

## **SUMMARY REPORT**

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

University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force Meeting  
October 8, 2012  
Sacramento, California

#### Task Force Members Present

Christine Anderson, Chair, Landscape Architect  
Patrick Caughey, Landscape Architect, Past President, American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)  
Linda Gates, Landscape Architect  
Lee-Anne S. Milburn, Landscape Architecture Department Chair, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Jon Wreschinsky, President, California Council, ASLA  
Dick Zweifel, Associate Dean, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

#### Task Force Members Absent

Sandra Gonzalez, Landscape Architect  
Linda Jewell, Professor, Landscape Architecture and Urban Design, University of California (UC), Berkeley

#### Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)  
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC  
Claire Chung, Examination Coordinator, LATC

#### Guests Present

J.C. Miller, Landscape Architecture Program Director, Department of Art and Design, UC Berkeley Extension  
Miel Wilson, Landscape Architecture Program Staff, Department of Art and Design, UC Berkeley Extension

### **A. Call to Order – Roll Call** **Chair's Remarks**

Task Force Chair, Christine Anderson, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and called roll.

## **B. Public Comment Session**

Ms. Anderson called for any public comments. J.C. Miller introduced himself as the Program Director for the UC Berkeley Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program. He introduced Miel Wilson, who he noted will be assisting him with the upcoming Self-Evaluation Report (SER) preparation.

## **C. Approve June 27, 2012 University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force Summary Report**

The Task Force members had no revisions for the June 27, 2012, University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force Summary Report.

- **Patrick Caughey moved to approve the June 27, 2012, University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force Summary Report.**

**Dick Zweifel seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 6-0.**

## **D. Review Proposed Language for California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, and Make a Recommendation**

Ms. Anderson presented the modified proposed regulatory language for CCR section 2620.5 for review and discussion. She explained that the modified proposed language included edits based on the Task Force discussion at its June 27, 2012 meeting. Trish Rodriguez noted that the proposed language included new regulation language allowing provisional approval for extension programs in order to allow the programs to correct deficiencies identified during the review process. She also noted that provisions to deny or rescind approval were added to the proposed language. She stated that edits were also made changing the approval period from the proposed seven years to six to align with Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) standards. She noted that the six-year approval period aligns with the biennial application fee proposed in CCR section 2649, Fees (agenda item E).

The Task Force discussed additional edits to the modified proposed language for CCR section 2620.5. The Task Force determined that the title “program administrator” should be used throughout the section when referring to a program head, or director, since the title of the lead administrator can vary between extension programs. The Task Force determined that CCR section 2620.5, item (i) should directly align with LAAB standards and that the last sentence in item (i) should be removed in order to align with LAAB program curriculum requirements. The Task Force also determined that the programs should submit an annual report instead of the proposed biennial report, in order to have consistent contact with the extension programs. The Task Force determined that provisional approval should be granted for a period of 24 months to align with LAAB standards.

Mr. Zweifel noted that extension programs are a different entity than degree programs. He stated that the standards in CCR section 2620.5 do not necessarily need to align with LAAB standards since LAAB accredits degree programs. Lee-Anne S. Milburn noted that the emphasis of

extension certificate programs is to prepare the students for licensure. The Task Force determined that the term “learning outcomes” should be included in item (k) to align with LAAB requirements, and that the last sentence in item (k) should be separated into a new item (l) to clearly identify the extension certificate program emphasis of protecting the public health, safety, and welfare.

The Task Force discussed evaluation criteria to include on the Annual Report Format. Ms. Milburn suggested that it include the minimum requirements for CCR section 2620.5 (n), and then address any significant changes, comments, and suggestions. Ms. Anderson noted that Ms. Milburn and Mr. Zweifel will prepare a draft Annual Report Format for review at the next Task Force meeting.

The Task Force determined that CCR section 2620.5, item (o) should have a new sub-item (1) to require the annual report to include verification of continued compliance with minimum requirements to align with LAAB standards. The Task Force determined that demographic information is important to gather for a possible administrative and funding needs. The Task Force determined that sub-item (3) in item (o) should say “Current enrollment and demographics” to require the programs to send demographic information in their annual reports.

#### **E. Review Proposed Language for CCR Section 2649, Fees, and Make a Recommendation**

Ms. Rodriguez presented the proposed language for CCR section 2649, Fees. She explained that Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5681, Fee Schedule, authorizes LATC to charge a maximum of \$600 for filing an application for approval of a school on a biennial basis. She noted that this fee must be specified in regulation for it to be enforceable. She noted that LATC voted to charge the maximum fee allowable by statute for filing an application for approval of a school at its August 14, 2012 meeting. She explained that the maximum fee allowable is \$600 collected on a biennial basis, for a total of \$1,800 over a six-year period. Ms. Anderson noted that LAAB’s application fees are substantially higher than \$600 every two years. Ms. Rodriguez explained that charging a higher fee would require changing BPC section 5681. Doug McCauley noted that raising the application fee in BPC section 5681 could possibly be addressed during the next Sunset Review Report if it is determined that charging a higher application fee is justified.

The Task Force discussed the proposed language for CCR section 2649 and determined that it needed further review by Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) legal staff to ensure that it is worded in a manner that specifies the fee properly. Ms. Rodriguez noted that the language must be written in a manner that directly links it to the authorizing statute. Ms. Anderson stated that LATC staff will have the DCA legal office review the language to address any concerns over clarity, and present the findings at the next Task Force meeting.

#### **F. Review Draft University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program Review Procedures, and Possible Action**

The Task Force reviewed the Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining LATC Approved Status of the draft LATC Review/Approval Procedures and discussed further edits that would adapt it for the extension programs and the role of LATC in the reviews. While reviewing the minimum requirements section, the Task Force generated additional questions regarding the proposed language for CCR section 2620.5. Mr. Zweifel expressed concern that CCR section

2620.5, item (a) may be written in a manner that allows four-year institutions to apply for approval that LATC may not have intended. The Task Force determined that DCA legal staff will need to provide an explanation of CCR section 2620.5, item (a), and clarify which four-year institutions may apply for approval.

The Task Force discussed the faculty and staffing requirements for approved extension certificate programs. The Task Force recommended adding provisions to CCR section 2620.5 that require a minimum of one full-time equivalence (FTE) program support staff, so that the programs have enough staffing support to address daily functional issues. The Task Force determined that each program needs to have enough faculty to deliver the range of necessary coursework and that each program should be required to have a minimum of three FTE instructional faculty, in alignment with LAAB standards.

The Task Force discussed the time-base requirement for the program administrator. Mr. Zweifel stated that a program needs to have a minimum level of oversight in order to be effective. Ms. Milburn stated that in order for a program to be effective, someone needs to be present at the campus to handle various matters that arise such as alumni and administration issues. She stated that it is important to have someone present within the program who can have enough time allotted in their schedule to meet individually with each part-time faculty member to discuss and review their performance. She noted that this level of review is not inherently built-in to the administrative system. She explained that deficiencies have a tendency to remain uncorrected unless a program administrator has enough time to review them with the faculty. She noted that this level of review is only possible if an administrator has the time available in their work schedule to accomplish it. Mr. Miller noted that although he is a half-time Program Director, there is additional value to being a part-time practicing landscape architect. He explained that working as a practicing landscape architect provides him with a unique perspective that helps him when counseling students in his role as an educator. He stated that this perspective would be harder to attain if he were not half-time. Mr. Caughey stated that it is valuable for students to be able to receive counseling from a practicing landscape architect, but that that level of counseling does not necessarily need to come from the administrator of a program. He noted that it could come from other instructional faculty members. Mr. Zweifel explained that there are more people to manage when a program relies on having an FTE aggregate to fulfill staffing requirements. He noted that he would be concerned if a program had to hire people on short notice, and the program administrator was not available to guide the process. The Task Force recommended that the program administrator should have a minimum of a .75 time-base, in order to meet a minimum level of program oversight. Mr. Zweifel asked Mr. Miller if it would be possible for the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program to meet this standard if it becomes a requirement. Mr. Miller stated that it is a realistic goal, but it will be challenging in an administrative context.

The Task Force also recommended adding a new item (p) to CCR section 2620.5, requiring a program title and degree description to incorporate the term “Landscape Architecture” to align with LAAB standards.

The Task Force reviewed the “standards” portion of the draft LATC Review/Approval Procedures and discussed further edits that would adapt it for the extension programs and the role of LATC in the reviews.

The Task Force also reviewed the draft Self-Evaluation Report Format for Certificate Programs in Landscape Architecture and discussed further edits that would adapt it for the extension programs and the role of LATC in the reviews.

Ms. Anderson reviewed the task list for the next Task Force meeting:

1. Mr. Zweifel and Ms. Milburn will create a new draft Annual Report Format, for review and approval.
2. Jon Wreschinsky and Mr. Caughey will create a table for health, safety, and welfare curriculum items within the addenda portion of the SER Format for Certificate Programs in Landscape Architecture.
3. Mr. Miller will provide input to the SER addenda tables in the SER Format for Certificate Programs in Landscape Architecture.
4. Ms. Anderson and LATC staff will assemble the final edits to SER Format.
5. Mr. Caughey and Mr. Wreschinsky will edit the draft Visiting Team Guidelines.
6. Linda Gates will draft a new purpose statement within the LATC Review/Approval Procedures.
7. Ms. Anderson and LATC staff will draft the new LATC Report Template edited by Ms. Milburn.
8. Ms. Anderson and LATC staff will review the proposed language for CCR section 2649 with DCA legal counsel.
9. Ms. Anderson and LATC staff will obtain clarification about which four-year institutions can apply for LATC approval based on the regulation language in CCR section 2620.5 (a).
10. Ms. Anderson and LATC staff will assemble the final edits to the LATC Review/Approval Procedures.

Ms. Anderson stated that the draft documents in the task list will be presented to LATC at the November 14, 2012, LATC meeting. She stated that Task force members need to submit their respective task items to LATC staff by November 5, 2012.

#### **G. Identify UC Extension Certificate Program Review Milestones and Possible Action**

The Task Force reviewed the milestones for review of the extension certificate programs. Ms. Anderson noted that LATC staff must notify each of the two extension programs that LATC will send them a revised SER Format in late November 2012. She also stated LATC must inform the extension programs that LATC needs to receive their completed SER at least 45 days in advance of their review, and that the site reviews will be conducted in March or April of 2013. Ms. Anderson noted that it is important for each of the site review team members to complete their reviews before leaving the site.

#### **H. Appointment of Site Review Teams**

Ms. Anderson appointed the Site Review Teams as follows:

UC Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program Site Review Team:

1. Christine Anderson
2. Jon Wreschinsky
3. Dick Zweifel

UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program Site Review Team:

1. Patrick Caughey
2. Linda Gates
3. Lee-Anne S. Milburn

### **I. Select Future Meeting Dates**

The Task Force members will be polled to determine the next Task Force meeting date.

### **Adjourn**

**Christine Anderson adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:13 p.m.