

**Minutes**

**NZRAB Board**

**25 November 2008**

**NZRAB offices, Wellington**

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am.

1. **Attendance**

Board members	Ron Pynenburg (Chair), Kate Davenport (Deputy Chair), Carolynn Bull, Anna-Marie Chin, Marsh Cook, Gordon Holden, Callum McKenzie, Helen Tonkin
Guests	Andrew Caffery, Manager – Monitoring and Governance Team, DBH Rebecca Taylor, Senior Advisor – Appointments and Governance, DBH Jeremy Ford, Senior Solicitor – Legal team, DBH.
In attendance	Paul Jackman (CE), Andrew Symonds (EO)
Apologies	None

The Chair welcomed the Board, including recent appointees. He then asked that the record note the Board's appreciation for the work of outgoing Board members Brian Elliott and Gordon Moller, who, he said, had made an outstanding contribution to the Board during its setup phase and would continue to do so by serving further on various Board committees.

2. **Potential Conflicts of interest**

Callum McKenzie advised that he had been an assessor in the recently completed initial registration round and had drafted the attachment to Board paper 6.2 Registrations Pathway 1 & 2.

3. **Minutes from Previous Board Meetings/Matters arising**

The Board resolved that the minutes of the 2 September 2008 Board were a true and accurate record, subject to the addition of the words "Carolynn Bull cautioned the Board against taking cognisance of Board paper 8.1 in regard to the training value of a discipline procedure."

Moved Carolynn Bull, seconded Kate Davenport.

In matters arising Gordon Holden asked that an additional item be added to the agenda in regard to mentoring for initial registration (7.3).

#### 4. **Governance**

##### **4.1 – CEO’s Report**

The Board noted the CE’s Report.

Moved Gordon Holden, seconded Carolynn Bull.

##### **4.2 – Board Manual**

The Board discussed the draft Board Manual and agreed that a reference should be included that any unsolicited communications about Board business received by Board members should be referred to the Chair or the CE.

Discussion also turned to the upcoming renegotiation of the Output Agreement with the Minister, a question being raised of whether it should include a reference to the Board, when appropriate, giving the Minister advice about broader questions involving the built environment in New Zealand and the role of architects in its creation.

A Board member requested that the Board members section of the website should include all Board policies.

The Board then resolved:

- That the Board adopt the revised manual as its Board Manual.

Moved Helen Tonkin, seconded Carolynn Bull.

- That the Board agree to the revised manual being provided to Board members and displayed on the NZRAB’s public website.

Moved Callum McKenzie, Carolynn Bull

##### **4.3 – Board Committees**

The Board resolved:

- that the Board agree to the revised memberships of the Board’s Committees, as proposed, subject to an amendment that the Public Protection Committee should have an additional member who should be an architect and the Chair of that Committee should be an architect.

Moved Gordon Holden, seconded Carolynn Bull.

#### **4.4 – Government Policy**

The Board noted the Government Policy report.

#### **4.5 – Briefing to the Incoming Minister**

The Board discussed the draft Briefing to the Incoming Minister and resolved that it should be amended so that it began with a description of the Board's functions and indicated greater urgency in regard to the need to revise the Board's public protection procedures.

The Board then resolved to agree:

- to the amended content of the BIM

Moved Callum McKenzie, seconded Carolyn Bull

- to the BIM being presented to the Minister for Building and Construction

Moved Helen Tonkin, seconded Carolyn Bull

- to the BIM being made public once it has been presented to the Minister.

Moved Carolyn Bull, seconded Gordon Holden.

### **5. Strategy and Finance**

#### **5.1 – Finance Report**

The Board resolved:

- That the Board note the NZRAB Finance Report July to September 2008

Moved Callum McKenzie, seconded Anna-Marie Chin

### **6. Registration**

#### **6.1 – Registration Report**

The Board reviewed the Registration Report and welcomed the statistical break-down of registration applicants being provided. It was suggested that these statistics could be improved in the future by adding the weeks of experience of each applicant and the sizes of practices relative to successful and unsuccessful applications.

The Board resolved:

- That the Board note the Registration Report.

Moved Helen Tonkin, seconded Anna-Marie Chin

## **6.2 – Registrations Pathways 1 and 2**

The Board resolved:

- That the Board determine that those applicants recommended for registration in the attached report (see below), on the basis of having met applicable minimum standards for registration, are registered under part 2 section 10 of the Registered Architects Act 2005.

<b>Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>
3394	Roz Smith	Auckland
3429	Peter Dawson	Auckland
3449	Christine Drinnan	Auckland
3471	Tom Rowe	Auckland
3475	Fiona Ewen	Auckland
3604	Ingo Ratsdorf	Auckland
3637	David Hargreaves	Auckland
3649	Rula Alatia	Auckland
3702	Florin Salcudean	Auckland
3736	Lyn Maltby	Auckland
3738	Evelyn McNamara	Auckland
3743	Jimmy Kuo	Auckland
3749	Michael Drinnan	Auckland
3645	Siobhan Liddle	Hamilton
3493	Martijn van der Tol	Wellington
3551	Sam Kebbell	Wellington
3555	Christopher Chung	Wellington
3570	Bruce Green	Wellington
3575	Lauren Wong	Wellington
3728	James Burgess	Wellington
3735	Damon Peachey	Wellington
3741	Irena Desmond	Wellington
3746	Ana O'Connell	Wellington
3737	Rebecca McLaughlin	Christchurch
3739	Sarah Ritchie	Wanaka
3747	Jane Rooney	Christchurch
3748	Stuart Hay	Christchurch
3751	Craig McAuliffe	Dunedin
3752	Mark Read	Arrowtown

Moved Gordon Holden, seconded Kate Davenport, abstained Callum McKenzie

- That the Board determine that those applicants not recommended for registration in the attached report (see below), on the basis of having not met applicable minimum standards for registration, are declined under part 2 section 10 of the Registered Architects Act 2005.

<b>Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)
(deleted)	(deleted)	(deleted)

Moved Anna-Marie Chin, seconded Helen Tonkin, abstained Callum McKenzie

### **6.3 – Registrations Pathway 7**

The Board resolved:

- That the Board approve the registration of Pathway 7 applicants Mr Dennis Winter, Mr Arthur Walters and Mr Alan Poor.

Moved Gordon Holden, Anna-Marie Chin

## **7. Continuing Registration**

### **7.1 – Continuing Registration Report**

The Board discussed the Continuing Registration Report. Particular attention was paid to the 4 November 2008 Minutes of the Continuing Registration Committee (attachment 1).

The Board resolved:

- That the Board note the Continuing Registration Report.

Moved Kate Davenport, seconded Gordon Holden.

- That the Board’s Continuing Registration Policy be amended so that architects in voluntary suspension are fully entitled to participate in and record CPD as part of their professional development activities to meet continuing registration requirements.

Moved Ron Pynenburg, seconded Carolyn Bull.

- That, with the addition of a concern as to the actual quality of the CPD currently available, the issues recorded in the 4 November 2008 minutes of the Continuing Registration Committee reflect the issues arising from the CPD survey that need to be addressed.

Moved Ron Pynenburg, seconded Gordon Holden.

### **7.2 – Timing Competence Reviews**

That the Board agree:

- that each year at 1 July architects that have achieved 1000 CPD points including 100 points in each of the units of competency 12 months or more prior to their next Competence Review being required shall be offered continuing registration for five more years, this to apply from 1 July 2009.
- that the proposed additional clause in regard to early Competence Reviews shall be included in the Board's Continuing Registration Policy.

Moved Kate Davenport, seconded Marsh Cook

### **7.3 – Mentoring for initial registration**

Gordon Holden said that the economic downturn meant many recent graduates seeking registration would struggle to meet the requirement of 45 weeks under the direction of a Registered Architect in an employment situation. Professor Holden said a lack of employment opportunities would force many graduates to become sole practitioners. In this situation the Board should consider amending the initial registration requirement so that the 45 weeks under the direction of a Registered Architect could also be via a mentoring as opposed to only an employment relationship.

The Board agreed to refer the matter to the Registration Committee which meets on 17 December 2008.

## **8. Public Protection**

### **8.1 – Public Protection Report**

The Board resolved that the Board:

- note the Public Protection Report

Moved Kate Davenport, seconded Callum McKenzie

- appoint Gordon Holden, Marsh Cook, and Sharron Cole as members of the Board's Investigating Committee
- appoint Gordon Holden as Chairperson and Marsh Cook as Alternate Chairperson of the Investigating Committee for 12 months

- appoint Callum McKenzie, Anna-Marie Chin and Kate Davenport as members of the Board's Disciplinary Committee
- appoint Callum McKenzie as Chairperson and Anna-Marie Chin as Alternate Chairperson of the Disciplinary Committee for 12 months.

Moved Kate Davenport, seconded Carolyn Bull

- agree that a review and revision of the complaints procedures set out in the Registered Architects Act and Rules be a priority for the Board (Public Protection Committee) in 2009.

Moved Carolyn Bull, seconded Helen Tonkin

### **8.2 – Discipline Report (deleted)**

Board members Callum McKenzie, Anna-Marie Chin and Kate Davenport left the meeting, given that they constituted the Board's Disciplinary Committee which might have to consider this complaint.

The remaining Board members then discussed the report of the Investigating Committee and the architect's submission.

The Board concluded that the case was insufficiently grave to meet the threshold of "gross carelessness or gross neglect" required by the Architects Act 1963.

The Board resolved:

- That the (deleted) complaint NOT be referred to a Disciplinary Committee hearing.

Moved Gordon Holden, seconded Marsh Cook.

## **9. Protection of Title**

### **9.1– Protection of Title Report**

The Board resolved:

- That the Board note the Protection of Title Report.

Moved Anna-Marie Chin, seconded Helen Tonkin

## **10. International and Standards**

### ***10.1– APEC Architect Project***

The Board resolved:

- That the Board note the work currently underway on New Zealand's involvement in the APEC Architect Project.

Moved Anna-Marie Chin, seconded Helen Tonkin

## **11 General Business**

Gordon Holden suggested that the Board commission the creation of a medallion to present to former Board members as recognition of their service.

## **Attachment 1**

**4 November 2008**

### **Minutes of meeting of the Continuing Registration Committee**

Committee Members attending: Gordon Holden (Chair)  
Ron Pynenburg  
Gordon Moller

Apologies: Anna-Marie Chin

In attendance: Paul Jackman (CE)  
.....

The meeting reviewed the results of the Board's August 2008 survey of architects' perceptions of the provision of CPD.

The meeting concluded the following.

1. The survey reveals concern (i.e. disagree or strongly disagree with the propositions) among 20-30% of architects regarding 10 of the questions asked, and respectively 76% and 50% of architects in the provinces do not find the provision of scheduled and individual CPD easy and convenient.
2. In the written comments these architects, and many others who answered more positively, articulated a number of perceptions, these being: –
  - CPD processes are inflexible, onerous, complicated, time-consuming and expensive.
  - Arbitrary rulings, such as utilising either PSGs or IOTs, and low points for 'research' trips, are being imposed.
  - Architects are not being treated as responsible professionals who are able to determine what CPD is relevant to them and what it is worth
  - CPD that architects believed is valid is not being awarded points
  - There is bias in points allocation towards NZIA-provided CPD, Industry provider CPD, and also scheduled CPD above individual CPD.
  - Non-NZIA members face higher costs and greater difficulties in accessing CPD
  - Overseas architects and those in voluntary suspension are not able to meet the CPD requirements

3. These concerns need to be addressed.
4. In particular, the survey reveals that at the moment too many architects have not been adequately informed:
  - that CPD is voluntary, given the Competence Review option
  - that if architects do not find scheduled CPD activities convenient or appropriate, they can undertake and gain recognition for individual CPD activities that they ought to be doing anyway to maintain and enhance their skills
  - how overseas architects, those in voluntary suspension, specialists, senior practitioners and the like can meet continued registration requirements
  - about critical aspects of the CPD regime, about which NZIA needs to provide information to the Board, including:–
    - a. criteria for CPD points allocation
    - b. criteria for listing as a 'scheduled' activity
    - c. criteria for becoming an 'industry provider'.
5. This lack of information is behind the anxiety and sense of being entrapped by CPD requirements reflected in the CPD survey results.
6. Primarily this needs to be resolved by implementing a communications programme that explains to architects:
  - the Board's Continuing Registration Policy
  - how CPD works within that policy
  - that CPD is not compulsory
  - the basis on which scheduled CPD (both listing of activities and recognition as an industry provider) is provided and the logic behind the CPD points awarded for it
  - the basis on which individual CPD takes place and the logic behind the CPD points awarded for it
  - that scheduled CPD cannot be expected to meet every architects' needs, given that architects work in a number of contexts, such as being in the main centres or the provinces; early, mid or late career; generalists or specialists; full time or part time; working in New Zealand or overseas
  - how utilising professional development activities outside the CPD regime will work to meet the Board's requirements for continued registration.
7. In addition, NZRAB and NZIA need to review carefully whether there are any other impediments to architects' utilisation of the individual CPD option.
8. If this review reveals any such impediments, they need be removed.

9. The CE will obtain from the research company that did the CPD survey a breakdown of the numerical results in terms of architects' ages and years practicing and whether they live in urban or provincial areas.
10. Gordon Holden will prepare a template for the appropriate relativities between CPD points awarded for scheduled and individual CPD as a starting point for further discussion.
11. The Committee will hold a further meeting on the afternoon of Tuesday 11 November at 1.00 pm which will be attended by NZIA Education Manager Joe Grayland, to discuss these matters further and to provide the requested information.
12. A paper will be prepared to the November Board meeting recommending that if architects achieve 1000 CPD points and 100 points in each of the units of competency prior to five years after their last Competence Review, they will be deemed forthwith to have had a successful Competence Review granting them five more years of registration before another Competence Review will be required again.