



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

MEETING MINUTES

Education Subcommittee

November 8, 2006

8:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Sacramento, CA 95834

Subcommittee Members Present

Richard Zweifel, Chair

Christine Anderson

Linda Gates

Steve Lang

Alexis Slafer

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)

Mary Ann Aguayo, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)

Ethan Mathes, Special Project Analyst

Mary Anderson, Examination Analyst

A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum

Chair's Remarks

Public Comment Session

Education Subcommittee Chair Richard Zweifel called the meeting to order at 8:48 a.m. All members of the Education Subcommittee were present and thus a quorum was established.

B. Review August 25, 2006 LATC Meeting Discussion and Charges

- 1. California Architects Board Direction to Reexamine Educational Credits for Examination Eligibility Relative to Parity with Allied Disciplines (Discussed under Item D)**
- 2. Related Issues and Impact any Changes will Make to Final Findings and Recommendations Regarding California's Eligibility Requirements for Examination (Discussed under Item D)**
- 3. Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 – Education and Training Credits (Discussed under Item D)**
- 4. Draft Response for the LATC to Review and Consider Before Forwarding to the Board and Proceeding to Report to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Legislature (Discussed under Item D)**

Mr. Zweifel reported that on May 9, 2006 the Education Subcommittee's recommendations were submitted to the LATC for review and approval. They were subsequently sent to the Board at their

June 7, 2006 meeting for review and approval. The Board approved the recommendations on California's eligibility requirements for examination, with the condition that the LATC review recommendation #1, Accept Accredited Professional Architecture and Civil Engineering Degrees, and provide an analysis to the Board on parity of the requirements to apply for examination between licensure of architects versus landscape architects prior to the package moving forward. Mr. Zweifel stated the mission of the Subcommittee was to re-review the original recommendations, assure that each recommendation is substantiated, and in doing so, address the Board's concerns. Christine Anderson affirmed the meeting should not rehash everything that had previously been discussed; rather it should review, confirm, and prepare documentation of each recommendation.

Mary Ann Aguayo reported that prior to today's meeting, she and Ethan Mathes met with the Little Hoover Commission (LHC) to obtain information regarding various studies and reports they put together for the Legislature. Ms. Aguayo learned it is a very elaborate process and the end product is a public document that should stand on its own. She expressed that the LHC reporting method could be a model in preparing the LATC's final report as it will be presented to the Legislature and eventually be used as part of Sunset Review. Ms. Aguayo and Doug McCauley agreed all the completed work for the recommendations need to be pulled together to provide a coherent policy-based document which can stand on its own.

Mr. McCauley reported the Board felt there should be parity between educational credits given for an accredited architecture degree and credit given for an accredited landscape architecture degree. More specifically, the Board felt that it should take an equitable amount of education plus experience for a graduate with an accredited architecture degree to qualify for the landscape architecture licensing examination as it does for a graduate with an accredited landscape architecture degree to qualify for the architect licensing examination.

Ms. Aguayo presented a chart she prepared for the August 25, 2006 LATC meeting. The chart compared the licensure requirements of architecture and landscape architecture and the parity between the two using the traditional method of a four-five year education plus experience to qualify for the architect and landscape architect examinations. Mr. Zweifel indicated that the chart in its current format is confusing and does not fully represent the need. Linda Gates stated that the current chart serves two functions: 1) answering the Board's question regarding parity, and 2) providing an outline of education and experience requirements for landscape architects and architects.

As the Subcommittee had previously recommended giving equal educational credit for accredited architecture and civil engineering degrees, staff was directed to prepare a comparison chart in order to evaluate them individually. The Subcommittee further directed staff to: 1) inquire whether civil engineers have an avenue to licensure for landscape architects to become civil engineers similar to that of architects, 2) create a chart demonstrating the traditional path to qualify for the landscape architect examination (i.e., accredited degree in landscape architecture plus two years of training/experience), and 3) create a chart to illustrate the path to landscape architect licensure with an accredited Architect degree plus experience or accredited Civil Engineer degree plus experience. In addition, the Subcommittee suggested staff draft examples of other methods to qualify for examination being created due to the proposed changes.

The charts will be presented to the Subcommittee for review prior to the next meeting (tentatively scheduled for December 19, 2006).

C. Review Existing *Materials*

- 1. August 25, 2006 LATC Meeting Draft Minutes and Staff Report**
- 2. Final Findings and Recommendations Regarding California's Eligibility Requirements for Examination**
- 3. Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 – Education and Training Credits**
- 4. Summary Reports for Prior Education Subcommittee Meetings**
- 5. Prior Education Subcommittee Studies and Research Material**

Materials were provided as reference to aid the Subcommittee in their discussion of the recommendations and to add additional information in order to support recommendations.

D. Discuss and Develop a *Plan of Action* to Complete Charges

- 1. Identify Missing Data**
- 2. Define Components Needed for Final Proposal**

The Subcommittee reviewed the Findings and Recommendations Regarding California's Eligibility Requirements for Examination draft and suggested changes to the document. Members agreed to provide additional rationale to staff by November 30, 2006 who will then prepare an update for the Subcommittee to review before the next meeting.

The Subcommittee reviewed the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 - Education and Training Credits and amended the proposed language based on the discussed recommendations. Staff reported the proposed language would be edited based on this discussion.

The Subcommittee further discussed the need to add explanatory language for foreign/international experience and to grant one year of experience credit. The Board's Table of Equivalence was reviewed to use as a guide. Discussion revealed that the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards maintains a list of qualifying foreign/international countries whose standards and qualifications to practice architecture are equivalent to those required in this state as a resource for the Board. The Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards does not currently maintain a list, therefore, it would be difficult for the LATC to determine equivalency. As a result, the members suggested proposed language to provide one year of credit for experience as or under a landscape architect in a foreign/international country to create a situation where at least one year of experience would be required within a CLARB member board jurisdiction. Even though, concerns were expressed as to how staff reviewing candidate applications would determine equivalency.

Ms. Aguayo reported that the LATC had asked the Landscape Architects Accreditation Board (LAAB) to consider including the extension certificate programs in the accreditation process. The LAAB is currently in the process of revising the accreditation standards and the accreditation of extension certificate programs will be open for discussion. The LAAB will be conducting a survey on accreditation, scheduled to go out to all licensure states within a couple of weeks. They will discuss the survey results at a January 2007 meeting and prepare a document outlining potential changes for comment by interested parties.

In discussing preparation of the draft response for forwarding to the Board and proceeding to report to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Legislature, the Subcommittee suggested staff complete the following:

- Provide a rationale within the report as to why the objectives were set.
- Obtain curriculum for accredited degrees in Architecture and Civil Engineering and document data to compare the two.
- Revise the chart outlining education credits given to architects and landscape architects and draft narrative explaining the differences.
- Edit CCR Section 2620 - Education and Training as discussed.
- Prepare a draft response to the Board's question of educational parity credits between architects and landscape architects.
- Define an unaccredited degree using the Board's Table of Equivalents, which reads "A professional degree in landscape architecture where the degree program has not been accredited by the LAAB and the program consists of at least a five-year curriculum."

In addition Mr. Zweifel agreed to provide staff with information regarding the Civil Engineering curriculum, and the Subcommittee agreed to review the Findings and Recommendations draft and provide additional substantiation to staff by November 30, 2006. The comments will aid staff in revising recommendations. Staff agreed to email a copy of the existing draft to the members. The Subcommittee further recommended that the LATC add a Strategic Planning item to review the candidate/reciprocity tracking chart data. They felt this review would facilitate a better understanding of unaccredited degrees and the educational credit given them.

E. Schedule Next Education Subcommittee Meeting Date

A teleconference has been tentatively scheduled for December 19, 2006 from 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. The meeting notice will need to include all the Subcommittee members and their teleconference location. The agenda items will be emailed to all parties to facilitate the workload.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:22 p.m.