



Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting

February 8, 2019
Los Angeles, California

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Members Present

Marq Truscott, Chair
Andrew Bowden, Vice Chair
Susan M. Landry
Patricia Trauth

LATC Member Absent

David Allan Taylor, Jr.

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)
Vickie Mayer, Assistant EO
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager
Cheri Gyuro, Public Information Officer, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA or Department)
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator
Tara Welch, Attorney III, DCA

Guests Present

Dean R. Grafilo, Director, DCA
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, California Council of American Society of Landscape Architects (CCASLA)
Stephanie Landregan, Director of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension, Landscape Architecture Program
Ron Ruiz, UCLA Extension Alumni
Allan Spulecki, UCLA Extension Alumni

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

LATC Chair Marq Truscott called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m., and Vice Chair Andrew Bowden called roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

B. Chair's Procedural Remarks and LATC Member Introductory Comments

Mr. Truscott began by announcing that a voluntary sign-in sheet was located at the back of the room should attendees want to be recorded in the official minutes of the meeting. He noted that Agenda Item D would be taken before Agenda Item C and Agenda Item E would be presented at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Truscott shared that lunch would arrive at noon and that the LATC would have a working lunch. He added that David Allan Taylor, Jr. has completed his service as an LATC member and that Jon Wreschinsky has been appointed to fill the vacancy.

D*. Update on the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) – Dean R. Grafilo, DCA Director

DCA Director, Dean R. Grafilo provided an update on current DCA activity. His presentation highlighted DCA's accomplishments and activities of 2018. He encouraged the Committee to visit the DCA website and review the 2018 Annual Report. Mr. Grafilo also shared that Governor Gavin Newsom released his proposed budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 on January 10, 2019. He added that the LATC and the Board are currently going through Sunset Review and that the DCA Office of Board and Bureau Relations is available to assist in that effort.

Mr. Bowden questioned if the Board and LATC Sunset Review Hearings would be held together. Laura Zuniga responded that the hearings would be combined and that herself, Program Manager Trish Rodriguez, LATC Chair Mr. Truscott and the Board President Sylvia Kwan would be attending. She added that before the hearing the Board would receive a Background Paper outlining any possible issues that may be addressed at the hearing.

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that seven public comment emails were received in reference to Agenda Item H regarding the requirements for an approved Extension Certificate Program.

F. Review and Possible Action on December 6-7, 2018 LATC Meeting Minutes

Andrew Bowden moved to approve the December 6-7, 2018 LATC Meeting Minutes.

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that a minor technical revision is necessary to correct the dates of the referenced Strategic Plan on page 10.

Andrew Bowden amended his motion to approve the December 6-7, 2018 LATC Meeting Minutes with the technical correction.

Susan M. Landry seconded the amended motion.

Members Bowden, Landry, Truscott, and Chair Trauth voted in favor of the motion. Member Taylor was absent. The motion passed 4-0.

G. Program Manager’s Report – Update on LATC’s Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs

Ms. Rodriguez reported that the next Board meeting would be held on February 27, 2019. She provided an update on the Business Modernization efforts, explaining that 30 As-Is Workshops have already been completed and preparation for the next phase of Could-Be Workshops is underway.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that recruitment is underway for the Special Projects Analyst position at both the Staff Services Analyst and Associate Governmental Program Analyst levels. She also shared that on January 1, 2019 LATC transitioned from pro-rated initial license fees to a flat \$400 license fee. Mr. Bowden asked if the change had been discussed by the Committee. Ms. Rodriguez responded that because the fees outlined in the previous Initial License Fee Chart were not fully congruent with the regulations, staff worked with DCA legal counsel to determine a more streamlined process under which all applicants for initial licensure would pay the same fee for a full two-year license in lieu of a proration. Mr. Bowden questioned if the initial license fee had increased from \$220 to \$400. Ms. Rodriguez replied that renewal fees are currently set at \$220 and initial license fees are \$400.

Ms. Rodriguez announced that presentations on the LATC’s social media plan and proposed amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5 would be provided later in the meeting.

Ms. Landry expressed concern with the fine charged to Geoffrey George Fujimoto, outlined on page 9 of the December 2018 Monthly Report, as she felt it was too lenient for his actions. Ms. Zuniga explained that this case was based on an advertisement violation and that no consumer was involved.

Tara Welch provided an update to the status of the regulatory package for CCR sections 2615 and 2620, announcing that staff submitted the package to the DCA Legal Office for review on February 7, 2019. She added that the section 100 change to CCR sections 2624 and 2624.1 was approved by the Office of Administrative Law on January 31, 2019.

Tracy Morgan Hollingworth questioned how Senate Bill 1480 which changes the frequency of boards to meet from three times a year to two times a year, will affect the LATC. Patricia Trauth responded that LATC may meet more frequently and that it currently meets four times per year.

Stephanie Landregan expressed that a \$400 initial license fee may discourage people from becoming licensed and asked if the LATC would consider a tiered initial license fee. Ms. Welch advised the Committee that fees are commonly based on fee studies and can be changed when a fee study warrants it. Mr. Bowden clarified that the current renewal fee is temporarily reduced due to a budget surplus and that the initial license fee of \$400 should not discourage applicants because their earning potential will increase once they receive the license. Being this item was not on the meeting agenda, Mr. Truscott directed staff to prepare an update for a future meeting that summarizes the current LATC license fee structure and when LATC is expected to return from a reduced renewal fee to the full fee.

H. Review and Possible Action on Extension Certificate Program Subcommittee's Recommendation to Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2620.5 Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program

Mr. Bowden expressed a possible conflict of interest due to his membership as the Chair on the UCLA Landscape Architecture Guidance Committee and recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Truscott explained that, in November 1991, the Board of Landscape Architects adopted CCR, title 16, section 2620.5, formally establishing requirements for Board approval of extension certificate programs, based on university accreditation standards from the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). He added that since the LAAB implemented changes to its accreditation standards in 2009, the LATC has been in the process of pursuing changes to section 2620.5. Mr. Truscott reminded the Committee that at their December 6, 2018 meeting, the LATC reviewed the current provisions of section 2620.5 and decided to create a subcommittee tasked with preparing recommended regulatory changes for the Committee to consider. He added that the subcommittee, comprised of himself and Ms. Landregan, developed recommended changes to section 2620.5 for the LATC's consideration at this meeting. Mr. Truscott clarified that the recommendations outlined in the meeting materials pertain to curriculum requirements, instructional personnel requirements, submittal requirements for Board approval/renewal of approval, and site visit requirements. He then requested the Committee to review and consider the subcommittee's recommendations outlined in the meeting materials and determine how to proceed. Mr. Truscott noted that the LATC received seven public comment emails in support of the subcommittee's recommendations.

Ms. Trauth questioned the subcommittee's recommendation to amend instructional personnel requirements outlined in section 2620.5(m)(1) to include allowance for approved extension certificates. Ms. Landregan explained that since approved extension certificates are considered a valid form of education in California, changing the regulation to allow instructional personnel with approved extension certificates would ensure that qualified individuals, holding approved extension certificates, would be allowed to teach in extension certificate programs. Ms. Welch clarified that the current regulation does not prevent individuals with extension certificates from teaching in extension certificate programs, it only requires that at least one half of a program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree in landscape architecture. She inquired why an extension certificate program would need more instructional personnel with extension certificates than professional degrees in landscape architecture. Ms. Landregan explained that most educational programs do not hire their graduates back to teach as it does not broaden the instructional core but that there are instances when an individual's experience qualifies for a teaching position. Ms. Landry expressed concern with accepting extension certificates alone as they are not equivalent to professional degrees in landscape architecture. She suggested amending the regulation to allow an extension certificate and another degree in lieu of a professional degree in landscape architecture. Ms. Landregan clarified that the UCLA Extension program offers most of what a master's program in landscape architecture provides. She added that the UCLA Extension program only allows a few conditional admissions of individuals who do not have an undergraduate degree but instead have experience in landscape construction. Ms. Landregan clarified that these applicants are admitted because California allows licensure to individuals with landscape construction experience and an approved extension certificate. Ms. Zuniga questioned how many students are admitted with landscape construction experience in lieu of a degree. Ms. Landregan responded that each year her program accepts about three students without a

degree. She added that it is not common because these individuals may not have study habits and therefore the program can be difficult for them. Ms. Landry added that since most of the extension program students have a degree in another field, it would be reasonable to amend the regulation to allow instructional personnel with an approved extension certificate and a degree in another field. She continued that this would prevent the LATC from diluting the current educational requirement of instructors set by the regulation.

Ms. Welch asked that if instructional personnel are allowed to hold an extension certificate, what other education or experience would they need to demonstrate that they are qualified for the position. She added that this change would potentially allow professors to have an extension certificate only. Mr. Truscott added that there are many faculty that are not licensed. Ms. Landry asked how many instructors are currently on staff at UCLA Extension. Ms. Landregan responded that there are currently 32 instructors. She added that about 10 percent of the instructor core have a degree in a field other than landscape architecture and about 20 percent are not licensed landscape architects.

Ms. Landry opined that if the Committee moves forward with the subcommittee's recommendation to amend section 2620.5(m)(1) to allow extension certificates, a degree should be required in addition to the certificate. Ms. Welch clarified that requiring only an extension certificate would create the possibility for half of a program's instructors to hold an extension certificate and have landscape construction experience but no degree. Ms. Landregan opined that the breadth of the extension certificate is comparable to a master's degree. She suggested that no more than 10 percent of instructors be allowed to hold an extension certificate.

Mr. Truscott opened the discussion up to public comment. UCLA Extension alumni, Ron Ruiz, introduced himself. He stated that the UCLA Extension program is a rigorous program with effective instructors and unique class schedules. He shared that he was present at the meeting to express his support of the program.

Ms. Landry pointed out that the subcommittee's recommended changes to section 2620.5 would not only affect UCLA Extension but would also pertain to any program that would seek to obtain Board approval. She added that in the City of Campbell there are two community colleges that may be interested in becoming certified. Ms. Landry continued that her concern is that while UCLA has a great program, this regulation will affect any program requesting certification. She asked what would happen in the future if the LATC received applications from associate programs. Mr. Truscott asked if Ms. Landry would be more comfortable with a descriptor requiring a terminal degree. Ms. Landry agreed and suggested accepting an approved extension certificate in landscape architecture and a degree in another field to maintain the quality of instructional personnel. Ms. Welch added that her concern with the proposed change is that it would open the possibility where half of a program's instructional personnel hold an extension certificate and a degree in a field other than landscape architecture. She added that LATC must have confidence in the education program to try and ensure that all students going through the program are getting enough variety or background in landscape architecture. Ms. Welch continued that LATC must ensure that both educational backgrounds provide sufficient education for the students completing the programs. She added that the potential for half of a program's instructors to have all the same background must be justifiable. Ms. Landregan stated that if the instructional personnel requirements are too narrow it will make hiring qualified staff more difficult. She added that no other academic institution in the US is required to hire licensed

instructors. Ms. Landregan explained that it would help if she could include in that 50 percent some of the very qualified individuals with extension certificates. She continued that, if the Committee does not include acceptance of an extension certificate in lieu of a degree in landscape architecture, she would rather the LATC not amend section 2620.5(m)(1) because it would further limit her ability to hire instructors.

Mr. Truscott suggested making a motion today or tabling this discussion for another meeting when the new LATC member can provide input on the issue. Ms. Landry expressed support for tabling the discussion. She added that since this regulation applies to any program in this state that wants to be approved, tabling it to allow for input from the new LATC member would be beneficial. Mr. Truscott suggested approving all of the subcommittee's recommendations except for the recommended change to section 2620.5(m)(1). Ms. Welch recommended that the Committee review proposed regulatory language so that it is clear what exactly is being approved. Mr. Truscott recommended directing staff to prepare proposed regulatory language to amend CCR section 2620.5 that reflects the subcommittee's recommended changes, without the proposed change to instructional personnel requirements, for the Committee's review and approval with the additional Committee member. Ms. Landregan and Landry voiced support for Mr. Truscott's suggestion. Ms. Trauth agreed and added that she would like for the Committee to finalize the regulatory changes at the next meeting. Mr. Truscott directed staff to prepare proposed regulatory language to amend section 2620.5 that reflects the subcommittee's recommended changes without the proposed change to instructional personnel requirements and agendaize the proposal for the next LATC meeting.

I. Review and Possible Action on Amendments to CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Sections 2680 Disciplinary Guidelines, 2655 Substantial Relationship Criteria, and 2656 Criteria for Rehabilitation

Ms. Welch explained that the proposed rulemaking would implement Assembly Bill (AB) 2138 which aims to reduce barriers to licensure for individuals with a criminal history. She added that this bill requires every board to adopt rehabilitation criteria to apply to an applicant or licensee when determining if they have been rehabilitated and are then safe to practice landscape architecture. Ms. Welch presented that DCA developed a template using regulations adopted by most of the boards and provided the proposed revisions to LATC's substantial relationship criteria for the Committee's consideration. She expanded that the proposed revisions add three criteria that DCA is recommending be adopted, as well as a provision that would include any violation of another state or federal law governing the practice of landscape architecture. Ms. Welch explained that to the extent that a violation is not specifically covered under the landscape architecture law of California, any other state or federal law that relates to landscape architecture would also be used to determine if the violation is substantially related to the practice. She continued that the proposal also adds Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 141, which provides that disciplinary action taken against a California licensee by another jurisdiction, for any act substantially related to the practice, may be a ground for disciplinary action by the respective state licensing board. Ms. Welch explained that the LATC has two options to amend CCR section 2656 (Criteria for Rehabilitation). She stated that when considering denying an application, Option 1 would allow the Board to either determine that successful completion of criminal probation or parole demonstrates completed rehabilitation and the Committee would not have to consider any other acts outside of successful completion of probation. Ms. Welch added that alternatively, the Board could have the freedom to consider the successful completion of parole and other criteria to

demonstrate rehabilitation. She continued that courts have typically rendered successful completion of probation insufficient to accurately determine successful rehabilitation because an individual who is under the close supervision of criminal courts will strive to be successful more so during probation. Ms. Welch stated that courts consider successful completion of probation with other rehabilitation criteria, a better barometer of an individual's achieved rehabilitation. She directed the Committee to the proposed language included in the meeting materials and noted that subsections (a) and (b) are aimed at applicants while subsections (c) and (d) are for licensees. She added that LATC must consider whether practicing landscape architecture safely for the public health, safety, and welfare would require looking at criminal probation and the additional rehabilitation criteria. Ms. Trauth inquired if the proposed regulatory language had been reviewed by the Board. Ms. Welch responded that the Board had not yet seen the proposed regulatory language. Mr. Bowden asked what additional steps could be required of an individual under the proposed regulation. Ms. Trauth questioned how the review of an individual's rehabilitation would potentially be conducted. Ms. Welch replied that currently when a formal accusation is filed against a licensee, or a statement of issues is filed against an applicant, alleging either denial of an application for licensure or suspension or revocation of a license based upon the criminal conviction, the applicant or licensee can then approach the Board to request an agreement to obtain or retain a license. She added that if an agreement is made, the individual can enter into a stipulated settlement with the Board allowing the applicant or licensee to practice under specified probationary terms. Ms. Welch clarified that AB 2138 only allows for a review of criminal convictions and disciplinary actions that occurred within the last seven years.

Mr. Truscott asked when DCA is expecting all licensing boards to file regulatory changes to implement AB 2138. Ms. Welch responded that the DCA template was developed in early January and boards are expected to review the proposed regulatory changes at their first meeting of the year. She added that all boards need to submit their final proposal to DCA by the end of May and that the regulation changes must be in place by July 1, 2020. Mr. Bowden noted that the LATC does not have the authority regarding enforcement decisions and can only make a recommendation to the Board on this proposal. He added that he would recommend Option 1. Ms. Welch noted that minor revisions to the proposed regulatory language are required to ensure uniformity within the Practice Act. She clarified that all references to the BPC should be changed to instead refer to the "Code" because that term is defined elsewhere in the regulations under CCR section 2602. She added that, for conformity with other regulations, the term "subdivision" used in CCR section 2656(d) should be revised to state "subsection."

Ms. Welch then informed the members that to comply with AB 2138, changes to the Disciplinary Guidelines are necessary to reflect proposed changes to CCR sections 2655 and 2656. Ms. Landregan questioned what the staff and cost impacts will be to implement the regulatory changes. Ms. Welch responded that this applies to all boards and that there was opposition due to the staff time and cost associated. She explained that the statutes will no longer allow boards to ask applicants if they have a criminal conviction. She clarified that the Board is one of the few boards within DCA that may continue asking the conviction question because the Board does not currently have a fingerprinting requirement. Ms. Welch added that because of this, the Board and Committee should not experience significant changes in cost. She stated that other boards that are unable to ask the conviction question will have to conduct additional reviews and investigations to gather necessary information regarding an applicant's criminal history. She added that with the additional reviews, investigation and staff time will probably increase as well as the cost to investigate. Ms. Landregan asked what the consequence would be should an applicant or licensee

fail to comply with the rehabilitation criteria. Ms. Welch responded that potentially they would not receive a license, or their license would be revoked. Mr. Bowden clarified that the Committee is tasked to choose between the two options for amending CCR section 2656. Ms. Welch clarified that the Committee's recommendation would be for the Board to adopt substantial relationship criteria, and rehabilitation criteria as outlined in either Option 1 or 2. Mr. Truscott noted that the Committee could decide to let the Board determine which option to choose. Ms. Landry recommended following the Board's direction.

Andrew Bowden moved to approve the proposed regulatory amendments to CCR sections 2655 (Substantial Relationship Criteria), 2656 (Criteria for Rehabilitation) Option 1, and 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines) along with the revisions to the *Disciplinary Guidelines* as presented with minor technical revisions as noted by DCA Legal Counsel Tara Welch.

Patricia Trauth seconded the motion.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. Member Taylor was absent. The motion passed 4-0.

J. Review and Possible Action to Approve Fiscal Year 2019-20 Intra-Departmental Contract with Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) for California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Development

Ms. Rodriguez presented that the current Intra-Departmental Contract with OPES for CSE development will expire on June 30, 2019 and a new contract is required for FY 2019-20. She noted that for this examination development cycle only, OPES recommends reducing the number of examination development workshops from six to three. Ms. Rodriguez added that following completion of an Occupational Analysis in FY 2020-21, OPES recommends continuing with four examination development workshops per exam cycle. Mr. Bowden asked how the proposed contract for FY 2019-20 compared to the contract for FY 2018-19. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that the cost of the proposed contract is less than the cost of the previous contract. Ms. Landry asked about the cost of the previous contract. Kourtney Nation replied that the total cost of the previous contract was about \$35,000.

Ms. Landry asked if the CSE reference materials have been updated. Ms. Rodriguez replied that a review of the reference materials has been conducted and the new reference material list will be updated in the CSE Candidate Guide shortly. Ms. Landry asked how the new reference material list will affect the CSE questions that are already created. Ms. Nation replied that OPES was able to connect the prepared CSE questions with new reference materials from the updated list. Ms. Landregan asked if the CSE was available online. Ms. Rodriguez replied that the exam is computer-based but not web-based. Ms. Landregan asked when the CSE is offered. Ms. Nation replied that the CSE is offered year-round, dependent on testing site availability.

Andrew Bowden moved to approve the Intra-Departmental Contract with OPES for CSE development for FY 2019-20.

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. Member Taylor was absent. The motion passed 4-0.

K. Review and Possible Action on Draft 2019-2021 Strategic Plan

Ms. Rodriguez reported that on December 7, 2018 the LATC participated in a session to update its Strategic Plan. She directed the Committee to the attached draft Strategic Plan for their review and possible approval. Mr. Truscott expressed support for the plan to be for three years.

Ms. Welch proposed revising objective 4.2 on page 11 of the draft plan to state, “Develop an online tutorial to clarify the licensure process for candidates.”

Ms. Landry expressed concern regarding privacy issues in social media, and the public and professional outreach goals outlined in the draft Strategic Plan which focus on social media. She suggested adding email communication when conducting outreach efforts. Ms. Zuniga added that the information shared via social media can also be provided to individuals on the LATC interested parties email list. Mr. Truscott clarified that Ms. Landry’s concern was to ensure that LATC maintains appropriate avenues for distributing information to licensees and candidates who are not using social media. Ms. Landry agreed and added that this service should extend to the public as well and that the information shared on social media should be the same as what is distributed by email. Ms. Rodriguez added that later in the meeting a presentation would be given on the LATC’s social media content strategy.

Ms. Landregan expressed support for the draft Strategic Plan and asked if a timeline had been established to complete the specified goals. Ms. Rodriguez responded that DCA SOLID offers timeline mapping assistance for LATC’s consideration. Ms. Trauth expressed interest in establishing a structured timeline to accomplish the Strategic Plan objectives. Mr. Truscott noted that the topic could be added to a future meeting agenda. Ms. Zuniga added that the Board is presented with an annual update on the progress of Strategic Plan objectives. Mr. Truscott asked the Committee members if they wanted to identify the top three objectives at a future meeting. Ms. Landry agreed and added that she would also like to designate a percentage of the objectives that should be accomplished within each year. Mr. Truscott proposed that the Committee adopt the Strategic Plan and then prioritize the objectives at the next meeting with the new LATC member. Ms. Landry suggested that the Committee adopt the Strategic Plan with the minor technical revision to objective 4.2 suggested by Ms. Welch. Ms. Welch clarified that the Committee is requested to adopt the Strategic Plan as a three-year plan with her suggested revision.

Patricia Trauth moved to approve the draft Strategic Plan for three years with minor technical revisions as noted by DCA Legal Counsel Tara Welch.

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. Member Taylor was absent. The motion passed 4-0.

L. Discuss and Possible Action on 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objective to Amend CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2603 (Delegation of Certain Functions) to Align with the California Architects Board’s Delegation of Certain Functions, CCR, Title 16, Division 2, Article 1, Section 103

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the proposed regulatory language in the meeting packet would align LATC practices with the Board. She explained that CCR section 2603 does not allow for the EO to approve LATC settlement agreements for the revocation or surrender of a license, whereas the Board’s CCR section 103 allows the EO to approve such settlement agreements on the Board’s behalf. She added that the LATC recently had a Stipulated Surrender of License in which the surrender of license as outlined in CCR section 2603 required Board approval. Ms. Rodriguez explained that by amending CCR section 2603 to align with the Board’s delegation authority outlined in CCR section 103, a revocation or surrender of a license, in which both parties agree to the action, could effectively be approved by the EO. She added that the Committee is asked to review and recommend to the Board approval of the proposed amendments to CCR section 2603.

Susan M. Landry moved to recommend that the Board approve the proposed amendments to CCR section 2603 as presented.

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. Member Taylor was absent. The motion passed 4-0.

E*. Presentation on the University of Southern California Landscape Architecture Program (Esther Margulies, Associate Professor of Practice, Interim Director Landscape Architecture + Urbanism)

Esther Margulies welcomed the Committee to the University of Southern California (USC) campus. She shared that the Landscape Architecture + Urbanism program is currently recruiting for a new Director. Ms. Margulies provided the Committee members and members of the audience with brochures including the program’s offerings. She then provided a brief overview of the program’s history and accreditation status. Ms. Margulies added that the program currently includes 45 students and 13 faculty. She specified that the program offers a three-year master’s degree and is currently accepting new students. Ms. Margulies then provided a description of the curriculum requirements and structure of the master’s program.

Ms. Landry questioned if the program teaches irrigation. Ms. Margulies responded that the program does not cover irrigation and she shared that in her own landscape architecture practice she prefers to hire irrigation specialists. She added that her goal is to teach the program’s students literacy in the fundamentals of irrigation design.

Ms. Trauth commented that as a manager of landscape architects it is frustrating when recent graduates need training in AutoCAD. Ms. Margulies shared that since she started her position with USC, the program has added training in AutoCAD to their courses on construction documents. She added that academic programs are still trying to determine how to incorporate the various design programs into their curriculums. Ms. Landregan added that the LAAB requirements do not include irrigation.

M. Discuss and Possible Action on the 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objective to Develop a Social Media Content Strategy to Inform the Public

Ms. Rodriguez reminded the Committee that the Strategic Plan contains an objective focused on developing a social media content strategy to inform the public about the Committee's resources, information, and regulations. She added that on January 7, 2019 staff met with the DCA Office of Public Affairs (OPA) to develop a social media content strategy that includes: 1) strategic objectives and goals; 2) target audiences and topics; 3) recommendations to enhance LATC's social media presence; 4) examples of social media posts; and 5) a timeline to begin implementing LATC's social media plan. Ms. Rodriguez mentioned that LATC staff also attended an initial training on January 24, 2019 covering introduction to social media, etiquette and best practices, and the tools and techniques for managing the LATC Twitter account. She then introduced DCA Public Information Officer Cheri Gyuro and announced that Ms. Gyuro would provide an overview of the proposed LATC Social Media Communications Plan. Ms. Gyuro presented that one of the main goals of the plan is to get more people involved with the LATC's social media so that California's rules and regulations governing landscape architecture are better understood. She added that LATC can increase social media traffic by constantly being active online. She continued that other important steps are to polish the LATC Twitter page and increase the number of tweets and followers. Ms. Gyuro shared that LATC aims to send out a few tweets every month. She explained that LATC's target audiences are landscape architect licensees, architect licensees, consumers, students, professors and candidates. She stated that the content shared on social media should include information on the latest in technology, professional news, regulations, meeting notifications, outreach events, and more. Ms. Gyuro then presented the LATC Twitter account page and demonstrated the changes she had recently implemented including updating the background picture and altering the LATC logo image to enhance the look of the page. She also informed the Committee that she had started sending tweets with approval from Ms. Rodriguez. Ms. Gyuro shared that she is also working on a social media best practices guide for all boards and bureaus. She highlighted the LATC's recent Twitter activity and demonstrated the Twitter account analytics page that summarizes LATC's Twitter activity. She added that the LATC's increased Twitter activity in January generated new followers and user impressions. Ms. Gyuro recommended updating the Twitter account background image quarterly. Mr. Truscott suggested requesting followers to submit images for LATC's use. Ms. Landry suggested changing the Twitter account background monthly. Ms. Trauth stated that there is currently an issue on social media platforms where landscape designers are grouped in categories with landscape architects and asked if there was a possible solution to this problem. Ms. Gyuro suggested posting clarifying information on LATC's social media accounts. Ms. Trauth suggested reaching out to the social media companies to clarify the difference between landscape designers and landscape architects.

N. Demonstration of New LATC Website Features

Ms. Nation reminded the Committee that prior to the launch of the new LATC website in October 2018, the Committee was provided an overview of the developmental website for their review and input. She added that at that time the Committee had requested staff to make minor changes to the License Search, Enforcement Actions, and Subscribe for Email Alerts buttons; the About Us section; and the Practice Act link on the homepage. Ms. Nation demonstrated that those changes had since been implemented. She then provided an overview of the information available on the LATC website for consumers, candidates and licensees. The Committee agreed to adding

information regarding the CSE to the LATC homepage. Ms. Rodriguez added that in May LATC will launch an online credit card license renewal process that the Board had recently launched for architects. Mr. Bowden questioned why the Contractors State Licensure Board (CSLB) licensure information is not available in the new DCA license verification system. Vickie Mayer clarified that CSLB has their own separate license verification system. Ms. Zuniga recommended adding a link that would direct users from the DCA license verification page to the CSLB license verification system.

O. Review Tentative Schedule and Discuss Future LATC Meeting Dates

Ms. Rodriguez announced tentative future meeting dates as:

Thursday, May 23, 2019, in Campbell
Tuesday, August 13, 2019, in Chula Vista
Friday, November 8, 2019, in Sacramento

P. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

**Agenda Items were taken out of order to accommodate guest speakers. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*