplished.**

The Board agrees with the taking of *Architect Registration Exam*. They also noted that perhaps more thought and research needs to go into requirement as they suspect it will not be popular with foreign architects. In addition, enforcement of this requirement may prove quite difficult with high profile, noted, foreign architects relative to doing projects in the United States.

The Board also has concerns regarding the fact that not all Countries practice architecture in the same manner that it is practiced in the United States. They suggested perhaps some Country's architects would need to have accrued some experience in offices of United States based architects. The applicant needs to demonstrate competence to independently practice architecture in the United States for a minimum of two to three years.

***The meeting adjourned at 10:03 a.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Architectural Licensing Board is scheduled for Friday, September 19, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.; State Office Building; Room 117; 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert M. Kuzmich, R.A.  
Board Administrator