

**MINUTES FOR BOARD MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE,  
INTERIOR DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL DESIGN**

**August 19, 2015**

**Board Conference Room, 2080 East Flamingo Road, Suite 120, Las Vegas, NV 89119**

**Wednesday, August 19, 2015**

Chairman George Garlock called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

Roll Call: George Garlock, Chairman; William Snyder, Acting Secretary/Treasurer; Kimberly Ciesynski; Greg Erny; John Klai; Larry Tindall; Nathaniel Waugh. Jim Mickey and Sean Tanner were absent.

Also in attendance: Monica Harrison, Deputy Director (acting on behalf of Executive Director Gina Spaulding); Louis Ling, Legal Counsel; Laura Bach, Investigator; Ginger Hahn, staff.

**AGENDA ITEM 1      Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**AGENDA ITEM 2      Approval of Consent Agenda**

Consent agenda included the following:

- A. Approval of Agenda
- B. Approval of Minutes: June 10, 2015
- C. Secretary/Treasurer Report
  1. Nevada Architect, Registered Interior Designer and Residential Designer Licensing Statistics
  2. Wells Fargo Bank Statements
  3. June 2015 QR Statement
- D. Ratification of Reciprocal Licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm Name Approval Requests
  1. Gray Architects and Engineers, P.S.C.
  2. Design Studio Blue, LLC
  3. HP Atelier
  4. Almany Architecture, PLLC
  5. Make Design, LLC
  6. Make Design Architecture + Interiors
  7. SMRT of Nevada, Inc.
  8. Drew Gregory Architect, LLC
  9. Schemata Workshop, Inc.
  10. EDI International, PC
- F. Firm Registration Approval Requests
  1. MG2 Corporation
  2. Nadel Nevada, Inc.
  3. RND Studio, LLC

## **Architects: Registration by Reciprocity**

7270	Brian M. Andersen	7284	Sean K. Slater	7298	Wells M. Squier, II
7271	Robert J. Carlson	7285	Greg T. Shue	7299	Keooura Savavong
7272	Lisa N. Kensey	7286	Felicia S. Santiago	7300	Steven J. Peterson
7273	Kristoffer K. Strain	7287	David A. De Valeria	7301	Christopher R. Martison
7274	John J. Kosich	7288	Vincent P. Duet	7302	Matthew T. Stroffregen
7275	Scott J. Straubhar	7289	Daniel A. Dzakowic	7304	Donald M. Kachur
7276	Michael R. Mariano	7290	Dimitrios C. Economides	7305	Patricia K. Beckman
7277	Nunzio M. de Santis	7291	Robert P. Pinta	7306	Timothy R. Eddy
7278	Jay P. Ammon	7292	John K. Grist	7307	Robert P. Heany
7279	James R. Clarke, Jr.	7293	Paul M. Hartman	7308	Derek M. Labrecque
7280	Richard G. Gardner	7294	Richard W. Riveire	7309	Kelly B. Morgan
7281	Timothy G. Geddie	7295	Manuel S. Tsihlas	7310	Brian N. Reno
7282	Hemant G. Modi	7296	Joel D. Westervelt		
7283	Craig D. Piper	7297	Jeffrey C. Van Sambeek		

**Motion:** Snyder moved to approve the consent agenda with the removal of item 2E-9 (per the request of the applicant). Motion seconded by Waugh.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

### **Agenda Item 4                      Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding the Application of Phillip Lane Pryor for Architect Reciprocal Registration**

Garlock told board members that the background information concerning this application was in the board book. The information was reviewed.

**Motion:** Tindall moved to approve Pryor's application. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

### **Agenda Item 5A-1                      Case No. 15-026N - In the Matter of Kurstin Schmitz and Urbane Design, Inc.**

The respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (b) by advertising on her website multiple Nevada projects representing registered interior design services without having a certificate of registration issued by this board.

Staff received a phone call from the MGM Grand Resorts security department inquiring about the services an unlicensed interior designer could provide. Staff informed them that work being done for the MGM would require the individual to be registered or working under the responsible control of a Nevada registrant. It was revealed that the unlicensed individual was Kurstin Schmitz and Urbane Design. A review of the website [www.urbanedesign.net](http://www.urbanedesign.net) found that the respondent was advertising twelve Nevada commercial projects as being designed by her firm. Further investigation revealed that the respondent was working under the responsible control of a Nevada registrant for her current projects and had been educated on the proper

manner to work in Nevada through a previous settlement agreement. The projects on her website were all done prior to 2006 and the respondent no longer had documentation on them. Subsequently, the respondent took down her website.

The respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning these projects. The respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondent an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$6,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,200.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

**Motion:** Waugh moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

**Vote:** Klai recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

#### **Agenda Item 5A-2**

#### **Case No. 15-028N - In the Matter of Kerry Joyce and Kerry Joyce & Associates**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture and registered interior design and engaging in the practice of architecture and registered interior design for a project located in Nevada without having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Staff received information that the respondents were working on a remodel at the Turnberry Tower West and was not registered. Further investigation revealed that the respondents issued a proposal to provide services that fall under the practice of registered interior design and prepared AutoCAD drawings outlining new FF&E and specifying new electrical outlets.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this project. The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$6,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,500.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

**Motion:** Klai moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Waugh.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5B**

#### **Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Closure of Enforcement Cases**

Bach recommended the following cases for closure without disciplinary action:

15-022N    15-027N

**Motion:** Tindall moved to close the above-referenced cases. Motion seconded by Erny.  
**Vote:** Garlock recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

### **AGENDA ITEM 5C      Enforcement Report**

Bach followed up with the board concerning 2 cases involving individuals working with general contractors on a 1099 basis that were discussed at the June 2015 board meeting. She sent letters of caution to 12 contractors and received a response from all of them. Upon being contacted, she went into further detail with the contractors concerning working with draftspersons. Bach announced that there was also an article in NSBAIDRD's newsletter, *FOCUS*, addressing how design professionals may lawfully practice within their scope of professional practice.

Bach reported that she mailed out letters to Nevada's building departments introducing herself and encouraging them to contact the board office with any questions or concerns pertaining to NSBAIDRD's disciplines, registrants, or unlicensed practice. She said the letter was also posted on NSBAIDRD's website.

Erny asked if Bach would be visiting the building departments in the future. She responded that the letters she mailed out were precursors to personal visits though she has no dates set as of yet. She plans to reach out to some of the Northern Nevada building departments in February 2016.

Bach announced that there may be 2 formal hearings at the October 2015 board meeting.

### **AGENDA ITEM 7A      Update Regarding the Nevada Residential Design Exam Content**

Tindall said the Residential Design Exam Committee had met several times to rewrite the content of the three RD exams. That part of the process is now complete. The new content, in contrast to the prior exams, is more realistic to what residential designers do and how they react to issues. Tindall said that there is a large pool of questions for the three exams so that the same exam will not be administered year after year.

Tindall reported all that remained to be done at the time was to update one exam to 2012 code. The Residential Design Exam Committee would be meeting the following day to complete the task. Tindall thanked the committee for their dedication to the project.

The Residential Design Exam Committee (Erny, Snyder, Tindall present; Mickey absent) chose to meet after the board meeting, instead of the following day, to complete the update of the final exam to 2012 code.

**AGENDA ITEM 7B      FYI: Update Regarding RD Exam on August 6-7, 2015**

Harrison said the Residential Design Exams (graphic and written) were administered on August 6 and 7. There were two candidates in Reno and four in Las Vegas. Tindall said there would be a grading session for the graphic exam very soon.

**Agenda Item 8A      Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Who Will Attend the 2015 Annual Council for Interior Design Qualification (CIDQ) Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia on November 13-14, 2015**

Garlock announced that Derrell Parker, former NSBAIDRD board member and Nevada's first registered interior designer, would be receiving the Louis S. Tregre Award at the Annual CIDQ meeting. He asked Ciesynski to give background on the award.

Ciesynski said that the award was created in 1991 to honor the memory of Louis S. Tregre, the founding director of the Council of Interior Design Qualification (CIDQ). The Tregre Award honors volunteers who have worked diligently and consistently to further the goals of the NCIDQ Exam. The award recognizes outstanding volunteer service to CIDQ at the grassroots level.

Ciesynski continued by saying that Parker is part of the grassroots of registered interior design in Nevada as he helped establish the laws that govern the profession and the standards that are in place today. She said that Parker has been well deserving of this award for a long time.

Garlock told board members to contact Harrison if they plan to attend the meeting.

**Agenda Item 3A      Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration: Architect**

Klai swore in the following individuals as architects:

1. Branislav Hetzel.....7311
2. Hung T. Tran.....7312
3. Miriam Salas.....7313
4. Miguel A. Villegas.....7314

**Motion:** Erny moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individuals as architects. Motion seconded by Snyder.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 3B      Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration:  
Registered Interior Design**

Snyder swore in the following individuals as registered interior designers:

1. Johnathan Garrison.....221-ID
2. Lindsey K. Hourie.....222-ID
3. Alison B. Schulze.....223-ID
4. Lori Leinard.....224-ID

**Motion:** Ciesynski moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individuals as registered interior designers. Motion seconded by Erny.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

After the board conducted the swearing-in and registration ceremony, Garlock introduced Randy Lavigne, Honorary AIA, Executive Director of AIA Nevada and AIA Las Vegas. Lavigne recognized the eight new registrants for their milestone accomplishments of becoming registered in the state of Nevada and presented them each with a Certificate of Recognition on behalf of the AIA.

Garlock told the new registrants that this ceremony was the best part of each board meeting, and he wanted them to know that the board staff is here to assist them with their needs. He opened the floor to the new registrants for feedback regarding their paths to licensure. There were no comments. Garlock congratulated the group and introduced Harrison.

Harrison congratulated the new registrants on their success and encouraged them to call the board office with any questions or concerns they may have. She stressed the importance of researching laws and rules in other jurisdictions prior to beginning the pursuit of any projects in those jurisdictions and told them that becoming NCARB certified will facilitate licensure by reciprocity in other jurisdictions.

**AGENDA ITEM 6A      Discussion and Request for Comments for Intern  
Development Program (IDP) Experience Portfolio  
Documentation Method**

Erny gave background on NCARB's proposed *Intern Development Program Experience Portfolio Documentation Method*. He said NCARB would like to have feedback from all member boards before the NCARB Board of Directors meets in September so that member board comments can be reviewed at that time. The comment period will remain open through September 29<sup>th</sup>, and NCARB will seek additional feedback through virtual meetings to be offered in October in order to ensure sufficient engagement by the member boards. NCARB hopes to have gathered enough feedback from the jurisdictions through the fall to be able to make a final determination on the proposed program in December, 2015.

***Background on NCARB's Proposed IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method***

*The Intern Development Program reporting requirement (known as the "six month rule") was implemented in July, 2010. At that point, no experience older than eight months could be reported and used to satisfy the IDP experience requirements. Last year, NCARB expanded the reporting of experience to allow 50% credit for experience up to five years in the past. Jurisdictions have*

*expressed that there are individuals who have work experience that falls outside of the current reporting requirements, i.e. more than 5 years old. This proposed program is intended to provide a path for completing the experience requirement for those who:*

- *left the profession and would like to come back*
- *did not document their IDP experience with NCARB*
- *did not pursue licensure in a timely fashion, e.g. project managers*
- *can otherwise meet licensure requirements including education and examination*

*The NCARB Board of Directors agreed that a gap exists in its program. NCARB staff was directed to develop a concept that would allow individuals to submit experience that identifies proficiency in the IDP experience categories that fall outside of the current reporting requirement. Staff was given two directives:*

- *Protect the traditional IDP path, or whatever the future program is called, as the preferred experience path.*
- *Develop a conceptual program that will not be overly complicated and financially burdensome.*

*This concept was first introduced to NCARB's Board of Directors two years ago when NCARB's Broadly Experienced Special Project Team was launched. An outline for this program was developed through numerous discussions over the past year. NCARB staff presented research and presentations of a conceptual program to its board.*

*NCARB states that it learned some valuable lessons in the past year regarding introduction of new or revised programs. As a result, they sought initial reaction and feedback from their Member Board Members at NCARB's Annual Business Meeting through five workshops.*

*Over 175 member board members and member board executives attended the workshops. Feedback from the attendees was similar in nature at each session:*

- *The concept of a program that will allow persons to document experience that falls outside of the current IDP reporting rules was supported.*
- *Attendees liked the concept that the current architect supervisor or a mentor will sign off on the experience. They noted this concept could be enhanced by adding a minimum number of years that the supervisor/mentor has known the applicant.*
- *The majority of attendees agreed that documentation of work product to demonstrate competency is better than documentation of hours. They noted that applicants may not be able to obtain actual work samples from previous employers. The program will need to define options for all applicants.*
- *They recommended that a robust supervisor/mentor training program to support this program be developed.*

*NCARB would like to see engagement on this proposal through two very important steps:*

- *member board 90-day comment period*
- *virtual meetings with member board members to be held in early October*

*These steps are being taken because implementation of this program will require a change to the IDP Guidelines. Changes at this level require a vote by NCARB's Board of Directors.*

*NCARB would like to take action on this proposal before the end of 2015. They assured the jurisdictions that no NCARB Board of Directors vote will be taken until sufficient discussion and feedback has occurred.*

### ***NCARB's Proposed Program – IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method***

#### *Executive Summary*

*In August 2013, an NCARB multi-departmental team was formed to thoroughly analyze the need, identify options, and develop an approach for individuals to document valid work experience fulfilling the spirit of the IDP but falling outside the limits of current IDP reporting requirements. Currently, licensure applicants can earn full credit for experience reported within eight months, and 50 percent credit for experience earned beyond eight months and up to five years.*

*NCARB says it is committed to supporting the facilitation of licensure and its message that "experience is experience." There is a group of individuals educated, trained, and experienced in architecture who, for whatever life event occurred, did not pursue*

licensure. These individuals now want to join fully in the profession through licensure. They can meet their jurisdiction's education requirement, and they are willing to take the Architect Registration Examination (ARE); however they are negatively impacted by NCARB's current IDP reporting requirements.

NCARB's research team was asked to identify ways to be more inclusive of intern architects' path to initial licensure while ensuring the process is objective, attainable, sustainable, and defensible. The team leaders presented thoughts, concepts, and approaches to the NCARB board of directors at the December 2013; and April, September, and December 2014 meetings. In December the board directed the research team to develop proposed program elements and requirements, with the intent to engage the member boards at the 2015 Annual Business Meeting. These elements include the proposed audience, proposed eligibility requirements, and proposed programmatic details and processes:

*Eligibility:*

- work experience occurred outside of current IDP reporting requirement (i.e. older than 5 years)
- work experience that meets the current IDP requirements (tasks, etc.)

*Documentation of Experience:*

- work history, including role, project types, project descriptions, project budgets, etc.
- work product samples demonstrating competent performance of IDP tasks in each of the six practice categories

*Certification/Affirmation of Competency:*

- current architect supervisor
- architect mentor who is NCARB certified

*Process:*

- work samples of valid experience will be submitted through automated e- portfolio system to the supervisor or mentor

*This program is being designed to provide a pathway for design professionals (e.g. project managers, project designers) who cannot complete the experience hours in the IDP experience areas based on their current employment role and responsibilities, though work experience performed beyond the limits of the reporting requirements would meet today's requirements.*

**PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

*To participate, an applicant will need to validate that they have substantial past experience that meets the current requirements of the IDP. The proposed approach requires detailed, verified documentation to support the claim that experience gained outside of the IDP reporting requirements has been completed competently and satisfies the current IDP requirements. Specifically, applicants will need to do the following:*

- Document work history since graduation to present.
  - a. Include a brief description of projects (type, size, cost, duration, and role on projects).
- Document project work product to demonstrate acquisition of knowledge/skills and competent performance of the expected tasks.
  - a. NCARB will develop descriptions and a format for applicants to follow.
- Submit documentation to a current architect supervisor or mentor who is NCARB certified.

*The applicant must be able to provide all required information and documentation for review and certification/affirmation of competence by their current supervisor or mentor.*

**ELIGIBILITY**

*The applicant must have:*



- work experience that occurred outside of current IDP reporting requirement (i.e. older than 5 years)
- work experience that meets the current IDP requirements (tasks, etc.)

*Rationale:*

*All persons participating in the IDP were required to comply with the IDP reporting requirements (known as the “six month rule”) as of July 1, 2010. There are individuals who have not reported experience in accordance with the IDP reporting requirement, but have substantial experience that is further in the past than the current IDP reporting requirement allows. While these individuals may currently be working in architecture or a related field, their current role and responsibilities will not allow them to perform tasks that are required by the IDP.*

**DOCUMENTATION OF EXPERIENCE**

*Each applicant will be required to provide detailed, verified documentation to support his/her claim that their experience gained outside of the IDP reporting requirements has been completed competently and satisfies the current IDP requirements.*

*The applicant will be required to document their complete work history. The information required will include:*

- employer name
- employer address
- dates of employment
- position(s) held
- roles and responsibilities

*Rationale:*

*The current architect supervisor or mentor certifying/affirming the competence of the applicant will have a “complete picture” of the applicant’s experience. This will allow for a more comprehensive look at and consideration of one’s overall experience.*

*The applicant will be required to list projects they are submitting to their supervisor to document satisfaction of the current IDP requirements: The information required will include:*

- project name
- project type
- project size
- project budget
- project duration
- project description
- applicant’s role in the project
- identify relevant IDP practice areas (reason for inclusion)

*Rationale:*

*The current architect supervisor or mentor certifying/affirming the competence of the applicant needs to have a “complete picture” of the projects the applicant is submitting in support of their prior experience. This will allow for a comprehensive and informed review and consideration of one’s experience in the practice areas defined by the IDP.*

Garlock said, if adopted, the proposed program would be in conflict with Chapter 623 of Nevada Revised Statutes, and the board needs to consider if they are willing to support going after changes to the law in order to comply with NCARB’s program.

Board members expressed that they may support this proposed program if its final amendment remains close to its present form. They felt it important to hear the input of the other jurisdictions and thoroughly discuss this matter before making a final decision.

Klai agreed with Garlock adding that the board should begin addressing this matter as soon as possible. He feels the board should begin drafting a bill in support of the program (in case of passage) so that it may be presented to Nevada's legislature in a timely manner for the 2017 legislative session.

Ling said the boards that are going to present a bill at the 2017 legislative session must have concepts delivered to the governor by May 2016. He asked how soon NCARB will proceed with changes after feedback is received.

Erny said that acceptance of the proposed program could move quickly because NCARB staff has already put a great deal of time into the development of the program. There have been many versions of the programs presented to NCARB's board since the idea was first launched. Some versions were thrown out right away while others were tweaked from the original presentation. Erny said that the IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method that was presented to the 54 jurisdictions for comment is the version that stood through the editing process.

Ling told the board it should definitely begin thinking about the changes that would have to be made to the Nevada Revised Statutes upon acceptance of the program. He said a brief, essentially one paragraph, description of the proposed bill would need to be presented to the governor. It should state that NSBAIDRD is attempting to bring NRS 623 into compliance with a new trending national standard. The bill can be pulled should the program not be adopted.

**Motion:** Klai moved to have staff respond to NCARB's request for comments to its IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method via a letter. The letter should include the following: NSBAIDRD may support the program after hearing more information. NSBAIDRD would like NCARB to provide a report of what the other jurisdictions have to say about the proposal before NSBAIDRD's October board meeting. NSBAIDRD requests that NCARB allow a collective discussion with the other jurisdictions to occur at the 2016 Regional Summit before a vote is made by NCARB's Board of Directors. NSBAIDRD wants ample time for discussion so that an informed decision can be made. NSBAIDRD will not be able to adopt the program until 2017 due to a need of legislative action. Motion seconded by Tindall.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6B      FYI: NCARB Accepts Schools for Integrated Path to Licensure**

Garlock said the information concerning NCARB's Integrated Path to Licensure was provided in the board book. He wants this item to be discussed further at the October 2015 board meeting as the board needs to take a look at the program overall and consider what it could mean to Nevada for reciprocal candidates who have achieved an initial license through the Integrated Path. Garlock asked Erny to give a brief introduction of the program.

Erny gave background on the program.

**Press Release Distributed by NCARB on August 10, 2015:**

**NCARB Accepts Over A Dozen Schools for “Integrated Path” To Licensure;  
Students Can Complete Internship and Take License Exams Before Graduation**

*Washington, DC – As part of its ongoing efforts to facilitate architectural licensure, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) has accepted proposals from over a dozen architecture schools to implement an integrated path to licensure within academic programs accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). This initiative will result in a more structured experience for students enrolled in an NCARB-accepted path that offers the ability to complete the requirements for architectural licensure at the time of graduation. The NCARB Integrated Path initiative invites programs accredited by the NAAB to propose approaches that would result in completing the requirements of the Intern Development Program (IDP) and the opportunity to take each division of the Architect Registration Examination® (ARE®) before graduation. Passing all ARE divisions prior to graduation is not required.*

*In its inaugural effort, the NCARB Integrated Path initiative has solicited statements of interest from all schools with NAAB-accredited programs and then invited all with accredited programs to submit proposals, which were received this past June. The review of these proposals was conducted by the NCARB Licensure Task Force (LTF), composed of interns/recently licensed architects, state licensing board members and executives, academic deans and instructors, and non-architect public members, as well as leaders representing the American Institute of Architects (AIA), the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA), and the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB).*

*NCARB will respond to each school with feedback as to how their proposal is or could become acceptable before releasing the names of the accepted programs. All programs that submitted proposals will be coached as to next steps including modifications necessary to move forward toward implementation. NCARB will also engage its state licensing board members regarding regulatory changes to allow access to the ARE prior to graduation.*

*The initiative began in 2013 as an experiment to pilot a new concept around providing an opportunity to pursue the education/experience/examination elements of licensure in a more integrated rather than sequential manner, without diluting any of the criteria for the three elements. “As the initiative progressed, the experimental pilot approach evolved into a full-fledged additional path with acceptance criteria. NCARB plans to solicit additional proposals on an annual basis, and maintain a review and coaching posture with all accepted programs,” said NCARB Chief Executive Officer Michael Armstrong.*

Garlock asked if all schools that participate in the program will have to follow the same structure. Erny replied that each school will implement the program according to the unique schedule established with its administration and faculty.

Erny expressed that he feels this program is going in the right direction. It allows for a more structured path to licensure, alleviates some of the procrastination of testing that occurs after graduation due to the ARE being built into the curriculum, and it integrates the firm culture into the school allowing for firms to understand what interns are going through. Klai agreed.

**AGENDA ITEM 6C      FYI: NCARB 2015 Post-Annual Meeting Report**

Garlock said this information was provided for board members’ information.

**AGENDA ITEM 6D      FYI: NCARB CEO Update for July 2015**

Garlock said this information was provided for board members’ information.

**Agenda Item 8B**

**Discussion and Possible Decision on the Nominations for the 2016 Council of Interior Design Qualification (CIDQ) Board of Directors**

Ciesynski gave background on the candidates nominated for CIDQ's 2016 Board of Directors.

**Motion:** Erny moved to approve the proposed slate of nominees for the 2016 CIDQ Board of Directors. Motion seconded by Klai.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

Erny inquired as to how the candidates are selected for nomination as he would like to know why the decision seems to have been already made before the election occurs. Ciesynski replied that it is a rigorous process, and she will present the process at the NSBAIDRD October 2015 board meeting.

Klai said that the selection process of being nominated is lengthy, and the criteria to uphold the position are stringent.

Ciesynski expressed that there is a need for more delegates to step up and express a desire to serve on CIDQ's board. Klai agreed and added that he would like to see Nevada represented on that board as this is the first time in a long time that Nevada has no representation there.

Ciesynski inquired as to where NSBAIDRD is with CIDQ taking over the binder process review, because she would like to put together a pilot program to get the process going. There are 2 candidates waiting for this program to launch.

Harrison said that she will find out where things stand with this so that things may progress.

**Agenda Item 8C**

**FYI: Q-Connection Newsletter June 2015**

Garlock said this information was provided for board members' information.

**AGENDA ITEM 9**

**Executive Director Report**

Harrison said that NSBAIDRD's website will no longer be supported by the state. This decision was made based on the following: the state will no longer be able to support the software (Microsoft FrontPage) NSBAIDRD uses for its website; the ability for staff to update NSBAIDRD's website through the state is more difficult than necessary, and the state wants to increase NSBAIDRD's fees due to a high volume of traffic.

Two companies are being looked at as options for this transition. The goal is to find a company that will support NSBAIDRD's needs, allow for an easy transition, give staff the ability to update the website as necessary, and keep fees affordable.

Harrison announced that the October board meeting will be in Reno due to the possibility of two formal hearings. This creates the need for a two day board meeting. She asked board

members to check their calendars and get back to her as to which dates suit their schedules. The meeting was originally set for October 21<sup>st</sup>.

It was decided that the board meeting would occur in Reno on October 21 – 22, 2015.

### **AGENDA ITEM 10      Board Counsel Report**

Ling reiterated that there may be two formal hearings at the October board meeting.

He reported that he will be attending the Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards' (FARB) Regulatory Law Seminar in October. Ling said he and Executive Director Spaulding had discussed this prior to the board meeting and agreed that NSBAIDRD, along with four other boards that Ling represents, will be paying for his attendance to the event.

### **AGENDA ITEM 11      Public Information Report**

Hahn reported that she had recently become an Architect Licensing Advisor with NCARB. This position was formerly known as the IDP Coordinator. The advisors community is made up of architects, interns, educators, career counselors, firm administrators, and staff of a few licensing boards. The program exists to facilitate the flow of information concerning education, examination, and experience to architecture students and interns.

Hahn attended NCARB's Annual Licensing Advisors Summit at the end of July, and she was able to attend an outreach event put on by NCARB and AIA San Diego during the seminar which proved to be a valuable experience. She said it was a great networking opportunity as well as learning experience. The seminar showcased the changes to the Intern Development Program (IDP) and Architect Registration Examination (ARE).

Klai extended an invitation to Hahn to attend the upcoming Emerging Professionals/Young Architects Forum event being held that Friday. He said the board needs representation with the emerging professionals. Hahn said she would attend.

Hahn told the board that the latest issue of *Focus* was provided to them in their board meeting books and that the next issue would be published in September. Garlock told Hahn that the newsletter was well done and that he liked its conciseness.

### **AGENDA ITEM 16      Items for Future Agenda**

Waugh spoke at this time and reported that he had been appointed to NCARB's Public Member Task Force by NCARB President Ward. The committee reports to the NCARB Board of Directors and is responsible for brainstorming ways to increase benefits for NCARB certificate holders; developing a process to identify and elect a public member board member to be ratified by membership to serve on the Board of Directors; reviewing established policies and rules for other elected board members; and discussing developing guidelines for public member qualifications to assist state officials when selecting public members to serve on state boards.

Waugh will participate in a committee conference call in September. There will be a committee meeting in Washington October 9-10. He will not be able to attend because he starts a new job in October. Waugh said he will be as involved as he is able to. The board congratulated Waugh.

- discussion of a date and place for joint board meeting with the California Architects Board in March 2016 (March 1-2, 2016 are the tentative dates. This meeting will allow the two states to establish a collective voice for NCARB's Regional Summit.)
- discussion of NCARB's Integrated Path to Licensure
- further discussion of NCARB's proposed IDP Experience Portfolio Documentation Method
- presentation of how candidates are selected for the CIDQ Board of Directors

**AGENDA ITEM 13      Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

Chairman Garlock adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

---

Gina Spaulding, Executive Director

---

Jim Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer