

SUMMARY REPORT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD **Landscape Architects Technical Committee**

November 14, 2012
Los Angeles, California

LATC Members Present

Stephanie Landregan, Chair
Andrew Bowden, Vice Chair
Nicki Johnson
Katherine Spitz
David A. Taylor, Jr. (arrived at 11:00 a.m.)

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)
Don Chang, Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC
Matthew McKinney, Enforcement Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Kimberly Alexander, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)
Christine Anderson, Chair, University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program Task Force
Lisa Bellora, APLD
Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, APLD
Hal Blevins, Landscape Architect
Jerry Hastings, Secretary, California Council/American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA)
Jack V. Ouzounian, Landscape Architect
Raul Villanueva, Personnel Selection Consultant, DCA Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)

A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum **Chair's Remarks** **Public Comment Session**

Stephanie Landregan called the meeting to order at 9:27 a.m. and called the roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

B. Approve August 14, 2012 LATC Summary Report

Ms. Landregan presented the August 14, 2012 LATC Meeting Summary Report for approval. Andrew Bowden stated that on page three of the Summary Report, the phrase, “he has practiced landscape architecture since 1970” should state, “he has been employed in the landscape architecture profession since 1970.” He also noted that the phrase, “he served on the Board of Landscape Architects” should state, “he served on the Board of Landscape Architects Enforcement Committee.” Katherine Spitz noted that on page three of the Summary Report, the phrase, “has practiced landscape architecture since 1986” should state, “has been practicing in a landscape architecture firm since 1986.”

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the August 14, 2012 LATC Summary Report with the corrections as noted.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

C. Program Manager’s Report

Trish Rodriguez presented the Program Manager’s Report. She explained that DCA has not determined a date for the release of phase one of the BreEZe Project; however, BreEZe is tentatively scheduled to be implemented for LATC in phase three scheduled for Fall 2013. She noted that another BreEZe Project update will be provided at the 2013 LATC strategic planning meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that LATC was disconnected from the examination and licensing functions of the Applicant Tracking System (ATS) on October 26, 2012. She explained that LATC started using a new workaround system (WAS) to supplement the lost functions of ATS. She stated that the WAS has been successfully implemented and minimal issues have been encountered. She added that an update on the WAS will also be provided at the strategic planning meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that Ms. Landregan delivered an outreach presentation at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, on November 5, 2012, and the survey results are included in the meeting packet.

Ms. Rodriguez shared that the final rulemaking file for the regulatory package for California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 2615, Form of Examinations, and 2620, Education and Training Credits, was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on October 31, 2012 for approval. She stated that the regulatory package for CCR section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, is temporarily suspended until modifications to the regulatory language can be addressed later in the meeting. Ms. Rodriguez continued that the regulatory package for CCR section 2614, Examination Transition Plan, was submitted to the DCA Legal Office on October 22, 2012, with a request for expedited review.

Ms. Rodriguez said that the LATC website was updated with the August 2013 and December 2013 Landscape Architects Registration Examination (LARE) administration dates, and the list of community colleges with landscape architecture degree programs was also updated. She

noted that the LATC website was updated with a link to the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) website.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that Raul Villanueva of OPES will provide a presentation on the occupational analysis (OA) process later in the meeting. She also stated that updates on the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force and the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force will be provided later in the meeting.

**E.* Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force Report and Review and Approve
Recommendation for a Legal Opinion on Business and Professions Code Section 5641,
Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions**

Christine Anderson provided an update on the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force. She stated that the Task Force held a meeting on October 18, 2012. She explained the charge of the Task Force is to ensure clarity about Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5641, Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions, and ensure that the provisions of the section protect the public. She explained that much of the discussion at the October 18, 2012 meeting centered around the Board and LATC being charged to enforce laws, but many times the laws are not specific enough to focus attention on particular areas. She stated that enforcement of BPC section 5641 relies on interpretation by LATC staff. She explained that the Task Force believes BPC section 5641 is clear; however, more measures can be taken to ensure that the law is implemented consistently in the future. She stated that the Task Force recommended that Don Chang provide a legal opinion letter on BPC section 5641. She added that the Task Force also discussed providing a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) about BPC section 5641, but there was concern that FAQs could be considered underground regulations. Pamela Berstler stated that the Task Force also discussed concern regarding licensed professionals understanding the difference between unlicensed practice and illegal practice.

Ms. Spitz asked what the next step is for the Task Force. Ms. Anderson responded that LATC will review the request for Mr. Chang to provide the legal opinion letter. She explained that if LATC requests that Mr. Chang provide the legal opinion letter, LATC will review the opinion once it is written. She stated that LATC will provide the opinion to the Task Force after reviewing it and the Task Force will determine if it provides enough clarity in the areas that they are interested in. She stated that the next step for the Task Force can be determined after the Task Force reviews the opinion. Mr. Chang stated that BPC section 5641 has a high degree of clarity on what unlicensed persons are permitted to do. He further stated that the phrase “as required by law” in BPC section 5641 is deliberately ambiguous. He explained that LATC must decide if it is appropriate for a legal opinion letter to be provided since the Task Force does not have authority to directly request an opinion from the DCA Legal Office. He explained that if LATC decides to request the legal opinion letter, LATC must also decide if the opinion will be written to the Task Force or directly to LATC.

Ms. Spitz asked for examples of some of the clarity issues regarding BPC section 5641. Ms. Anderson explained that it is sometimes difficult to determine what differentiates a construction drawing and a conceptual drawing. Ms. Spitz opined that attempting to specifically define a construction drawing might make the term “construction drawing” less accurate. She explained that a construction drawing is a sketch intended for use by a contractor to implement a design and that some residential projects can be performed without detailed drawings that give instruction to a contractor. She explained these types of projects can be performed by using

written notes that tell a contractor how to implement a project and do not include drawings. She stated she is concerned about narrowing down the exact elements that should go into a construction drawing because it can add a burden to the profession of landscape architecture. Ms. Landregan stated the Task Force is concerned with how BPC section 5641 affects the health, safety, and welfare of the public. She explained that some building departments have standard plans and designs that an unlicensed person can use to safely construct various projects. She explained that there are no plan checkers for landscape architecture plans so the landscape architect license becomes the method of regulation.

Ms. Anderson stated that one of the Task Force members is a building official and he explained that the building departments in some jurisdictions provide a large amount of input as to what unlicensed persons are allowed to do; however, the level of input is not consistent across all jurisdictions. She stated that the laws in the Landscape Architects Practice Act apply uniformly across all California jurisdictions and LATC needs to ensure that there is consistency when enforcement cases are reviewed. Ms. Landregan stated that there was an inconsistent application of BPC section 5641 in the past. She explained that APLD notified LATC that the inconsistent application of the law made it difficult for APLD members to perform services as landscape designers. Ms. Anderson explained that complaints can come from a variety of sources to LATC enforcement staff. She noted that LATC enforcement staff may not have a background in landscape architecture; therefore, BPC section 5641 must be clear enough so that the initial review of a complaint can be assessed in a proper manner. Ms. Berstler stated the primary reason for the formation of the Task Force was the inconsistent handling of complaints by LATC staff in the past. She explained that as laws change, it is important to have a legal interpretation of BPC section 5641 stating it is flexible and it is intentionally designed to have ambiguity.

Hal Blevins stated that he is concerned about allowing landscape designers to perform any tasks other than sketches and that landscape designers should obtain a landscape architect license. Ms. Landregan provided a brief explanation of the purpose of the Task Force to Mr. Blevins. Mr. Blevins stated his degree is in architecture. He explained that he performed work under a licensed landscape architect, then he took and passed the landscape architect licensing examination. He stated he does not understand why landscape designers think they can design without a license. He stated that landscape designers do not carry errors and omissions insurance or liability insurance, and their fees to perform services do not reflect the cost of holding these types of insurance policies. He stated that he works in the residential profession and that landscape designers intrude on his business. He stated that he sent several complaints to the LATC and he has several complaints to file against landscape designers.

Mr. Bowden stated that he agreed with Ms. Spitz regarding how a non-licensed professional can give direction to a contractor in a verbal form without violating BPC section 5641; however, if the non-licensed professional followed-up the verbal direction with a detail, then they would be in violation of BPC section 5641. Ms. Rodriguez stated that part of the reason the Task Force was created was because there was an increase in complaints that was received by LATC several years ago. She noted that the Program Manager's report includes the current pending enforcement caseload of 30, which seems to be in the range of the standard average number of pending cases in a typical year. Nicki Johnson asked why LATC is not more proactive with enforcement similar to how the landscape architecture regulatory body in Nevada actively searches for enforcement violations. Mr. McCauley stated that LATC has a legal obligation to investigate each complaint that is received. He explained that Nevada has a much smaller population than California and the regulatory boards between states have varying missions.

Ms. Spitz stated that it is not possible for LATC to list everything an unlicensed person is allowed to do in BPC section 5641. She opined that section 5641 does not need refinement and she is concerned about the resources being used to address this concern. Ms. Landregan explained that LATC was given direction to investigate clarity over section 5641 at its last Sunset Review. She explained that one of the goals of LATC is to not be a restraint to trade and that LATC exists to protect the consumer. She stated that LATC does not exist to provide for the economic continuity of landscape architects, or to protect the right of landscape architects to earn income. She explained that if Mr. Chang provides a legal opinion letter, it will include an explanation of how to interpret BPC section 5641 that should be consistently interpreted by all professions, that is fair to every trade, and will protect the consumer. Mr. Chang stated that in the past, LATC staff interpreted BPC section 5641 to mean that an unlicensed person was prohibited from creating any kind of construction documents, performing construction work, or providing details. He stated the problem with this interpretation is that it may not be giving full meaning to the law itself, because the law is modified with the phrase “as required by law.” He stated that he will provide a clarification for the phrase “as required by law” in his opinion and he will not attempt to define what construction documents or details are.

Ms. Berstler asked how many of the complaints in the enforcement statistics listed in the Program Manager’s report were against licensed persons and how many complaints were against unlicensed persons. Ms. Rodriguez stated that staff would need to research the question. Ms. Landregan asked staff to investigate providing this complaint information at the next LATC meeting.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the recommendation of the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force to have Don Chang, DCA Legal Counsel, provide a legal opinion letter to LATC for BPC section 5641.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

D. Overview and Discussion of Occupational Analysis Process and Request Authorization for Staff to Enter into Intra-Agency Contract with Office of Professional Examination Services

Mr. Villanueva of OPES provided an overview of the OA and Intra-Agency Contract (IAC) process. He explained the mission of OPES, and the legal mandates and professional standards for licensing examinations. Ms. Landregan asked how OPES prepares an examination with California-specific subject matter areas not included in the national exam. Mr. Villanueva responded that the OA describes the entire practice of landscape architecture. He explained that critical tasks and knowledge statements are identified from the OA and California-specific subject matter can be parsed out as the basis for creating the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). He stated that the OA is based on the overall description of the practice. He explained that one of the challenges of developing the CSE is to relate the California-specific subject matter areas to the critical tasks of the profession and proportionally develop the exam based on that.

Mr. Villanueva explained the steps to conduct an OA. He explained the first step is reviewing background information to identify changes in laws and the profession and to review results of previous studies of the profession. He noted that one of the best places for LATC input in the OA process is during the initial stages when the background information is reviewed so that emerging trends affecting the profession can be identified. He explained that this information can be communicated to staff and then staff can relay the information to OPES. He stated that the next step in the OA process is developing job content and structure items. He continued that during this step, OPES conducts interviews with licensees and works with subject-matter expert (SME) focus groups to develop and refine task and knowledge statements. He stated that developing task and knowledge statements defines California-specific practice and that once task and knowledge statements are developed, OPES develops and evaluates a pilot survey. He stated that LATC staff ensures licensee email addresses are available and invitations are distributed to licensees requesting their participation. He explained that after the OA survey invitations are sent, OPES conducts the OA survey with those who have expressed an interest in participating. He stated that it is an online survey that is reviewed on an ongoing basis. He explained that once the survey results are received, a survey analysis is conducted to interpret the data.

Ms. Landregan stated that licensees perform some important tasks on an infrequent basis. She asked how OPES reviews task information with SMEs. Mr. Villanueva explained that one of the rubrics of the OA survey analysis is to assign a critical index value to each of the tasks and arrange them by criticality. He explained that the SMEs discuss each of the tasks, what is critical for the profession, and what is critical for licensure. He stated that this discussion is important because tasks cannot be rated by critical index value alone. He stated that OPES relies on LATC staff to ensure that entry-level licensees ideally have a 50-60% participation rate in the OA process. He explained that entry-level perspective is important to ensure that critical tasks for safe entry-level practice are addressed.

Mr. Villanueva explained that the last step in the OA process is developing the validation report which is a summary of the results and survey analysis. He stated that it serves as documentation that OPES has met the technical requirements of the OA. He continued that the validation report also provides ratings and linkage of task and knowledge statements. He stated that the examination plan is included in the validation report and that this step is where overlapping content areas on the national exam and the California-specific exam can be identified. Mr. Villanueva stated that LATC members contribute to the OA process by monitoring and reporting changes to the profession and relevant laws. He stated that LATC recruits licensee participation, ensures adequate funding, and gives final approval and acceptance of the validation report. He explained that OPES contributes to the OA process by providing technical oversight, workshop facilitation, developing a questionnaire based on input from SMEs, providing an analysis of the survey results, and writing the final validation report. He stated that LATC staff contributes to the OA process by working proactively with OPES to ensure that exams are current and valid. He noted that this is accomplished by engaging in planning sessions and maintaining open communication with OPES. He explained that licensees contribute to the OA process by acting as SMEs and providing information representing all areas of current practice. He added that SMEs ensure job-relatedness in all areas of the OA and that SMEs also evaluate the task and knowledge statements to ensure accuracy of technical and conceptual terms. Mr. Villanueva explained that SMEs ensure thoroughness for the description of the current practice of the profession. He noted that the meaning of “entry-level” for landscape architects is different from some professions because landscape architects are required to have both education and experience before licensure is granted. Mr. Villanueva concluded by summarizing the goals

of the landscape architect OA. He stated that the OA develops a description of the practice that considers anticipated changes in the profession and that it also provides an examination plan that facilitates identification of California-specific subject matter areas and their associated tasks. He also explained that the OA minimizes content overlap between the CSE and the LARE.

Ms. Landregan stated that she has a list of legislative changes and changes to the practice of landscape architecture that she would like to provide for the OA process. She indicated that she would provide them to Ms. Rodriguez to forward to OPES. She inquired if the OA survey allowed for answers that are not predetermined for the survey taker. Mr. Villanueva responded that open-ended questions are not used in OA surveys. He explained that although this may seem to be a restriction, it is necessary in order to quantify human judgment. Mr. Bowden asked how many SMEs are used in the exam development process. Mr. Villanueva responded that a specific percentage of the licensing population is used because the licensee populations can vary. Ms. Anderson asked if there is a methodology in place to account for surveys that are incomplete. Mr. Villanueva replied that incomplete records are not used and it is important to obtain complete records. Mr. McCauley asked for further clarification on the types of anticipated changes in the profession that LATC should provide to OPES during the OA process. Mr. Villanueva responded that LATC should only provide changes that can be reasonably anticipated as occurring. Ms. Landregan asked if LATC could compensate volunteers for responding to the survey. She explained that she has seen greater response to surveys when an incentive is provided. Mr. Villanueva responded that he is aware of a board that provides continuing education credit for completing surveys, but this would be a topic for discussion between LATC staff. Mr. McCauley stated that the Board and LATC have not compensated survey respondents in the past. Ms. Landregan noted that David A. Taylor, Jr. arrived to the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Villanueva reviewed a draft project plan for the OA. He explained that reviewing the background information takes approximately a month to complete. He stated that recruiting SMEs should happen in January 2013 and that the pilot survey should ideally take 30 days to collect, depending on the response rate and representativeness of the samples received. He explained that from August 2013 through October 2013, data will be analyzed, results will be arranged, workshops will be conducted, and the examination plan will be assembled. He stated the development of the validation report takes approximately 30 days and that most OA plans follow this format because the steps are similar regardless of the profession.

Ms. Landregan called for any public comments. There were no public comments.

- **David A. Taylor, Jr. moved to authorize LATC staff to enter into an intra-agency contract with OPES to conduct the OA in 2013.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

F. University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program Task Force Report Including Review and Approval of Draft UC Extension Certificate Program Review Documents:

- 1. Review and Approval Procedures**
- 2. Self-Evaluation Report**
- 3. Visiting Team Guidelines**
- 4. Annual Report Format**
- 5. Visiting Team Report Template**

Ms. Landregan recused herself from participation in the discussion and voting on this agenda item due to a financial conflict of interest. Mr. Bowden temporarily assumed the Chair's duties.

Ms. Anderson commended John Keidel and Ms. Rodriguez for working hard to complete these documents and develop them in a short amount of time. Ms. Anderson stated that the Task Force developed five documents for the reviews of the extension certificate programs. She explained that CCR section 2620.5 requires extension certificate programs to go through an approval process by LATC because the LAAB does not review or accredit extension certificate programs. She explained that the extension certificate programs were last reviewed in 2006 and the procedures to conduct the reviews were inadequate. She explained that the Task Force developed the Review and Approval Procedures, Self-Evaluation Report (SER), Visiting Team Guidelines, Annual Report Format, and the Visiting Team Report Template.

Ms. Anderson provided an overview of the Review and Approval Procedures. She stated that the target audience for this document is the site review team and LATC staff. She stated that the LAAB Accreditation Standards and Procedures publication was used as a template to create the LATC Review and Approval Procedures. She discussed significant differences between the LAAB Accreditation Standards and Procedures and the LATC Review and Approval procedures, including that the mission statement was changed to reflect LATC standards and that the proposed regulatory language for CCR section 2620.5 was added. She explained the standards and assessments within the document correlate directly with LAAB guidelines. She stated that assessments were added relating to health, safety, and welfare, because this was a distinguishing factor between a certificate program and a degree-granting program.

Mr. Bowden asked if LATC could require all future extension program students to have a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs.

Ms. Anderson responded that LATC could require this, but the Task Force did not want to place an immediate burden on the schools to conform to new requirements. She explained that LATC must carefully consider the rules they impose on the extension certificate programs because they do not want to make approval requirements so stringent that it compels the schools to not pursue LATC approval. Mr. Bowden stated that he respects the opinion of the Task Force, but he is concerned that LATC grants the same amount of educational credit to certificate holders from both extension certificate programs when the programs are very different from each other. He stated he is unsure if both extension certificate programs are providing the same education.

Ms. Anderson stated that almost all of the students in the UC Berkeley extension certificate program have a bachelor's degree but there are several who do not. She stated that if LATC makes a bachelor's degree a prerequisite to entering the program, it could mean that the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program loses their approval. Ms. Spitz responded that students who are already enrolled in the extension certificate program could be "grandfathered" into the

program if LATC makes a bachelor's degree a prerequisite to entry. Mr. Bowden stated that the intent of LATC requiring a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite to entry would be make it a requirement at a future point and not to cause a program to lose their approval immediately. He explained that one of LAAB's criticisms of the extension certificate programs is that they do not require bachelor's degrees as a prerequisite to entry and LAAB may not be able to accredit the programs for this reason. Ms. Anderson noted that any changes to CCR section 2620.5 will need to be addressed during the discussion of Agenda Item G.

Mr. Bowden stated that the term "graduate" on page one of the Review and Approval Procedures might not be the appropriate term to use because students of extension programs do not graduate; they become certificate holders. Ms. Anderson stated that she would research the issue and determine if it is the appropriate term to use.

Ms. Anderson explained that the SER, Visiting Team Guidelines, and the Annual Report Format documents were also developed for review of the extension certificate programs. Ms. Rodríguez noted that the highlighted portions of the documents reflect changes made subsequent to the November 2, 2012 Task Force meeting. Ms. Anderson asked for any suggested edits to the documents. Mr. Taylor asked if it was reasonable to expect that the site review teams would have the Visiting Team Report completed on the third day of site reviews as indicated in the review documents. Ms. Anderson responded that the Task Force discussed this question in detail and it was determined to be a reasonable expectation. She noted that the intent of completing the Visiting Team Report on the third day is so that the information is fresh on the minds of the visiting team members, and it is good to provide feedback to the extension certificate programs before leaving the site. She noted that LAAB uses this methodology for site reviews.

Mr. Taylor noted that on the SER the phrase should say, "File complete annual reports" rather than "Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports." The LATC members concurred with this edit. Mr. Bowden asked if the proposed .5 time-base requirement for the Program Administrator was .75 time-base at one point. Ms. Anderson stated that the Task Force debated requiring a .75 time-base for the Program Administrator, but JC Miller, UC Berkley Extension Certificate Program Administrator, made a compelling argument that the .5 time-base requirement allows him to work as a landscape architect and it provides him with a valuable perspective for the students. Mr. Taylor noted that he is in favor of the .5 time-base requirement for the Program Administrator.

Mr. Bowden asked for any public comments. Mr. Hastings asked how LAAB monitors the programs that they accredit. Ms. Anderson stated that LAAB reviews the programs every six years and the programs are required to submit an annual report.

- **Nicki Johnson moved to approve the Review and Approval Procedures, SER, Visiting Team Guidelines, Annual Report Format, and the Visiting Team Report Template with the edits as noted.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.

G. Review Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, and Possible Action

Ms. Landregan recused herself from participation in the discussion and the voting on this agenda item due to a financial conflict of interest. Mr. Bowden continued Chair duties.

Ms. Rodriguez presented the proposed regulatory language for CCR section 2620.5 for review and approval. She noted that the proposed modifications to section 2620.5 were recommended from the UC Extension Certificate Program Review Task Force at the November 2, 2012 Task Force meeting. Mr. Taylor stated that he agreed with Mr. Bowden's suggestion from earlier in the meeting of requiring a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the program.

Mr. Bowden stated that this requirement is not intended to penalize anyone enrolled in the programs; it is intended to further align LATC approval requirements with LAAB.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that there are an increasing number of students attending associate degree programs and subsequently attending extension certificate programs. She noted that this is a pathway to licensure that would no longer be present if a bachelor's degree becomes a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs. Mr. Bowden stated that the intent of making a bachelor's degree a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs is to set a minimum level of education as a requirement for entry. Mr. Chang noted that having a bachelor's degree shows that a student has at least two years of general educational experience.

Ms. Anderson explained that the general education requirements for an associate in science degree are stringent and consistent between associate's degree programs in California. She stated that associate's degree programs differ from each other when they become focused in distinct areas such as architecture or physics.

Mr. Bowden stated that UC Berkeley has a three-year extension certificate program and UCLA has a four-year extension certificate program. He stated that students are given the same amount of educational credit for receiving a certificate from either program. He asked if this difference between the programs has caused issues in the past. Ms. Anderson explained this difference is partially because one of the schools operates on a quarter system, and the other school operates on a semester system. Mr. Bowden asked the LATC members if they want to add regulation language to CCR section 2620.5 to include a requirement for a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs. Mr. Chang stated that LATC could require a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry and make it effective several years from now. Ms. Anderson stated that a benefit of not requiring a bachelor's degree for entry into the program is that there is another pathway to entry into the profession. Ms. Johnson stated that she prefers to not impose the bachelor's degree prerequisite requirement because of the high cost of attending school and the financial climate. Ms. Spitz responded that the extension programs are expensive and the cost issue may not be pertinent to the conversation. Mr. Taylor added his concern is that candidates are gaining the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities for entry into the landscape architecture profession. Mr. Bowden stated that he would like to have a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite to entry into the extension certificate programs. Ms. Spitz suggested making this requirement effective in September 2015.

Mr. Chang suggested a motion to modify CCR section 2620.5 to require that extension certificate programs require a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs, effective September 2015. Mr. Chang stated staff will submit a Notice of Availability

of Modified Language, notify the two extension programs of this change, and any associate's degree programs in landscape architecture that LATC is aware of.

- **David A. Taylor, Jr. moved to modify CCR section 2620.5 to require that extension certificate programs require a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs, effective September 2015.****

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.

***It was noted later in the meeting that LATC did not vote to approve the proposed changes to CCR section 2620.5 and a new vote was taken.*

Mr. Bowden returned LATC Chair duties to Ms. Landregan.

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

1. Election Results

2. Present New Landscape Architect Registration Examination Data

Ms. Anderson provided an update on the 2012 Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) annual meeting in San Francisco. She explained that there were workshops regarding policy guidance; CLARB's proposed eligibility requirement; and welfare at the annual meeting. She stated there was also a discussion about the title Professional Landscape Architect; threats to licensure and global relevance for landscape architecture. Ms. Landregan stated the global relevance discussion was driven by an influx of international students to universities. Ms. Rodriguez noted that Ms. Landregan was voted as CLARB President-Elect.

Ms. Landregan stated that the new LARE requires candidates to become a CLARB Council Record holder. She explained that having a Council Record benefits LARE candidates by allowing them to pay one time to have a record for an entire year instead of having to pay to register for each exam throughout the year. She stated this saves money for candidates who take multiple sections of the LARE throughout the year. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the first administration of the new LARE was for sections 1 and 2 only. She stated that LATC requested the California LARE pass rates compared to the national pass rates from CLARB after the first administration of the new LARE. She noted that CLARB provided the data through a manual calculation and it was time-consuming for CLARB to generate. She stated that LATC should determine if it is necessary for LATC to gather data regarding California LARE pass rates compared to the national LARE pass rates. She stated that LATC recently passed a regulation change that allows candidates who have only completed the LARE educational prerequisite to take sections 1 and 2 of the LARE. She stated that the pass rate data displayed in the meeting packet shows how candidates scored who took sections 1 and 2 of the LARE under the new regulation criteria. Ms. Landregan explained that if LATC can provide a justification for CLARB to provide the California LARE pass rates compared to the national LARE pass rates, it will assist in requesting this information from CLARB in the future. Mr. Bowden stated that this data comparison is important because if there is a problem in California landscape architecture schools, it allows LATC to have awareness of it. Ms. Landregan stated that LATC does not have control over landscape architecture schools in California; LATC only has control over the extension certificate programs. Mr. Bowden noted that although LATC does not have control

over the LAAB-approved landscape architecture schools in California, LATC is the regulatory body for landscape architecture in California. He explained that if the California LARE candidate pool has problems with the examination compared to the national candidate pool, then there could be a problem with the curriculum being taught in California. Mr. McCauley noted that California LARE pass rates have varied from the national average in the past because California provides certain pathways to licensure that some other states do not.

Ms. Spitz asked if there is a problem with the current California LARE pass rates.

Ms. Landregan stated that California LARE pass rates on section B (Inventory, Analysis and Program Development) of the five-section LARE used to be approximately 15 percentage points lower than the national average. Mr. Bowden stated there might still be a need for CLARB to provide LATC with the California LARE pass rates compared to the national LARE pass rates. Ms. Landregan stated that she has talked with CLARB about gathering the pass rate data for the next Sunset Review. Ms. Landregan stated that pass rate data will be available at a future point once more administrations of the new four-section LARE have been administered.

Ms. Anderson noted that it is important for LATC to notify CLARB if variances are identified between California LARE pass rates and the national pass rate average. Ms. Landregan requested that Ms. Anderson and Ms. Rodriguez contact CLARB staff to determine if CLARB will be able to provide LATC with California LARE pass rates compared to the national pass rates in the future.

Ms. Rodriguez suggested that an amendment was needed to the motion passed in Agenda Item G. She stated that the motion should be modified to also approve the other proposed changes in the regulation language that were presented, and authorize staff to proceed with submitting a Notice of Availability of Modified Language to modify the regulation. Ms. Landregan recused herself again from participation in the discussion and the voting on Agenda Item G due to a financial conflict of interest. Mr. Bowden temporarily assumed the Chair's duties.

- **David A. Taylor, Jr. made a motion to amend his previous motion in Agenda Item G to approve the proposed modifications to CCR section 2620.5; additionally modify CCR section 2620.5 to require that extension certificate programs require a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite for entry into the extension certificate programs, effective September 2015; and to authorize staff to submit a Notice of Availability of Modified Language for this regulatory package.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.

Mr. Bowden returned LATC Chair duties to Ms. Landregan.

I. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

January 24-25, 2013, location to be determined

Adjourn

- **Stephanie Landregan adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate the arrival of a guest speaker. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*