

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

F I N A L M I N U T E S

MEETING OF:

STATE ARCHITECTS LICENSURE BOARD

TIME: 8:59 A.M.

Held at

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE

2525 North 7th Street

CoPA HUB, Eaton Conference Room

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

June 22, 2026

State Architects Licensure Board
June 22, 2026

BOARD MEMBERS:

William J. Bates, RA, President
Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner of
Professional and Occupational Affairs
Michael Johns, RA, Vice President - Absent
Patrick Endler, RA, Secretary
Jason Birl, RA - Absent
Richard DeYoung, RA
Nicole Dress, RA
Mary McClenaghan, RA
Seth Miller, Esquire, Office of Attorney General

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

Lindsay Szymanski, Esquire, Board Counsel
Angela L. Solomon, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison
J. Leslie Warner, Board Administrator
Mark Farrell, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel, Office of
Chief Counsel
Thomas Leech, II, Business Licensing Division Chief
Andrew LaFratte, MPA, Deputy Policy Director, Office
of Policy
Ronald Rouse, Esquire, Senior Counsel, PA Office of
General Counsel

ALSO PRESENT:

Sarah Henle, NCIDQ, LEED, President, IDLCPA
Carrie Hillman, Director of Government Relations,
Schafer Government Affairs, IDLCPA
Cat Booth, Intern, Schafer Government Affairs, IDLCPA
Melissa Cannata, Career Certified
Anthony Potter, Esquire, American Institute of
Architects Pennsylvania
Robyn St. Hilaire, Esquire, American Institute of
Architects Pennsylvania
Steve Swarney, EVP, CEO, American Institute of
Architects Pennsylvania
Lisa Granger, NCIDQ, EDAC, CHID, LEED ID+C, Senior
Interior Designer, Perkins Eastman
Emma Gaus, NCIDQ, Interior Designer, Perkins Eastman
Jade Morningstar, NCIDQ, Interior Designer, Perkins
Eastman

State Architects Licensure Board
June 22, 2026

ALSO PRESENT (cont.):

Tineke Reali, IIDA, NCIDQ, LEED Green Associate, WELL
AP, Senior Associate, Perkins Eastman
Ryan
Rachel Wilbur-Adams, Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

State Architects Licensure Board

June 22, 2026

The special regulatory meeting of the State Architects Licensure Board was held on Monday, June 22, 2026. William J. Bates, RA, President, called the meeting to order at 8:59 a.m.

Introduction of Board Members/Attendees

[President Bates requested an introduction of Board Members and attendees. A quorum of Board Members was present.]

[Lindsay Szymanski, Esquire, Board Counsel, reminded everyone that the meeting was being recorded, and voluntary participation constituted consent to be recorded.]

Report of Regulatory Counsel - Introduction

[Mark Farrell, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel introduced the four open regulation packages. Regulation 16A-4120, Licensure by Endorsement or Act 41, was in the final rulemaking stage and close to the finish line.]

1 Regulation 16A-4112, General Revisions, was in the
2 proposed rulemaking stage. He noted Regulatory
3 Counsel had everything from the Board for the General
4 Revisions.

5 Regulation 16A-4122, Continuing Education (CE) for
6 Architects, went out for an exposure draft. He
7 stated there was enough input that Regulatory Counsel
8 was able to draft the Preamble and Annex. He added
9 the proposed Preamble and Annex were included in the
10 Board packet for a potential vote.

11 The final package, 16A-4123, Certified Interior
12 Designers, went out for an exposure draft; however,
13 Regulatory Counsel did not have enough information to
14 attempt to draft the regulatory documents for the
15 package. He explained the main purpose of the
16 meeting would be this package. He noted the package
17 also intertwined a bit with the Architects CE
18 package.

19 Mr. Farrell reviewed the documents provided to the
20 Board in advance of the meeting. The first memo
21 outlined the regulatory packages. Attached to the
22 memo, he provided the Board's entire Chapter 9 set of
23 regulations in one document. Interspersed are the
24 provisions from each of the four pending packages, so
25 the Board could view how the packages united. He

1 noted there had been concern at the last meeting as
2 to potential contradictions between packages. He
3 also provided a memo with the comments received for
4 the Certified Interior Designers package from the
5 Council for Interior Design Qualification (CIDQ) and
6 Interior Design Legislative Coalition of Pennsylvania
7 (IDLCPA). He explained, as he went through the main
8 interwoven document, he would pause at each step
9 where there were comments relevant to the provision.
10 The final document provided to the Board was the
11 draft Annex and Preamble for 16A-4122.

12 Mr. Farrell pointed out a consistent theme many of
13 the provisions were controlled by the statute that
14 recently passed. He noted, in many instances,
15 Regulatory Counsel had cut and pasted language
16 directly from the statute into the regulations for
17 consistency. He explained the stakeholder input is
18 extremely valuable, especially with the Certified
19 Interior Designers package, which is a new licensure
20 type.]

21 ***

22 Report of Regulatory Counsel
23 [Mark Farrell, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel, Office of
24 Chief Counsel, started with page seven on the main
25 document with the definition of accredited school

1 where IDLCPA had commented that degrees are not
2 typically interior design services. IDLCPA
3 recommended using "architecture, interior design, or
4 similar" to capture the different programs. He noted
5 there was little ability to adjust the definition.

6 Carrie Hillman, Director of Government Relations,
7 Schafer Government Affairs, IDLCPA, commented IDLCPA
8 agreed with the definition provided the Board
9 recognized equivalent degrees. She noted concerns
10 about enumerating every single degree name as the
11 degrees tend to change and morph over time.

12 Mary McClenaghan, RA, commented the definition
13 seemed to be muddled as there were two kinds of
14 accredited programs, architecture and interior
15 design. She read the definition as someone could go
16 to interior design school to get a degree in
17 architecture. She suggested the two kinds of
18 programs should be clear and distinct.

19 Mr. Farrell noted it was clear what was meant
20 anywhere accredited school was used further on in the
21 regulations. He also confirmed the definition was
22 pulled directly from Act 144.

23 Ms. Hillman commented, after looking at the
24 definition again, the definition was not stating the
25 degree was interior design services, but the academic

1 program was offering interior design services and
2 that was accredited by a national accrediting body.
3 She noted there was intentional vagueness as there
4 are non-CIDA (Council for Interior Design
5 Accreditation) accredited programs that are not
6 accredited but offered at an accredited school that
7 offer a different pathway to certification.

8 Mr. Farrell noted Ms. McClenaghan's concern was
9 about the definition of accredited program, not
10 accredited school. He stated there was nothing wrong
11 with separating the accredited program definition to
12 avoid confusion.

13 Richard DeYoung, RA, suggested shifting "or
14 Council of Architectural Interior Designers
15 Accreditation" to the end of the definition would
16 correct the issue.

17 President Bates agreed the definition as written
18 was confusing and should be made as clear as possible
19 given the variety of programs.

20 It was noted the accredited programs definition
21 was referring to different programs: The National
22 Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) programs for
23 architectural courses and CIDA accredited programs
24 for interior design services related programs. It
25 was also confirmed the definition for accredited

1 school was pulled directly from the statute.

2 Ms. McClenaghan stated the definition of
3 accredited school should also be separated. Mr.
4 Farrell acknowledged her concern, but with it being a
5 statutory definition, he would have to determine if
6 the definition could be separated. He reiterated,
7 further into the regulations, it is very clear in the
8 context of the provision if the school is related to
9 architects or certified interior designers.

10 Mr. DeYoung pointed out the term building systems
11 is used in several places in the regulations, but no
12 definition was listed. Mr. Farrell asked for context
13 which Mr. DeYoung provided. Mr. Farrell also asked
14 if there was industry-wide accepted definition for
15 building systems that could be used. Discussion
16 ensued on what would be included under building
17 systems.

18 Mr. Farrell questioned if the building systems
19 definition might overlap with issues regarding the
20 definition of "interior design services" and
21 "practice of architecture." He noted both
22 definitions were pulled directly from the statute.
23 He shared comments from CIDQ, which had noted model
24 language for the definition of the practice of
25 interior design that might be helpful in developing a

1 uniform scope across all jurisdictions. CIDQ also
2 indicated there was some overlap in what architects
3 and certified interior designers are trained and
4 tested to perform in non-structural interior
5 construction. To account for the overlap, CIDQ
6 recommended the provisions be included in the
7 language.

8 Mr. DeYoung looked up the definition of building
9 systems and found a clear definition from
10 lawinsider.com. The site defined building systems as
11 "any electrical, mechanical, structural, plumbing,
12 heating, ventilating, air conditioning, sprinkler,
13 life, safety or security systems." The Board agreed
14 with using the definition in the regulations.

15 Mr. Farrell pointed out, if there was not complete
16 agreement during the meeting, there would be
17 additional changes for the public and stakeholders to
18 provide input during the rulemaking process. He
19 asked if there were any further concerns regarding
20 the definitions for interior design services or
21 practice of architecture.

22 Ms. McClenaghan shared concerns with interior
23 design services, primarily with the specificity of
24 the definition. President Bates and Mr. DeYoung both
25 generally accepted the definition. Mr. Farrell noted

1 the definition builds on itself as one reads it. Ms.
2 McClenaghan provided examples of her concerns. It
3 was asked if consideration should be given to adding
4 a reference to engineers to the certified interior
5 services definition, as included under the practice
6 of architecture. Mr. DeYoung acknowledged Ms.
7 McClenaghan's concerns, but with the aforementioned
8 definition of building systems, the definition of
9 certified interior services had the needed clarity.
10 The question was raised if modifications could even
11 be made with the definition being pulled from the
12 statute. Mr. Farrell suggested to avoid changing the
13 definition. He noted there is often a tendency to
14 get too specific. Acting Commissioner Claggett
15 stated, if any change were to be made, it should be
16 to add "or engineering" to the last sentence. Mr.
17 Farrell would consider the discussion, and a formal
18 index would be prepared for the Board's review.

19 Discussion ensued on if "or engineering" was
20 enough to add or if the four lines regarding
21 engineering from the practice of architecture
22 definition would need to be added. President Bates
23 stated there was a distinction in the practice of
24 architecture definition to avoid overlap between the
25 practices of architecture and engineering.

1 Anthony Potter, Esquire, American Institute of
2 Architects Pennsylvania, stated it would be easiest
3 to simply add "or engineering" at the end of the
4 definition.

5 Angela L. Solomon, Esquire, Board Prosecution
6 Liaison, shared a prosecution perspective. She
7 noted, for both the Architects Board and the
8 Engineers Board, she does see cases where an engineer
9 might be practicing architecture. Any time there is
10 potential overlap, prosecution looks at the two Acts
11 in conjunction with one another. She suggested not
12 adding an additional definition of engineering to the
13 architects' regulation and to leave the two practices
14 separate. However, she noted a call out indicating
15 that something is not in the practice of engineering
16 would potentially be appropriate and make her job
17 easier given the blurred lines between the two
18 practices.

19 Mr. Farrell did not want to tweak the framework of
20 the definition too far from what was stated by the
21 legislature. He stated adding "or engineering" at
22 the end of the interior design services would be
23 enough to indicate the Board's desires without
24 disturbing the definition.

25 Prior to moving on from definitions, the question

1 was asked regarding the context of "first" under the
2 definition of professional degree. Mr. DeYoung
3 provided an explanation, indicating the definition
4 was fairly well understood. Mr. Farrell noted the
5 definition was pulled from the statute. He added, in
6 the future with similar exercises, he would notate in
7 the margin where language was copied verbatim from
8 the statute.

9 It was also noted the address of NCARB (National
10 Council of Architectural Registration Boards) was
11 incorrect. The decision was made that no address
12 would be indicated in the regulations in case of
13 future location changes. It was also decided that
14 CIDQ should be defined, the same as NCARB.

15 Mr. Farrell moved on to section 9.11, NCARB
16 membership. CIDQ and IDLCPA commented, asking the
17 Board to consider CIDQ membership in addition to
18 NCARB membership. The Board discussed the
19 possibility of CIDQ membership before concluding Mr.
20 Farrell would change the regulation to allow for the
21 CIDQ membership.

22 Mr. Farrell noted the next few pages only
23 contained changes from the General Revisions package
24 already in the pipeline. He moved on to Section
25 9.53, General requirements for certified interior

1 designers. Mr. DeYoung commented he had stumbled
2 over the semantics or sentence structure of
3 §9.53(a)(1). He read the provision, which included
4 "a 4-year or 5-year CIDA accredited program with a
5 degree in interior design or architecture." He noted
6 CIDA accredited programs do not give degrees in
7 architecture. It was noted the intention was to
8 include interior architecture programs.

9 The Board discussed interior architecture
10 programs. President Bates and Mr. DeYoung discussed
11 struggling with the term interior architecture with
12 architecture being a protected title yet schools are
13 using it for interior design. It was suggested, if
14 interior architecture was going to be used, then
15 there needed to be a definition. Ms. Solomon noted
16 prosecuting cases where any derivation of the term
17 architecture and holding oneself out as an architect
18 is grounds for a case of unlicensed practice or
19 holding out. Her opinion was for the Board to be
20 careful in how the word was modified and used. Mr.
21 Potter agreed with Ms. Solomon's position, noting the
22 term architecture was defined by statute and any
23 variation was prohibited.

24 Mr. DeYoung commented by using the term "or
25 substantially equivalent program", any interior

1 architecture program was covered without using the
2 word architecture. Mr. Bates agreed with striking
3 architecture from §9.53(a)(1).]

4 ***

5 [The Board recessed from 9:47 a.m. until 9:52 a.m.]

6 ***

7 [Nicole Dress, RA, asked if Mr. Farrell would be
8 going back to §9.41. Mr. Farrell explained the
9 section was part of the General Revisions, and the
10 changes indicated were from a year or two ago which
11 were still working their way through the process.

12 Mr. Farrell indicated the issue with architecture
13 in §9.53(a)(1) was written in the statute. He noted
14 §701(b)(1) of the statute explicitly stated it would
15 "include a professional degree in interior design or
16 architecture from an accredited school." He asked if
17 the Board would turn down somebody for a license for
18 certification as an interior designer who has a
19 degree in architecture but wants to be an interior
20 designer.

21 Ms. McClenaghan stated Mr. Farrell's question was
22 answered further down. She questioned §9.53(a)(2),
23 noting the language indicated the person should be
24 under the direct supervision of a nationally
25 certified interior designer or registered architect.

1 She wondered if a registered architect should also
2 have the title of certified interior designer if the
3 individual would be qualified to sign off as a
4 supervisor. Mr. DeYoung noted §9.53(c) indicated an
5 architect was qualified to be a certified interior
6 designer. Ms. Hillman indicated §9.53(a)(2) was
7 meant to reflect CIDQ examination standards and
8 mirrors national practice. It was noted, it appeared
9 when drafting the legislation, the thought was that a
10 degree in architecture would also include elements of
11 interior design while an interior design degree may
12 not include architecture. Mr. Farrell noted there
13 was a provision in the statute that says architects
14 can be issued a certificate for interior design
15 services without an examination and without fees.
16 Therefore, a registered architect would still have
17 the ability to supervise individuals for the purposes
18 of examination qualification.

19 Mr. DeYoung questioned why an architect, who is
20 authorized, would even want a certified interior
21 design designation as it is not a requirement for
22 architects to perform interior design. Ms.
23 McClenaghan replied a client would be more likely to
24 choose an architect who has a certified interior
25 design certificate over someone who just indicates

1 they do architecture and interior design. It was
2 noted, in Texas, an architect does not have to apply
3 to be an interior designer. Texas automatically
4 registers architects as interior designers if
5 desired. Mr. Farrell stated Pennsylvania's General
6 Assembly did not set up the statute to allow
7 automatic registration. He directed the conversation
8 back to the initial issue of the word architecture in
9 §9.53(a)(1). The Board agreed with removing the word
10 architecture.

11 Ms. Hillman noted, during statute discussions with
12 several legislators, the topic of automatic
13 registration came up and the prime sponsor at the
14 time stated an architect still needed to prove some
15 competency in interior design. Mr. DeYoung noted
16 talking about §9.53(c) while the Board was discussing
17 §9.53(a)(1). He reiterated his earlier opinion that
18 substantially equivalent would be enough to cover
19 interior architecture. Mr. Farrell stated, while
20 substantially equivalent could be added, he was
21 unsure architecture could be struck because of the
22 statute. Based on discussions, it was suggested
23 §9.53(a)(1) could be changed to read "the applicant
24 is a graduate of a four-year or five-year CIDA
25 accredited program or a substantial equivalent

1 program or school approved by the Board."

2 Mr. Farrell noted IDLCPA commented on the last
3 line of §9.53(a)(1), indicating it recommended
4 changing "national certified interior designer" to
5 "an interior designer who holds an active NCIDQ
6 certification." Ms. Hillman explained the
7 recommendation was based on there not being a
8 definition for nationally certified interior
9 designer. Mr. Potter suggested not using the word
10 "nationally" as there are not any national regulation
11 licenses. Ms. Hillman explained the lack of
12 regulation for interior designers in all 50 states
13 was part of the problem when working on the
14 legislation.

15 President Bates noted there was added confusion
16 with some states recognizing licensed interior
17 designers while other recognize certified interior
18 designers. Ms. Hillman noted the word "active" is
19 important as someone with active certification has
20 completed required CE. Mr. DeYoung suggested adding
21 a definition for nationally certified interior
22 designer indicating the person would be a current
23 NCIDQ holder. It was also suggested "nationally"
24 could be subbed out with another word and then the
25 term could be defined. Mr. Farrell will work on the

1 verbiage for the next draft for the Board's review.

2 Ms. Solomon commented on application cases, noting
3 she will review the qualifications of the supervisor
4 of the person applying for licensure. President
5 Bates noted, with supervisors, the Board would expect
6 to see the supervisors seal on their letter of
7 recommendations.

8 Mr. Farrell directed the conversation to
9 §9.53(a)(2). IDLCPA had commented the section needed
10 to be revisited as CIDA does not accredit two- and
11 three-year programs. IDLCPA recommended changing the
12 language to align with the education and experience
13 in accordance with CIDQ requirements which also allow
14 for non-CIDA accredited schools to have a pathway to
15 NCIDQ certification. He noted CIDQ sent in a similar
16 comment.

17 Ms. Hillman and Sarah Henle, NCIDQ, LEED,
18 President, IDLCPA, explained the thought process
19 behind IDLCPA's comments. Ms. Hillman stated the
20 Board did not need to call out "CIDA accredited" but
21 could leave it as "an applicant who is a graduate of
22 a two-year program in interior design or
23 substantially equivalent program approved by the
24 Board."

25 Mr. Farrell noted the issues being discussed

1 strictly impact the certified interior designer
2 community. He asked if the Board was willing to go
3 along with matching what was provided by the
4 industry. Ms. McClenaghan replied the suggestions
5 were similar to the architect requirements in Section
6 9.41.

7 Mr. Potter commented the "approved by the Board"
8 language could be problematic as he expected the
9 Board would not be approving programs in advance. He
10 expected there would be Board hearings on educational
11 equivalency. He also indicated the language modified
12 the equivalent program.

13 Mr. DeYoung stated, when someone is approved to
14 be an architect who does not have an accredited
15 degree in architecture, they still have to take the
16 architectural registration exam. He asked why the
17 interior design sections did not just state they have
18 to have a current NCIDQ. He suggested simplifying
19 the language and indicating that, if the person does
20 not have a CIDA accredited degree, then their path is
21 to have a certain amount of experience and be a
22 current NCIDQ holder. He pointed out the current
23 language appeared to create a loophole that someone
24 did not need to have NCIDQ if they did not go to a
25 CIDA school.

1 It was noted the intention of the section was
2 that the applicant needed to meet the eligibility in
3 part A to be qualified to sit for the examination in
4 part B. Ultimately the applicant will need to pass
5 the exam to show they are qualified and capable.
6 President Bates noted, based on that understanding,
7 the section was filtering language for staff to
8 review prior to either shifting the applicant to the
9 Board for review or automatically setting the
10 applicant in motion for the exam. Mr. Farrell stated
11 Regulatory Counsel would revise the paragraphs to
12 reflect the actual pathways.

13 Mr. DeYoung moved on to §9.53(c) where he
14 suggested there should be language indicating that
15 the regulations do not prohibit an architect from
16 practicing interior design in the normal practice of
17 architecture. Mr. Farrell noted the discussion had
18 lost sight of the regulations being a title
19 protection measure, meaning they indicate what a
20 person can call themselves, not necessarily
21 controlling what they can or cannot do. He added it
22 was implied throughout that an architect can do what
23 a certified interior designer can do but cannot use
24 the certified interior designer name without being
25 certified by the Board. Mr. DeYoung understood Mr.

1 Farrell's point but noted the provision stating
2 "certification of architects" creates the potential
3 argument that an architect cannot practice interior
4 design if they are not certified. He emphasized a
5 need for clarity that a registered architect by right
6 can practice interior design. It was noted another
7 issue was that interior designers cannot be title
8 protected which is why the regulation is for
9 certified interior designers. Mr. Farrell stated it
10 would not hurt to add language based on Mr. DeYoung's
11 suggestion. Ms. McClenaghan suggested using simple
12 language, stating architects can provide interior
13 design services. It was also suggested the change
14 could be made under the practice of architecture.

15 Ms. McClenaghan noted four requirements to be a
16 registered architect. She questioned the equivalency
17 for certified interior designers. The parallels were
18 explained.

19 President Bates indicated having trouble with the
20 language of §9.53(c), noting it starts to imply
21 architects do not have the right to provide interior
22 design services. Ms. Solomon suggested a change to
23 the definition of practice of architecture by adding
24 "to include interior design services" at the end of
25 "utilization of space within and surrounding such

1 structures." Mr. Farrell noted §9.53(c) was verbatim
2 from statute. It was confirmed the intent of
3 §9.53(c) was to ensure there were no additional fees
4 or barriers for architects to get the certified
5 interior designer certification. It was also noted
6 the prime sponsor of the legislation felt very
7 strongly that architects should still be able to
8 demonstrate competency.

9 Mr. DeYoung returned to his suggestion that a
10 simple statement should be added to §9.53(c) stating
11 "nothing in this provision shall prohibit an
12 architect from providing interior design services in
13 their normal practice of architecture." He also
14 noted adding more qualifications to the practice of
15 architecture, as indicated by Ms. Solomon, could lead
16 to more complications where someone could pick apart
17 the definition. Discussion ensued on the appropriate
18 place for changes, with Mr. Potter agreeing that Mr.
19 DeYoung's suggested language was the most articulate.

20 The Board questioned the need for registration
21 for architects with Ms. McClenaghan indicating
22 registered architects should automatically get the
23 certified interior design qualification. Mr. DeYoung
24 stressed that Board was stating that architects can
25 practice interior design without having a certified

1 interior design title. Regarding competency, it was
2 noted language could be added indicating "an
3 architect's active license to practice architecture
4 in Pennsylvania is prima facie evidence of competency
5 in interior design." President Bates noted it was
6 really about architects getting the interior design
7 certificate if they wished and not limiting
8 architects from interior design services.

9 It was noted there were two ideas contemplated,
10 first allowing architects to provide interior design
11 services and, secondly, the idea of using the
12 architect's registration as prima facie evidence,
13 thereby eliminating the need to delegate work to
14 someone else. Mr. Farrell noted the discussion was
15 already covered and implied but it would be better if
16 it was explicit on the page. President Bates noted
17 the clear indication would also help to avoid
18 potential litigation down the road or challenges to
19 someone's work. Mr. Farrell will redraft the
20 language and bring it back to the Board.

21 It was noted, for clarity, there was still a
22 clear line of differentiation between interior design
23 services and architectural services because of the
24 sign and seal. Interior designers would like to be
25 able to practice independently for preliminary

1 sketches and preliminary designs and then be able to
2 work with an architect who is still a signing and
3 sealing entity for permitting. Ms. McClenaghan
4 argued interior design drawings do not have to be
5 sealed by a registered architect and what was being
6 described was plan stamping, an illegal practice if
7 the interior designer intended to provide all
8 sketches and design intent to an architect to just
9 sign and seal. Mr. DeYoung stated the intention was
10 that the interior designer's ideas were incorporated
11 into the development of the architectural drawings
12 and design. President Bates noted drawings provided
13 by the interior designer should not require a seal
14 for plan review.

15 Mr. Farrell stated there were still a couple of
16 comments for review. In §9.402(c), preapproved
17 providers, one comment was received asking that CIDQ
18 be added to the list and another comment stated to
19 strike American Society of Interior Designers (ASID)
20 and add Green Business Certification Inc. (GBCI). He
21 noted the changes would mean the entities would not
22 need to go through the approval process as the list
23 indicates the Board is confident that any courses
24 offered by the entities would be acceptable.

25 The Board discussed what courses GBCI offers that

1 would be qualifying for certified interior designers.
2 It was noted Pennsylvania would be requiring 24 CE
3 credits for certified interior designers, half of
4 which would have to be in health, safety, and welfare
5 (HSW).

6 Mr. DeYoung stated §9.303 should indicate the CE
7 requirements of that section are for architects just
8 as §9.401 indicates the CE requirement of that
9 section are for certified interior designers. Mr.
10 Farrell noted Mr. DeYoung's clarification. Mr.
11 DeYoung noted struggling with the HSW requirements
12 for certified interior designers as they cannot
13 design building systems. It was noted if considering
14 the perspective of an interior designer laying out
15 furniture in relation to means of egress, then the
16 HSW courses would allow coordination between the
17 design teams.

18 Mr. Potter suggested, on §9.74, modifying the
19 language after "certificate" to "use the title of a
20 certified interior designer." Mr. DeYoung noted the
21 same changed should be made in §9.75. Mr. DeYoung
22 also commented the language in the sections began to
23 become more of a practice act than a title act. Mr.
24 Farrell explained, because the sections are speaking
25 to reciprocal licensure, there is little bit of

1 practice involved. Mr. DeYoung questioned the use of
2 "licensure" in §9.75 as the certification is not a
3 license. Mr. Farrell noted "licensure" could be
4 changed to "certification." He also noted some
5 states issue a license, and it was used as a generic
6 noun term. Mr. DeYoung indicated a desire for the
7 change from licensure to certification especially
8 with the act being a title act and not a practice
9 act.

10 The Board discussed the language of "provide
11 interior design services" in both sections as the
12 Board would be issuing a certificate to use the title
13 of certified interior designer, not issuing a
14 certificate to practice interior design. Mr. Farrell
15 agreed with striking the language was worthy. He was
16 not concerned about changing licensure to
17 certification in the title of §9.75. Mr. DeYoung
18 stressed there was a major issue in using licensure.

19 President Bates suggested eliminating licensure and
20 just using "reciprocity." It was noted the statute
21 uses the word licensure within the reciprocity
22 clause. Mr. Farrell stated just using reciprocity
23 would still align with the statute.

24 Mr. Farrell explained Sections 9.301 through
25 9.308 were related to the CE for architects. He

1 stated the sections were sent out as an exposure
2 draft and are a solid basic plan for the handling of
3 CE. He noted Regulatory Counsel did not make any
4 changes to what the Board had approved as an exposure
5 draft. Mr. DeYoung commented §9.303 should say for
6 architects. Mr. Farrell agreed, noting the same
7 change for §9.304 and §9.305.

8 The question was posed as to why the architects
9 had eight sections for CE and certified interior
10 designers only had five. Mr. Farrell explained
11 §9.302 applied to both architects and certified
12 interior designers. In addition, some CE information
13 only applied to architects. He also noted some of
14 the certified interior designer CE was compressed.
15 He also explained there were areas in the regulations
16 where "or certified interior designers" was able to
17 be inserted instead of a whole new set of
18 regulations. He noted the CE regulations for
19 certified interior designers was structured very
20 similarly to architects, but Regulatory Counsel
21 suggested to keep them separate since certified
22 interior designers was an entirely new license class.

23 Ms. Dress returned to §9.41, questioning the
24 indication of §9.41a. Mr. Farrell noted the
25 numbering of §9.41a was correct, as a new section was

1 added, but \$9.42 was already in reserved despite
2 being no longer in use therefore unusual numbering
3 was needed.

4 Mr. Farrell stated his only other matter was the
5 potential vote to approve the proposed Preamble and
6 Annex for 16A-4122. He noted the preamble document
7 of any package explains in a narrative format the
8 story behind the regulation. He added, if the Board
9 approved the Preamble and Annex, then it could be put
10 into the stream of approvals to move the package
11 forward.

12 A question was posed regarding the years
13 indicated in §9.303, asking if the years should start
14 in 2027 instead of 2029. Mr. Farrell noted the
15 wording is confusing as the 2029 indicates that the
16 CE is needed for licensee to renew in 2029, which
17 means they need to take the CE starting in 2027. He
18 would consider if there was a way to add language
19 explicitly saying the biennial period in which CE
20 should begin accumulating. In looking at the
21 proposed Preamble document, Mr. Farrell noted the
22 dates were explained accurately at the bottom of page
23 three of the Preamble.

24 It was suggested there could be confusion with
25 the word certificate in the regulations when there

1 are different meanings. Mr. DeYoung asked if the
2 regulations should state "interior design
3 certificate" any place where "certificate" is
4 referring to an interior designer. Mr. Farrell
5 stated the statute amended the definition of
6 certificate to being a "certificate issued by the
7 Board under Chapter 7 indicating that the individual
8 named is a certified interior designer." He stated
9 the same definition should be repeated in the
10 regulations. It was questioned whether there should
11 then be a definition for NCARB. Mr. Farrell replied
12 there is a preface to the definitional section
13 stating the "words and phrases, when used in this
14 chapter, have the following meanings, unless the
15 context clearly indicates otherwise." Therefore,
16 from a regulation drafting standpoint, there was no
17 need to add a specific NCARB certificate definition.

18 Mr. Farrell stated a motion for 16A-4122, CE for
19 architects, should include a provision that the
20 approval includes the amendments discussed in the
21 meeting. The amendments would include adding the
22 word "architecture" to some of the subheadings in
23 §9.301 through §9.308 to make it clear that it is
24 architect that is being referred to. In addition,
25 the Preamble on page three would be modified to make

1 it clear that CE should begin accumulating in July
2 2027 to June 2029 biennium.

3 Ms. McClenaghan commented there would also be
4 confusion in §9.303(a) where it states "beginning
5 with July of 2029, a licensed architect shall
6 complete a minimum of 24 hours." She noted the date
7 implies CE accumulation does not begin until 2029
8 when it actually starts in 2027. Mr. Farrell stated
9 the section technically refers to the future
10 biennium; however, he would rephrase the section for
11 clarity.

12 The Board discussed if it would vote on approving
13 16-4122 or wait until the next meeting. Acting
14 Commissioner Claggett pointed out the importance of
15 having quorum, and if they waited, they might not be
16 able to vote at the next meeting, pushing the
17 approval into September. President Bates commented,
18 if the regulation was moved along, the Board would be
19 in a position to notify all registered architects of
20 the required CE well in advance of the July 2027
21 date.]

22 ***

23 MS. SZYMANSKI:

24 At this time, I believe the Chair would
25 entertain a motion to approve the

1 proposed regulation, which is the
2 Preamble and Annex for the Architect
3 Continuing Education, which is 16A-
4 4122, as amended per the discussion in
5 today's public session and direct Board
6 Counsel to move the proposed rulemaking
7 through the regulatory process.

8 MS. DRESS:

9 So moved.

10 PRESIDENT BATES:

11 We have a motion. How about a second?

12 MR. DEYOUNG:

13 Second.

14 PRESIDENT BATES:

15 How about a roll call then?

16
17 Arion Claggett, aye; Richard DeYoung,
18 aye; Nicole Dress, aye; Mary
19 McClenaghan, aye; Seth Miller, aye;
20 Patrick Endler, aye; William Bates,
21 aye.

22 [The motion carried unanimously.]

23 ***

24 [William J. Bates, RA, President, summarized the
25 meeting, noting the vote would allow Counsel to

1 proceed with the next steps for 16A-4122. In
2 addition, Regulatory Counsel would work on refining
3 the regulation for certified interior designers and
4 present a more formal proposed Annex and Preamble in
5 the future.]

6 ***

7 Adjournment

8 PRESIDENT BATES:

9 I will consider a motion to adjourn.

10 MR. DEYOUNG:

11 So moved.

12 ***

13 [There being no further business, the State
14 Architects Licensure Board Meeting adjourned at 11:16
15 a.m.]

16 ***

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Architects Licensure Board meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Architects Licensure Board meeting.



Rachel Wilbur-Adams,

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting
Service, Inc.

STATE ARCHITECTS LICENSURE BOARD
REFERENCE INDEX

June 22, 2026

TIME	AGENDA
8:59	Official Call to Order
8:59	Introductions
9:04	Report of Regulatory Counsel
11:16	Adjournment