



NOTICE OF MEETING

November 14, 2012

9:00am – 1:00pm

Landscape Architects Technical Committee

University of California, Los Angeles

1317 Perloff Hall, Room 1302

Los Angeles, CA 90095

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) will hold a meeting as noted above. The agenda items may not be addressed in the order noted and the meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda which may be at a time earlier than that posted in this notice. The meeting is open to the public and held in a barrier free facility according to the Americans with Disabilities Act. Any person requiring a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting John Keidel at (916) 575-7230, emailing latc@dca.ca.gov, or sending a written request to LATC, 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, California, 95834. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

Agenda

- A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum
Chair's Remarks
Public Comment Session
- B. Approve August 14, 2012 LATC Summary Report
- C. Program Manager's Report
- D. Overview and Discussion of Occupational Analysis Process and Request Authorization for Staff to Enter into Intra-Agency Contract with Office of Professional Examination Services
- E. Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force Report and Review and Approve Recommendation for a Legal Opinion on Business and Professions Code Section 5641, Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions

(Continued on Reverse)

- F. University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program Task Force Report Including Review and Approval of Draft UC Extension Certificate Program Review Documents:
 - 1. Review and Approval Procedures
 - 2. Self-Evaluation Report
 - 3. Visiting Team Guidelines
 - 4. Annual Report Format
 - 5. Visiting Team Report Template

- G. Review Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, and Possible Action

- H. Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)
 - 1. Election Results
 - 2. Present New Landscape Architect Registration Examination Data

- I. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

Adjourn

Please contact John Keidel at (916) 575-7230 for additional information related to the meeting. Notices and agendas for LATC meetings can be found at www.latc.ca.gov.

Agenda Item A

CALL TO ORDER-ROLL CALL-ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Member Roster

Stephanie Landregan, Chair

Andrew Bowden

Nicki Johnson

Katherine Spitz

David Allan Taylor, Jr.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

LATC Chair Stephanie Landregan will review the scheduled LATC actions and make appropriate announcements.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Members of the public may address the Committee at this time. The Committee Chair may allow public participation during other agenda items at her discretion.

Agenda Item B

APPROVE AUGUST 14, 2012 LATC SUMMARY REPORT

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) is asked to approve the attached August 14, 2012, LATC Meeting Summary Report.

SUMMARY REPORT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD **Landscape Architects Technical Committee**

August 14, 2012
Sacramento, California

LATC Members Present

Andrew Bowden
Nicki Johnson
Stephanie Landregan
Katherine Spitz

LATC Member Absent

David Allen Taylor Jr., Chair

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer, Board
Gary Duke, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC
Jacqueline French, Enforcement Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Christine Anderson, Past LATC Member
Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)
Judy Geer, Test Development Staff, DCA Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)
Peter Larimer, Landscape Architect, Sierra Chapter, American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)
Richard Risner, Landscape Architect, San Diego Chapter ASLA
Michael Scheele, Landscape Architect, Northern California Chapter (CC)/ASLA
Marq Truscott, Landscape Architect, Sierra Chapter/ASLA
Raul Villanueva, Test Development Staff, OPES
Keith Wilson, Board Member, CC/ASLA
Jon Wreschinsky, President, CC/ASLA

- A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum**
Chair's Remarks
Public Comment Session

Stephanie Landregan called the meeting to order at 10:36 a.m. and called the roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established. She noted that David Allen Taylor, Jr. was unable to attend and serve as LATC Chair. Ms. Landregan served as Chair for the meeting. Ms. Landregan introduced and welcomed the new LATC members Nicki Johnson and Katherine Spitz, and returning LATC member Andrew Bowden.

B. Approve November 14, 2011 LATC Summary Report

Ms. Landregan presented the November 14, 2011 LATC Meeting Summary Report for approval. Doug McCauley noted that there was only one member out of the current LATC members who was on LATC when the November 14, 2011 LATC meeting occurred. He asked if LATC could approve the November 14, 2011 Summary Report under these circumstances. Gary Duke stated the LATC members who were not present at the November 14, 2011 LATC meeting could vote to approve the Summary Report pursuant to the “rule of necessity.”

The LATC members had no revisions for the November 14, 2011 LATC Summary Report.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the November 14, 2011 LATC Summary Report.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

C. Approve May 4, 2012 LATC Summary Report

Ms. Landregan presented the May 4, 2012 LATC Meeting Summary Report for approval. Mr. Bowden referred to page seven of the Summary Report regarding California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2615, Form of Examinations, which stated, “Ms. Anderson also suggested LATC add a statement to the LATC website referring people to the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) website for an updated list of schools that offer LAAB accredited degrees” He asked if this statement was added to the website.

Trish Rodriguez noted that the statement was not added because LATC reviewed the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) website and there were discrepancies between their list of accredited schools and the list of degrees that the schools offered. She suggested that because of these discrepancies, LATC should provide the list of schools on the LATC website instead of creating a link to the CCCCCO website.

Ms. Landregan noted that any candidate who has an LAAB accredited degree could apply for candidacy in California. She explained that LATC could put the list of LAAB accredited schools on the LATC website, but the list would need to exclude University of California (UC) Berkeley’s undergraduate program because it is not LAAB accredited. Ms. Rodriguez noted that LATC accepts non-accredited degrees. She stated that LATC would need to clarify that LATC accepts non-accredited degrees and state the amount of educational credit a candidate can receive for a non-accredited degree on the website. Ms. Landregan concurred and suggested that LATC can add a statement to the website noting that other LAAB accredited degrees meet the education requirement and provide a link to the LAAB website. Ms. Landregan stated LATC could draft a statement after the meeting for further review.

Mr. Bowden referred to a statement on page seven of the May 4, 2012 Summary Report which read “Ms. Anderson stated LATC will add an agenda item to a future LATC meeting to discuss

adding a provision to the law to allow a certain amount of licensed experience in landscape architecture in other jurisdictions to supplement deficiencies in obtaining a California landscape architect license.” He asked if this issue was addressed. Ms. Landregan stated this discussion item needed more background information before it should be discussed with the new LATC members. Ms. Rodriguez noted that the plan is to have this topic of discussion added to the agenda for the next Strategic Planning.

The LATC members had no revisions for the May 4, 2012 LATC Summary Report.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the May 4, 2012 LATC Summary Report.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Duke noted that the new LATC members needed to be sworn-in before proceeding further with the meeting. Mr. McCauley presented Christine Anderson with a certificate to recognize her past service as LATC member. Mr. McCauley also presented Mr. Bowden with a certificate to recognize him for all his past contributions to LATC and welcomed him back to LATC.

Ms. Rodriguez introduced and welcomed the new LATC members. Ms. Johnson stated that she was appointed to LATC on May 24, 2012. She noted that she owns her own business and previously worked at an engineering firm in Roseville. She stated that she also previously worked at a landscape architecture firm in Clovis and that she graduated from California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo.

Katherine Spitz stated that she is Principal of Katherine Spitz Associates, Inc. in Los Angeles and has been practicing landscape architecture since approximately 1986. She noted that she is also a licensed architect and attended UC Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Architecture.

Mr. Bowden stated that he is Principal of Land Concern, LTD, in Santa Ana and that he has been licensed since 1979. He also stated that he has practiced landscape architecture since 1970. He noted that he served on the Board of Landscape Architects, and was appointed to LATC under Governor Schwarzenegger. He stated that he is now on LATC from an appointment by Governor Brown.

Mr. McCauley read the Oath of Office and swore in Ms. Johnson, Ms. Spitz, and Mr. Bowden as members of the LATC.

Ms. Rodriguez also introduced John Keidel, LATC Special Projects Coordinator, and Jacqueline French, LATC Enforcement Coordinator. She noted that she is currently recruiting for the LATC Licensing Coordinator and LATC Examination Coordinator positions.

D. Program Manager’s Report

Ms. Rodriguez presented the Program Manager’s Report. She explained that BreZE is scheduled to be implemented for LATC in the Phase Three release set for Fall 2013.

Mr. McCauley explained that the Board and LATC were scheduled to be implemented in the same release of BreZE in order to combine efforts.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that recent regulation changes require modifications to the Applicant Tracking System (ATS) in order to accommodate a new, four-section version of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE), administered by the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB). She noted that DCA determined that these modifications were unable to be made to ATS and a workaround solution was required. She explained that LATC has a programmer on-loan from the Contractor's State Licensing Board to develop a workaround solution. She stated that LATC will remain on ATS until approximately August 27, 2012, which will be the same time LATC receives the exam results from the final administration of the five-section LARE administered in June 2012. Mr. Bowden asked why LATC is scheduled for Phase Three release of BreEZe. Mr. McCauley explained that part of it is to let the first phases be implemented to work out as many issues as possible before the Board and LATC transition to the new system.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that LATC has conducted outreach efforts. She stated that since the last LATC meeting, Mr. Taylor gave a presentation at California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, and Steve Lang gave a presentation at the UCLA Extension Certificate Program. She noted there have been outreach efforts to community colleges as well.

LATC discussed the pending regulation package for CCR sections 2615, Form of Examinations, and 2620, Education and Training Credits. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the pending regulation package for CCR section 2615 has been updated to include new cleanup language. She explained that part of the justification for this regulation package is that CLARB allows candidates to schedule themselves for all sections of the LARE, even if LATC deems them eligible to only take sections 1 and 2. Ms. Anderson noted that although candidates can schedule themselves for sections of the LARE, CLARB has each candidate sign an affidavit stating that they have followed the rules for the state in which they are applying for licensure.

Ms. Landregan noted that some states do not have an experience requirement in order to take the LARE. Ms. Rodriguez suggested that a new letter should be sent to candidates to provide them with the most recent information regarding the LARE and that this letter should also be provided to the new LATC members so they can become familiar with LATC correspondence.

Ms. Landregan concurred with this recommendation.

LATC discussed the pending regulation package for CCR section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program. Ms. Rodriguez explained that this regulation package is suspended in anticipation of additional recommended changes as a result of the upcoming UC Extension Certificate Program Task Force meeting.

LATC discussed the pending regulation package for CCR section 2614, Examination Transition Plan. Ms. Rodriguez noted that this regulation package is being expedited in anticipation of the first administration of the new four-section LARE in September 2012. She noted that if the regulation package is not approved by the Office of Administrative Law by the time the first administration of the four-section LARE is administered, LATC will provide transitional credit to candidates.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that members of OPES are in attendance at the meeting and will provide an update on the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) later in the meeting. She also stated that updates on the UC Extension Certificate Program Task Force and the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force will be provided later in the meeting.

E. Report on California Supplemental Examination and Possible Action

Ms. Landregan introduced Judy Geer and Raul Villanueva of OPES to provide an update on the CSE pass rates. Mr. Villanueva stated that there were two factors involved in reviewing the CSE pass rates: candidates and the exam. He noted that candidates are required to have a fair amount of experience and education to take the LARE. He stated that the pass rates on the portions of the five-section LARE that do not have exhibit sections ranged around 70%, and the pass rates on portions of the LARE with exhibit sections ranged around 38%. He explained that this means the portion of the examination with the lower pass rate becomes the “gate” to passing. He explained that the CSE candidate pool consists of the top 38% of candidates who passed the LARE. He stated that when the top performers of a difficult examination take the CSE, it can increase the pass rate.

Mr. Villanueva stated that he reviewed the LARE and CSE for any content overlap that would result in a higher pass rate. He stated that there is overlap between content on the LARE and CSE, particularly on test questions with greater difficulty. He recommended that test questions should move towards items that are more California-specific during future item-writing workshops. He stated that although an 89% pass rate on the CSE is high, it is an appropriate pass rate considering the factors mentioned. He stated that future items should move away from general landscape architecture practice and focus on California-specific practice. He also recommended that LATC develop the item bank by identifying well-performing California-specific content to ensure that the content is current. He noted OPES would continue to monitor pass rate performance.

Ms. Landregan asked if LATC could interact with OPES during the initial item-writing phases to find topics that are California-specific for the next item writing session. She explained that the last time the task analysis was conducted for the CSE, LATC thought the pool of subject matter experts (SME) that was used was too narrow, and many elements that were used on the previous take-home CSE were not used on the new CSE. Mr. Villanueva stated that LATC input is important during the initial stages of the occupational analysis (OA). He noted that the information LATC provides would be given to LATC staff as OPES begins assembling the plan. He stated that the OA should be viewed as an applied research project, in that outside influence should stop at a certain point so data can be collected and evaluated objectively without any kind of undue influence. He stated that it is difficult to have LATC or Board members present during the workshops because their presence alone can have an influence, whether this influence is intentional or not.

Ms. Spitz asked where the appropriate place for LATC input would be during the examination development process. Mr. Villanueva stated the appropriate place would be during planning stages, and during the SME selection process. Ms. Geer noted that during the current exam cycle, OPES received input from the Board, and there were certain issues the Board wanted to be discussed with the SMEs. She stated that the issues were taken into consideration and discussed with the SMEs. Mr. Bowden asked if the current 89% pass rate is representative of the exam performing in a manner to protect the public interest. Mr. Villanueva stated that the pass rate is appropriate given the factors mentioned earlier. Ms. Landregan asked if OPES conducts candidate surveys. Mr. Villanueva stated that OPES intentionally does not gather candidate information as part of the examination development process. Ms. Landregan asked what factors are considered when selecting SMEs in order to test for minimal competency and to protect the

interest of the public. She also asked if OPES seeks SMEs who are younger and more recently licensed. Ms. Geer stated that OPES looks for SMEs with different experience backgrounds, different geographical backgrounds, and especially look for newer licensees to balance out SMEs who have been licensed longer. She stated they look for a balance between younger and older licensees. Ms. Spitz asked what the next steps are in the exam development process. Mr. McCauley stated that since there is opportunity for LATC to provide input in the process, LATC might want to add something to the agenda for the next LATC meeting to address topics for the next OA.

Ms. Geer provided a detailed overview of the OPES examination development process and answered questions from LATC and staff. OPES informational series handouts were provided to LATC. Ms. Landregan thanked Ms. Geer and Mr. Villanueva for providing helpful and detailed presentations.

H.* Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)

Ms. Landregan provided an introductory overview of CLARB to the new LATC members. She described the purpose, structure, and mission of CLARB. She stated CLARB is a service organization of Member Boards and has no authority to license. She noted they conduct examination development for the LARE and strive to cover all necessary material. She stated California is a member of CLARB Region V and Ms. Anderson is the Region V Director. Ms. Landregan announced she is the CLARB Vice President, and is on the ballot to be CLARB President-Elect. She noted that California has the most licensees of any of the CLARB Member Boards so it is important for LATC members to participate in CLARB activities. Ms. Landregan encouraged the new LATC members to be as active as possible with CLARB activities.

Mr. McCauley stated the CLARB membership fee is paid by the LATC and there are no individual membership dues for the LATC members. Ms. Landregan stated that Mr. Taylor and herself nominated the following candidates to the CLARB Nominations and Awards Committee: Frank Basciano, Tom Nieman, and Marjorie Pitz.

Ms. Landregan explained that there was not a quorum when they were nominated, so she suggested a motion to ratify the nominations of these three candidates.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to ratify the nomination of Frank Basciano, Tom Nieman, and Marjorie Pitz to the CLARB Nominations and Awards Committee.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Landregan also suggested a motion to vote for the slate that CLARB has presented for their Board of Directors.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to vote for the CLARB Board of Directors by voting for Dennis Bryers as President, Stephanie Landregan as President-Elect, Jerany Jackson as Vice President, Chris Hoffman as Secretary, and Tim Schmalenberger as Secretary.****

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

***It was noted later in the meeting that two nominees for CLARB Secretary were inadvertently included in the vote for the CLARB Board of Directors slate and a new vote was taken.*

F. Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force Report and Possible Action

Ms. Anderson provided an update on the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force. She stated that the Task Force met on May 24, 2012. She noted that the Task Force is comprised of representatives from LATC, the Board, ASLA, APLD, DCA, the California Landscape Contractors Association, and a California Building Official. She explained that the purpose of the Task Force is to ensure that there is clarity regarding Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5641, Exceptions and Exemptions, and ensure that these provisions protect the public. She stated the Task Force discussed their purpose at length and reviewed BPC section 5641. She noted they examined what kinds of materials would be needed to assist in clarifying BPC section 5641. She stated that the Task Force reviewed laws regarding landscape design from other states and mainly focused on the topic of residential practice. She stated the Task Force also discussed residential design, residential landscape architecture, unlicensed practice, and how building officials interpret BPC section 5641. Ms. Anderson concluded by noting the next meeting date was set for October 18, 2012.

G. University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force Report and Possible Action

Ms. Landregan recused herself from participation in discussion on agenda item G because she is the Director of the UCLA Landscape Architecture Extension Program. She explained that she has a vested interest in any decisions that affect the Program. Ms. Landregan temporarily passed LATC Chair duties to Mr. Bowden for discussion on agenda item G and stepped out of the meeting room.

Ms. Anderson, University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force Chair, provided an update on the Task Force. She stated that LATC provides approval for both the UCLA Extension Certificate Program and the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program. She explained this approval has previously been conducted on a five-year cycle. She stated that the last time the approval was conducted, LATC identified recent changes to LAAB's requirements for Bachelor's and Master's Degree programs. She suggested that they needed to incorporate similar changes into the LATC approval process. She conveyed the importance for LATC to align with LAAB requirements because it reduces workload and provides an introduction into developing LATC procedures. She explained that since these changes needed to be made, LATC gave both extension programs an extension of two years, extending their approvals to December 2013. She elaborated that the last time the site reviews were conducted, the site review teams encountered several operational issues such as there were no forms to use in evaluating the

programs and there were no training procedures for the site review teams. She recommended that these items be developed before the next site review. Ms. Anderson noted that the Task Force was appointed during the last Strategic Planning session in January 2012. She noted that the Task Force has a balance of members from both the professional and educational side of landscape architecture. She noted that the Task Force also has members who have been on the LAAB accreditation teams. She indicated that LATC needs to ensure that the Task Force members know that the site review teams will also be chosen from the members of the Task Force.

Ms. Anderson explained that at the June 27, 2012, Task Force meeting, the Task Force identified the potential need to specify a fee for review of the programs in order to fund the cost of reviewing the programs. She stated that the Task Force hopes to meet one more time before the next LATC meeting for their approval of any modifications to the proposed language for CCR section 2620.5, and for subsequent approval by the Board. Ms. Rodriguez noted that the next LATC meeting would be some time in November 2012. She explained that the review and approval procedures would not need to be presented to the Board for approval since they are not regulatory in nature. Mr. Bowden asked if Ms. Anderson expects the development of the review and approval procedures to be complete before the next LATC meeting. Ms. Anderson stated that she believes they will be able to complete the review and approval procedures but she is concerned that follow-up tasks may come out of the next meeting. She stated that she hopes to have a final draft of the procedures document for review and approval at the next LATC meeting.

Mr. Bowden explained that the UCLA Extension Certificate Program requires a Bachelor's degree to enter the program, but the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program does not. He asked Ms. Anderson if the review and approval procedures would address this issue. Ms. Anderson explained that it is important for LATC to provide the criteria for approval and to align the guidelines with LAAB as much as possible. She stated that this issue will be taken into consideration in development of the procedures.

Ms. Spitz asked how far the extension certificate programs are from meeting current LAAB requirements. Ms. Anderson explained that the difference is that LAAB accredits degree programs and LATC will approve certificate programs. She noted that they are two different entities requiring different evaluation criteria.

Ms. Anderson noted that LATC should be aware that the LAAB Board of Trustees is currently reviewing a proposal to change the LAAB requirements to allow for non-first degree granting programs to be accredited by LAAB. She stated this would take approval duties away from LATC and put the responsibility with LAAB. She stated that she is in favor of this because she does not believe LATC should be approving programs. Mr. Bowden asked if any items needed to be voted on or if any follow-up action is needed. Ms. Anderson reiterated that the Task Force members need to know that the site review teams will also be chosen from the members of the Task Force. Ms. Rodriguez stated that she and Ms. Anderson will ensure the Task Force members are aware of this.

I. Review and Discuss Application Fee for Approval of Landscape Architecture School and Possible Action

Mr. Bowden introduced Agenda Item I and asked if a fee has ever been charged for the application for approval of a school of landscape architecture since BPC section 5681, Fee Schedule, was modified to authorize it. Ms. Rodriguez replied that a fee has never been charged. She explained that although the fee is authorized in BPC section 5681, it must also be specified in regulation for LATC to have the authority to charge it. She noted that this requires a change of LATC regulations. She explained that this agenda item is being presented for LATC to decide if a fee should be specified in regulation, and Ms. Spitz asked what the \$600 fee amount in BPC section 5681 was based on. Mr. Keidel stated that the fee was based on a cost-sharing proposal between three landscape architecture schools at UCLA, UC Berkeley, and UC Irvine. He stated that the fee amount included review costs at the time the statute was established and meant to mirror the costs of ASLA accreditation. Ms. Mayer noted that BPC section 5681 would need to be changed in the Legislature in order to increase the fee amount. She explained that LATC should first determine if they want to charge a fee. She stated that if they want to charge the fee, they must then determine the amount. Ms. Rodriguez added that LATC has paid for the entire cost of the approvals in the past.

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Duke to explain the regulation process after LATC makes a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Duke stated that after the Board votes to approve LATC's recommendation, LATC would need to take action to establish a rulemaking file and begin the process. Ms. Anderson stated that LATC would not be able to charge the fee until the regulation was signed into law.

Ms. Anderson indicated that LAAB charges at least \$1,200 annually for accreditation. She explained that one of the reasons the fee should be established is to ensure that a new school makes a valid effort to meet the criteria for approval when they apply.

Mr. Bowden asked if LAAB accreditation would replace LATC approval if LAAB decides to allow the accreditation of extension certificate programs. Ms. Mayer explained that it could possibly replace LATC approval and would likely require changes to the regulations.

Ms. Mayer noted that the current regulation package for CCR section 2620.5 states that schools are to be approved for a period of seven years, and it is unclear how to implement a \$600 fee on a biennial basis with a seven-year approval period. Mr. Duke stated that clarification is needed from Don Chang, DCA legal counsel, on how to implement the \$600 fee. He also noted that the proposed regulation package for CCR section 2620.5 does not include any provisions for removing approval from a school and it will be important to include this to address this situation.

- **Katherine Spitz made a motion to charge the maximum allowable fee for the approval of a school of landscape architecture.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Spitz asked if LATC could discuss raising the application fee at the next LATC meeting. Mr. McCauley stated that it could be an issue that is raised at the Strategic Planning session. Ms. Rodriguez noted that a cost analysis would also be needed to justify raising the fee.

H.* Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)

Ms. Landregan was summoned back to the meeting and Mr. Bowden transferred Chair duties back to Ms. Landregan. Mr. McCauley stated that LATC needed to revisit Agenda Item H to vote on the CLARB Board of Directors Secretary since two nominees for the Secretary position were inadvertently voted for earlier in the meeting.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to amend his previous motion to approve the vote for the CLARB Board of Directors, by voting for Dennis Bryers as President, Stephanie Landregan as President-Elect, Jerany Jackson as Vice President, and Tim Schmalenberger as Secretary.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

J. Election of LATC Officers

Mr. Duke provided an overview of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act of 2004 for the new LATC members. He explained that this act covers all state boards and commissions and it ensures an opportunity for public participation in all public meetings. Mr. Duke reviewed a handout of the top ten rules of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. Ms. Berstler asked if there are any Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act restrictions concerning dialogue in social media outlets such as Facebook and LinkedIn. Mr. Duke explained that the same restrictions regarding email conversations would apply to discussions held over social media outlets. He cautioned against using a social media outlet to discuss LATC matters.

Ms. Landregan stated that election of LATC officers typically occurs in the summer of each year. She stated that she is interested in the LATC Chair position.

- **Katherine Spitz made a motion to elect Stephanie Landregan as LATC Chair.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Landregan temporarily passed Chair duties to Mr. Bowden so that she could make a motion.

- **Stephanie Landregan made a motion to elect Andrew Bowden as LATC Vice Chair.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Bowden transferred Chair duties back to Ms. Landregan.

K. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

November 14, 2012, location TBD

Adjourn

- **Stephanie Landregan adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate the arrival of the Chair of the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*

Agenda Item C

PROGRAM MANAGER'S REPORT

The Program Manager's Report provides a synopsis of current activities and is attached for the LATC's review along with other program updates.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Program Manager's Report
2. Outreach Survey Results
3. CC/ASLA Bill Tracking List

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Program Manager's Report

November 14, 2012

ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT

Committee Members

An election of the LATC officers was held at the August 14, 2012 meeting. Stephanie Landregan was elected Chair and Andrew Bowden was elected Vice Chair.

BreEZe Project

The BreEZe Project is the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA) program that provides the DCA organizations an enterprise system that supports all applicant tracking, licensing, renewal, enforcement, monitoring, cashiering, and management capabilities. BreEZe will support the DCA's highest priority initiatives of Job Creation and Consumer Protection by replacing the DCA's aging legacy business systems with an integrated software solution that utilizes current technologies to facilitate increased efficiencies in the DCA boards' and bureaus' licensing and enforcement programs.

BreEZe will be web-enabled to allow application, renewal, and payment processing via the Internet for applicants and licensees. Furthermore, BreEZe will allow the public to file complaints and look up licensee information and complaint status through the Internet. As part of the BreEZe implementation, interfaces to electronically share data with internal and external systems will be established; existing data will be converted and migrated into BreEZe; user training will be conducted; and system documentation will be created.

BreEZe will be implemented in three phases and LATC will be part of phase three, planned for Fall 2013. The implementation date for phase one release of BreEZe has been temporarily delayed while the vendor works out several stability issues with Office of Information Systems (OIS). A new release date has not yet been provided by OIS for phase one. As of November 7, 2012, the software vendor is performing BreEZe System Testing while DCA prepares for the User-Acceptance Testing (UAT) phase of implementation. UAT is a process to obtain confirmation that a system meets mutually agreed-upon requirements. OIS will continue to update LATC as BreEZe implementation moves forward.

Applicant Tracking System (ATS)/Workaround System (WAS)

LATC staff worked closely with OIS to determine ATS requirements and temporary manual processes necessary to implement regulation changes (i.e., examination transition, educational credit for partial degrees and architectural degrees, etc.) concurrently with the implementation of the DCA BreEZe enterprise system. On April 17, 2012, LATC staff attended a DCA Business Technical Review (BTR) meeting to determine if the necessary ATS changes that resulted from the recent LATC regulation changes could be made to ATS. The BTR was also charged with making a recommendation to DCA's Change Control Board (CCB). As a result of this meeting, the BTR members determined that resources devoted to BreEZe were needed to make the

necessary changes to ATS and the BreEZe project would be negatively impacted if resources were diverted from it. The BTR members recommended that all of LATC's automated processes normally done under ATS (cashiering, application evaluation, exam eligibility, etc.) be discontinued and converted to manual workaround processes until the LATC transitions to BreEZe in the fall of 2013. On April 23, 2012, the BTR's decision was appealed before the CCB. The CCB concurred with BTR's recommendation and denied the LATC's request to modify ATS. LATC was presented with the alternatives and recommendations at its meeting on May 4, 2012.

In response to the decision of the CCB, a DCA programmer on loan from the Contractors State License Board began development of a new and separate WAS. LATC staff worked closely with OIS to ensure the manual processes were developed and implemented with minimal impact when LATC transitions to BreEZe. Staff created flowcharts for specific business processes for the development of the WAS. The DCA programmer met with LATC staff on June 28, 2012, to conduct an assessment of the time and work required to develop the WAS. He provided the results of his assessment to staff on July 2, 2012, and estimated approximately 55-68 hours needed to complete the WAS. The programmer and staff meet regularly to assess various LATC business processes. On July 23, 2012, the programmer provided a test version of the user interface for the WAS to solicit feedback from staff on the program's functionality. On August 16, 2012, the programmer provided an updated test version of the WAS and the related server. Staff was provided training on how to use the server. The programmer met with ATS and BreEZe staff on August 27, 2012, to discuss the possible system requirements for transition to BreEZe. The ATS disconnection deadline was temporarily extended to allow the programmer to complete development of the WAS and properly test it with LATC staff. The programmer delivered the first release of the WAS to LATC for testing on October 2, 2012. LATC staff worked with the programmer to debug the initial WAS release until October 26, 2012, when LATC was cut-off from all functions of ATS except cashiering. LATC staff continue to work with OIS to ensure a smooth transition from ATS to WAS.

Outreach

An outreach presentation was provided to students by Stephanie Landregan on November 5, 2012, at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. The LATC updated its presentation material to include the new exam structures of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination.

Approximately 35 students attended the outreach presentation. Surveys were provided to each attendee of the presentation. Thirty-three surveys were collected. The presentation was well received. Survey results are attached.

Regulatory Changes

CCR sections 2615, Form of Examinations, and 2620, Education and Training Credit – CLARB will, in September 2012, implement modest structural changes to the LARE better aligning its content with the current practice of landscape architecture. CCR section 2615 was recently amended to allow a candidate with a landscape architect degree or a landscape architect extension certificate to take the multiple choice sections of the LARE. The multiple choice sections of the LARE are currently sections A, B, and D. However, when the LARE transitions

in September from a five-section exam to a four-section exam, each section will be comprised of multiple choice items. Section 2615 must be amended to clarify that such candidates should only be allowed to take sections 1 and 2 of the new LARE. Additionally, an amendment is necessary to clearly specify the LATC will not recognize the LARE scores for sections 3 and 4 if a candidate takes the sections when not eligible at the time it was administered.

The Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) is the accrediting organization for landscape architectural programs. LAAB released their updated “Accreditation Standards And Procedures” publication on February 6, 2010. CCR section 2620 needs to be updated to reflect this change. CCR section 2620(a)(4) includes the phrase “city/community college.” This phrase needs to be corrected to say “community college” and avoid redundancy. Following is a chronology, to date, of the processing of the regulatory proposal for CCR sections 2615 and 2620:

May 4, 2012	Proposed regulatory changes approved by LATC
May 18, 2012	Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations published by Office of Administrative Law (OAL)
June 22, 2012	Notice of Change of Date of Regulatory Hearing and Extension of Written Comment Period published by OAL (Hearing date changed and written comment period extended to allow time to notify interested parties)
August 6, 2012	Public hearing, no public comments received
August 28, 2012	Final rulemaking file to DCA Legal Office
October 29, 2012	Final rulemaking file received from DCA Legal Office
October 31, 2012	Final rulemaking file to OAL

CCR section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program - LATC reviews landscape architecture extension certificate programs in California approximately every five years in order to determine the programs’ adherence to the requirements under CCR section 2620.5. Examination candidates may receive educational credit for landscape architecture certificates from extension programs approved by LATC. Currently, there are two landscape architecture extension certificate programs in the state of California; UCLA and University of California Berkeley (UCB).

On October 22, 2009, LATC recommended that the current extension certificate requirements be revised, if necessary, to ensure that the proposed updates made by LAAB pertaining to public health, safety, and welfare are also reflected in the extension certificate program requirements.

Since the UCLA and UCB Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Programs’ approval were set to expire in 2010, at its July 28, 2010, meeting, LATC extended these programs’ expiration dates until 2012 in order to allow sufficient time to re-evaluate the current requirements and proceed with the rulemaking process, if needed.

LATC staff, along with then member Christine Anderson and Legal Counsel Don Chang, worked together in reviewing the current California standards contained in the regulations as well as the recently updated LAAB standards. Since the LAAB standards are broad, not state specific, and mostly apply to four-year baccalaureate institutions, the workgroup decided not to rely on the LAAB standards for the update but rather to revise the standards based on California

needs. Some of the key changes recommended by the workgroup involved an annual report from each landscape architecture extension certificate program to update LATC on changes between review cycles, currently not defined in section 2620.5. As the public agency responsible for the protection of the consumer, the workgroup identified the need to incorporate health, safety and welfare on all program curriculum areas. Both California extension certificate programs provided feedback on the proposed regulatory changes identified by the workgroup.

At the November 22, 2010, LATC meeting, Committee members reviewed and approved, with minor changes, the proposed language to amend CCR section 2620.5. A few of the significant revisions in this regulatory proposal include: adding a “public policy and regulation” criterion; requiring nine specified areas of study to cover public health, safety, and welfare; allowing the program’s instructional personnel to hold a certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture; and establishing an annual review process that gives the Board the option to further evaluate each program, if desired.

At its December 15-16, 2010, meeting, the Board approved the proposed regulation to amend CCR section 2620.5 and delegated authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the regulation provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and to make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.

Since the last UC Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program reviews were conducted in 2006, the next reviews were due in 2011. During the November 16, 2011 LATC meeting, the UC extension program directors, present at the meeting, were asked if they could provide a voluntary update on their certificate programs in March 2012 with the self-evaluation reports completed by December 2013. A letter was mailed out to the extension certificate program directors extending their current certification through December 31, 2013.

Following is a chronology to date, of the processing of LATC’s regulatory proposal for CCR 2620.5:

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| November 22, 2010 | Proposed regulatory changes approved by LATC |
| December 15, 2010 | Final approval by the Board |
| June 22, 2012 | Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations published by OAL
(Notice re-published to allow time to notify interested parties) |
| August 6, 2012 | Public hearing, no public comments received |

Note: Further action on the regulation package for CCR section 2620.5 was temporarily suspended due to the potential for further recommended changes to the regulatory language that could arise from the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force meetings (see Agenda G).

CCR section 2614 Examination Transition Plan – The existing regulation sets forth the transition plan for previous divisions of the licensing examination to the divisions of LARE through June 2012. This proposal would amend CCR section 2614 by adding subsections (f)(1) – (4), thus establishing a transition plan for those candidates who passed sections of previously administered landscape architect licensing examinations into the new four section LARE when it transitions in September 2012. Following is a chronology to date, of the processing of LATC’s regulatory proposal for CCR 2614:

November 16, 2011	Proposed regulatory changes approved by LATC
December 7, 2011	Final approval by the Board
June 22, 2012	Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations published by OAL (Notice re-published to allow time to notify interested parties)
August 6, 2012	Public hearing, no public comments received
August 7, 2012	Final rulemaking file to DCA Legal Office
October 4, 2012	Final rulemaking file received from DCA Legal Office
October 5, 2012	15-Day Notice of Availability of Modified Language Posted, no public comments received
October 22, 2012	Final rulemaking file to DCA Legal Office with a request for an expedited review

LATC Website

Landscape Architect Registration Examination – The following exam administration dates were posted on the website:

September 10-22, 2012 Sections 1 & 2
 December 3-15, 2012 Sections 3 & 4
 April 8-20, 2013, Sections 1, 2, 3, & 4
 August 19-30, 2013, Sections 1, 2, 3, & 4
 December 2-14, 2013, Sections 1, 2, 3, & 4

Web License Lookup – LATC currently receives a monthly report of licensees from OIS. The BreEZe team has indicated that BreEZe will include a function to accommodate the automated licensee lookup functionality when BreEZe is implemented for LATC in Fall 2013.

The LATC website was updated to include a current list of schools that offer Associate Degree Programs in landscape architecture.

LATC EXAMINATION PROGRAM

Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) – Upcoming Changes

The LARE, which is developed by CLARB, previously consisted of five sections. The multiple-choice sections (A, B, and D) are computer-delivered and normally administered in March and September of each year. The graphic performance sections (C and E) are “pencil and paper” format examinations and normally administered in June and December of each year.

The LARE transitioned from a five section (A-E) exam to a four section (1-4) exam commencing with the first administration of sections 1 and 2 on September 10 – 22, 2012. Exam sections 3 and 4 will be administered on December 3 – 15, 2012.

A regulatory proposal to amend CCR 2614, Examination Transition Plan, and allow transitional credit for the new sections of the LARE was noticed on June 22, 2012. See section under Regulatory Changes above for additional information.

California Supplemental Examination (CSE)

The Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) entered into an Intra-Agency Contract Agreement with the LATC to redevelop the CSE during fiscal year 2010/2011, and has developed and administered (through an exam vendor) the exam since 2007. OPES conducted five examination development workshops in Sacramento September 2010 through March 2011, and the new CSE was introduced to candidates in August 2011.

OPES will provide information on the test development process and validation, and report on the results of the CSE later in the meeting. In addition, LATC should begin the process of a new occupational analysis. OPES will provide an overview of the intra-agency contract process and occupational analysis standard project plan.

University of California Extension Certificate Program

At the January 2012 LATC strategic planning meeting, members were appointed to a task force and charged to develop procedures for reviewing the extension certificate programs and conduct the reviews of the programs utilizing the new procedures, as outlined in CCR section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program). The University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force met on June 27, 2012, October 8, 2012, and November 2, 2012. An update of the meeting will be provided by the Task Force chair at today's meeting.

ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

Exempt Area of Practice

LATC held its annual strategic planning session on January 23-24, 2012. Outlined in the plan, was an objective to appoint and convene a task force to review the exempt area of practice Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5641, *Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions*. Members of various professional organizations were asked to nominate members to this task force. The task force was assembled and is comprised of members from LATC, California Architects Board, California Council/American Society of Landscape Architecture (CC/ASLA), California Landscape Contractors Association (CLCA), the Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD), as well as past LATC staff and Committee members.

The task force met on May 24, 2012, and discussed the exempt area of practice, BPC section 5641, and any issues or concerns relating to the unlicensed practice of landscape architecture. Several action items came out of the meeting which were further reviewed and discussed at the October 18, 2012, Task Force meeting in Sacramento. An update of the meeting will be provided by a member of the Task Force at today's meeting.

Complaint Statistics

(1st Quarter 2012 & 2011)	2012			2011		
	July	August	September	July	August	September
Complaints Opened	4	3	2	1	0	4
Complaints to Expert	0	1	0	0	0	0
Complaints to DOI	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints Pending DOI	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints Pending AG	0	0	0	1	1	0
Complaints Pending DA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints Pending	30	31	30	57	48	39
Complaints Closed	0	2	3	1	9	13
Settlement Cases (§5678.5) Opened	0	0	0	0	0	1
Settlement Cases (§5678.5) Pending	3	3	3	0	0	1
Settlement Cases (§5678.5) Closed	0	0	0	0	0	0
Citations Final	0	0	1	0	0	0

Student Outreach Presentation Survey Results

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona – November 5, 2012

How well did we achieve our meeting objectives?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. The presentation was informative. I learned more about pathways to licensure than I already knew.	25	8	0	0	0
	76%	24%	-	-	-
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation was very thorough • The speaker was clear and concise and very informational • Did not know about all the other committees • I had no idea how the test was designed until now • I learn a lot of information about licensure 					
2. I understand the importance of licensure and how it relates to the public's health, safety, and welfare.	27	6	0	0	0
	82%	18%	-	-	-
Comments: <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>					
3. I now know what I have to do to become licensed.	24	9	0	0	0
	73%	27%	-	-	-
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I knew a bit beforehand, however this lecture filled in several blank spots 					

4. I could have used this information earlier.	14	11	5	1	2
	42%	33%	15%	3%	6%
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This information came just in time • I would love to learn this and have a class about this • No, just on time. I have not started to process of LARE testing • For planning purposes I wish I had known this sooner to prepare for some of the things I didn't know • I think this presentation should be given during 3rd year here at Cal Poly Pomona 					
5. The presentation answered all of my questions.	12	18	0	0	3
	36%	55%	-	-	9%
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes and made me aware of other themes I hadn't even considered 					
6. The handouts were useful and comprehensive.	17	15	0	0	1
	52%	45%	-	-	3%
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I appreciate the info and packet that was handed 					
7. If you answered "Disagree", or "Strongly Disagree", to any of the questions above, please provide details of your experience and any suggested improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have not started the LARE test yet, so I disagreed with the "I could have used this sooner" question • #4 I think that this 4th and final year is the perfect time to be concerned about licensure • Covers the basic info of LARE tests • I don't think that I have been hindered by not knowing the information before • Is useful for a base of information for what you are going to do after college • I really enjoy the preview of the test and examples. Thank you 					

8. How will you use the information received today?

- This information had facilitated and thoroughly explained how to obtain the license. It will keep me on track and potentially help me to pass
- I will continue to prepare for new information to work with
- Prior to this lecture, I was not too interested in taking the LARE test, but this definitely made me re-evaluate that though
- To continue to retain and have knowledge, skills and abilities to be better prepared for test; acquire internship as soon as possible
- Study and take the test
- I will check into details of taking exam asap, look at CLARB website and start reading the STDS book
- I will use this information for my lecture exam. I know where to look for exam information
- Prepare myself for the test
- I will use the information for my future if I am going to get the license
- I aspire to eventually obtain my licensure
- Check out the website to see if there's more info
- To continue my pursuit for licensure
- I will use it as a vase for my 5 year plan after college
- I will use this info to get aware of books in order to be successful
- Based on the information I received, I now know how to prepare for the test
- I will take section 1 and 2 right after graduation
- I will be looking forward to take the test section 1 and 2 next year after my graduation
- I will use the information I received today to study for the test in the future as well as broader my knowledge in general about landscape architecture and the knowledge that it requires
- I will use them to better prepare me for the exam after I graduate
- I will look up and acquaint myself with LATC and CSE to assist in my preparation towards licensure
- I wasn't too sure about what was on the test and now I know
- Beginning to review some of
- Think about it 3rd quarter
- Start gathering resources and study in free time
- The information I received today I plan to use it to guide me through the process to get my license

9. Please use this space to include any other comments not covered in the questions above.

- Thanks for the book and handout

Rodriguez, Trish@DCA

From: Terri Thomas <tthomas@thomadv.com>
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2012 8:58 AM
To: Rodriguez, Trish@DCA
Subject: FW: Emailing: Print Report/Per your request. TT

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CC/ASLA**AB 685 (Eng D) State water policy.**

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/25/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/25/2012-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 524, Statutes of 2012.

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/25/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law establishes various state water policies, including the policy that the use of water for domestic purposes is the highest use of water. This bill would declare that it is the established policy of the state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. The bill would require all relevant state agencies, including the Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the State Department of Public Health, to consider this state policy when revising, adopting, or establishing policies, regulations, and grant criteria when those policies, regulations, and grant criteria are pertinent to the uses of water described above.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

Notes 1: 6/3/2011 A-03/31/2011 to: WATCH

AB 819 (Wieckowski D) Bikeways.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/28/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/28/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 716, Statutes of 2012

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/28/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with county and city governments, to establish minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways, and authorizes cities, counties, and local agencies to establish bikeways. Existing law requires all city, county, regional, and other local agencies responsible for the development or operation of bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted to utilize all minimum safety design criteria and uniform specifications and symbols for signs, markers, and traffic control devices established pursuant to specified provisions of existing law. This bill would require the department to establish, by June 30, 2013, procedures for

cities, counties, and local agencies to be granted exceptions from the requirement to use those criteria and specifications for purposes of research, experimentation, testing, evaluation, or verification. The bill would require the department, by November 1, 2014, to report to the transportation policy committees of both houses of the Legislature the steps that the department has taken to implement those requirements, including, but not limited to, information regarding requests received and granted by the department from July 1, 2013, to June 30, 2014, inclusive, for those exceptions, and the reasons the department rejected any requests for those exceptions.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

Notes 1: 3/9/2011 I-02/17/2011 to: WATCH

AB 1478 (Blumenfield D) State Parks: finances.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/25/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/25/2012-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 530, Statutes of 2012.

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/25/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law establishes, in the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Park and Recreation Commission consisting of 9 members appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Existing law requires the commission, among other things, to establish general policies for the guidance of the Director of Parks and Recreation in the administration, protection, and development of the state park system. This bill would establish qualification criteria for the members of the commission, including requiring one member to have demonstrated expertise in cultural or historical resources management. The bill would require the Speaker of the Assembly and the Senate Committee on Rules to each appoint one ex officio legislative member. The bill would require the commission to evaluate and assess the department's deferred obligations. The bill would also authorize the commission to, among other things, conduct an annual workshop to review the department's annual operating budget and proposed capital improvement projects. The bill would appropriate \$120,000 annually in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 fiscal years from the State Parks and Recreation Fund to the commission to perform these activities. The bill would appropriate \$20,500,000 from the State Parks and Recreation Fund to the department for expenditure as specified. The bill would prohibit the department from closing or proposing the closure of a state park in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 fiscal years. The bill would also appropriate \$10,000,000 from the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Water Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006, to be expended as specified, including for purposes of capital outlay and support for capital outlay projects of a state park. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1487 (Committee on Budget) State government: state funds.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/17/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/17/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 343, Statutes of 2012

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/17/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law requires every state agency and court for which an appropriation has been made to submit to the Department of Finance for approval, a complete and detailed budget at such time and in such form as may be prescribed by the department, setting forth all proposed expenditures and estimated revenues for the ensuing fiscal year. Existing law requires the Department of Finance to, among other things, develop, issue, and implement consistent and adequate guidelines to be utilized by agencies required to submit budgets to the department. This bill would require the Controller to submit a newly modified annual report to the Governor, to instead be referred to as the budgetary-legal basis annual report. The bill would require the budgetary-legal basis annual report to account for prior year adjustments, fund balances, encumbrances, deferred payroll, revenues, expenditures, and other components on the same basis as that of the applicable Governor's Budget and Budget Act. The bill would require the Controller to confer with the Department of Finance to propose and develop methods to facilitate these changes. The bill would require the annual reports of the Controller to be posted on the Internet Web site of the Controller, and would authorize the Controller to charge a reasonable fee for providing copies of those reports, not to exceed the costs thereof. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1585 (John A. Pá©rez D) Community development.**Current Text:** Chaptered: 9/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/29/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 777, Statutes of 2012**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 9/29/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies. Existing law authorizes the city, county, or city and county that authorized the creation of a redevelopment agency to retain the housing assets, functions, and powers previously performed by the redevelopment agency, excluding amounts on deposit in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. Existing law creates the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund to be used for these purposes, and provides that funds in that account shall be used in accordance with applicable housing-related provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law. This bill would make conforming changes to clarify that specified provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law relating to the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund apply for purposes of funding administrative and planning costs associated with the implementation of the provisions described above. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1588 (Atkins D) Professions and vocations: reservist licensees: fees and continuing education.**Current Text:** Chaptered: 9/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/29/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 742, Statutes of 2012**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 9/29/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law provides for the regulation of various professions and vocations by boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs and for the licensure or registration of individuals in that regard. Existing law authorizes any licensee whose license expired while he or she was on active duty as a member of the California National Guard or the United States Armed Forces to reinstate his or her license without examination or penalty if certain requirements are met. This bill would require the boards described above, with certain exceptions, to waive the renewal fees, continuing education requirements, and other renewal requirements as determined by the board, if any are applicable, of any licensee or registrant who is called to active duty as a member of the United States Armed Forces or the California National Guard if certain requirements are met. The bill would, except as specified, prohibit a licensee or registrant from engaging in any activities requiring a license while a waiver is in effect. The bill would require a licensee or registrant to meet certain renewal requirements within a specified time period after being discharged from active duty service prior to engaging in any activity requiring a license. The bill would require a licensee or registrant to notify the board of his or her discharge from active duty within a specified time period.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1750 (Solorio D) Rainwater Capture Act of 2012.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/25/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/25/2012-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 537, Statutes of 2012.

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/25/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Under existing law, the State Water Resources Control Board (state board) and the California regional water quality control boards prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge of stormwater in accordance with the national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit program and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Under existing law, the state board administers a water rights program pursuant to which the state board grants permits and licenses to appropriate water, upon an application to appropriate water. This bill would enact the Rainwater Capture Act of 2012, which would provide that use of rainwater collected from rooftops does not require a water right permit from the state board. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	CONCERNS				

AB 1822 (Berryhill, Bill R) California Architects Board.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/14/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/14/2012-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 317, Statutes of 2012.

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/14/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law, the Architects Practice Act, provides for the licensure and regulation of architects by the California Architects Board, which consists of 5 architect members appointed by the Governor, 3 public members appointed by the Governor, and 2 public members appointed by the Legislature, as specified. Existing law requires these members to serve 4-year terms. This bill would provide for the staggering of the terms of the members

appointed by the Governor whose terms commence on specified dates by requiring certain of those members to serve 5- and 6-year terms, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1879 (Gaines, Beth R) Disability access: State Architect.

Current Text: Introduced: 2/22/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 5/25/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(8). (Last location was A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 4/25/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 5/25/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law requires the Division of the State Architect to develop and submit building standards regulations, including regulations to increase accessibility to buildings, structures, sidewalks, and curbs by persons with disabilities. These standards are required to be at least as high as those promulgated under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act. Existing law also requires the Division of the State Architect to submit proposed amendments to the California Code of Regulations to the United States Department of Justice to ensure that California's accessibility building standards are consistent with federal regulations. This bill would require the State Architect to prepare a report containing all federal and state disability access regulations and noting any state disability access regulations that are in direct conflict with federal disability access regulations. This would require the State Architect to make the report available to the Governor and the Legislature by January 1, 2014, in the form that the State Architect decides is the least costly. This reporting provision would become inoperative as of January 1, 2017.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1963 (Huber D) Income taxes: sales and use taxes: Legislative Analyst's Office: report.

Current Text: Vetoed: 9/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/29/2012-Vetoed by the Governor

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/29/2012-A. VETOED

Summary: Existing law imposes taxes based upon taxable income, at specified rates, and imposes state sales and use taxes on retailers and on the storage, use, or other consumption of tangible personal property in this state. This bill would require the Legislative Analyst's Office to assess potential changes to the laws described above in order to reduce revenue volatility and to provide a report including these assessments to the Legislature on or before July 1, 2013. This bill also would repeal obsolete provisions requiring a report by the Legislative Analyst to the Legislature in 2004.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	NEUTRAL				

AB 1965 (Pan D) Land use.**Current Text:** Chaptered: 9/25/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/25/2012-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 554, Statutes of 2012.**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 9/25/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law requires the Department of Water Resources to develop preliminary maps for the 100- and 200-year flood plains protected by project levees, as specified, and to provide the preliminary maps to cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley. This bill would additionally require the department, on or before July 2, 2013, to release floodplain maps, as specified, and the available data as to the water surface elevation of flooding in urban areas, as specified. The bill would provide that the department's issuance of floodplain maps are not subject to the review and approval of the Office of Administrative Law, as specified. The bill would provide that the state or any state agency is not liable for any claim based upon the reasonable exercise or performance of a discretionary or ministerial function or duty pursuant to this provision. The bill would incorporate additional changes pursuant to SB 1278, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 1989 (Carter D) State parks: bicycle facilities.**Current Text:** Amended: 4/18/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 4/27/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(5). (Last location was A. W., P. & W. on 4/19/2012)**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 4/27/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law vests the Department of Parks and Recreation with control of the state park system and specifies that certain funds are available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for state park planning, acquisition, and development projects, among other things. Existing law imposes various taxes, including taxes on the privilege of engaging in certain activities. The Fee Collection Procedures Law, the violation of which is a crime, provides procedures for the collection of certain fees and surcharges. This bill would, on and after January 1, 2013, impose a surcharge on every retailer for the privilege of selling a new bicycle in this state at the rate of \$2 per new bicycle. This would constitute a change in state statute that would result in a taxpayer paying a higher tax within the meaning of Section 3 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, and thus would require for passage the approval of 2/3 of the membership of each house of the Legislature. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2021 (Wagner R) Works of improvement: disputed amounts.**Current Text:** Amended: 8/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/1/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was S. THIRD READING on 8/30/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/1/2012-S. DEAD

Summary: Existing law contains various provisions relating to contracts for the performance of private works of improvement, including provisions for the withholding and disbursement of retention proceeds. Existing law provides that, with respect to those contracts for works of improvement, the retention proceeds withheld from any payment may not exceed 150% of the disputed amount. This bill would increase the amount that may be withheld from progress payments or final payments, depending on the circumstances, to a sum of various amounts and percentages, as specified.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2117 (Gorell R) Waste discharge requirements: stormwater.

Current Text: Amended: 5/1/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 5/25/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(8). (Last location was A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/16/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 5/25/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Under existing law, the State Water Resources Control Board (state board) and the California regional water quality control boards prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge of stormwater in accordance with the federal national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit program. Existing law requires the state board or the regional boards to issue waste discharge requirements which apply and ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and any more stringent effluent standards or limitations necessary to implement water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses, or to prevent nuisance. This bill would require the state board, in consultation with affected stakeholders, to prepare a comprehensive statewide stormwater plan, as prescribed, and submit the plan to the Legislature, by January 1, 2015, subject to agreement by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to provide grant money to cover the cost of preparing the plan .

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2215 (Nestande R) Tax reform.

Current Text: Introduced: 2/24/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 5/11/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(6). (Last location was A. PRINT on 2/24/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 5/11/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law imposes various taxes, including an ad valorem property tax, taxes upon personal and corporate income, a tax on retailers measured by the gross receipts from the sale of tangible personal property sold at retail in this state, or on the storage, use, or other consumption in this state of tangible personal property purchased from a retailer for storage, use, or other consumption in this state, and an annual license fee for any vehicle subject to

registration in this state. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would reform California's tax structure.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2237 (Monning D) Contractors: definition.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/19/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/19/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 371, Statutes of 2012

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/19/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law, the Contractors' State License Law, creates the Contractors' State License Board within the Department of Consumer Affairs and provides for the licensure and regulation of contractors. Existing law defines the term "contractor" to include, among others, any person or consultant to an owner-builder who undertakes, offers to undertake, or submits a bid to construct a building or home improvement project. Existing law requires applicants and licensed contractors to pay specified fees that are deposited into the continuously appropriated Contractors' License Fund. Under existing law, it is a crime for a person to act as a contractor without a license. This bill would define the term "consultant" for purposes of the definition of a contractor to include a person who provides a bid, or who arranges for and sets up work schedules and maintains oversight of a construction project, with respect to a home improvement contract, as specified. Because consultants who provide the above-described services would be required to pay license fees which are deposited into the Contractors' License Fund, the bill would make an appropriation. Because this bill would expand the scope of an existing crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2245 (Smyth R) Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: bicycle lanes.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/28/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/28/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 680, Statutes of 2012

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/28/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would, until January 1, 2018, exempt from CEQA the restriping of streets and highways for bicycle lanes in an urbanized area that is consistent with a prepared bicycle transportation plan. A lead agency would be required to take specified actions with regard to making an assessment of traffic and

safety impact and holding hearings before determining a project is exempt. The bill would require a state agency, that determines that a project is exempt under this provision, and approves or determines to carry out that project, to file a notice of the determination with OPR. The bill would require a local agency, that determines that a project is exempt under this provision, and approves or determines to carry out that project, to file a notice of determination with OPR and the county clerk in the county in which the project is located. This bill contains other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	SUPPORT				

Notes 1: Support ltr. 4/19/12
Request for Signature ltr. 8/27/12

AB 2311 (Atkins D) Stormwater Resource Planning Act.

Current Text: Introduced: 2/24/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 5/11/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(6). (Last location was A. PRINT on 2/24/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 5/11/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Under existing law, the State Water Resources Control Board and the California regional water quality control boards prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge of stormwater in accordance with the national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit program and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Existing law, the Stormwater Resource Planning Act, authorizes a city, county, or special district to develop, jointly or individually, a stormwater resource plan that meets certain standards. This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes in these provisions.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2320 (Nestande R) Franchise Tax Board: State Board of Equalization: study.

Current Text: Amended: 4/19/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 5/25/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(8). (Last location was A. RLS. on 4/26/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 5/25/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law requires the Franchise Tax Board to administer the Personal Income Tax Law and the Corporation Tax Law, and requires the State Board of Equalization to administer various other taxes. This bill would require the Franchise Tax Board and the State Board of Equalization, before January 1, 2014, to jointly conduct a study and deliver a report to the Legislature determining the cost of administration and compliance with the Revenue and Taxation Code, as provided, and to determine how much revenue is being lost by California's economy due to its complex system of taxation.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2398 (Hueso D) Water recycling.**Current Text:** Amended: 5/21/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 7/6/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(13). (Last location was S. N.R. & W. on 6/7/2012)**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 7/6/2012-S. DEAD

Summary: Existing law establishes the State Water Resources Control Board (state board) and the California regional water quality control boards (regional boards) as the principal state agencies with authority over matters relating to water quality. Existing law requires the State Department of Public Health (department) to adopt uniform water recycling criteria for indirect potable water reuse for groundwater recharge, as defined, by December 31, 2013. Existing law requires the department to develop and adopt uniform water recycling criteria for surface water augmentation, as defined, by December 31, 2016, if a specified expert panel convened by the department finds that the criteria would adequately protect public health. Existing law requires the department to investigate the feasibility of developing uniform water recycling criteria for direct potable reuse, as defined, and to provide a final report on that investigation to the Legislature by December 31, 2016. Existing law requires the department, in consultation with the state board, to report to the Legislature from 2011 to 2016, inclusive, as part of the annual budget process, on the progress towards developing and adopting the water recycling criteria for surface water augmentation and its investigation of the feasibility of developing water recycling criteria for direct potable reuse. Existing law requires the state board to enter into an agreement with the department to assist in implementing the water recycling criteria provisions. This bill would enact the Water Recycling Act of 2012 to revise and consolidate those and other provisions relating to recycled water, and make other conforming changes to existing law. The act would establish a statewide goal to recycle a total of 1.5 million acre-feet of water per year by 2020 and 2.5 million acre-feet of water per year by 2030. The act would require the state board and regional boards, the department, the Public Utilities Commission, the Department of Water Resources, and other state agencies to exercise the authority and discretion granted to them by the Legislature to encourage the use of recycled water and meet the goals of the act. The act would require the department, on or before December 31, 2013, to adopt drinking water criteria for groundwater recharge projects utilizing recycled water. The bill would require the department, on or before December 31, 2016, to develop and adopt drinking water criteria for the use of advanced treated purified water for raw water augmentation projects not subject to the drinking water criteria for groundwater recharge projects utilizing recycled water. The act would subject those criteria to review by an expert panel convened and administered by the department to advise the department on public health issues and scientific and technical matters. The act would prescribe the types and contents of permits for recycled water to be issued by the state board or a regional board, as appropriate. Because certain reports submitted as part of the permit application process would be submitted under penalty of perjury, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program by creating a new crime. The act would establish the Water Recycling Research Fund and require that certain civil penalties be deposited into the fund, to be expended by the state board, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to conduct or fund research necessary to support the continued and safe use of recycled water in the state. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

AB 2570 (Hill D) Licensees: settlement agreements.**Current Text:** Chaptered: 9/25/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/25/2012-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 561, Statutes of 2012.**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 9/25/2012-A. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law provides that it is a cause for suspension, disbarment, or other discipline for an attorney to agree or seek agreement that the professional misconduct or the terms of a settlement of a claim for professional misconduct are not to be reported to the disciplinary agency, or to agree or seek agreement that the plaintiff shall withdraw a disciplinary complaint or not cooperate with an investigation or prosecution conducted by the disciplinary agency. Existing law prohibits a physician and surgeon from including specified provisions in an agreement to settle a civil dispute arising from his or her practice. Except as specified, existing law authorizes any interested person to petition a state agency requesting the adoption of a regulation. This bill would prohibit a licensee who is regulated by the Department of Consumer Affairs or various boards, bureaus, or programs, or an entity or person acting as an authorized agent of a licensee, from including or permitting to be included a provision in an agreement to settle a civil dispute that prohibits the other party in that dispute from contacting, filing a complaint with, or cooperating with the department, board, bureau, or program, or that requires the other party to withdraw a complaint from the department, board, bureau, or program, except as specified. A licensee in violation of these provisions would be subject to disciplinary action by the board, bureau, or program. The bill would also prohibit a board, bureau, or program from requiring its licensees in a disciplinary action that is based on a complaint or report that has been settled in a civil action to pay additional moneys to the benefit of any plaintiff in the civil action. This bill contains other related provisions.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 71 (Leno D) State agencies: boards, commissions, and reports.**Current Text:** Chaptered: 9/28/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/28/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 728, Statutes of 2012**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 9/28/2012-S. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law requires various state agencies to submit certain reports, plans, evaluations, and other similar documents to the Legislature and other state agencies. This bill would eliminate the requirement that certain state agencies submit certain reports to the Legislature and other state agencies relating to a variety of subjects. The bill would also modify various requirements of certain reports by, among other ways, requiring specified reports be placed on the Internet Web site of the reporting agency rather than submitted to the Legislature or other state agencies, requiring certain agencies to collaborate with other agencies in preparing specified reports, consolidating certain reports, deleting the requirement that specified state agencies make specified information available on their Internet Web sites, and transferring reporting duties from one agency to another. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 654 (Steinberg D) Redevelopment.**Current Text:** Amended: 1/31/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 7/6/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(13). (Last location was A. H. & C.D. on 4/16/2012)**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 7/6/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law suspends various activities of redevelopment agencies and prohibits the agencies from incurring indebtedness for a specified period. Existing law also dissolves redevelopment agencies and community development agencies, as of October 1, 2011, and designates successor agencies, as defined. Existing law requires successor agencies to wind down the affairs of the dissolved redevelopment agencies and to, among other things, repay enforceable obligations, as defined, and to remit unencumbered balances of redevelopment agency funds, including housing funds, to the county auditor-controller for distribution to taxing entities. This bill would revise the definition of the term "enforceable obligation" and modify provisions relating to the transfer of housing funds and responsibilities associated with dissolved redevelopment agencies. The bill would provide that any amounts on deposit in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund of a dissolved redevelopment agency be transferred to specified entities. The bill would make conforming changes. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 975 (Wright D) Professions and vocations: regulatory authority.**Current Text:** Vetoed: 9/25/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)**Status:** 9/25/2012-Vetoed by the Governor**Is Urgency:** N**Location:** 9/25/2012-S. VETOED

Summary: Existing law, the Business and Professions Code, provides for the licensure and regulation of various professions and vocations by boards, bureaus, and commissions within the Department of Consumer Affairs, including, but not limited to, the California Architects Board and the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists. Under existing law, a city or county shall not prohibit a person or group of persons, authorized by one of these boards, bureaus, or commissions, as specified, to engage in a particular business from engaging in that business. This bill would provide that, beginning July 1, 2013, the California Architects Board and the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists have the sole and exclusive authority to license and regulate the practice of professions and vocations regulated by those boards pursuant to provisions of that code, and that no licensing requirements, as specified, shall be imposed upon a person licensed to practice one of those professions or vocations other than under that code or by regulation promulgated by the applicable board through its authority granted under that code. The bill would prohibit a city, county, city and county, school district, other special district, a local or regional agency, joint powers agency, or state agency, department or other state office, except

for those boards, from imposing a licensing requirement upon a person licensed to practice a profession or vocation regulated by one of these boards. The bill would state findings and declarations of the Legislature.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	SUPPORT				

Notes 1: 1/24/2012 I-01/19/2012 to: WATCH

SB 1061 (Walters R) Professional engineers.

Current Text: Introduced: 2/13/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 4/27/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(5). (Last location was S. B., P. & E.D. on 3/1/2012)

Is Urgency: Y

Location: 4/27/2012-S. DEAD

Summary: Existing law establishes the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors in the Department of Consumer Affairs. Existing law recognizes various engineering disciplines. Existing law prohibits the practicing of civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering by any person who has not passed a specified examination and who is not appropriately licensed by the board in that discipline. Existing law makes various violations of the Professional Engineers Act a crime, including the practice or offer to practice by a person of civil, electrical, or mechanical engineering without authorization as provided by the act. This bill would also prohibit the practice of agricultural, chemical, control system, fire protection, industrial, metallurgical, nuclear, petroleum, and traffic engineering, as defined, by any person who has not passed a specified examination and who is not appropriately licensed by the board in the particular discipline. The bill would authorize any licensed engineer to practice engineering work in any of those fields in which he or she is competent and proficient. The bill would make other changes to related provisions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1151 (Steinberg D) Sustainable Economic Development and Housing Trust Fund: long-range asset management plan.

Current Text: Amended: 5/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 7/6/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(13). (Last location was A. H. & C.D. on 6/15/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 7/6/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies, as of February 1, 2012, and provides for the designation of successor agencies, as defined. Existing law imposes various requirements on successor agencies and subjects successor agency actions to the review of oversight boards. Existing law requires successor agencies to wind down the affairs of the dissolved redevelopment agencies and to, among other things, dispose of assets and properties of the former redevelopment agencies, as directed by the oversight board. Proceeds from the sale of assets are transferred to the county auditor-controller for distribution as property tax proceeds to taxing entities, as prescribed.

This bill would establish a Sustainable Economic Development and Housing Trust Fund, to be administered by a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority (authority), to serve as a repository of the unencumbered balances and assets of the former redevelopment agency. The bill would authorize moneys from the fund to be expended for specified purposes relating to economic development and affordable housing. The bill would require an authority to prepare a long-range asset management plan that governs the disposition and ongoing use of the fund. The bill would require an authority to submit the plan to the Department of Finance by December 1, 2012, and would require the department to approve or return the plan for revision to the authority prior to final approval by December 31, 2012.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1156 (Steinberg D) Sustainable Communities Investment Authority.

Current Text: Vetoed: 9/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/29/2012-Vetoed by the Governor

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/29/2012-S. VETOED

Summary: The Community Redevelopment Law authorizes the establishment of redevelopment agencies in communities to address the effects of blight, as defined. Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies, as of February 1, 2012, and provides for the designation of successor agencies. This bill would authorize certain public entities of a Sustainable Communities Investment Area, as described, to form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority (authority) to carry out the Community Redevelopment Law in a specified manner. The bill would require the authority to adopt a Sustainable Communities Investment Plan for a Sustainable Communities Investment Area and authorize the authority to include in that plan a provision for the receipt of tax increment funds provided that certain economic development and planning requirements are met. The bill would authorize the legislative body of a city or county forming an authority to dedicate any portion of its net available revenue, as defined, to the authority through its Sustainable Communities Investment Plan. The bill would require the authority to contract for an independent financial and performance audit every 5 years. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1186 (Steinberg D) Disability access.

Current Text: Chaptered: 9/19/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/19/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 383, Statutes of 2012

Is Urgency: Y

Location: 9/19/2012-S. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law requires an attorney to provide a written advisory to a building owner or tenant with each demand for money or complaint for any construction-related accessibility claim, as specified. A violation of this requirement may subject the attorney to disciplinary action. This bill would, instead, require an attorney to provide a written advisory with each demand letter or complaint, as defined, sent to or served upon a defendant or

potential defendant for any construction-related accessibility claim, as specified. The bill would require the Judicial Council to update the form that may be used by attorneys to comply with this requirement on or before July 1, 2013. The bill would require an allegation of a construction-related accessibility claim in a demand letter or complaint to state facts sufficient to allow a reasonable person to identify the basis for the claim. The bill would require any complaint alleging a construction-related accessibility claim to be verified by the plaintiff, and would make any complaint filed without verification subject to a motion to strike. The bill would prohibit a demand letter from including a request or demand for money or an offer or agreement to accept money. The bill also would prohibit an attorney, or other person acting at the direction of an attorney, from issuing a demand for money to a building owner or tenant, or an agent or employee of a building owner or tenant, on the basis of one or more construction-related accessibility violations, as specified. The bill would require an attorney to include his or her State Bar license number in a demand letter, and to submit copies of the demand letter to the California Commission on Disability Access and, until January 1, 2016, to the State Bar. The bill also would require, until January 1, 2016, an attorney to submit a copy of a complaint to the commission. The bill would provide that a violation of these requirements may subject the attorney to disciplinary action, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	SUPPORT				

SB 1237 (Price D) Professions and vocations: regulatory boards.

Current Text: Amended: 8/6/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 8/17/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(14). (Last location was A. APPR. on 8/16/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 8/17/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: Existing law, until January 1, 2013, declares that using a vertical enforcement and prosecution model for the Medical Board of California's investigations is in the best interests of the people of California. Under existing law, a vertical enforcement and prosecution model is described as the joint assignment of a complaint to a board investigator and to a deputy attorney general responsible for prosecuting the case if the investigation results in the filing of an accusation. Existing law requires the board to, among other things, establish and implement a plan to locate specified staff in the same offices in order to carry out the intent of the vertical enforcement and prosecution model. This bill would extend the operation of these provisions to January 1, 2014, and would also make a conforming change in that regard. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1276 (Wyland R) Indemnity: design professionals.

Current Text: Amended: 3/26/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 5/11/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(6). (Last location was S. JUD. on 3/29/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 5/11/2012-S. DEAD

Summary: Under existing law, all contracts, amendments to contracts, provisions, clauses, covenants, and agreements contained in, collateral to, or affecting contracts with a public agency for design professional services that purport to require the design professional to defend the public agency under an indemnity agreement, including the duty and the cost to defend, are unenforceable. Existing law exempts claims that arise out of, pertain to, or relate to the negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct of the design professional from this provision. This bill would limit a design professional's duty to defend a public agency against a negligence claim to reimbursement of defense costs incurred by the public agency that were caused by the design professional's actual negligence.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1380 (Rubio D) Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: bicycle transportation plan.

Current Text: Amended: 8/21/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/1/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was A. INACTIVE FILE on 8/28/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/1/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA requires the lead agencies to make specified findings in an EIR. This bill, until January 1, 2018, would exempt from CEQA a bicycle transportation plan for an urbanized area, as specified, and would also require a local agency that determines that the bicycle transportation plan is exempt under this provision and approves or determines to carry out that project, to file notice of the determination with OPR and the county clerk. This bill would require OPR to post specified information on its Internet Web site, as prescribed. This bill contains other existing laws.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1572 (Pavley D) California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: AB 32 Investment Fund.

Current Text: Amended: 8/31/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 9/1/2012-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was A. SECOND READING on 8/31/2012)

Is Urgency: N

Location: 9/1/2012-A. DEAD

Summary: The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air

Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The act requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. The act authorizes the state board to include use of market-based compliance mechanisms. The state board has adopted by regulation a program pursuant to the act to cap greenhouse gas emissions and provide for market-based compliance mechanisms, including the auction of allowances (cap-and-trade program). Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the state board from the auction or sale of allowances as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature. Existing law requires a state agency, prior to expending any money appropriated to it by the Legislature from the fund, to prepare a record consisting of a description of proposed expenditures and of how they will further the regulatory purposes of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, how they will achieve specified greenhouse gas emissions reductions, how the agency considered other objectives of that act, and how the agency will document expenditure results. This bill would appropriate a specified portion of moneys collected by the state board and derived from the auction or sale of allowances in the 2012-13 fiscal year from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to the state board. Under the bill, a specified portion of the money appropriated to the state board would be available to fund prescribed projects that meet certain goals relating to greenhouse gas emissions reductions. This bill would require any funds allocated to fund or finance eligible projects, as specified, or awarded, as specified, to be committed by December 31, 2013. This bill would require the state board, the Strategic Growth Council, and the California Pollution Control Financing Authority to adopt regulations, and authorize those entities to adopt emergency regulations, for the purposes of funding eligible projects, as prescribed. The bill would require the California Pollution Control Financing Authority and the Strategic Growth Council to prepare and submit to the Legislature, until January 1, 2017, annual reports on funded projects and activities. The bill would require the state board to publish information on projects on its Internet Web site. This bill contains other related provisions.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

SB 1578 (Committee on Governmental Organization) Treasurer.

Current Text: Chaptered: 8/29/2012 [pdf](#) [html](#)

Status: 8/29/2012-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 227, Statutes of 2012

Is Urgency: N

Location: 8/29/2012-S. CHAPTERED

Summary: Existing law requires the Treasurer to, among other things, receive and keep in the vaults of the Treasurer or deposit in banks or credit unions all moneys belonging to the state, keep an account of all moneys received and disbursed, and report daily to the Controller the amounts disbursed during the preceding day and the funds out of which the disbursements were paid. Existing law authorizes the Treasurer to appoint certain officers and employees, as specified. Existing law grants certain employees of the Treasurer's office when performing assigned duties, as specified, with the powers and authority conferred by law upon peace officers. This bill would modify these provisions by removing the Treasurer's authority to appoint certain officers and eliminating the powers and authority granted to certain employees

of the Treasurer's office. This bill would also require the Treasurer's office to be kept open for business from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. unless otherwise provided by law.

Organization	Position	Priority	Assigned	Subject	Group
CC/ASLA	WATCH				

Total Measures: 33

Total Tracking Forms: 33

Agenda Item D

OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS PROCESS AND REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR STAFF TO ENTER INTO INTRA-AGENCY CONTRACT WITH OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION SERVICES

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) conducted the last occupational analysis (OA) for the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) in 2006. According to the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES), an OA is conducted approximately every five years. At the August 14, 2012 LATC meeting, OPES consultants Raul Villanueva and Judy Greer, discussed test development and validation, reported on the results of the CSE, and recommended that LATC begin the process of a new occupational analysis.

In anticipation of the OA being part of the 2013 strategic plan, an overview of the Intra-Agency Contract and OA process will be presented by a member of the OPES. Major project events, timeline and responsibilities will be discussed.

The LATC is asked to authorize staff to enter into intra-agency contract with OPES to conduct a new OA.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. OPES Intra-Agency Contract Informational Handout
2. OPES Occupational Analysis Informational Handout
3. Occupational Analysis Standard Project Plan

INTRA-AGENCY CONTRACT AGREEMENT



Purpose

The Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) provides professional examination services to the boards, bureaus, and committees of the Department of Consumer Affairs on a fee-for-service basis through Intra-Agency Contract Agreements (IAC).

Process

The process is initiated by contacting the OPES Chief or supervisors to schedule a meeting to discuss specific licensure examination needs and expectations. An IAC is developed prospectively by mutual agreement between OPES and the board, bureau, or committee. It defines the activities, roles, and responsibilities of each party to the agreement, and a summary outline of the processes and benchmarks. The Department of Consumer Affairs' Contracts Unit reviews and encumbers the projected costs, and OPES invoices the board, bureau, or committee on a quarterly basis for the actual cost of OPES staff hours.

Services

See other titles in this Informational Series for descriptions and details of OPES' services. The following services are provided through an IAC. Costs include test validation staff (\$60 per hour); editing (\$56 per hour); and support staff (\$43 per hour).

- Occupational analyses
- Audit of national examination programs
- Test plan development
- Examination development
- Examination administration
- One-time, nonroutine projects

Certain activities are provided without additional charge to the board, bureau, or committee, and include:

- Test scoring and item analysis
- Examination program analysis
- Consultation and oversight
- Psychometric expertise
- Administrative support
- Computer-based testing (CBT) support

Contact

To learn more about these and other examination-related services, please contact the Office of Professional Examination Services at (916) 575-7240.

OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS



Purpose	<p>An occupational analysis (or job analysis) defines a profession in terms of the actual tasks that new licensees must be able to perform safely and competently at the time of licensure. In order to develop a licensing examination that is fair, job-related, and legally defensible, it must be based solidly upon what licensees actually do on the job. The occupational analysis should be reviewed routinely every five to seven years to verify that it accurately describes current practice.</p>
Process	<p>Typically, the process begins by selecting and interviewing a sample of licensees who accurately represent the geographic, ethnic, gender, experience, and practice specialty mix of the profession. During the interview, they identify the tasks that they perform within major categories of their profession and the knowledge required to perform those tasks. A committee of subject matter experts meets to finalize the task and knowledge statements, and develop a questionnaire. The questionnaire is sent to a representative sample of licensed practitioners. The data are analyzed, and the results are used to update the description of practice and/or develop a content outline.</p>
Content Outline	<p>The content outline specifies the tasks and knowledge that a newly licensed practitioner is expected to master by the time of licensure, and identifies the relative weight or percentage of each major subject area to be assessed in an examination. The content outline is used to develop questions for and validate new examinations.</p>
Content Validation Strategy	<p>In order for an examination to be valid, it must be empirically linked to the content outline of a recent occupational analysis. The Office of Professional Examination Services recommends that occupational analyses be validated no less than every five to seven years.</p>
Legal Standards and Guidelines	<p>A number of statutes, standards, and professional guidelines set criteria for the licensing process in California. These include the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, the Federal Uniform Guidelines for Employee Selection Procedures, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, California Government Code section 12944 of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Business and Professions Code section 139, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended.</p>
Contact	<p>To learn more about these and other examination-related services, please contact the Office of Professional Examination Services at (916) 575-7240.</p>

MAJOR PROJECT EVENTS	TARGET DATE	RESPONSIBILITY
1. Review Background Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Review past OAs > Review changes in Law & Practice > Identify emerging trends & considerations 	January	OPES: Research OPES: Research / BOARD: Communicate same to OPES OPES: Research / BOARD: Communicate same to OPES
2. Develop Job Content and Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Recruit SMEs for interviews > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Schedule and conduct interviews > Transcribe interview information > Develop preliminary list of tasks and knowledge 	January February February February March	Board Staff: Ensure Entry and Practice Diversity Board Staff OPES OPES OPES
3. Review Tasks and Knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Recruit SMEs for first 2-day workshop > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct first workshop with SMEs > Revise tasks and knowledge > Recruit SMEs for second 2-day workshop > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct second workshop with SMEs > Revise tasks and knowledge 	January March April April February May June June	Board Staff: Ensure Entry and Practice Diversity Board Staff OPES / SMEs OPES Board Staff: Ensure Entry and Practice Diversity Board Staff OPES / SMEs OPES / Board Staff review results
4. Construct and Distribute Pilot Questionnaire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Develop demographic items and rating scales > Prepare Web-based questionnaire for pilot study > Prepare text of letters for pilot study and final distribution (presurvey, survey, postsurvey) of questionnaire > Prepare announcement of OA in newsletter or other media > Email questionnaire for pilot study to selected participants analysis 	July July July July July July	OPES OPES / Board Staff review results Board Staff Board Staff OPES prepares / Board staff sends emails OPES

MAJOR PROJECT EVENTS	TARGET DATE	RESPONSIBILITY
5. Construct and Distribute Final Questionnaire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Prepare draft of final questionnaire > Determine sampling plan > Provide master file for mailing labels > Prepare final Web-based questionnaire > Assemble and mail questionnaire invitations to selected participants > Prepare and distribute questionnaire 4-6 weeks after distribution of questionnaire (OPTIONAL) 	August August August August August September	OPES OPES OPES OPES Sent by Board Staff Sent by Board Staff
6. Data Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Download final questionnaire data files > Convert and merge data files for analysis > Analyze demographics, task and knowledge > Develop preliminary description of practice 	September September September September	OPES OPES OPES OPES
7. Review Survey Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Recruit SMEs for two 2-day workshops > Provide list of SMEs to OPES > Conduct first 2-day workshop with SMEs > Conduct second 2-day workshop with SMEs > Develop description of practice 	August September September October October	Board Staff: Ensure Entry and Practice Diversity Board Staff OPES/SMEs OPES/SMEs OPES
8. Submit Validation Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Prepare draft of validation report > Review report and provide comments > Prepare, print and submit final validation report 	December December December	OPES Provided by Board staff to BOARD: OPES can provide presentation to BOARD OPES

Agenda Item E

EXCEPTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS TASK FORCE REPORT AND REVIEW AND APPROVE RECOMMENDATION FOR A LEGAL OPINION ON BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 5641, CHAPTER EXCEPTIONS, EXEMPTIONS

The Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force is charged to determine how the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) can ensure clarity about Business and Professions Code (BPC) Division 3, Chapter 3.5, Article 3, section 5641 Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions, and ensure that these provisions protect the public.

During the May 24, 2012, meeting, the Task Force discussed that the charge of the Task Force is to ensure the provisions in BPC section 5641 are clear and this could include investigating possible changes to the provisions. At the conclusion of the May 24, 2012, Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force meeting, members were asked to submit information to be reviewed and considered at the next meeting.

At the October 18, 2012, meeting, the Task Force members provided information to assist in discussion on how LATC can ensure clarity regarding BPC section 5641. The Task Force reviewed and discussed the following information:

1. Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) Determinants of Success Research Study, October 2011
2. CLARB Landscape Architect Registration Examination Specifications
3. September 7, 2012, Letter from the Association of Professional Landscape Designers (including Washington State Landscape Architects Practice Act)
4. Dan Chudy, California Building Official, Suggestions to BPC Section 5641
5. Linda Gates, Landscape Architect, Suggestions to BPC Section 5641

After reviewing and discussing the provisions in BPC section 5641, the Task Force recommended that Don Chang, DCA Legal Counsel, should provide a legal opinion letter for BPC section 5641.

LATC is asked to review and approve the recommendation of the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force to have Don Chang, DCA Legal Counsel, provide a legal opinion letter for BPC section 5641.

Agenda Item F

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (UC) EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM TASK FORCE REPORT INCLUDING REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DRAFT UC EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENTS:

- 1. Review and Approval Procedures**
- 2. Self-Evaluation Report**
- 3. Visiting Team Guidelines**
- 4. Annual Report Format**
- 5. Visiting Team Report Template**

The UC Extension Certificate Program Task Force was charged with developing the procedures for review of the UC extension certificate programs. The procedures will incorporate new standards outlined in the proposed language for California Code of Regulations section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program.

At the June 27, 2012, Task Force meeting, the Task Force used the February 6, 2010, Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board's (LAAB) Accreditation Standards and Procedures as a template to draft the LATC's Review Procedures and discussed potential edits to adapt them for use by LATC. The Task Force also used the February 6, 2010, LAAB Self-Evaluation Report Format for First-Professional Programs in Landscape Architecture as a template to draft an LATC Self-Evaluation Report and discussed potential edits to adapt them for use by LATC. The Task Force met on October 8, 2012 and November 2, 2012 to develop and finalize the documents. The Task Force approved the documents and authorized Chair, Christine Anderson, to make additional edits. The approved draft documents are attached with the Chair's edits highlighted in yellow.

LATC is asked to review and approve the draft Review and Approval Procedures, Self-Evaluation Report, Visiting Team Guidelines, Annual Report Format, and the Visiting Team Report Template.

(Continued on Reverse)

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Review and Approval Procedures
2. Self-Evaluation Report
3. Visiting Team Guidelines
4. Annual Report Format
5. Visiting Team Report Template

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Review/Approval Procedures

Landscape Architects Technical Committee

**2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7230**

November 2, 2012

Purpose

Mission

The mission of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) is to regulate the practice of landscape architecture in a manner which protects the public health, safety, and welfare and safeguards the environment by:

- Protecting consumers and users of landscape architectural services
- Empowering consumers by providing information and educational materials to help them make informed decisions
- Informing the public and other entities about the profession and standards of practice
- Ensuring that those entering the practice meet standards of competency by way of education, experience, and examination
- Establishing and enforcing the laws, regulations, codes, and standards governing the practice of landscape architecture
- Requiring that any person practicing or offering landscape architectural services be licensed

Overview and Educational Preparation for Licensure

In implementing its mission, LATC has established regulations identifying the education and training requirements necessary for a candidate to apply for the licensure examination. In order to identify the appropriate combination of requirements, LATC has convened an Education Subcommittee on several occasions since its inception. Each time, the subcommittee has recognized and upheld the value of education, experience, and examination in the training of a candidate for licensure. At the same time, LATC has also recognized the need to define multiple options for meeting the education and training requirements. The majority of the options for addressing the education requirement are based on the use of a traditional college or university degree programs that are accredited by the national Landscape Architectural Accrediting Board (LAAB). However, LATC recognized the need to address both the inability of standard accredited degree programs to expand capacity for additional graduates and the growing need of students in California to obtain their education through night school programs. The need for this non-traditional approach to obtain education might be due to any number of circumstances: finding a second career in landscape architecture, military veterans returning from serving their country, mothers and fathers returning to the work force after raising a family, or the inability to find the economic means to attend a full degree program. The post-degree professional landscape architecture education, offered by the University of California (UC) extension programs strives to address this nontraditional route. Acknowledging these facts, the Education Subcommittee, in 2006, recommended that extension graduates in landscape architecture be allowed some education credit toward taking the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE). *The extension programs are not reviewed by LAAB. Thus, in allowing education credit for extension program graduates, LATC assumes the responsibility for ongoing verification that the extension programs provide the education in landscape architecture necessary for a graduate to qualify to take the LARE.* To facilitate this evaluation, the LATC has interpreted standards established by LAAB to objectively evaluate landscape architectural certificate programs and judge whether a landscape architectural program is in compliance. The intent of the LATC is not to supersede LAAB's role in accreditation, but to allow additional access to licensure for candidates within the State of California who might not find it feasible to pursue a regular degree-level program.

Academic Quality

LATC approved programs must maintain and monitor – and strive to advance – academic quality within their program and their institution. “Academic quality” at its most basic definition is that the program satisfies (meets or exceeds) student and professional expectations. However, the program reflects the

institutional mission, thus providing diversity amongst programs and fostering innovation in practice and serves the community. The program must have specific processes to determine if its quality standards are being met; this evaluation must be on-going and forward-thinking. In addition to student achievements, academic quality is also indicated by high standards of teaching and service. The goals and results of these activities should reflect both the institutional mission and the profession of landscape architecture.

Definitions, Interpretation and Application

Approved(al) – an acceptance by LATC for graduates to meet the education credit for licensure examination.

Approval Period – The period of time between review cycles.

Assessment - Each criterion has one or more questions that seek qualitative and quantitative evidence used to assess the level of compliance with or achievement of the related criteria.

Compliance - Achieved when LATC concludes, after review of relevant indicators or other evidence, that a standard is met or met with recommendation as defined below. To achieve approval a program must demonstrate to LATC, through the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), site visit, and technical accuracy review of the Visiting Team Report, that it complies with all standards.

Criteria - Each standard has one or more criteria statements that define the components needed to satisfy the related standard. Not satisfying a criterion does not automatically lead to an assessment of a standard as ‘not met’. To be approved, a program demonstrates progress towards meeting the criteria.

Discreet Program – A program that is not a hybrid with another.

Initial Application – An application for review by a program that has not been reviewed before.

Intent - Explains the purpose of the standard.

Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) – Organization charged with accrediting landscape architectural degree-granting programs as overseen by the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA).

LATC Certificate Program Approval - A voluntary process of peer review designed to evaluate programs based on their own stated objectives and the review standards.

Program - An inclusive term for the coursework and other learning experiences leading to a landscape architectural curriculum and the supporting administration, faculty, facilities and services which sponsor and provide those experiences.

Recommendation Affecting LATC Approval - Are issues of serious concern, directly affecting the quality of the program. Recommendations affecting approval are only made when the visiting team assesses a standard as met with recommendation or not met. Recommendations are derived from the identified areas of weakness in meeting a standard that are described in the rationale sections of the Visiting Team Report. The program is required to report progress regularly on these issues. Recommendations Affecting Approval identify issues, and do not prescribe solutions.

Renewal – An application for review by a program that has been reviewed and approved before.

Shall...is defined as mandatory.

Should...is defined as prescriptive.

Standards - Qualitative statements of the essential conditions an approved program must meet. A program must demonstrate adequate evidence of compliance with all standards to achieve LATC approval.

Standard Met - Evidence shows that overall program performance in this area meets LATC minimum standards. A standard may be judged as met even though one or more indicators are not minimally met.

Standard Met With Recommendation - Deficiencies exist in an area directly bearing on approval. The problem or problems have observable effects on the overall quality of the program.

Standard Not Met - Cited deficiency is so severe that the overall quality of the program is compromised and the program's ability to deliver adequate landscape architecture education is impaired.

Suggestions for Improvement - Areas where the program can build on strength or address an area of concern that does not directly affect approval at the time of LATC review.

Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining LATC Approved Status

The Landscape Architects Practice Act contains the following language which addresses the minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining Approval Status:

California Code of Regulations section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, states the following:

“An extension certificate program shall meet the following requirements:

- (a) The educational program shall be established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code.
- (b) There shall be a written statement of the program's philosophy and objectives which serves as a basis for curriculum structure. Such statement shall take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture. The program objectives shall provide for relationships and linkages with other disciplines and public and private landscape architectural practices. The program objectives shall be reinforced by course inclusion, emphasis and sequence in a manner which promotes achievement of program objectives. The program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives.
- (c) The program shall have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.
- (d) The program shall be administered as a discrete program in landscape architecture within the institution with which it is affiliated.

- (e) There shall be an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (f) The program shall have sufficient authority and resources to achieve its educational objectives.
 - (g) The program administrator shall be a California licensed landscape architect.
- (h) The program administrator shall have the primary responsibility for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program. The faculty shall be adequate in type and number to develop and implement the program approved by the Board.
- (i) The program curriculum shall provide instruction in the following areas related to landscape architecture including public health, safety and welfare:
 - (1) History, theory and criticism
 - (2) Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
 - (3) Public Policy and regulation
 - (4) Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management
 - (5) Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
 - (6) Construction documentation and administration
 - (7) Written, verbal and visual communication
 - (8) Professional practice
 - (9) Professional values and ethics
 - (10) Plants and ecosystems
 - (11) Computer applications and other advanced technology
- (j) The program shall consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units.
- (k) The program shall maintain a current syllabus for each required course which includes the course objectives, learning outcomes, content, and the methods of evaluating student performance.
- (l) The program clearly identifies where the public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed.
- (m) The curriculum shall be offered in a timeframe which reflects the proper course sequence. Students shall be required to adhere to that sequence, and courses shall be offered in a consistent and timely manner in order that students can observe those requirements.
- (n) A program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:
 - (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.
 - (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.

- (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.
 - (4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).
 - (5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.
- (o) The program shall submit an annual report in writing based on the date of the most recent Board approval. The report shall include:
- (1) Verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements;
 - (2) Any significant changes such as curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report;
 - (3) Current enrollment and demographics; and
 - (4) Progress toward complying with the recommendations, if any, from the last approval.
- (p) The program title and degree description shall incorporate the term “Landscape Architecture.”

The Board may choose to further evaluate changes to any of the reported items or to a program.

The Board will either grant or deny an application. When specific minor deficiencies are identified during evaluation of an application, but the institution is substantially in compliance with the requirements of the Code and this Division, a provisional approval to operate may be granted for a period not to exceed 24 months, to permit the institution time to correct those deficiencies identified. A provisional approval to operate shall expire at the end of its stated period and the application shall be deemed denied, unless the deficiencies are corrected prior to its expiration and an approval to operate has been granted before that date or the provisional approval to operate has been extended for a period not to exceed 24 months if the Board is satisfied that the program has made a good faith effort and has the ability to correct the deficiencies.

The Board shall review the program at least every six years for approval.

The Board may rescind an approval during the six-year approval period based on the information received in the program’s annual report after providing the school with a written statement of the deficiencies and providing the school with an opportunity to respond to the charges. If an approval is rescinded, the Board may subsequently grant provisional approval in accordance with the guidelines of this section to allow the program to correct deficiencies.”

A program approved by LATC shall:

- a. Continuously comply with LATC approval standards;
- b. Pay the annual sustaining and other fees as required; and
- c. Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports.

The program administrator shall inform LATC if any of these factors fails to apply during an approval period. The program administrator is responsible for reporting any substantive changes to the program when they occur. Substantive changes would be those that may affect the approval status of the program.

STANDARDS

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

INTENT: Using a clear concise mission statement, each landscape architecture certificate program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes why the program exists and the needs that it seeks to fulfill. It also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.

A. Program Mission. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment 1: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relate to the institution's mission statement?

Assessment 2: Does the mission statement take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture?

Assessment 3: Does the program's literature fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives?

Assessment 4: Does the program title and degree description shall incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture?"

B. Educational Goals. Clearly defined and formally stated academic goals reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment 1: Does the program have an effective procedure to determine progress in meeting its goals and is it used regularly?

Assessment 2: Does the program have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs?

C. Educational Objectives. The educational objectives specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment: Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives that describe how the goals will be met?

D. Long-Range Planning Process. The program is engaged in a long-range planning process.

Assessment 1: Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process?

Assessment 2: Is the long-range plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

Assessment 3: Does the SER respond to recommendations and suggestions from the previous accreditation review and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

E. Program Disclosure. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and LATC approval status.

Assessment: Is the program information accurate?

Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration *The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.*

INTENT: Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.

A. Program Administration. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program.

Assessment 1: Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Assessment 2: Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture?

Assessment 3: Does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program? Does he/she have the primary responsibilities for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating all aspects of the program?

Assessment 4: Is the educational program established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code?

Assessment 5: Does the program meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:

- (a) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.*
- (b) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.*
- (c) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.*
- (d) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).*
- (e) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.*

Assessment 6: Is the program administrator a California licensed landscape architect?

Assessment 7: Has an organizational chart been provided that clearly identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and with the institution that supports it?

B. Institutional Support. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15-18:1?

Assessment 2: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Assessment 3: Does the institution provide student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, internships, etc.?

Assessment 4: Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

C. Commitment to Diversity. The program demonstrates commitment to diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment: How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

D. Faculty Participation. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Assessment 2: Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty?

Assessment 3: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations?

E. Faculty Number. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program's goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in creative activity and scholarship and to be actively involved in professional endeavors such as presenting at conferences. To address this criterion, a certificate program should have a minimum of three fulltime equivalent faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture and are licensed California landscape architects.

Assessment 1: Are the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

Assessment 2: Is at least 50% of the academic faculty licensed as a landscape architect?

Assessment 3: Does the strategic plan or long-range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?

Standard 3: Professional Curriculum

The certificate curriculum shall include the core knowledge skills and applications of landscape architecture. In addition to the professional curriculum, the certificate program shall require that all enrolled students have, at minimum, a bachelor's degree for entry into the program.

INTENT: The purpose of the curriculum is to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and objectives. Curriculum objectives should relate to the program's mission and specific learning objectives. The program's curriculum should encompass coursework and other opportunities intended to develop students' knowledge, skills, and abilities in landscape architecture.

A. Mission and Objectives. The program's curriculum addresses its mission, goals, and objectives.

Assessment: Does the program identify the knowledge, skills, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

B. Professional Curriculum. The program curriculum includes coverage of:

- History, theory and criticism
- Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
- Public Policy and regulation
- Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management
- Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
- Construction documentation and administration
- Written, verbal and visual communication
- Professional practice
- Professional values and ethics
- Plants and ecosystems
- Computer applications and other advanced technology

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum address the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and objectives?

Assessment 2: Does student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession?

Assessment 3: Do curriculum and program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?

Assessment 4: Does the curriculum provide opportunities for student engagement in interdisciplinary professions?

Assessment 5: Does the curriculum include a "capstone" or terminal project?

Assessment 6: Does the program consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units?

C. Syllabi. Syllabi are maintained for **all required** courses.

*Assessment 1: Do syllabi include educational objectives, **learning outcomes**, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?*

Assessment 2: Do syllabi identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to successfully complete the course and advance in the curriculum?

D. Curriculum Evaluation. At the course and curriculum levels, the program evaluates how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning objectives in a timely way.

Assessment 1: Does the program demonstrate and document ways of:

- a. Assessing students' achievement of course and program objectives in the length of time to graduation stated by the program?*
- b. Reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?*
- c. Maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and values of the profession?*

Assessment 2: Do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses and curriculum?

E. Augmentation of Formal Educational Experience. The program provides opportunities for students to participate in internships, off campus studies, research assistantships, or practicum experiences.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide any of these opportunities?

Assessment 2: How does the program identify the objectives and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?

Assessment 3: Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

F. Coursework and Areas of Interest:

Assessment 1: What percentage of current students are currently enrolled in the program with a bachelor's degree or higher? Please provide a breakdown of degree levels admitted.

Assessment 2: How does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, coursework outside landscape architecture, collaboration with related professions, etc.?

Assessment 3: How does student work incorporate academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

Standard 4: Student and Program Outcomes.

The program shall prepare students to pursue careers in landscape architecture.

INTENT: Students should be prepared – through educational programs, advising, and other academic and professional opportunities – to pursue a career in landscape architecture upon graduation. Students should have demonstrated knowledge and skills in creative problem solving, critical thinking, communications, design, and organization to allow them to enter the profession of landscape architecture.

A. Student Learning Outcomes. Upon completion of the program, students are qualified to pursue a career in landscape architecture.

Assessment 1: Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry-level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?

Assessment 2: Do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's learning objectives, including critical and creative thinking and their ability to understand, apply and communicate the subject matter of the professional curriculum as evidenced through project definition, problem identification, information collection, analysis, synthesis, conceptualization and implementation?

Assessment 3: Can the students demonstrate and understanding of the health, safety and welfare issues affecting the coursework studied? Can these issues be applied to the real world?

B. Student Advising. The program provides students with effective advising and mentoring throughout their educational careers.

Assessment 1: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic development?

Assessment 2: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding career development?

Assessment 3: Are students aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?

Assessment 4: How satisfied are students with academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

C. Participation In Extra Curricular Activities. Students are encouraged and have the opportunity to participate in professional activities and institutional and community service.

Assessment 1: Do students participate in institutional/college organizations, community initiatives, or other activities?

Assessment 2: Do students participate in events such as LaBash, ASLA Annual Meetings, local ASLA chapter events and the activities of other professional societies or special interest groups?

Standard 5: Faculty

The qualifications, academic position, and professional activities of faculty and instructional personnel shall promote and enhance the academic mission and objectives of the program.

INTENT: *The program should have qualified experienced faculty and other instructional personnel to instill the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students will need to pursue a career in landscape architecture. Faculty workloads, compensation, and overall support received for career development contribute to the success of the program.*

A. Credentials. The qualifications of the faculty, instructional personnel, and teaching assistants are appropriate to their roles.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty have a balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?

Assessment 2: Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?

Assessment 3: Are adjunct and/or part-time faculty integrated into the program's administration and curriculum evaluation/development in a coordinated and organized manner?

Assessment 4: Are qualifications appropriate to responsibilities of the program as defined by the institution?

B. Faculty Development. The faculty is continuously engaged in activities leading to their professional growth and advancement, the advancement of the profession, and the effectiveness of the program.

Assessment 1: Are faculty activities such as scholarly inquiry, professional practice and service to the profession, university and community documented and disseminated through appropriate media such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?

Assessment 2: Are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated, and are the results used for individual and program improvement?

Assessment 3: Do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc?

Assessment 4: Are the activities of faculty reviewed and recognized by faculty peers?

Assessment 5: Do faculty participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

C. Faculty Retention. Faculty hold academic status, have workloads, receive salaries, mentoring and support that promote productivity and retention.

Assessment 1: Are faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition evaluated to promote faculty retention and productivity?

Assessment 2: What is the rate of faculty turnover?

Standard 6: Outreach to the Institution, Communities, Alumni, and Practitioners

The program shall have a record or plan of achievement for interacting with the professional community, its alumni, the institution, community, and the public at large.

INTENT: *The program should establish an effective relationship with the institution, communities, alumni, practitioners and the public at large in order to provide a source of service learning opportunities for students, scholarly development for faculty, and professional guidance and financial support. Documentation and dissemination of successful outreach efforts should enhance the image of the program and educate its constituencies regarding the program and the profession of landscape architecture.*

A. Interaction with the Profession, Institution, and Public. The program represents and advocates for the profession by interacting with the professional community, the institution, community and the public at large.

Assessment 1: Are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?

Assessment 2: Are service activities documented on a regular basis?

B. Alumni and Practitioners. The program recognizes alumni and practitioners as a resource.

Assessment 1: Does the program maintain a current registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, licensure, and significant professional accomplishments?

Assessment 2: Does the program engage the alumni and practitioners in activities such as a formal advisory board, student career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education etc.?

Standard 7: Facilities, Equipment, and Technology

Faculty, students and staff shall have access to facilities, equipment, library and other technologies necessary for achieving the program's mission and objectives.

INTENT: *The program should occupy space in designated, code-compliant facilities that support the achievement of program mission and objectives. Students, faculty, and staff should have the required tools and facilities to enable achievement of the program mission and objectives.*

A. Facilities. There are designated, code-compliant, adequately maintained spaces that serve the professional requirements of the faculty, students and staff.

Assessment 1: Are faculty, staff and administration provided with appropriate office space?

Assessment 2: Are students assigned permanent studio workstations adequate to meet the program needs?

Assessment 3: Are facilities adequately maintained and are they in compliance with ADA, life-safety and applicable building codes? (Acceptable documentation includes reasonable accommodation reports from the university ADA compliance office and/or facilities or risk management office.)

B. Information Systems and Technical Equipment. Information systems and technical equipment needed to achieve the program's mission and objectives are available to students, faculty and other instructional and administrative personnel.

Assessment 1: Does the program have sufficient access to computer equipment and software?

Assessment 2: Is the frequency of hardware and software maintenance, updating and replacement sufficient?

Assessment 3: Are the hours of use sufficient to serve faculty and students?

C. Library Resources. Library collections and other resources are sufficient to support the program's mission and educational objectives.

Assessment 1: Are collections adequate to support the program?

Assessment 2: Do courses integrate library and other resources?

Assessment 3: Are the library hours of operation convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?

REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES

Initiating Review and Approval

A program can apply to the LATC for approval whenever it meets the Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Approval Status

A program should notify LATC of its intention to apply for initial approval at least four months before the anticipated visit. A program must have had one graduating class, and meet the approval requirements (see Minimum Requirements For Achieving And Maintaining LATC Approved Status) before a visit can be scheduled. The approval process is the same whether a program is applying for renewal of accreditation or initial accreditation.

Candidacy Status

To assist non-approved programs, the LATC has developed a Candidacy Status to help programs prepare for the accreditation process. The purpose of candidacy is to establish stable, constructive, ongoing, and helpful partnerships between LATC and institutions working toward becoming approved by LATC. Programs designated as “candidates” have voluntarily committed to work toward LATC approval. Candidacy status signifies that the program is demonstrating reasonable progress toward the attainment of accreditation. However, candidacy status does not indicate approval status or guarantee eventual approval.

To achieve candidacy status a program must meet the minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining approved status.

After achieving candidacy status, a program must apply for initial approval once it has had at least 20 graduates. If initial approval is not granted, the program can retain its candidacy status for one additional year.

To achieve candidacy status, a program may submit a SER and undergo a program review. A program review is an initial assessment where **the LATC will review** the program’s SER and determine whether the program should be granted candidacy status or not. In addition, LATC will make recommendations and suggestions on how the program can continue to advance towards meeting the approval standards.

LATC will vote on whether to grant a program candidacy status at its next regularly scheduled meeting by reviewing the program’s SER and the Visiting Team Report. If LATC decides not to grant candidacy status this decision is not subject to appeal. The program will be informed in writing of LATC’s decision.

After achieving candidacy status, programs are required to submit annual reports to LATC.

Programs that have achieved candidacy status must pay a biennial application renewal fee (a fee schedule can be obtained from the LATC).

Self-Evaluation Report

All programs applying for accreditation prepare a SER following the required LATC format. The SER describes the program's mission and objectives, its self-assessment, and future plans; provides a detailed response to the recommendations of the previous visiting team; and details the program's compliance with each approval standard. It is important that faculty, administrators, and students participate in preparing the SER. The SER must include a statement explaining the participation of each group. The LATC notifies each program of the approval schedule and LATC deadlines.

Since LATC approval is a voluntary process, the LATC cannot conduct a review without an invitation or written notice of consent from the chief executive officer of the institution. This invitation and notice of preferred visit dates must be submitted at least four months prior to the review.

At least 45 days before the visit, the program submits two copies of the SER and proposed visit schedule to the LATC Program Manager.

If the documents are not submitted by this deadline, the program may be notified that the visit has been postponed. In the case of a currently LATC approved program, this may result in the suspension of approval and/or the term of approval expiring.

The program is responsible for all costs incurred plus an administrative fee (a fee schedule can be obtained from the LATC).

LATC Certificate Program Review Committee/Visiting Team

Visiting team members are selected by the LATC. There are three categories of evaluators:

Landscape architecture educators or administrators who hold a first-professional degree in landscape architecture, teach or have taught in an accredited program, and hold the minimum academic rank of tenured associate professor.

LATC Member (current or former)

Landscape architecture practitioners who are licensed landscape architects and have at least five full years of practice experience.

Where special conditions warrant, such as providing team member training or assisting with site-evaluation procedures and matters of due process, a four-person team may be assembled.

Exceptions to these criteria must be approved by the LATC.

Visiting Team Selection

The visiting team consists of one landscape architecture educator, one practitioner, and one LATC member.

Teams are selected to avoid potential conflicts of interest. For example, a previous affiliation with the program under review, or an affiliation with a program in the same geographic location with competing enrollments, monies, etc., renders an evaluator ineligible.

The program is advised of the proposed team, including each proposed team member's present position, experience, and areas of expertise. The program has the right to challenge one team member, with cause. For the purpose of challenge, conflict of interest can be cited if the nominee comes from the same geographic location and is affiliated with a competitive institution; if the nominee had a previous affiliation with the institution; or if the institution can demonstrate that the nominee is not competent to evaluate the program. However, the final decision on team assignments rests with the LATC chair.

Following the program's review of potential team members, the team members are invited to serve. When the visiting team composition and date of the review are finalized, the team and the program are

formally notified. Any subsequent changes in team makeup because of scheduling conflicts or emergencies are made in consultation with the program.

At the discretion of the LATC chair, one of the following may accompany the visiting team: an additional LATC member, a landscape architecture educator who has a specialist background relevant to the program under review, or another LATC evaluator for training purposes.

Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Visiting Team

The team chair is responsible for making assignments and assembling the Visiting Team Report. Team members receive the LATC Approval Standards and Procedures and the LATC Visiting Team Guidelines and are expected to be thoroughly familiar with these documents before the accreditation visit. Each visiting team member must carefully review the SER and carry out assignments as the team chair directs.

Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Program

The LATC Program Manager, after conferring with the team and the institution, schedules the dates of the accreditation visit. The program is responsible for making all lodging arrangements for the visiting team. Hotel accommodations should, where possible, use on-campus facilities such as those for visiting faculty or guest lecturers. LATC is responsible for the travel, lodging, and meal expenses of the visiting team within State travel guidelines.

Sample Visit Schedule

The following is a sample schedule of activities for a visiting team of the LATC. This includes all necessary elements and provides adequate time for report preparation. The certificate programs generally function in the evening. The visiting team is required to spend at least three hours each day to prepare reports and executive summaries. Changes may be made to this schedule as long as this requirement is met.

Day 1

8:30 am	Breakfast with certificate program administrator
9:30 am	Familiarization tour of the landscape architectural facilities. Tour should be brief.
10:30 am	Meet with the chief administrator of the unit that in which the certificate program is located
11:00 am	Meet with the immediate supervisor of the landscape architecture certificate program administrator.
12:00 pm	Lunch
1: 30 pm	Team meets with landscape architecture certificate program administrator to finalize schedule and to discuss the program in general
3: 00 pm	Executive session: confirm team member assignments and plan how the team will conduct interviews and various meetings that will take place during the visit.
4:30 pm	Curriculum review by faculty to visiting team. Reviews how program accomplishes its mission through the curriculum and a review of student work from each class and sequence.
6:00 pm	Dinner

7:00 pm Interviews with students and faculty. Student interviews should be conducted with students grouped by year. It is recommended that student interviews take place before faculty interviews. Faculty interviews are usually a series of individual interviews at half-hour intervals, to discuss impressions of the program--strengths, weaknesses, faculty input, faculty development. Group faculty interviews can be conducted if more acceptable to the faculty and the team.

Day 2

8:30-11:30 am Review of student work and facilities. Additional interviews as necessary.

11:30 am Inspection of library and other supporting facilities, e.g., computing center, special services, etc.

12:30 pm Lunch with recent graduates and practitioners, to be arranged at the discretion of the team and the school. Opportunity to evaluate graduates' satisfaction with the educational process and the degree to which the program prepared them to perform entry-level functions.

2: 00 pm Team meets in executive session to review findings.

6:00 pm Dinner with faculty.

8:00 pm Additional interviews with students and faculty.

Day 3

8:30 am Breakfast meeting with program administrator.

9:30 am Team meets in executive session to compile draft report and advisory recommendations.

12:00 Noon Lunch. Review of the team's findings with the program administrator, the chief administrator and the immediate supervisor of the landscape architecture program administrator.

3:00 pm Team departs from campus.

The program prepares the visit schedule and forwards it to the LATC Program Manager, along with the SER, at least 45 days prior to the visit. The recommended schedule includes interviews with students, faculty, and administration officials, as well as alumni and local practitioners. Team members may conduct interviews by telephone with persons who are unable to meet with them on campus, such as alumni, practitioners or faculty on leave. The appropriate administrators should be interviewed both at the beginning and at the end of the team's visit. Early inspection of space and facilities and an exhibit of work produced by students in the program are vital.

The team members meet in several executive sessions over the course of the visit to prepare a complete report in draft form, and to decide on an advisory recommendation to LATC on the program's approval status. The content of this report, except the advisory recommendation, is discussed with the appropriate administrator as well as the certificate program administrator, particularly in regard to strengths and weaknesses of the program, recommendations affecting approval, and suggestions for program improvement. It is important to note to the administrators that all of the information discussed verbally is in draft form until it has been reviewed, approved, and distributed by LATC. This draft is not to be copied for the program.

Visiting Team Report

Before the visit, the visiting team receives the completed SER, the LATC Review/Approval Procedures and the Visiting Team Guidelines. The guidelines include a format for the Visiting Team Report, which is designed to ensure a response to all the LATC requirements and approval standards. The team chair makes writing assignments as necessary and is responsible for compiling the report.

Within ten days following the visit, the visiting team chair completes final editing and sends copies to the other team members and the LATC Program Manager, who review the report. The report may be edited for grammar, spelling and style. The team members should send any comments to the LATC Program Manager. Any substantive changes or additions will be referred to the team chair and may result in distributing the report to the team to review the report a second time.

Institutional Response

Within ten days of the receipt of the team report, the LATC Program Manager shall send copies to the appropriate campus administrator and the certificate program director for their comment and technical accuracy review.

Within fifteen days following receipt of the team report, the institution shall submit its institutional response (substantive comments and corrections) to the LATC Program Manager. The certificate program shall respond to any standard that is assessed as “met with recommendation” or “not met.” This response should include any documentation the program deems pertinent.

The team report and institutional response are sent to the LATC members at least three weeks before the next scheduled LATC meeting.

Vacating of Application for Accreditation

Any time before action by LATC, an institution may vacate its application for LATC Certificate Approval without penalty by notifying the LATC Program Manager in writing. LATC will not refund fees and the program will be assessed for expenses incurred by LATC.

LATC Review and Decision

The LATC Certificate Program Approval review decision may take place at the next scheduled LATC meeting following receipt of the Visiting Team Report and institutional response. LATC may consult with a member of the visiting team (usually the chair) and/or LATC Program Manager in order to clarify items in the Visiting Team Report or institutional response. Certificate Programs may request to appear before the LATC to discuss the pending approval decision. LATC's decision will be based upon the program's SER, annual reports, Visiting Team Report, payment of application fee, and institutional response.

Any adverse approval decision, defined as either “LATC Certificate Program Approval denial,” or “withdrawal of LATC Approval,” will be substantiated with specific reasons, and program administrators will be notified of their right to appeal any such decision (see Appeal Process). A program that has not been granted approved status, or a program from which approval has been withdrawn, may reapply for approval when its administrators believe the program meets current requirements.

LATC Actions

LATC Certificate Program Approval is granted for a period of one to six years. A program may apply for an approval review at any time before its term expires, but may not defer a visit to extend its term. The LATC may vary these normal terms at its discretion. Reasons for such variance will be supplied to the program. The official action letter to the institution indicates the date on which approval will expire. The annually published list of accredited programs includes the LATC Certificate Approval status of each program along with the next scheduled approval review.

LATC can take the following actions:

Approved LATC Certificate Program

Granted when all standards are met or when one or more standards are met with recommendation, and continued overall program quality and conformance to standards are judged likely to be maintained.

Approval may be granted up to six (6) years.

A program receiving approval may be required to submit special progress reports at the discretion of LATC.

Provisionally Approved LATC Certificate Program

Granted when one or more standards are met with recommendation and the cited deficiencies are such that continued overall program quality or conformance to standards is uncertain. Provisional LATC Certificate Program Approval may be granted up to two (2) years. This status shall not be granted more than twice without an intervening period of approval. Provisional status is not deemed to be an adverse action and is not subject to be appealed.

Initial LATC Certificate Program Approval

Granted on a first review when all standards are at least minimally met and the program's continued development and conformance to the LATC approval standards is likely. Initial approval may be granted for up to six (6) years.

Programs receiving initial LATC Certificate Program Approval must submit a special progress report after two or three years (time determined by LATC). LATC will review the progress report to determine if an approval review should be scheduled immediately or as originally scheduled when initial LATC Certificate Program Approval was granted.

Suspension of LATC Certificate Program

This status results if a program fails to maintain good standing for administrative reasons. Suspension of approval is not subject to appeal.

Denial of LATC Certificate Program

This status results when one or more standards are not met. This determination is subject to appeal.

Withdrawal of LATC Certificate Program

This status results if a program fails to comply with accreditation standards. This determination is subject to appeal.

Notification of LATC Action

The institution is officially notified of the LATC's action with a letter. Copies of the letter are sent to the certificate program administrator and LATC visiting team.

The LATC retains a copy of a program's two most recent SERs.

Confidentiality

The LATC treats all material generated by the program and LATC for the LATC Certificate Program Approval review as confidential. However, the LATC encourages the widest dissemination of all approval materials within the institution. The Visiting Team Report and SER are considered to be the property of the institution. The LATC reserves the right to release a complete report should the institution release a portion of the team report that might, in the judgment the LATC, presents a biased or distorted view of the site-evaluation findings.

Reference to LATC Certificate Program Approval

A program's approval status must be clearly conveyed in all program and institutional literature.

Delaying a scheduled LATC Certificate Program Approval Visit

Occasionally, a program may want to delay a scheduled LATC Certificate Program Approval visit because of unexpected circumstances. LATC will grant a site visit delay for up to one year (from spring semester 2014 to spring semester 2015 for example) if the following conditions are met:

- a. The program received a six year term of LATC Certificate Program Approval at its last review.
- b. The program is in compliance with LATC Minimum Requirements for achieving and maintaining LATC approved status.
- c. All fees and required reports have been submitted.

To request a delay the LATC Program Manager must receive a letter from the chief administrator of the unit that in which the certificate program is located

Rescheduling Visit

When the visit is rescheduled, priority for selecting visit dates will go to programs hosting visits in their regular cycle.

A delayed visit cannot be postponed again for any reason. If the rescheduled review does not take place the program's accreditation will lapse. If a program chooses to apply, it will be through the initial accreditation process.

Term of LATC Certificate Program Approval

When LATC takes action, the grant of certificate approval will begin from the originally scheduled review date.

Annual Reports and Other Reports

Each LATC Approved Certificate Program submits an annual report to allow LATC to monitor the program's continuing compliance with approval requirements. The report must include:

- a. Changes in curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report

- b. Current enrollment
- c. Number of graduates for the current year
- d. Report on employment for previous year's graduates
- e. Progress toward complying with the recommendations of the most recent approval review

The LATC may choose to alert the program administrator as well as the chief administrator of the unit that in which the certificate program is located of its concern for potential effects of reported changes.

Policy on Substantive Change

In order to support LATC-Approved Certificate programs as they make changes between regular approval visits, LATC will offer consultative reviews of proposed changes prior to submission of an official request for Substantive Change. Substantive Change will normally be included in annual reports, yet, is encouraged to be reported prior to the change. Primary responsibility for reporting Substantive Change rests with the certificate program administrator.

Substantive Change is any change that compromises a program's ability to meet one or more of the LATC program standards or that makes a certificate program unable to meet any of the following Minimum Requirements for maintaining approved status as currently stated in the LATC Review/Approval Procedures and must be reported:

1. The program title and certificate description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) must be as follows:
 - a. An academic unit that offers a single certificate program has at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom is full-time.
3. The parent institution is accredited by the institutional accrediting body of its region.
4. There is a designated program administrator for the program under review.

Other Reports

From time to time, LATC may require programs to prepare special reports to explain or describe a certain issue or problem. These issues will be ones that LATC believes require additional explanation than what is included in annual reports. The due date for submitting a special report may be different from the annual report due date.

Maintaining Good Standing

To maintain good standing a program must continuously meet the minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining LATC Approved status. LATC must be informed if any of these requirements cannot be met during an approval period.

Should a program fail to maintain good standing, LATC Approval may be suspended or withdrawn.

Suspension of LATC Certificate Program Approval

Should a program fail to maintain good standing for administrative reasons (such as failure to pay required fees or submit required reports) approval may be suspended. Before this action is taken, the LATC shall draft a letter requesting the program to explain why approval should not be suspended.

Since suspension of LATC Approval occurs only for administrative reasons it is not subject to appeal. Students attending a program with suspended approval are considered to be attending an approved program. A program can be suspended for a maximum of one year (12 months). LATC will begin procedures to withdraw approval to take effect immediately when the maximum period of suspension is reached.

If evidence of remedial action is submitted and judged adequate within the one-year period of suspension, reinstatement of the previous grant of LATC Certificate Program Approval may be made.

Withdrawal of LATC Certificate Program Approval

Should a program fail to comply with approval standards, approval may be withdrawn. Before withdrawing approval, the LATC shall send a letter requesting the program to explain why Approval should not be withdrawn. The LATC may suggest to the program that an approval visit is in order. Withdrawal of LATC approval is an adverse action and can be appealed (see Appeals Process).

If the program's parent institution or other programs within the institution are placed on probationary status or have accreditation withdrawn by their accrediting agencies, LATC may send a letter to the landscape architecture program to determine the program's current condition.

THE APPEAL PROCESS

When the LATC takes adverse action on LATC Certificate Program Approval, specific reasons shall be provided for that action to the certificate program administrator/director and chief administrator of the unit that in which the certificate program is located adverse actions include denial or withdrawal of accreditation.

Recipients of adverse action shall be advised of their right to appeal. An appeal must be based on one or more of the following issues:

1. Whether the LATC and/or the visiting team conformed to the procedures described in this document; or
2. Whether the LATC and/or the visiting team conformed to the LATC Approval Standards.

A written notice of appeal shall be signed by the chief administrator of the unit that in which the certificate program is located. The appeal must be submitted within twenty days of notice of LATC's action letter. The appeal must be sent to the LATC Program Manager who shall notify the LATC Chair. The certificate program must submit, within sixty days of LATC's action, a "comprehensive written statement" of all the reasons for the appeal. Failure to submit this statement within sixty days of notice of LATC's action is equivalent to withdrawing the appeal. During the appeal period, the approved status of the program before the adverse action will not change. The record of the appeal upon which the appeal is based shall be limited to the material that was presented to the LATC at its scheduled meeting from which the final approval report consisting of the action letter from LATC is issued.

Self-Evaluation Report Format for

CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS IN

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Landscape Architects Technical Committee

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7230

November 2, 2012

REQUEST FOR REVIEW

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Date

Invitation to review is extended by: _____

Identify the program in Landscape Architecture to be reviewed and the name of the institution.

This landscape architectural program certifies that it has been in operation since _____ (date) and is legally entitled to confer the following certificates:

Preferred Dates for Review: Indicate first, second, and third preferences.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Please give complete address for the program requesting review. Include the name, phone number, and e-mail address for the program administrator.

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT FORMAT

Certificate Programs in Landscape Architecture

INSTRUCTIONS

Preparing a self-evaluation report is a valuable part of the approval process. To receive the maximum benefit of this process, it is in the program's interest to examine itself carefully and present information in a clear and concise manner. The following provides a procedure where those involved with a certificate program may make a concise self-evaluation of its performance. The visiting evaluators, assigned by the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), will review this report prior to and during their visit, approaching the task as colleagues interested in understanding the program and its stated objectives within the framework of the institution and the approval standards.

The attached form is an outline of the *Self-Evaluation Report (SER)* to be completed by the program for which approval is being requested. Any supporting or related programs may be described in the appendix. They will be reviewed only with respect to their relationship to and/or effect upon the program under review.

Report Preparation

Bring as many faculty members, administrators, students, graduates, staff and employers as possible into the preparation of this self study.

Terminology

The *institution* is the university, college, institute or other parent body through which the program is administered.

The *program* is administered by some division of an institution such as a college, school, division or department responsible for the curriculum and the students enrolled.

The *program administrator* is the chairman, director, head, dean, or other official immediately responsible for the program.

SER Format

- Pages should be 8 1/2" x 11", numbered, single spaced and suitable for copying.
- Use the exact heading, numbering, and sequence for the standards as given.
- Place an extended tab, numbered to correspond to the seven approval standards, on each of the sections for ease of reference. Some parts of individual sections may also be in tabular form if the program deems this useful.
- The total report (excluding appendices) should not be more than 100 sheets double sided or two hundred typed pages. Brevity and concise writing is appreciated. Ancillary information that is not critical to the SER does not facilitate an effective review by the visiting team.
- One digital copy must be submitted to LATC and each team member.

Provide digital copies of other information (examples of student work, appendix materials such as important policies, resumes, etc.). Please also note applicable websites (departmental and/or college website, important sites on the institution website such as university tenure and promotion policies, etc.) where appropriate within the report and in an appendix.

Two bound copies of the SER and digital materials must be sent to the LATC Program Manager. In addition, the program sends each visiting team member one copy of the bound SER and digital materials. These need to be received at least 45 days prior to the visit.

PROGRAM SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

For the Academic Year _____ Institution _____

Program _____

Certificate Title/Certificate Length _____

Chief Administrative Official
of the Institution _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the College _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the Division
(if applicable) _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the Department _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the Program _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Report Submitted by _____

name _____ *date* _____

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

For Achieving And Maintaining Approved Status

California Code of Regulations Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, states the following:

“An extension certificate program shall meet the following requirements:

- (a) The educational program shall be established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code.
- (b) There shall be a written statement of the program's philosophy and objectives which serves as a basis for curriculum structure. Such statement shall take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture. The program objectives shall provide for relationships and linkages with other disciplines and public and private landscape architectural practices. The program objectives shall be reinforced by course inclusion, emphasis and sequence in a manner which promotes achievement of program objectives. The program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives.
- (c) The program shall have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.
- (d) The program shall be administered as a discrete program in landscape architecture within the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (e) There shall be an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (f) The program shall have sufficient authority and resources to achieve its educational objectives.
- (g) The program administrator shall be a California licensed landscape architect.
- (h) The program administrator shall have the primary responsibility for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program. The faculty shall be adequate in type and number to develop and implement the program approved by the Board.
- (i) The program curriculum shall provide instruction in the following areas related to landscape architecture including public health, safety, and welfare:
 - (1) History, theory and criticism
 - (2) Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
 - (3) Public Policy and regulation
 - (4) Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management

- (5) Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
 - (6) Construction documentation and administration
 - (7) Written, verbal and visual communication
 - (8) Professional practice
 - (9) Professional values and ethics
 - (10) Plants and ecosystems
 - (11) Computer applications and other advanced technology
- (j) The program shall consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units.
- (k) The program shall maintain a current syllabus for each required course which includes the course objectives, learning outcomes, content, and the methods of evaluating student performance.
- (l) The program clearly identifies where the public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed.
- (m) The curriculum shall be offered in a timeframe which reflects the proper course sequence. Students shall be required to adhere to that sequence, and courses shall be offered in a consistent and timely manner in order that students can observe those requirements.
- (n) A program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:
- (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.
 - (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.
 - (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.
 - (4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).
 - (5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.
- (o) The program shall submit an annual report in writing based on the date of the most recent Board approval. The report shall include:
- (1) Verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements;
 - (2) Any significant changes such as curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report;
 - (3) Current enrollment and demographics; and
 - (4) Progress toward complying with the recommendations, if any, from the last approval.
- (p) The program title and degree description shall incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture."

The Board may choose to further evaluate changes to any of the reported items or to a program.

The Board will either grant or deny an application. When specific minor deficiencies are identified during evaluation of an application, but the institution is substantially in compliance with the requirements of the Code and this Division, a provisional approval to operate may be granted for a period not to exceed 24 months, to permit the institution time to correct those deficiencies identified. A provisional approval to operate shall expire at the end of its stated period and the application shall be deemed denied, unless the deficiencies are corrected prior

to its expiration and an approval to operate has been granted before that date or the provisional approval to operate has been extended for a period not to exceed 24 months if the Board is satisfied that the program has made a good faith effort and has the ability to correct the deficiencies.

The Board shall review the program at least every six years for approval.

The Board may rescind an approval during the six-year approval period based on the information received in the program's annual report after providing the school with a written statement of the deficiencies and providing the school with an opportunity to respond to the charges. If an approval is rescinded, the Board may subsequently grant provisional approval in accordance with the guidelines of this section to allow the program to correct deficiencies."

A program approved by the LATC shall:

- a. Continuously comply with approval standards;
- b. Pay the biannual sustaining and other fees as required; and
- c. Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports.

The program administrator shall inform the LATC if any of these factors fails to apply during an approval period.

The _____ program meets the minimum conditions to apply for LATC approval.

Program Administrator Name

Title

Program Administrator Signature

Date

INTRODUCTION

1. History of Program.

In chronological form provide a brief history of the program being reviewed, concentrating on events since the last review.

2. Response to Previous LATC Review.

Describe the progress that has been made on the recommendation affecting approval from the previous approval visit (not applicable to those seeking initial approval). List each prior recommendation verbatim and provide an updated recap of responses made on annual interim reports. List each suggestion for Improvement and provide an update.

3. Describe current strengths and opportunities.

4. Describe current weaknesses and challenges.

5. Describe any substantial changes in the program since the last approval review.

6. Describe who participated (faculty, administrators, students, alumni, outside professionals, etc.) in preparing this self-evaluation and briefly state their roles. The LATC recommends involving as many people as possible in preparing the SER, as the process of self-evaluation can be one of the greatest benefits of approval.

Note: Begin a new page for each standard. Insert a tab here and between all other standards.

1. PROGRAM MISSION and OBJECTIVES

STANDARD 1: *The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.*

INTENT: *Using a clear concise mission statement, each landscape architecture program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes why the program exists and the needs that it seeks to fulfill. It also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.*

A. Program Mission

1. State the current program mission and date adopted.
2. Describe how the mission statement reflects the purpose and values of the program and how it relates to the institution's mission statement, **philosophy and objectives.**
3. **Describe how the program reflects the values, mission and goals of the broader community of Landscape Architecture.**

B. Educational Goals

1. State the academic goals of the program.
2. Describe how the academic goals relate to the program's mission.
3. Describe how the program regularly evaluates its progress in meeting its goals.
4. **State the program's plan for evaluation. Include, as applicable, admission and selection procedures and requirements, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.**

C. Educational Objectives

1. List the educational objectives of the program.
2. Describe how educational objectives fulfill the academic goals.

D. Long Range Planning Process

1. What is the program's long-range planning process?
2. Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process.
3. Describe how the long-range plan is reviewed and revised periodically and how it presents realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission.

E. Program Disclosure

1. Describe how program information is disseminated to the public. Provide a link to material on the internet and copies of other materials to the Site Review Team.

2. PROGRAM AUTONOMY, GOVERNANCE & ADMINISTRATION

STANDARD 2: *The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.*

INTENT: *Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.*

A. Program Administration

1. Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?
2. Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture? If not, where is he/she appointed?
3. How does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program? Describe the primary responsibilities and authority of the administrator.
4. Is the educational program established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code?
5. Identify all instructional and administrative personnel and their credentials in landscape architecture. Specifically note those that hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture and/or are licensed by the Board as landscape architects.
6. Identify the time base for the program administrator, instructional faculty and all direct program administrative support personnel.
7. How does the program clearly identify the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and with the institution that supports it? Please provide an organizational chart that illustrates this relationship as part of the SER appendix.

B. Institutional Support

1. Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?
2. What are student/faculty ratios in studios? How are student faculty ratios influenced by the program? What is considered normal?
3. Is funding adequate for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc?
4. Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

C. Commitment To Diversity

1. How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, full-time faculty and staff?

D. Faculty Participation

1. Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?
2. Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and promotion to all ranks?

E. Faculty Numbers

1. Does an academic unit that offers a certificate program have a minimum of 3 full time faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?
2. Is at least 50% of the academic faculty licensed as a California landscape architect?
3. Does the strategic plan or long range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?
4. Is the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

3. PROFESSIONAL CURRICULUM

STANDARD 3: *The certificate curriculum shall include the core knowledge skills and applications of landscape architecture. In addition to the professional curriculum, the certificate program shall require that all enrolled students have, at minimum, a bachelor's degree for entry into the program.*

INTENT: *The purpose of the curriculum is to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and objectives. Curriculum objectives should relate to the program's mission and specific learning objectives. The program's curriculum should encompass coursework and other opportunities intended to develop students' knowledge, skills, and abilities in landscape architecture.*

A. Mission And Objectives

1. How does the curriculum address the program's mission, goals, and objectives?
2. How does the program identify the knowledge, skills, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

B. Program Curriculum

1. How does the program curriculum include coverage of:
 - History, theory and criticism
 - Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
 - Public Policy and regulation
 - Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management
 - Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
 - Construction documentation and administration
 - Written, verbal and visual communication
 - Professional practice
 - Professional values and ethics
 - Plants and ecosystems
 - Computer applications and other advanced technology
2. How does the curriculum address the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and objectives?
3. How do student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession?
4. How do the curriculum and other program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?
5. Are students required to complete a "capstone" or terminal project prior to graduation?
6. Please identify the units required for graduation from the program?

C. Syllabi

1. How do syllabi include educational objectives, learning outcomes, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?
2. How do syllabi identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to successfully complete the course and advance in the curriculum?

D. Curriculum Evaluation

1. How does the program evaluate how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning objectives in a timely way at the course and curriculum levels?
2. How does the program demonstrate and document ways of:
 - a. assessing students' achievements of course and program objectives in the length of time to graduation stated by the program?
 - b. reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?
 - c. maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and values of the profession?
3. How do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses, and curriculum?

E. Augmentation of Formal Educational Experience

1. How does the program provide opportunities for students to participate in internships, off campus studies, research assistantships, or practicum experiences?
2. How does the program identify the objectives and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?
3. Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

F. Coursework and Areas of Interest

1. What percentage of current students are currently enrolled in the program with a bachelor's degree or higher? Please provide a breakdown of degree levels admitted.
2. How does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, coursework outside landscape architecture, collaboration with related professions, etc.?
3. How does student work incorporate academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

4. STUDENT and PROGRAM OUTCOMES.

STANDARD 4: *The program shall prepare students to pursue careers in landscape architecture.*

INTENT: *Students should be prepared – through educational programs, advising, and other academic and professional opportunities – to pursue a career in landscape architecture upon graduation. Students should have demonstrated knowledge and skills in creative problem solving, critical thinking, communications, design, and organization to allow them to enter the profession of landscape architecture.*

A. Student Learning Outcomes

1. Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry-level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?
2. How does the program assess student work and how it demonstrates students are competent to obtain entry-level positions in the profession?
3. How do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's learning objectives, including critical and creative thinking and their ability to understand, apply and communicate the subject matter of the professional curriculum as evidenced through project definition, problem identification, information collection, analysis, synthesis, conceptualization and implementation?
4. How does the program assess the preparation of students in the above areas?

B. Student Advising

1. How does the student advising and mentoring program function?
2. How does the program assess the effectiveness of the student advising and mentoring program?
3. Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic and career development?
4. Are students aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?
5. How satisfied are students with academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

C. Participation in Extra Curricular Activities

1. What opportunities do students have to participate in institutional/college organizations, community initiatives, or other activities? How do students take advantage of these opportunities?
2. To what degree do students participate in events such as LaBash, ASLA Annual Meetings, local ASLA chapter events, and the activities of other professional societies or special interest groups?

5. FACULTY

STANDARD 5: *The qualifications, academic position, and professional activities of faculty and instructional personnel shall promote and enhance the academic mission and objectives of the program.*

INTENT: *The program should have qualified experienced faculty and other instructional personnel to instill the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students will need to pursue a career in landscape architecture. Faculty workloads, compensation, and overall support received for career development contribute to the success of the program.*

A. Credentials

1. Is the faculty's balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?
2. Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?
3. How are adjunct and/or part-time faculty integrated into the program's administration and curriculum evaluation/development in a coordinated and organized manner?

B. Faculty Development

1. How are faculty activities documented and disseminated through appropriate media, such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?
2. How do faculty teaching and administrative assignments allow sufficient opportunity to pursue advancement and professional development?
3. How are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated?
4. How are the results of these evaluations used for individual and program improvement?
5. How do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc?
6. How do faculty participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

C. Faculty Retention

1. Are faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition evaluated to promote faculty retention and productivity?
2. What is the rate of faculty turnover?

6. OUTREACH TO THE INSTITUTION, COMMUNITIES, ALUMNI & PRACTITIONERS

STANDARD 6: *The program shall have a record or plan of achievement for interacting with the professional community, its alumni, the institution, community, and the public at large.*

INTENT: *The program should establish an effective relationship with the institution, communities, alumni, practitioners and the public at large in order to provide a source of service learning opportunities for students, scholarly development for faculty, and professional guidance and financial support. Documentation and dissemination of successful outreach efforts should enhance the image of the program and educate its constituencies regarding the program and the profession of landscape architecture.*

A. Interaction with the Institution, and Public

1. How are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?
2. How are service activities documented on a regular basis?
3. How does the program interact with the institution and the public, aside from service learning?
4. How does the program assess its effectiveness in interacting with the institution and the public?

B. Interaction with the Profession, Alumni and Practitioners

1. How does the program recognize professional organizations, alumni, and practitioners as resources?
2. Does the program maintain a current registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, postgraduate study, and significant professional accomplishments?
3. Does the program use the alumni registry to interact with alumni?
4. How does the program engage alumni, practitioners, allied professionals and friends in activities such as a formal advisory board, student career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education, etc?
5. How does the program assess its effectiveness in engaging alumni and practitioners?

7 ■ FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT & TECHNOLOGY

STANDARD 7: Faculty, students and staff shall have access to facilities, equipment, library and other technologies necessary for achieving the program's mission and objectives.

INTENT: The program should occupy space in designated, code-compliant facilities that support the achievement of program mission and objectives. Students, faculty, and staff should have the required tools and facilities to enable achievement of the program mission and objectives.

A. Facilities

1. How are faculty, staff, and administration provided with appropriate office space?
2. How are students assigned permanent studio workstations adequate to meet the program needs?
3. How are facilities maintained to meet the needs of the program?
4. Are facilities in compliance with ADA, life-safety, and applicable building codes?
5. If known deficiencies exist, what steps is the institution taking to correct the situation? (Provide documentation on reasonable accommodation from the institution's ADA compliance office and/or facilities or risk management office.)

B. Information Systems and Technical Equipment

1. How does the program ensure that students and faculty have sufficient access to computer equipment and software?
2. What are the program's policies on the maintenance, updating, and replacement of computer hardware and software?
3. What are the hours that the computer lab (if applicable) and studios are open to students/faculty?
4. How does the program determine if these times are sufficient to serve the needs of the program?
5. How does the program assess the adequacy of equipment needed to achieve its mission and objectives?

C. Library Resources

1. What library resources are available to students, faculty, and staff?
2. How does the program determine if the library collections are adequate to meet its needs?
3. How does instructional courses integrate the library and other resources?
4. What are the hours that library is open to students and faculty?

5. How does the program determine if these hours are convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?
6. How does the program assess its library resources?

ADDENDA

A. Program Details

B. Curriculum

C. Student Information

D. Alumni Information

E. Faculty Information

F. Facilities Information

A. PROGRAM DETAILS

Faculty Resources

1. Budgeted Instructional Resources: TOTAL

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Instructors/lecturers						
Guest speakers						
One-semester appointments						
Teaching Assistants						
Other						

2. Budgeted Instructional Resources: MALE

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Instructors/lecturers						
Guest speakers						
One-semester appointments						
Teaching Assistants						
Other						

3. Budgeted Instructional Resources: FEMALE

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Instructors/lecturers						
Guest speakers						
One-semester appointments						
Teaching Assistants						
Other						

4. Number of Instructors with Undergraduate / MLA / Doctorate Degrees

	Undergrad degree in landscape architecture (BLA or BSLA)	MLA	Doctorate
Instructors/lecturers			
Guest Speakers			
One-semester appointments			
Teaching Assistants			
Other			

B. CURRICULUM

1. Required / Elective Courses

Total Units/Credit Hours required to complete certificate requirements:

_____ units or _____ credit hours

Elective Units / Credit Hours required to complete certificate requirements:

_____ units or _____ credit hours

Required Courses	Units/Credit Hours
History, theory and criticism	
Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability	
Public Policy and regulation	
Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management	
Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application	
Construction documentation and administration	
Written, verbal and visual communication	
Professional practice	
Professional values and ethics	
Plants and ecosystems	
Computer applications and other advanced technology	

2. Typical Program of Study

Identify length of term/semester and relation of contact hours to unit/credit hours. List courses (instructional units) for a typical program of study, using the format given below.

Instructions

- List specific Landscape Architecture (LA) courses required (e.g., LA 31 Landscape Architecture Studio 4). Course numbers must correspond with those used in other sections of this report.
- Show group or controlled elective requirements by title (e.g., Social Science Elective, Planning Elective).
- List free electives as "Electives."
- The sequence of courses is to be typical student coursework.
- Reproduction of appropriate pages from the program catalog may be used for this description providing they contain the required information.

*** Course Pedagogic Objectives - course objectives lead to professional skill development in these critical practice areas:

- A – Technical Thinking
- B – Spatial Reasoning
- C – Computer Aided Design/GIS
- D – Construction Detailing
- E – Construction Documentation
- F – Design Studio
- G – Design Theory
- H – Grading and Drainage
- I – History of Landscape Architecture
- J – Plant Materials
- K – Professional Practice
- L – Site Analysis
- M – Stormwater Management
- N – Sustainable Design

C. STUDENT INFORMATION

1. Overview

Include only students who have declared candidacy in the certificate program being reviewed for the last five years.

Academic Year	In-State		Out-of-State		Foreign		TOTAL	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Current Year								
1 Year Ago								
2 Years Ago								
3 Years Ago								
4 Years Ago								

2. Prior Degree Holdings

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Number of students holding Bachelor's degrees						
Number of students holding Master's degrees						
Number of students holding other forms of education (please explain)						

3. Enrollments

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Total enrollment						
Males						
Females						

D. ALUMNI INFORMATION

1. Certificates Awarded

Tabulate the number of certificates awarded in the present year (estimated) and for the years since the last SER.

Academic Year	Males	Females	TOTAL
Current Year			
1 Year Ago			
2 Years Ago			
3 Years Ago			
4 Years Ago			
5 Years Ago			
6 Years Ago			

2. Current Employment

Tabulate the present employment of those having completed the certificate program since the last SER.

Present Occupation	Males	Females	TOTAL
Private Practice			
Public Practice			
Landscape Hort./Design Build			
Volunteer Service (Specify)			
Other (Specify)			
Unknown			
TOTAL			

E. FACULTY INFORMATION

1. Previous and Present Faculty

Tabulate faculty and staff specifically assigned and budgeted to the particular program under review. The number listed in the TOTAL column should agree with the information provided for Standard 2C (Faculty Numbers). Use the following format:

Rank/Title	Current	1 Year Ago	2 Years Ago	TOTAL
Instructor				
Guest Speaker				
Other				
TOTALS				

2. Instructional Assignments

Complete the following table for all full and part time instructors. Begin with the Program Administrator and list in order of rank.

Teaching: Percentage FTE assigned to courses taught/instruction.

Research: Include only the percentage of time specifically assigned to research and so recognized by reduction in full-time teaching load. Do not include research efforts normally considered a part or full-time faculty members' contributions.

Administration: Include only the percentage of time devoted to regularly assigned administrative responsibilities. Do not include incidental ad hoc administrative duties, i.e., committee work, visiting lecturer arrangements, student advisement.

Faculty member	Degree	Teaching %			Admin / other %	TOTAL %
		Land. Arch. Curriculum				

3. Courses Taught by Individual Faculty Members

Complete the following table for each instructor.

Courses Taught: Use current year or last academic year depending on time of report preparation

Term Symbols: Use the institutional terminology. For example: Fall Semester - FS, Spring Semester, SS, Fall Quarter - FQ, Winter Quarter - WQ, Spring Quarter SQ, Summer Term - ST.

Contact Hours: Actual number of scheduled contact hours per week between instructor and students.

Course Taught	Course Number	Term	Credit Hours	Contact Hrs / Week	Number Of Students	FTE Students

4. Visiting Lecturers/Critics

List the name, specialty, dates in attendance and the contribution of visiting critics and lecturers, resource personnel, etc. who served the program. List only persons who were brought in for the program under review. Indicate by an asterisk (*) those sponsored jointly with other departments or sponsored at the college or school level. Use the format below to list this information for the present and two preceding academic years.

Name	Field/Specialty	Date(s)	Contribution
* Edward Armor	Architecture	1/29-30/10	Lecturer (Green Architecture and Current City/County Codes) and In-studio Critic
David Crane	National Park Service Historian	2/26/10	Juror

5. Individual Teacher's Record

Name:

Rank:

Department or unit (if not part of the program under review):

Education: (College and higher)

Institution	Number of Years Attended	Degree/Date Granted
--------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------

Teaching Experience: (College level)

Institution	Years Taught	Subjects
--------------------	---------------------	-----------------

Practice Experience: (Brief listing; however, if experience in practice is lengthy and you feel strongly about presenting such, please include resume in the Appendix.)

Firm or Agency	Number of Years	Responsibilities
-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------

Professional Registration: Give profession and state/province(s).

Professional & Academic Activities. Offices held, exhibitions, competitions, committee memberships in professional societies or boards, etc., for last five years.

Publications. List significant publications, projects and/or reports covering the last five years. Identify refereed publications with an asterisk.

Contributions. Briefly describe your involvement in advancing the knowledge or capability of the profession of landscape architecture in the last five years.

F. FACILITIES INFORMATION

Instructions

1. Tabulate space data as shown below.
2. Describe any steps that are being taken to improve the spaces.
3. Include floor plan(s) on standard 8 1/2" x 11" sheets. Label these plans to identify various types of spaces and who controls/uses it.
4. If spaces are shared by other programs or departments, indicate this on the spaces affected.

Program Facilities

Room #	Size (SF)	Max. Capacity Normal Max. Users	Type of Space (studio, office, storage, etc.)	Shared Use (S) Exclusive Use (E)

Organizational Chart

Please attach an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Visiting Team Guidelines

Landscape Architects Technical Committee

**2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7230**

November 2, 2012

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for volunteering to serve as a visiting team member representing the Landscape Architects Technical Committee. The certificate program approval process could not succeed without dedicated volunteers like you. As a member of the Visiting Team, team members are acting as a liaison between LATC and the institution seeking approval for its program, therefore, you are a representative of LATC.

Please refer to the Review/Approval Procedures document to find details on the accreditation process. The site visit is a vital part of the approval process.

Visiting Team Member Responsibilities

The following guidelines provide general information regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Visiting Team and its members. While it is not possible to put everything into writing, the following guidelines will give the Visiting Team members a better understanding of their role, duties and responsibilities.

Approval reviews provide an important external assessment for programs of landscape architecture. These reviews should provide proactive, constructive, and positive insights focused on improving the quality of landscape architectural education. A great deal of the success of program approval reviews depends on how members of the visiting team prepare and conduct themselves during the review.

Team members need to be well prepared by reading and reviewing all documents (including student work provided) prior to the visit and by communicating with each other before arriving at the institution. The manner in which the team conduct interviews, reviews work and facilities, the care taken in determining findings and crafting the visiting team report, and the way that findings are presented to the various constituents of the host institution impact the perception, quality and thus, the success of the visit. Every step in the process requires a thoughtful professional demeanor.

Visit Preparation

Read the entire Self Evaluation Report (SER)

- Know your assignment (given by the visiting team chair) and focus on those standards in the SER
- Identify any additional information (not provided in the SER) you may require to properly evaluate standards assigned to you.
- Formulate questions that need to be asked to properly assess standards assigned to you.

During the visit:

- Be punctual for all meetings.
- Be a good listener; do not overly insert yourself into the discussion.
- Ensure that the team has access to representative examples of student work
- Be objective; your role is to observe, analyze and report. Do not express views that could be interpreted as a bias about program content and outcomes.
- Have a positive attitude and tone in the interviews.
- Keep confidences; this will encourage candor.
- Focus on important issues; stay away from small problems.
- Seek a balanced view of issues; do not let a small faction skew the team's perception of an issue.
- Be thorough in searching for the truth about an issue.
- Identify important issues early (at the conclusion of the first day) so you can revisit them and gather additional information that will or will not support them.
- Write clearly, concisely and provide factual information to support any recommendations; avoid vague terms – “some faculty said...”, “it was reported...” etc.
- During the exit interviews, be prepared to discuss the rationale for any recommendations or suggestions in the standards.

Overview of the Site Visit

The site visit has four principal objectives:

- To verify information in the SER;
- To gather new information through observation and interviews;
- To assess whether the program under review meets LATC's approval standards; and
- To identify/verify program strengths and areas for improvement.

Visit Outcomes

It is very important that the team acknowledge that all verbal feedback is a compilation of the team's recommendations to the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) and not a finding of the LATC.

- **Verbal feedback to the program:** the exit interviews conducted on the last day of the visit should be a brief summary that includes:
 - **Team Report:** a written report completed after the visit that is shared with the program, the administration, and LATC, and
 - **Recommendation to LATC:** the team's consensus of the appropriate approval status for the program, based on their observations. This recommendation is **confidential** and **is not disclosed** to the program during the visit.

Visiting Team Report

A rough draft of the team report should be completed by the conclusion of the visit. The team report follows the Visiting Team Report Format that is sent to the chair of each site review team. The visiting team report has four sections.

1. Overall analysis
2. Report on each standard
3. Summary of recommendations and suggestions to the program
4. Confidential recommendation to LATC

Section 1: Overall Analysis

The overall analysis includes two sections:

- A. An introduction that sets the tone of the report and provides the reader with a sense of the program's institutional and regional context and a brief summary (two pages at most) of the team's findings. The assessment should include a statement about the focus of the program and its unique characteristics, a summary of its strengths and challenges.
- B. A review of each recommendation affecting program approval and suggestion for improvement from the last program approval review, with the team's assessment of whether the issue has been adequately addressed. If any of these items are still of concern, they should be addressed in the appropriate section of the report.

Section 2: Report On Each Standard

The team must report on each standard. See the LATC Review/Approval Procedures document for definitions. This section has four parts:

- A. Assessment of Program Compliance with each Standard (included in template)
- B. Team's Assessment
- C. Recommendations Affecting Program Approval (if applicable)
- D. Suggestions for Improvement (if applicable)

A. Assessment of Program Compliance with Each Standard

The site review team indicates one of three conclusions about the program's compliance with the standard: met, met with recommendation(s), or not met.

Standard Met - Evidence shows that overall program performance in this area meets LATC minimum standards. A standard may be judged as met even though one or more criteria are not minimally met.

Standard Met With Recommendation - Deficiencies exist in an area directly bearing on program approval. The problem or problems have observable effects on the overall quality of the program.

A finding of "met with recommendation" must be justified in the rationale section by stating the evidence the team considered, what deficiencies were found, and why, in the teams view, the deficiencies have a serious impact on overall program quality. Since one or more findings of "met with recommendation" may result in provisional approval by the Board, the team must provide justification of its assessment.

Standard Not Met - Cited deficiency is so severe that the overall quality of the program is compromised and the program's ability to deliver adequate landscape architecture education is impaired.

A finding of "not met" must be supported by evidence that the deficiencies in this area are so severe that overall program quality is unacceptably compromised. A program that has even one standard assessed as not met will be denied approval.

B. Team Assessment

The rationale section provides justification for the team's assessment.

Each standard has one or more criteria statements that define the components needed to satisfy the related standard. Not satisfying a criterion does not automatically lead to an assessment of a standard as 'not met'. To be approved a program demonstrates progress towards meeting the criteria. In this document, criteria are identified by letters (e.g., A. Program Mission).

Each criterion has one or more questions that seek qualitative and quantitative evidence used to assess the level of compliance with or achievement of the related criteria.

The site review team must report on each criterion following the format in the example section of this document.

For a finding of "standard met," the rationale may appropriately cite areas of strength as well as concern.

A finding of "not met" must be supported by evidence that the deficiencies in this area are so severe that overall program quality is unacceptably compromised.

C. Recommendations Affecting Program Approval (If Applicable)

Are issues of serious concern, directly affecting the quality of the program. Recommendations affecting approval are only made when the site review team assesses a standard as met with recommendation or not met. Recommendations are derived from the identified areas of weakness in meeting a standard that are described in the rationale sections of the visiting team report template. The program is required to report progress regularly on these issues. Recommendations Affecting Approval identifies issues, and does not prescribe solutions.

D. Suggestions for Improvement (If Applicable)

Areas where the program can build on strength or address an area of concern that does not directly affect approval at the time of the LATC review. Some suggestions may derive from the team's view that if left unattended these concerns could lead to a future determination that it has become serious enough to warrant a finding of "met with recommendation". Although programs are not required to take action on suggestions, they must report their response to them which could range from dismissing them to reporting progress in addressing them. Other suggestions may derive from items that the team's opinion is that an area can become a greater strength or provide improvement to the program. Suggestions should be a very useful part of the peer review process. It is important to keep suggestions to a minimum. The maximum number of suggestions shall be **seven (7)**. A team may direct more than one suggestion to a particular standard but the total number may not exceed seven. Suggestions, unlike recommendations, may be prescriptive but they should be supported by evidence found in the rationale.

Section 3: Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions to Programs

This section summarizes all recommendations affecting approval and suggestions for improvement from the reports on each standard. There cannot be any recommendations or suggestions for improvement that were not previously identified.

Section 4: Confidential Recommendation to LATC

The site review team should agree on its recommendation to LATC of the type of approval action. This recommendation is **advisory** only and should be kept confidential. **Do not disclose it in the exit interview(s).** The recommendation sheet must be completed and signed (**by all visiting team members**) before leaving the campus. The team's recommendation is advisory as the program has the opportunity to respond to the team report and supply additional information to LATC. The team's recommendation must be supported by the report's text.

Completion Schedule

The site review team should complete a draft of their report prior to the end of the visit. One way to expedite this process is for team members to bring their own computers.

Within **ten (10) working days** of the site visit, the site review team chair shall send draft copies of the site review team report to the program approval manager and to the other team members. The report will be forwarded to the LATC Program Manager. The team chair will be contacted by the LATC Program Manager shortly thereafter to discuss the team findings and any questions he/she may have concerning the site visit. The principal reader may also contact the other members of the site review team. The draft report may be edited for grammar, spelling, and style before being sent to the program for technical accuracy review and comment.

If there are any difficulties in producing the report or submitting it within the required ten days, the site review team chair should contact the program manager and provide a revised submission date for the report.

Interviews

Coming into contact with those who bring the institution to life is one of the most important dimensions of the site visit. The interviews can yield the greatest dividends if appropriate preparation is undertaken.

The site review team chair and the program chair should confer about the visit schedule as soon as the assignment of the site review team chair is confirmed. A schedule is printed in the procedures document. The schedule should insure the availability of key university administrative officials. Meeting with subordinate administrative staff for primary interviews is not an acceptable substitute. Not being able to meet with the key university administration dilutes the team's potential effectiveness to help the program. In addition, the schedule should be arranged to allow the site review team to develop a good understanding of all facets of the program by the end the first full day of the visit.

It is important that the interviews be consistent. This document includes sample questions for each group (administrators, faculty, students, alumni and practitioners). The team should agree in advance on the core questions that will be asked in each interview and by whom. The team chair may, at his/her discretion, decide to conduct interviews on an individual basis rather than as

a team; if so, it is even more important to agree on the ground rules. Teams should identify the most important areas to cover, leave time in each interview to probe areas of concern, and allow the interviewee the chance to ask any questions he or she may have. The team should extend an invitation to all faculty and students to meet with the team or a member of the team individually (under conditions of anonymity) to discuss specific issues of concern.

Exit Interview

There are four exit interviews in a typical program review visit: an informal one with program chair at breakfast; a private one with the president or other high-level administrator; a private one with the dean; and a group interview with the program's faculty and students.

The site review team chair normally conducts the exit interviews. The exit interview should provide a balanced picture of the team's findings. Each recommendation affecting approval and suggestion for improvement should be reported to all groups. It is best to read the recommendations and suggestions to avoid reporting them differently to different audiences which could leave them open to different interpretations by the various groups. The program should never be surprised by a recommendation or suggestion in the team's written report that was not mentioned in the exit interview.

The team's recommendation on approval status to LATC should not be disclosed to anyone.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR THE SITE REVIEW TEAM

(Questions which elicit information already provided in the SER generally should be avoided. These questions are examples, to generate conversation and to make sure key areas of the program are discussed. **It is not expected that all questions will be asked. Site Review Team members should discuss questions in advance of meetings to determine what questions may be most efficient in providing the team with information to make an assessment of the program.** Questions and responses can be used for the team to comment on more than one standard or criterion. **Site Review Team members should listen more than they speak.**

QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. How is the program regarded by other elements of the institution?
2. How does the program contribute to the institution's mission and record of achievement?
3. How is the future of the program regarded by others in the institution?
4. How is the program's faculty regarded academically and as contributors to the leadership (committee) structure of the institution?

5. Are there some issues or questions that the team should pay particular attention to during the visit?
6. How is the program perceived within the community outside of the institution?

QUESTIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT HEAD/PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR

1. Has the department's long-range planning effort influenced recent policy decisions? How?
2. What has been the influence of alumni and practitioner contact in facilitating the program's mission?
3. Are there special efforts underway to recruit able students, particularly women and minorities? How successful have these efforts been? What is the main draw for students who enroll in the program?
4. How do the standards for faculty selection, development, salary determination, etc., support the goals of the program?
5. Is there a strategy to assist the faculty in its professional development objectives? Is it working?
6. What efforts have been undertaken to update and strengthen the curriculum? What prompted these efforts?
7. Do you think the curriculum addresses contemporary issues?
8. How does the program assist in preparing graduates for employment or additional education opportunities? Does the program have an advisory board comprised of a variety of experts (both LA and non-LA) to provide feedback and direction to the program?
9. Is the advisory board effective in facilitating fundraising efforts for the program? Does the program have other fund raising mechanisms in place?
10. How are instructors and other faculty members assessed?
11. (If not clearly defined in the SER) How do you assess course effectiveness?
12. How do you assess how effective courses are in addressing curriculum goals?
13. How often and by what means (assessment techniques) do you evaluate how well the curriculum is addressing your program mission and goals?
14. How and how often do you assess the overall program mission and goals?

15. How are your assessment/evaluation efforts working? Do you anticipate any revisions? Does the university have resources to help you in these areas?
16. How does the program contribute to the institution's mission?

QUESTIONS FOR INSTRUCTORS

1. What are the dean's (program administrator's) expectations for the program? Have these expectations lead to faculty debate? Is this debate healthy or divisive?
2. What is the faculty's role in the objective-setting process?
3. What effect has long-range planning had on important policy decisions, particularly those involving faculty considerations? Have the program's objectives influenced these considerations?
4. How were faculty members involved in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report?
5. Are the standards for faculty selection, development, salary determination pulling the program in the right direction?
6. Are you pleased with the students attracted to this program?
7. What are your current teaching-service interests? What assistance is available in pursuing these professional interests?
8. What is the greatest source of satisfaction in serving on this faculty?
9. Is your long-term professional growth well served by remaining on this faculty?
10. Do you understand the policies and procedures that lead to your professional teaching development and do you have the mentoring and support achieve this?
11. Are administrative and support personnel resources generally adequate?
12. What do you think of the current curriculum?
13. Do you think any changes are necessary in the curriculum?
14. Are the computer and library resources satisfactory for your teaching interests?
15. How effective is your program's assessment/evaluation process? For courses? For determining how courses support curriculum goals? How curriculum supports program mission and goals?
16. Are you excited about any current innovative efforts in the institution?
17. How successful are graduates in seeking/obtaining employment? Are they satisfied with the types of positions they obtain?

18. Are you satisfied with the physical facilities that house the program?
19. How effective are the instructors and guest speakers?
20. How is the program's relationship with other programs?

QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

1. What caused you to select this program and this institution?
2. Would you recommend this program to others?
3. To what extent are students involved in the policy-making decisions of the school? Have good ideas advanced from such student involvement been implemented?
4. Were students involved in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report?
5. How soon after initial enrollment are career and placement counseling opportunities made known to students? Are these services adequate? Is the academic advising adequate? Are professional staff and instructors available as advisors?
6. Do you think this program attracts able students?
7. What do you think of the capabilities of other students in the program?
8. If faculty evaluation forms are available to students, have the results of these questionnaires made any difference? If they do not exist, should they?
9. Do you get a sense of the profession from your instructors?
10. Do instructors seem concerned about their teaching performance? Does the program emphasize good teaching?
11. How are the scholarly interests of faculty introduced into the curriculum?
12. Are course prerequisites enforced?
13. What single learning experience has been most exciting and memorable?
14. Have you been expected to utilize the library resources in your courses? Computer resources?
15. Are the program's handbook, website, and course literature accurate in describing the course content from year to year? Is this material effective in helping you select classes to meet your educational objectives?
16. Are course syllabi thoroughly explained included course learning objectives?

17. What are the plusses and minuses of the physical facilities? Are you satisfied with them?
18. How effective are the instructors and guest speakers?
19. What is the program's relationship with other programs?

Questions for Practitioners and Alumni

Alumni

1. How did the program prepare you for your career in Landscape Architecture?
2. Were you prepared to handle the work expectations upon graduation? 5 years? Now?
3. What sorts of contact do you have with the department, school and college? If any, what have you heard, experienced or gathered?
4. Have you hired any alumni recently? If not, would you recommend hiring a graduate?
5. Are you in contact with any of your classmates?
6. What do you see as the program's strengths and weaknesses?
7. If requested, and you were available, would you consider advising, participating in the program and or serving on an Advisory Board?
8. How were the scholarly interests of faculty introduced into the curriculum?

Practitioners

1. What type of practice do you have?
2. What kind of contact do you have with the program?
3. What do you see as the program's strengths and weaknesses?
4. Have you employed graduates from this program and if so, how are they doing in your office?
5. What is their contribution? Do they meet your expectations?
6. How do they compare with employees who graduated from other schools?
7. Do graduates demonstrate adequate technical skills?

Intern - Practitioners

1. What type of contact did you have with the intern?
2. Do you actively recruit interns from (school) and why?
3. What is their contribution? Do they meet your expectations?
4. How do they compare with employees who graduated from other schools?

Advisory Boards

1. What type of contact do you have with the program?
2. Do you meet frequently, what is the setting and who sets the agenda?
3. Do you find that your input is considered by the program and what sorts of issues do you find most important to it.
4. Does the board review student work?
5. Do you recommend curriculum/faculty changes based on the need to adjust to changing professional/economic conditions?

EXAMPLE

PART I

OVERALL ANALYSIS

A. Introduction

The Bachelor of Landscape Architecture program resides in the five Department College of Design at xxxxx University in xxxxx. The Department of Landscape Architecture shares the college with other Departments that may include, but not limited to, Architecture, Art + Design, Graphic Design, and Industrial Design.

The Department of Landscape Architecture has a certificate program. The program is approximately sized at 20 students each. This five-year program graduates approximately 10 students per year and there is no pressure from the university or college to increase the program enrollment. At this size, the faculty/student ratio for the Certificate Program is well within the standard of 15:1.

xxxxxx Extension is located in a university town in the state's central region. The area attracts industry and associated research and development from around the world. This highly developed area is rich in both cultural and environmental amenities. It also has a significant number of landscape architects who have been enlisted by the department in teaching and in the formal mentoring and advising of students. The department has recently developed excellent relationships with other college departments, the professional community and with the city and state-wide municipalities.

The College of Design has developed a rich interdisciplinary curriculum that is unusually progressive in the mixing of students and faculty with a curriculum that engages all college members with a First Year Experience that is truly interdepartmental and a later Swing Studio that requires mid-curriculum students to enroll in a studio in another college unit.

The college is led by Dean xxxxxx who has provided strong and enlightened leadership by both building the college infrastructure (excellent facilities and IT equipment and support) and a college leadership team and faculty that irreversibly values cross-disciplinary teaching and learning. In 20xx, Professor xxxxxxxx was appointed Department Head. Previous issues of program isolation, lack of external interaction and support and curriculum issues have been addressed and corrected. The visiting team commends his tireless and highly effective leadership efforts.

As is the case with all academic programs in this time of budget uncertainties, the future will be difficult but with the university, college and external support, and the able college and departmental leadership, this program should be able to meet the challenges ahead.

All cohorts interviewed and evidence presented suggest that the certificate Program at xxxxxx University has met the LATC standards and satisfied the two recommendations coming out of the 20XX accreditation report.

The overall evaluation of the present program's direction is commendable.

B. Confirmation That Minimum Requirements For Approval Are Satisfied

1. The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
3. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
4. Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows:
 - a. *An academic unit that offers a single first-professional program has at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom is full-time.*
 - b. An academic unit that offers a certificate program has at least 3 instructional FTE, at least two of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, and at least one full time support faculty

Programs	FTE Instructional Faculty	Faculty with Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture	Full Time FTE Support Faculty
Certificate program Single Program	3	2	1

5. The parent institution is accredited by a recognized institutional accrediting agency. [Such as recognition by the U.S. Department of Education or Council for Higher Education Accreditation]
6. There is a designated program administrator responsible for the leadership and management functions for the program under review.

Does the program meet the minimum requirements listed above?

The visiting team has seen evidence to show that the certificate program at XXX University meets the minimum requirements.

C. Review of Each Recommendation Affecting Program Approval Identified by the Previous Review in xxxx

The Site Review Team made three recommendations as part of the 20xx visit. They are:

Recommendation 1

Review the balance of hand graphics and computer technology in design and design implementation courses such that the use of computer technology is more fully integrated into all courses (Standard 3).

Response from the Visiting Team:

After a thorough examination of the revised curriculum, discussions with students, faculty, and the department head, and through a careful review of displayed student work, the visiting team concluded that this recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 2

Expand and solidify the professional practice content on the curriculum (Standard 3).

Through the initiation of a formal Mentorship program which teams a student with a local practitioner and the professional practice course the team concluded that this recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 3

Provide the L.A. Department with office and studio space that gives the program more visibility and greater access to other departments and the College facilities.

There have been no changes in the program's facilities and the team concluded that this recommendation has not been satisfied. See the rationale following Standard 7.

D. Review of Each Suggestion for Improvement from the Previous Review in XXXX

1. Consider adding references to scholarship/research and interdisciplinary program in its mission statement (Standard 1).

The mission statement has been updated to include references to interdisciplinary programs and research. See Standard 1 for more input on the mission statement.

2. Consider a comprehensive narrative or equivalent of each curriculum sequence to aid faculty as to the context of their course in the curriculum (Standard 3).

The program developed a narrative of each curriculum sequence that has been helpful to students and faculty. See Standard 3 on curriculum for more details.

EXAMPLES

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

Assessment:

_____ Met X Met With Recommendation _____ Not Met

INTENT: Using a clear concise mission statement, each landscape architecture certificate program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes why the program exists and the needs that it seeks to fulfill. It also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.

A. Program Mission. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment 1: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relate to the institution's mission statement?

Team comments: Yes. The program mission statement in the program's 20xx strategic plan focuses primarily on the stewardship and enhancement of the urban environment in an effort to improve the quality of life for the urban populous - principally in the northwestern region of the country. This focus is also articulated in the institution's mission statement and appropriate to the urban environment in which the institution is located.

Assessment 2: Does the mission statement take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture?

Team comments: Yes.

Assessment 3: Does the program's literature fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives?

Team comments: Yes.

Assessment 4: Does the program title and degree description shall incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture?"

Team comments: Yes.

B. Educational Goals. Clearly defined and formally stated academic goals reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment 1: Does the program have an effective procedure to determine progress in meeting its goals and is it used regularly?

Team Comments: Collectively, the faculty reviews the work in each course as a means of evaluating how well each course is addressing the program's goals. Reviews are scheduled for about one third of the curriculum each year. At the reviews, faculty also discusses how general education courses and elective choices support program goals.

Assessment 2: Does the program have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs?

Team Comments: Yes.

C. Educational Objectives. The educational objectives specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment : Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives that describe how the goals will be met?

Team Comments: Yes. The objectives describe how the sequence of courses, the focus of specific courses, the relationship between courses during the semester, field trips, study abroad programs and internships work together to achieve the academic goals. In addition, the faculty as a whole annually reviews the objectives to determine if they are appropriate and realistic as a vehicle to achieving program goals.

D. Long-Range Planning Process. The program is engaged in a long-range planning process.

Assessment 1: Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process?

Team Comments: The program has been engaged in long-range planning. The strategic plan defines goals and objectives for a five-year period. The goals addressing the curriculum have a

set of objectives that are successfully guiding its development. The objectives supporting the goals that address student recruitment and facilities are weak.

Assessment 2: Is the long-range plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

Team Comments: The long-range plan is reviewed annually at a faculty retreat just prior to the start of fall semester. It has been an important and effective guide for curriculum development but less so guiding student recruitment and facilities (individual faculty offices, seminar space and computer technology).

Assessment 3: Does the SER respond to recommendations and suggestions from the previous accreditation review and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

Team Comments: The LATC visiting team made four recommendations after the last visit. The SER reported on the progress made to resolve all four. Two of the recommendations (strategic planning and curriculum development) have been resolved. Recommendations about student recruitment and facilities although addressed to some degree, need additional attention.

E. Program Disclosure. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

Assessment: Is the program information accurate?

Team Comments: All program media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

F. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

1. Clearly articulate the Program's mission; and identify supporting educational objective the attainment of which can be demonstrated.

Suggestions for Improvement:

1. Develop a stronger statement of objectives related to outreach and scholarship and the measures that should be used to evaluate progress towards their attainment.

EXAMPLE**Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration**

The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.

Assessment:

_____Met _____Met With Recommendation _____Not Met

INTENT: Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.

A. Program Administration. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program.

Assessment 1: Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Team Comments: Administrators from department heads to the Provost said the LA program was a discrete and important unit in the college and university. However, the program is a small “program” with less than 50 students, in the much larger Department of Architecture with over 300 students that is the smallest department in the College of Design. The program is not very visible. The only sign on the outside or inside of the building that says Landscape Architecture is in the listing of programs on the Department of Architecture’s office door. In addition, LA students do not have their own studio space. They are in architecture studio space. LA faculty and students do not see themselves as being a very discrete unit in the department or college.

Assessment 2: Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture?

Team Comments: The program administrator has a faculty appointment in landscape architecture.

Assessment 3: Does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program?

Team Comments: The department head has the authority and responsibility to lead and manage the department. The department head reports directly to the dean of the college and participates, along with other department heads, in discussions on resource allocations and management of the college.

Assessment 4: Is the educational program established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code?

Team Comments: Yes. The program has approved by the *Western Association of Schools and Colleges since 1995.*

Assessment 5: The program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:

- (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.*
- (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.*
- (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.*
- (4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).*
- (5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.*

Does the program meet these requirements?

Team Comments: Yes. The program meets each of the requirements above.

Assessment 6: Is the program administrator a California licensed landscape architect?

Team Comments: Yes. The program administrator is an active California licensed landscape architect, license number XXXX.

B. Institutional Support. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15:1?

Team Comments: At the present time, student/faculty ratios are 11:1; down from the 18:1 that the program has historically had. While the lower ratios have their positive side, there was concern expressed by the department head and the dean that a continued decline in enrollment may well lead to a loss of resources.

Assessment 2: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Team Comments: Funding for faculty development is available but it is limited. All requests for supported travel have to be made to the provost's office. The university's first priority is to fund travel associated with gaining funded research grants. Second is funding for untenured faculty to present (not just attend) at conferences. Funds for computers, software and other technical support are available. Students pay a per credit hour fee to the university and the college to support technology.

Assessment 3: Is funding adequate for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc?

Team Comments: Funding for scholarships has historically been adequate. Normally, the program has about 30 scholarships to award among its 100 students. Funds for these scholarships come from the department endowment, the college, and university and off-campus organizations like the garden club. However, the recent turn-down in the economy has reduced this number and last year, the department awarded 13 scholarships. The department has five work-study positions.

Assessment 4: Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

Team Comments: The department has adequate support personal. It has two support staff members whose responsibilities center on ("herding cats") student course advising, receiving and managing applications and assisting the department head with clerical tasks. The college provides computer support and some assistance with accounting.

C. Commitment to Diversity. The program demonstrates commitment to diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment: How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

Team Comments: While the department has achieved gender balance of students and faculty, recruitment of minority students and faculty has been largely unsuccessful. There are no minority faculty members and of the 120 students, two are African-American, two are Hispanic, one is Asian and one is from India. The department advertises each faculty position in all LA and related professional media and request alumni, friends at other universities and practitioners nominate candidates, especially minority candidates for positions.

D. Faculty Participation. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Team Comments: Faculty discusses and makes recommendations on the allocation of resources but the principle responsibility lies with the department head. Faculty also have input on some of

the operating practices of the department and a significant role evaluating and modifying the curriculum.

Assessment 2: Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation, promotion and tenure of faculty?

Team Comments: The department's criteria for annual evaluation have been "on the books" for many years and faculty have participated in making minor adjustments to it. The promotion and tenure guidelines went through a major revision two years ago. A faculty committee was responsible for the revisions that were then approved by the faculty. The need for the revision was triggered by a university requirement to add a post-tenure review process.

Assessment 3: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and for tenure and promotion to all ranks?

Team Comments: The department does not have a formal mentor program. Some faculty admitted they did not know what the expectations for gaining tenure were and said the department head had not discussed it with them. They also seemed a bit uncomfortable when the visiting team seemed to know more about the expectations than they did. The policies and procedures are clearly spelled out in the department, college and university faculty handbooks and on line.

E. Faculty Number. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program's goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in research, creative activity and scholarship and to be actively involved in professional endeavors such as presenting at conferences. To address this criterion:

1. A unit that offers a professional certificate program should have a minimum of three part time faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture; and
2. An academic unit that offers a professional degree should have a minimum of three part time faculty, at least two of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture.¹

¹*(This criterion does not conflict with the numbers listed in the Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status (p. 5). Those numbers are minimums and are expected for emerging programs and programs that are becoming established to enroll a small number of students.)*

Assessment 1: Does an academic unit that offers a first professional program have a minimum of three part time faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?

Team Comments: Yes, three adjunct professors and two support staff all with at least one degree in landscape architecture and two are licensed.

Assessment 2: Does an academic unit that offers professional certificate programs have a minimum of three full-time faculty, at least two of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?

Team Comments: Yes; two adjunct professors and two associate professors All faculty and one adjunct professor have at least one degree in landscape architecture and two are licensed landscape architects and one is a licensed architect.

Assessment 3: Does the strategic plan or long-range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?

Team Comments: The strategic plan does not adequately address the number or expertise of faculty needed for new Programs as envisioned by the department.

Assessment 4: Are the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

Team Comments: The program has adequate faculty to appropriately address all of its responsibilities.

F. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain

Recommendation affecting accreditation:

The published requirements in the Scholarship Procedures of the School should be examined and potentially revised to reflect the expectations in keeping with the scholarship mission of the university. Increased clarity is imperative for the consistent interpretation of scholarly expectations for promotion and tenure at all levels of review.

Suggestions for Improvement:

Develop a Memorandum of Understanding, comparable to that developed for the Community Planning Program to ensure that the necessary authority of the Program Administrator and faculty be formally recognized.

Examples of Appropriate Recommendations Affecting Approval:

Arrange the curriculum with greater flexibility and less conflict in order to meet both major objectives of the certificate curriculum; providing "basic competency in the fundamental aspects of design and technology," and "advanced study in an area of concentration."

A specific plan for the full use and maintenance of computer technology for faculty and students should be developed and implemented.

Integrate the use of computers into the curriculum.

Develop a clear set of measurable objectives for the program which are linked to the curriculum.

Improve balance between theory and practice within the curriculum.

Examples of Inappropriate Recommendations Affecting Program Approval

Add a GIS course to ensure all students have knowledge of GIS.

Hire two additional landscape architecture faculty to reduce student/faculty ratios in studios.

Increase funds allocated to program for purchase of computer hardware and software.

Team Member Misconduct

Conduct

LATC expects all visiting team members to act as professionals. Visiting team members must refrain from engaging in any conduct that might be deemed unprofessional or inappropriate. For example, no team member should make any statement or engage in any activity that might offend the reasonable sensibilities of representatives of the program. Conduct that will not be tolerated under any circumstances includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Comments that might be construed as showing disrespect for the program, its representatives or the sponsoring institution.
- Comments or actions that may be otherwise inappropriate for workplace settings, such as:
 - Offensive or demeaning terms of a sexual, racial, ethnic, or similar nature; Unwelcome suggestions regarding, or invitations to, social engagements or Work-related social events.
 - The deliberate or careless creation of an atmosphere of sexual harassment or personal intimidation; or
 - The deliberate or careless expression of jokes or remarks of a sexual, racial, ethnic, or similar nature to or in the presence of individuals who may find such jokes or remarks offensive.

Any team member who fails to act in a professional and respectful manner at all times may be dismissed immediately from the team by the team chair.

Appendix A

SITE REVIEW TEAM CHAIR VISIT CHECK LIST

BEFORE VISIT

1. ___ Make travel arrangements and notify program.
2. ___ Review Self-Evaluation Report (should arrive about 45 days before visit.) Expect to be contacted by LATC Program Manager
3. ___ Contact other team members, discuss assignments.
4. ___ Discuss schedule with program.
5. ___ Review **APPROVAL** Standards and Procedures and Visiting Team Guidelines.
6. ___ Exchange home phone numbers with team members, Extension Program Administrator and LATC Program Manager to be used in case of emergency.

DURING VISIT

1. ___ Introduction and orientation session with the team, review SER and other materials.
2. ___ Review team member responsibilities and potential interview questions.
3. ___ Complete and sign Recommendation Form.
4. ___ Complete Team Report

AFTER VISIT

1. ___ File team report with LATC Program Manager within 10 days.
2. ___ Send copies of report to team members.
3. ___ Submit expense voucher to LATC

Appendix B

ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION TO THE
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Date of Visit _____

Institution _____

Degree Title _____

Visiting Team Recommendation

_____ Initial Approval

APPROVAL

_____ Provisional Approval

_____ Denial

Signatures:

APPROVAL

Granted when all standards are met or when one or more standards are met with recommendation, and continued overall program quality and conformance to standards are judged likely to be maintained.

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM APPROVAL may be granted up to six (6) years.

A program receiving **APPROVAL** may be required to submit special progress reports at the discretion of the LATC.

Provisional APPROVAL

Granted when one or more standards are met with recommendation and the cited deficiencies are such that continued overall program quality or conformance to standards is uncertain. Provisional **APPROVAL** may be granted up to two (2) years. This status shall not be granted more than twice without an intervening period of **APPROVAL**. Provisional status is not deemed an adverse action and is not subject to be appealed.

Initial APPROVAL

Granted on a first review when all standards are at least minimally met and the program's continued development and conformance to the **APPROVAL** standards is likely. Initial **APPROVAL** may be granted for up to six (6) years. Programs receiving initial **APPROVAL** must submit a special progress report after two or three years (time determined by LATC). The LATC will review the progress report to determine if an **APPROVAL** review should be scheduled immediately or as originally scheduled when initial **APPROVAL** was granted.

Denial of APPROVAL

This status results when one or more standards are not met. This determination is subject to appeal.

Appendix C

NEW

**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM
REVIEW TASK FORCE
INVOICE**

REPEAT

ADDRESS CHANGE

Claimant Name _____ DATE: _____

Are you a California Resident (Y/N) Yes Please check the one that applies: Corporation _____ Partnership _____ Individual x Estate or Trust _____

Social Security Number: _____

Mailing Address: _____
Street City State Zip

Meeting Date: _____

Purpose: _____

Expenses (please itemize and attach receipts):

<i>Hotel night(s)</i>	\$	<i>Dinner</i>	\$	_____
<i>Breakfast(s)</i>	\$	<i>Lunch</i>	\$10	_____
<i>Incidentals</i>	\$	<i>Toll for Bridge</i>	\$	_____
<i>Airport Parking</i>	\$	<i>Taxi/BART</i>	\$	_____
<i>Hotel Parking</i>	\$	<i>Air</i>	\$	_____
<i>Mileage</i>	42.7mi	<i>miles \$0.55 per mile</i>	\$23.49	_____

TRAVEL SUBTOTAL _____

**** Provided by LATC, *Provided by Hotel.**

CLAIM TOTAL _____

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the information provided on this document is true and correct.

Signature of Claimant (please sign in ink)

Phone

STATE USE ONLY			
APPROVED FOR PAYMENT	ALLOTMENT CODING	FY	AMOUNT
BOARD APPROVAL	6000/404.21/60000 (Task Force Extension Certificate Meeting/Review – LATC Use Only)	2012/13	
CLIENT SERVICE TEAM	6000/404.22/60000 (Task Force Extension Certificate Travel – LATC Use Only)	2012/13	

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Annual Report Format

Landscape Architects Technical Committee

**2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834**

November 2, 2012

PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT

For the Academic Year _____ Institution _____

Program _____

Chief Administrative Official
of the Institution

name title

address

e-mail address phone number

Chief Administrative Official
of the College (if applicable)

name title

address

e-mail address phone number

Chief Administrative Official
of the Division (if applicable)

name title

address

e-mail address phone number

Chief Administrative Official
of the Department

name title

address

e-mail address phone number

Chief Administrative Official
of the Program

name title

address

e-mail address phone number

Report Submitted by _____
name *date*

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

For Achieving And Maintaining Approved Status

California Code of Regulations Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, states the following:

“An extension certificate program shall meet the following requirements:

- (a) The educational program shall be established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code.
- (b) There shall be a written statement of the program's philosophy and objectives which serves as a basis for curriculum structure. Such statement shall take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture. The program objectives shall provide for relationships and linkages with other disciplines and public and private landscape architectural practices. The program objectives shall be reinforced by course inclusion, emphasis and sequence in a manner which promotes achievement of program objectives. The program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives.
- (c) The program shall have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.
- (d) The program shall be administered as a discrete program in landscape architecture within the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (e) There shall be an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (f) The program shall have sufficient authority and resources to achieve its educational objectives.
- (g) The program administrator shall be a California licensed landscape architect.
- (h) The program administrator shall have the primary responsibility for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program. The faculty shall be adequate in type and number to develop and implement the program approved by the Board.
- (i) The program curriculum shall provide instruction in the following areas related to landscape architecture including public health, safety, and welfare:

- (1) History, theory and criticism
 - (2) Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
 - (3) Public Policy and regulation
 - (4) Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management
 - (5) Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
 - (6) Construction documentation and administration
 - (7) Written, verbal and visual communication
 - (8) Professional practice
 - (9) Professional values and ethics
 - (10) Plants and ecosystems
 - (11) Computer applications and other advanced technology
- (j) The program shall consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units.
- (k) The program shall maintain a current syllabus for each required course which includes the course objectives, learning outcomes, content, and the methods of evaluating student performance.
- (l) The program clearly identifies where the public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed.
- (m) The curriculum shall be offered in a timeframe which reflects the proper course sequence. Students shall be required to adhere to that sequence, and courses shall be offered in a consistent and timely manner in order that students can observe those requirements.
- (n) A program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:
- (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.
 - (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.
 - (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.
 - (4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).
 - (5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.
- (o) The program shall submit an annual report in writing based on the date of the most recent Board approval. The report shall include:
- (1) Verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements;
 - (2) Any significant changes such as curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report;
 - (3) Current enrollment and demographics; and

(4) Progress toward complying with the recommendations, if any, from the last approval.

(p) The program title and degree description shall incorporate the term “Landscape Architecture.”

The Board may choose to further evaluate changes to any of the reported items or to a program.

The Board will either grant or deny an application. When specific minor deficiencies are identified during evaluation of an application, but the institution is substantially in compliance with the requirements of the Code and this Division, a provisional approval to operate may be granted for a period not to exceed 24 months, to permit the institution time to correct those deficiencies identified. A provisional approval to operate shall expire at the end of its stated period and the application shall be deemed denied, unless the deficiencies are corrected prior to its expiration and an approval to operate has been granted before that date or the provisional approval to operate has been extended for a period not to exceed 24 months if the Board is satisfied that the program has made a good faith effort and has the ability to correct the deficiencies.

The Board shall review the program at least every six years for approval.

The Board may rescind an approval during the six-year approval period based on the information received in the program’s annual report after providing the school with a written statement of the deficiencies and providing the school with an opportunity to respond to the charges. If an approval is rescinded, the Board may subsequently grant provisional approval in accordance with the guidelines of this section to allow the program to correct deficiencies.”

A program accredited by LAAB shall:

- a. Continuously comply with accreditation standards;
- b. Pay the annual sustaining and other fees as required; and
- c. Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports.

The program administrator shall inform Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) if any of these factors fails to apply during an approval period.

The _____ program meets the minimum conditions to apply for LATC approval.

Program Administrator Name

Title

Program Administrator Signature

Date

RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS REVIEW

- 1. Describe the progress** that has been made on the Recommendations Affecting Approval from the previous approval visit (not applicable to those seeking initial approval). List each prior Recommendation verbatim and provide an updated recap of responses made on annual interim reports. List each Suggestion for Improvement and provide an update.
- 2. Describe any substantial changes** in the program since the last approval review.

PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHICS AND STATISTICS

PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHICS AND STATISTICS

1. How many students does your program currently have? ____
2. How many students are actively seeking certification from your program currently? ____
3. What was the total number of **each of the following for** your academic unit in the last academic year?

	Male	Female	Total
Applicants			
Admitted			
Accepted			
Enrolled			
International students enrolled			

5. How many students graduated from your program during the last academic year? ____
6. Please tabulate the activities of your graduates from the last academic year.

Activity	Male	Female	Total
Advanced study and research			
Teaching			
Private practice			
Government practice			
Landscape horticulture/design build			
Volunteer service			
Not employed in landscape architecture			
Unknown			
Other			

7. What is the total approved operating budget for your academic unit (not including salaries) for the last academic year? ____
8. How many support staff do you have in your academic unit? _____

Report of the Site Review Team

Landscape Architects Technical Committee

LATC VISITING TEAM REPORT TEMPLATE
Date

Landscape Architecture Program
School
Address

VISITING TEAM MEMBERS
Name
Name
Name

Schedule for Site Review Visit

Insert Visit Schedule

PART I

OVERALL ANALYSIS

Introduction (up to two pages)

Confirmation that Minimum Requirements for Approval are Satisfied

California Code of Regulations Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, states the following:

“An extension certificate program shall meet the following requirements:

- (a) The educational program shall be established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code.
- (b) There shall be a written statement of the program's philosophy and objectives which serves as a basis for curriculum structure. Such statement shall take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture. The program objectives shall provide for relationships and linkages with other disciplines and public and private landscape architectural practices. The program objectives shall be reinforced by course inclusion, emphasis and sequence in a manner which promotes achievement of program objectives. The program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives.
- (c) The program shall have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.
- (d) The program shall be administered as a discrete program in landscape architecture within the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (e) There shall be an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (f) The program shall have sufficient authority and resources to achieve its educational objectives.
- (g) The program administrator shall be a California licensed landscape architect.
- (h) The program administrator shall have the primary responsibility for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program. The faculty shall be adequate in type and number to develop and implement the program approved by the Board.
- (i) The program curriculum shall provide instruction in the following areas related to landscape architecture including public health, safety, and welfare:

- (1) History, theory and criticism
 - (2) Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
 - (3) Public Policy and regulation
 - (4) Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management
 - (5) Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
 - (6) Construction documentation and administration
 - (7) Written, verbal and visual communication
 - (8) Professional practice
 - (9) Professional values and ethics
 - (10) Plants and ecosystems
 - (11) Computer applications and other advanced technology
- (j) The program shall consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units.
- (k) The program shall maintain a current syllabus for each required course which includes the course objectives, learning outcomes, content, and the methods of evaluating student performance.
- (l) The program clearly identifies where the public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed.
- (m) The curriculum shall be offered in a timeframe which reflects the proper course sequence. Students shall be required to adhere to that sequence, and courses shall be offered in a consistent and timely manner in order that students can observe those requirements.
- (n) A program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:
- (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.
 - (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.
 - (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.
 - (4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).
 - (5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.
- (o) The program shall submit an annual report in writing based on the date of the most recent Board approval. The report shall include:
- (1) Verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements;
 - (2) Any significant changes such as curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report;
 - (3) Current enrollment and demographics; and
 - (4) Progress toward complying with the recommendations, if any, from the last approval.
- (p) The program title and degree description shall incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture."

The Board may choose to further evaluate changes to any of the reported items or to a program.

The Board will either grant or deny an application. When specific minor deficiencies are identified during evaluation of an application, but the institution is substantially in compliance with the requirements of the Code and this Division, a provisional approval to operate may be granted for a period not to exceed 24 months, to permit the institution time to correct those deficiencies identified. A provisional approval to operate shall expire at the end of its stated period and the application shall be deemed denied, unless the deficiencies are corrected prior to its expiration and an approval to operate has been granted before that date or the provisional approval to operate has been extended for a period not to exceed 24 months if the Board is satisfied that the program has made a good faith effort and has the ability to correct the deficiencies.

The Board shall review the program at least every six years for approval.

The Board may rescind an approval during the six-year approval period based on the information received in the program's annual report after providing the school with a written statement of the deficiencies and providing the school with an opportunity to respond to the charges. If an approval is rescinded, the Board may subsequently grant provisional approval in accordance with the guidelines of this section to allow the program to correct deficiencies."

A program approved by LATC shall:

- a. Continuously comply with LATC approval standards;
- b. Pay the annual sustaining and other fees as required; and
- c. Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports.

Review of Each Recommendation Affecting Approval Identified by the Previous Review in (year)

Review of Each Suggestion for Improvement From the Previous Review in (year)

PART II

ASSESSMENT OF EACH STANDARD

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

Assessment:

_____ Met _____ Met With Recommendation _____ Not Met

INTENT: Using a clear concise mission statement, each landscape architecture program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes why the program exists and the needs that it seeks to fulfill. It also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.

A. PROGRAM MISSION. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment 1: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relates to the institution's mission statement?

Team comments:

Assessment 2: Does the mission statement take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture?

Team comments:

Assessment 3: Does the program's literature fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives?

Team comments:

Assessment 4: Does the program title and degree description shall incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture?"

Team comments:

B. EDUCATIONAL GOALS. Clearly defined and formally stated academic goals reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment 1: Does the program have an effective procedure to determine progress in meeting its goals and is it used regularly?

Team comments:

Assessment 2: *Does the program have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs?*

Team comments:

C. EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES. The educational objectives specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment: Does the program have an effective procedure to determine progress in meeting its goals and is it used regularly?

Team Comments:

D. LONG-RANGE PLANNING PROCESS. The program is engaged in a long-range planning process.

Assessment 1: Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Is the long-range plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Does the SER respond to recommendations and suggestions from the previous accreditation review and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

Team Comments:

E. PROGRAM DISCLOSURE. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

Assessment: Is the program information accurate?

Team Comments:

F. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration

The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.

Assessment:

_____ Met _____ Met With Recommendation _____ Not Met

INTENT: Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.

A. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program.

Assessment 1: Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program? Does he/she have the primary responsibilities for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program?

Team Comments:

Assessment 4: Is the educational program established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and College or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code?

Team Comments:

Assessment 5: Does the program meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:

- (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.*
- (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.*
- (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.*

(4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).

(5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.

Team Comments:

Assessment 6: Is the program administrator a California licensed landscape architect?

Team Comments:

Assessment 7: Has an organizational chart been provided that clearly identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and with the institution that supports it?

Team Comments:

B. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15-18:1?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Does the institution provide student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, internships, etc?

Team Comments:

Assessment 4: Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

Team Comments:

C. COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY. The program demonstrates commitment to diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment: How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

Team Comments:

D. FACULTY PARTICIPATION. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations?

Team Comments:

E. FACULTY NUMBER. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program's goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in research, creative activity and scholarship and to be actively involved in professional endeavors such as presenting at conferences. To address this criterion, a certificate program should have a minimum of three fulltime equivalent faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture and are licensed California landscape architects.

Assessment 1: Are the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Is at least 50% of the academic faculty licensed as a landscape architect?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Does the strategic plan or long-range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?

Team Comments:

F. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendation affecting accreditation:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Standard 3: Professional Curriculum

The certificate curriculum shall include the core knowledge skills and applications of landscape architecture. In addition to the professional curriculum, the certificate program shall require that all enrolled students have, at minimum, a bachelor's degree for entry into the program.

Assessment:

_____Met _____Met With Recommendation _____Not Met

INTENT: The purpose of the curriculum is to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and objectives. Curriculum objectives should relate to the program's mission and specific learning objectives. The program's curriculum should encompass coursework and other opportunities intended to develop students' knowledge, skills, and abilities in landscape architecture.

A. MISSION AND OBJECTIVES. The program's curriculum addresses its mission, goals, and objectives.

Assessment: Does the program identify the knowledge, skills, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

Team Comments:

B. PROFESSIONAL CURRICULUM. The program curriculum includes coverage of:

- History, theory and criticism
- Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability
- Public Policy and regulation
- Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management
- Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application
- Construction documentation and administration
- Written, verbal and visual communication
- Professional practice
- Professional values and ethics
- Plants and ecosystems
- Computer applications and other advanced technology

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum address the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and objectives?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Does student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Do curriculum and program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?

Team Comments:

Assessment 4: Does the curriculum provide opportunities for student engagement in interdisciplinary professions?

Team Comments:

Assessment 5: Does the curriculum include a “capstone” or terminal project?

Team Comments:

Assessment 6: Does the program consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units?

Team Comments:

C. SYLLABI. Syllabi are maintained for **all required** courses.

*Assessment 1: Do syllabi include educational objectives, **learning outcomes**, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?*

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Do syllabi identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to successfully complete the course and advance in the curriculum?

Team Comments:

D. CURRICULUM EVALUATION. At the course and curriculum levels, the program evaluates how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning objectives in a timely way.

Assessment 1: Does the program demonstrate and document ways of:

- a. Assessing students' achievement of course and program objectives in the length of time to graduation stated by the program?*
- b. Reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?*
- c. Maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and values of the profession?*

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses and curriculum?

Team Comments:

E. AUGMENTATION OF FORMAL EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE. The program provides opportunities for students to participate in internships, off campus studies, research assistantships, or practicum experiences.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide any of these opportunities?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: How does the program identify the objectives and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

Team Comments:

F. COURSEWORK AND AREAS OF INTEREST.

Assessment 1: What percentage of current students are currently enrolled in the program with a bachelor's degree or higher? Please provide a breakdown of degree levels admitted.

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: How does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, coursework outside landscape architecture, collaboration with related professions, etc.?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: How does student work incorporate academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

Team Comments:

I. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendations Affecting Accreditation:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Standard 4: Student and Program Outcomes.

The program shall prepare students to pursue careers in landscape architecture.

Assessment:

_____ **Met** _____ **Met With Recommendation** _____ **Not Met**

INTENT: Students should be prepared – through educational programs, advising, and other academic and professional opportunities – to pursue a career in landscape architecture upon graduation. Students should have demonstrated knowledge and skills in creative problem solving, critical thinking, communications, design, and organization to allow them to enter the profession of landscape architecture.

A. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES. Upon completion of the program, students are qualified to pursue a career in landscape architecture.

Assessment 1: Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry-level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's learning objectives, including critical and creative thinking and their ability to understand, apply and communicate the subject matter of the professional curriculum as evidenced through project definition, problem identification, information collection, analysis, synthesis, conceptualization and implementation?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Can the students demonstrate and understanding of the health, safety and welfare issues affecting the coursework studied? Can these issues be applied to the real world?

Team Comments:

B. STUDENT ADVISING. The program provides students with effective advising and mentoring throughout their educational careers.

Assessment 1: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic development?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding career development?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Are students aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?

Team Comments:

Assessment 4: How satisfied are students with academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

Team Comments:

C. PARTICIPATION IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES. Students are encouraged and have the opportunity to participate in professional activities and institutional and community service.

Assessment 1: Do students participate in institutional/college organizations, community initiatives, or other activities?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Do students participate in events such as LaBash, ASLA Annual Meetings, local ASLA chapter events and the activities of other professional societies or special interest groups?

Team Comments:

D. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Standard 5: Faculty

The qualifications, academic position, and professional activities of faculty and instructional personnel shall promote and enhance the academic mission and objectives of the program.

Assessment:

_____ **Met** _____ **Met With Recommendation** _____ **Not Met**

INTENT: The program should have qualified experienced faculty and other instructional personnel to instill the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students will need to pursue a career in landscape architecture. Faculty workloads, compensation, and overall support received for career development contribute to the success of the program.

A. CREDENTIALS. The qualifications of the faculty, instructional personnel, and teaching assistants are appropriate to their roles.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty have a balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Are adjunct and/or part-time faculty integrated into the program's administration and curriculum evaluation/development in a coordinated and organized manner?

Team Comments:

Assessment 4: Are qualifications appropriate to responsibilities of the program as defined by the institution?

Team Comments:

B. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. The faculty is continuously engaged in activities leading to their professional growth and advancement, the advancement of the profession, and the effectiveness of the program.

Assessment 1: Are faculty activities such as scholarly inquiry, professional practice and service to the profession, university and community documented and disseminated through appropriate media such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated, and are the results used for individual and program improvement?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc?

Team Comments:

Assessment 4: Are the activities of faculty reviewed and recognized by faculty peers?

Team Comments:

Assessment 5: Do faculty participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

Team Comments:

C. FACULTY RETENTION. Faculty hold academic status, have workloads, receive salaries, mentoring and support that promote productivity and retention.

Assessment 1: Are faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition evaluated to promote faculty retention and productivity?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: What is the rate of faculty turnover?

Team Comments:

D. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendations Affecting Accreditation:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Standard 6: Outreach to the Institution, Communities, Alumni, and Practitioners

The program shall have a record or plan of achievement for interacting with the professional community, its alumni, the institution, community, and the public at large.

Assessment:

_____ Met _____ Met With Recommendation _____ Not Met

INTENT: The program should establish an effective relationship with the institution, communities, alumni, practitioners and the public at large in order to provide a source of service learning opportunities for students, scholarly development for faculty, and professional guidance and financial support. Documentation and dissemination of successful outreach efforts should enhance the image of the program and educate its constituencies regarding the program and the profession of landscape architecture.

A. INTERACTION WITH THE PROFESSION, INSTITUTION, AND PUBLIC. The program represents and advocates for the profession by interacting with the professional community, the institution, community and the public at large.

Assessment 1: Are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Are service activities documented on a regular basis?

Team Comments:

B. ALUMNI AND PRACTITIONERS. The program recognizes alumni and practitioners as a resource.

Assessment 1: Does the program maintain a current registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, licensure, and significant professional accomplishments?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Does the program engage the alumni and practitioners in activities such as a formal advisory board, student career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education etc.?

Team Comments:

C. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendations Affecting Accreditation: Suggestions for Improvement:

Standard 7: Facilities, Equipment, and Technology

Faculty, students and staff shall have access to facilities, equipment, library and other technologies necessary for achieving the program's mission and objectives.

Assessment:

_____ Met _____ Met With Recommendation _____ Not Met

INTENT: The program should occupy space in designated, code-compliant facilities that support the achievement of program mission and objectives. Students, faculty, and staff should have the required tools and facilities to enable achievement of the program mission and objectives.

A. FACILITIES. There are designated, code-compliant, adequately maintained spaces that serve the professional requirements of the faculty, students and staff.

Assessment 1: Are faculty, staff and administration provided with appropriate office space?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Are students assigned permanent studio workstations adequate to meet the program needs?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Are facilities adequately maintained and are they in compliance with ADA, life-safety and applicable building codes? (Acceptable documentation includes reasonable accommodation reports from the university ADA compliance office and/or facilities or risk management office.)

Team Comments:

B. INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT. Information systems and technical equipment needed to achieve the program's mission and objectives are available to students, faculty and other instructional and administrative personnel.

Assessment 1: Does the program have sufficient access to computer equipment and software?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Is the frequency of hardware and software maintenance, updating and replacement sufficient?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Are the hours of use sufficient to serve faculty and students?

Team Comments:

C. LIBRARY RESOURCES. Library collections and other resources are sufficient to support the program's mission and educational objectives.

Assessment 1: Are collections adequate to support the program?

Team Comments:

Assessment 2: Do courses integrate library and other resources?

Team Comments:

Assessment 3: Are the library hours of operation convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?

Team Comments:

D. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Team Comments:

Recommendations Affecting Accreditation:

Suggestion for Improvement:

PART III

Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions

A. Recommendations Affecting Approval

B. Suggestions for Improvements

Agenda Item G

REVIEW PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR) SECTION 2620.5, REQUIREMENTS FOR AN APPROVED EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM, AND POSSIBLE ACTION

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) established the original requirements for an approved extension certificate program based on university accreditation standards from the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). These requirements are outlined in CCR section 2620.5. In 2009, LAAB implemented changes to their university accreditation standards. Prompted by the changes made by LAAB, LATC drafted updated requirements for an approved extension certificate program and submitted a regulation package with the proposed changes to CCR section 2620.5 to the Office of Administrative Law on June 22, 2012.

At the June 27, 2012, University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force meeting, the Task Force discussed several standards that could potentially require further changes to the proposed language contained in CCR section 2620.5. The Task Force also discussed adding regulatory language allowing provisional approval for extension programs in order to allow the programs to correct deficiencies identified during the review process and changing the approval period from the proposed seven years to six years to align with LAAB standards. The six-year approval period also aligns with the biennial application fee proposed in CCR section 2649, Fees.

LATC staff and Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) legal counsel discussed adding new “provisional approval” language for the extension programs to the regulations subsequent to the June 27, 2012, Task Force meeting. During this discussion, it was determined that provisions to deny or rescind an approval during the proposed biennial update process should also be included in CCR section 2620.5 to address any issues which may arise during the review process. Additionally, DCA legal counsel recommended adding language to provide schools with an opportunity to respond to any charges, such as deficiencies, before an approval is rescinded.

LATC held a public hearing on the proposed changes to CCR section 2620.5 on August 6, 2012. No comments were received. Further action on the regulation package was temporarily

suspended due to the potential for further recommended changes to the regulatory language that could arise from the Task Force meetings.

At the October 8, 2012, Task Force meeting, the Task Force reviewed the modified proposed language for CCR section 2620.5, and proposed the following edits to the proposed language:

1. Use the title “program administrator” when referring to the head or director of the program for consistency;
2. Change the curriculum standards in item (i) to directly align with LAAB curriculum standards;
3. Remove the last sentence in item (i) to omit the Board approval requirement for the revision of curriculum;
4. Add the term “learning outcomes” in item (k) to the program syllabus requirements;
5. Separate the last sentence in item (k) into a new item (l) to clearly identify that the extension certificate programs have an emphasis to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public;
6. Add a new item (n)(3) stating that a landscape architecture extension certificate program administrator should be at least .75 time-base;
7. Add a new item (n)(4) stating a program’s administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE);
8. Add a new item (n)(5) stating a program shall have three FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture;
9. Add a new item (o)(1) to require a program’s annual report to include verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements;
10. Add the word “significant” and “such as” in item (o)(2) to require the annual report to report significant changes;
11. Add the phrase “and demographics” to item (o)(3) to require the annual report to report demographic information;
12. Add a new item (p) to specify that a program’s title and degree description shall incorporate the term “Landscape Architecture”;
13. Change the approval period from seven years to six, to align with LAAB standards;
14. Require the programs to submit an annual report to align with LAAB standards and to keep in frequent contact with the programs;
15. Grant provisional or conditional approval for a term of 24 months rather than 18 months, to align with LAAB standards;
16. Include language to authorize provisional or conditional approval per recommendation by DCA legal counsel; and,
17. Include language to rescind approval per recommendation by DCA legal counsel.

Subsequent to the October 8, 2012, Task Force meeting, DCA legal counsel also recommended changing CCR section 2620.5 (a) to state that a school must be approved “by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges” instead of approved by “a regional accrediting body” in order to restrict LATC approvals to California schools.

At the November 2, 2012 Task Force meeting, the Task Force decided to remove the proposed .75 time-base requirement for the program administrator and change it to a .5 time-base

requirement in order to allow more time to evaluate if the Extension Certificate Programs will be able to meet a .75 time-base requirement. The Task Force voted to recommend that LATC approve the modified proposed language as noted.

LATC is asked to review the attached modified proposed language for CCR section 2620.5 and take possible action.

ATTACHMENT:

Proposed Modified Language for CCR Section 2620.5

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MODIFIED PROPOSED LANGUAGE**

Changes to the originally proposed language are shown by double underline for new text and ~~underline with strikeout~~ for deleted text.

California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26

Amend Section 2620.5 to read as follows:

§ 2620.5 Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program

An extension certificate program shall meet the following requirements:

- (a) The educational program shall be established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges ~~under a regional accrediting body Section 94900 of the Education Code~~ or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code.
- (b) There shall be a written statement of the program's philosophy and objectives which serves as a basis for curriculum structure. Such statement shall take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture. The program objectives shall provide for relationships and linkages with other disciplines and public and private landscape architectural practices. The program objectives shall be reinforced by course inclusion, emphasis and sequence in a manner which promotes achievement of program objectives. The program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives.
- (c) The program shall have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.
- (d) The program shall be administered as a discrete program in landscape architecture within the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (e) There shall be an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (f) The program shall have sufficient authority and resources to achieve its educational objectives.
- (g) The program's ~~administrator~~ director shall be a California licensed landscape architect.
- (h) The program administrator ~~director~~ ~~faculty~~ shall have the primary responsibility for

developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program. The faculty shall be adequate in type and number to develop and implement the program approved by the Board.

- (i) The program curriculum shall provide instruction in the following areas related to landscape architecture including public health, safety, and welfare:
 - (1) History, ~~design theory, art~~ and ~~criticism/critique communication~~
 - (2) Natural ~~and~~ cultural, ~~and social~~ systems; including and principles of sustainability
 - (3) Public Policy and regulation
 - (4) ~~Design, site design and~~ planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management as a process in shaping the environment
 - (5) Site design and Implementation: Plant materials, methods, technologies, and their application
 - (6) ~~Construction~~ documentation, materials, and administration techniques and implementation
 - (7) Written, verbal and visual communication
 - (8) ~~76~~ Professional practice ~~methods~~
 - (9) ~~87~~ Professional ~~ethics and values~~ and ethics
 - (10) ~~98~~ Plants and ecosystems
 - (11) Computer applications, systems and other advanced technology

~~The program's areas of study curriculum shall not be revised until it has been approved by the Board.~~

- (j) The program shall consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units.
- (k) The program shall maintain a current syllabus for each required course which includes the course objectives, learning outcomes, content, and the methods of evaluating student performance, ~~and~~
- (l) The program clearly identifies where the public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed.
- (m) The curriculum shall be offered in a timeframe which reflects the proper course sequence. Students shall be required to adhere to that sequence, and courses shall be offered in a consistent and timely manner in order that students can observe those requirements.
- (n) A program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:
 - (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.
 - (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.
 - (3) The program administrator shall be at least .5 time-base.
 - (4) The program administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE).

(5) The program shall have 3 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture.

(o~~n~~) The program shall submit an annual report in writing based on the date of the most recent Board approval. The report shall include:

(1) Verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements;

(2) Any significant changes such as ~~in~~ curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report;

(3~~2~~) Current enrollment and demographics; and

(4~~3~~) Progress toward complying with the recommendations, if any, from the last approval.

(p) The program title and degree description shall incorporate the term “Landscape Architecture.”

The Board may choose to further evaluate changes to any of the reported items or to a program.

The Board will either grant or deny an application. When specific minor deficiencies are identified during evaluation of an application, but the institution is substantially in compliance with the requirements of the Code and this Division, a provisional approval to operate may be granted for a period not to exceed 24 months, to permit the institution time to correct those deficiencies identified. A provisional approval to operate shall expire at the end of its stated period and the application shall be deemed denied, unless the deficiencies are corrected prior to its expiration and an approval to operate has been granted before that date or the provisional approval to operate has been extended for a period not to exceed 24 months if the Board is satisfied that the program has made a good faith effort and has the ability to correct the deficiencies.

The Board shall review the program at least every ~~six~~seven years for approval. ~~The Board may shorten the current approval based on the information received in the programs’ annual reports.~~

The Board may rescind an approval during the six-year approval period based on the information received in the program’s annual report after providing the school with a written statement of the deficiencies and providing the school with an opportunity to respond to the charges. If an approval is rescinded, the Board may subsequently grant provisional approval in accordance with the guidelines of this section to allow the program to correct deficiencies.

Note: Authority cited: Section 5630, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 5650, Business and Professions Code.

Agenda Item H

REPORT ON COUNCIL OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (CLARB)

- 1. Election Results**
- 2. Present New Landscape Architect Registration Examination Data**

The results of the 2012-2013 CLARB Board of Directors election will be shared. Stephanie Landregan, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Chair, was elected President-Elect of CLARB. Christine Anderson, former LATC member, continues to serve as Region V Director, covering Alaska, Arizona, British Columbia, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

Additionally, CLARB's new Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE), sections 1 and 2, was administered on September 1-22, 2012. Amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 2615 and 2620, the regulations which outline eligibility requirements, allow candidates who have received a Board-approved degree in landscape architecture or an extension certificate in landscape architecture from a Board-approved school to be eligible to apply for the sections 1 and 2 only of the LARE.

In all, there were fifty California candidates that took the new examination. Eight of these candidates qualified under the new changes to CCR section 2615, taking sections 1 and 2 soon after graduation. Three of these candidates passed both sections 1 and 2, and three passed section 1 only. The results of these candidates are attached along with the National and California pass rates for LATC review.



[Home](#) > [Member Boards](#) > [Leadership & Governance](#) > [Board of Directors](#)



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

BYLAWS

ELECTIONS

COMMITTEES

PAST PRESIDENTS

2012-2013 CLARB Board of Directors

CLARB is governed by a volunteer Board of Directors made up of the best and brightest leaders in the landscape architecture community. Each year, the CLARB membership elects officers who provide oversight and direction to the organization.

President	Dennis Bryers
President-Elect	Stephanie Landregan
Vice President	Jerany Jackson
Secretary	Christopher Hoffman
Treasurer	Randy Weatherly
Past President	Denise Husband
Region I Director	Terry DeWan
Region II Director	Bob Hartnett
Region III Director	John Tarkany
Region IV Director	Phil Meyer
Region V Director	Christine Anderson
Executive Director (ex officio)	Joel Albizo

Also, Amy Kobe, Executive Director of the Ohio Board of Landscape Architect Examiners, will attend the 2012-2013 CLARB Board meetings as the Member Board Executive (MBE) Observer.

Organizational Structure

In order to establish closer communications between Member Boards and the Board of Directors, and further to assist CLARB in achieving its stated objectives, five regions have been established.

Region 1 – Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ontario, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia

Region 2 – Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Region 3 – Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas

Region 4 – Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Wyoming

Region 5 – Alaska, Arizona, British Columbia, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington

Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) California and National Pass Rates

2012	September							December						
	California			National*				California			National*			
	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(4) Diff.	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(4) Diff.
1-Project and Construction Administration	50	37	74%	251	195	78%	-4%							
2-Inventory and Analysis	51	35	69%	291	211	73%	-4%							
3-Design														
4-Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation														

2013	April							August							December							
	California			National*				California			National*				California			National*				
	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(4) Diff.	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(4) Diff.	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(1) Total	(2) Pass	(3) %	(4) Diff.	
1-Project and Construction Administration																						
2-Inventory and Analysis																						
3-Design																						
4-Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation																						

*National figures include California candidates

New LARE first administration September 2012
Section 1 and 2 only were administered in September 2012.
Section 3 and 4 only were administered in December 2012.

(1) Total number of candidates that took the exam

(2) Number of candidates that passed the exam

(3) Percentage of candidates that passed the exam.

(4) The difference between the California pass rate and the National pass rate. An (-) indicates California's pass rate is lower than the National rate.

In the September LARE, 50 California candidates had taken the section 1 exam while 51 California candidates had taken the section 2 exam. Among these candidates, 8 of them were eligible for sections 1 and 2 only. Below is the result for candidates who were only eligible to take sections 1 and 2 only in September 2012.

	Number of Candidate	Passed	Failed
Candidates that took Section 1 only	4	3	1
Candidates that took Section 2 only	-	-	-
Candidates that took both Section 1 and 2	4	3	1



COUNCIL OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL
REGISTRATION BOARDS

[About CLARB](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Contact](#) | [Create Profile](#) | [Site Map](#)

[Home](#) > [Member Boards](#) > [Membership Meetings](#) > [Upcoming Meetings](#)



[MEETING ARCHIVES](#)

[UPCOMING MEETINGS](#)

Upcoming Meetings

[The 2013 CLARB Spring Meeting](#)

March 1-2, 2013 at Hotel Valley Ho in Scottsdale, Arizona

[The 2013 CLARB Annual Meeting](#)

September 26-28, 2013 at The W Foshay in Minneapolis, Minnesota

Stay tuned for more information.

Questions? Please [contact Missy Sutton](#) at CLARB.

Copyright 2009 Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards | [Terms of Service](#)

