



SUMMARY REPORT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee

May 4, 2012
Sacramento, California

LATC Members Present

Christine Anderson, Chair
David Allen Taylor Jr., Vice Chair
Stephanie Landregan

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
Terri Villareal, Examination Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, Association of Professional Landscape Designers
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, Executive Director, California Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA)
Daniel Iacofano, Principal, Moore Goltsman Iacofano, Inc. (MIG)
Cindy Kanemoto, Organizational Change Manager, DCA BreEZe Team
J.C. Miller, Landscape Architecture Program Director, Department of Art and Design, University of California (UC) Berkeley Extension
Karen Munoz, Associate Budget Analyst, DCA Budget Office
John Nicolaus, Government Affairs Liaison, CC/ASLA
Sean O'Conner, Business Project Manager, DCA BreEZe Team

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 10:06 a.m. and called the roll. Three members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

Ms. Anderson called for any public comments. John Nicolaus stated that several students in California community colleges have expressed concern to CC/ASLA that LATC is not clear

regarding what degree programs or curricula are sanctioned for licensure. He stated that one landscape architecture student sent many letters and made many calls to CC/ASLA regarding this issue. Mr. Nicolaus requested that LATC analyze the two-year landscape architecture programs in California, determine what their curricula are, examine how the goals of these programs align with the goals of LATC, and disseminate the results of the analysis to the public.

Ms. Anderson noted that LATC received a letter regarding this issue from Jon Wreschinsky, CC/ASLA President. She stated LATC also received a letter regarding this issue from Michael Watts, President of the Cuyamaca College Student Affiliate Chapter of American Society of Landscape Architects. She stated that copies of both of these letters will be included in the summary report for this meeting. Ms. Anderson stated the letters to CC/ASLA will be public record. Mr. Nicolaus asked LATC to provide CC/ASLA with a letter advising them of the status of this request.

B. Approve January 23-24, 2012 LATC Summary Report

The Committee members had no revisions for the January 23-24, 2012 LATC Summary Report.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to approve the January 23-24, 2012 LATC Summary Report.**

David Taylor seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0.

G.* Discuss and Possible Action of Impact on System Requirements and Workload, of California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Sections 2614, Examination Transition Plan; 2615, Form of Examinations; and 2620, Education and Training Credits

Trish Rodriguez explained that CCR sections 2615, Form of Examinations; and 2620, Education and Training Credits, were recently amended to allow Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) candidates with partial (80%) completion of their landscape architecture degree to receive one year of education credit. She explained that the work associated with processing candidate applications with partial completion of their landscape architecture degree will greatly increase workload for LATC staff and it would be difficult to track and calculate partial completion for these degree programs.

She also noted the recently approved regulation changes allow candidates who have completed their landscape architecture degree to take sections 1 and 2 of the LARE. She shared her concern that the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) cannot prevent candidates from taking the other sections of the exam that they are not eligible to take (sections 3 and 4) and that candidates register directly for the LARE with CLARB.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that changes need to be made to DCA's Applicant Tracking System (ATS) due to the new format of the LARE and the recent changes to CCR sections 2614, 2615, and 2620. She explained that DCA directed LATC to implement manual processes instead of using ATS because these changes will impact the implementation of the DCA BreEZe project. She

noted LATC is scheduled to be included in the third phase of BreEZe implementation scheduled for Fall 2013.

Vickie Mayer stated that the exam transition will require programming changes in ATS to show transitional credit. She explained that the DCA Office of Information Services (OIS) cannot reassign personnel from the BreEZe project to make the programming changes in ATS because it would adversely affect the BreEZe project. Ms. Mayer explained that Contractors State License Board offered to loan a programmer to LATC for approximately 40 hours to create a workaround database in lieu of making programming changes to ATS. Ms. Mayer noted that when the workaround solution is developed, it will be incorporated into BreEZe when BreEZe is implemented. Mr. McCauley noted that the decision to implement a manual workaround solution for ATS required LATC to re-examine the recently identified strategic planning goals and focus efforts on the goals that are mission critical.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that staff reviewed pending LARE candidates and did not find any who applied under the 80% degree completion criteria. Ms. Landregan suggested that LATC change the LARE application form so that it has separate checkboxes to identify the candidates that are applying under the 80% degree completion criteria and checkboxes for other application criteria to assist with tracking.

Ms. Mayer stated that although LATC may not receive many applications from candidates applying under the 80% degree completion criteria, processing the applications will be relatively time consuming. She stated LATC must take a role in the processing of these candidates rather than having the burden fall on the candidate. Ms. Anderson noted the Education Subcommittee's intent for allowing candidates who completed 80% of their landscape architecture degree to take the LARE was to allow a pathway into the profession for candidates who have a sufficient amount of landscape architecture experience but did not finish their degree. She explained this issue originated from public comments.

Ms. Mayer stated LATC will modify the LARE application, monitor applications received under the 80% degree completion criteria, and track the time it takes to process the applications. Mr. McCauley suggested LATC contact the Deans of the California colleges that have landscape architecture programs and ask them to consider writing a letter for candidates that have met the 80% degree completion criteria to expedite the application process.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to direct staff to implement the 80% rule as discussed, monitor the workload associated with implementation, and identify potential problems with the implementation.**

David Taylor seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0.

Ms. Mayer stated LATC should advise candidates who are eligible for sections 1 and 2 of the LARE not to take sections 3 and 4 until LATC has determined they are eligible. She explained that if candidates take sections 3 and 4 of the LARE before LATC deems them eligible and LATC receives their examination results back from CLARB, LATC should not release the exam results to the candidate. She noted that this raises the question of whether or not a candidate's scores will count if they are deemed eligible to take sections 3 and 4 of the LARE after they have

already taken these sections. Ms. Anderson explained CLARB wants to move towards a system where candidates can take the LARE regardless of a state's eligibility requirements and apply for licensure after taking the LARE. She explained this system would be problematic for LATC because large amounts of candidates who are not eligible to take the LARE based on California eligibility standards may take the LARE and then LATC must inform them they are not eligible for licensure. Ms. Anderson stated that CLARB will not assist LATC in preventing candidates from taking certain sections of the LARE.

LATC and staff discussed the justification for the six-year training and experience requirement for California LARE applicants. Ms. Anderson noted the Education Subcommittee might need to re-evaluate the six-year education and experience requirement. She stated LATC needs to monitor how many candidates apply for sections 1 and 2 of the LARE and monitor the criteria upon which they apply for examination. Mr. Taylor stated the Education Subcommittee should re-examine the pathway to licensure since the field of landscape architecture has changed in the last ten years.

- **David Taylor moved to add clarifying language to CCR section 2615, Form of Examinations, to provide that if a candidate is not eligible to take the LARE at the time of examination, LATC will not recognize their LARE scores.**

Stephanie Landregan seconded the motion.

Motion carried 3-0.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to direct staff to work with DCA OIS staff to implement necessary manual workarounds that integrate with the new BreZE system.**

David Taylor seconded the motion.

Motion carried 3-0.

D. Program Manager's Report

Ms. Rodriguez presented the Program Manager's Report. She introduced DCA BreZE staff to give an update on the status of the project. Sean O'Conner stated that the BreZE project is in the middle of the first phase of implementation. He noted LATC is scheduled to be included in the third phase of BreZE implementation scheduled for Fall 2013. He noted that an option is being considered to move LATC to release two of BreZE, which is scheduled for implementation in Spring 2013. Mr. O'Conner noted that the implementation date for the first phase of release one has been delayed by about four weeks from the original target date. He explained that this change was initiated by the solutions vendor and this delay does not affect the implementation dates for the other two release phases. Mr. O'Conner introduced Cindy Kanemoto, organizational change manager for BreZE. Ms. Kanemoto noted that the organizational change team keeps DCA executive officers informed about the status of the BreZE project and anything they need to know that affects them about the project. Mr. O'Conner noted that LATC can emulate the cashiering procedures of other DCA boards and bureaus that use manual cashiering.

The Program Manager's Report was deferred to allow Daniel Iacofano to facilitate Agenda Item C (Review and Approve July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 Draft Strategic and Communications Action Plan).

C. Review and Approve July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 Draft Strategic and Communications Action Plan

LATC and staff discussed and made edits to the July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 Draft Strategic and Communications Action Plan with Mr. Iacofano facilitating the discussion. LATC proceeded to review the strategic plan objectives and adjust their target dates as necessary.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to approve the July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 Draft Strategic and Communications Action Plan as amended.**

David Taylor seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0.

D. Program Manager's Report

Ms. Rodriguez continued with the Program Manager's Report. She stated Terri Villareal has worked on outreach with California schools regarding the upcoming regulation changes and LARE transition. Ms. Anderson noted that LATC should try to conduct outreach with each of the six California landscape architecture programs each year.

Ms. Rodriguez stated the regulatory proposal package for CCR sections 2615, Form of Examinations, and 2620, Education and Training Credits, was approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on March 7, 2012. She noted a regulatory public hearing is scheduled for CCR section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program. Ms. Rodriguez stated LATC is preparing to mail out exam results with an informational insert about the LARE transition.

Mr. McCauley stated that the results from the new California Supplemental Examination (CSE) did not necessarily match results from the previous CSE. He stated that the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) was asked to examine the new exam results so that LATC can verify that the results conform to ongoing examination standards. He stated OPES will provide a more detailed report for the next LATC meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that there is an Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force meeting scheduled for May 24, 2012 in Sacramento. Mr. McCauley stated the first meeting will establish the framework for future meetings.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that Jacqueline French joined LATC as the Enforcement Coordinator in January 2012. She noted that LATC has been able to close between two and six complaints per month since January. Ms. Rodriguez noted that pending enforcement complaints have had a reduction in comparison to pending complaints in 2011.

E. Budget Update

Karen Munoz provided an overview of the budget process and fund condition update for the LATC. She noted that LATC does not have any outstanding loans. Mr. McCauley noted that the cumulative effect of furloughs and various budget cutbacks is an increased fund balance. Mr. McCauley explained that OPES is an economical source for test development. He stated that OPES costs approximately half of what private test vendors cost. Mr. McCauley indicated that once the ongoing costs for the new exam are identified, LATC will re-examine revenue again. Mr. McCauley noted that the report provided in the meeting packet is the template for analyzing a fund condition using the typical conservative snapshot.

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

Ms. Anderson stated that she and Ms. Landregan attended the Spring CLARB meeting. Ms. Anderson suggested that LATC should respond to CLARB about four topics that were discussed during the Spring meeting. She stated these topics were structured internship, usage of the title Professional Landscape Architect (PLA), CLARB vs. state processing of candidates, and Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) accreditation of non-degree granting programs. Ms. Anderson explained that she and Ms. Landregan were not able to present their opinions about these subjects during the meeting because of their respective roles in CLARB. Ms. Anderson explained that she drafted a letter to CLARB addressing each of these issues and it was included in the meeting packet for the LATC's review and discussion. LATC discussed the content of the draft letter to CLARB.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to approve the draft letter to CLARB.**

David Taylor seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0.

Ms. Anderson noted that the CLARB annual meeting is scheduled for September 2012. Ms. Landregan stated that the CLARB candidate ballot will be released in June 2012 and that LATC will need to vote on it. She suggested that LATC vote on the CLARB nominees at the August 2012 LATC meeting.

H. Review and Approve Proposed Amendment to CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Sections 2615, Form of Examinations; and 2620, Education and Training Credits

Ms. Rodriguez presented the cleanup language for CCR sections 2615 and 2620, for review and discussion. Don Chang stated he will provide additional language for this regulatory proposal that states LATC will not recognize the LARE scores for candidates who take sections 3 and 4 of the LARE before they are deemed eligible by the LATC. Mr. McCauley stated that LATC does not need Board approval of the proposed language prior to submitting it to OAL for publication because the proposed changes are cleanup language, no public comments are expected for this regulatory action, and no objection is expected from the Board. He noted the Board would still have the right of refusal for the proposed regulatory changes.

Ms. Landregan asked if a regulation change for CCR section 2615 and 2620 might be needed for the issue mentioned during the public comment session at the beginning of today's meeting

regarding LATC-approved associate degree programs in landscape architecture. Mr. Chang explained that the associate degree issue mentioned during the public comment session is an administrative issue and a regulation change would not be needed. LATC and staff discussed the regulations regarding associate degrees in landscape architecture. Ms. Landregan stated the regulations are clear that LATC-approved landscape architecture associate degree programs must say “Associate degree in landscape architecture.” Mr. McCauley suggested LATC align website content with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO). He stated that the LATC website should link to the CCCCCO website to avoid any confusion about schools that offer approved landscape architecture associate degrees in California. Ms. Anderson also suggested LATC add a statement to the LATC website referring people to the LAAB website for an updated list of schools that offer LAAB accredited degrees.

Ms. Landregan stated that various other jurisdictions allow licensees from other states who have ten years of licensed experience to apply for licensure, even though they may not meet their jurisdiction’s education requirements. Mr. Chang noted that some jurisdictions recognize that licensed experience in other jurisdictions can supplement deficiencies in obtaining a license. He explained that this scenario is different from the scenario of a newly licensed person from another state who does not meet California’s requirements obtaining immediate reciprocity with California as a way to subvert the California examination.

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.

- **Christine Anderson moved to approve the proposed amendments as noted to CCR sections 2615, Form of Examinations; and 2620, Education and Training Credits, with the addition of language stating that if a candidate is not eligible to take the LARE at the time of their examination, their LARE scores will not be recognized by LATC.**

Stephanie Landregan seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0.

I. Discuss and Possible Action for University of California Extension Certificate Programs Self Evaluation Reports

Ms. Anderson stated that the UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles landscape architecture extension certificate programs recently provided LATC with voluntary Self Evaluation Reports (SER). She stated that LATC needs to decide how to review these reports and schedule a date for the next UC Extension Certificate Program Task Force meeting. Ms. Anderson stated the Task Force needs direction for the development of a procedures manual for the review of the UC landscape architecture extension certificate programs. Ms. Anderson explained the goals of the Task Force.

Ms. Landregan suggested that LATC send an acknowledgement letter to both schools that submitted SERs after a task group reviews them. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the first step is formulating a task group, identifying any issues, and then reporting on any issues that arise. Ms. Anderson suggested that the task group review the SERs. She noted that the response to the

task group review of the SERs will prompt the first meeting of the UC Extension Certificate Program Task Force.

- **Christine Anderson moved to direct staff to begin review of the voluntary SERs, respond to each program appropriately, and convene the first meeting of the UC Extension Certificate Program Task Force to outline further steps.**

David Taylor seconded the motion.

The motion carried 2-0-1 (Stephanie Landregan abstained).

J. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

August 14, 2012, Sacramento

Adjourn

- **Christine Anderson adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:39 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate the guest speakers and facilitator. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*