

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

Hearing Date: August 6, 2012

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulation: Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program

Section Affected: California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620.5

UPDATED INFORMATION

The Initial Statement of Reasons is included in the file. The information contained therein is updated as follows:

The Landscape Architects Committee (LATC) appointed the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force (Task Force), which was charged to develop the procedures for the review of the extension certificate programs and conduct reviews of the programs utilizing the new procedures, as outlined in CCR section 2620.5. The Task Force held meetings on June 27, 2012, October 8, 2012, and November 2, 2012. As a result of these meetings, the Task Force recommended several changes for CCR section 2620.5 to the LATC in order to further update the extension certificate program requirements with current standards of the practice of landscape architecture. The LATC reviewed and approved the Task Force's recommended modifications to the proposed language for CCR section 2620.5 at its November 14, 2012 meeting.

The LATC issued a Notice of Availability of Modified Language on November 30, 2012 to make the following modifications 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 subsection (i) to directly align with the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) curriculum standards; 3) remove the last sentence in subsection (i) to omit the Board approval requirement for the revision of curriculum; 4) add the term "learning outcomes" in subsection (k) to the program syllabus requirements; 5) separate the last sentence in subsection (k) into a new subsection (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 subsection (n)(3) stating that a landscape architecture extension certificate program administrator should be at least .5 time-base; 7) add a new subsection (n)(4) stating a program's administrative support shall be 1.0 full-time equivalence (FTE); 8) add a new subsection (n)(5) stating a program shall have 3.0 FTE instructional faculty with a degree in landscape architecture; 9) add a new subsection (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 subsection (o)(2) to require the annual report to report significant changes; 11) add the phrase "and demographics" to subsection (o)(3) to require the annual report to report demographic information; 12) add a new subsection (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 approval for a term of 24 months rather than 18 months, to align with LAAB standards; 16) include language to authorize provisional approval per recommendation by DCA legal counsel; 17) include language to rescind approval per recommendation by DCA legal counsel; 18) change subsection (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; and, 19) add a new item (q) requiring that effective September 2015, students shall be required to have a Bachelor’s degree as a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs. The LATC is withdrawing the proposed adoption of subsections (n)(5) and (q) in response to a public comment that was received.

The Notice of Proposed Changes is also included in the file. The information contain therein is updated as follows:

Under “Fiscal Impact Estimates,” the fiscal impact on public agencies is stated as “none.” Since the regulatory proposal will add a new requirement for approved extension certificate programs to provide the LATC with an annual report, there will be a cost for the LATC to review these reports; however, the workload associated with reviewing these reports is absorbable within existing staff resources.

#### LOCAL MANDATE

A mandate is not imposed on local agencies or school districts.

#### SMALL BUSINESS IMPACT

This regulation will not have a significant adverse economic impact on small businesses.

#### ANTICIPATED BENEFITS OF THIS REGULATORY ACTION

This regulatory proposal will bring the extension certificate program requirements up-to-date with current standards of the practice of landscape architecture.

#### CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives were proposed or considered.

#### SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE INITIAL NOTICE PERIOD OF JUNE 22, 2012 THROUGH AUGUST 6, 2012

There were no objections or recommendations regarding the proposed action during the initial 45-day comment period.

## SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD THE MODIFIED TEXT WAS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

The modified text was made available to the public for comment from November 30, 2012 through 5:00 pm on January 9, 2013. The following comments were made regarding the modified proposal:

- Stephanie Landregan (see section VIII), Program Director for the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Extension Certificate Program, objected to the new subsection (q) which would require students entering the program to have a Bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the program, effective September 2015. She explained that although she agrees with the degree entry criteria, she also ascribes to the academic privilege of allowing exceptions for admission based upon academic review.

Response: This comment was accepted and the proposed action was modified by removing subsection (q).

- Ms. Landregan also objected to the new subsection (n)(5) which would require approved extension certificate programs to have 3 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty with a degree in landscape architecture. She explained that this requirement is not compatible with the reality of the UCLA extension certificate program having all adjunct instructors. She suggested changing the 3 FTE requirement to 2 FTE. She also recommended in subsection (n)(5) changing the requirement for the FTE faculty to have a "degree in landscape architecture" to a "degree or a certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture."

Response: This comment was accommodated and the proposed action was modified by removing subsection (n)(5).

## FINDING OF NECESSITY

The LATC hereby finds that it is necessary for the public health, safety, and welfare of the people of California that this regulation apply to business.