



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee

January 16, 2007
Sacramento, CA

LATC Members Present

Christine Anderson, Chair
Linda Gates
Stephanie Landregan
Steve Lang
Dennis Otsuji

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board
Mary Ann Aguayo, Program Manager, LATC
Ethan Mathes, Special Project Analyst
Mary Anderson, Exam Coordinator
Terri Villareal, Enforcement Officer
Jessica Molina, Student Assistant

Guests Present

Heather Clendenin, University of California, Berkeley Extension
Iris Cochlan, California Architects Board Liaison
Alexis Joan Slafer, University of California, Los Angeles Extension
Richard Zweifel, Administrative Dean, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

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 1:21 p.m. and called roll. All five members of the LATC were present and thus a quorum was established. There were no Chair's remarks or public comment.

B. Review and Approve November 7, 2006 LATC Meeting Minutes

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to approve the November 7, 2006 LATC Meeting Minutes.**
- **Dennis Otsuji seconded the motion.**
- **The motion carried 5-0.**

C. Site Visit Team’s Extension Certificate Reports for the University of Berkeley (UCB) and University of Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Programs

1. Review Comments Received on LATC Report from UCB and UCLA Regarding Reports

The LATC reviewed and commented on both extension program reports. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620.5, the extension programs are reviewed every five years for compliance with accreditation standards set forth by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). LAAB’s mission is to evaluate, advocate for, and advance the quality of education in landscape architectural programs. A summary of the discussion follows:

UCB Extension Program

Heather Clendenin clarified that the UCB extension program is interrelated with the degree program, but needs bolstering. Dennis Otsuji suggested Ms. Clendenin discuss these issues with the UCB extension program chair. Ms. Anderson questioned whether citing examples in the report would be prescriptive in nature. Doug McCauley agreed, but that it also depends on the nature of example given.

Ms. Landregan inquired about the UCB extension program budget and resource allocation process. Ms. Anderson explained the budget process and that some budgetary items are mandatory and some discretionary.

Ms. Landregan suggested the UCB extension program follow through on streamlining the UCB extension program for students with related professional degrees (Suggestions for Improvement, page 10). Ms. Clendenin stated that consideration for streamlining the program for students with related professional degrees is currently being worked on and it will be a long process. Ms. Anderson agreed certain professionals would benefit from this suggested improvement.

Ms. Clendenin clarified that the courses covering 20th century art, architecture and design history are, in fact, part of the UCB extension program.

Ms. Landregan felt the statement (Rationale, page 22) regarding the enforcement of prerequisite tracking was vague, and that if it is currently a problem it needs to be addressed. Ms. Clendenin clarified this issue was based on staffing. Ms. Landregan suggested making the bullet statement more definitive and less vague.

Ms. Anderson affirmed the UCB extension program has a weak relationship with UCB. Ms. Clendenin clarified UCB is not fiscally responsible for the extension program. Ms. Landregan agreed UCB should have a better relationship with the extension program.

Ms. Clendenin explained students evaluate the UCB extension program, classes and instructors with surveys. Ms. Anderson stated she would work on clarifying this point (Rationale, page 28).

UCLA Extension Program

Ms. Landregan enquired whether the Suggestions for Improvement under Curriculum could be weighted based on priority; in particular weighting based on whether suggestions are made by students, faculty or administrators. Linda Gates explained the suggestions are more observations and not required but that they could be prioritized. Alexis Joan Slafer agreed.

Ms. Slafer pointed out that Section 3 of the report did not include whether the stated standards were met or not met. Ms. Gates clarified that the standards were met and the statements would be included in the final report.

Mr. Otsuji questioned whether students understand the design process. Ms. Landregan agreed with the suggestion that design instructors could create benchmarks of knowledge and skills (Suggestions for Improvement, page 13). Ms. Gates also agreed. Ms. Landregan further felt this is a key to the success of the program. LATC members arrived at a consensus of the perceived deficiency and the importance of reaching an in-depth understanding.

Ms. Landregan suggested citing more specifics regarding furniture and equipment (Suggestions for Improvement, page 28). Ms. Gates felt it was not an issue with the students that were surveyed, but agreed to look into it further.

2. Review and Approve Final Draft of LATC Report

Due to the extensive discussion and clarifications needed on the reports, the members agreed that final drafts were not ready for approval at this time. Ms. Anderson and Ms. Gates agreed to include the clarifications and edits discussed by the group and submit final drafts to staff by January 24 for inclusion in the February 6 and 7, 2007 LATC meeting packet.

D. Discuss Extension Certificate Program Approval Process

Ms. Anderson and Ms. Gates discussed the review process and suggestions discussed during a recap of the process that took place January 5, 2007. Areas discussed include: 1) addition of a summary of the program changes that have occurred since the last review and including the remaining required details in an appendix; 2) begin the review with the status of the last review (i.e., curriculum and credit review); 3) include an experienced Site Team member from previous visits; 4) hold an orientation session or conference call prior to the site visit to review the LATC charge, the review process and expectations, and the review the programs Self Evaluation Report content; 5) include time each day of the review for the Site Team to meet alone for regrouping, discussion and writing the report; and 6) prepare consistent guidelines and checklists perhaps in fill-in-the-blank format or checklists to measure standard in context to LATC's charge.

Ms. Landregan suggested reviewing the extension program review process within six months in order to improve it for the next review. Mary Ann Aguayo expressed that this could be a strategic planning item to be scheduled for completion within two years or so in order that an updated process and plan are in place for the review to take place in five years.

E. Update on the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board's Consideration of Accrediting Landscape Architect Extension Certificate Programs

Mary Anderson updated the LATC on the status of LAAB progress on the accreditation of California landscape architecture extension certificate programs. She said the LAAB has sent out a survey and is considering the review of the extension certificate programs. Christine Anderson suggested drafting a letter stating the LATC position on this issue.

Adjournment

Due to a technical issue with the teleconference call, the meeting ended prior to a motion to adjourn. The meeting ended at 3:50 p.m.