



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

SUMMARY REPORT - FINAL

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
Landscape Architects Technical Committee

October 9, 2007
University of California Berkeley Extension
San Francisco, CA

LATC Members Present

Christine Anderson, Chair
Stephanie Landregan
Steve Lang

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board
Mary Ann Aguayo, Program Manager, LATC
Don Chang, Department of Consumer Affairs Legal Counsel
Ethan Mathes, Special Project Analyst
Emon Graves, Examination Coordinator
Dominica Eriksen, Student Assistant

Guests Present

Joel Albizo, Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)
Jim Hanson, Landscape Architecture Candidate
Mimi Malayan, University of California Berkeley (UCB) Extension
Anastasia Meadors, UCB Extension
James Penrod, CLARB
Adriana Rodriguez, Center for Public Interest Law
Janet Sager, Landscape Architecture Candidate
Alexis Slafer, University of California Los Angeles Extension
Cleve Turner, CLARB
Diana Wu, UCB Extension
Richard Zweifel, Associate Dean, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, 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 9:30 a.m. and called roll. All three members of the LATC were present and thus a quorum was established.

Christine Anderson welcomed the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) members present at the meeting. She asked the public members to introduce themselves to the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC). The public members introduced themselves to the LATC.

Ms. Anderson reported that she attended the September 27, 2007 California Architects Board (Board) meeting. At the meeting the Board had expressed concern regarding the lack of architecture students who have graduated in recent years. The LATC agreed that the issue was similar to landscape architecture graduates and they wanted to address the issue at the strategic planning meeting and possibly align with the Board in the effort. Stephanie Landregan requested making this issue an agenda item. Ms. Anderson went on to report that the California Public Utilities Commission has new energy legislation but she wants to know more about it and include the LATC in the legislation. The Board also supplied a report on ongoing legislation, which may be useful to the LATC in order to participate and/or be aware of any legislation affecting the LATC.

Janet Sager introduced herself and presented her complaint regarding the June 12, 2007 administration of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE). Ms. Sager explained there was excessive noise during the administration of this examination, it became a distraction in her ability to take the examination, and that she wanted the LATC to review the complaint. Jim Hanson reported that his experience was similar when taking this examination. Ms. Anderson conveyed that staff had already thoroughly reviewed and responded to the complaint and determined the LATC is unable to specifically act on Ms. Sager's complaint. Don Chang explained that, unlike the Board, there is no existing regulation to address this particular issue. Steve Lang asked if the contract with the examination site addressed these concerns so this situation did not occur in the future. Mary Ann Aguayo confirmed the contract does contain provisions against excessive noise. Ms. Landregan recommended modifying regulation to address some kind of examination appeal process. Mr. Chang advised that the LATC could thoroughly review the facts of the complaint and the subsequent staff response, but to also limit the discussion of an appeal process to procedure and protocol issues only. Ms. Landregan requested this issue be added to the agenda for the next LATC meeting where the LATC could review the staff response to the complaint and discuss formalizing an appeal process. The LATC agreed and noted the importance for future contracts to specifically address the requirements and needs of the LATC.

Ms. Anderson pointed out the attached letter in the agenda commenting on education credits given for four-year degrees in "any subject." Richard Zweifel remarked the issue of giving education credit for four-year degrees in "any subject" was discussed at the Education Subcommittee meetings and it was concluded that a landscape architecture curriculum is necessary to qualify for the licensure examination. Mr. Lang added that the Education Subcommittee believed curriculum in landscape architecture was an important component for health, safety and welfare protection. The LATC debated the importance of a landscape architecture curriculum for licensure and the merit of awarding education credit for a four-year degree in "any subject." Ms. Landregan suggested reconvening the Education Subcommittee that would include additional non-educator members. Mr. Zweifel emphasized the Education Subcommittee determined that an education in landscape architecture was a critical component to licensure. The LATC agreed to send this issue back to the Education Subcommittee and consider modifying current membership.

Mr. Zweifel suggested reviewing the re-licensure process at a future meeting. The LATC agreed to review at a future meeting the re-licensure (regulatory and staff) process and also a suspended license option.

B. Approve July 20, 2007 LATC Summary Report

Ms. Anderson commented the summary report should reflect that the meeting took place in Los Angeles. Ms. Landregan requested a letter be sent to the American Society of Landscape Architects to encourage a meeting as mentioned in Item L. The LATC agreed a letter would be appropriate.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to approve the July 20, 2007 LATC Summary Report as amended.**
- **Steve Lang seconded the motion.**
- **The motion carried 3-0.**

C. Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)

- 1. Introduction of CLARB President and Executive Director**
- 2. Update on Annual Meeting**

Ms. Anderson announced that Ms. Landregan was elected Region V Director. She also reported some of the key points to come out of the CLARB annual meeting were the announcement of the discontinuation of C2Ed, CLARB's continuing education program, and that CLARB is actively streamlining its internal processes. Ms. Anderson went on to report that due to testing center's concern for examination security, some Region V testing centers are fingerprinting candidates without CLARB's knowledge. CLARB emphasized examination security is an ongoing concern and that they will be looking into possibly prohibiting cellular phones from the testing environment. The LATC's change to the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) was discussed; there was concern about the necessity of the CSE and how other states implement supplemental examinations.

Cleve Turner presented the LATC with CLARB's Presidential Award. He then welcomed Ms. Landregan as the new Region V Director, and introduced Joel Albizo, CLARB Executive Director and James Penrod, Examinations Coordinator. Mr. Turner reported that CLARB is in the process of reorganization and is undertaking in strategic planning with the board of directors and membership to evaluate CLARB's core competency of representing member boards. Mr. Lang questioned whether, as part of CLARB's reorganization, they would work hard to hold down costs specific to examination fees. Mr. Turner stressed that this was an important consideration for CLARB and that they would work on concerns of the member boards. Ms. Anderson added that ongoing communication with CLARB has recently improved.

D. Review and Approve Proposal to Delegate Administration and Reviews of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination Graphic Sections C and E to the CLARB

Ms. Aguayo provided a synopsis of the item, which was continued from the last LATC meeting. She reported research found that 11 member boards currently delegate authority for administering the graphic performance sections of the LARE. These member boards were

contacted and surveyed on their experiences with the delegation of the LARE. Research found there were no reported issues with the delegation. Ms. Aguayo explained the benefits of CLARB administering the LARE; there are no health, safety or welfare impacts, delegation meets the Sunset Review Committee recommendation that candidates bear the cost of the licensing examination, oversight of licensure is still maintained as the LATC would still qualify candidates for the examination, staff resources could be directed to the ongoing maintenance and administration of the new CSE, examination costs to candidates would be equal to the 11 member boards currently delegating the LARE, and the administration of the examination would be more secure since the responsibility would not lie with one LATC staff person.

Ms. Landregan inquired as to how much LATC staff time delegating the LARE to CLARB would save. Ms. Aguayo explained that the duties of the examination coordinator, no longer carried out due to a delegation, should allow the ongoing maintenance and administration of the new CSE without requesting additional resources. Ms. Landregan noted that changing the law in order to delegate the examination was not in this agenda item. Mr. Chang clarified the LATC could direct staff to start the process of modifying the law and also begin working with CLARB on the transition. Ms. Landregan expressed concern about the selection of examination sites and wanted to assure that they would be thoroughly evaluated. Doug McCauley explained that the LATC would be able to consult and advise on the selection of examination sites. Mr. Chang confirmed the LATC should confirm the examination sites and also include it into the contract with CLARB. Mr. Albizo clarified that CLARB, in choosing examination sites, looks to optimize the experience of the candidate while working closely with the member boards. Mr. Penrod explained CLARB's examination site selection review process and assured that CLARB staff supports their selection of an examination site based on the best fit for the candidate and member board.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to direct staff to proceed with the necessary review and amendment to the regulations and to pursue a contract with Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards delegating the authority to conduct the graphic performance sections of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination.**
- **Steve Lang seconded the motion.**
- **The motion carried 3-0.**

Ms. Anderson remarked she would like LATC staff continue to maintain its candidate tracking data and possibly have CLARB track candidate data as well. She also noted the importance of assuring the LATC maintain its authority to verify candidate eligibility prior to testing for the LARE. The LATC and CLARB staff agreed.

E. Program Manager's Report

Ms. Aguayo reported that the recent changes to LARE fees became effective on October 3, 2007. There has been no response to date from the Division of the State Architect (DSA) regarding LATC's comments on the proposed Certified Access Specialist Program. Mr. McCauley noted any comments received by DSA regarding their proposal must be addressed. Ms. Anderson wanted to assure that a landscape architecture license is recognized.

Ms. Aguayo reported that there are still two vacancies on the LATC, but there may be candidates being reviewed for the openings. Ms. Anderson confirmed she would get her paperwork

submitted to serve for another term on the LATC. Ms. Aguayo reported the Candidate Information guide was updated and is being printed and that the Practice Act is going through final approval. Ms. Landregan enquired about the progress of the LATC consumer guides and commented that she wanted to see an emphasis placed on these guides versus the Practice Act in an effort to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. Ms. Aguayo explained the revision of the consumer guides would require the assistance of the LATC and possibly a subcommittee. Mr. McCauley also explained that due to LATC staff size some goals might not be met as efficiently as those by organizations with a larger staff. Ms. Aguayo went on to report that the I-Licensing project is still in progress, the electronic filing project is on hold, the interested parties list has been updated, and staff is using the electronic mail function for notification of interested parties. Ms. Landregan wanted staff to make sure the constituencies important to the LATC remain on the interested parties list.

Mr. McCauley reported the governor signed Assembly Bill (AB) 937 [Business and Professions Code (BPC) Sections 5616 and 5640] on October 5, 2007 and will become effective January 1, 2008. Ms. Aguayo discussed the exceptions conflict in BPC 5616; staff would make modifications to these exceptions similar to the Board model and then bring it back before the LATC at its next meeting. Mr. McCauley explained the Legislative Subcommittee Bill Tracking chart; the list was developed per the Board's request for more information on bills relevant to architects. He added the Board would monitor the legislation but not act on it unless absolutely necessary and where the particular legislation would impact board programs. Mr. McCauley believed AB 999 might interest the LATC, as it might apply to design professionals. Ms. Landregan wanted to make sure staff is aware of any legislation related to stormwater issues.

Ms. Aguayo reported that Linda Gates would soon be presenting an overview of the landscape architecture licensure process to Merritt College. She also thanked staff for their work during the absence of the examination coordinator and introduced the new examination coordinator Emon Graves and new student assistant Dominica Eriksen. Website updates included the announcement of the new California Supplemental Examination, posting of historical agendas and summary reports, and Practice Act updates. Mr. Zweifel and Ms. Landregan inquired about the recent low passage rates on the LARE. Mr. Penrod explained cut score workshops addressed minimum competency standards. Ms. Anderson asked when the next CLARB occupational analysis would take place. Mr. Penrod stated it would likely be in 2010. He also mentioned forms for participation in the cut score workshops are on the CLARB website. Ethan Mathes updated on changes to pending regulation.

The University of California Berkeley (UCB) Extension provided an update to their ongoing approval of the Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate program.

Anastasia Meadors reported that, as outlined in UCB Extension's timeline, a work-study student was hired in support of the program. Other reported progress included continued research on career counseling and access to career counseling, enhancements to information available to students on the Extension program website and also available as publications, and continued work on an internship program. Ms. Anderson offered the LATC's help to enhance access to the profession. Ms. Landregan commented that the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board has indicated interest in taking on the certification of extension certificate programs. Mr. Lang suggested the University of California Los Angeles Extension program could be a resource to UCB Extension and vice versa, as there is a need for collaboration between extension certificate programs and the LATC.

F. Review and Consider Request for Re-Licensure

Ms. Anderson reported she and Mr. Lang reviewed the request for re-licensure and that they did not find anything significant to keep Jerry Croxdale from regaining his landscape architecture license.

- **Steve Lang moved to approve of Jerry Croxdale's request for re-licensure pending his passage of the California Supplemental Examination.**
- **Stephanie Landregan seconded the motion.**
- **The motion carried 3-0.**

G. Annual Budget and Projections Reports

Ms. Aguayo noted the attached budget projections do not include fee increases. Mr. McCauley clarified that all projected expenses reflect only known increases, such as medical benefits and contracted costs. Mr. Lang asked about the budgeted versus annual expenditures for examinations. Ms. Aguayo explained the budgeted amount assumes an optimum number of candidates examine, whereas actual numbers are typically lower. Ms. Landregan wanted more information on communications expenditures and suggested making this a future agenda item. Ms. Aguayo proposed a subcommittee to address the ongoing communications issue. Ms. Landregan wanted to find a way to make the Strategic Plan – Communications Plan a priority for the LATC. The LATC agreed. Mr. Lang requested that staff prepare a request for proposal for an outside vendor to address the communications plan. The LATC discussed projected expenditures and their impact on the communications budget. Ms. Landregan requested a staff report of the communications plan at the next LATC meeting.

H. Annual Enforcement Report

Ms. Aguayo noted that it appears the low enforcement statistics for fiscal year 2005/2006 were likely an anomaly. Mr. Lang asked about the lack of enforcement action. Mr. McCauley clarified that LATC's enforcement efforts are generally commensurate with other licensing boards.

I. Update on 2007-08 Strategic Plan – Action Plan

The LATC made several suggestions to clarify the language in the Action Plan. Ms. Landregan suggested prioritizing consumer communication and making the consumer guides bilingual. Ms. Landregan volunteered to review the residential consumer guide language and propose updates, and Ms. Anderson agreed to help. The LATC discussed methods to address communications issues, specifically establishing methods of communicating to consumers, via the creation of a subcommittee or contracting with a consultant. Mr. McCauley suggested setting aside time at the upcoming strategic planning meeting to address these issues.

J. Report from Sunset Review Subcommittee

Ms. Anderson reminded everyone that the Sunset Review Report draft would be due in 2009. Ms. Landregan suggested the LATC seek out potential sunset review issues and respond to them prior to sunset review. Mr. McCauley noted that the sunset review process is likely to be

different at the next review. Ms. Anderson thought the current Sunset Review Subcommittee should continue to keep track of sunset review issues.

K. Review Tentative Schedule for Future Meetings

The next LATC meeting will be January 17-18, 2008, with the strategic planning session held on January 17, 2008.

Future LATC meetings will be tentatively held:

April 18, 2008 in Sacramento

July 18, 2008, location to be determined

October 24, 2008, location to be determined

Adjournment

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to adjourn.**
- **Steve Lang seconded the motion.**
- **The motion carried 3-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.