

## **SUMMARY REPORT**

### **CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD** **Landscape Architects Technical Committee**

January 23-24, 2012  
Berkeley, California

#### LATC Members Present

Christine Anderson, Chair  
Stephanie Landregan, Vice Chair

#### Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer, Board  
Don Chang, 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

Joel Albizo, Executive Director, Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)  
Ramie Allard, Association for Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)  
Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, APLD  
Rachael Davidson, Center for Public Interest Law, University of San Diego  
Jerry Hastings, Secretary, California Council of American Society of Landscape Architects (CCASLA)  
Linda Jewell, University of California (UC), Berkeley Extension  
J.C. Miller, Landscape Architecture Program Director, Department of Art and Design, UC Berkeley Extension  
Dave Mitchell, CCASLA

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

LATC Chair Christine Anderson called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. and called the roll. Two members of the LATC were present, thus a quorum was not established. Ms. Anderson noted that since a quorum was not established, LATC would be unable to vote on any agenda items.

## **B. Approve November 16, 2011 LATC Summary Report**

The Committee members had no revisions for the November 16, 2011 LATC summary report. Ms. Anderson commended LATC staff for a thorough encapsulation of the November 16, 2011 meeting. Ms. Anderson noted that LATC cannot vote to approve this item since a quorum was not established. She moved the approval of the summary report to the next day in anticipation of a quorum being established.

## **C. Program Manager's Report**

Trish Rodriguez presented the Program Manager's Report. She stated that John Keidel has transferred from the Enforcement Coordinator position to the Special Projects Coordinator position. Ms. Rodriguez stated that Jacqueline French filled the Enforcement Coordinator position and noted that she is recruiting to fill two student assistant positions.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the DCA BreEZe project is progressing and will be implemented in three phases. She noted that LATC is included in the third phase, scheduled for Fall of 2013.

Ms. Rodriguez advised that Ms. Landregan will be delivering a landscape architecture outreach presentation on January 30, 2012, at California Polytechnic State University, Pomona. She also explained that LATC is in the process of scheduling outreach presentations for universities and community colleges that have landscape architecture programs.

Ms. Rodriguez advised that the rulemaking packages for California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2615 – Form of Examinations, and CCR section 2620 – Education and Training Credits, are scheduled to be complete by the end of February, within the one year time limit required by the Administrative Procedure Act.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that during the November 16, 2011 LATC meeting, the LATC discussed noticing the rulemaking package for CCR section 2620.5 – Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). She explained this action item was delayed because processing the rulemaking package for CCR section 2614 – Examination Transition Plan, took a higher priority. She stated that the rulemaking package for CCR section 2614 was delivered to OAL on January 17, 2012, and is scheduled for publication on January 27, 2012. Ms. Rodriguez noted that the rulemaking package for CCR section 2620.5 needs to be noticed with OAL.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that Ms. Landregan requested a list of all the testing sites for the CLARB testing vendor, Pearson VUE, at the November 16, 2011 LATC meeting. She stated the LATC received a list of 22 sites that administer the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) in California and included them in the Program Manager's Report. She noted that CLARB will start using these sites in March 2012, before the LARE transition takes place in September 2012. Ms. Rodriguez explained that Pearson VUE should be able to accommodate additional testing sites if needed as CLARB will review candidate registration to ensure there are adequate locations available. Ms. Rodriguez also noted there are no updates on the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) and an enforcement update will be provided later in the meeting.

Ms. Landregan asked what the status is on all of the pending LATC rulemaking packages.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the package for CCR section 2620.5 – Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, needs to be noticed so that the one-year processing timeframe can begin. Ms. Landregan asked what will happen to the rulemaking packages for CCR section 2615 – Form of Examinations, and CCR section 2620 – Education and Training Credits, after the February 25, 2012, submission deadline. Don Chang explained that once OAL receives a rulemaking package, it has 30 working days to review it. He noted that OAL may have additional changes and additional time may be needed to make modifications. Mr. Chang explained that the rulemaking packages could be approved and effective as early as March 2012, or possibly June 2012 if there are any delays.

Ms. Landregan noted that this timeline is significant because it affects graduating classes for students at California colleges. She explained that students might be able to take sections of the LARE immediately after graduation. Mr. McCauley asked Mr. Chang if the rulemaking package becomes codified 30 days after OAL approves it. Mr. Chang explained that after the rulemaking package is reviewed and approved by OAL, it is filed with Secretary of State's Office and normally becomes effective 30 days after approval from OAL. He noted that LATC could ask for the rulemaking package to become effective upon filing with Secretary of State's Office. The members concurred it would be best if the package becomes effective upon filing with the Secretary of State's Office.

Ms. Anderson stated that graduates would not be able to take all sections of the LARE; only the sections that are not vignette sections. Ms. Landregan noted that this clarification might need to be added in the language for CCR sections 2615 and 2620. Mr. Chang explained that it might be possible to make this change by adding it to the existing regulatory package for CCR section 2614 – Examination Transition Plan. Ms. Landregan stated LATC needs to investigate making this change. Mr. McCauley concurred and stated LATC will examine it. Ms. Anderson noted that this change needs to be in effect by September 2012, when the LARE transition will take place. Mr. Chang noted that if there are no delays in processing the change package, it could be in effect and complete by August 2012. Ms. Landregan asked if the changes could be retroactive so that the candidates who took the test receive credit for it due to the timeline. Mr. Chang stated he would investigate this possibility.

Ms. Landregan asked if the new CSE developed by the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) is being administered. Ms. Rodriguez stated that first exam was administered in August 2011. Ms. Landregan asked how the new CSE results compare to the prior CSE. Ms. Rodriguez stated that OPES is waiting for a sufficient test sampling to conduct an analysis of the data. She advised there should be a sufficient sampling in approximately eight months. Ms. Landregan asked if LATC would receive an update once the analysis is conducted. Ms. Rodriguez stated LATC would receive an update in the Program Manager's report once the analysis has taken place. Ms. Landregan asked how many candidates who have taken the new CSE have passed it. Ms. Rodriguez responded that she will provide that information at the next LATC meeting.

**D. Presentation by Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) Representative Including Information on the Determinants of Success, CLARB's Report on the Definition of Welfare, and Landscape Architect Registration Examination Transition**

Ms. Anderson introduced Joel Albizo, CLARB Executive Director. Ms. Anderson noted that she and Ms. Landregan serve on the CLARB Board of Directors. Ms. Anderson thanked CLARB for providing this presentation in advance of the LATC Strategic Planning meeting.

Mr. Albizo introduced himself and explained that the CLARB community consists of all the landscape architecture licensure boards, CLARB's elected leaders, hundreds of volunteers for the LARE, and CLARB staff. Mr. Albizo stated that there are many ongoing challenges to the CLARB community and that these challenges are not unique to California. Mr. Albizo explained that in an effort to be proactive, CLARB has developed a relevancy strategy. He noted that times are changing and it is important for CLARB and the member boards to focus on how to stay as relevant as possible.

Mr. Albizo outlined the four components of CLARB's framework for their relevancy strategy: gaining stronger statutory authority; increasing efficiency; gaining more candidates and licensees; and increasing health, safety, and welfare awareness. He noted that statutory authority is the basis upon which boards exist. He stated that boards do not exist without candidates and licensees. Mr. Albizo explained that health, safety, and welfare are the core building blocks of the regulation for landscape architects. He noted that one of the challenges for CLARB has been that people do not understand what health, safety, and welfare mean and how they relate to regulation. Mr. Albizo explained that he examined the LATC's Strategic Plan and noticed that CLARB and the LATC have similar priority goal areas. He noted that this provides an opportunity for synergy between CLARB and the LATC.

Mr. Albizo stated that CLARB is focusing on upgrading and updating the Model Law Regulations in an effort to gain stronger statutory authority. He explained that the Model Law Regulations are documents that CLARB has published and maintained, and they provide a template for boards when they are looking to upgrade their own regulations. He noted that there are three areas that there are likely to be changes in these documents: exam qualifications, continuing education, and the definition of welfare. He explained that CLARB conducted a major study on what is associated with success on the LARE and the results of the study indicate there may be a reason to modify the qualifications to take the LARE. Mr. Albizo noted that there is a lack of standardization among CLARB member boards regarding their continuing education requirements. He explained that CLARB has developed a Committee of Member Board Executives that are in the process of creating a framework for continuing education requirements for potential use by all CLARB member boards.

Mr. Albizo explained that welfare has never been clearly defined among CLARB member boards. He explained that it is important to understand what welfare means and how it relates to landscape architecture. Mr. Albizo explained there is an opportunity for increased efficiency with the CLARB Council Record Program. He noted that the Council Record Program is a professional internet-based record keeping service that has exam scores, education, experience, and continuing education information. He stated that several boards are using CLARB's Council Record Program to conduct administrative processing more efficiently.

Mr. Albizo stated that the LATC strategic plan has a suggestion to look at some kind of national landscape architecture certification. He explained that CLARB currently has the CLARB Certified Landscape Architect certification, which requires three basic qualifications: an LAAB Accredited degree, successful completion of the LARE, and three years of diversified experience under a licensed landscape architect. He noted that if someone meets these qualifications, it will be easy for them to become licensed anywhere.

Mr. Albizo explained that CLARB supports its member Boards by defining the standards of core competency for landscape architects. He noted that it is in CLARB's interest to make sure that the core competencies for landscape architects are contemporary and relevant. He stated that CLARB realized through discussion that there was a large body of work in landscape architecture that was not easily categorized under health or safety. He explained that CLARB contracted an independent research firm to study this body of work and create a definition of welfare as it relates to landscape architecture.

Mr. Albizo discussed the seven tangible, explicit impacts of landscape architecture on public welfare. He explained the impact of landscape architecture on environmental and economic sustainability; community building; health, safety, and welfare awareness and environmental stewardship; aesthetic and creative experiences; and creating effective communities. Mr. Albizo explained that the work of landscape architects directly affects and enhances public welfare through environmental design and stewardship. He explained that the work they do results in preserving, protecting, and enhancing the environment. He noted that CLARB's main goal of studying the concept of welfare is to create a greater understanding of the scope of practice of landscape architects.

Mr. Albizo explained that CLARB developed a presentation on welfare for member boards to use. He explained that this welfare presentation helps people understand what landscape architects do that is related to welfare. He stated that it also strengthens the board's relevance by creating an understanding of landscape architecture and why regulation is important. He stated that CLARB's goal is to have at least 25 boards make at least one presentation on welfare and meet in the fall of 2012 to debrief on their presentations. He noted that the welfare presentation has grass roots potential at the local level because local examples of landscape architecture can be used.

Mr. Albizo stated that CLARB is principally concerned with developing, administering, and scoring the LARE. He explained that the landscape architecture body of knowledge changes over time. He noted that each board conducts a task or job analysis every five to seven years to reassess what the core and minimum competencies are for the profession. Mr. Albizo explained that the LARE is changing so that it can stay current with contemporary practice, respond to the needs of the stakeholders, and retain relevance in testing.

Mr. Albizo stated there are no changes to fundamental content in the new LARE. He explained that the core competencies are the same, but the structure of the test is changing from five sections to four sections. Mr. Albizo stated that CLARB's principal goal for stakeholders is to maintain a relevant and defensible exam. He explained that what was relevant and defensible five years ago may not necessarily be relevant and defensible today. He stated that the LARE has been changed to an entirely computerized format in an effort to stay relevant and defensible.

Mr. Albizo demonstrated an example of a test question in the new computerized testing format during his slideshow. He explained that this new format will provide multiple opportunities for an examinee to demonstrate their understanding of the concepts and processes of landscape architecture. Mr. Albizo noted that it is far more reliable and defensible to be able to answer ten questions that progressively and systematically test your understanding than it is to take one vignette.

Mr. Albizo discussed the four main benefits CLARB has identified for the new LARE. He stated that the new LARE will enable ease of navigation for the exam system by creating uniformity about how people apply and have the material presented to them. He noted this is more reliable because the methods are statistically valid. He stated that examinees today use technology more than examinees did ten years ago, so the computerized format makes the test more relevant. He explained that the new LARE will increase accessibility to take the exam. He stated that the exam can be given over two weeks at many testing centers instead of being administered two days out of the year. He stated that the new testing format will also enable international candidates to take the exam.

Mr. Albizo discussed the increased reliability of the computerized method of examination. He noted that the current, vignette-based graphical sections of the LARE have a degree of subjectivity that will be eliminated in the new computer-based format. He explained that the new exam will include multiple choice questions in all sections which will increase overall reliability.

Jerry Hastings asked if sections three and four of the new LARE will be graded and scored as quickly as sections one and two of the new exam. Mr. Albizo responded that the new grading process will be done using computer-based statistical analysis so it will be much faster. Mr. Albizo noted that a flowchart is available on CLARB's website that shows how CLARB grades the current exam. He noted that future exams may deliver the results almost instantly once a larger body of statistical data has been accumulated.

Mr. Albizo discussed the LARE transition process. He explained that the content of sections one and two of the new exam match almost exactly to sections A and B of the current exam. He explained that the content of section D will be divided between sections three and four of the new exam. He noted that candidates who have successfully passed sections A and B will receive credit for sections one and two of the new exam. He explained that candidates who have passed either sections C or E of the current exam must also pass section D in order to receive credit for the sections three and four of the new exam. He noted that this message was broadly, concisely, and repeatedly conveyed to the profession through a variety of channels and subsequent enrollment for section D has increased. He explained that the LARE transition strategy has been based on minimizing confusion for the candidates. Mr. Albizo explained that the registration process for the new LARE will be simplified. He noted that all candidates will go to the CLARB website to register. He stated that some states require their candidates to receive board approval before taking the exam.

Mr. Albizo stated that CLARB conducted a study of the determinants of success for the LARE. He explained that boards like the LATC were interested in what factors were associated with success on the exam. He explained that CLARB surveyed every LARE candidate for one year (four administrations) and about 50% of surveyed candidates responded. He explained that on sections A and B, experience was not a factor to success; however, recentness to graduation was

a factor. He stated that for section C, having a Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) accredited degree and usage of the practice problems helped with exam success. Mr. Albizo noted that there were no statistically relevant findings for success on section D of the exam. He stated that preparation time and diversified experience contributed towards success on section E of the exam. Mr. Albizo explained that the main finding from the study is that experience does not have a significant impact on success for exam sections other than E. He explained that this is relevant because some boards make candidates wait after getting a degree in landscape architecture before they can take the LARE. He stated that this study has evidence that making candidates wait to take the exam can make it more difficult for them to pass the test.

Ms. Landregan noted that the Board has an intern development program based upon the idea that an internship is beneficial to success on the architect licensure exam. She asked if the data from the LARE survey shows that experience will only impact success on section E of the LARE, and asked if education is more beneficial than experience. Mr. Albizo responded that it would be hard to rationalize an internship program as a way to prepare for the LARE based on the findings of the LARE survey.

Ms. Landregan noted that the LARE is testing if a candidate's design falls within the parameters of health, safety, and welfare instead of whether or not they can create a good design. Mr. Albizo stated the LARE is testing whether you can solve a design problem in such a way that it would protect the public's health, safety and welfare. He stated the new exam identifies what is tested as it relates to public welfare and that this method brings a systematic and defensible testing of welfare competencies.

Ms. Landregan asked if design experience might help in each of the areas on the LARE and if education trains candidates to think in a way to pass the test. Mr. Albizo responded that while the study does not address this level of specificity that one could reasonably assume that education is giving candidates the tools to be able to demonstrate and apply their knowledge base to their practice.

Ms. Anderson asked if CLARB is going to continue to conduct surveys and conduct statistical findings on the LARE as it evolves and changes. Mr. Albizo responded that the content of the LARE is not changing so it is unlikely that the findings of the survey would change but noted that the study may be repeated in the future as more data is generated.

Ms. Anderson noted that California lacks any statistically relevant findings on whether or not experience makes an impact on the exam. She explained that this is because California law requires that you have a certain amount of experience and education before you can take the LARE.

Ms. Landregan noted that UC Berkeley is the only California university that does not have a LAAB accredited degree program. She noted that it might be beneficial to examine how people who do not have a LAAB accredited degree perform on the LARE in comparison to candidates who do have a LAAB accredited degree. Mr. Albizo noted that there are about 60-70 LAAB accredited schools in the US. Ms. Landregan noted that most people who sit for the exam have a LAAB accredited degree.

Mr. Albizo explained that the survey findings address people who have degrees in landscape architecture, not degrees such as horticulture or urban design. He stated that the findings of the

survey do not distinguish between candidates who have a Master's Degree or Bachelor's Degree in landscape architecture. He noted that the findings of the survey are defensible.

Mr. Albizo discussed considerations for the LATC, including providing input to Model Law and Regulations, gaining efficiency through the council record, leveraging the public welfare findings, and increasing efficiencies through the new exam processes. He noted that one of CLARB's goals is to be able to look back two years from now and say that we are more relevant now than we were two years ago.

Dave Mitchell asked if there will be a transition period carrying over credit for section D for one year after the transition. Mr. Albizo stated that CLARB announced the transition last summer, and there were two opportunities after the announcement for candidates to take section D.

Mr. Hastings asked if candidates will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement for taking sections three and four of the new LARE. Mr. Albizo responded that candidates should be and that it is a standard practice.

Ms. Landregan asked how CLARB is helping to assist in test preparation. Mr. Albizo responded that the content that is being tested is the same as before. He explained that pass rates are lower on the grading and drainage section of the exam. He stated that whatever candidate knowledge deficits existed before the LARE transition will still exist independently of the exam format. Mr. Albizo noted that one of the benefits of the new exam is that practice problems will be available on CLARB's website.

Mr. Mitchell asked how the LARE transition information is being delivered to current candidates. Ms. Rodriguez responded that an insert was included with the last test results for any candidates who still have LARE sections to complete. Mr. Albizo explained that CLARB did a thorough job of spreading the message about the LARE transition. He explained that CLARB spread the message through a variety of methods including Facebook, Twitter, and a variety of other outlets including licensure boards and numerous ASLA publications, adding that CLARB spoke with many California candidates directly at the recent ASLA annual meeting in San Diego. He noted that it is possible there are people who have not received information about the LARE transition; however, the information has been readily available.

Ms. Landregan asked if CLARB will conduct red line reviews. Mr. Albizo responded that red line reviews will not be conducted. He stated that CLARB previously conducted red line reviews in an effort to give feedback to candidates. He stated that red line reviews were not conducted out of a sense of practicality or based on evidence that they were beneficial but out of a desire to support candidates. He added that no other design profession offered this service due to reasons of philosophy and/or practicality. He explained that CLARB lost money by conducting the reviews and it is uncertain if they were beneficial, although most who utilized the service found them to be of value.

Ms. Anderson thanked Mr. Albizo for his presentation.

## **E. Discuss and Appoint Review Development Committee and Review Committee for University of California Extension Programs**

Ms. Anderson stated that the purpose of this agenda item is to appoint the subcommittee for the UC extension review programs and task them with two major tasks. Ms. Anderson read the list for the subcommittee members:

1. Linda Jewell – Landscape Architecture Professor, UC Berkeley
2. Linda Gates – Former LATC member, previously on the extension review subcommittee for the UC Los Angeles extension program
3. Dennis Otsuji – Former LATC member
4. Lee-Anne Milburn – Landscape Architecture Department Head at California Polytechnic State University, Pomona
5. Sandra Gonzalez – Former LATC member, former CLARB President
6. Pat Caughey – San Diego Chapter Representative, American Society of Landscape Architects
7. Dick Zwifel – Associate Dean, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
8. Jon Wreschinsky – President, CCASLA

Ms. Anderson noted that all the members were notified. Ms. Anderson charged the subcommittee with the task of reviewing the extension programs. She also charged the committee with developing the procedures for the extension review process. She stated that a portion of the subcommittee would develop the procedures in addition to reviewing the extension programs.

Ms. Landregan asked if the subcommittee should also be charged with setting the standards to coincide with the new LAAB standards. Ms. Anderson responded that those standards have already been set to coincide with LAAB standards and the Board approved them in December 2010. She noted that the standards are currently in the regulatory approval process.

Ms. Anderson stated that letters were sent to both of the UC landscape architecture extension programs notifying them that their certification approval from the LATC was extended to December 2012. She explained that this extension will allow the LATC enough time to address these issues and give both extension programs time to respond to the self-evaluation report.

## **F. Annual Enforcement Report**

John Keidel gave the annual LATC enforcement report for the 2011/2012 fiscal year.

Mr. Keidel stated that the LATC is continuing to monitor case activity related to case aging, as part of the DCA Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative. He stated that DCA identified an enforcement goal of closing all enforcement cases within an average of 18 months from when they are opened. He explained that a key element of meeting this goal is reducing the pending enforcement caseload to a manageable level. Mr. Keidel stated that on January 10, 2011, there were 71 pending enforcement cases. He stated that as of January 10, 2012, there were 34 pending enforcement cases. He noted that this is a caseload reduction of 52%. Mr. Keidel stated that the LATC is working towards reducing the pending caseload even further.

## **Adjourn**

- **Christine Anderson adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

January 24, 2012  
Berkeley, California

LATC Members Present

Christine Anderson, Chair  
Stephanie Landregan, Vice Chair

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, Board  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer, Board  
Don Chang, Legal Counsel, DCA  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, LATC  
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC  
Jacqueline French, Enforcement Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Joel Albizo, Executive Director, CLARB  
Ramie Allard, APLD  
Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, APLD  
Jerry Hastings, Secretary, CCASLA  
Daniel Iacofano, Principal, Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc. (MIG)  
Dave Mitchell, CCASLA  
Laura Morton, President, APLD

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

The LATC Chair Christine Anderson called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. (approximate) and called the roll. Two members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was not established. Ms. Anderson noted that since a quorum was not established, LATC would be unable to vote on any agenda items.

**B. Strategic and Communications Planning Review Session for Fiscal Year 2012/2013**

The LATC commenced its annual strategic planning session, facilitated by Daniel Iacofano of Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc., reported on the issues raised by key stakeholders during the interviews conducted in preparation for the session. He then assisted LATC as they identified and established goals for the upcoming year(s). The LATC: 1) reviewed and updated the six goal areas of the Strategic Plan (Regulation and Enforcement, Professional Qualifications, Public and Professional Awareness, Organizational Relationships, and Organizational Effectiveness); 2) identified several objectives to meet these goals; 3) established target dates for completion; and 4) updated the Communications Plan.

The strategic planning session discussion will be incorporated into the July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013 Strategic Plan and the LATC will meet in April 2012 to finalize the plan.

**C. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates**

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

April 26, 2012, Sacramento

**Adjourn**

- **Christine Anderson adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. (approximate).