



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

SUMMARY REPORT - DRAFT

Education Subcommittee

February 27, 2007

12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Sacramento, CA 95834

Subcommittee Members Present

Richard Zweifel, Chair

Christine Anderson

Steve Lang

Alexis Slafer

Subcommittee Member Absent

Linda Gates

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

Jessica Molina, Student Assistant

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 12:08. Linda Gates was absent. All other members were present.

Richard Zweifel stated that today's meeting is a continuation of the January 16, 2007 meeting and the goal is to finalize the recommendations to the LATC for their consideration. Mr. Zweifel stated that the Education Subcommittee was formed in August 2004 and he found this review very interesting, and is grateful to all members and staff for their work and participation towards improving paths for candidates towards licensure. Mr. Zweifel stated his understanding of today's meeting is to review of the comparison of curriculum of accredited degrees in architecture and civil engineering in order to recommend an appropriate amount of educational credit, if any, to review California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2620 and determine appropriate amount of credit for each educational and experience category, and to review the table of contents for the report to the legislature. Mary Ann Aguayo provided an overview of the material provided and expectation of what is included.

No public in attendance therefore no public comments were made.

B. Review and Approve January 16, 2007 Summary Report

The Summary Report was not available for review at today’s meeting and will be submitted to the LATC for approval at their next meeting.

C. Review and Approve Components of the Draft Response to the Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee’s 2004 Recommendation regarding the Education and Experience Requirements for Examination:

1. Revised Final Findings and Recommendations Regarding California’s Eligibility Requirements for Examination
2. Proposed Changes to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 – Education and Training Credits
3. Revised Charts Outlining Education Credits for Architects and Landscape Architects
4. Comparison of Curriculum for Accredited Degrees in Architecture and Civil Engineering
5. Draft Response to The California Architects Board Question Regarding Parity
6. Format for Report to the Legislature

Mr. Zweifel began by reviewing the cover page for section C which includes the history and charge of reviewing the eligibility requirements in California. In doing so, he was reminded that this process began in August 2004 and that time was well spent thoroughly reviewing access to examination.

Alexis Slafer questioned the fourth paragraph that indicates “*parity does exist between examination for architects and landscape architects, whereas the current proposed change requires a combined 10 years education and experience to become eligible for all examinations.*” Mr. McCauley questioned and Subcommittee agreed that the portion of the sentence should state “between examination eligibility requirements for...”. The Subcommittee discussed possible confusion between stating ten years when six years is the requirement to qualify for the landscape architects examination in California. The Subcommittee agreed that this sentence requires clarification to state what the current proposal was at the time the sentence was written and to define the ten years. Ms. Aguayo reminded the Subcommittee that the Board posed the question in terms of the traditional path that candidates take to become eligible for the licensure examination. The Board defined parity by number of years candidates take to complete a degree and experience to qualify for the licensure exam.

Mr. Zweifel suggested indicating the change was to provide one year of credit for an accredited degree in architecture which is an increase from the current requirements which provide no credit for architectural degrees.

C.1 Revised Final Findings and Recommendations Regarding California's Eligibility Requirements for Examination

Mr. Zweifel confirmed that Agenda Item C.1, Revised Final Findings and Recommendations had been completed and presented at the January 16, 2007 meeting and any recommendations, as a result of today's meeting would be incorporated into the Final draft.

C.2 Proposed Changes to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 – Education and Training Credits

At the January 16, 2007 meeting, the Subcommittee requested an outline of current paths that California candidates can take to qualify for the licensure examination in order to aid in reviewing Agenda Item C.2, Proposed Changes to Education Training Credits 2620 and determining an appropriate amount of credit for each education and experience requirement. The Subcommittee reviewed the Synopsis of Current Paths to Qualify for Exam/Licensure as requested which prompted much discussion requiring consideration and/or confirmation of previous recommendations.

Questions arose regarding credit being provided for unaccredited landscape architecture degrees and the possible lack of oversight of these programs. Ms. Slafer indicated that the concern is not necessarily the unaccredited degree but whether the program has lost accreditation and if so, why. The Subcommittee was reminded that accreditation is an option for programs. Ms. Slafer indicated that there is more of a comfort level if the institution itself is accredited. The Subcommittee was reminded that the Board provides credit for unaccredited degrees and that the Candidate Tracking system has been implemented as a mechanism to gather information for re-evaluation at a later date. The Subcommittee agreed that there is no justification to remove educational credit currently being granted; however to revisit this issue at a later date when data becomes available.

The Subcommittee also expressed ongoing concern over the associate degree receiving educational credit. A review of the associate degree in landscape architecture curricula was conducted at a prior meeting and in addition, an Education Specialist from California Community Colleges attended a meeting in March 2005 to discuss the process for the associate degrees. The Subcommittee determined that the associate degree is difficult to quantify, and data is not available to modify or remove the educational credit and recommended that the one year of educational credit for an Associate degree in landscape architecture continue to provide access to examination. The Subcommittee was reminded that providing this type of educational credit is also consistent with the Board's language which provides one year of educational credit in a field related to architecture. The Subcommittee directed staff to include a recommendation in the Final Findings and Recommendations to monitor the information for review in the future. Staff was also directed to add a recommendation that states "*Subcommittee recommends that the LATC provide a minimum description of standards as guidelines for associate degree programs to meet*". The Subcommittee is not recommending that the LATC review or require the guidelines be met; however, the tracking chart will be reviewed in the future to determine if a problem exists.

The Subcommittee reconfirmed that Education is still considered a very important piece of qualifications; however all agreed that the degree, plus experience, plus the examination is really the true test.

Mr. Zweifel questioned acceptance and the process for evaluation of foreign degrees. Mary Anderson reported that the transcripts are submitted by the candidate to an approved foreign evaluation services

who completes a general evaluation of the courses equating the degree to an accredited master or bachelor degree in the United States. Foreign education determined equivalent to an accredited master or bachelor degree in landscape architecture in the United States receives four years of educational credit. No credit is provided for unaccredited or other degrees.

Members of the Subcommittee agree that the Extension Certificate is a very specialized program specific to landscape architecture. When reviewing the two years of educational credit currently allocated, it does not appear equitable when compared to educational credits allocated to an unaccredited degree. The Subcommittee previously recommended increasing the educational credit from two years to three years; however, after further consideration Ms. Slafer recommends the Extension Certificate continue to receive two educational credits. Ms. Aguayo stated that staff recommends leaving Extension Certificate credit as is because most graduates have a four-year degree for which the LATC currently provides four years of educational credit. Impact to others without the four-year degree is minimal and if so, still provides more than the minimum required educational credit for entry. Members of the Subcommittee agreed to leave the current credit for an Extension Certificate at two years of educational credit.

C.4 Comparison of Curriculum for Accredited Degrees in Architecture and Civil Engineering

Mr. Zweifel reminded the Subcommittee they had previously considered related disciplines. The Subcommittee confirmed a previous assessment that some formal education as well as experience in landscape architecture is required for adequate preparation to examine. Architecture and civil engineering both have an accrediting board and appeared to have a closer association with landscape architects than other disciplines. Mr. Zweifel reminded the Subcommittee that architecture and civil engineering degrees were given the same weight and the original proposal was to provide an equal amount of one year of educational credit to both degrees.

Mr. Zweifel reported he analyzed and determined whether sufficient educational equivalents of either or both degrees equate to educational credit be provided. Mr. Zweifel presented his report and summarized his findings. The Subcommittee agreed that landscape architecture areas specific to Health, Safety and Welfare do not seem to be covered under the civil engineering degree.

Mr. Zweifel stated based on course outlines, it was difficult to determine a direct correlation of many subject areas. Based on his analysis, Mr. Zweifel would not treat the two accredited degrees the same.

Ms. Aguayo reported that she spoke with the Engineers Board regarding qualification and they don't have an entry and do not provide credit for a landscape architecture degree or experience. They do have an entry not specific to landscape architects that anyone can go through to meet eligibility, which was described by the Engineers Board as a very elaborate and difficult process. Ms. Aguayo informed the members that the recent task analysis survey shows that 14.4% of landscape architects are also architects and only 0.5% are engineers (based on 403 responses).

After Subcommittees review and discussion of the comparison charts between architecture and landscape architecture, they agreed to recommend educational credit be granted for an accredited degree in architecture as previously determined; however not for civil engineers at this time.

C.2 Proposed Changes to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 – Education and Training Credits

The Subcommittee returned to Agenda Item 2, Proposed Changes to Education Training Credits 2620, to determine appropriate amount of education and experience credit for each item. After consideration of other educational credits, parity charts reviewed and curriculum comparison, the Subcommittee recommends providing one year of educational credit for an accredited architecture degree. One year of educational credit provides access for architects and demonstrates parity. When considering parity under model qualifications, in total it would take less time for architects to become landscape architects than it would for landscape architects to become architects. Under current regulations, architects do not receive any educational credit.

The Subcommittee previously recommended providing 50% experience credit (maximum two years) for architects similar to what the Board offers for landscape architects; however, after discussion, the Subcommittee assessed that a more complex form of determining credits is unnecessary and that the current language requires a sufficient amount of work experience.

The Subcommittee had also previously recommended adding experience credit for foreign/international experience similar to what the Board offers. After further review and discussion, it was determined that the Board refers to a National Council of Architectural Registration Board list of foreign/international countries with a verified record of substantial practice in architecture whose standards and qualification to practice architecture are equivalent to those required in California. Staff checked with the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards to see if they have a similar list and they do not. Without a means to verify foreign/international experience, the Subcommittee does not recommend providing any experience credit.

C.5 Draft Response to The California Architects Board Question Regarding Parity

Ms. Aguayo provided an update on Agenda Item 5, Draft Response to the California Architects Board Regarding Parity and confirmed that the analysis will be updated and a response will be written. The response will be submitted to the LATC for approval and forwarded to the Board with a cover letter from the LATC.

C.6 Format for Report to the Legislature

The Subcommittee reviewed the outline provided and was requested to conceptually approve the proposed contents for the final report. The Subcommittee noted the importance for the report to address the Joint Legislative Sunset Review in the beginning overall summary. In addition, the Subcommittee recommends adding the following: 1) Relationships of the Education Subcommittee, LATC, Board, etc., 2) Task Analysis that is not recognized, 3) Addition of Dates to Studies Conducted, 4) Early Eligibility, 5) Recognition of Access and the Partnership with Students/Candidates/Profession, and 6) Implementation of the Candidate Tracking System to Evaluate Trends in the Future. The Subcommittee agreed that the format is very comprehensive.

Ms. Slafer indicated the importance of stating within the recommendation for early eligibility to include the Extension Certificate candidates. Ms. Slafer indicated that CLARB will not allow candidate with an Extension Certificate to sit for the exam early. Christine Anderson suggested that CLARB be instructed that eligible candidates will be allowed to sit early. Mary Anderson indicated that as long as candidates

have been approved for examination by the LATC, they would be allowed to sit however, she will verify with CLARB.

The final Finding and Recommendations will be submitted to the LATC for their approval during their next meeting scheduled for May 4, 2007.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.