

MEETING MINUTES

9:00 a.m. Item A - Roll call. Introductions of all present. Guests present included Alexis Slafer, UCLA Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program, Heather Clendenan, UCB Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program, and Daniel Iacofano of Moore, Iacofano and Goltzman, Inc.. Introduction of new employee Mary Anderson, Licensing Coordinator for the Landscape Architect Program.

9:05 a.m. Item B - Chair Remarks. DZ requested that Item H be taken out of order so that it may be heard this morning. DZ thanked all who helped with the consumer guides. SS recommended that thank you letters be sent to all who contributed to consumer guides.

9:10 a.m. Item C - Review of LATC Summary Reports. The meeting minutes from the December 10, 1999 LATC meeting and February 11-12, 2000 strategic planning session were reviewed. DZ requested that, in the future, the meeting minutes be e-mailed to each of the Committee members as soon as possible after the meeting. SG moved to have the minutes stand as written and to have future meeting minutes e-mailed to Committee members. LG seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

9:15 a.m. Item D - Public Comment. DZ invited the guests to comment during the discussion of extension certificate programs (Item F). No public comments were received at this time.

9:17 a.m. Item E - Program Managers Report. GK and SG attended the CLARB annual meeting in early March and provided an overview of the meeting. This was the first time that all regions met in one place. Additionally, each region had its own regional meeting. At the western regional meeting, Washington state relayed that they just implemented a state exam that is similar to the take home exam that California is devising. GK relayed that it was helpful to see what feedback Washington had received. GK said that based upon discussions at the regional meeting, the exam statistics for California are consistent with the exam statistics for other states. GK went on to give an overview of the discussion of the CLARB budget. CLARB presented a future fee projection and program analysis that included 4 options. California and the other states in the western region, except Washington, voted to support the option that solely involved increasing CLARB dues (referred to as Option B). The LATC's second choice was the option that involved splitting the increased cost between dues and exam fees. Washington, because of their newly passed legislation requiring a 2/3 vote for any fee increase, elected to support Option A which involved no fee increase. SG relayed that she questioned the costs involved with CLARB administration. SG indicated that the possibility of prorated amounts based upon each state's licensee population was discussed, but that this only had appeal if that meant that since California has such a big population it would have more of a vote in CLARB actions.

States with smaller populations were opposed to this idea. SG, LG, and GK discussed the costs of CLARB administration and why the LATC no longer receives a breakdown of these costs. SS inquired as to whether it seemed that CLARB had already determined that the fees must be increased. SG informed the LATC that it seemed like there was enough opposition that it was not necessarily a done deal.

GK went on to give an overview of CLARB's Outreach 2000 program, which is a program that CLARB has developed in response to the drop in licensure numbers. DZ is the LATC's representative for this program, and in that role he will be going to universities within California discussing the benefits of licensure. DZ said that his response to the preview he saw of the Outreach 2000 presentation video was that CLARB needed to refine the presentation so that the target audience was not so narrowly defined. DZ said that the presentation he previewed seemed to only address the steps to licensure, which is helpful to potential candidates, but that it needed to be reworked so the ASLA chapters could gain insight from it.

DT asked GK if there was any discussion as to whether the licensure trends in California are reflective of in a nationwide trend of decline in the number of requests for licensure. GK indicated that the reduction in requests for licensure can partially be attributed to the fact that California law allows practice under supervision of a licensee. LG added that her experience has been that individuals are not trained in school to pass the tougher parts of the exam. SG said she thought that landscape architect students could benefit greatly from a mentoring program similar to the engineering tech program. DT inquired if it is in the best interest of the LATC to work toward increasing the number of licensees. SG said that increasing the number of licensees could lead to better protection of the consumer. LG added that increasing the number of licensees could help alleviate some of the difficulty of adequately supervising the work of non-licensees. DZ responded that it would be helpful to have statistics related to the number of landscape architect graduates and the percentage of these individuals who attain licensure. LG responded that her experience has been that there is currently more interest in licensure than there was 8 years ago.

GK continued her Program Managers report and relayed that the consumer guides were currently at the printer. GK suggested that due to the timing of the printing, the next newsletter should be referred to as the Spring version. The LATC members agreed that would be most appropriate.

GK went on to relay that the rulemaking file for the change to the exam review regulation had been sent to OAL. The deadline for making a request for exam review was Friday March 24, 2000. CLARB had recently told GK that it will take 4 to 6 weeks for them to complete their exam reviews. GK informed the LATC that the Citations regulation change would be filed with OAL by mid- to late April. The Disciplinary Guidelines regulatory language change had been noticed and the hearing will be on May 8, 2000.

GK relayed that the results from the December exam were mailed to candidates at the end of February. GK provided an overview of the December examination statistics.

9:40 a.m. – Item H - Review and Approval 2000 Strategic Plan. Daniel Iacofano presented the draft updated Strategic Plan. Starting with an overview of the framework of the Plan. DZ commented that it is important that the message get across that the purpose of having a plan is to remain current with trends in the profession. It is important that the Plan include a statement to the effect that this is the third strategic plan since 1997. The LATC went through the Strategic Plan point by point and made clarifying edits throughout the document. The conclusion was that Daniel would make the editorial changes once staff provided him a copy of the latest version. Once Daniel makes the edits, he will send a draft back to staff. Staff will review it for consistency with their notations. The revised draft plan will be included on the agenda for the May 19, 2000 LATC meeting. DT moved to approve the Strategic Plan with the changes that were discussed. SG seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

11:45 a.m. – Item F – Discussion of Approved Extension Certificate Programs. GK provided an overview of how evaluations were last conducted and of the CLARB certification requirements. GK relayed that there are not any other states that have extension certificate programs in Landscape Architecture. DZ emphasized that the true focus of establishing the extension program review process is not to compare the certificate programs with degree programs, but that the LATC's charge is to improve access to the examination for licensure via making certificate programs available to interested individuals. DZ stated that a subcommittee needs to be established to review the Self Evaluation Review (SER), to create review committees and to schedule the reviews. SG shared with the group that the last time this was done, each review subcommittee consisted of a LATC member who chaired the subcommittee and 2 licensees (1 from each geographic region). The LATC discussed whether the institutions or the LATC should pay for the costs associated with the reviews (i.e. travel and lodging costs), and it was agreed that this cost would be the responsibility of the LATC. Heather Clendenan asked if it was best to assume that LAAB was not going to be responsible for certificate program approval. DO responded that it was best to go ahead and establish a process for certificate program review so that the LATC will have all the documentation available when LAAB decides to evaluate the programs. Heather Clendenan indicated that it would help if each certificate program's promotional material reflected the focus on access to the exams. DO voiced his opinion that the decline in the number of approved extension programs could be attributed to comparisons being made between the certificate programs and degree programs. DT asked if the LATC was expecting a response to the letter that the LATC sent to LAAB related to program approvals. DO responded that a response is expected but that it is not expected immediately. Based upon the responses LAAB received from ASLA, CLARB, and CELA, they had decided to establish a task force to evaluate the questions that arose from the responses. SG said that it is important that the LATC keep their

procedures for program approval independent of LAAB's procedures. DT questioned whether it is cost effective to rework review procedures if LAAB intends to do the same thing in the future. DT asked if it is appropriate for the LATC to create a process for review. SS interjected that the main goal is to provide a means of access to the exam and that goal is attained if the programs are recognized by the LATC. LG stated that she is concerned that the existing approved programs do not comply with the existing regulations. DZ said that his opinion was that it was appropriate for the LATC to evaluate the existing review process and regulations. SG volunteered to begin the process of establishing a program review subcommittee by evaluating the SER format and comparing the review requirements to the regulations. She indicated that she would bring the results of her analysis back to the next LATC meeting. LG suggested that she re-examine how the process works now and how the existing approved programs do not meet current regulation. Alexis Slafer said that similar to the national procedures, she would like the review process to continue to include site visits. DT offered to assist SG with the task of evaluating review of the certificate programs. DO said that the procedure established by the subcommittee could function as a model for the rest of the nation. Heather Clendenan asked if, in the interim, she should do any lobbying. DO suggested that it would be best to wait a couple of months to see where the process goes.

12:25 p.m. – Lunch/Closed Session.

1:40 p.m. – Future Meetings. The next LATC meeting will be on May 19, 2000 in Sacramento.

1:50 p.m. – Item G – Holders of Cancelled Licenses. SG and DZ provided the LATC a review of two requests for issuance of new licenses from individuals whose licenses had expired. The first individual, Ken Alperstein, was presented by SG. This individual's license was issued in 1993 and expired in 1996. He missed his final renewal date by 1 month. Since 1996, he has not stamped plans and for the past 3 years he has worked for a firm that specializes in golf course design. SG's opinion is that he has not practiced in violation of the Practice Act, since golf course design is exempt from the Practice Act. DZ relayed that the subject claimed that he thought that his secretary paid the renewal fee, but she had not. SG said that the work he provided seemed competent. DT said that he had a problem with the fact that what had been submitted for review was exempt from the Practice Act. DZ said that he thought that it was sufficient to illustrate that Mr. Alperstein is competent to practice landscape architecture. DO asked if there was any monetary penalty for the fact that he let his license lapse. DZ said that it cost \$690 for the re-licensure review and that if he was not issued a new number the license plus delinquent fee would be \$450. LG added that there is no penalty to pay past renewal or license fees. DZ indicated that he thought it was appropriate to issue a new license and charge \$300. SG added that she thought it would be appropriate to require that he take and pass the California exam in order to demonstrate his abilities and knowledge. LG asked her fellow Committee members if

they thought it would be appropriate to require that he take and pass a specific section of the LARE. DZ said that he thought it would be appropriate to discuss the issues related to re-licensure requests at the next LATC meeting. SG moved that Mr. Alperstein be issued a new license once he pays the \$300 licensing fee and after he takes and passes the California exam. LG seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The second person requesting consideration for re-issuance of a license was John Larson. DZ indicated that he cited financial hardship as the reason why he never renewed his original license which was issued in 1986 and expired in 1988. In 1991, this individual said that he taught a LARE preparation course, and since 1996 he has lived in Minnesota and practiced under a landscape architect who is licensed in Minnesota. DZ stated that he was concerned about this individual's knowledge base since he has not been licensed in California for 12 years. LG said that the question is whether or not he is competent to practice in California. DZ answered that based on work sample provided he does seem competent. SG said that she thought that he should have to retake the exam. DZ cautioned that the LATC has to be very careful that they are not encouraging "renewal dodging" in allowing individuals in similar situations to simply re-license without a penalty. GK relayed that there is not a maximum number of times an individual can take the exam nor is there a maximum time limit between the time that individuals pass the exam and pay for licensure. SG voiced her concern that if a maximum time is set for the period between successful completion of the LARE and requests for licensure, it may dissuade people from applying for licensure. Related to John Larson and his review for licensure, SG said that she did not want to be punitive, however, she was unsure if he had illustrated competency. LG said that it could not be said that this individual would endanger public safety. However, LG thinks that the existing regulations are too accommodating. DZ suggested that the issue of the existing regulations and reciprocity requirements throughout the nation be discussed as an agenda item for the next LATC meeting. The LATC directed staff to confer with the Minnesota Board to see if Mr. Larson is licensed there and whether or not he has been involved in any complaint cases. DZ suggested that Mr. Larson be required to take the California exam. Furthermore, his original passing test scores should be verified. LG moved that Mr. Larson be issued a new license after he successfully passes the California exam. DT seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

2:45 p.m.- Meeting Adjourned.