

Region 6 Resolutions Feedback – 2024 Regional Summit
March 2, 2024

2024-E: Tri-National Agreement

- Questions about how the years changed (will confirm).
 - o Answer in the room is that it went from five to zero

2024-F: Model Regs – Exam Eligibilities

- Coffee Polk provided overview of the resolution
- Bob Calvani: Looks bad on paper, but it makes sense and is a good resolution
- Laura: CA is changing to 18 or graduate from high school
- Jim (NM): Would this take away the NAAB degree requirement?
 - o Harm: No, that path remains. It is an important path. Some of the people who take the non-accredited degree path are some of the most driven because they are in it for the long haul

2024-G: NCARB Certificate to be on the Board of Directors

- Calvani: Would like to propose an amendment. The amendment would update so that the **president** of NCARB hold NCARB Certificate (meaning they should be an architect)
 - o Celestia: Any candidate would have to be voted in. There are checks and balances in place. Why would we prevent that?
 - o Scott Harm: Past public member was in line, but current bylaws prevented them from moving forward?
- Clarification on what this resolution does
- Discussion on whether public members should move up
- Greg Erny: Motion, Jim Oswald Second
 - o Questions/concerns about their authority at this meeting to vote on things in the region that haven't been discussed with state Board
- Motion: didn't pass. Information about Calvani idea will be sent to region members
- Support for the base resolution in general was expressed.
- Comments about whether anyone should have a certificate.

2024-H: Regional Realignment

- Calvani: Good for NCARB overall. WCARB is largest region, most power
- Erny (?): Still vote independently. When it comes to vote, we vote based on our state concerns.
- Oschwald: Historical presidents, most from Region 3 and 4
- Celestia Carson: Regarding representative on the board. We have 13 Member Boards represented by our Region and others have as low as 6. There is fairness issue.
 - o Our current structure is from the 1960s, hope we look at this regularly and don't just keep whatever we do today until the 2080s
- Shouldn't we be more worried about parity, even and fair?

- Realignment is like redistricting, like a census. Should do this on a regular basis.
- I don't think this has been fully vetted. Should be a 2/3 mandate. Needs more time.
- Should hear from the states that are impacted.
- More work on the transition.
- How many votes should it take get elected to the board? Given 10 candidates this year, At Large could be elected with as few as six votes.
- More work before it is voted on.
- Should think about our own dues, we need to think more about economics for the remaining jurisdictions in the region.
- Need to look at economic side of resolution completely.
- Colorado is impartial. We will work with anyone. It makes sense based on the information presented
 - o Met with Region 5, they seemed excited to welcome us
- Idaho: Haven't discussed much yet. I would miss you, see good points on both sides. Not a personal decision. This is an impersonal decision.
 - o Second ID member: No strong feelings.
- Email Catherine if you have more comments on realignment.