California Architects Board
Board Meeting
December 7, 2017
Sacramento, California
NOTICE OF BOARD MEETING

December 7, 2017

Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building
914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 651-6466 or (916) 574-7220 (Board)

Agenda
10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
(or until completion of business)

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

B. President’s Procedural Remarks and Board Member Introductory Comments

C. Executive Officer’s Report – Update on Board’s Administration/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs

D. Update on the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) –
   Christopher Castrillo, Deputy Director, Office of Board and Bureau Services

E. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
   The Board may not discuss or take action on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Board’s next Strategic Planning session and/or place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

F. Review and Possible Action on September 7, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

G. Election of 2018 Board Officers

H. Discuss and Possible Action on 2017 Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Awards

I. Discuss and Possible Action on the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice Between Canada, Mexico, and the United States

(Continued on Reverse)
J. Discuss and Possible Action on Reducing the Mandatory Wait Period to Retake the California Supplemental Examination (CSE)

K. Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) Report
   1. Update on October 18, 2017 PQC Meeting
   2. Update and Possible Action on PQC’s Recommendation Regarding 2017–2018 Strategic Plan Objective to Collaborate With and Support Existing and Emerging Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) Programs to Promote Their Success

L. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Amendments to Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines and California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 2, Section 154 (Disciplinary Guidelines)

M. Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Report
   1. Update on November 2, 2017 LATC Meeting
   2. Update and Possible Action on LATC’s Recommendation to Amend CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) that Define Related and Non-Related Baccalaureate Degrees and Experience-Only Pathways and Prescribe Allowable Credit for Initial Licensure

N. Review of Future Board Meeting Dates

O. Closed Session (will not be webcast)
   1. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 11126(f)(4) and 11126.1, Review and Possible Action on September 7, 2017 Closed Session Minutes
   2. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate on Disciplinary Matters
   3. Adjourn Closed Session

P. Reconvene Open Session (will not be webcast)

Q. Adjournment (will not be webcast)

Action may be taken on any item on the agenda. The time and order of agenda items are subject to change at the discretion of the Board President and may be taken out of order. The meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier or later than posted in this notice. In accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, all meetings of the Board are open to the public. The Board plans to webcast this meeting on its website at www.cab.ca.gov. Webcast availability cannot, however, be guaranteed due to technical difficulties. The meeting will not be cancelled if webcast is not available. If you wish to participate or to have a guaranteed opportunity to observe, please plan to attend the physical location. Adjournment, if it is the only item that occurs after a closed session, may not be webcast.

(Continued on Reverse)
Government Code section 11125.7 provides the opportunity for the public to address each agenda item during discussion or consideration by the Board prior to the Board taking any action on said item. Members of the public will be provided appropriate opportunities to comment on any issue before the Board, but the Board President may, at his or her discretion, apportion available time among those who wish to speak. Individuals may appear before the Board to discuss items not on the agenda; however, the Board can neither discuss nor take official action on these items at the time of the same meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting:

**Person:** Mel Knox  
**Telephone:** (916) 575-7221  
**Email:** mel.knox@dca.ca.gov  
**Telecommunications Relay Service:** Dial 711  
**Mailing Address:** California Architects Board  
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  
Sacramento, CA 95834

Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

*Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Board in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount (Business and Professions Code section 5510.15).*
CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

Roll is called by the Board Secretary or, in his/her absence, by the Board Vice President or, in his/her absence, by a Board member designated by the Board President.

Business and Professions Code section 5524 defines a quorum for the Board:

Six of the members of the Board constitute a quorum of the Board for the transaction of business. The concurrence of five members of the Board present at a meeting duly held at which a quorum is present shall be necessary to constitute an act or decision of the Board, except that when all ten members of the Board are present at a meeting duly held, the concurrence of six members shall be necessary to constitute an act or decision of the Board.

Board Member Roster

Jon Alan Baker
Denise Campos
Tian Feng
Pasqual V. Gutierrez
Sylvia Kwan
Ebony Lewis
Matthew McGuinness
Robert C. Pearman, Jr.
Nilza Serrano
Barry Williams
PRESIDENT’S PROCEDURAL REMARKS AND BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Board President Matthew McGuinness or, in his absence, the Vice President will review the scheduled Board actions and make appropriate announcements.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT - UPDATE ON BOARD’S ADMINISTRATION/
MANAGEMENT, EXAMINATION, LICENSING, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

Executive Officer, Doug McCauley, will provide the Board with an update on its administration/
management, examination, licensing, and enforcement program activities.

Attachments:
2. Enforcement Program Report
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 28, 2017

TO: Board and Landscape Architects Technical Committee Members

FROM: Doug McCauley, Executive Officer

SUBJECT: MONTHLY REPORT

The following information is provided as an overview of Board activities and projects as of November 28, 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT

Board The next Board meeting is scheduled for December 7, 2017, in Sacramento.

BreEZe The Board is working in collaboration with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) on a Business Modernization Plan to effectively facilitate the analysis, approval, and potential transition to a new licensing and enforcement platform. The Plan will be an academic look at the purpose, guiding principles, objectives and activities needed to achieve the Board’s goals of business modernization. The Plan will have an accompanying document, the Business Modernization Report (Report), which is an artifact specific to the Board that documents the business modernization activities that will be conducted. The Report will include proposed timelines, milestone documentation, business planning artifacts, project approval documents, among other items. Together, these documents will outline a specific framework, and the Board’s progress within such framework.

The primary objective of the Plan is to ensure that business modernization efforts for the Board follow a structured approach based on best practices and lessons learned, with more accurately planned, managed, and implemented technology solutions. The thorough planning, business analysis, and program-specific nature of this effort will ensure success for the Board and DCA.

The Business Modernization Plan and Report will be available in early December.
On August 17, 2017, staff met with DCA’s SOLID organizational change management staff to discuss the initial inventory of the Board’s existing administrative, enforcement, and licensing business processes. This inventory will inform the proposed timeline for the effort, currently under development. At the request of DCA, on October 11, 2017, staff provided suggested edits to the Report described above. Staff are also completing the Project Charter for the business activities phase of the modernization effort, and met with SOLID on November 7, 2017, to finalize the document. The Charter specifies our role and responsibilities as key project stakeholders. It also describes the project decision-making authority for our business area, and the commitment DCA needs from the Board to conduct a successful project.

Communications Committee The next Communications Committee meeting is scheduled for December 19, 2017, in Sacramento. At this meeting the Committee will continue its work on the assigned objectives from the 2017–2018 Strategic Plan.

Executive Committee The Executive Committee meeting, originally scheduled for November 15, 2017, was cancelled due to changes as to member availability. Members will be polled to determine when the Committee will next meet.

Legislation SB 547 [Chapter 429, Statutes of 2017] extends the sunset date of the California Council of Interior Design Certification (CCIDC) and its certification program until January 1, 2022. The bill was signed by the Governor on October 2, 2017, and becomes effective on January 1, 2018.

Liaison Program Board members last provided liaison reports at the March 2, 2017, Board meeting.

Newsletter The most recent issue of the California Architects newsletter was posted online on November 6, 2017. In an effort to provide increased distribution of the newsletter, staff worked with DCA Office of Information Services and identified a way to compile all of the emails in our systems to distribute the newsletter using ListServe. The newsletter was subsequently emailed to all licensees and current candidates, and promoted Facebook and Twitter. This approach resulted in an increase of people being sent the newsletter to 28,049.

Sunset Review The Board’s 2018 Sunset Review report is due for submission to the Legislature on November 1, 2018. Preparations for the 2018 Sunset Review are now underway, with staff having launched the effort with a meeting on October 19, 2017. The draft report will be presented to the Executive Committee in May 2018 for input and recommendations for the Board.

Personnel Lisa Chullino was selected to fill the Enforcement Analyst position effective November 20, 2017. Brian Eisley was selected to fill the Licensing Technician position effective October 16, 2017.

Supplemental Examination Technician Cody Bueghly separated from State service effective October 13, 2017. Enforcement Technician Cecilia Sharp accepted a position with the Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education effective November 20, 2017. Recruitment efforts are currently underway to fill both positions and two Examination/Licensing Technician positions.
Social Media  The Board has expanded its social media presence to include three platforms, which are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Current Followers</th>
<th>Followers 1 Year Prior</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (launched June 6, 2017)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram (launched September 20, 2016)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>237%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter (launched in 2014)</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training  The following employee(s) have been scheduled to participate in upcoming training:

- 12/11-12/17  Presentation Skills for Analysts (Lauren and Coleen)
- 12/20/17  Managing Time and Workload (Coleen)
- 1/30/18  Effective Business Writing (Lauren)
- 2/7/18  Interviewing Techniques for Investigators and Inspectors (Katie, Lauren, and Alicia)
- 2/21/18  Investigative Techniques (Katie, Lauren, and Alicia)
- 2/22/18  Interpersonal Skills for Analysts (Lauren)
- 3/13/18  Research, Analysis, & Problem Solving (Katie)

Website  In November, staff posted the Notice of Meeting for the December 7, 2017, Board meeting. Staff also updated the Board’s website with the latest issue of the Board’s newsletter California Architects.
EXAMINATION AND LICENSING PROGRAMS

Architect Registration Examination (ARE)  The pass rates for ARE divisions taken by California candidates between October 1–31, 2017, are shown below:

### October 2017 ARE 5.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DIVISIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL PASSED</th>
<th>TOTAL FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Divisions</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Management</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development &amp; Documentation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 2017 ARE 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DIVISIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL PASSED</th>
<th>TOTAL FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Divisions</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design &amp; Construction Systems</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Systems</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents &amp; Services</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming, Planning, &amp; Practice</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Systems</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National pass rates for 2016 ARE 5.0 have been released by NCARB for divisions taken between November 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017 (see table below).

**November 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 ARE 5.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA</th>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Passed (%)</td>
<td>Passed (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Management</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development &amp; Documentation</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016 ARE 4.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA</th>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Passed (%)</td>
<td>Passed (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design &amp; Construction Systems</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Systems</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents &amp; Services</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming, Planning, &amp; Practice</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Systems</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California Supplemental Examination (CSE) CSE development is an ongoing process. The Intra-Agency Contract Agreement (IAC) with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) for examination development for fiscal year (FY) 2017/18 was approved by the Board on June 15, 2017. The IAC expires on June 30, 2018.

Board staff is researching with OPES the feasibility of reducing the mandatory wait time after a candidate fails the CSE while maintaining examination security and defensibility. The Board will be provided with an update regarding the results of the research at its December 7, 2017 meeting.

The pass rates for the CSE taken by candidates between November 1-25, 2017, and prior FYs are shown in the following tables:

### November 1-25, 2017 CSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATIONS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES PASSED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2017/18 CSE
(as of November 25, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATIONS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES PASSED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2016/17 CSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATIONS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES PASSED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCARB Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) Launched in 2015, IPAL is an initiative spearheaded by NCARB and designed to provide aspiring architects the opportunity to complete requirements for licensure in a more integrated and streamlined manner while earning their accredited degree. Programs from three California schools were accepted by NCARB for
participation: NewSchool of Architecture and Design, University of Southern California, and Woodbury University; to-date there are 26 programs at 21 participating schools.

The Board sponsored legislation (which became operative on January 1, 2017) that authorizes it to grant students enrolled in an IPAL program early eligibility for the ARE. Periodically, the Board invites accepted California schools to its meetings for updates on the progress of their respective program. Woodbury University provided the Board with an update on its IPAL program at the Board’s September 7, 2017, meeting.

At its October 18, 2017, meeting the Professional Qualifications Committee provided a recommendation regarding the related 2017–18 Strategic Plan objective that will be considered at the December 7, 2017, Board meeting.

Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) The PQC met on October 18, 2017, in Sacramento. At the meeting, the PQC commenced work on the 2017–2018 Strategic Plan objectives.

**ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM**

**Education/Information Program** Architect consultants are the primary source for responses to technical and/or practice-related questions from the public and licensees. In November (as of November 27, 2017), there were 32 telephone and/or email contacts requesting information, advice, and/or direction. Licensees accounted for nine of the contacts and included inquiries regarding written contract requirements, out-of-state licensees seeking to do business in California, scope of practice relative to engineering disciplines, and questions about stamp and signature requirements.

**Collection Agency Contract** The Board’s 2015-2016 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee (REC) to pursue methods to obtain multiple collection mechanisms to secure unpaid citation penalties. At its November 5, 2015, meeting, the REC reviewed and discussed this objective, and voted to recommend to the Board that it should encourage staff to continue pursuing all avenues for collecting unpaid administrative fines, and specifically, start utilizing a collection agency for unpaid accounts aged beyond 90 days, or at the discretion of the Executive Officer (EO). The Board approved the REC’s recommendation at its December 10, 2015, meeting. Following the meeting, staff identified outstanding accounts that could be referred to a collection agency and obtained quotes for full-service debt collection services, including “skip-tracing,” credit reporting, and filing legal actions as appropriate. Staff is currently in the process of securing a contract with a collection agency through the informal solicitation method [Government Code (Gov.) section 14838.5] to allow the Board to refer unpaid accounts aged beyond 90 days to a collection agency. The collection agency contract is planned to be presented to the Board for review and possible action at its March 2018 meeting.

**Disciplinary Actions** Arthur Frank Kent (Huntington Beach) Effective October 13, 2017, Kent’s architect license number C-15748 was revoked. Kent was also ordered to reimburse the Board $7,485 for its enforcement costs if his license is reinstated. The action came after a Proposed Decision, as corrected, was adopted by the Board.
An Accusation was filed against Kent for alleged violations of Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5583 (Fraud or Deceit), 5584 (Negligence or Willful Misconduct), and 5536.22(a) (Failure to Use a Written Contract). The Accusation alleged that Kent was subject to disciplinary action in that he: committed fraud or deceit by accepting payment for professional services he thereafter failed to perform and lying about performing the services he promised to perform; committed negligence or willful misconduct by accepting payment for professional services he thereafter failed to perform; and failed to use a written contract, executed prior to the commencement of actual work. Specifically, on or about August 2, 2013, Kent was hired to prepare site and utility plans to install a commercial trailer on vacant property located in Whittier, California. Kent did not provide the client with a written contract for his professional services. On or about August 1, 2013, the client paid $320 to Kent for conceptual site plans, and on or about August 22, 2013, the client paid $960 to Kent for preliminary drawings. On or about January 26, 2014, Kent admitted to the Board that the client gave him a $773 check made payable to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department for permit fees on the project, and that he told the client that he submitted the drawings to the City. Kent admitted that he did not submit the drawings or the permit fees to the City, and that he acted unprofessionally. Kent and the client agreed to terminate their professional relationship, and Kent agreed to refund his money.

Enforcement Actions (effective September - October) Nagy R. Bakhoum (Torrance) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $500 administrative fine to Bakhoum, architect license number C-26503, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) (License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements). The action alleged that Bakhoum certified false or misleading information on his 2016 License Renewal Application. Bakhoum paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on September 13, 2017.

Kevin Douglas Berman (Overland Park, Kansas) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $500 administrative fine to Berman, architect license number C-34265, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) (License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements). The action alleged that Berman certified false or misleading information on his 2017 License Renewal Application. Berman paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on September 19, 2017.

Thomas Brian Chiaramonte (San Anselmo) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $500 administrative fine to Chiaramonte, architect license number C-29727, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5600.05(b) (License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements). The action alleged that Chiaramonte failed to maintain records of completion of the required coursework for two years from the date of license renewal and failed to make those records available to the Board for auditing upon request. Chiaramonte paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on October 20, 2017.

Scott Jay Johnson (Seattle, Washington) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $500 administrative fine to Johnson, architect license number C-17563, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) (License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements). The action alleged that Johnson certified false or misleading information on his 2017 License Renewal Application. Johnson paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on October 20, 2017.
Elias A. Kuddis (Glendale) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $500 administrative fine to Kuddis, architect license number C-10790, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) (License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements). The action alleged that Kuddis certified false or misleading information on his 2016 License Renewal Application. Kuddis paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on September 13, 2017.

Pawchwan Lim (San Diego) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $1,000 administrative fine to Lim, architect license number C-22952, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5584 (Willful Misconduct) and Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 160(b)(1) (Rules of Professional Conduct). The action alleged that Lim failed to obtain a building permit from the City of Santee Building Division, as required by section 105.1 of the 2013 California Residential Code, prior to installing and removing walls in a single-family residence located in Santee, California, that he had purchased for the purpose of renovating and reselling it. Lim paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on September 26, 2017.

David Benjamin Meleca (Columbus, Ohio) The Board issued a two-count citation that included a $3,000 administrative fine to Meleca, dba David B. Meleca Architects, LLC, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC §§ 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and 5536.1(c) (Unauthorized Practice) and CCR § 134(a) (Use of the Term Architect). The action alleged that on or about December 16, 2015, Meleca executed an Agreement for Services with a client offering to provide design development, construction documents, permitting/bidding assistance, and limited construction administration services for a new restaurant building to be located in Torrance, California. The Agreement described Meleca’s firm, David B. Meleca Architects, LLC, as “the Architect” of the project. On or about February 25, 2016, Meleca prepared a permit set of architectural drawings for the project. On or about March 2, 2016, Meleca’s firm then issued a “CONSULTANT WORK AUTHORIZATION” to California licensed architect David Udkow to “Review/Sign/Seal Plans for Landlord and City submittal,” and on or about March 3, 2016, Udkow stamped and signed the permit set of architectural drawings. Meleca’s offering to provide design development, construction documents, permitting/bidding assistance, and limited construction administration services and his preparation of a permit set of architectural drawings for a new restaurant building, which is not a building exempt from the requirements of the Architects Practice Act pursuant to BPC §§ 5537(a) and 5538, without being under the immediate and responsible direction of a California licensed architect, constitutes the practice of architecture as defined in BPC § 5500.1. Meleca also used the business name “David B. Meleca Architects, LLC” without a California licensed architect who is in management control of the services that are offered and provided by the business entity and either the owner, a part-owner, an officer, or an employee of the business entity. The citation became final on October 18, 2017.

Guy Edward Turner (Los Angeles) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $1,500 administrative fine to Turner, dba GT Architecture, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC § 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and CCR § 134(a) (Use of the Term Architect). The action alleged that on or about November 22, 2016, Turner met with a client to discuss design services for an existing single-family residence located in Woodland Hills, California. At the meeting, the client gave Turner cash as a down payment for the preparation of construction plans, and Turner provided the client with a handwritten “RECEIPT
FOR RETAINER FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES,” and his business card, which included the business name “GT Architecture” and the web address “GTarchitectureLA.com.” On or about December 19, 2016, the client was provided with a drawing consisting of exterior elevations for the project. The title block on the drawing included Turner’s logo, which contained the words “GT,” “GUY TURNER,” and “ARCHITECTURE.” In addition, on or about July 27, 2017, Turner’s LinkedIn profile described him as an “Owner” and “Designer” at “GT Architecture” in Hollywood, California, and stated his specialties include “Architectural Design,” and Turner’s Houzz profile under the business name “GT Architecture” stated the business “offers full architectural services from concept design to construction drawings and permit expedite.” Furthermore, Turner’s advertisement on the Internet at gosmith.com under the business name “GT Architecture” stated the business “specializes in architect,” and Turner’s advertisement on the Internet at manta.com under the business name “GT Architecture” stated: “Architectural Design, construction plans Hollywood Los Angeles, hillside remodel, renovations, custom homes, additions & alterations, Permits City of LA.” Turner also used the business name “GT Architecture” without a California licensed architect who is in management control of the services that are offered and provided by the business entity and either the owner, a part-owner, an officer, or an employee of the business entity. The citation became final on October 18, 2017.

John E. Wells III (Newport Beach) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a $250 administrative fine to Wells, architect license number C-4232, for an alleged violation of BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) (License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements). The action alleged that Wells certified false or misleading information on his 2017 License Renewal Application. Wells paid the fine, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on October 30, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcement Statistics</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Prior Month</th>
<th>FYTD</th>
<th>5-FY Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>2012/13-2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received/Opened (Reopened):</td>
<td>32 (0)</td>
<td>39 (0)</td>
<td>162 (0)</td>
<td>314 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days to Close:</td>
<td>46 days</td>
<td>73 days</td>
<td>80 days</td>
<td>123 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending:</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>134*</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Pending:</td>
<td>140 days</td>
<td>124 days</td>
<td>116 days*</td>
<td>151 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending AG: †</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplinary Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending AG:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending DA:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing Education (§5600.05)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received/Opened:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Common Violations  The majority of complaints received are filed by consumers for allegations such as unlicensed practice, professional misconduct, negligence, and contract violations, or initiated by the Board upon the failure of a coursework audit.

During FY 2017/18 (as of November 27, 2017) 17 citations with administrative fines became final with 23 violations of the provisions of the Act and/or Board regulations. Below are the most common violations that have resulted in enforcement action during the current FY:

- BPC § 5536(a) - Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect [17.4%]
- BPC § 5536.1(c) - Unauthorized Practice [8.7%]
- BPC § 5584 - Negligence or Willful Misconduct [4.3%]
- BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) - License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements [56.6%]
- CCR § 134(a) - Use of the Term Architect [8.7%]
- CCR § 160(b)(1) - Rules of Professional Conduct (Willful Misconduct) [4.3%]

Regulatory Proposals  CCR § 152.5 (Contest of Citations, Informal Conference) - Staff developed proposed regulatory language to amend CCR § 152.5 to allow the EO to delegate to a designee, such as the Assistant Executive Officer or the Enforcement Program Manager, the authority to hold an informal conference with a cited person and make a decision to affirm, modify, or dismiss a citation. The proposed regulatory language also contains additional revisions to CCR § 152.5, including: changing the deadline for requesting an informal conference for consistency with the deadline for requesting a formal administrative hearing; authorizing the EO or a designee to extend the 60-day period for holding the informal conference for good cause; and clarifying that the decision to affirm, modify, or dismiss a citation is made following (rather than at the conclusion of) an informal conference, and a copy of the decision will be transmitted to the cited person within 30 days after the conference. The REC reviewed and discussed staff’s draft proposed regulation to amend CCR § 152.5 at its November 8, 2016, meeting, and voted to recommend to the Board that it approve the regulation and authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory change. At its December 15, 2016, meeting, the Board approved the proposed regulation to amend CCR § 152.5, authorized staff to proceed with the required regulatory change to amend CCR § 152.5, and delegated authority to the EO to adopt the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed. Staff is preparing the proposed regulatory package for submission to DCA for review, prior to publicly noticing with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL).

CCR § 154 (Disciplinary Guidelines) - The Board’s 2013 and 2014 Strategic Plans included an objective to review and update the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines. The REC reviewed
recommended updates to the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines in 2013 and 2014. Additionally, at the request of the REC, staff consulted with a representative of AIACC to address a proposed modification to the “Obey All Laws” condition of probation. The representative concurred with the revision and indicated that there was no issue with the proposal. Staff then consulted with the REC Chair who agreed to provide the Disciplinary Guidelines with recommended revisions to the Board for consideration at its December 2014 meeting due to the target date established for the Strategic Plan objective. At its December 2014 meeting, the Board approved the proposed revisions to the Disciplinary Guidelines and authorized staff to proceed with a regulatory proposal to amend CCR § 154 in order to incorporate the revised Disciplinary Guidelines by reference. Staff prepared the required regulatory documents for the Board’s review and approval at its June 10, 2015, meeting. The Board approved the proposed regulatory language to amend CCR § 154 at its June 10, 2015, meeting and delegated the authority to the EO to adopt the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and to make minor technical or non-substantive changes, if needed.

At its August 6, 2015, meeting, the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) reviewed recommended updates to LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines based on the revisions made to the Board’s Guidelines. Following the meeting, Legal Counsel advised LATC staff that additional research may be necessary regarding Optional Conditions 9 (CSE) and 10 (Written Examination) in LATC’s Guidelines. LATC staff subsequently discussed the matter with Legal Counsel on September 30, 2015. Board staff reviewed Legal Counsel’s comments as they relate to the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines, and determined the Board’s Guidelines would also need to be amended. On October 21, 2015, Board and LATC staff sent proposed edits to these conditions to Legal Counsel for review. Legal Counsel notified Board and LATC staff on November 12, 2015, that the proposed edits were acceptable, but substantive, and would require re-approval by the Board.

On November 25, 2015, Legal Counsel further advised staff to include the current version of the Board’s Quarterly Report of Compliance form (1/11) as “Attachment A” in the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines, as this method was previously approved by OAL for the 2000 edition of the Guidelines. At its December 10, 2015, meeting, the Board reviewed and approved the additional recommended revisions to the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines and the proposed regulation to amend CCR § 154, and delegated the authority to the EO to adopt the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and to make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed. Staff prepared the proposed regulatory package for Legal Counsel’s review and approval on March 15, 2016. On April 8, 2016, Legal Counsel advised staff that further substantive changes were necessary prior to submission to OAL. Staff developed recommended revisions to the Guidelines in response to Legal Counsel’s concerns, and presented those revisions to the REC for review and consideration at its November 8, 2016, meeting. At the meeting, the REC voted to recommend to the Board that it approve the additional revisions to the Disciplinary Guidelines and authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory change to amend CCR § 154. The additional revisions to the Guidelines and the proposed regulatory language to amend CCR § 154 were presented to the Board for consideration at its December 15, 2016, meeting. At the meeting, the Board approved the additional revisions to the Disciplinary Guidelines and the proposed regulation to amend CCR § 154, authorized staff to proceed with the required regulatory change to amend CCR § 154 in order to incorporate the revised Guidelines by reference, and delegated authority to the EO to
adopt the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed.

Following the December 15, 2016, Board meeting, LATC staff updated LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines to include the approved revisions that are appropriate for LATC. On July 13, 2017, LATC approved the revised Guidelines and recommended that they be presented to the Board for approval. On September 5, 2017, Legal Counsel advised LATC staff that additional substantive changes to LATC’s Guidelines and the proposed language to amend CCR § 2680 were necessary prior to Board approval and submission of the regulatory package. The Board approved the revisions to LATC’s Guidelines and the proposed language to amend CCR § 2680, including the necessary changes identified by Legal Counsel, at its September 7, 2017, meeting. Following the meeting, Board staff reviewed Legal Counsel’s recommendations as they relate to the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines and determined that they would also need to be amended. Staff is preparing additional, recommended revisions to the Board’s Guidelines and the proposed language to amend CCR § 154 in response to Legal Counsel’s recommendations, and will present those revisions to the Board for review and approval at its December 7, 2017, meeting.

Regulatory and Enforcement Committee (REC) The next REC meeting has not been scheduled at this time.

Written Contract (BPC § 5536.22) A proposal was previously submitted by the Board to the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee (BP&ED) for possible inclusion in an omnibus bill. The amendment to BPC § 5536.22 sought to clarify that the following elements are needed in architects’ written contracts with clients for professional services: 1) a description of the project; 2) the project address; and 3) a description of the procedure to accommodate contract changes. BP&ED staff determined that the proposal was substantive and, as such, would need to be included in another bill. At its April 28, 2016, meeting, the REC accepted staff’s recommendation to also include a: 1) statement identifying the ownership and/or reuse of instruments of service prepared by the architect; and 2) notification to the client that the architect is licensed by the Board, in the amendment to BPC § 5536.22. Staff developed proposed language for BPC § 5536.22 to include these two additional elements, and presented it to the REC for consideration at its November 8, 2016, meeting. At the meeting, the REC supported adding the two additional provisions to the written contract requirement, but expressed concerns that the use of the word “complaints” in the proposed language for subsection (a)(9) could result in frivolous complaints to the Board against architects. The REC ultimately voted to recommend to the Board that it approve the proposed language to amend BPC § 5536.22 with the words “concerns about” instead of “complaints concerning” in the proposed subsection (a)(9). The Board considered the REC’s recommendation at its December 15, 2016, meeting, and approved the proposed language to amend BPC § 5536.22 with the exception of proposed subsection (a)(9); the Board returned subsection (a)(9) to the REC for further study and consideration of alternative methods of disclosure. The language has been submitted to the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee on October 27, 2017, for consideration to be included in the 2017 Omnibus Committee bill.
Committee  The LATC met on November 2, 2017, in Los Angeles. The next meetings are
tentatively scheduled for February, May, August, and November 2018, with dates and locations
to be determined.

Personnel  Trish Rodriguez rejoined the LATC on November 7, 2017, as Special Projects Manager
to assist the LATC and the Board on the upcoming Sunset Review Reports and BreEZe.

Training  The following employee(s) have been scheduled to participate in upcoming training:

11/30/17  Research, Analysis, and Problem Solving (Stacy)

Website  In November, staff published the July 13, 2017, LATC Meeting Minutes, and the updated
“Licensee Search” lists to the website.

BreEZe  Refer to section under Board’s Administrative/Management.

Social Media  The LATC maintains a Twitter account that currently has 139 followers. This
account largely permits the LATC to have active social media participation with the public and
professionals.

LATC EXAMINATION PROGRAM

California Supplemental Examination (CSE)  LATC’s current Intra-Departmental Contract with
OPES for examination development expires on June 30, 2018. OPES provides the LATC with
Occupational Analysis (OA) and examination development services. BPC § 139 requires that an
OA be conducted every five to seven years. An OA was completed by OPES for the LATC in
2014. The Test Plan developed from the 2014 OA is being used during content development of
the CSE. The CSE development is based on an ongoing analysis of current CSE performance and
evaluation of examination development needs. Staff recruits subject matter experts to participate
in examination development workshops to focus on item writing and examination construction.
Monthly examination development workshops began on August 25, 2016, and concluded on
December 2, 2016. The questions developed have been added to the examination item bank.

CSE Results  The pass rates for the CSE taken by candidates during FY 2017/18 (as of
November 27, 2017), and prior FYs are shown in the following tables:
### FY 2017/18 (as of November 27, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATIONS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES PASSED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2016/17 CSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATIONS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES PASSED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2015/16 CSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMINATIONS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES PASSED</th>
<th>CANDIDATES FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) The next LARE administration will be held from December 4-16, 2017. The candidate application deadline was October 20, 2017. Examination results will be released five-six weeks following the last day of administration.

The pass rates for LARE sections taken by California candidates during the August 7-19, 2017 administration are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SECTIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL PASSED</th>
<th>TOTAL FAILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project and Construction Management</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46 68%</td>
<td>22 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and Analysis</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55 69%</td>
<td>26 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54 71%</td>
<td>22 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading, Drainage and Construction</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52 74%</td>
<td>18 26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National pass rates for LARE sections taken in 2016 are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Construction Management</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and Analysis</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legislation**  
SB 800 (Hill) – BPC § 5680.2 authorizes a license that has expired to be renewed within three years after its expiration. Existing law prohibits a license that is expired for more than three years from being renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated but authorizes the holder of the expired license to apply for and obtain a new license if the applicant for the new license meets certain criteria, pays certain fees, and passes an examination or otherwise establishes to the satisfaction of the Board that the applicant is qualified to practice landscape architecture. In line with the LATC’s 2015-2016 Strategic Plan objective, this bill authorizes a license to be renewed within five years of its expiration. The bill also prohibits a license that is expired for more than five years from being renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated but would authorize the holder of the expired license to apply for a new license, as specified. SB 800 was passed by both houses in September 2017 and approved by the Governor on October 7, 2017. The change in statutes will take effect January 1, 2018. Accordingly, LATC staff will begin a regulatory package to repeal CCR §§ 2624 and 2624.1.

**Regulatory Proposals**  
CCR § 2615 (Form of Examinations) – Reciprocity Requirements - At its meeting on February 10, 2015, LATC directed staff to draft proposed regulatory language to
specifically state that California allows reciprocity to individuals who are licensed in another jurisdiction, have 10 years of practice experience, and have passed the CSE. At the LATC meeting on November 17, 2015, the Committee approved proposed amendments to CCR § 2615(c)(1), and recommended that the Board authorize LATC to proceed with a regulatory change. At its December 10, 2015, meeting, the Board approved the regulatory changes and delegated authority to the EO to adopt the corresponding regulations to amend CCR § 2615 provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed.

The LATC received extensive input during the public comment period expressing concern about the proposed length of post-licensure experience (at least 10 years, within the past 15 years) to be required of reciprocity candidates who do not meet California’s educational requirements (specifically, a degree in landscape architecture). At its November 4, 2016, meeting, LATC reviewed and discussed the public comments, heard from several members of the audience, and directed staff to provide additional research and possible options for its next meeting in January 2017. At its January 17, 2017, meeting, the Committee directed staff to draft proposed regulatory language allowing reciprocity licensure to applicants licensed to practice landscape architecture by any US jurisdiction, Canadian province, or Puerto Rico, upon passing the CSE. Staff consulted with legal counsel to draft new, proposed regulatory language in accordance with the Committee’s direction. Staff was also advised that it would be more timely to begin a new regulatory proposal for this new language in lieu of continuing with the existing proposal. Pursuant to Government Code section 11346.4, the one-year deadline to finalize the existing regulatory proposal is on August 12, 2017, which is not sufficient time to complete the required review/approval process through the control agencies.

At its April 18, 2017, meeting, the Committee approved the new proposed regulatory language to amend CCR § 2615(c)(1) and recommended that the Board authorize LATC to proceed with the regulatory change. The LATC’s recommendation was considered by the Board at its June 15, 2017, meeting. Following discussion, the Board voted to reject the proposed regulatory language. The Board directed staff to prepare a proposal that addresses both the LATC’s initial and reciprocal licensure requirements, and that closely aligns with the Board’s current licensure requirements. The Board requested that the LATC’s proposal should be presented to the Board at its next meeting.

At the July 13, 2017, meeting, the LATC reviewed proposed language to amend CCR § 2620 (Education and Training Credits) composed by staff and DCA Legal. This proposed language reflects the Board’s licensing provisions by granting credit for related and non-related degrees while also adding an experience-only pathway. The Committee voted to establish an Education/Experience Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to determine the execution for these proposed pathways to licensure. Specifically, the Committee directed the Subcommittee to determine the appropriate amount of credit to grant for these new pathways, and define related versus unrelated degrees and the execution of an ‘experience-only’ pathway. The Subcommittee met on October 3, 2017 and issued recommendations in accordance with its charge. These recommendations were provided to the LATC at its meeting on November 2, 2017.

As initial licensing provisions and reciprocity provisions are closely tied, the LATC voted on July 13, 2017 to recommend to the Board that reciprocity requirements align with the final,
amended provisions to CCR § 2620. Accordingly, upon Board approval of amended language to CCR § 2620, staff will pursue corroborative changes to CCR § 2615.

Following is a chronology, to date, of the processing of LATC’s regulatory proposal for CCR § 2615:

November 17, 2015  Proposed regulatory language approved by the LATC
December 10, 2015  Proposed regulatory language approved by the Board
August 2, 2016     Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations submitted to OAL
August 12, 2016    Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations published by OAL
September 27, 2016 Public hearing, public comments received during 45-day period
April 18, 2017     LATC voted to withdraw regulatory proposal and approved new proposed regulatory language
June 15, 2017      Board requested LATC prepare an alternate proposal that refines both initial and reciprocal licensure requirements to be more closely related to those of the Board’s
July 13, 2017      LATC voted to recommend to the Board that reciprocity requirements align with initial licensure requirements once they are determined by the Education/Experience Subcommittee and approved by the LATC and the Board at subsequent meetings
October 3, 2017    The Education/Experience Subcommittee met and recommended expanded initial licensure pathways (and their respective education/experience credit allocations) as amendments to CCR § 2620 for the LATC’s consideration
November 2, 2017   LATC met to review the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s recommendations and voted to recommend that the Board approve proposed amendments to CCR § 2620 to expand initial licensure pathways

CCR § 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) – LATC established the original requirements for an approved extension certificate program based on university accreditation standards from the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). These requirements are outlined in CCR § 2620.5. In 2009, LAAB implemented changes to their university accreditation standards. Prompted by the changes made by LAAB, LATC drafted updated requirements for an approved extension certificate program and recommended that the Board authorize LATC to proceed with a regulatory change. At the December 15–16, 2010, Board meeting, the Board approved the regulatory change and delegated authority to the EO to adopt the regulations to amend CCR § 2620.5 provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed. The regulatory proposal to amend CCR § 2620.5 was published by the OAL on June 22, 2012.

In 2012, the LATC appointed the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force, which was charged with developing procedures for the review of the extension certificate programs, and conducting reviews of the programs utilizing the new procedures. The Task Force held meetings on June 27, 2012, October 8, 2012, and November 2, 2012. As a result of these meetings, the Task Force recommended additional modifications to CCR § 2620.5 to further
update the regulatory language with LAAB guidelines and LATC goals. At the November 14, 2012, LATC meeting, LATC approved the Task Force’s recommended modifications to CCR § 2620.5, with an additional edit. At the January 24–25, 2013, LATC meeting, LATC reviewed public comments regarding the proposed changes to CCR § 2620.5 and agreed to remove a few proposed modifications to the language to address the public comments. The Board approved adoption of the modified language for CCR § 2620.5 at their March 7, 2013, meeting.

On July 17, 2013, a Decision of Disapproval of Regulatory Action was issued by OAL. The disapproval was based on OAL’s determination that the regulatory package did not meet the necessity standard of the Gov. § 11349.1, subdivision (a)(1). Gov. § 11349(a) defines “necessity” as demonstrating the need for the regulatory change through evidence not limited to facts, studies, and expert opinion. Based on OAL’s disapproval, staff worked with DCA Legal Counsel and the Task Force Chair to refine the proposed language and identify appropriate justification that would meet OAL’s requirements.

In May 2014, the LATC Special Projects Analyst prepared draft language for CCR § 2620.5 incorporating Legal Counsel’s recommendation that regulatory language be added to address the application, approval, denial, and annual review processes. On December 8, 2014, staff was advised by LAAB that the accreditation standards are scheduled to be reviewed and updated beginning with draft proposals in the spring of 2015. LAAB anticipated adopting new standards in early 2016. On December 30, 2014, staff met with the Task Force Chair to discuss proposed changes to CCR § 2620.5 and the probability that new LAAB accreditation standards will be implemented in 2016. Staff also met with Legal Counsel on January 14, 2015, to discuss justifications to proposed changes and again on January 28, 2015, to further review edits and justifications.

Proposed regulatory language was presented to the LATC at its February 10–11, 2015, meeting. At this meeting, the Committee approved the appointment of a new working group to assist staff in substantiating recommended standards and procedures in order to obtain OAL approval. Linda Gates and Christine Anderson, former LATC members and University of California extension program reviewers, were appointed to the working group.

On June 5, 2015, LAAB confirmed that they are in the process of updating their Standards and Procedures for the Accreditation of Landscape Architecture Programs. The process included a public call for input and commentary that took place in the fall of 2014. LAAB met in the summer of 2015 to draft revisions to the Standards. In the fall of 2015, additional public input and comments were received.

On October 8, 2015, LATC received a copy of LAAB’s proposed revisions which included several suggested changes to curriculum requirements. LAAB implemented its new Accreditation Standards and Procedures in March 2016, making significant changes to the curriculum requirements beginning in 2017. Staff recommended that LATC review the LAAB Accreditation Standards and Procedures at its January 2017 meeting, and determine how to proceed. Prior to the meeting, Stephanie V. Landregan, Director of the University of California Los Angeles Extension Certificate program, requested that discussion be postponed until the April 18, 2017, LATC meeting. Her request was granted, and this topic was tabled, accordingly.
At the April 18, 2017, LATC meeting, the Committee heard comments from Ms. Landregan and Christine Anderson, president-elect of the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards, that offered insight on how LATC could incorporate LAAB accreditation standards and continue to approve University of California Extension Certificate programs. In addition, the LATC was presented with several written public comments addressing the University of California Extension Certificate programs. After discussion, the Committee directed staff to form a subcommittee to recommend regulatory changes for LATC’s consideration at a later meeting date.

Following is a chronology, to date, of the processing of LATC’s regulatory proposal for CCR § 2620.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 22, 2010</td>
<td>Proposed regulatory language approved by LATC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2010</td>
<td>Proposed regulatory language approved by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 2012</td>
<td>Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations published by OAL (Notice re-published to allow time to notify interested parties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2012</td>
<td>Public hearing, no public comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 30, 2012</td>
<td>40-Day Notice of Availability of Modified Language posted on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>Written comment (one) received during 40-day period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2013</td>
<td>Modified language to accommodate public comment approved by LATC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2013</td>
<td>Final rulemaking file submitted to DCA’s Legal Office and Division of Legislative and Policy Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2013</td>
<td>Final approval of modified language by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 2013</td>
<td>Final rulemaking file submitted to OAL for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2013</td>
<td>Decision of Disapproval of Regulatory Action issued by OAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 2013</td>
<td>LATC voted not to pursue a resubmission of rulemaking file to OAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 2014</td>
<td>Staff worked with Task Force Chair to draft justifications for proposed changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 2014</td>
<td>LAAB reported that accreditation standards are scheduled to be reviewed and updated in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 2015</td>
<td>LATC approved the appointment of a new working group to assist staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2015</td>
<td>LATC received LAAB’s suggested revisions to curriculum requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>LAAB implemented its new Accreditation Standards and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2017</td>
<td>LATC directed the formation of a subcommittee to recommend regulatory changes for LATC’s consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017–2018 Strategic Plan  Below is a summary of progress made toward the Strategic Plan objectives:

Expand Credit for Education Experience - to include degrees in related areas of study, i.e., urban planning, environmental science or horticulture, etc., to ensure that equitable requirements for education are maintained. At the November 17, 2015, LATC meeting, the Committee directed staff to agendize this objective at its next meeting. At its meeting on February 10, 2016, the Committee agreed to table the objective until its upcoming Strategic Planning session in January 2017. At its January 17, 2017, meeting, the Committee considered options of granting education credit for related, as well as unrelated, degrees in landscape architecture or architecture. After discussion and receiving public comments, the Committee directed staff to conduct a public
forum to receive additional input from the public by the next scheduled meeting, on April 18, 2017. Accordingly, staff scheduled two public forums to take place in northern and southern California, respectively, to enhance accessibility for public participation.

The first public forum was held on March 17, 2017, in Sacramento. Twelve participants attended the forum, which was facilitated by the DCA SOLID office. Participants were advised that the forum was for the sole purpose of gathering public input for consideration by the Committee. Accordingly, the feedback collected ranged from comments of support, opposition, and general feedback toward the expansion of education requirements.

The second public forum was held on April 18, 2017, in Pomona during the LATC meeting. Seventeen participants attended the forum, which was opened with a PowerPoint presentation by Program Manager Brianna Miller. Chair Trauth called on members of the public for comment. Feedback collected during the forum addresses support and opposition to the expansion of education requirements. LATC staff also collected all submitted written comments and presented them to the Committee for consideration.

At the June 15, 2017, Board meeting, the Board directed the LATC to develop a proposal to align its initial and reciprocal licensure requirements with one another, and where possible, mirror those of the Board.

At the July 13, 2017, LATC meeting, the Committee reviewed proposed language to amend CCR § 2620 (Education and Training Credits) composed by staff and DCA Legal Counsel. This proposed language reflects the Board’s licensing provisions by granting credit for related and non-related degrees while also adding an experience-only pathway. The Committee voted to establish an Education/Experience Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to determine the execution for these proposed pathways to licensure. Specifically, the Subcommittee was charged to define related and non-related degrees (baccalaureate and associate) and experience-only pathways and prescribe allowable credit for initial licensure.

The Subcommittee met on October 3, 2017, in Sacramento. The meeting discussion was facilitated by the DCA SOLID office. During the meeting, the Subcommittee discussed and determined recommended credit for each of the five initial licensure pathways under its charge and identified degrees to be defined as “related degrees.”

At the November 2, 2017 LATC meeting, the Committee reviewed the Subcommittee’s recommendations to amend CCR § 2620. The recommendations included prescribed education and experience credit for the following proposed pathways: Related Degrees (Accredited), Related Degrees (Unaccredited), Any Bachelor’s Degree, and Experience-Only. The LATC accepted the Subcommittee’s recommended pathways as presented with a modification to degrees accepted under the proposed “Related Degrees (Unaccredited)” category to be accepted under “Any Bachelor’s Degree”.

The LATC voted to recommend to the Board the approval of amended language to CCR § 2620 that expands the approved pathways for initial licensure. This proposed language will be presented to the Board for approval at its December 7, 2017, meeting.
Advocate for Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) to Institute an Internship/Experience-Based Program - to allow applicants’ participation in the licensure process early and provide a more comprehensive experience component. For the LATC (and CLARB), an AXP-like program could balance the need for multiple pathways into the profession while maintaining protection of the public’s health, safety and welfare.

At the July 13, 2017, LATC meeting, the Committee discussed advocating for the CLARB to develop a structured internship program similar to NCARB’s AXP. The Committee voted to draft a letter to CLARB advising of NCARB’s program and for CLARB to seek guidance from NCARB in order to create a similar structured internship program (using the AXP as a model). This letter was provided to CLARB on October 13, 2017. CLARB President, Christine Anderson, acknowledged receipt of the LATC’s letter and noted that CLARB will follow-up with questions, should they arise.

Incorporate a Quick Link on the Website That will Enable Consumers to Search Enforcement Actions and More Easily Identify Licensee Violations – Currently, stakeholders can be routed to enforcement actions on the LATC’s website either through the “Licensee Search” link or via the “Consumer Tab” on the header of the website. In order to make this search tool more prominent, LATC staff consulted with the DCA Publication, Design, & Editing Office (on October 9, 2017) to obtain a mock-up of a web button that would be placed on the home page of the website. This web button would specifically route a stakeholder to LATC’s enforcement actions.

At the November 2, 2017, LATC meeting, staff presented the web button mock-up to the Committee for review. The Committee voted to approve the design and placement of the web button. Accordingly, staff will amend the LATC website to incorporate the new web button.

Expand Communication to Licensees Utilizing an “Opt-In” Email Component on the Website to Increase Stakeholder Awareness of LATC - Currently, stakeholders may join the LATC email subscriber list via the “Quick Hits” section of the LATC’s website. However, this link is embedded within other links on the same column. In pursuit of making email sign-up more prominent, LATC staff presented the LATC on November 2, 2017 with a proposed web button that would be added to the home page of the website to enable stakeholders to subscribe to LATC email alerts. Additionally, staff proposed increasing its email communication to its interested parties in effort to expand information sharing and increase stakeholder awareness. Examples presented of such increased communication included providing more information about scheduled Committee meetings and how to provide public comment, information about examinations, subject matter expert recruitment, and/or regular updates relevant to current issues facing the LATC. The LATC voted to approve the Web button and increased stakeholder communication.

LATC ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

Disciplinary Guidelines As part of the Strategic Plan established by LATC at the January 2013 meeting, LATC set an objective of collaborating with the Board in order to review and update LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines. At its December 2014 meeting, the Board approved the proposed updates to their Disciplinary Guidelines and authorized staff to proceed with the required regulatory change in order to incorporate the revised Disciplinary Guidelines by reference. At its
February 10, 2015, meeting, LATC approved proposed revisions to its *Disciplinary Guidelines* based on the recent Board approval for their *Guidelines*. Staff provided the revised *Disciplinary Guidelines* to the new Deputy Attorney General Liaison for review. He suggested several amendments, which staff added to the *Guidelines*. The amended *Disciplinary Guidelines* and proposed regulatory package were approved by LATC at its August 6, 2015, meeting and by the Board at their September 10, 2015, meeting.

On October 21, 2015, staff sent DCA Legal Counsel suggested edits to the Optional Conditions section in the *Disciplinary Guidelines* for review. Legal Counsel notified staff on November 12, 2015, that the edited portions were sufficient and substantive, and would require re-approval by the Board. On November 25, 2015, Legal Counsel further advised staff to include the current version of the Board’s Quarterly Report of Compliance form (1/11) as “Attachment A” in the *Disciplinary Guidelines*. At its December 10, 2015, meeting, the Board approved the revised *Disciplinary Guidelines* and the proposed regulation to amend CCR § 2680, and delegated the authority to the EO to adopt the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and to make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed. Staff prepared the proposed regulatory package for Legal Counsel’s review and approval on March 15, 2016. On April 8, 2016, Legal Counsel advised staff that further substantive changes were necessary prior to submission to OAL. Board staff developed recommended revisions to the *Guidelines* in response to Legal Counsel’s concerns, and presented those revisions to the REC for review and consideration at its November 8, 2016, meeting. At the meeting, the REC voted to recommend to the Board that it approve the additional revisions to the *Disciplinary Guidelines* and authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory change to amend CCR § 2680, and delegated the authority to the EO to adopt the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and to make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed. Staff prepared the proposed regulatory package for Legal Counsel’s review and approval on March 15, 2016. On April 8, 2016, Legal Counsel advised staff that further substantive changes were necessary prior to submission to OAL. Board staff developed recommended revisions to the *Guidelines* in response to Legal Counsel’s concerns, and presented those revisions to the REC for review and consideration at its November 8, 2016, meeting. At the meeting, the REC voted to recommend to the Board that it approve the additional revisions to the *Disciplinary Guidelines* and authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory change to amend CCR § 154 in order to incorporate the revised *Guidelines* by reference. The additional revisions to the *Guidelines* and the proposed regulatory language to amend CCR § 154 were approved by the Board at its December 15, 2016, meeting. Staff updated its *Guidelines* to include the approved revisions that are appropriate to the LATC. On July 13, 2017, the Committee approved the revised *Guidelines* and recommended they be presented to the Board for approval.

On September 5, 2017, Legal Counsel advised LATC staff that additional substantive changes to LATC’s *Guidelines* and the proposed language to amend CCR § 2680 were necessary. These changes were communicated by legal counsel during the Board’s September 7, 2017 meeting. The Board approved the revisions to LATC’s *Guidelines*, including the necessary changes identified by Legal Counsel, as well as proposed language to amend CCR § 2680. Following the meeting, Board staff began preparing additional, recommended revisions to the Board’s *Guidelines* and the proposed language to amend CCR § 154 in response to legal counsel’s concerns, and will present those revisions to the Board for review and approval at its December 7, 2017, meeting. Upon the approval of the recommended revisions to the Board’s *Guidelines*, Board and LATC staff will collaborate in preparing the proposed regulatory packages for submission to DCA for review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcement Statistics</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Prior Month</th>
<th>FYTD 2017/18</th>
<th>5-FY Avg 2012/13-2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received/Open (Reopened):</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td>20(0)</td>
<td>26 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days to Close:</td>
<td>33 days</td>
<td>115 days</td>
<td>106 days</td>
<td>290 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age (Pending):</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>114 days</td>
<td>108 days*</td>
<td>266 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending AG: †</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplinary Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending AG:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending DA:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Reports (§5678)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received/Open:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Calculated as a monthly average of pending cases.
** Also included within “Complaints” information.
*** As of November 27, 2017
† Also included within “Pending Citations.”
ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM REPORT

Types of Complaints Received FYTD 2017/18*

- Licensee Misconduct: 39.5%
- Continuing Education: 21.6%
- Unlicensed Practice: 20.4%
- Advertising: 14.8%
- Settlement Reports: 3.7%

Complaints Received, Closed, and Pending by FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FYTD 2017/18*</th>
<th>FY 2016/17</th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FYTD reflects data as of November 27, 2017.
Comparison of Age of Pending Complaints by FY

![Bar chart showing the number of complaints by age category for different fiscal years.](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Closure</th>
<th>FYTD 2017/18*</th>
<th>FY 2016/17</th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cease/Desist Compliance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Issued</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Withdrawn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Evidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Advisement</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Jurisdiction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Violation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred for Disciplinary Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (i.e., Duplicate, Mediated, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FYTD reflects data as of November 27, 2017.
## Disciplinary and Enforcement Actions by FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>FYTD 2017/18*</th>
<th>FY 2016/17</th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Cases Initiated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Disciplinary Cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Disciplinary Orders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Citations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fines Assessed</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>$45,750</td>
<td>$79,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FYTD reflects data as of November 27, 2017.

## Most Common Violations by FY

During FY 2017/18 (as of November 27, 2017), 17 citations with administrative fines became final with 23 violations of the provisions of the Architects Practice Act and/or Board regulations. The most common violations that resulted in enforcement action during the current and previous two fiscal years are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business and Professions Code (BPC) Section or California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section</th>
<th>FYTD 2017/18*</th>
<th>FY 2016/17</th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPC § 5536(a) and/or (b) – Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPC § 5536.1(c) – Unauthorized Practice</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPC § 5536.22(a) – Written Contract</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPC § 5584 – Negligence or Willful Misconduct</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPC § 5600.05(a)(1) and/or (b) – License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements**</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR § 160(b)(2) – Rules of Professional Conduct</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FYTD reflects data as of November 27, 2017.

** Assembly Bill 1746 (Chapter 240, Statutes of 2010) became effective January 1, 2011 and amended the coursework provisions of BPC § 5600.05 by requiring an audit of license renewals beginning with the 2013 renewal cycle and adding a citation and disciplinary action provision for licensees who provide false or misleading information.
Christopher Castrillo was appointed DCA Deputy Director, Office of Board and Bureau Services on October 5, 2017. Deputy Director Castrillo will provide the Board an update on the Department.
Agenda Item E

REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2017 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Board is asked to review and take possible action on the minutes of the September 7, 2017, Board meeting.

Attachment:
September 7, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes (Draft)
A. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

Board President, Matthew McGuinness, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and Board Secretary, Tian Feng, called roll.

Board Members Present
Matthew McGuinness, President
Tian Feng, Secretary
Sylvia Kwan, Vice President
Jon Alan Baker
Denise Campos (arrived at 10:12 a.m.)
Pasqual Gutierrez
Ebony Lewis
Robert C. Pearman, Jr.
Nilza Serrano
Barry Williams

Guests Present
Mark Christian, Director of Government Relations, American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)
Catherine Roussel, Career and Outreach Coordinator, Woodbury University (Woodbury)
Marq Truscott, Member, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, Dean, School of Architecture, Woodbury

Staff Present
Doug McCauley, Executive Officer (EO)
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Alicia Hegje, Program Manager Administration/Enforcement
Brianna Miller, Program Manager, LATC
Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager Examination/Licensing
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst
Bob Carter, Architect Consultant
Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Caesar Victoria, Television Specialist, DCA

Six members of the Board present constitute a quorum. There being nine present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.
B. PRESIDENT’S PROCEDURAL REMARKS AND BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Mr. McGuinness 1) announced that the meeting is being webcast; 2) acknowledged that LATC member, Marq Truscott, was in attendance; 3) thanked Catherine Roussel for assisting with arranging the meeting site; 4) introduced Tara Welch as the Board’s new legal counsel; and 5) reminded members that votes on all motions will be taken by roll-call.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

D. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON JUNE 15, 2017 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. McGuinness asked for comments concerning the minutes of the June 15, 2017, Board meeting. Doug McCauley offered an edit on page 3, under Agenda Item E, to replace “those who practice in exempt areas” with “unlicensed individuals.”

In relation to the Board’s discussion at the June 15, 2017, meeting, Mr. Feng announced that the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) President, Kristine Harding, conveyed to him that there are current efforts underway to increase the diversity of candidates for NCARB leadership opportunities.

- Nilza Serrano moved to approve the June 15, 2017, Board meeting minutes, with an edit on page 3 under Agenda Item E changing “those who practice in exempt areas” to “unlicensed individuals.”

   Barry Williams seconded the motion.

   Members Baker, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. Member Campos was absent at time of vote. The motion passed 9-0.

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT- UPDATE ON BOARD’S ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT, EXAMINATION, LICENSING, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that its next meeting, scheduled for December 7, 2017, will be in Sacramento. He also provided an update on the enforcement case management and licensing system known as BreEZe. He reported that Board staff met with DCA Office of Information Services staff on July 11, 2017, when the Board learned that BreEZe Phase Three is no longer an implementation group; instead, remaining DCA boards and bureaus may now opt into BreEZe if they choose. Mr. McCauley informed that the Board anticipates it will opt to incorporate BreEZe into its business operations, and that preparations to identify key milestones are underway.

Mr. McCauley also reported that Senate Bill 547, the legislation that, in part, extends the sunset provisions for the California Council of Interior Design Certification (CCIDC) until 2022, is on the Senate floor. He noted that monitoring the Sunset Review process for CCIDC is valuable because the Board can become aware of current cross-cutting and evolving issues and dynamics as it prepares for its Sunset Review in 2018.
Mr. McCauley reported, in response to Jon Baker’s request from the June 15, 2017, meeting concerning the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) wait-time to retest, that the structure of the examination item bank presents issues that make reducing the wait-time problematic. He asked the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) to be more definitive and to provide a formal assessment with possible variables to consider for future development. Mr. McCauley informed that the OPES will attend the December 7, 2017, meeting, and will be available to answer questions and develop a plan of action. Mr. Baker enquired about the number of different CSE forms that exist, to which Mr. McCauley stated that the number of forms is protected information and due to examination security, cannot be discussed at a public meeting.

Mr. McCauley reported that the LATC and the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) currently do not have a structured internship program, so LATC is now recommending to CLARB that it develop such a program. He explained that a structured program will ensure that emerging professionals get experience in all critical areas of practice, which would protect the public health, safety, and welfare; it also helps to better prepare candidates for examination.

Mr. McCauley opined that LATC enforcement metrics are impressive, and reported that the five-year average for case-aging is 266 days, but is currently at 109 days. He also reported that the Board’s enforcement metrics are similarly positive, exceeding the 151-day average at 109 days.

Ms. Serrano enquired about the high number of California-candidates that have failed various divisions of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) 5.0, to which Mr. McCauley informed that declines in candidate performance are common whenever a new examination is released; he reminded the Board that it saw a similar pattern when NCARB introduced ARE 4.0. Mr. McCauley indicated that the pass/fail metrics generally stabilize over time. Ms. Serrano expressed concern that the new ARE 5.0 may impact a candidate’s ability to obtain licensure (because of the high fail rate), to which Marcus Reinhardt informed that candidates still have the option to take ARE 4.0 or ARE 5.0 until June 30, 2018. Ms. Serrano asked if a failing score on the ARE 5.0 will have a monetary impact on a candidate, to which Mr. Reinhardt answered that any failed examination requires a candidate to retest. Sylvia Kwan commented that the fee to take ARE 5.0 is less expensive than ARE 4.0 because ARE 5.0 administers fewer divisions. Ms. Kwan also noted that NCARB is creating conditions for reduced costs, and that companies often pay for their employees to take the examination. Mr. Feng opined that candidates are adapting to ARE 5.0. Ms. Serrano opined that ARE 4.0 and 5.0 low pass rates for California candidates are unacceptable because students spend a lot of time and money on an education, yet cannot pass an examination. Mr. McCauley reported that NCARB has communicated with the profession and test-preparation companies to provide accurate, publicly available information about the ARE 5.0. He opined that this kind of engagement should lead to better-prepared candidates who take the examination. Mr. Baker opined that until ARE 5.0, the examination was not very well integrated, which contributed to the problem of low pass rates. He also commented that much of the examination now requires candidates to have sufficient practical experience, which is obtained through an effective Architectural Experience Program (AXP). Mr. Baker observed that, consistently and across the board, in almost every category, California candidate performance is lower than the national average. He conveyed his desire for staff to bring more detailed data about this phenomenon (e.g., accredited degree, non-accredited degree, and experience only candidates) to identify what is impacting the average. Mr. Reinhardt indicated that the Board’s psychometrician, OPES, has been asked about this concern. He explained that because there are many ways for an individual to obtain licensure in California, there are more variables than the Board can account for since there are factors unique to each candidate and
their chosen path to licensure. Ebony Lewis conveyed that it is very important for the Board to understand which pathways to licensure are more successful than others so that emerging professionals may know which pathways lead to successful outcomes; Mr. Baker concurred. Mr. McGuinness expressed concern that the information being requested will not result in changes to the examination, and, instead, might produce unintended consequences. He noted that the examination tests for minimum level of competency, and warned that if the Board seeks the data, other jurisdictions could use it against California candidates. Mr. Baker assured that no one is suggesting potentially compromising the rigor of the examination, but if an individual chose a pathway to licensure that puts them at a disadvantage the Board should at least be aware of why the pathway is less advantageous. He explained that because the data might reveal information that the Board believes is problematic is not a valid reason not consider the data to understand what is happening. Mr. Williams asked how candidates can effectively be classified, to which Mr. McCauley replied that staff will consult with NCARB to collect the best information available. Mr. McCauley also reminded the Board that OPES will be available to speak and answer questions about the CSE at the next meeting, which will help the Board digest the data.

Mr. McCauley noted that the CSE wait-time was discussed at a recent meeting with AIACC’s Emerging Professional’s Academy, which memorialized its interest in the issue. He directed the Board’s attention to their letter, which, he advised, should be considered written public comment to help inform the Board’s actions at the December meeting. Mr. Baker asked if the Board has seen a Test Plan for the new CSE, to which Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that the most recent CSE Test Plan was presented to the Board by OPES in 2014; Vickie Mayer noted that the CSE Test Plan is updated every five to seven years. Mr. Baker asked if the Test Plan will be updated based on the release of ARE 5.0, to which Mr. McCauley explained that the Board always uses the most recent Occupational Analysis (OA) from NCARB to conduct a side-by-side analysis. Mr. Reinhard informed that the current Test Plan will be in effect until the next OA is released, likely around the year 2019.

F. PRESENTATION ON WOODBURY UNIVERSITY’S INTEGRATED PATH TO ARCHITECTURAL LICENSURE (IPAL) BY INGALILL WAHLROOS-RITTER, DEAN

Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter of Woodbury’s School of Architecture gave a presentation on its IPAL program. The presentation covered:

1. Woodbury’s federal designation as a Hispanic-serving institution;
2. The school’s ethical philosophy and commitment to architectural practice;
3. Requirements for licensure (i.e., education, experience, examination);
4. Woodbury’s IPAL structure and timeline; and
5. Efforts to raise awareness of IPAL.

Two architecture students, one Bachelor of Architecture student and one Master of Architecture student, shared with the Board their IPAL and AXP experience. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter explained how it can be a financial burden on architecture firms to hire IPAL students, and recommended, as an incentive, that firms be recognized by the profession for providing IPAL students with valuable exposure to architectural projects. She recommended, for instance, that The American Institute of Architects offer IPAL-designated architecture firms membership discounts.

Mr. Williams asked if the IPAL student curriculum and traditional architecture student curriculum at Woodbury is integrated. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter informed that the curriculum at Woodbury has not
changed, but noted that firms offer suggestions about skills students should learn earlier in their architectural education. Mr. Baker thanked Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter for her efforts to place students at firms. He opined that the work experience will enhance IPAL students’ career advancement because, by the time they graduate, they will already have hands-on experience at firms. Mr. Baker asked why Woodbury has not restructured its program in a way that prepares students for IPAL participation. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter replied that the balance between classroom studio work and professional practice should be weighed to allow room for different teaching and learning outcomes. She acknowledged that students at the school of architecture, collectively, struggle to pass examinations, and stated that the school’s approach is designed to help them. Mr. Baker commented that the more Woodbury focuses on structuring its program to prepare students, the more the Board can help the program and the students.

Ms. Serrano asked how Woodbury is a designated Hispanic-serving institution, to which Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter explained that the federal government recognizes that greater-than 25 percent of students at Woodbury are Hispanic and, therefore, the university qualifies for federal funding. Ms. Serrano asked about the international versus domestic student ratio at Woodbury, to which Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter reported that approximately 20 percent of students at Woodbury are international students. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter informed that international students have enquired about participating in the IPAL program, and she can see no reason why these students may not. She also estimated that 70 percent of Woodbury’s architectural students stay in Los Angeles after graduation. Robert C. Pearman, Jr. asked what would happen to an IPAL student if the IPAL-participating firm he or she works for decides to discontinue participating in the program, to which Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter stated that another placement will be found for that student. Denise Campos enquired about the IPAL program acceptance rate at Woodbury. Ms. Roussel opined that 50 percent of students who apply are accepted into the IPAL program at Woodbury. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter agreed that Ms. Roussel’s estimation is likely more accurate.

Ms. Kwan suggested that firms who employ IPAL students should apply for grants to help cover the cost of hiring these students. She offered to raise the idea at her next Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards’ Executive Committee meeting to stimulate thought at NCARB about how to support firms who participate in the IPAL program. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter added that, perhaps, firms can think of their employment of IPAL students as a kind of philanthropic gift, which may then provide tax benefits. Mr. McGuinness supported Ms. Kwan’s idea for firms to seek grant funding to finance IPAL students’ employment.

Mr. Williams noted that California State Polytechnic University, Pomona is geographically isolated from architecture firms, but the University is considering developing an IPAL program. Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter noted that administrators from other universities have asked if their students can participate in IPAL at Woodbury for similar reasons. Mr. Pearman asked if employment under the Division of the State Architect (DSA) is qualifying AXP experience, to which Mr. Reinhardt answered that it would indeed be valid employment experience so long as the candidate works under an architect. Mr. Pearman suggested the Board encourage the DSA to accept as many IPAL students as they can.

Ms. Campos congratulated Ms. Wahlroos-Ritter and Woodbury on its positive student diversity metrics.
REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE (REC) REPORT

Mr. Williams updated the Board on the recent activities of the REC and informed that the Committee last met on August 24, 2017, to work on its assigned 2017-2018 Strategic Plan objectives. Mr. Williams reported that:

1. The Board’s architect consultants and staff are in the process of making necessary updates and revisions to the content of the Building Official Information Guide. The proposed changes are planned to be presented to the REC for review and discussion at its next meeting.

2. Staff presented the REC with proposed methods to further educate consumers on the standard of care, including:
   a. Updating and expanding the content of the “Consumers” section of the Board’s website;
   b. Developing and sharing more consumer-oriented materials through the Board’s social media accounts; and
   c. Promoting the Architect Consultants’ Education and Information Program.

The REC requested that staff further research the intent of the objective (to educate consumers on the standard of care), for the REC to develop its message to consumers and made a recommendation to the Board.

3. Staff provided the REC with statistics related to the Board’s citation collection rate over the past five years, which is currently 54 percent (with collection rates for 78 percent for licensees and 41 percent for unlicensed individuals). Staff will reassess the effectiveness of the Board’s citation collection methods after the collection agency contract is in place and the outstanding accounts have been pursued by the collection agency.

4. Staff shared its intention to create a checklist for new licensees containing: license renewal and coursework requirements; mailing address and business entity reporting requirements; common violations of the Architects Practice Act; and information regarding the Architect Consultants’ Education and Information Program. The draft checklist is planned to be presented to the REC for review and discussion at its next meeting.

Mr. Williams also reported that the REC made a recommendation for the Board’s consideration concerning its retention schedule for complaint and citation records. Alicia Hegje explained that every DCA board and bureau is required to maintain and review their Records Retention Schedule every three years. Ms. Hegje informed that the Board’s current Schedule is due to expire in December 2018, which requires complaint and citation records to be retained in the Board’s office for five years after they are closed, and then be confidentially destroyed. She further reported that, in the past, citations were retained in the Board’s office and disclosed to the public for 100 years; the Board then reduced the disclosure period for citations from 20 years to 5 years in 2005. Ms. Hegje explained that the current five-year retention period often prevents staff from being able to disclose citation information to consumers, and from establishing a pattern of past citations to be used in future disciplinary and enforcement actions. Therefore, to increase consumer protection, she asked the Board to consider REC’s recommendation to increase the retention period for the citation records and related complaint files, and the public disclosure period for citations from 5 years to 10 years. Ms. Hegje also indicated that the proposed changes would allow for additional time to collect outstanding fines from
Mr. Feng asked for background information about why, in 2005, the retention period was reduced from 20 years to 5 years. Vickie Mayer recalled that the REC believed a five-year retention period seemed to be more reasonable. However, Ms. Mayer explained that staff finds the five-year limitation to be problematic, especially when trying to establish a pattern, collecting an outstanding fine, or disclosing citation information to consumers (information may not be available if record is beyond five years). She reported that staff researched the retention schedules of other DCA boards and bureaus in similar professions, and some of them have 15-year retention periods. Ms. Mayer opined that 10 years would be enough time to fit the Board’s needs and address its concerns as staff provides the information to consumers. Mr. Feng stated that he supports the recommended retention period extension to 10 years, but would like to see additional reporting or evidence about the 10-year timeframe being in alignment with best practices. Mr. Pearman opined that 10 years seems reasonable when one considers that a judgement in California is valid for 10 years. Pasqual Gutierrez asked if there is any monetary impact to increasing the number of years of records retention, to which Mr. McCauley stated that any monetary impact would be minor and absorbable. Ms. Serrano asked if the records are in electronic or paper form, to which Mr. McCauley confirmed that the records are all in paper form.

Mark Christian agreed that the recommendation to increase the retention period to 10 years is reasonable for the reasons explained by staff. Mr. Christian stated that AIACC would have no issue with the increase. He asked the Board to consider keeping the retention policy for violations that do not involve the performance of services (e.g., continuing education [CE] requirements) at five years, if it could be divided in such a way. Mr. McCauley explained that CE violations may seem relatively minor, but, in most of cases, one has signed under penalty of perjury that they have completed their CE coursework requirements, yet have not. Mr. Williams reported that the REC discussed that very point and determined that because one certifies they have completed the required coursework, it is indicative of a character/personal misconduct issue, and is still a violation that should be enforced the same as any other violation. Ms. Campos asked for clarification in her understanding that enforcement records will be purged after five years under the current retention schedule. Ms. Hegje explained that if, six years ago there was a citation against someone, the Board would have no record of that citation if that person was reported to have engaged in that same or another violation today. Ms. Mayer also noted that, if a citation is currently reportable and one violates the Act again, if the old violation is purged while the new violation is being investigated before it goes to hearing, it cannot be added to the new complaint as an aggravating factor or pattern. She suggested reassessing the effectiveness of the 10-year retention period in the future.

- **Tian Feng moved to approve the REC’s recommendation to extend the Board’s retention period for citations and related complaint files, and the public disclosure period for citations from 5 years to 10 years.**

 Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

Tara Welch commented, in response to Mr. Christian’s query, that it is possible to divide violations under different retention time periods. Ms. Welch advised the Board not to consider that approach to avoid inadvertently encouraging violations of the Act based on retention time. She noted that it would also invite administrative problems for the Board that could threaten consumer protection. Mr. Christian reiterated his rationale for the request to exempt certain

unlicensed individuals through a collection agency and the Franchise Tax Board “Intercept Program.”
violations from the proposed 10-year retention period; certain violations that have no direct harm to a member of the public or involvement with a client. Ms. Serrano conveyed her desire to protect consumers from all violations of the Act as much as possible.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.

H. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

Brianna Miller updated the Board on the recent activities of the LATC, and informed that the Committee last met on July 13, 2017, in Sacramento.

Ms. Miller reminded the Board of its June 15, 2017, request for the LATC to develop a proposal for its initial and reciprocal licensure requirements to closely align with one another and, where possible, mirror those of the Board (which includes an experience-only pathway). She informed that, in response to the Board’s request, staff prepared a draft Table of Equivalents to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) to align with that of the Board’s, which was presented to the LATC at its July 13, 2017, meeting. Ms. Miller reported that the Committee subsequently approved the pathways noted on the draft Table of Equivalents, including “experience only,” and established a subcommittee to determine the amount of experience credit appropriate for the proposed new pathways, and to determine what types of degrees related to landscape architecture should be considered. She also noted the proposed licensure pathways detailing those which were accepted compared to those which were accepted and referred to the subcommittee for further discussion. Ms. Miller informed that the subcommittee is scheduled to meet on October 3, 2017, and its recommendations will be considered by the LATC at its November meeting. She directed the Board’s attention to a letter contained in the meeting packet, dated August 25, 2017, from the LATC Chair to the Board President that conveyed LATC’s agreement with the Board regarding the importance of developing a comprehensive licensure proposal that supports diverse pathways into the profession. Ms. Miller also directed the Board’s attention to historical information about CCR §§ 2620 and 2615 (Form of Examinations). Mr. Feng commented that he hopes the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee is able to successfully meet its charge. Mr. Baker asked for clarity about the evaluation of a candidate’s training and educational experience, to which Ms. Miller answered that the chart in Attachment 5 compares the LATC’s maximum education credit allowed with the Board’s maximum credit for similar experience (out of eight years).

Ms. Miller reminded the Board that it previously approved the LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines at its December 15, 2016, meeting. She reported that LATC staff recently reviewed and revised its Disciplinary Guidelines to mirror the Board’s wherever possible, and directed the Board’s attention to recommended highlighted revisions to the LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines. Ms. Welch informed the Board that a few additional substantive items should first be reviewed as it considers whether to approve LATC’s proposed revisions to the Disciplinary Guidelines. The Board was asked to consider the following additional changes to the proposed revisions:

- Change heading C under II. General Considerations, to “Cost Reimbursement” for purposes of consistency;

- Delete item 9 under heading D Factors to be Considered, as its inclusion is inappropriate and unnecessary;
• Change the word “statute” to “section” under heading IV. Disciplinary Guidelines;

• Delete “Plea of Nolo Contendere” in the heading of Section 5676 under IV. Disciplinary Guidelines;

• Add “renewal” before “fee” under VI. Conditions of Probation, item 5. Maintain Active and Current License, to specify the type of fees referenced in that text;

• Delete proposed sentence “Notice and opportunity to be heard are not required …”, “or the matter is referred to the Attorney General’s office,” and paragraph beginning with “If respondent has not complied…,” under VI. Conditions of Probation, item 8. Violation of Probation; to avoid the appearance that due process may be denied.

• Change heading under 16. Cost Recovery back to Cost Reimbursement to be consistent; and

• Change authority cited for Proposed Regulatory Language Title 16, CCR § 2680 from “Section 11425.50(e)” of Government Code to “Section 11400.20” as a more appropriate reference.

Mr. Pearman asked if the Board should review its Disciplinary Guidelines for similar changes, to which Ms. Welch replied that, indeed, it should review its Disciplinary Guidelines for similar changes if the Board approves the modifications to LATC’s Guidelines.

• Nilza Serrano moved to approve the proposed regulatory language, as modified, direct the EO to take all steps necessary to initiate the formal rulemaking process, and authorize the EO to make any non-substantive changes to the rulemaking package, and, if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, adopt the proposed regulatory changes, as modified.

Robert Pearman seconded the motion.

Members Baker, Campos, Feng, Gutierrez, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Williams and President McGuinness voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 10-0.

Mr. Pearman noted that the LATC CSE pass-rate was approximately 70 percent two years ago but has recently dropped to 50 percent. He asked if this is something to be concerned about, to which Mr. McCauley explained that data regarding the candidate population is not immediately available and that he would follow-up with Mr. Pearman. Mr. Pearman also observed that the LATC has no public members, and asked if the Board should consider changing the Committee makeup for the greater public interest. Mr. McCauley indicated that the issue was raised and considered during a previous Sunset Review, and resulted in no change to the composition of the LATC membership due to opposition from the previous Administration.

I. REVIEW OF FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES

The Board agreed to have staff survey member availability for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday Board meetings in 2018.
J. CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into closed session to:

1. Consider action on the June 15, 2017, Closed Session Minutes; and
2. Deliberate on disciplinary matters.

K. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened open session.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:16 p.m.
PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Members of the public may address the Board regarding items not specified on the meeting agenda at this time. However, the Board may not discuss or take action on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Board’s next Strategic Planning session and/or place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

Public comments will also be taken on agenda items at the time the item is heard and prior to the Board taking any action on said items. Total time allocated for public comment may be limited at the discretion of the Board President.
ELECTION OF 2018 BOARD OFFICERS

Business and Professions Code section 5518 states:

The Board shall elect from its members a president, vice president, and a secretary to hold office for one year, or until their successors are duly elected and qualified.

The Board Member Administrative Procedure Manual provides for a nomination process as follows:

The Board president shall appoint a Nominations Committee prior to the last meeting of the calendar year and shall give consideration to appointing a public and a professional member of the Board to the Committee. The Committee’s charge will be to recommend a slate of officers for the following year. The Committee’s recommendation will be based on the qualifications, recommendations, and interest expressed by the Board members. A survey of Board members will be conducted to obtain interest in each officer position. A Nominations Committee member is not precluded from running for an officer position. If more than one Board member is interested in an officer position, the Nominations Committee will make a recommendation to the Board and others will be included on the ballot for a runoff, if they desire. The results of the Nominations Committee’s findings and recommendations will be provided to the Board members in the meeting packet prior to the election of officers. Notwithstanding the Nominations Committee’s recommendations, Board members may be nominated from the floor at the meeting.

Board President Matthew McGuinness appointed Pasqual V. Gutierrez and himself to serve as members of the Nominations Committee. All Board members were surveyed as to their interest, and the Nominations Committee recommends the following slate of officers for 2018 for the Board’s consideration based on the qualifications, recommendations, and interest expressed by the Board members:

Nominations Committee Recommended Slate of Officers for 2018
President - Sylvia Kwan
Vice President - Tian Feng
Secretary - Barry Williams

The following member(s) were also nominated/volunteered for officer positions:
Denise Campos - Secretary

At this meeting, Messrs. Gutierrez and McGuinness will present the recommended slate of officers to the Board for its consideration. The Board is asked to consider the slate as recommended by the Committee and elect the officers for 2018.
DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATION REGARDING 2017 OCTAVIUS MORGAN DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

The Board, at its September 2000 meeting, voted to establish an annual system for recognizing the volunteers who contribute to the Board and to grant a special award for distinguished service. The award was named the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award, after the first Board President. The following guidelines for the award were approved by the Board.

**Purpose:** To recognize and thank our committed volunteers on their efforts.

**Criteria:** Volunteers who, over time, have provided the Board with outstanding and dedicated service. Potential winners would be committee or task forces members, exam subject matter experts/commissioners, or others. Board members are eligible, provided they have served the Board five or more years in addition to their terms on the Board.

**Number of awards:** Three to five per year in order to spread the recognition.

**Selection process:** Board members and staff nominate individuals. The names of those receiving awards are announced at the December Board meeting.

**Award:** The Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award recipients would be sent an appropriate item of recognition and would be noted in the Board’s newsletter. Board members will purchase the item of recognition from their own monies if prohibitions are in place from making the purchase from Board funds (motion approved at December 5-6, 2012, Board meeting).

The following individuals have been recipients of the award:

2016 – Connie Christensen and Don Hodges  
2015 – Robert Greig and Alex Rogic  
2014 – Albert Okuma and Charles Smith  
2013 – Loangle Newsome and Linda Zubiate  
2012 – Victor Newlove, Roger North, and Roger Wilcox  
2011 – Denis Henmi, Phyllis A. Newton, and Richard R. Tannahill  
2010 – Wayne Holta, Arlee Monson, and John Petrucelli  
2009 – Richard Cooling, Richard Dodd, Morris Gee, and Larry Segrue  
2008 – Chad R. Overway, Eric H. Jacobsen, and Bruce L. Macpherson  
2007 – John Canestro, Gerald Cole, and Michelle Plotnick  
2006 – Allan Cooper, Robert George, and Richard Holden  
2005 – Andrew Barker, Robert DePietro, and Paul Neel  
2003 – Carol Tink-Fox, Jim McGlothlin, and Ron Ronconi  
2002 – Glenn A. Gall, Lucille M. Hodges, RK Stewart, and Richard T. Conrad  
2001 – George Ikenoyama, Fred Yerou, Richard Crowell, Jack Paddon, and Cynthia Easton  
2000 – Charles J. Brown, Mackey W. Deasy, and Barry Wasserman
Staff were asked to submit nominations for 2017 recipients to the Board for consideration at its December 7, 2017, meeting; a list of the recommended nominees will be provided to the Board members prior to the meeting.

The Board is asked to consider the 2017 Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award nominees and reconfirm that Board members will purchase the awards from their own personal funds.
DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB) TRI-NATIONAL MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE BETWEEN CANADA, MEXICO, AND THE UNITED STATES

In February 2014, NCARB announced the long-anticipated implementation of the *Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice* (Tri-National MRA), attachment 1, between the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities, Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certificacion of Mexico, and NCARB. The Board previously indicated on the NCARB Annual Licensing Requirements Survey that it would accept the Tri-National MRA, which recognizes the NCARB Certificate issued to foreign architects who have successfully completed the rigorous evaluation process (equal to the former Broadly Experienced Foreign Architects program), for the purpose of providing reciprocal licensure in California.

In its October 3, 2017, letter (attachment 2) NCARB requested Member Boards that responded with acceptance of the Tri-National MRA sign the *Letter of Undertaking* (attachment 3). The underlying goal of the Tri-National MRA is to ensure the qualifications of those Canadian, Mexican, and United States architects interested in pursuing licensure across borders are thoroughly vetted and the competencies and eligibility requirements (attachments 4-6) are met.

The Board is asked to review the Tri-National MRA and consider granting the Board President authority to sign the *Letter of Undertaking* as an endorsement of NCARB’s efforts to foster the exchange of professional credentials in support of cross-borders practice with Canada and Mexico.

Attachments:
1. *Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice*
2. Letter from NCARB dated October 3, 2017
3. *Letter of Undertaking*
4. Tri-National Competencies
5. Eligibility Requirements for Canadian Architects
6. Eligibility Requirements for Mexican Architects
10 March 2014

Dear Member Board Members and Member Board Executive;

After many years of discussion, we are pleased to announce that NCARB has granted an NCARB Certificate to two Mexican architects that recently completed the formal pilot program of the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice (known as “the Agreement”) and satisfied the terms of the Agreement. We encourage you to recognize the NCARB Certificate issued to architects who have successfully completed the rigorous Tri-National process as equal to the BEFA, and therefore grant a license to those seeking licensure in your jurisdiction.

As background, the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994 spurred a discussion between leaders and regulators of the architecture profession in Canada, Mexico, and the United States regarding ways to facilitate the mutual recognition of licensure credentials among all three countries. While NAFTA does not govern or regulate mutual recognition of licensure credentials, it represents a desire to pursue a special relationship between our three countries. Following many years of negotiations, the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice and its Implementation Mechanisms were signed by the leadership of the Council in October 2005 and ratified by our Member Boards at the Annual Meeting in June 2006. That vote positioned the Council to work in tandem with representatives of Canada and Mexico and proceed with the implementation of the Agreement.

The terms of the Tri-National Agreement, available for review on the Members Only section of the NCARB website, are closely aligned with those of the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect (BEFA) program which served as its model. Both of these parallel processes require a recognized degree in architecture leading to licensure, comprehensive post-licensure experience in the home country, the submission of a dossier documenting project-specific experience, and an in-person interview conducted in the language of the host country.

Although there are many similarities between the programs, there are two significant differences in which the expectations of the Tri-National program exceed the BEFA:

- The Tri-National Agreement requires not less than 10 years of post-licensure practice, 2 years of which must be in responsible control of comprehensive practice, as opposed to the 7 years required by the BEFA, and
- The Mexican applicants must first complete an extensive in-country evaluation and Certification process conducted by their local colegio and the Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certificacion (CONARC).
Even though the Tri-National Agreement includes architects from Canada and Mexico, the Council anticipates that only Mexican architects will apply for the NCARB Certificate through the Tri-National Agreement. Our long-standing relationship and recently enacted MRA with Canada provides a more direct path for those Canadian architects seeking the Certificate.

Development, pilot testing, and implementation of the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement has been a long and arduous process supported by volunteers, leadership, and staff from all three countries. The underlying goal has always been to remove barriers and provide qualified architects the opportunity to offer professional services across borders while ensuring the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare. Should you wish further explanation or discussion, please feel free to contact Stephen Nutt, Senior Architect/Advisor to the CEO at snutt@ncarb.org.

Thank you for your support,

Blakely C. Dunn, AIA, NCARB
President / Chair of the Board

Michael J. Armstrong
Chief Executive Officer
TRI-NATIONAL MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT
FOR INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE
OAXACA, MÉXICO
OCTOBER 7, 2005

Among
COMITÉ MEXICANO PARA LA PRÁCTICA INTERNACIONAL DE LA
ARQUITECTURA (COMPIAR)
comprising
FEDERACIÓN DE COLEGIOS DE ARQUITECTOS DE LA REPÚBLICA
MEXICANA (FCARM)
And the
ASOCIACIÓN DE INSTITUCIONES DE ENSEÑANZA DE LA ARQUITECTURA
DE LA REPÚBLICA MEXICANA (ASINEA),
And the
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS
(NCARB, U.S.A.)
And the
COMMITTEE OF CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL COUNCILS (CCAC)

And witnessed by the
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS (AIA)
And the
ROYAL ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF CANADA (RAIC)

Whereas, the signatories, COMPIAR, NCARB and CCAC, are the national representatives of the Competent Bodies of Colegios, Member Boards and Provincial/Territorial Associations of the Domestic Jurisdictions in charge of negotiations regarding the procedures to regulate international practice of architects within Mexico, the United States and Canada, commit themselves to carry out the agreement described below, in the spirit of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA, Chapter XII, Annex 1210.5) and

Whereas AIA and RAIC, the national bodies representing the profession of architecture within the United States and Canada, endorse and support this agreement, and

Whereas, the signatories share the goal of allowing qualified architects to offer professional services within their Domestic Jurisdictions under circumstances that protect the health, safety and welfare of the public and respect the architectural culture, heritage and laws of the Domestic Jurisdiction in which the services are performed, and

Whereas, all parties recognize that differences among the standards and processes for licensing/registering architects in the Domestic Jurisdiction of Mexico, the United States and Canada must be duly respected and appropriately addressed in order to reach this goal, now

Therefore, COMPIAR (FCARM and ASINEA), NCARB, and CCAC express their
commitment and understanding of the following, which shall not modify any other agreements between the signatories, and witnesses hereto.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Agreement:

COMPIAR
Is the Mexican committee of architects established by the Mexican government in charge of negotiations regarding the international practice of foreign architects in México and Mexican architects abroad. It is chaired jointly by FCARM and ASINEA.

COLEGIO
Colegio refers to a local association of architects officially recognized under Mexican law.

COMPETENT BODY
Refers to, as applicable, the Federación de Colegios, Member Board, or Provincial /Territorial Association.

LICENSED ARCHITECT
Licensed/registered refers to the licensing, registering, certifying, granting a Cédula or otherwise authorizing an architect to use the title “architect” and otherwise engage in the Practice of Architecture within the applicable jurisdiction by a Competent Body.

MEMBER BOARD
Member Board refers to the agency in the United States jurisdictions with authority by law to license/register architects and otherwise regulate use of the title “architect” and the practice of architecture within the applicable jurisdiction.

PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATION
Provincial/Territorial Association refers to the self-regulating licensing bodies in Canada empowered by law to register/license architects and otherwise regulate use of the title “architect” and the practice of architecture within the applicable jurisdiction.

RESPONSIBLE CONTROL
Responsible control refers to that amount of control over and detailed knowledge of the content of architectural technical submissions during their preparation as is ordinarily exercised by registered/licensed architects in the Host Jurisdiction applying the required standard of care.

PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE
The Practice of Architecture refers to an architect being registered/licensed to design buildings for human habitation without limit as to type, size, or cost of construction.

FORM AND CONTENT OF AGREEMENT
1. Participants

1.1 The parties to implement the agreement are:

1.1.1 Federación de Colegios de Arquitectos de la República Mexicana (FCARM), and the Asociación de Instituciones de Enseñanza de la Arquitectura de la República Mexicana (ASINEA)
1.1.2 National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)
1.1.3 Committee of Canadian Architectural Councils (CCAC)

1.2 The parties endorsing and supporting the agreement are:

1.2.1 American Institute of Architects (AIA)
1.2.2 Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (RAIC)

1.3 For Mexico, the competent authorities other than the parties are

1.3.1 The Secretaría de Economía – Dirección General de Negociaciones y Servicios (the Secretary of Economy – General Directorate of Negotiations and Services), and
1.3.2 The Secretaría de Educación Pública – Dirección General de Profesiones (the Secretary of Education – General Directorate of Professions)

1.4 For the United States, the competent authorities other than the parties are the state and territorial boards of architecture

1.5 For Canada, the competent authorities other than the parties are:
The provincial/territorial architectural associations

1.6 Status and area of competence of each party

1.6.1. COMPIAR is the official body established by the Mexican Federal Government to negotiate the international practice of foreign architects in México and Mexican architects abroad. It is chaired jointly by FCARM and ASINEA.
1.6.2 FCARM is the organization in Mexico that represents the local Colegios. These Colegios are mandated by law to protect the title “architect” within their jurisdiction.
1.6.3 ASINEA is the organization that represents the schools of architecture in Mexico
1.6.4 NCARB is the organization whose membership comprises the 55 state and territorial boards of architecture that regulate the profession in the United States.
1.6.5 CCAC is the committee that represents the 11 Canadian Provincial and Territorial Associations that are mandated by law to regulate the profession in Canada.

2. Purpose of the agreement
2.1 This Agreement establishes criteria, procedures and measures for the mutual recognition of qualifications that will facilitate the portability of qualifications through reciprocity for the provision of services within the NAFTA countries. The purpose of this agreement is to:

2.1.1 Establish mutually acceptable standards for practice and professionalism, including expertise, autonomy, commitment and accountability.
2.1.2 Establish a system of governance to serve the Agreement that enables it to properly monitor performance, facilitate implementation, including the audit of academic standards and systems of continuing professional development (CPD) and resolve disagreements.
2.1.3 Ensure consumer protection and safeguard the interest of society, architecture, the environment, sustainability, culture and public health, safety, welfare.
2.1.4 Set standards in recognizing equivalence in qualifications;
2.1.5 Prevent practice by unqualified persons.
2.1.6 Not supersede or otherwise affect any other agreements between or among any of the parties.

3. Reference and background framework

Principles of Professionalism

Members of the architectural profession in the NAFTA countries are dedicated to the highest standards of professionalism, integrity and competence, and bring to society unique skills and aptitudes essential to the sustainable development of the built environment and the welfare of their societies and cultures. Principles of professionalism are established in legislation, as well as in codes of ethics and regulations defining professional conduct

3.1.1 Expertise
Architects possess a systematic body of knowledge, skills and theory developed through education, graduate and post-graduate training, and experience. The process of architectural education, training and examination is structured to assure the public that, when an architect is engaged to perform professional services, that architect has met acceptable standards enabling competent performance of those services. Furthermore, members of most professional societies of architects are charged to maintain and advance their knowledge of the art and science of architecture, to respect the body of architectural accomplishment and to contribute to its growth.

Autonomy
Architects provide objective expert advice to the client and/or users. Architects are charged to uphold the ideal that learned and uncompromised professional judgment should take precedence over any other motive in the pursuit of the art and science of architecture. Architects are also charged to embrace the spirit and letter of the laws governing their professional affairs and to consider thoughtfully the social, urban and environmental impact of their professional activities.

Commitment
Architects bring a high level of selfless dedication to the work done on behalf of their clients and society. Members of the profession are charged to serve their clients and the public in a competent and professional manner and to exercise unprejudiced and unbiased judgment on their behalf.

Accountability
Architects are aware of their responsibility for the independent and, if necessary, critical advice provided to their clients and for the effects of their work on society and the environment. Architects undertake to perform professional services only when they, together with those whom they may engage as consultants, are qualified by education, training and/or experience in the specific technical areas involved.

3.2 Professional Designation

The designation “architect” is reserved by law to a person who is professionally and academically qualified and registered/licensed/certified to practice architecture in the jurisdiction in which s/he practices and is responsible for advocating the fair and sustainable development, welfare and cultural expression of society’s habitat in terms of space, form and historical context.

3.3 Scope of Practice of Architecture

Architects registered in a jurisdiction are required to follow the laws and codes in force in each jurisdiction in which they have been authorized to practice. Architects practicing outside their own country under this agreement are limited to providing those services that local architects are permitted to provide and will only provide those services they customarily provide in their own country if less than those services permitted in the host jurisdiction.

This MRA recognizes the highest standards of education and practical training of architect within the three countries, which enables them to fulfill their fundamental professional requirements. These standards recognize different national, educational traditions and, therefore, allow for factors of equivalency.

4. Mutual Recognition

The following are the foundations of the Mutual Recognition Agreement:

The circumstances under which the Competent Bodies of the three nations shall accept the credentials of a licensed/registered Foreign Architect as a basis for being licensed/registered to engage in the Practice of Architecture in the Host Jurisdiction, subject to the requirements of periodic renewal.

The circumstances under which a minimum of 10 years of defined professional experience
in the Practice of Architecture by an Architect licensed/registered in his/her home jurisdiction.

The nature and extent of the demonstrations to be required by the Competent Bodies of each nation for showing that the Foreign Architect has acquired knowledge of the codes, laws and other matters applicable to the Practice of Architecture in the Host Jurisdiction.

The nature and responsibilities of the Tri-National Council for International Practice, with respect to overseeing administrative processes implementing a Mutual Recognition Agreement such as transmission of documents, fees, verification of experience and other matters.

Mutual recognition means that Tri-National architects who meet the following requirements shall be recognized in each other's jurisdictions.

4.5 Basis for eligibility

Tri-National architects must have completed an accredited or recognized architecture program (by NAAB, ASINEA/COMAEA or CACB), or recognized equivalent that has been accepted for licensure, and been assessed within their own country as eligible for independent practice; and shall demonstrate a period of not less than ten years in certified post-registration/licensure, at least two years of which must be in responsible control of the comprehensive practice of architecture as verified by the architect's Competent Body as determined by the Trinational Council for International Practice, and documented by a dossier of work.

4.5.1 Mexican Architect

The Mexican architect shall:
4.5.1.1 Meet the requirements set down by the Federal Government (Professional Cédula).
4.5.1.2 Comply with FCARM registration/certification requirements

4.5.2 US Architect

The US Architect shall:
4.5.2.1 Meet jurisdictional education, training and examination (ARE and its US predecessors) requirements in effect at the time of registration/licensure
4.5.2.2 Comply with any jurisdictional registration/licensing requirements

4.5.3 Canadian Architect

The Canadian Architect shall:
4.5.3.1 Meet jurisdictional education, training and examination (ARE and its Canadian predecessors) requirements in effect at the time of registration/licensure
4.5.3.2 Comply with any jurisdictional registration/licensing requirements

4.6 Criteria for post-registration/licensure practice experience
4.6.1 Certified professional experience in Responsible Control of the comprehensive practice of architecture comprising all activities from preliminary studies through construction contract administration. Certification shall be in a form accepted by the Trinational Council for International Practice as described in the Appendix, entitled Mechanisms for the Implementation of the North American MRA, confirming that the applicant has been practicing architecture, and thereby maintaining registration, and is in good standing.

4.7 Other Provisions

4.7.1 Where an applicant does not meet the above criteria, an assessment will be made by his/her Competent Body indicating the extent of any additional requirements and how they may be satisfied.

5. Ratification and Effectiveness

This Agreement has been duly executed and signed by an official representative of each of the signatories. The Agreement shall come into effect on the date it is suitably ratified by the competent bodies.

This Agreement and its Appendix shall be executed in English, Spanish and French.

This Agreement, including one Appendix, constitutes the Mutual Recognition Agreement, negotiated between the Architects of the NAFTA countries. The Appendix is meant to outline the mechanisms for the implementation of the Agreement and may be amended through negotiations by all parties.

For México:  Federación de Colegios de Arquitectos de la República Mexicana, A.C.

José Manuel Reachi Mora  
President, FCARM

Aarón Bernal Rodríguez  
President, ASINEA

Fernando Mora Mora  
General Coordinator, CONARC

Xavier Cortés Rocha  
Member, COMPIAR
José Luis Cortés Delgado
Member, COMPIAR

Héctor García Escorza
General Coordinator, COMPIAR

For the United States: National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

H. Carleton Godsey
President, NCARB

Robert A. Boynton
Past President, NCARB

Douglas K. Engebretson
2nd Vice President, NCARB

For Canada: Committee of Canadian Architectural Councils

Stuart Howard
Chair CCAC

Charles H. Henley
Past Chair CCAC

Witnesses:
For Mexico:

Ambrosio Vásquez Arango
Col. de Arqs. Oaxaca

Guillermo Múlpica Soto
Secretaría Economía

For the United States of America:

Douglas L Steidl
President, AIA

Mark Arnold Leyes
Consulate, United States of America
Honorary Witnesses:

[Signatures]

---
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Among

FEDERACIÓN DE COLEGIOS DE ARQUITECTOS DE LA REPÚBLICA MEXICANA (FCARM)

and the

COMITÉ MEXICANO PARA LA PRÁCTICA INTERNACIONAL DE LA ARQUITECTURA (COMPIAR)

and the

ASOCIACION DE INSTITUCIONES DE ENSEÑANZA DE LA ARQUITECTURA DE LA REPÚBLICA MEXICANA (ASINEA),

and the

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB, USA)

and the

CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL LICENSING AUTHORITIES (CALA)
(on behalf of each of the Architectural Regulatory Bodies of Canada)

COLLECTIVELY REFERRED TO AS
“THE PARTIES”

WHEREAS The parties entered into a Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement signed in Oaxaca, Mexico on the 7th day of October, 2005 (the agreement).

AND WHEREAS The parties at their meeting in Washington, DC, USA on 22 April, 2010 agreed to amend the Agreement as follows:

1. All references in the agreement to the Committee of Canadian Architectural Councils (CCAC) shall be replaced with reference to Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA)

2. The words “as verified by the architect’s competent body” shall be deleted from paragraph 4.5 - Basis for Eligibility.

22 April 2010

Amendment to the Tri-National MRA
3. The words "(ARE and its Canadian predecessors)" shall be deleted from paragraph 4.5.3.1.

4. Section 4.7 shall be deleted in its entirety.

5. Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certificación (CONARC) be added as a party to this agreement.

6. All other provisions of the agreement not altered by this amendment are confirmed.

7. Where required, the parties shall make best efforts to have this amendment ratified by their authorizing jurisdictions on or before 31 October, 2010.

Signed this 22 day of April, 2010 in Washington, DC, United States.

For México: Federación de Colegios de Arquitectos de la República Mexicana, A. C.

Lizandro De La Garza Villarreal
President, FCARM

José Luis Cortés Delgado
Executive Coordinator, COMPIAR

Francisco Cabrera Betancourt
Executive Coordinator, CONARC

Xavier Cortés Rocha
Counselor, COMPIAR

Luis Enrique López Cardiel
Foreign Affairs Secretary, FCARM

Hon FAIA, Hon RAIC

Raúl López Ramírez
Counselor, CONARC

David Cabrera Ruiz, representing
Jorge Tamés y Batta
President, ASINEA

22 April 2010 Amendment to the Tri-National MRA
For the United States: National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

Andrew W. Prescott, AIA
President, NCARB

Scott C. Veazey, AIA, NCARB
Second Vice President, NCARB

For Canada: Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities

Gerrie Doyle, OAA, RAIC
Chair, International Relations Committee, CALA
President, OAA

Andre Bourassa, Architecte
President, OAQ

Pierre E. Gallant, MAIBC, AAA, MRAIC
President, AIBC

Honorary Witnesses:

Lenore M. Lucey, FAIA, NCARB, CAE
Executive Vice President, NCARB

David Edwards, SAA, MAA, AAA
Past President FRAIC

Kristi Doyle, Hon. RAIC
Director of Policy, OAA

Jerome Marburg, LL.B. MBA
Deputy Executive Director, AIBC

22 April 2010 Amendment to the Tri-National MRA
APPENDIX
MECHANISMS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
TRI-NATIONAL MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT
FOR INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE

Guanajuato, Gto, Mexico
October 4, 2008

1.0 RULES AND PROCEDURES TO MONITOR AND ENFORCE

1.1 Council for Tri-National Practice of Architecture

1.1.1 The Council for Tri-National Practice of Architecture (CTPA) is established to
facilitate the implementation of this Agreement, to oversee administrative
processes, and to monitor the performance of all parties who have agreed to be
bound by the terms and conditions of this Agreement to ensure, insofar as it may,
that any issues or disagreements arising hereunder are resolved promptly and in a
manner consistent with the intent of this Agreement.

1.1.2 The Council will also monitor the Tri-National processes in an effective and
nondiscriminatory manner, and continue information exchange by whatever
means are considered most appropriate, including regular communication and
sharing of information.

1.1.3 The Council for Tri-National Practice of Architecture shall maintain regular
contact and meet annually or as often as required in order to effectively perform
its duties and assist in the resolution of disputes.

1.1.4 Each Council for Tri-National Practice of Architecture country must be
represented by a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of five (5)
Officers/Members/Representatives appointed by each organization. The
organizations are the Federación de Colegios de Arquitectos de la República
Mexicana (FCARM) in Mexico, the National Council of Architectural
Registration Boards (NCARB) in the US, and the Committee of Canadian
Architectural Councils (CCAC) in Canada.

1.2 Meetings

1.2.1 At Council meetings a representative of the host organization shall serve as
Chair. Hosting shall be on a rotating basis: Mexico, Canada, US.

1.2.2 Meeting locations and dates shall be proposed by the hosting organization,
subject to agreement by the others.

1.2.3 The host organization is responsible for location hotel and meeting room
arrangements, catering, dinner reservations, Agenda, Minutes and, shall provide
translation services when needed.

1.2.4 Face-to-face meetings and draft agenda require two-month notice.

1.2.5 Minutes must be prepared and distributed within two months.
1.3 Expenses

1.3.1 Each organization is responsible for their travel, hotel and miscellaneous expenses for its attendees. The host organization shall make rooming arrangements for each attendee to be individually charged.

1.3.2 Lunches during the meeting day are the responsibility of the host organization.

1.3.3 Dinners during the meeting are paid by the meeting host organization and back billed to the others, proportionately.

1.3.4 In the case of jointly appointed task force or committee, each organization shall assume responsibility for its appointees.

1.4 Finances

1.4.1 There are no dues.

1.4.2 Each organization is responsible for its own expenses.

2.0 MECHANISMS FOR DIALOGUE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CO-OPERATION

The Council for Tri-National Practice of Architecture will put in place mechanisms and procedures, which will include:

2.1 Establishing the standards of professional competency as defined in step 3 dossier that must be met by architects in the three countries who wish to avail themselves of this agreement.

2.2 Establishing the rules and procedures necessary for the application, evaluation and monitoring of the provisions in this Agreement. Members of the Council for Tri-National Practice of Architecture shall maintain regular contact and hold meetings annually or as often as required to review the implementation and effectiveness of the agreement.

2.3 Acting as an information source in each participating jurisdiction so that architects can be informed about registration/licensing requirements and sanctions that might be applied in accordance with this document.

2.4 Establishing communication mechanisms so that architects within the participating jurisdictions will understand the rights and obligations they will have to meet when they are granted a license or registration to practice their profession in a foreign country.

2.5 A means to resolve differences in interpretation of the mechanisms for the implementation of this agreement. Any proposed changes or irreconcilable disputes must be presented to the original signatories for resolution.

2.6 An appeals process for applicants, as determined by the signatories of this agreement.

2.7 Additional tasks as determined by the Tri-national Council.
3.0 MECHANISMS FOR APPLICATION

3.1 The point of contact for information for Mexico: FCARM; for the USA: NCARB; for Canada: RAIC.

3.2 Procedures for processing applications shall be drafted by October 2008, tested on initial applications in Spring 2009, and finalized by June 2009.

3.3 Once established and operational, actual applications shall be processed within a reasonable period of time from receipt of a completed application.

3.4 Documentation forms to be used by local jurisdictions to certify an applicant's registration/licensure status shall be in uniform format and in English, Spanish and French as developed from time to time.

4.0 LICENSING REQUIREMENTS/PROCEDURES OTHER THAN QUALIFICATIONS

4.1 Residency Requirements: Competent Bodies represented by the Parties to this agreement shall not require applicants to take up residency.

4.2 Proof of Good Standing: Applicants for registration shall be required to produce evidence of good standing.

4.3 Professional Liability Insurance: Where required applicants for registration shall produce evidence of Professional Liability Insurance as required by the host Competent Body.

4.4 Local Requirements and Language: Applicants shall comply with local regulations for the practice of architecture in the host Competent Body. The nature and extent of the demonstrations to be required by the host Competent Body, for showing that the foreign Architect has acquired local knowledge of the codes, laws and other matters applicable to the Practice of Architecture, shall be done in the common and technical language of that Jurisdiction.

4.5 Relevant Laws & Regulations: Applicants for registration in any Jurisdiction shall be fully responsible for complying with the laws and regulations of that Jurisdiction.

4.6 On-going Verification of Competence: Where compliance with a prescribed number of hours of Continuing Professional Development (Continuing Education) is a requirement for registration, applicants will agree to provide evidence of compliance as and when required.

4.7 Regulations Relating to Nationality: Only nationals of the countries represented by the parties shall be beneficiaries of this agreement.

4.8 Compliance with Host Jurisdiction’s Ethics: Applicants shall comply with host jurisdiction’s code of professional conduct and/or ethics.

5.0 TRANSPARENCY

5.1 Conditions for entry to and expulsion from jurisdictional registers shall be made publicly available.
6.0 RECIROCITY

6.1 Mechanisms for the implementation of this agreement must maintain the principle of reciprocity. The Parties shall, to the extent possible, encourage the incorporation of their jurisdictions to accept and implement this Agreement, with a view to achieve universal acceptance in the future.

6.2 Incorporation of new jurisdictions shall be notified during future meetings of the CTPA.

7.0 REVISION OF AGREEMENT

7.1 The agreement is ongoing, subject to periodic review by the Signatories.

8.0 NOTICE OF TERMINATION

8.1 If any Signatories wish to terminate this Agreement, it will inform the other Signatories of this decision by giving 12 months notice in writing.

Appendix
Mechanisms for the Implementation of the MRA
APPLICATION PROCESS

STEP 1: ELIGIBILITY

1.1 To be eligible for Tri-National benefits through this process an Architect must meet the requirements of paragraph 4.5 of the MRA.

STEP 2: APPLICATION

The applicant must:

2.1 File an application and pay required fees; and

2.2 The applicant shall secure a written statement from their Competent Body stating that the applicant either has no record or notice of a disciplinary action or if such record exists, describing such action and its current status. This statement must be sent directly to the point of contact for information of the applicant’s home jurisdiction.

STEP 3: DOSSIER

3.1 Upon completion of their record and confirmation of initial eligibility for certification through the Tri-National process, an applicant must submit a dossier for review by their Home Review Body to determine satisfaction of Step One and to demonstrate competence to independently practice architecture in the host jurisdiction.

3.2 The dossier must:

3.2.1 Be prepared in a format specified and submitted electronically;

3.2.2 Contain a resume that outlines the applicant’s comprehensive practice experience in the applicants home jurisdiction and lists the significant projects over which the applicant exercised responsible control;

3.2.3 Demonstrate competence for the comprehensive practice of architecture, through graphic and written descriptions of a minimum of three projects appropriately complex to demonstrate competency as indicated below. “Comprehensive Practice” means practice in responsible control.

3.3 An Architect in responsible control must be competent to create architectural designs that:

3.3.1 Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale;

3.3.2 Respond to environmental concerns and address sustainability issues;

3.3.3 Show skill in land-use planning and planning process;

3.3.4 Take account of cultural and social factors.
3.4 An Architect in responsible control must be competent to translate a design concept into built form and be able to:

3.4.1 Investigate and interpret design objectives and relevant issues and prepare the brief for a design project;

3.4.2 Advise on project evaluations, feasibility studies and programs;

3.4.3 Evaluate and determine structural, constructional and engineering elements of a building and integrate the advice and design of specialist disciplines into a building project;

3.4.4 Assess the physical influences on buildings and the technologies associated with providing internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate, and coordinate and integrate services systems to control them;

3.4.5 Meet building users’ requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations;

3.4.6 Provide advice on issues of construction, procurement and contract administration;

3.4.7 Generate the documentation and information needed to translate a design concept into a building;

3.4.8 Manage the procurement of buildings, administer contractual arrangements and monitor their construction.

3.5 An Architect in responsible control must be competent in the practice of architecture and:

3.5.1 Observe legal and regulatory obligations related to the planning and construction of buildings;

3.5.2 Have adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations and procedures involved in the management and realization of a design project as a building;

3.5.3 Observe the standards of conduct expected of a professional;

3.5.4 Maintain competence in relevant aspects of the practice of architecture.

3.6 The applicant must describe the nature of their Responsible Control over each of the projects in each of the areas.

**STEP 4: INTERVIEW**

4.1 If there is concern about the dossier meeting all requirements, the applicant may be required to participate in an interview before a committee in the host jurisdiction. The interview will be conducted in the language of the host jurisdiction.

4.2 The purpose of the interview may include the confirmation of:

4.2.1 The applicant’s responsibility over the development, management and implementation of each submitted project;

4.2.2 The applicant’s understanding of the host jurisdictions licensing and professional conduct requirements; and

4.2.3 The applicant’s knowledge of the host jurisdictions building codes and laws.
STEP 5: NOTIFICATION

5.1 After satisfying all requirements, the applicant will be notified of the committee’s decision by the host country competent body. A successful applicant will receive the support of the host national body, through whatever means available, for licensing in the various jurisdictions in that country. Local Competent Bodies within the host country may have additional non-discriminatory requirements.

5.2 An unsuccessful applicant will be notified of their deficiencies, and may elect to repeat the application process, including payment of all fees.

The signature of this Appendix is subject to the ratification by the national representatives of the competent bodies.

This agreement of the Implementation Mechanisms is the appendix of the Mutual Recognition Agreement, signed between the Architects of the NAFTA countries in Oaxaca, Mexico on October 7, 2005, and approved by the NAFTA Free Trade Commission on August 14, 2007.

For Mexico: Federación de Colegios de Arquitectos de la República Mexicana, A. C.

Iván Cervantes Errea
President, FCARM

José Luis Cortés Delgado
Representative, ASINEA

Fernando Mora Mora
President, CONARC

Xavier Cortés Rocha
Member, COMPIAR

Héctor García Escobal
Coordinator, COMPIAR

For the United States: National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

Gordon E. Mills, FAIA
President, NCARB

Andrew W. Prescott, AIA
First Vice President, NCARB

10.04.2008

Appendix
Mechanisms for the Implementation of the MRA
Kenneth J. Naylor, AIA
Second Vice President, NCARB

For Canada:

Stuart Howard, MAIBC, FRAIC, AIA
Past Chair, CCAC

Observers:

Guillermo Malpica Soto
Secretaría de Economía

Appendix
Mechanisms for the Implementation of the MRA
October 3, 2017

Matt McGuiness, Chair
California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Dear Matt McGuiness:

In February 2014, NCARB announced the long-anticipated implementation of the *Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice* (known as “the Agreement”). Your Board has previously indicated on the NCARB annual licensing requirements survey that this Agreement has been accepted for purposes of providing reciprocal licensure in your jurisdiction. With this letter, we are writing to ask you to verify that acceptance is still valid by signing the enclosed *Letter of Undertaking*.

Development, pilot testing, and implementation of the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement was a long and rigorous process supported by volunteers, leadership, and staff from all three countries. The underlying goal has always been to ensure that the qualifications of those U.S., Canadian, and Mexican architects interested in pursuing licensure across our borders are thoroughly vetted.

For background purposes, in the mid-1990s, the leaders and regulators of the architecture profession in Canada, Mexico, and the United States joined together to explore ways to facilitate the mutual recognition of licensure credentials among all three countries. Following many years of negotiations, the *Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice* and its *Implementation Mechanisms* were signed by the leadership of the Council in October 2005 and ratified by our Member Boards at the Annual Meeting in June 2006. That vote positioned the Council to work in tandem with representatives of Canada and Mexico and proceed with the implementation of the Agreement.

The terms of the Tri-National Agreement are closely aligned with those of the former Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect (BEFA) path, which served as its model. The Agreement requires four basic components:

1. a recognized degree in architecture leading to licensure in the home country,
2. 10 years of comprehensive post-licensure experience in the home country, 2 years of which must be in responsible control,
3. the submission of a dossier documenting project-specific experience related to specific core competencies (see attached), and
4. an in-person interview before a panel of peers conducted in the language of the host country.
Prior to being eligible, Mexican applicants must first complete an extensive in-county evaluation and certification process conducted by their local colegio and the Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certificacion (CONARC).

Similar to the process we are following with the Canada and Australia/New Zealand arrangements, we respectfully request that you document your Board’s acceptance of the Tri-National MRA that recognizes the NCARB Certificate for reciprocal licensure issued to architects who have successfully completed the rigorous evaluation process by signing the enclosed Letter of Undertaking.

Should you wish further explanation or discussion, please feel free to contact Stephen Nutt, Senior Architect/Advisor to the CEO at snutt@ncarb.org.

Thank you for your support,

Gregory L. Erny, FAIA. NCARB
President / Chair of the Board

Michael J. Armstrong
Chief Executive Officer

Attachments: Letter of Undertaking
Tri-National Competencies

CC: Douglas McCauley
Board Executive
Letter of Undertaking
with respect to the

TRI-NATIONAL MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT
FOR INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE
between the
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS
and the
CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL LICENSING AUTHORITIES
and the
CONSEJO NACIONAL de REGISTRO de CERTIFCACION

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)
representing the architectural registration boards of the 50 United States,
the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

AND

The Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA)
representing the architectural licensing boards of the 11 provinces and territories of Canada.

AND

The Consejo Nacional de Registro de Certification (CONARC)
representing the registered and certified architects of Mexico.

WHEREAS, NCARB, CALA, and CONARC have agreed to and signed the Tri-National Mutual
Recognition Agreement for International Practice (Agreement) dated October 7, 2005 and
implemented February 2014, ratified by the architectural licensing/registration authorities of the
United States, Canada, and Mexico.

NOW THEREFORE, this Letter of Undertaking shall be signed, without modification, by each
individual registration board wishing to participate in the Agreement.

The undersigned registration board, having the authority to license/register persons as Architects
within its jurisdiction, wishes to become a signatory to the Agreement by virtue of this Letter of
Undertaking. In doing so, the registration board agrees to and acknowledges the following:

1. The terms used in this Letter of Undertaking shall have the same meaning as defined in the
   Agreement between NCARB, CALA, and CONARC.

2. The undersigned individual has the authority to sign on behalf of the registration board.
3. The undersigned registration board will not impose any additional education, experience, or examination requirements, or require the applicant to provide education transcripts, experience verifications, examination scores, or government identification numbers (including, but not limited to, Social Security Numbers or social insurance numbers). However, the host registration board may impose familiarity with local laws and other local requirements that also apply to all domestic applicants seeking reciprocal licensure.

4. In keeping with the above, the undersigned registration board agrees that it will accept for licensure/registration to practice architecture in its jurisdiction a licensed/registered architect who holds a valid and current NCARB Certificate that has been issued in accordance with the Agreement and satisfies all conditions outlined within the Agreement.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the registration board named below has caused the duly authorized person, on its behalf, to execute and deliver this *Letter of Undertaking*.

Entered into on ______________________________, 20__.

By: _________________________________________________________
Name of State Registration Board

_________________________________________________________
Name of duly authorized individual and title

_________________________________________________________
Signature
TRI-NATIONAL COMPETENCIES

A qualified applicant seeking reciprocity through the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice is required to prepare a dossier of work that demonstrates the following professional competencies.

A. **An Architect in responsible control must be competent to create architectural designs that:**
   1. Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale;
   2. Respond to environmental concerns and address sustainability issues;
   3. Show skill in land-use planning and planning process;
   4. Take account of cultural and social factors.

B. **An Architect in responsible control must be competent to translate a design concept into built form and be able to:**
   1. Investigate and interpret design objectives and relevant issues and prepare the brief for a design project;
   2. Advise on project evaluations, feasibility studies and programs;
   3. Evaluate and determine structural, constructional and engineering elements of a building and integrate the advice and design of specialist disciplines into a building project;
   4. Assess the physical influences on buildings and the technologies associated with providing internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate, and coordinate and integrate services systems to control them;
   5. Meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations;
   6. Provide advice on issues of construction, procurement and contract administration;
   7. Generate the documentation and information needed to translate a design concept into a building;
   8. Manage the procurement of buildings, administer contractual arrangements and monitor their construction.

C. **An Architect in responsible control must be competent in the practice of architecture and:**
   1. Observe legal and regulatory obligations related to the planning and construction of buildings;
   2. Have adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations and procedures involved in the management and realization of a design project as a building;
   3. Observe the standards of conduct expected of a professional;
   4. Maintain competence in relevant aspects of the practice of architecture.
TRI-NATIONAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS
(For use by Canadian Architects)

Under the terms of the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice between Canada, Mexico, and the United States, the Architect must meet the following eligibility requirements:

1. **The Provincial/Territorial Licence holder must be a citizen of Canada or hold permanent residency status.**

2. **The Provincial/Territorial Licence holder must hold a current and active registration as an architect issued by one of the 11 Canadian architectural regulators and shall demonstrate a period of not less than TEN years of post-licensure experience, at least two years of which must be in responsible control of the comprehensive practice of architecture.**

3. **The Provincial/Territorial Licence holder must complete the Tri-National MRA Resume Form that outlines the practice experience in the home jurisdiction and lists the projects the Architect will include in the dossier.**

4. **The Provincial/Territorial Licence holder must submit a dossier conforming with the Tri-National Dossier Format Requirements documenting a minimum of three projects that demonstrates competence in the practice of architecture as indicated below:**

   A. **Competence to create architectural designs that:**
      - Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale;
      - Respond to environmental concerns and address sustainability issues;
      - Show skill in land-use planning and planning process;
      - Take account of cultural and social factors.

   B. **Competence to translate a design concept into built form and be able to:**
      - Investigate and interpret design objectives and relevant issues and prepare the brief for a design project;
      - Advise on project evaluations, feasibility studies, and programs;
      - Evaluate and determine structural, construction, and engineering elements of a building and integrate the advice and design of specialist disciplines into a building project;
      - Assess the physical influences on buildings and the technologies associated with providing internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate, and coordinate and integrate services systems to control them;
      - Meet building users’ requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations;
      - Provide advice on issues of construction, procurement, and contract administration;
      - Generate the documentation and information needed to translate a design concept into a building;
      - Manage the procurement of buildings, administer contractual arrangements, and monitor their construction.

   C. **Competence in the practice of architecture and:**
      - Observe legal and regulatory obligations related to the planning and construction of buildings;
      - Have adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations and procedures involved in the management and realization of a design project as a building;
      - Observe the standards of conduct expected of a professional;
      - Maintain competence in relevant aspects of the practice of architecture.
TRI-NATIONAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS
(For use by Mexican Architects)

Under the terms of the Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement for International Practice between Canada, Mexico, and the United States, the Architect must meet the following eligibility requirements:

1. The CONARC Certificate holder must be a citizen of Mexico or hold permanent residency status.

2. The CONARC Certificate holder must hold a current and active registration as an architect in a CONARC jurisdiction and shall demonstrate a period of not less than TEN years of post-licensure experience, at least two years of which must be in responsible control of the comprehensive practice of architecture.

3. The CONARC Certificate holder must complete the Tri-National MRA Resume Form that outlines the practice experience in the home jurisdiction and lists the projects the Architect will include in the dossier.

4. The CONARC Certificate holder must submit a dossier conforming with the Tri-National Dossier Format Requirements documenting a minimum of three projects that demonstrates competence in the practice of architecture as indicated below:

   A. Competence to create architectural designs that:
   - Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale;
   - Respond to environmental concerns and address sustainability issues;
   - Show skill in land-use planning and planning process;
   - Take account of cultural and social factors.

   B. Competence to translate a design concept into built form and be able to:
   - Investigate and interpret design objectives and relevant issues and prepare the brief for a design project;
   - Advise on project evaluations, feasibility studies, and programs;
   - Evaluate and determine structural, construction, and engineering elements of a building and integrate the advice and design of specialist disciplines into a building project;
   - Assess the physical influences on buildings and the technologies associated with providing internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate, and coordinate and integrate services systems to control them;
   - Meet building users’ requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations;
   - Provide advice on issues of construction, procurement, and contract administration;
   - Generate the documentation and information needed to translate a design concept into a building;
   - Manage the procurement of buildings, administer contractual arrangements, and monitor their construction.

   C. Competence in the practice of architecture and:
   - Observe legal and regulatory obligations related to the planning and construction of buildings;
   - Have adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations and procedures involved in the management and realization of a design project as a building;
   - Observe the standards of conduct expected of a professional;
   - Maintain competence in relevant aspects of the practice of architecture.
The CSE is the examination that candidates seeking licensure must pass after successfully taking the divisions of the national examination. The purpose of the CSE is to assess whether a candidate possesses the minimum requisite architectural knowledge to perform the critical tasks outlined in the CSE Test Plan.

The CSE Test Plan serves as the basis for development of content for the examination and was derived from the feedback received during the 2014 Occupational Analysis that was conducted by the Department of Consumer Affairs’ Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES). The CSE Test Plan focuses the examination content to address the unique requirements and conditions that exist in California with minimal overlap of that content presented on the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards’ Architect Registration Examination (ARE).

Together the ARE and CSE serve as an effective means to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, which is the mission of the Board. Ensuring the integrity and psychometric defensibility of the CSE is of paramount importance to the Board and includes preventing overexposure of its content to a candidate. To this end, California Code of Regulations section 124 requires a candidate who fails the CSE to wait at least 180 days before they may retake the examination.

At its June 15, 2017, meeting, the Board directed staff to collaborate with OPES and assess whether it would be psychometrically defensible to reduce the mandatory wait period.

Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager, will provide the Board with an update. The Board is asked to consider the information provided and direct staff as appropriate.
PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE (PQC) REPORT

1. Update on October 18, 2017 PQC Meeting

2. Update and Possible Action on PQC’s Recommendation Regarding 2017-2018 Strategic Plan Objective to Collaborate With and Support Existing and Emerging Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) Programs to Promote Their Success
UPDATE ON OCTOBER 18, 2017 PQC MEETING

The Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) met on October 18, 2017, in Sacramento. Attached is the meeting notice. PQC Chair, Tian Feng, will provide an update on the meeting.

Attachment:
October 18, 2017 Notice of Meeting
NOTICE OF MEETING

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE
October 18, 2017

Action may be taken on any item listed on the agenda.

Sequoia Room
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 109A
Sacramento, CA 95834

Agenda
10:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
(or completion of business)

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

B. Chair’s Remarks and Committee Member Comments

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

The Committee may not discuss or take any action on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Board’s next Strategic Planning session or place the matter on the agenda of a future Committee meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

D. Review and Possible Action on July 12, 2016, Committee Meeting Minutes

E. Discuss and Possible Action on the Following 2017-2018 Strategic Plan Objectives to:

1. Conduct an Analysis to Determine the Effectiveness of the Continuing Education Requirement (Identify Alternatives as Appropriate) and Prepare a Report for the Legislature as Required by Business and Professions Code Section 5600.05

2. Collaborate With and Support Existing and Emerging Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) Programs to Promote Their Success

3. Revise the Candidate Handbook to Reduce Candidate Confusion

Continued
F. Adjournment

Action may be taken on any item on the agenda. The time and order of agenda items are subject to change at the discretion of the Committee Chair and may be taken out of order. The meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier or later than posted in this notice. In accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, all meetings of the Committee are open to the public. This meeting will not be webcast. If you wish to participate or to have a guaranteed opportunity to observe, please plan to attend at the physical location.

Government Code section 11125.7 provides the opportunity for the public to address each agenda item during discussion or consideration by the Committee prior to the Committee taking any action on said item. Members of the public will be provided appropriate opportunities to comment on any issue before the Committee, but the Committee Chair may, at his or her discretion, apportion available time among those who wish to speak. Individuals may appear before the Committee to discuss items not on the agenda; however, the Committee can neither discuss nor take official action on these items at the time of the same meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting:

**Person:** Timothy Rodda
**Telephone:** (916) 575-7217
**Telecommunications Relay Service:** Dial 711
**Email:** timothy.rodda@dca.ca.gov
**Mailing Address:**
California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

*Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Board in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount (Business and Professions Code section 5510.15).*
UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PQC RECOMMENDATION REGARDING 2017-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE TO COLLABORATE WITH AND SUPPORT EXISTING AND EMERGING INTEGRATED PATH TO ARCHITECTURAL LICENSURE (IPAL) PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE THEIR SUCCESS

The Board’s 2017-2018 Strategic Plan contains an objective assigned to the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) to collaborate with and support existing and emerging IPAL programs and promote their success.

Launched in 2015, IPAL, a National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) initiative, is designed to provide aspiring architects the opportunity to complete licensure requirements in a more integrated and streamlined manner while earning their National Architectural Accrediting Boards accredited degree. Programs from three California schools were accepted by NCARB for participation: NewSchool of Architecture and Design, University of Southern California, and Woodbury University; there are currently 26 programs at 21 participating schools.

The Board has demonstrated its support for IPAL programs by:

- Sponsoring legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 177 (Hill) [Chapter 428, Statutes of 2015] and Senate Bill (SB) 1479 (Hill) [Chapter 634, Statutes of 2016], (which became operative on January 1, 2017) that authorizes it to grant students enrolled in an IPAL program early eligibility for the Architect Registration Examination (attachments 1 and 2).
- Inviting California IPAL programs to its meetings for progress reports.
- Mailing letters to firms requesting participation and coordination with IPAL schools to offer internships (attachment 3).
- Publishing regular articles in its newsletter (attachments 4-6).

At its October 18, 2017, meeting, the PQC discussed the Strategic Plan objective and made a recommendation to the Board directing staff to prepare a letter to NCARB that requests it collaborate with The American Institute of Architects and revive the Emerging Professional’s Companion (EPC). The purpose of which would be to allow firms the opportunity to use the exercises in the EPC on live projects in their respective office as a teaching tool for first and second year IPAL students. It is hoped this would address the problem of firms hiring first and second year architecture students who often lack exposure to professional practice.

The Board is asked to consider the PQC’s recommendation and provide staff with appropriate direction.

Attachments:
1. AB 177 (Hill) [Chapter 428, Statutes of 2015]
2. SB 1479 (Hill) [Chapter 634, Statutes of 2016]
4. NewSchool of Architecture and Design Newsletter Article
5. University of Southern California Newsletter Article
6. Woodbury University Newsletter Article
AB-177 Professions and vocations: licensing boards. (2015-2016)

Assembly Bill No. 177

CHAPTER 428

An act to amend Sections 207, 5510, 5517, 5620, 5621, 5622, 6710, 6714, 6749, 7839.2, 7841, 7841.1, 7841.2, 8710, and 8759 of, to amend and repeal Section 7885 of, to amend, repeal, and add Sections 205, 6797, 7886, and 8800 of, to add Section 5550.2 to, and to add and repeal Sections 6775.2, 7860.2, and 8780.2 of, the Business and Professions Code, relating to professions and vocations, and making an appropriation therefor.

[ Approved by Governor October 02, 2015. Filed with Secretary of State October 02, 2015. ]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 177, Bonilla. Professions and vocations: licensing boards.

(1) The Professional Engineers Act provides for the licensure and regulation of engineers by the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists. The act requires the board to appoint an executive officer. Existing law repeals the board and the executive officer position on January 1, 2016.

This bill would extend the operation of these provisions to January 1, 2020. The bill, until January 1, 2020, would add as a cause for disciplinary action by the board, as specified, the failure or refusal of a licensee or certificate holder under the act to respond to a written request from a representative of the board to cooperate in the investigation of a complaint against that licensee or certificate holder.

(2) Existing law, the Architects Practice Act, provides for the licensure and regulation of architects and landscape architects by the California Architects Board and authorizes the board to appoint an executive officer. Existing law establishes, within the jurisdiction of the board, the Landscape Architects Technical Committee for the purpose of, among other things, assisting the board in the examination of candidates for a landscape architect’s license. Existing law repeals the board, the executive officer position, and the committee on January 1, 2016. Existing law requires a person to pass an examination as a condition of licensure as an architect and authorizes a person to take the examination if he or she meets certain examination eligibility requirements.

This bill would extend the operation of those provisions to January 1, 2020. The bill would also authorize the board to grant eligibility to a candidate to take the licensure examination if he or she is enrolled in an Additional Path to Architecture Licensing program, as specified.

(3) The Professional Land Surveyors’ Act provides for the licensure and regulation of land surveyors by the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, which is vested with the power to administer the act until January 1, 2016.

This bill would extend that power to January 1, 2020. The bill, until January 1, 2020, would also add as a cause for disciplinary action by the board, as specified, the failure or refusal of a licensee or certificate holder under the
act to respond to a written request from a representative of the board to cooperate in the investigation of a complaint against that licensee or certificate holder.

(4) The Geologist and Geophysicist Act provides for the registration and regulation of professional geologists and professional geophysicists and the certification of applicants in a specialty in geology and geologists-in-training by the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists. The act requires an applicant for registration as a geologist to meet certain requirements, including, among others, that he or she has graduated with a major in geological sciences from college or university, and requires an applicant for registration as a geophysicist to meet certain requirements, including, among others, that he or she has completed a combination of at least 30 semester hours in courses, as specified. The act requires an applicant for certification as a geologist-in-training to comply with certain requirements, including, among others, that the applicant successfully pass the Fundamentals of Geology examination.

This bill would provide for licensure instead of registration under the act. The bill would also allow an applicant for licensure as a geologist to have graduated from a college or university with a major in a discipline other than geological sciences that, in the opinion of the board, is relevant to geology. The bill would also allow an applicant for licensure as a geophysicist to have completed at least the equivalent of 30 semester hours in courses, as specified. The bill would require an applicant for certification as a geologist-in-training to have graduated from a college or university with a major in geological sciences or any other discipline relevant to geology, as specified. The bill, until January 1, 2020, would add as a cause for disciplinary action by the board, as specified, the failure or refusal of a licensee or certificate holder under the act to respond to a written request from a representative of the board to cooperate in the investigation of a complaint against that licensee or certificate holder.

(5) Under existing law, there is the Professions and Vocations Fund in the State Treasury, which consists of certain special funds and accounts, including the Professional Engineer’s and Land Surveyor’s Fund and the Geology and Geophysics Account of the Professional Engineer’s and Land Surveyor’s Fund. Under existing law the moneys in the Geology and Geophysics Account are continuously appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Geologist and Geophysicist Act, the moneys in the Professional Engineer’s and Land Surveyor’s Fund are continuously appropriated for the purposes of the Professional Engineers Act and the Professional Land Surveyors’ Act, and the moneys in those funds that are attributable to administrative fines, civil penalties, and criminal penalties, as specified, are not continuously appropriated and are only available for expenditure upon appropriation by the Legislature.

This bill, beginning July 1, 2016, would abolish the Geology and Geophysics Account of the Professional Engineer’s and Land Surveyor’s Fund and would rename the Professional Engineer’s and Land Surveyor’s Fund as the Professional Engineer’s, Land Surveyor’s, and Geologist’s Fund. The bill would direct those moneys collected under the Professional Engineers Act, the Professional Land Surveyors’ Act, and the Geologist and Geophysicist Act to be deposited into the Professional Engineer’s, Land Surveyor’s, and Geologist’s Fund, a continuously appropriated fund. Because additional moneys, except for fine and penalty money, would be deposited into a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would make an appropriation.

(6) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Section 205 of the Business and Professions Code, proposed by AB 179 and AB 180, that would become operative only if this bill and either or both of those bills are chaptered and become effective January 1, 2016, and this bill is chaptered last.

Vote: majority Appropriation: yes Fiscal Committee: yes Local Program: no

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 205 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

205. (a) There is in the State Treasury the Professions and Vocations Fund. The fund shall consist of the following special funds:

(1) Accountancy Fund.

(2) California Architects Board Fund.

(3) Athletic Commission Fund.

(4) Barbering and Cosmetology Contingent Fund.

(5) Cemetery Fund.
(37) Structural Pest Control Research Fund.

(b) For accounting and recordkeeping purposes, the Professions and Vocations Fund shall be deemed to be a single special fund, and each of the several special funds therein shall constitute and be deemed to be a separate account in the Professions and Vocations Fund. Each account or fund shall be available for expenditure only for the purposes as are now or may hereafter be provided by law.

(c) This section shall become operative on July 1, 2016.

SEC. 3. Section 207 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

207. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the money in any fund described in Section 205 that is attributable to administrative fines, civil penalties, and criminal penalties imposed by a regulating entity, or cost recovery by a regulating entity from enforcement actions and case settlements, shall not be continuously appropriated. The money in each fund that is not continuously appropriated shall be available for expenditure as provided in this code only upon appropriation by the Legislature.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annual Budget Act may appropriate, in a single budget item for each individual fund described in subdivision (a) of Section 205, the entire amount available for expenditure in the budget year for that fund. That appropriation may include funds that are continuously appropriated and funds that are not continuously appropriated.

SEC. 4. Section 5510 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

5510. There is in the Department of Consumer Affairs a California Architects Board which consists of 10 members.

Any reference in law to the California Board of Architectural Examiners shall mean the California Architects Board.

This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2020, and as of that date is repealed. Notwithstanding any other law, the repeal of this section renders the board subject to review by the appropriate policy committees of the Legislature.

SEC. 5. Section 5517 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

5517. The board may appoint a person exempt from civil service who shall be designated as an executive officer and who shall exercise the powers and perform the duties delegated by the board and vested in him or her by this chapter.

This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2020, and as of that date is repealed.

SEC. 6. Section 5550.2 is added to the Business and Professions Code, to read:

5550.2. Notwithstanding subdivision (b) of Section 5552, the board may grant eligibility, based on an eligibility point determined by the Additional Path to Architectural Licensing Program, for a candidate to take the examination for a license to practice architecture if he or she is enrolled in an Additional Path to Architectural Licensing program that integrates the experience and examination components offered by a National Architectural Accrediting Board-accredited degree program.

SEC. 7. Section 5620 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

5620. The duties, powers, purposes, responsibilities, and jurisdiction of the California State Board of Landscape Architects that were succeeded to and vested with the Department of Consumer Affairs in accordance with Chapter 908 of the Statutes of 1994 are hereby transferred to the California Architects Board. The Legislature finds that the purpose for the transfer of power is to promote and enhance the efficiency of state government and that assumption of the powers and duties by the California Architects Board shall not be viewed or construed as a precedent for the establishment of state regulation over a profession or vocation that was not previously regulated by a board, as defined in Section 477.

(a) There is in the Department of Consumer Affairs a California Architects Board as defined in Article 2 (commencing with Section 5510) of Chapter 3 of Division 3.
SB-1479 Business and professions. (2015-2016)

Senate Bill No. 1479

CHAPTER 634

An act to amend Sections 5092, 5094.3, 5550.2, 7074, 7159.5, 7612.6, 7844, and 7887 of the Business and Professions Code, and to amend Section 13995.1 of the Government Code, relating to business and professions.

[ Approved by Governor September 25, 2016. Filed with Secretary of State September 25, 2016. ]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 1479, Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development. Business and professions.

(1) Existing law provides for the licensure and regulation of accountants by the California Board of Accountancy, which is within the Department of Consumer Affairs. Existing law requires an applicant for licensure as a certified public accountant to provide documentation to the board of the completion of a certain number of units of ethics study, as specified. Existing law requires a portion of those units to come from courses containing specified terms in the course title, including, but not limited to, corporate governance.

This bill would instead require those units to come from courses in specified subjects relating to ethics.

(2) The Architects Practice Act provides for the licensure and regulation of architects and landscape architects by the California Architects Board, which is within the Department of Consumer Affairs, and requires a person to pass an examination as a condition of licensure as an architect. Existing law authorizes the board to grant eligibility to a candidate to take the licensure examination if he or she is enrolled in an Additional Path to Architecture Licensing program that integrates the experience and examination components offered by a National Architectural Accrediting Board-accredited degree program.

This bill would instead authorize the board to grant eligibility to a candidate to take the licensure examination if he or she is enrolled in a degree program accepted by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards that integrates the licensure degree experience and examination components required under that act.

(3) The Contractors’ State License Law provides for the licensure and regulation of contractors by the Contractors’ State License Board, which is within the Department of Consumer Affairs. That law requires, except as specified, an application for an original license, an additional classification, or for a change of qualifier to become void when certain conditions are met, including if the applicant or examinee for the applicant has failed to appear for the scheduled qualifying examination and fails to request and pay the fee for rescheduling within 90 days of notification of failure to appear or if the applicant or the examinee for the applicant has failed to achieve a passing grade in the scheduled qualifying examination and fails to request and pay the fee for rescheduling within 90 days of notification of failure to pass the examination.

This bill would delete those above-mentioned conditions as reasons for an application for an original license, an additional classification, or for a change of qualifier to become void.
With respect to home improvement contracts between an owner or tenant and a contractor, whether a general contractor or a specialty contractor, that is licensed or subject to be licensed with regard to the transaction, existing statutory law makes the failure to comply with specified provisions governing the furnishing of a performance and payment bond a cause for discipline. Existing regulatory law requires a licensee seeking approval of a blanket bond to meet certain conditions and to submit to the board an Application for Approval of Blanket Performance and Payment Bond. Existing regulatory law requires a licensee to be licensed in this state in an active status for not less than 5 years prior to submitting that application.

This bill would instead require such a licensee to be licensed for not less than 2 years prior to submitting that application.

(4) Existing law, the Cemetery and Funeral Act, requires each cemetery authority to annually file with the Cemetery and Funeral Bureau a specified written report that includes information relating to the general and special endowment care funds. Existing law requires the report to be accompanied by an annual audit report of those funds and specifies the scope of the audit.

This bill would require the audit to be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

(5) The Geologist and Geophysicist Act provides for the registration and regulation of professional geologists and professional geophysicists by the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, which is within the Department of Consumer Affairs. That act requires an applicant for registration to take an examination and requires the examination to be held at the times and places within the state that the board determines.

This bill would authorize the board to make arrangements with a public or private organization to conduct the examination. The bill would authorize the board to contract with such an organization for materials or services related to the examination and would authorize the board to allow an organization specified by the board to receive, directly from applicants, payments of the examination fees charged by that organization for materials and services.

(6) The California Tourism Marketing Act requires the Governor to appoint a Tourism Selection Committee, as specified, and provides that the Director of the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development has the power to veto actions of the commission. That act states various findings and declarations by the Legislature regarding the tourism industry in California, including that the mechanism created by that act to fund generic promotions be pursuant to the supervision and oversight of the secretary.

This bill would instead find and declare that the mechanism to fund generic promotions be pursuant to the supervision and oversight of the Director of the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development.

Vote: majority  Appropriation: no  Fiscal Committee: yes  Local Program: no

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 5092 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

5092. (a) To qualify for the certified public accountant license, an applicant who is applying under this section shall meet the education, examination, and experience requirements specified in subdivisions (b), (c), and (d), or otherwise prescribed pursuant to this article. The board may adopt regulations as necessary to implement this section.

(b) An applicant for the certified public accountant license shall present satisfactory evidence that the applicant has completed a baccalaureate or higher degree conferred by a college or university, meeting, at a minimum, the standards described in Section 5094, the total educational program to include a minimum of 24 semester units in accounting subjects and 24 semester units in business related subjects. This evidence shall be provided prior to admission to the examination for the certified public accountant license, except that an applicant who applied, qualified, and sat for at least two subjects of the examination for the certified public accountant license before May 15, 2002, may provide this evidence at the time of application for licensure.

(c) An applicant for the certified public accountant license shall pass an examination prescribed by the board pursuant to this article.

(d) The applicant shall show, to the satisfaction of the board, that the applicant has had two years of qualifying experience. This experience may include providing any type of service or advice involving the use of accounting, attest, compilation, management advisory, financial advisory, tax, or consulting skills. To be qualifying under this
(2) To qualify under this subdivision, the course title shall contain one or more of the terms “introduction,” “introductory,” “general,” “fundamentals of,” “principles,” “foundation of,” or “survey of,” or have the name of the discipline as the sole name of the course title.

(f) A maximum of one semester unit of ethics study for completion of a course specific to financial statement audits.

(g) An applicant who has successfully passed the examination requirement specified under Section 5082 on or before December 31, 2013, is exempt from this section unless the applicant fails to obtain the qualifying experience as specified in Section 5092 or 5093 on or before December 31, 2015.

SEC. 3. Section 5550.2 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

5550.2. Notwithstanding subdivision (b) of Section 5552, the board may grant eligibility to take the licensure examination to a candidate enrolled in a degree program accepted by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards that integrates the licensure degree experience and examination components required under this chapter. The eligibility point shall be determined by that degree program.

SEC. 4. Section 7074 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

7074. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an application for an original license, for an additional classification, or for a change of qualifier shall become void when:

(1) The applicant or the examinee for the applicant has failed to achieve a passing grade in the qualifying examination within 18 months after the application has been deemed acceptable by the board.

(2) The applicant for an original license, after having been notified to do so, fails to pay the initial license fee within 90 days from the date of the notice.

(3) The applicant, after having been notified to do so, fails to file within 90 days from the date of the notice any bond or cash deposit or other documents that may be required for issuance or granting pursuant to this chapter.

(4) After filing, the applicant withdraws the application.

(5) The applicant fails to return the application rejected by the board for insufficiency or incompleteness within 90 days from the date of original notice or rejection.

(6) The application is denied after disciplinary proceedings conducted in accordance with the provisions of this code.

(b) The void date on an application may be extended up to 90 days or one examination may be rescheduled without a fee upon documented evidence by the applicant that the failure to complete the application process or to appear for an examination was due to a medical emergency or other circumstance beyond the control of the applicant.

(c) An application voided pursuant to this section shall remain in the possession of the registrar for the period as he or she deems necessary and shall not be returned to the applicant. Any reapplication for a license shall be accompanied by the fee fixed by this chapter.

SEC. 5. Section 7159.5 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

7159.5. This section applies to all home improvement contracts, as defined in Section 7151.2, between an owner or tenant and a contractor, whether a general contractor or a specialty contractor, that is licensed or subject to be licensed pursuant to this chapter with regard to the transaction.

(a) Failure by the licensee or a person subject to be licensed under this chapter, or by his or her agent or salesperson, to comply with the following provisions is cause for discipline:

(1) The contract shall be in writing and shall include the agreed contract amount in dollars and cents. The contract amount shall include the entire cost of the contract, including profit, labor, and materials, but excluding finance charges.
June 23, 2017

Ms. Jane Smith  
ACME Sample Architect Firm  
12345 Any Street  
Anywhere, CA 90011

Dear Ms. Smith:

On behalf of the California Architects Board, I am writing to encourage you to consider offering internship opportunities to students who are enrolled in the new innovative Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) program.

NewSchool of Architecture and Design, the University of Southern California, and Woodbury University (contact information on the reverse side) are 3 of 17 institutions accepted into the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) IPAL initiative. IPAL orchestrates the integration of education and experience into the curriculum, as well as provides students an accelerated opportunity to take each of the six divisions of the Architect Registration Examination. Board member Pasqual Gutierrez was instrumental in the development of this program and served on NCARB’s IPAL Task Force.

The success of this endeavor requires action and support from the profession. NCARB has developed the framework for the program and coached the institutions on how to best meet their goals. The schools have invested significantly in developing their programs and launching with an initial cohort of students this year. The Board amended the Architects Practice Act to accommodate IPAL students for early testing. A crucial component of the effort is commitment from practicing architects to provide quality professional experience for the students.

We are creating a powerful model for the future that will help usher graduates into the profession more effectively. Current NCARB data shows that it takes many candidates 12 years to complete the licensure process. By integrating the components of licensure into the degree program, graduates will be better positioned to enter the profession as productive practitioners.

We are very enthusiastic about the positive impact of this effort. In fact, past president Jon Baker’s firm has already placed an IPAL intern. I urge you to consider placing an IPAL intern as well.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW McGUINNNESS  
President
California IPAL Contacts

Mitra Kanaani, IPAL Coordinator
NewSchool of Architecture and Design
(858) 663-2127
mkanaani@newschoolarch.edu

Catherine Roussel, Career and Outreach Coordinator
Woodbury University
(818) 394-3339
catherine.roussel@woodbury.edu

Charles Lagreco, Associate Professor
University of Southern California
(213) 740-2092
Lagreco@usc.edu

Visit the NCARB website (www.ncarb.org/become-architect/ipal) for more information on Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure.
Integrated Path to Architecture Licensure (IPAL) at NewSchool of Architecture & Design

By Mitra Kanaani, D. Arch., MCP, AIA, ICC, Professor of Graduate Architecture and IPAL Coordinator at NewSchool of Architecture & Design

NewSchool of Architecture & Design is proud to be one of only 18 schools selected by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) to participate in the Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL). In California, NewSchool is one of only two institutions to offer IPAL at the graduate level.

IPAL is a new pedagogical model in architectural education that offers qualified students the opportunity to simultaneously work toward their architectural licensing requirements while earning their degree. By combining education, experience, and examination, there will be a unique opportunity for the participating students to enter the profession as licensed architects in an expeditious way, with the same rigor for the requisite knowledge, skills, and experience, for a fulfilling career in architecture.

By enhancing current educational knowledge and skills with experiential learning and licensing exam preparation, IPAL will transform architectural education not only for students, but also for the schools that are going to be involved in such integrated pedagogy. Participating institutions must offer a curriculum that holistically integrates architectural discipline and practice, and that ensures every graduate is prepared to excel professionally and make a positive impact on their industry and community.

Through the IPAL program at NewSchool, students can concurrently complete their National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)-accredited degree, professional experience, and licensing exams in an accelerated timeline that will save them time and professional expenditures. NewSchool will be offering two tracks — IPAL 4+2 and IPAL 4+3 — leading to the first professional Master of Architecture degree, both launching in the fall of 2016. IPAL 4+2 is a three-year program for students who have completed a four-year Bachelor of Architecture. The IPAL 4+3 is a four-year program for candidates who have a bachelor's degree unrelated to architecture.

During the first year of NewSchool’s IPAL program, students will take a full course-load of architectural graduate foundation courses, including design, precedents and critical thinking, as well as constructability, and tectonics. There are specific IPAL courses that allow the students exposure to the professional practice of architecture. During the first summer, students will have opportunity for study abroad options, as well as the opportunity to gain experience in architectural firms or on job sites.

In their second year, students will have part-time internships during the fall and spring and full-time internships during summer. These paid internships will follow NCARB requirements for the Architectural Experience Program (AXP). NewSchool, as part of its IPAL requirements, has collaborated with leading industry partners to form a consortium of prominent firms which will provide invaluable practical opportunities for students to fully understand the variety of professional roles available in architecture.

The six divisions of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) are synchronized with the course sequence so that students can take two divisions each year during their second, third, and fourth years. The final year of the program will consist of a full-time practicum and the remaining ARE divisions.

Since its founding, NewSchool has promoted a culture of professional practice through faculty who are active in the industry and curricula that are forward-thinking and career-oriented. As we implement IPAL, we will continue to innovate so that we anticipate and serve the needs of our profession.

For more information, visit NewSchool’s website.

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) at the University of Southern California

This article is the second in a series of three for the California IPAL initiative schools. The next IPAL program to be featured in the California Architects newsletter is the School of Architecture at Woodbury University.

By Michael Hricak, FAIA, BS Arch., M. Arch., Lecturer, University of Southern California (USC) School of Architecture and Charles Lagreco, AIA, BA Arch., MFA Arch., Dipl. Arch., Associate Professor, USC School of Architecture with highlights of the USC School of Architecture’s IPAL Initiative Program

In the fall of 2016, an experimental program initiated by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) with the support of the California Architects Board (CAB) was introduced to the USC School of Architecture community with an entry in the USC catalog.

Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) Initiative Program

The USC School of Architecture was selected as one of the initial 14 accredited architectural schools in the United States to participate in the NCARB IPAL initiative. The IPAL program is designed to monitor and provide support for obtaining architectural licensure within designated professionally accredited programs that combine an integrated approach to the Architectural Experience Program (formerly IDP, now AXP) and the taking of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) both of which are required for licensure.

USC is one of three schools in California that has been accepted into IPAL and supported by the California Architects Board to allow students to take the ARE while enrolled in school rather than having to wait until after graduation, as is currently the case in California.

USC provides both support for the AXP requirements through the Architectural Guild network of firms and the NotLy ARE support program to help students prepare and successfully address the examination requirements for licensure.

USC’s selection and participation in the IPAL program does not change any of the requirements to our existing architectural degree programs. However, it will provide guidance and additional assistance to all our architecture students in becoming eligible for licensure by encouraging them to take advantage of our increased access to the state and national licensure examinations concurrent with enrollment in our accredited professional degree programs. It will also provide support and encourage architectural experience in the professional community and provide the opportunity to significantly reduce the amount of time necessary to become a licensed architect while increasing the awareness and interaction between professional and academic experience.

The advantages of this initiative are much more than positioning students for licensure at graduation. What is being launched is a fully integrated experience providing both perspective and relevance to the training requirement, thus enriching the academic experience. By exposing the students/candidates to the usefulness of applying practical skills to guide design decisions, these educational and professional experiences bridge the hypothetical and the practical.

Finally, the effectiveness of the program will be determined by: the success rates of student/candidates completing the ARE divisions and the projected increase in pass rates of enrolled students due to the proximity in time of the exams to the academic study of the subjects. A key factor and advantage of IPAL programs will be the ability for students to prepare for the exams with their peers in a collaborative environment rather than having to study for exams independently while working full time after graduation.

The USC School of Architecture is committed to the IPAL initiative and considers it to be an enrichment of our current efforts in making licensure available earlier and more efficiently, while strengthening the quality of the workforce and providing increased access to the profession. The USC School of Architecture is very pleased to be involved in the testing of this initiative and will be monitoring the impact on our programs over the next few years as increasing numbers of students participate.

For more information, visit the IPAL page on the NCARB website.
Integrated Path to Architecture Licensure (IPAL) at Woodbury University

Final article in a three-part series for the California IPAL initiative schools.

Highlights of Woodbury University School of Architecture’s IPAL programs provided by Catherine Roussel, AIA.

Woodbury University Embraces Integrated Path to Licensure to Empower Change

Woodbury University School of Architecture has a long-standing engagement with practice. Recognizing that perspectives are shaped by experience, the School of Architecture is rethinking student learning to redefine professional engagement. Expanding the scope of architectural education, the university is strengthening its commitment to practice by preparing students to lead positive change in the built environment. As our first cohort of Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) students begin their second summer of work and newly accepted students are starting to work in offices, we see more clearly how the program can benefit firms and proactively support the profession. Looking forward, we encourage firms to partner with us in shaping new connections between education and practice.

When we first reached out to firms for their support of our IPAL proposal in 2014, we were met with universal support, recounts Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA. Fourteen firms wrote letters of support and pledged to work with students to fulfill their Architectural Experience Program (AXP) hours through the IPAL program. Though Woodbury University has long had a work experience requirement for undergraduate students in all disciplines, the IPAL program is more intense. In order to ensure student success, we established a competitive process where students must demonstrate commitment and readiness. In turn, partner firms recognize that they have a critical role in guiding interns through the AXP experience.

IPAL provides structure, through a partnership between firms and the academy, to help students complete both AXP and degree requirements, which together help prepare students for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE). While not everyone chooses this integrated path, it can be an invaluable process for those who do.

Bachelor of Architecture students have the opportunity to complete the five-year program in six years, incorporating two years of internship, and passing the ARE prior to receiving their BArch. Following their second year, participating students work each summer in an internship, and complete a one-year internship between their fourth and fifth years. Consequently, successful students have the opportunity to be licensed upon graduation (candidates must compete all licensure requirements, including [but not limited to] passage of all division of the ARE and passage of the CSE). Woodbury’s Master of Architecture program is among the first of four graduate programs accepted by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) nationally. This path is set up to take students four years to complete with a summer internship between the first and second year and a one-year internship between their second and third years, finishing the AXP hours with one final summer of work.

This initiative would not be possible without our state board. Woodbury acknowledges the support of the California Architects Board and the decision to allow examination before graduation for IPAL students. These efforts are further supported by the Board’s decision to adopt NCARB’s recommended reduction in the hours required for AXP from 5,600 to 3,740 core hours for all candidates. Together, these changes have enabled IPAL programs to support students through all of the licensure requirements, encouraging students to engage with practice sooner and helping make licensure more attainable.

The IPAL option is generating interest among students to integrate their education with experience. As one student observed, “I really wanted to integrate work into my architectural education. I knew that combining the experience of both would make me stronger and it has.” Catherine Herbst, architecture chair for Woodbury University’s San Diego campus, agrees that learning is more effective when education and practice are integrated. “It is a better way to learn.” Another student said she chose the IPAL path in order to complete her studies and licensure as soon as possible because you never know what will happen in the future.

“The sooner the students begin working in an office, the better. IPAL students, on the licensure track, are inspiring others and having a positive influence. However, one of the challenges has been giving work assignments to students so early in their professional degree program. We are having to rethink our internship program, and are making it stronger as a result.”

— Jonathan Ward of NBBJ, Los Angeles

http://www.cab.ca.gov/news/newsletters/2017-02/ipal_at_woodbury_university.shtml
Late dean of Woodbury’s School of Architecture, Norman Millar who was a champion of the IPAL initiative nationally, touched on the importance of IPAL at Woodbury by saying that, “From the perspective of a school with a preponderance of first-generation college students who reflect the multicultural diversity of our region, we see NCARB’s [Integrated] Path to Architectural Licensure initiative as an important stepping stone to improving the diversity—including gender diversity—of licensed architects. We embrace the opportunity to work closely with a consortium of architecture firms and our state board in the process.”

The first cohort of IPAL students reflected that diversity and included seven women out of eight students at the Burbank campus. That has since leveled out to a more even ratio of men to women, with some international students joining the program. We now have 25 students and expect this number to grow each year until our first class graduates in 2020. Students interested in IPAL generally apply during their second year of the BArch program. We have also accepted some first-year students and will consider transfer students. In a summer internship, students can expect to fulfill 500–600 of their AXP hours.

We have not changed the curriculum; however, we are increasingly emphasizing skills in the first two years of the BArch program—to serve students through their academic studies as well as to prepare them for practice. Students also complete the first in a series of practice courses in their second year, in which they produce construction documents and learn Revit. Graduate students bring with them varied experience that also enriches their contribution to firms as they gain experience in practice.

With a growing consortium of firms in Los Angeles and San Diego who have hired qualified students, from global offices like NBBJ to Carrier Johnson in San Diego and Bestor Architecture in Los Angeles, Woodbury’s program is quickly gaining recognition. We invite any firms who are interested in preparing the next generation of architects for an increasingly complex world and expanding range of practice to contact us. Our team includes Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA, Architecture Chair, Catherine Herbst, AIA, (San Diego) as well as graduate and undergraduate Chairs, Ewan Branda and Heather Flood (Los Angeles), and Architect Licensing Advisor, Catherine M. Roussel, AIA. Information about the IPAL, BArch, and MArch programs are available on the Woodbury University website.

At Woodbury, we believe in the power of practice to empower change. By embracing IPAL, we’ve made concrete steps to building professional experiences that better serve both firms and students. We see the IPAL program as a vital opportunity to help students understand the built environment, expand their critical thinking skills, and engage with new design problems. We remain committed to professional development, partnering with firms and practices to give students well-rounded experiences and challenges that they are prepared to tackle. We appreciate the support of the California Architects Board, and we will continue to explore new education models like IPAL that allow students to address the complex demands inherent to contemporary practice.

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834
REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BOARD’S
DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES AND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR),
TITLE 16, DIVISION 2, SECTION 154 (DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES)

The California Architects Board (Board) and Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) staff have been working collaboratively to update the Board’s and LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines.

The Board previously: 1) approved revisions to the Board’s and LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines and the proposed language to amend CCR §§ 154 and 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines); 2) authorized staff to proceed with the required regulatory changes to incorporate the revised Guidelines by reference; and 3) delegated authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the regulations, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and to make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed.

Following the Board’s approval of the Guidelines, legal counsel recommended additional substantive changes which were necessary prior to submission of the regulatory packages. The Board approved the recommended revisions to LATC’s Guidelines at its September 7, 2017, meeting. Board staff reviewed legal counsel’s recommendations as they relate to the Board’s Guidelines and determined that some changes would also need to be made to the Board’s Guidelines prior to submission of the regulatory package. Accordingly, staff has updated the Board’s Guidelines (Attachment 1) and the proposed language to amend CCR § 154 (Attachment 2) to include the necessary revisions identified by legal counsel (highlighted in yellow).

The Board is asked to review legal counsel’s recommended revisions to the Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines and the proposed regulatory language to amend CCR § 154, and take possible action.

Attachments:
1. Board’s Disciplinary Guidelines with recommended revisions
2. Proposed Regulatory Language, CCR, Title 16, Section 154
PENDING REGULATORY CHANGE
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I. INTRODUCTION

To establish consistency in disciplinary penalties for similar offenses on a statewide basis, the California Architects Board (CAB Board) has adopted these uniform disciplinary guidelines for particular violations. This document, designed for use by Administrative Law Judges, attorneys, Board licensees, others involved in the Board’s disciplinary process, and ultimately the Board, shall may be revised from time to time and will be distributed to interested parties upon request.

These guidelines include general factors to be considered, probationary terms, and guidelines for specific offenses. The guidelines reference the statutory and regulatory provisions for specific offenses are referenced to the statutory and regulatory provisions.

For purposes of this document, terms and conditions of probation are divided into two general categories: (1) Standard Conditions are those conditions of probation which will generally appear in all cases involving probation as a standard term and condition; and (2) Optional Conditions are those conditions which address the specific circumstances of the case and require discretion to be exercised depending on the nature and circumstances of a particular case.

The Board recognizes that these recommended penalties and conditions of probation are merely guidelines and that mitigating or aggravating circumstances and other factors may necessitate deviations, as discussed herein. If there are deviations from the guidelines, the Board would request that the Administrative Law Judge hearing the matter include an explanation in the Proposed Decision so that the circumstances can be better understood and evaluated by the Board upon review of the Proposed Decision and before final action is taken.

Additional copies of this document may be obtained by contacting the CAB Board at its office in Sacramento, California. There may be a charge assessed sufficient to cover the cost of production and distribution of copies.

II. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. Proposed Decisions

The Board requests that Proposed Decisions following administrative hearings include the following:

a. Specific code sections violated, along with their definitions descriptions.

b. Clear description of the underlying facts demonstrating the violation committed.

c. Respondent’s explanation of the violation if he/ or she is present at the hearing.

d. Findings regarding aggravation, mitigation, and rehabilitation where appropriate.

e. When suspension or probation is ordered, the Board requests that the disciplinary order include terms within the recommended guidelines for that offense unless the reason for departure from the recommended terms is clearly set forth in the findings and supported by the evidence.
B. Stipulated Settlements

The Board will consider agreeing to stipulated settlements to promote cost-effective consumer protection and to expedite disciplinary decisions. The respondent should be informed that in order to stipulate to a settlement with the Board, he or she may be required to admit to the violations set forth in the accusation or statement of issues. All proposed stipulated settlements must be accompanied by a memorandum from the Deputy Attorney General addressed to Board members explaining the background of the case and defining the allegations, mitigating circumstances, admissions, and proposed penalty, along with a recommendation for the Board to adopt the stipulated settlement.

C. Cost Reimbursement

The Board seeks reimbursement of its investigative and prosecution costs in all disciplinary cases. The costs include all charges incurred from the Office of the Attorney General, the Division of Investigation, and Board services, including, but not limited to, expert consultant opinions and services. The Board seeks reimbursement of these costs because the burden for payment of the costs of investigation and prosecution of disciplinary cases should fall upon those whose proven conduct required investigation and prosecution, not upon the profession as a whole.

D. Factors to be Considered -

In determining whether revocation, suspension, or probation is to be imposed in a given case, factors such as the following should be considered:

1. Nature and severity of the act(s), offense(s), or crime(s) under consideration.
2. Actual or potential harm to any consumer, client, or the general public.
3. Prior disciplinary record.
4. Number and/or variety of current violations.
5. Aggravating evidence.
7. Rehabilitation evidence.
8. In the case of a criminal conviction, compliance with terms of sentence and/or court-ordered probation.
9. Overall criminal record.
10. Time passed since the act(s) or offense(s) occurred.
9. Whether the respondent’s conduct was intentional or negligent, demonstrated incompetence, or, if the respondent is being held to account for conduct committed by another, the respondent had knowledge of or knowingly participated in such conduct.
11. Any financial benefit to the respondent from his or her misconduct.
10. Whether or not the respondent cooperated with the Board’s investigation, other law enforcement or regulatory agencies, and/or the injured parties.
11. Recognition by the respondent of his or her wrongdoing and demonstration of corrective action to prevent recurrence.
E. Substantial Relationship Criteria

Title 16, California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 2, Article 2, section 110 states:

For the purposes of denial, suspension, or revocation of the license of an architect pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of an architect if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of an architect to perform the functions authorized by his/her license in a manner consistent with the public health, safety or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include, but not be limited to, those involving the following:

(a) Any violation of the provisions of Chapter 3, Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code.

F. Criteria for Rehabilitation
(For cases involving an applicant, the conviction of a crime, the reinstatement of licensure, or the reduction of penalty)

Title 16, California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 2, Article 2, section 110.1 requires the Board, when considering the denial of an architect’s license under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code; the suspension or revocation of a license based on the conviction of a crime; a petition for reinstatement of a license; or a petition for reduction of penalty, to consider the following criteria:

(a) When considering the denial of an architect’s license under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code, the Board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of the applicant and his/her present eligibility for a license will consider the following criteria:

(1) The nature and severity of the act(s) or crime(s) under consideration as grounds for denial.
(2) Evidence of any act(s) committed subsequent to the act(s) or crime(s) under consideration as grounds for denial which also could be considered as grounds for denial under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code.
(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or crime(s) referred to in subdivision (1) or (2).
(4) The extent to which the applicant has complied with any terms of parole, probation, restitution, or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the applicant.
(5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the applicant.

(b) When considering the suspension or revocation of the license of an architect on the grounds that the person licensed has been convicted of a crime, the Board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of such person and his/her present eligibility for licensure will consider the following criteria:

(1) Nature and severity of the act(s) or offense(s).
(2) Total criminal record.
(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).
(4) Whether the licensee has complied with any terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the licensee.
(5) If applicable, evidence of expungement proceedings pursuant to Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.
(6) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.
(c) When considering the petition for reinstatement of the license of an architect, the Board shall evaluate evidence of rehabilitation submitted by the petitioner, considering those criteria specified in subsection (b).

III. DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES

The offenses are listed by section number in the Business and Professions Code or California Code of Regulations. The standard terms of probation as stated herein shall be included for all probations. The optional conditions of probation as stated herein, are to be considered and imposed along with any other optional conditions if facts and circumstances warrant. The number(s) in brackets listed after each condition of probation refers to the specific standard or optional conditions of probation listed on pages __________.

A. Business and Professions Code Sections

Section 5536
Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation or denial of license application  
**MINIMUM:** Issue initial license (if applicable), stayed revocation, and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]  
b. Cost reimbursement [#16]  
c. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 5536.1
Signature and Stamp on Plans and Documents; Unauthorized Practice

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation or denial of license application  
**MINIMUM:** Issue initial license (if applicable), stayed revocation, and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]  
b. Cost reimbursement [#16]  
c. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)
Section 5536.22
Written Contract

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Cost reimbursement [#16]

b. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 5536.4
Instruments of Service – Consent

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Cost reimbursement [#16]

b. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 5536.5
State of Emergency – Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation or denial of license application

**MINIMUM:** Issue initial license (if applicable), stayed revocation, and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]

b. Cost reimbursement [#16]

c. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 5558
Mailing Address and Name and Address of Entity Through Which License Holder Provides Architectural Services; Filing Requirements

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional condition:

a. Cost reimbursement [#16]
Section 5577
Conviction of a Crime Substantially Related to the Qualifications, Duties, and Functions of an Architect

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation or denial of license application

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]
- ba. Cost reimbursement [#1216]
- eb. Criminal probation reports [#1418]

Section 5578
Acts in Violation of the Architects Practice Act

The appropriate penalty depends on the nature of the offense.

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. Cost reimbursement [#16]
- b. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 5579
Fraud or Misrepresentation in Obtaining License

**MAXIMUM/MINIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. Ethics course [#14]
- b. Cost reimbursement [#16]
Section 5580
Impersonation or Use of Assumed or Corporate Name

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]
- ba. Continuing education courses Ethics course [#114]
- eb. Cost reimbursement [#1216]
- dc. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)

Section 5582
Aiding and Abetting the Unlicensed Practice of Architecture

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]
- ba. Continuing education courses Ethics course [#114]
- eb. Cost reimbursement [#1216]
- dc. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)

Section 5582.1
Signing Others’ Instruments of Service or Permitting Misuse of Name

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]
- ba. Continuing education courses Ethics course [#114]
- eb. Cost reimbursement [#1216]
- dc. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)
Section 5583
Fraud or Deceit

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation Ethics course [#1-714]

b. Continuing education courses [#1115]

c. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

d. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)

Section 5584
Negligence

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]

b. California Supplemental Examination [#9]

e. Continuing education courses [#1115]

d. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

c. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)

Section 5584
Willful Misconduct

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation Ethics course [#1-714]

b. Continuing education courses [#1115]

c. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

d. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)
Section 5585  
**Incompetency or Recklessness**

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation  
**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]  
- ba. California Supplemental Examination [#912]  
- eb. Continuing education courses [#1415]  
- ec. Cost reimbursement [#1416]  
- ed. Restitution [#1317](if applicable)

Section 5586  
**Disciplinary Action by a Public Agency**

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation  
**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

- a. Continuing education courses [#15]  
- b. Cost reimbursement [#16]  
- c. Restitution [#17](if applicable)

Section 5588  
**Failure to Report of Settlement or Arbitration Award**

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation  
**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional condition:

- a. Cost reimbursement [#16]
Section 5600.05
License Renewal Process; Audit; False or Misleading Information on Coursework on Disability Access Requirements

MAXIMUM: Revocation
MINIMUM: Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Continuing education courses [#15]
b. Cost reimbursement [#16]

B. General Provisions of Business and Professions Code

Section 125.6
Discrimination by Licensee

MAXIMUM: Revocation
MINIMUM: Stayed revocation, 60 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]
b. Cost reimbursement [#16]

c. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 140
Failure to Record and Preserve Cash Transactions Involving Wages

MAXIMUM: Revocation
MINIMUM: Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional condition:

a. Cost reimbursement [#16]

Section 141
Effect of Disciplinary Action Taken by Another State or the Federal Government

MAXIMUM: Revocation
MINIMUM: Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Continuing education courses [#15]
b. Cost reimbursement [#16]
c. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)
Section 143.5
Provision Prohibited in Settlement Agreements

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation and 3 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]

b. Cost reimbursement [#16]

Section 480-(a)
Denial of Licenses

An applicant’s application may be denied for (1) conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the practice of architecture; (2) any act involving dishonesty, fraud or deceit with the intent to substantially benefit himself or another, or substantially injure another; (3) any act which if done by a licensee would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license; or (4) knowingly making a false statement of fact required to be revealed in the application for such license.

**RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE MAXIMUM:** Denial of license application

**MINIMUM:** Issue initial license, stayed revocation, and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]

b. Continuing education courses [#15]

c. Cost reimbursement [#16]

d. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 490
Conviction of Crime; Suspension, Revocation – Grounds

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Cost reimbursement [#16]

b. Criminal probation reports [#18]
Section 496
Subversion of Licensing Examinations or Administration of Examinations

RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE

MAXIMUM: Denial or revocation or denial of license application

MINIMUM: Issue initial license (if applicable), stayed revocation, and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]

b. Continuing education courses [#15]

c. Cost reimbursement [#16]

d. Restitution [#17] (if applicable)

Section 499
False Statement in Support of Another Person’s Application

MAXIMUM: Revocation

MINIMUM: Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [#14]

b. Cost reimbursement [#16]

C. Title 16, California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 2
Article 9. Professional Conduct

Section 160
Rules of Professional Conduct

a. Competence

MAXIMUM: Revocation

MINIMUM: Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]

ba. California Supplemental Examination [#912]

eb. Continuing education courses [#1115]

dc. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

ed. Restitution [#1317] (if applicable)
b. **Willful Misconduct**

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days' actual suspension [#11], and 5 years' probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]

b. **California Supplemental Examination Ethics course** [#914]

c. Continuing education courses [#14][15]

de. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

d. Restitution [#13][17] (if applicable)

c. **Conflict of Interest**

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days' actual suspension [#11], and 5 years' probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]

b. Continuing education courses Ethics course [#14][14]

c. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

d. Restitution [#13][17] (if applicable)

d. **Full Disclosure**

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days' actual suspension [#11], and 5 years' probation on all standard conditions [#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. All standard conditions of probation [#1-7]

b. Continuing education courses Ethics course [#14][14]

c. Cost reimbursement [#1216]

d. Restitution [#13][17] (if applicable)
e. Copyright Infringement

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [\#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [\#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. **All standard conditions of probation** Ethics course [\#1-7,14]

b. Continuing education courses [\#11,15]

c. Cost reimbursement [\#12,16]

d. Restitution [\#13,17] (if applicable)

f. Informed Consent

**MAXIMUM:** Revocation

**MINIMUM:** Stayed revocation, 90 days’ actual suspension [\#11], and 5 years’ probation on all standard conditions [\#1-10] and the following optional conditions:

a. Ethics course [\#14]

b. Continuing education courses [\#15]

c. Cost reimbursement [\#16]

d. Restitution [\#17] (if applicable)

D. Violation of Probation

**Maximum Penalty** -

Actual suspension; vacate stay order and reimpose penalty that was previously stayed; and/or revoke, separately and severally, for violation of probation and/or for any additional offenses.

**Minimum Penalty** -

Actual suspension and/or extension of probation.

The maximum penalty is appropriate for repeated similar offenses, or for probation violations indicating a cavalier or recalcitrant attitude. If the probation violation is due in part to the commission of additional offense(s), additional penalties shall be imposed according to the nature of the offense; and the probation violation shall be considered as an aggravating factor in imposing a penalty for those offenses.
IV. MODEL DISCIPLINARY ORDERS

A. Licensee

Revocation of License

Architect License No. ________, issued to respondent ________, is revoked.

Respondent shall relinquish and shall forward or deliver his or her license to practice architecture and wall certificate to the Board within ten (10) days of the effective date of this Decision. Respondent may not reapply or petition the Board for reinstatement of his or her revoked license for three (3) one (1) years from the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall pay to the Board its costs of investigation and prosecution in the amount of $________ within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Decision.

Option: As a condition precedent to reinstatement of his/her revoked license, respondent shall reimburse the Board for its costs of investigation and prosecution in the amount of $________. Said amount shall be paid in full prior to the reinstatement of his or her license unless otherwise ordered by the Board.

Revocation Stayed and License Placed on Probation

Architect License No. ________, issued to respondent ________, is revoked; however, the revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for ________ years on the following terms and conditions:

Public Reproval

Architect License No. ________, issued to respondent ________, is publicly reproved. This reproval constitutes disciplinary action by the Board and shall become a part of respondent’s license history with the Board.

Surrender of License

Respondent ________ surrenders Architect License No. ________ as of the effective date of this Decision. Respondent shall relinquish and shall forward or deliver his or her license to practice architecture and wall certificate to the Board within ten (10) days of the effective date of this Decision.

The surrender of respondent’s license and the acceptance of the surrendered license by the Board shall constitute the imposition of discipline against respondent. This Decision constitutes disciplinary action by the Board and shall become a part of respondent’s license history with the Board.

B. Petition for Reinstatement

Grant Petition with No Restrictions on License

The petition for reinstatement filed by petitioner ________ is hereby granted, and petitioner’s architect license shall be fully restored.
Grant Petition and Place License on Probation

The petition for reinstatement filed by petitioner ________ is hereby granted, and petitioner’s architect license shall be reinstated and immediately revoked; however, the revocation shall be stayed and the petitioner shall be placed on probation for a period of ________ years on the following terms and conditions:

Grant Petition and Place License on Probation After Completion of Conditions Precedent

The petition for reinstatement filed by petitioner ________ is hereby granted, and petitioner’s architect license shall be fully reinstated upon the following conditions precedent:

Upon completion of the conditions precedent above, petitioner’s architect license shall be reinstated and immediately revoked; however, the revocation shall be stayed, and petitioner shall be placed on probation for a period of ________ years on the following terms and conditions:

Deny Petition

The petition for reinstatement filed by petitioner ________ is hereby denied.

C. Petition to Revoke Probation

Revocation of Probation

Architect License No. _______, issued to respondent _______, is revoked.

Extension of Probation

Architect License No. _______, issued to respondent _______, is revoked; however, the revocation is stayed, and respondent is placed on probation for an additional ________ year(s) on the following terms and conditions:

D. Applicant
(in cases where a Statement of Issues has been filed)

Grant Application with No Restrictions on License

The application filed by respondent ________ for initial licensure is hereby granted, and an architect license shall be issued to respondent upon successful completion of all licensing requirements, including payment of all fees.

Grant Application and Place License on Probation

The application filed by respondent ________ for initial licensure is hereby granted, and an architect license shall be issued to respondent upon successful completion of all licensing requirements, including payment of all fees. However, the license shall be immediately revoked, the revocation shall be stayed, and respondent shall be placed on probation for ________ years on the following terms and conditions:
Grant Application and Place License on Probation After Completion of Conditions Precedent

The application filed by respondent ________ for initial licensure is hereby granted, and an architect license shall be issued to respondent upon the following conditions precedent:

Upon completion of the conditions precedent above and successful completion of all licensing requirements, including payment of all fees, respondent shall be issued an architect license. However, the license shall be immediately revoked, the revocation shall be stayed, and respondent shall be placed on probation for ________ years on the following terms and conditions:

Deny Application

The application filed by respondent ________ for initial licensure is hereby denied.

V. CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

A. Standard Conditions of Probation
(To be included in all cases of probation)

Severability Clause

Each condition of probation is a separate and distinct condition. If any condition of this Decision and Order, or any application thereof, is declared unenforceable in whole, in part, or to any extent, the remainder of this Decision and Order, and all other applications thereof, shall not be affected. Each condition of this Decision and Order shall separately be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

1. Obey All Laws
   Respondent shall obey all federal, state, and local laws and regulations governing the practice of architecture in California and comply with all conditions of probation.

2. Submit Quarterly Reports
   Respondent, within 10 days of completion of the quarter, shall submit quarterly written reports to the Board using the Board’s Quarterly Probation Report of Compliance form (1/00Rev. 9/201612/2017) obtained from the Board (Attachment A).

3. Personal Appearances
   Upon reasonable notice by the Board, the respondent shall report to and make personal appearances at times and locations as the Board may direct.

4. Cooperate During Probation
   Respondent shall cooperate fully with the Board, and with any of its agents or employees in their supervision and investigation of his or her compliance with the terms and conditions of this probation. Upon reasonable notice, the respondent shall provide the Board, its agents or employees with the opportunity to review all plans, specifications, and instruments of service prepared during the period of probation.
5. **Maintain Active and Current License**

Respondent shall maintain an active and current license to practice architecture in California for the length of the probation period. Failure to pay all renewal fees and meet applicable coursework requirements prior to respondent’s license expiration date shall constitute a violation of probation.

6. **Notification of Changes to Address, Telephone Number, and/or Employment**

Respondent shall notify the Board in writing of any and all changes to his or her address of record, telephone number, and employment within 10 calendar days of such change.

57. **Tolling for Out-of-State Practice, Residence or In-State Non-Practice**

Respondent shall provide a list of all states, United States territories, and elsewhere in the world where he or she has ever been licensed as an architect or held any architecture related professional license or registration within 30 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision. Respondent shall further provide information regarding the status of each license and registration and any changes in the license or registration status within 10 calendar days, during the term of probation. Respondent shall inform the Board if he or she applies for or obtains an architectural license or registration outside of California within 10 calendar days, during the term of probation.

In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the State or for any reason stop practicing architecture in California, respondent shall notify the Board or its designee in writing within 10 days of the dates of departure and return, or the dates of non-practice or the resumption of practice within California. **Respondent’s probation is tolled, if and when he or she ceases practicing in California.** Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding thirty days in which respondent is not engaging in any activities defined in Section 5500.1 of the Business and Professions Code. **Periods of temporary or permanent residency or practice outside California or of non-practice within California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.** Respondent shall not be relieved of the obligation to maintain an active and current license with the Board. It shall be a violation of probation for respondent’s probation to remain tolled pursuant to the provisions of this condition for a period exceeding a total of five years.

All provisions of probation other than the quarterly report requirements, examination requirements, cost reimbursement, restitution, and education requirements, shall be held in abeyance until respondent resumes practice in California. All other provisions of probation shall recommence on the effective date of resumption of practice in California. **Periods of temporary or permanent residency or practice outside California or of non-practice within California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.**

68. **Violation of Probation**

If respondent violates probation in any respect, the Board, after giving respondent notice and opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order which was stayed. Notice and opportunity to be heard are not required for those provisions stating that a violation thereof may lead to automatic termination of the stay and/or revocation of the license. If an accusation or a petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation or the matter is referred to the Attorney General’s office, the Board shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be automatically extended until the matter is final.

If respondent has not complied with any term or condition of probation, the Board shall have continuing jurisdiction over respondent, and probation shall automatically be extended, until all terms and conditions have been satisfied or the Board has taken other action as deemed appropriate to treat the
failure to comply as a violation of probation, to terminate probation, and to impose the penalty that was stayed.

9. License Surrender While on Probation

During respondent’s term of probation, if he or she ceases practice due to retirement or health reasons, or is otherwise unable to satisfy any condition of probation, respondent may surrender his or her license to the Board. The Board reserves the right to evaluate respondent’s request and exercise its discretion in determining whether to grant the request, or to take any other action deemed appropriate and reasonable under the circumstances, without further hearing. Upon formal acceptance of the tendered license and wall certificate, respondent will no longer be subject to the conditions of probation. All costs incurred (i.e., cost reimbursement) are due upon reinstatement or relicensure.

Surrender of respondent’s license shall be considered a disciplinary action and shall become a part of respondent’s license history with the Board.

710. Completion of Probation

Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's license will be fully restored.

B. Optional Conditions of Probation

811. Suspension

Respondent is suspended from the practice of architecture for ______ days beginning on the effective date of this Decision.

912. California Supplemental Examination

Option 1 (Condition Subsequent)

Within ______ days six months of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall take and pass the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) designated by the Board.

If respondent fails to pass said examination within six months, respondent shall so notify the Board and shall cease practice until respondent takes and successfully passes said examination, has submitted proof of same to the Board, and has been notified by the Board that he or she may resume practice. Tolling provisions apply during any period of non-practice due to respondent’s failure to take and pass said examination. It shall be a violation of probation for respondent’s probation to remain tolled pursuant to this condition for a period exceeding a total of three years. Failure to pass the required examination no later than 100 days prior to the termination of probation shall constitute a violation of probation. Respondent is responsible for paying all costs of such examination.

Option 2 (Condition Precedent)

Prior to resuming or continuing practice, respondent shall take and pass the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) designated by the Board within two years of the effective date of this Decision.

This probationary period shall not commence until respondent takes and successfully passes said examination, has submitted proof of same to the Board, and has been notified by the Board that he or she may resume practice. Respondent is responsible for paying all costs of such examination.
10.3. Written Examination

Option 1 (Condition Subsequent)
Within one year of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall take and pass (specified) sections of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE).

If respondent fails to pass said examination within one year or within two attempts, respondent shall so notify the Board and shall cease practice until respondent takes and successfully passes said examination, has submitted proof of same to the Board, and has been notified by the Board that he or she may resume practice. Tolling provisions apply during any period of non-practice due to respondent’s failure to take and pass said examination. It shall be a violation of probation for respondent’s probation to remain tolled pursuant to this condition for a period exceeding a total of three years. Failure to pass the required examination no later than 100 days prior to the termination of probation shall constitute a violation of probation. Respondent is responsible for paying all costs of such examination.

Option 2 (Condition Precedent)
Prior to resuming or continuing practice, respondent shall take and pass (specified) sections of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) within two years of the effective date of this Decision.

This probationary period shall not commence until respondent takes and successfully passes said examination, has submitted proof of same to the Board, and has been notified by the Board that he or she may resume practice. Respondent is responsible for paying all costs of such examination.

14. Ethics Course

Within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall submit for prior Board approval a course in ethics that will be completed within the first year of probation.

Failure to satisfactorily complete the required course as scheduled or failure to complete same within the first year of probation shall constitute a violation of probation. Respondent is responsible for submitting to the Board for its approval the specifics of the course required by this condition, and for paying all costs of said course.

15. Continuing Education Courses

Respondent shall successfully complete and pass professional education courses approved in advance by the Board or its designee, directly relevant to the violation as specified by the Board. The professional education courses shall be completed within a period of time designated by the Board, which timeframe shall be incorporated as a condition of this probation.

Failure to satisfactorily complete the required courses as scheduled or failure to complete same no later than 100 days one year prior to the termination of probation shall constitute a violation of probation. Respondent is responsible for submitting to the Board for its approval the specifics of each course required by this condition, and for paying all costs of such courses.

16. Cost Reimbursement

Respondent shall reimburse the Board $_________ for its investigative and prosecution costs. The payment shall be made within ______ days/months of the effective date of this Decision is final.
Option: The payment shall be made as follows: __________ (specify either prior to the resumption of practice or in monthly or quarterly payments, the final payment being due one year before probation is scheduled to terminate).

1317. Restitution

Within ______ days of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall make restitution to __________ in the amount of $__________ and shall provide the Board with proof from __________ attesting the full restitution has been paid. In all cases, restitution shall be completed no later than one year before the termination of probation.

Note: Business and Professions Code section 143.5 prohibits the Board from requiring restitution in disciplinary cases when the Board’s case is based on a complaint or report that has also been the subject of a civil action and that has been settled for monetary damages providing for full and final satisfaction of the parties in the civil action.

1418. Criminal Probation Reports

If respondent is convicted of any crime, respondent shall provide the Board with a copy of the standard conditions of the criminal probation, copies of all criminal probation reports, and the name of his or her probation officer.

15. Relinquish License and Wall Certificate

Respondent shall relinquish and shall forward or deliver the license to practice and the wall certificate to the Board within 10 days of the effective date of this decision and order.

1619. Notification to Clients/Cessation of Practice

In orders which provide for a cessation or suspension of practice, within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision, respondent shall comply with procedures provided by the Board regarding notification to, and management of, provide all clients with whom he or she has a current contractual relationship in the practice of architecture with a copy of the Decision and Order of the Board and provide the Board with evidence of such notification, including the name and address of each person or entity required to be notified.
IV. REHABILITATION CRITERIA

California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 2, Section 110.1, Criteria for Rehabilitation states:

(a) When considering the denial of an architect’s license under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code, the Board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of the applicant and his/her present eligibility for a license will consider the following criteria:

(1) The nature and severity of the act(s) or crime(s) under consideration as grounds for denial.

(2) Evidence of any act(s) committed subsequent to the act(s) or crime(s) under consideration as grounds for denial which also could be considered as grounds for denial under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code.

(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or crime(s) referred to in subdivision (1) or (2).

(4) The extent to which the applicant has complied with any terms of parole, probation, restitution, or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the applicant.

(5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the applicant.

(b) When considering the suspension or revocation of the license of an architect on the grounds that the person licensed has been convicted of a crime, the Board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of such person and his/her present eligibility for licensure will consider the following criteria:

(1) Nature and severity of the act(s) or offense(s).

(2) Total criminal record.

(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).

(4) Whether the licensee has complied with any terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the licensee.

(5) If applicable, evidence of expungement proceedings pursuant to Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.

(6) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.

(c) When considering the petition for reinstatement of the license of an architect, the Board shall evaluate evidence of rehabilitation submitted by the petitioner, considering those criteria specified in subsection (b).
QUARTERLY PROBATION REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

1. NAME: ____________________________________________ TELEPHONE #: ( )
   (Last/First/Middle) (Residence)
   RESIDENCE ADDRESS OF RECORD: ________________________________
   CITY: ___________________________ STATE: __________ ZIP CODE: __________

2. NAME OF FIRM: ____________________________________________ YOUR TITLE: ____________________________
   FIRM ADDRESS: ________________________________________________
   CITY: ___________________________ STATE: __________ ZIP CODE: __________
   TELEPHONE #: ( )

3. On the back second page of this form, detail your architectural activities for the probation period
   beginning: ________ Mo. ________ Day ________ Year and ending: ________ Mo. ________ Day ________ Year.

4. Site List any other activities related to the practice of architecture:
   ACTIVITY DATE
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

5. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the information contained in this quarterly report
   regarding my professional practice is true and correct.
   Signature: ______________________________________________________
   Date: __________________________________________________________
DATE: ___________  QUARTER: _____  YEAR: _____

CLIENT NAME: ___________________________________________  TELEPHONE #: (   ) ______________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________________________

CITY: ___________________________  STATE: ____________  ZIP CODE: _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE/ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE START-COMPLETE</th>
<th>YOUR INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLIENT NAME: ___________________________________________  TELEPHONE #: (   ) ______________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________________________

CITY: ___________________________  STATE: ____________  ZIP CODE: _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE/ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE START-COMPLETE</th>
<th>YOUR INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLIENT NAME: ___________________________________________  TELEPHONE #: (   ) ______________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________________________

CITY: ___________________________  STATE: ____________  ZIP CODE: _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE/ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE START-COMPLETE</th>
<th>YOUR INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PROPOSED REGULATORY LANGUAGE

Article 8. Disciplinary Proceedings

Amend Section 154 as follows:

Section 154. Disciplinary Guidelines.

In reaching a decision on a disciplinary action under the Administrative Procedure Act (Government Code Section 11400 et seq.), the Board shall consider the disciplinary guidelines entitled “Disciplinary Guidelines” [2000Rev. 12/20167] which are hereby incorporated by reference. Deviation from these guidelines and orders, including the standard terms of probation, is appropriate where the Board in its sole discretion determines that the facts of the particular case warrant such a deviation - for example: the presence of mitigating factors; the age of the case; evidentiary problems.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 5510.1 and 5526, Business and Professions Code; and Section 11425.50(e), Government Code. Reference: Sections 125.3, 125.6, 140, 141, 143.5, 480(a), 490, 496, 499, 5536, 5536.1, 5536.22, 5536.4, 5536.5, 5553, 5558, 5560, 5561.5, 5565, 5577, 5578, 5579, 5580, 5582, 5582.1, 5583, 5584, and 5585, 5586, 5588, and 5600.05, Business and Professions Code; and Section 11425.50(e), Government Code.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

1. Update on November 2, 2017 LATC Meeting

2. Update and Possible Action on LATC’s Recommendation to Amend CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) that Define Related and Non-Related Baccalaureate Degrees and Experience-Only Pathways and Prescribe Allowable Credit for Initial Licensure
UPDATE ON NOVEMBER 2, 2017 LATC MEETING

The LATC met on November 2, 2017, in Los Angeles. Attached is the meeting notice. LATC Program Manager, Brianna Miller, will provide an update on the meeting.

Attachment:
November 2, 2017 Notice of Meeting
NOTICE OF MEETING
Landscape Architects Technical Committee

LATC MEMBERS
Patricia Trauth, Chair
Marq Truscott, Vice Chair
Andy Bowden
David Allen (DJ) Taylor, Jr.

November 2, 2017

UCLA Extension
10995 Le Conte Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024
(310) 825-9971 or (916) 575-7230 (LATC)

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) will hold a meeting, as noted above. The notice and agenda for this and other meetings of the LATC can be found on the LATC’s website: latc.ca.gov. For further information regarding this agenda, please see below, or you may contact Tremaine Palmer at (916) 575-7233.

Agenda
11:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
(or until completion of business)

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

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

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
   The Committee may not discuss or take action on any item raised during this public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Committee’s next Strategic Planning session and/or place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

D. Presentation of Open Meeting Act Requirements (Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs)

E. Review and Possible Action on July 13, 2017 LATC Meeting Minutes

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

G. Presentation on the University of California, Los Angeles Landscape Architecture Extension Program (Stephanie V. Landregan, Program Director)

(Continued)
H. Update and Possible Action on Education/Experience Subcommittee’s Recommendation to Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) That Define Related and Non-Related Degrees (Baccalaureate and Associate) and Experience-Only Pathways and Prescribe Allowable Credit for Initial Licensure

I. Update on 2017 Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) Annual Meeting

J. Discuss and Possible Action on the Following 2017-2018 Strategic Plan Objectives to:

   1. Incorporate a Quick Link on the Website That will Enable Consumers to Search Enforcement Actions and More Easily Identify Licensee Violations

   2. Expand Communication to Licensees Utilizing an “Opt-In” E-Mail Component on the Website to Increase Stakeholder Awareness of LATC

K. Election of 2018 LATC Officers

L. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

M. Adjournment

Action may be taken on any item on the agenda. The time and order of agenda items are subject to change at the discretion of the Committee Chair and may be taken out of order. The meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda, which may be at a time earlier or later than posted in this notice. In accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, all meetings of the Committee are open to the public. This meeting will not be webcast. If you wish to participate or to have a guaranteed opportunity to observe, please plan to attend the physical location.

Government Code section 11125.7 provides the opportunity for the public to address each agenda item during discussion or consideration by the Committee prior to the Committee taking any action on said item. Members of the public will be provided appropriate opportunities to comment on any issue before the Committee, but the Committee Chair may, at his or her discretion, apportion available time among those who wish to speak. Individuals may appear before the Committee to discuss items not on the agenda; however, the Committee can neither discuss nor take official action on these items at the time of the same meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7(a)).

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting:

Person: Tremaine Palmer
Telephone: (916) 575-7233
Telecommunication Relay Service: Dial 711
Email: tremaine.palmer@dca.ca.gov

Mailing Address: Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

*Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the LATC in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount (Business and Professions Code section 5620.1).*
UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON LATC’S RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND CCR, TITLE 16, DIVISION 26, SECTION 2620 (EDUCATION AND TRAINING CREDITS) THAT DEFINE RELATED AND NON-RELATED BACCALAUREATE DEGREES AND EXPERIENCE-ONLY PATHWAYS AND PRESCRIBE ALLOWABLE CREDIT FOR INITIAL LICENSURE

The LATC’s 2017-2018 Strategic Plan contains objectives to expand pathways to both initial and reciprocal licensure by exploring requirements for applicants who have degrees related to the field of landscape architecture or experience only. Currently, applicants for both initial and reciprocal licensure must verify a minimum of six years of combined education and training credit. Education credit may be granted for either a degree or approved extension certificate in landscape architecture, or a degree in architecture accredited by the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB). Attachment 1 details historical information on the development of current training and educational credit outlined in CCR §2620 (Education and Training credits) and a summary of the LATC’s prior evaluation of alternative degrees.

Recent Background Information Regarding CCR §2620 (Education and Training Credits)

At the January 17, 2017 LATC meeting, the Committee discussed the LATC’s Strategic Plan objective to expand credit for educational experience to include degrees related to the field of landscape architecture. Following discussion, the Committee directed staff to hold a public forum to receive input on changes to CCR §2620 in terms of related degrees. In an effort to increase accessibility to the public, staff held two forums: one in Northern California (Sacramento) on March 17, 2017, and another in Southern California (Pomona) on April 18, 2017, during the LATC meeting. Twelve individuals attended the March forum and 17 attended in April. In total, 56 comments were collected by way of the public forums and written comments.

On June 15, 2017, the LATC presented a proposal to the California Architects Board (Board) that would amend the LATC’s reciprocal licensure requirements. The proposal would allow licensees from any United States jurisdiction, Canadian Province, or Puerto Rico who have passed a written examination substantially equivalent in scope and subject matter required in California as determined by the Board to be eligible for licensure upon passing the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). Upon consideration of this proposal, the Board conveyed that the LATC’s initial and reciprocal licensure requirements should closely align with one another and, where possible, mirror those of the Board (which include related degrees and an experience-only pathway). The Board directed the LATC to develop such a proposal at its July 13, 2017 meeting for the Board’s consideration.

In response to the Board’s request, staff prepared a draft Table of Equivalents to amend CCR §2620 (Education and Training Credits) to align with the Board’s. Staff’s proposed amended language would grant credit for related and non-related degrees, while also adding an experience-only pathway for individuals with six years of training experience under a licensed landscape architect. For additional reference, Attachment 2 outlines the Board’s Table of Equivalents (CCR §117), which is used to evaluate architect candidates’ training and educational experience.

Staff presented the draft Table of Equivalents to the LATC at its July 13, 2017, meeting.
Following discussion, the Committee approved all pathways noted on the draft Table, including the related and non-related degrees and experience only pathways, and established an Education/Experience Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to define degrees related and unrelated to landscape architecture and the amount of education and experience credit appropriate for the proposed new pathways.

Below were the proposed licensure pathways detailing those which were accepted by the LATC and referred to the Subcommittee:

1. Degree in a field related to landscape architecture where the degree program consists of at least a four-year curriculum
2. Degree in a field related to landscape architecture where the degree program consists of at least a two-year curriculum
3. Degree in a field non-related to landscape architecture where the degree consists of at least a four-year curriculum
4. Degree in a field non-related to landscape architecture where the degree consists of at least a two-year curriculum
5. Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a licensed landscape architect

Education/Experience Subcommittee Recommendations

As prescribed by the LATC during its July 13, 2017 meeting, the Subcommittee consisted of one LATC member, one California licensed landscape architect, one educator who is a California licensed landscape architect, one California licensed landscape contractor (C-27), and one public member.

The Subcommittee met on October 3, 2017 with the charge of recommending to the LATC amendments to CCR §2620 (Education and Training Credits) that define related degrees and non-related degrees (baccalaureate and associate) and experience-only pathways, and prescribe allowable credits for initial licensure.

To aid the Subcommittee in issuing its recommendations, the meeting was facilitated by two representatives from the Department of Consumer Affairs SOLID Office. In addition, LATC staff conducted and presented additional research related to the Subcommittee’s charge, including a graphic displaying LATC’s current licensure pathways (Attachment 3). Provided research also included:

1. Charts detailing licensure requirements of other states as they relate to the LATC’s current and proposed licensure pathways (Attachments 4 and 5).
2. Content outline (based on a 2014 Occupational Analysis) for the CSE and the content areas of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (Attachments 6 and 7). Respectively, these documents provide an overview of the knowledge, skills, and abilities tested for in the State and national examinations.
4. Accrediting standards for accredited degrees in landscape architecture, architecture, and civil engineering (Attachment 8).
5. Board’s Table of Equivalents CCR §117 (Experience Evaluation).
The Subcommittee made recommendations for each of the five proposed pathways under its charge. The Subcommittee recommended two categories, Accredited and Non-Accredited for “degree in a field related to landscape architecture where the degree program consists of at least a four-year curriculum”. The Subcommittee also recommended degree types for related two-year degrees. In addition, the LATC currently grants one-year of education credit for a degree in architecture (which consists of at least a four-year curriculum that has been accredited by NAAB); however, the Subcommittee recategorized this degree as a “Related Degree (Accredited)” and prescribed a differing education credit amount of two years, accordingly.

**LATC Recommendations**

During its November 2, 2017 meeting, the LATC reviewed the Subcommittee’s recommendations and proposed amendments to CCR § 2620. The LATC was also presented with written and oral public comments from individuals who expressed dissatisfaction with the related degrees stipulated by the Subcommittee on the basis that the connection of these degrees to landscape architecture may be difficult to validate without an evaluation of curriculum.

The LATC expressed support for the Subcommittee’s recommendations, including the Subcommittee’s recommended pathway for related degrees (accredited), which provides two years of education credit for a candidate who holds an accredited degree in architecture or civil engineering. The LATC also maintained the recommended pathways that provide credit for any baccalaureate degree and an experience-only pathway. However, the LATC elected not to adopt the Subcommittee’s proposed lists of degrees designated as “related” for the related (non-accredited) four-year degrees and related two-year degrees.

In summary, the LATC recommended for the Board’s approval expanded pathways for initial licensure that include:

- Related degrees (accredited architecture and civil engineering degrees);
- Non-related baccalaureate degrees; and
- An experience-only pathway.

A graphic summary detailing the LATC’s recommendations, including credit allocation for the newly proposed pathways, is included in Attachment 9. In addition, proposed amendments to CCR § 2620 are included in Attachment 10.

Also included in attachments for the Board’s consideration are a draft of the Subcommittee’s October 3, 2017 meeting minutes (Attachment 11) and public comments, including those received for the Subcommittee meeting and the November 2, 2017 LATC meeting (Attachment 12).

At today’s meeting, the Board is asked to review the LATC’s recommendations as shown in Attachment 9, and take possible action to approve proposed amendments to CCR §2620 (Attachment 10) that expand the pathways to initial licensure to include 1) related baccalaureate degrees, 2) non-related baccalaureate degrees, and 3) experience-only pathways to initial licensure.

**Attachments:**
1. Historical Information: Development of Current CCR §2620
2. CCR §117 (Experience Evaluation) Architects Practice Act
3. Current 6-Year Requirement Graphic
4. Pathways to Licensure Chart
5. Degrees and Training Accepted by CLARB Jurisdictions for Initial Licensure
6. California Supplemental Examination – Examination Content Outline
7. Landscape Architect Registration Examination – Content Areas
8. Accrediting Standards for Accredited Degrees in Landscape Architecture, Architecture, and Civil Engineering
9. Proposed 6-Year Requirement Graphic as Recommended by the LATC
10. Proposed Amendments to CCR §2620
11. Education/Experience Subcommittee October 3, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Draft)
12. All public comment received (including those that were received for the Education/Experience Subcommittee)
Historical Information: Development of Current CCR 2620

Prior to January 1, 1997, CCR 2620 included a provision to grant credit for any bachelors or associate degree towards the required six years of training and educational experience, allowed eligibility to applicants with six years of training experience under the direct supervision of a licensed landscape architect in lieu of requiring education, and also granted up to one year of training credit for experience as, or under the supervision of, a licensed architect, registered civil engineer, licensed landscape contractor or certified nursery person. In March 1994, the California Board of Landscape Architects (BLA) began discussing the possibility of increasing the maximum amount of credit allowed for experience as a licensed landscape contractor. The BLA reviewed CCR 2620 and determined that, in order to grant additional credit for landscape contractor experience, the education requirement should be changed. In November 1994, the BLA finalized revisions to CCR 2620 that would allow up to four years of training credit for landscape contractor experience and require all applicants to hold either a degree or approved extension certificate in landscape architecture in order to qualify for the licensing exams, and ultimately licensure. These regulatory changes took effect on January 1, 1997.

In August 2004, LATC formed an Education Subcommittee charged with evaluating California’s eligibility requirements for the national Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) to ensure that applicants have appropriate educational and training/work experience before the examination is taken. Specifically, the Subcommittee was to determine appropriate levels of experience as they relate to: 1) public health, safety, and welfare; and 2) successfully preparing applicants for the examination. The Subcommittee met between October 8, 2005 and February 27, 2007.

The Subcommittee discussed the acceptance of various “related” degrees that are either recognized by other states or were identified by Subcommittee members and/or LATC staff. Consideration of accepting degrees related to landscape architecture was a result of the following: 1) the Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee previously raised concerns regarding the fact that, prior to 1997, California applicants could receive educational credit for holding any type of bachelor’s degree with a four-year curriculum; 2) Board grants educational credit for designated degrees related to architecture and unrelated degrees; 3) review of the neighboring and larger landscape architectural licensing jurisdictions (New York, Florida, Texas, Arizona, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington) revealed that at least six out of those nine jurisdictions recognize degrees related to landscape architecture; and 4) at the time, Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) allowed applicants to sit for the licensing examination with any type of bachelor’s degree, plus three years of diversified experience under the direct supervision of a licensed landscape architect.

After extensive review of the research material and discussion at the June 17, 2005 meeting, the Subcommittee recommended that LATC accept accredited bachelor’s degrees in architecture and civil engineering to satisfy the education requirement for examination eligibility with a caveat of conducting further research on other related degree programs. At the December 2, 2005 meeting, the Subcommittee discussed the additional research and agreed to recommend...
acceptance of accredited professional degrees in architecture and civil engineering (undergraduate and graduate degrees), as those degrees emphasize the acquisition of critical thinking and technical skills that are necessary to address health, safety, and welfare issues and are essential to the practice of landscape architecture. Also at this meeting, the Subcommittee agreed to recommend one-year of educational credit be granted for completion of these degree programs. One year of educational credit was agreed upon because the Subcommittee determined the curricula examined for such degree programs did not include sufficient specific exposure to landscape architecture related topics, but did address a certain measure of critical thinking and technical skills that are necessary to address health, safety, and welfare issues.

The Subcommittee determined that there was not clear and/or comparable rationale for granting similar credit for other related degree programs based on their insufficient curriculum and/or lack of accreditation standards. For example, urban design and horticulture degrees were considered and not included in this recommendation because they are either non-accredited or the coursework is not specifically related to the practice of landscape architecture.

The Education Subcommittee’s findings and recommendations were approved by the LATC on May 9, 2006 and presented to the California Architects Board (Board) at its meeting on June 7, 2006. At this meeting, the Board questioned education credit parity between architects and landscape architects. As a result of the Board’s parity question, the Education Subcommittee reconvened on November 8, 2006 and agreed to research the parity issue as it pertained to education curriculum for architects and civil engineers. At its February 27, 2007 meeting, the Subcommittee discussed the education curriculum research and decided to revise their earlier recommendation and recommend acceptance of accredited professional degrees in architecture, but not in civil engineering. Along with its earlier determination as to critical thinking and technical skills, the Subcommittee also noted that there were similar curriculum elements in the architectural degree programs in comparison to the landscape architecture programs and that it would warrant educational credit. The Education Subcommittee’s final recommendations were approved by the LATC on May 4, 2007 and the Board on June 15, 2007. As a result, CCR 2620 was amended to allow credit for an accredited degree in architecture.

As part of staff’s research on the Strategic Plan objective, in July 2016, Department of Consumer Affairs legal counsel reviewed Business and Professions Code section 5650 (Examinations - Qualifications, Application, Fee) and determined that it does not impose a degree requirement. Instead, what it does impose is an experience requirement and allows a “degree from a school of landscape architecture approved by the board” to count as four years toward California’s six-year experience requirement. Therefore, the LATC is not bound by statute to keep the current education requirement in place.

The history of changes in qualifying educational credit is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Allowed</th>
<th>Maximum Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Time Period Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved degree in Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Effective Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-approved degree in Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree in Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved extension certificate in Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Prior to January 1, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any associate degree</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Prior to January 1, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited degree in architecture</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>After March 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial completion of approved degree</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>After March 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial completion of extension certificate</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>After March 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 117 Experience Evaluation

The Board’s evaluation of candidates’ training and educational experience is based on the Board’s Table of Equivalents as listed below. The Table is comprised of four columns. Column A lists the types of experience for which credit may be granted. Columns B and C specify the maximum credit that may be granted to a candidate who was determined by the Board to be eligible for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE), the California Supplemental Examination, or licensure prior to January 1, 2005 and who is active in the examination process or to a candidate who is otherwise exempt from the IDP/IAP requirement specified in Section 116(b). Column D specifies the maximum credit that may be granted to a new or inactive candidate who was determined by the Board to be eligible for the ARE on or after January 1, 2005 and who is subject to the IDP/IAP requirement.

(a) Experience Equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Description</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates Eligible Prior to January 1, 2005 or Otherwise Exempt from IDP/IAP Requirement</td>
<td>Candidates Eligible Prior to January 1, 2005 or Otherwise Exempt from IDP/IAP Requirement</td>
<td>Candidates Eligible January 1, 2005 or After and Subject to IDP/IAP Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</td>
<td>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</td>
<td>Max. Credit Allowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) A professional degree in architecture, where the degree program has been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) or the Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) A professional degree in architecture, where the degree program has not been accredited by NAAB or CACB and the program consists of at least a five-year curriculum, or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) A four-year degree in architecture Baccalaureus Atrium (BA), Atrium Baccalaureus (AB), Bachelor of Science (BS), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>3 1/2 years</td>
<td>3 1/2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A degree from a school/college which has an NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited professional degree program in architecture, where the degree could be accepted for entry into a two-year NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited Master of Architecture program, or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>3 1/2 years</td>
<td>3 1/2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to architecture as defined in subsection (b)(6), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) (A) Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Experience under the direct supervision of an architect(s) licensed in a United States jurisdiction shall be granted 100% credit.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Certification by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) shall be granted a maximum of eight years credit upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate’s current and valid NCARB blue cover file, transmitted by NCARB.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) While a candidate is enrolled in a college or university, credit shall be granted:</td>
<td>1 year or 1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) 100% for experience obtained under the direct supervision of architect(s) licensed in the U.S.</td>
<td>1 year or 1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a registered civil or structural engineer and/or a licensed landscape architect licensed in a United States jurisdiction.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California licensed general building contractor.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California certified building official as defined in subsection (c)(7).</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column A</td>
<td>Column B</td>
<td>Column C</td>
<td>Column D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Description</td>
<td>Candidates Eligible Prior to January 1, 2005 or Otherwise Exempt from IDP/IAP Requirement</td>
<td>Candidates Eligible Prior to January 1, 2005 or Otherwise Exempt from IDP/IAP Requirement</td>
<td>Candidates Eligible January 1, 2005 or After and Subject to IDP/IAP Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Equivalents</td>
<td>Max. Credit Allowed</td>
<td>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</td>
<td>Max. Credit Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) 50% for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a foreign licensed architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country where the experience occurred.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Completion of the Intern Development Program (IDP) of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards or the Intern Architect Program of Canada shall be granted a minimum of three years credit, upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate’s current and valid NCARB IDP file transmitted by NCARB or documentation transmitted by a Canadian provincial architectural association, respectively.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) (A) Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a registered civil or structural engineer, and/or a licensed landscape architect licensed in a United States jurisdiction shall be granted 50% credit.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California licensed general building contractor shall be granted 50% credit.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California certified building official as defined in subsection (c)(7) shall be granted 50% credit.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Experience as a licensed architect practicing in another U.S. jurisdiction with a verified record of substantial architectural practice shall be granted 100% credit.</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) (A) A post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture consisting of a Master, Master of Science, or Ph.D. degree, or units toward such a degree, or</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Teaching and/or research in NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited architectural curriculums shall be granted 100% credit only for those hours worked if verified by the college or university.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) (A) Experience under the direct supervision of an architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country where the experience occurred shall be granted 50% credit.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Experience as a foreign licensed architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country with a verified record of substantial architectural practice shall be granted 50% credit.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Education Equivalents:

"Education equivalents" shall mean Table categories (a)(1) through (a)(9), (a)(10)(A), (a)(11), (a)(13), and (a)(15)(A) and (B).

1. For the purposes of this section, NAAB shall refer to the National Architectural Accrediting Board, and CACB shall refer to the Canadian Architectural Certification Board.
2. A "professional degree program" shall be defined as one of the following types of programs: 1. Bachelor of Architecture, five-year program; 2. Bachelor of Architecture for individuals with a prior degree; 3. Master of Architecture, four-year undergraduate program in architecture plus a two-year graduate program in architecture; 4. Master of Architecture, four-year undergraduate program in another discipline plus a three-year graduate program in architecture.
3. Where a candidate is seeking education equivalents for having obtained a professional degree or units towards such a degree from an NAAB-accredited or CACB-accredited program, he or she shall be eligible for such credit if such program is or was accredited by NAAB or CACB either at the time of graduation or within two years after the date of graduation or termination of enrollment.
4. Credit allowed for units obtained without a degree shall only be computed within the categories of subsections (a)(1) through (5) or (a)(14)(A) of this section. No credit for units obtained under subsections (a)(6) or (7) shall be recognized unless such units have been transferred to and accepted by a school within subsections (a)(1) through (5) of this section.
5. Academic units based on the categories specified in subsections (a)(1) through (5) or (a)(14)(A) of this section shall be evaluated up to the maximum allowed for that subsection. Where a candidate has not obtained a degree, the maximum credit allowed for the categories contained in subsections (a)(1) through (5) or (a)(14)(A) shall be six months less than the maximum credit that would have been granted if the candidate had obtained a degree in that category. Fractions greater than one-half of an academic year shall be counted as one-half of a year and smaller fractions will not be counted. 30 semester units or 45 quarter units is considered to be one academic year.
6. Degrees in a field related to architecture shall be evaluated under subsection (a)(5) and defined as the following: Architectural Design; Architectural Engineering; Architectural Studies; Architectural Technology; Building Science; City and Regional Planning; Civil, Mechanical, Structural, or Electrical Engineering; Construction Engineering; Construction Management; Environmental Design; Interior Architecture; Landscape Architecture; and Urban and Regional Design.
7. Experience obtained as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a licensed professional as defined in subsections (a)(8), (a)(12), and (a)(15)(A) or (B) while a candidate is enrolled in a college or university shall be allowed maximum credit for
(A) A candidate who obtained a degree in a program where credit earned is based on work experience courses (i.e., internship or co-op programs) shall not receive more than the maximum credit allowed for degrees earned under subsections (a)(1) through (7).

(C) A candidate who is certified as having completed the requirements of IDP, as referenced in section 109(b)(2), based upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate’s current and valid NCARB IDP file transmitted by NCARB, is exempt from the provisions of subsection (b)(7)(B) relating to maximum credit allowed for degrees where credit is earned based on work experience courses.

(8) A candidate who possesses a degree and possesses units from more than one college or university shall have the degree evaluated first prior to evaluating additional education credits.

(9) A candidate with multiple degrees shall not be able to accumulate credit for more than one degree unless he or she has received one professional degree in architecture and one post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture as specified in subsection (a)(14)(A). Otherwise, the degree that receives the most credit as determined by subsection (a) shall take priority over any other degree.

(10) A candidate who possesses a professional degree and also possesses a post professional degree in architecture or with an emphasis on architecture as specified in subsection (a)(14)(A) shall be granted one additional year credit for the post professional degree.

(11) Degrees from a foreign college or university shall be granted credit, as determined by the applicable category contained in subsections (a)(1) through (7). A transcript(s) certified by the college or university must be evaluated by NAAB or an educational evaluation service, approved by the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services, Inc. (NACES) equating the degree toward a comparable U.S. degree. Any cost of evaluation shall be the responsibility of the candidate. Professional degrees accredited by CACB shall be accepted by the Board and shall not be required to be evaluated by NAAB or an NACES education evaluation service equating the degree toward a comparable U.S. degree.

(12) Units from a foreign college or university shall be granted credit, as provided for in the applicable category contained in subsections (a)(1) through (5) upon submission of a transcript(s) certified by the college or university. These certified documents must be evaluated by NAAB or an NACES educational evaluation service equating the units toward a comparable U.S. degree. Any cost of evaluation shall be the responsibility of the candidate. Professional degrees accredited by CACB shall be accepted by the Board and shall not be required to be evaluated by NAAB or an NACES education evaluation service equating the degree toward a comparable U.S. degree.

(c) Training Equivalents:

"Training equivalents" shall mean Table categories (a)(8) through (a)(15).

(1) Candidates shall be at least 18 years of age or a high school graduate before they shall be eligible to receive training credit for work experience.

(2) Except as provided below, work experience shall be granted training credit only when:

(A) The supervising professional is licensed in a United States jurisdiction or a Canadian province and the work experience is obtained or the project is located in a United States jurisdiction or Canadian province, or

(B) The supervising professional is licensed in a qualifying foreign country where the work experience is obtained or project is located.

Training credit shall be granted for work experience obtained under the authority of or on the property of the United States Federal Government when the work experience is obtained as or under the direct supervision of a licensed professional as defined in subsections (a)(8), (a)(12)(A), and (a)(13).

The term "qualifying foreign country" shall mean a foreign country whose standards and qualifications for issuing a license to practice architecture are equivalent to those required in this state.

(3) Employment shall be considered on the basis of a calendar month of 40-hour work weeks. Credit may be given for overtime.

(4) Every candidate shall earn at least one year of training credit for experience as or under the direct supervision of an architect(s) licensed in a United States jurisdiction granted at 100% credit or at least two years of experience under the direct supervision of an architect(s) registered in a Canadian province granted at 50% credit.

(5) Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(B) and (a)(12)(A) shall not exceed the two years maximum credit allowed for experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a licensed professional architect in a United States jurisdiction. Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(C) and (a)(12)(B) shall not exceed the one year maximum credit allowed for experience as or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California licensed general building contractor. Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(D) and (a)(12)(C) shall not exceed the one year maximum credit allowed for experience as or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a California certified building official. Any combination of credit received under subsections (a)(10)(E) and (a)(15)(A) or (B) shall not exceed the maximum credit allowed for experience as or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a foreign licensed architect licensed in the qualifying foreign country where the experience occurred. A candidate cannot exceed two years maximum credit in any combination under subsections (a)(10)(B) through (D) and (a)(12)(A) through (C).

(6) Experience under the supervision of a "responsible managing officer" operating under a corporate contractor license shall qualify as experience under subsection (a)(12)(B) and shall be verified by the responsible managing officer of that corporation.

(7) For the purpose of this section, a California certified building official shall be as defined by Section 18949.27 of the Health and Safety Code as an individual who is certified in accordance with or otherwise exempt from Chapter 7, Part 2.5 of Division 13 (commencing with Health and Safety Code Section 18949.25).

(8) The entry point for IDP shall be as defined in NCARB’s Intern Development Program Guidelines, as referenced in section 109(b)(2).

(d) Practice Equivalents:

"Practice equivalents" shall mean Table categories (a)(8) through (a)(15).

(1) Practice credits for experience as a licensed architect, registered civil and/or structural engineer, California licensed general building contractor, licensed landscape architect, or certified California building official may be accumulated only after initial registration, licensure or certification by a licensing authority of a political jurisdiction.

(2) A candidate verifying his or her experience as a licensed architect, registered civil and/or structural engineer, California licensed general building contractor, licensed landscape architect, or certified California building official shall complete an Employment Verification Form (19C-12/3/2008) available from the Board on his or her own behalf, subject to licensure, registration, or certification, and attach a list of projects for the time period covered. The list shall include the names and addresses of the clients, type of projects, construction costs, date project was started, date of completion, and all services provided by the candidate.

(e) Miscellaneous Information:

(1) Independent, non-licensed practice or experience, regardless of claimed coordination or liaison with licensed professionals, shall not be granted credit.

(2) Training experience under subsections (a)(10)(B) through (D), (a)(12), or (a)(14) can only be accumulated after the candidate has obtained credit for at least the five years of educational equivalents as evaluated by the Board. Candidates who are certified as having completed the requirements of IDP as referenced in section 109(b)(2), based upon receipt in the Board office of the candidate’s current and valid NCARB IDP file transmitted by NCARB, or IAP, as referenced in section 109(b)(2), based upon receipt in the Board
office of documentation transmitted by a Canadian provincial architectural association, are exempt from this requirement for their IDP/IAP training units.
**6-Year Requirement - Current**

Landscape Architecture

- **LAAB**
  - Education: 4 years
  - Training Experience: 2 years
- **NON-LAAB ACCREDITED**
  - Education: 3 years
  - Training Experience: 3 years
- **EXTENSION CERTIFICATE***
  - Education: 2 years
  - Training Experience: 4 years
- **ASSOCIATE**
  - Education: 5 years
  - Training Experience: 1 year
- **NAAB (ARCHITECTURE)**
  - Education: 5 years
  - Training Experience: 1 year

*Extension Certificate with a four-year degree grants four years of education credit; Extension Certificate with a two-year degree in Landscape Architecture grants three years of education credit.
## Pathways to Licensure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Experience Only</th>
<th>LAAB (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>Non-LAAB (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>NAAB (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>Related 4-yr (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>Non-related 4-yr (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>AA in LA (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>Related AA (+Work Experience)</th>
<th>Non-related AA (+Work Experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2+ years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3-4 years4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+3-4 years4</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+7 years</td>
<td>+8 years</td>
<td>+8 years</td>
<td>+9 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1 year</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.5 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0+ years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+2-3 years2</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+8 years</td>
<td>+8 years</td>
<td>+8 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3-4 years3</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1 year</td>
<td>+1 year</td>
<td>+1 year</td>
<td>+1 year</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3-4 years3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3-4 years3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+0 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8 (CLARB)2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+2-3 years2</td>
<td>+3-4 years2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+3-4 years3</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>8 (CLARB)2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+3-4 years3</td>
<td>+4-5 years2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>8 (CLARB)2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+0 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>+4 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+6 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>Board Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+1-2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+5 years</td>
<td>+3 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Work experience must begin prior to August 1, 2012.  
2 Additional credit granted for a post professional LAAB degree.  
3 Additional credit granted for related Masters degree.  
4 Requires CLARB Certificate.  
5 Experience only if 8 years gained prior to 2003.
## Degrees And Training Accepted by CLARB Jurisdictions for Initial Licensure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Accredited Architecture Degree Accepted</th>
<th>Any Bachelors Degree Accepted</th>
<th>Non Accredited LA Degree Accepted</th>
<th>Training Experience-Only Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 May be granted upon Board Review

2 A foreign degree evaluated to be substantially equal to a LAAB degree.
EXAMINATION CONTENT OUTLINE: LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT CALIFORNIA SPECIFIC EXAMINATION

I. SITE ASSESSMENT (15%): This area assesses the candidate’s ability to evaluate and analyze the project site and surrounding conditions to determine opportunities and constraints based on the client’s goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Statements</th>
<th>Knowledge Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Site Inventory and Analysis (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gather general site information and data to identify alternative approaches to the project</td>
<td>2 Knowledge of methods for collecting and evaluating the information (e.g., regulatory impacts, projected costs, local and environmental issues) needed to determine the feasibility of approaches to a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Identify on- and off-site conditions and evaluate the potential opportunities and constraints for project development</td>
<td>10 Knowledge of the types of natural site conditions and resources (e.g., sensitive environments, geology, and existing ecology) and their potential effect on site development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Evaluate the potential impacts to the site and surrounding areas posed by the project development</td>
<td>13 Knowledge of types of hazardous conditions (e.g., fire, flood, erosion, storm water, soil contaminants) and their potential effect on site development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Knowledge of methods for obtaining site and design history sufficient to understand the significance of cultural/historical site elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Knowledge of procedures used to evaluate the impact of off-site conditions (e.g., environmentally sensitive resources, watershed boundaries) on site development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Knowledge of methods and procedures for clarifying and evaluating regulatory requirements (e.g., applicable laws, responsible agency, requirements and approval process) and their potential effect on project development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Knowledge of methods for determining the laws, codes, easements and restrictions that apply to the project and their impact on project development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Knowledge of data and information resources available (e.g., agency contacts, technical consultants) to research the potential impacts from on- and off-site factors on site development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Laws, Codes, and Regulations (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Determine the relevant laws, codes, and regulations that govern the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Identify the responsible regulatory agencies and their requirements and approval processes to evaluate the impact on the project (e.g., scope, costs, schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Coordinate research with technical consultants to evaluate the regulatory and property requirements (e.g., easements, setbacks, restrictions, master/general plans) affecting the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (10%): This area assesses the candidate’s ability to develop and evaluate program elements based on the client’s goals and the site conditions and constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Statements</th>
<th>Knowledge Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Develop project program based on the goals and objectives of the client and</td>
<td>1  Knowledge of methods for determining the project scope and developing project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>users</td>
<td>parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Develop program alternatives that support human communities, preserve and</td>
<td>3  Knowledge of water management strategies and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance the environment and biodiversity, and restore degraded sites (e.g.,</td>
<td>5  Knowledge of methods and techniques for communicating program ideas to clients,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil mitigation, constructed wetland)</td>
<td>the project team, and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Identify and engage individuals, groups, and organizations that may have</td>
<td>6  Knowledge of current approaches to sustainable and low impact development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific knowledge or concerns about the site so that the potential impact on</td>
<td>7  Knowledge of design strategies to facilitate active living (e.g., walkable cities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the project can be evaluated</td>
<td>transit-oriented development, safe routes to schools, bike paths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9  Knowledge of design strategies that preserve native habitat and promote biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Knowledge of methods for preserving, enhancing, or featuring unique site features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., vegetation, geology, views, waterways, cultural/historical elements) in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. DESIGN PROCESS (65%): This area assesses the candidate’s ability to develop, evaluate, and refine design solutions to meet the client’s needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Statements</th>
<th>Knowledge Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A Sustainability and Energy Conservation (6%)</strong></td>
<td>55 Knowledge of regulations and best management practices for sustainable development (e.g., CalGreen, LEED, Sustainable Site Initiative, Green Roofs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Develop project solutions to implement environmentally responsible design practices to assist in resource preservation (e.g., air quality, energy conservation, water conservation)</td>
<td>58 Knowledge of landscape solutions that promote energy conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Develop landscape solutions to promote energy conservation (e.g., strategic tree planting, use local products)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B Site Remediation (6%)</strong></td>
<td>30 Knowledge of the effects of environmental toxicity on soil and plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Develop measures for the mitigation, remediation, or reclamation of impacts to the environment from site development</td>
<td>31 Knowledge of mitigation solutions for complying with environmental regulations (e.g., CEQA, NEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 Knowledge of remediation strategies and their application for natural resource restoration/preservation (e.g. bioremediation and phytoremediation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 Knowledge of strategies for amending site conditions (e.g., alkaline soil, requirements of soil conditions, aerially deposited lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3C Access and Circulation (13%)</strong></td>
<td>46 Knowledge of California accessibility requirements and methods for achieving accessibility in the site and the vehicular and non-vehicular circulation system designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Design circulation systems (vehicular and non-vehicular) within regulatory design specifications to facilitate implementation of project</td>
<td>47 Knowledge of resources for interpreting and implementing regulatory and technical requirements (e.g., agency contacts, technical consultants) related to site development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Design site plan for user safety, security, and crime prevention to facilitate implementation of project</td>
<td>49 Knowledge of design options for site layout to increase user safety, security, and crime prevention (e.g., equipment, lighting, plantings, site layout)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. DESIGN PROCESS (65%): This area assesses the candidate’s ability to develop, evaluate, and refine design solutions to meet the client’s needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Statements</th>
<th>Knowledge Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3D Water Management (12%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Design site grading and drainage plan that facilitates implementation of the project and offers solutions for stormwater management</td>
<td>41 Knowledge of federal, State, and local laws and requirements regarding stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Develop design solutions for water conservation and management to assist in resource preservation (e.g., water reuse, water recycling, water harvesting)</td>
<td>42 Knowledge of design solutions for water management and conservation (e.g., erosion control, rainwater harvesting, grey water, reclaimed water, retention and detention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3E Planting &amp; Landscape Strategies (18%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Design planting plan to identify vegetation types and locations based on client goals, suitability, and sustainability to comply with the requirements of the project plan</td>
<td>23 Knowledge of factors that affect plant health and longevity (e.g., geography, weather, soils, water quality, water availability, pathogens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Knowledge of approaches to plant selection and compatibility that support water management and conservation (including WUCOLS)</td>
<td>24 Knowledge of approaches to plant selection and compatibility that support water management and conservation (including WUCOLS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Knowledge of landscape strategies that support California’s ecological communities and ecoregions</td>
<td>25 Knowledge of landscape strategies that support California’s ecological communities and ecoregions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Knowledge of plants invasive to California ecological communities</td>
<td>26 Knowledge of plants invasive to California ecological communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Knowledge of plants noxious to people and domesticated animals</td>
<td>27 Knowledge of plants noxious to people and domesticated animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Knowledge of planting strategies that mitigate site hazards (e.g., erosion, fire)</td>
<td>29 Knowledge of planting strategies that mitigate site hazards (e.g., erosion, fire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3F Irrigation (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Design irrigation system to facilitate water management and efficient distribution of water to promote healthy plant growth</td>
<td>34 Knowledge of principles and procedures of irrigation system design (e.g., equipment, applications, water conservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Knowledge of methods and procedures for employing alternative water sources</td>
<td>35 Knowledge of methods and procedures for employing alternative water sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Knowledge of State and local requirements regarding water management and conservation (e.g., AB 1881, CBC)</td>
<td>36 Knowledge of State and local requirements regarding water management and conservation (e.g., AB 1881, CBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Knowledge of how to perform water use calculations</td>
<td>37 Knowledge of how to perform water use calculations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Construction Documents and Contract Performance (10%): This area assesses the candidate’s ability to prepare construction documents and perform administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Statements</th>
<th>Knowledge Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34  Develop professional services contract in keeping with legal requirements and professional practice</td>
<td>59 Knowledge of procedures for preparing construction documents and jurisdictional submittals (e.g., approvals, permits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30  Prepare construction documents including demolition, site protection and preservation, grading and drainage, planting, irrigation, layout, lighting, etc.</td>
<td>63 Knowledge of processes and procedures for construction bidding, contract negotiation, and project delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35  Perform project/contractual responsibilities in keeping with professional and ethical standards</td>
<td>64 Knowledge of professional and ethical standards related to practice of landscape architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 Knowledge of California law as it relates to contracts and construction (e.g., lien requirements, minimum warranty periods, California Building Code)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 Knowledge of procedures for evaluating work conformance and completeness in relation to the construction documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 Knowledge of procedures for contract close-out (e.g., punch lists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content areas for the LARE: LARE Exam Section</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pre-Project Management                          | • Select Project Team  
• Develop Contract  
• Negotiate Contract  
• Prepare RFPs or RFQs  
• Determine Project Scope, Schedule, and Budget |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 10%                 |
| Project Management                               | • Manage Project Team  
• Manage Project Scope, Schedule, and Budget  
• Determine Common Goals and Objectives  
• Establish Quality Control  
• Procedures and Conduct  
• Quality Control Review  
• Facilitate Meetings: Coordinate Work of/with Other Disciplines, Document Design Decisions and Project Communication  
• Execute Records Retention Policy  
• Facilitate Client Review and Coordination  
• Obtain Permits  
• Prepare Cost Estimates  
• Prepare Project Deliverables |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 30%                 |
| Bidding                                          | • Develop Bidding Criteria  
• Prepare and Issue Addenda  
• Facilitate Meetings  
• Evaluate Bids and Make Recommendations  
• Identify Delivery Methods  
• Evaluate Contractor Qualifications  
• Assist with Construction Contract Execution and Administration |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 20%                 |
| Construction                                     | • Respond to RFIs  
• Coordinate with Contractors  
• Facilitate Pre-Construction Meeting  
• Document Pre-Construction Existing Conditions  
• Review Submittals  
• Prepare Change Orders  
• Conduct and Document Construction-related Actions  
• Prepare Drawing Revisions or Clarification Sketches  
• Review and Certify Applications for Payment  
• Attend Substantial Completion (practical completion) Walkthrough and Prepare Punch List (deficiency list)  
• Attend Final Completion Walkthrough  
• Prepare As-Built (record) Drawings  
• Conduct Warranty Review  
• Conduct Project Close-out  
• Collect and Analyze Performance Metrics |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 30%                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Design</th>
<th>Stakeholder Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design and Execute Public Participation Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritize Stakeholder Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiate Communication Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synthesize Stakeholder Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate Concept(s)/Schematic(s)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Inventory and Analysis</th>
<th>Site Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Determine Applicable Codes, Regulations, and Permitting Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect Contextual Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gather Stakeholder Input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify Policy Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct Project Related Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct Onsite Investigation and Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document Site Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine Performance Metrics</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Inventory and Analysis</th>
<th>Physical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Determine Appropriate Types of Analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform Circulation Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Utility Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform Visual Resource Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform Micro and Macro Climate Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform Hydrological Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform Vegetation Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Ecological Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform Topographical Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Soil and Geotechnical/Geological Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Environmental Studies</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Inventory and Analysis</th>
<th>Contextual Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Analyze Codes, Regulations, and Permitting Requirements for Design Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Cultural, Historical, and Archeological Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Social Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret Economic Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyze Contextual Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyze Stakeholder Feedback</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>• Estimate Maintenance and Management Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Maintenance and Operation Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Maintenance Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Management Plan</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Planning</th>
<th>• Perform Site Analysis and Determine Opportunities and Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Vision or Framework Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and Conduct Urban Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Land Use Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Strategic Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Site Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Historic/Cultural Restoration and Preservation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Parks, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Design Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop View Corridor Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Redevelopment Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Environmental Resources Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Multi-modal Transportation Plan</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design</td>
<td>• Synthesize and Apply the Site Analysis Develop and Refine the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create the Basis for the Design</td>
<td>• Create Conceptual Design Alternatives and Scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate Design Alternatives</td>
<td>• Evaluate Design Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refine and Synthesize Concept Alternative</td>
<td>• Develop Schematic Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Preliminary Quantities and Cost Estimate</td>
<td>• Prepare Preliminary Quantities and Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Presentation Drawings and Communication Tools</td>
<td>• Compile Materials Sample Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and Develop Performance Metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Demolition Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Existing Conditions Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Soil Boring Location Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Site Protection Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Mitigation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan and Details</td>
<td>• Develop Layout Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop General Notes</td>
<td>• Develop Grading and Drainage Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Planting Practices, Plans, Notes and Schedules</td>
<td>• Develop Materials Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Details</td>
<td>• Prepare Sections, Elevations, and Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate Code Requirements</td>
<td>• Prepare Summary of Quantities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Site Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Phasing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Irrigation Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Site Furnishings Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Lighting Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Signage and Wayfinding Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Traffic Control Plan</td>
<td>• Develop Emergency Access Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Stormwater Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications</td>
<td>• Develop Technical Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Bid Form/Schedule</td>
<td>• Develop Project Manual/Front End Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Site Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Standard 3: Professional Curriculum

The first-professional degree curriculum shall include the core knowledge, skills, and applications of landscape architecture.

a. In addition to the professional curriculum, a first-professional degree program at the bachelor’s level shall provide an educational context enriched by other disciplines, including but not limited to liberal and fine arts, natural sciences, and social sciences, as well as opportunities for students to develop other areas of interest.

b. In addition to the professional curriculum, a first-professional degree at the master’s level shall provide instruction in and application of research and scholarly methods.

c. A first-professional degree at the master’s level that does not require all students to have an undergraduate degree before receiving the MLA shall meet the requirements for both a and b, above.

INTENT: Each landscape architecture curriculum shall be designed to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and specific educational objectives of the program. The curriculum shall encompass both coursework and other co-curricular opportunities intended to develop students’ knowledge and skills in landscape architecture.

A. Curricular Expression of the Mission and Objectives. The program’s curriculum shall address and express its mission, goals, and objectives. (This criterion is directed not toward the evaluation of the mission and objectives, but rather toward the way the curriculum is developed and delivered in carrying out the expectations of the mission and objectives.)

Assessment: The program identifies the knowledge, skills, abilities, and values it expects students to possess at graduation.

B. Professional Curriculum. The program curriculum shall be guided by, but not limited to, coverage of:

History, theory, philosophy, principles, and values
  - design history
  - design theory
  - criticism
  - sustainability, resiliency, stewardship
  - health, safety, welfare

Design processes and methodology
  - critical thinking
  - analysis
  - ideation
  - synthesis
  - site program
  - iterative design development
  - design communication
Systems and processes—natural and cultural (related to design, planning, and management)
plants and ecosystems sciences
built environment and infrastructure
human factors and social and community systems
human health and well-being

Communication and documentation
written communication
oral communication
visual and graphic communication
design and construction documents
numeracy, quantitative problem-solving, and communication
community and client engagement

Implementation
construction technology and site engineering
site materials
use and management of plants and vegetation
policies and regulation

Computer applications and advanced technologies
visualization and modeling
communication (conceptual and construction drawings)
geospatial analysis

Assessment and evaluation
site assessment
pre-design analysis
landscape performance
post-occupancy evaluation
visual and scenic assessment

Professional practice
values
ethics
practice
construction administration

Research and scholarly methods (for master’s-level degree programs)
quantitative and qualitative methods
establishing a research hypothesis
framing research questions
literature/case study review/precedent review
research integrity and protection of human subjects
communication of research

Assessment 1: The curriculum addresses the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports the degree program’s goals and objectives.

Assessment 2: Student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession.

Assessment 3: Curriculum and program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession.
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the school’s stated curricular goals and content. While the NAAB stipulates the student performance criteria that must be met, it specifies neither the educational format nor the form of student work that may serve as evidence of having met these criteria. Programs are encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, methods, and materials to satisfy these criteria. The NAAB will consider innovative methods for satisfying the criteria, provided the school has a formal evaluation process for assessing student achievement of these criteria and documents the results.

The APR must include the following information:

- An overview of the school’s curricular goals and content.
- A matrix cross-referencing each required course with the performance criteria it fulfills. For each criterion, the school must highlight the cell on the matrix that points to the greatest evidence of achievement.

For the purpose of accreditation, graduating students must demonstrate understanding or ability in the following areas:

1. **Speaking and Writing Skills**

   *Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively*

2. **Critical Thinking Skills**

   *Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards*

3. **Graphics Skills**

   *Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process*

4. **Research Skills**

   *Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework.*

5. **Formal Ordering Systems**

   *Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design*
6. Fundamental Design Skills

   Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites

7. Collaborative Skills

   Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

8. Western Traditions

   Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

9. Non-Western Traditions

   Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

10. National and Regional Traditions

    Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

11. Use of Precedents

    Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

12. Human Behavior

    Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

13. Human Diversity

    Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

14. Accessibility

    Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities
15. Sustainable Design

*Understanding* of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities.

16. Program Preparation

*Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

17. Site Conditions

*Ability* to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project.

18. Structural Systems

*Understanding* of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

19. Environmental Systems

*Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope.

20. Life Safety

*Understanding* of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

21. Building Envelope Systems

*Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies.

22. Building Service Systems

*Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems.
23. Building Systems Integration

*Ability to* assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

24. Building Materials and Assemblies

*Understanding of* the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

25. Construction Cost Control

*Understanding of* the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

26. Technical Documentation

*Ability to* make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

27. Client Role in Architecture

*Understanding of* the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

28. Comprehensive Design

*Ability to* produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies and the principles of sustainability

29. Architect’s Administrative Roles

*Understanding of* obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

30. Architectural Practice

*Understanding of* the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others
31. Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

32. Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

33. Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect’s responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

34. Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice.

4. Supplemental Information

The following sections explain material that must be included at the end of each APR.

4.1 Student Progress Evaluation Procedures

Supplemental information to the APR must include the following:

- A description of the procedures for evaluating student transfer credits and advanced placement
- A description of the procedures for evaluating student progress, including the institutional and program policies and standards for evaluation, advancement, graduation, and remediation.

4.2 Studio Culture Policy

Supplemental information to the APR must include the school’s current studio culture policy.

4.3 Course Descriptions

Supplemental information to the APR must include for each required and elective
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I. GENERAL CRITERIA FOR BACCALAUREATE LEVEL PROGRAMS

All programs seeking accreditation from the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET must demonstrate that they satisfy all of the following General Criteria for Baccalaureate Level Programs.

Criterion 1. Students

Student performance must be evaluated. Student progress must be monitored to foster success in attaining student outcomes, thereby enabling graduates to attain program educational objectives. Students must be advised regarding curriculum and career matters.

The program must have and enforce policies for accepting both new and transfer students, awarding appropriate academic credit for courses taken at other institutions, and awarding appropriate academic credit for work in lieu of courses taken at the institution. The program must have and enforce procedures to ensure and document that students who graduate meet all graduation requirements.

Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives

The program must have published program educational objectives that are consistent with the mission of the institution, the needs of the program’s various constituencies, and these criteria. There must be a documented, systematically utilized, and effective process, involving program constituencies, for the periodic review of these program educational objectives that ensures they remain consistent with the institutional mission, the program’s constituents’ needs, and these criteria.

Criterion 3. Student Outcomes

The program must have documented student outcomes that prepare graduates to attain the program educational objectives.

Student outcomes are outcomes (a) through (k) plus any additional outcomes that may be articulated by the program.

(a) an ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering
(b) an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data
(c) an ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, ethical, health and safety, manufacturability, and sustainability
(d) an ability to function on multidisciplinary teams
(e) an ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems
(f) an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility
(g) an ability to communicate effectively
(h) the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and societal context
(i) a recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning
(j) a knowledge of contemporary issues
(k) an ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

**Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement**

The program must regularly use appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained. The results of these evaluations must be systematically utilized as input for the continuous improvement of the program. Other available information may also be used to assist in the continuous improvement of the program.

**Criterion 5. Curriculum**

The curriculum requirements specify subject areas appropriate to engineering but do not prescribe specific courses. The faculty must ensure that the program curriculum devotes adequate attention and time to each component, consistent with the outcomes and objectives of the program and institution. The professional component must include:

(a) one year of a combination of college level mathematics and basic sciences (some with experimental experience) appropriate to the discipline. Basic sciences are defined as biological, chemical, and physical sciences.

(b) one and one-half years of engineering topics, consisting of engineering sciences and engineering design appropriate to the student's field of study. The engineering sciences have their roots in mathematics and basic sciences but carry knowledge further toward creative application. These studies provide a bridge between mathematics and basic sciences on the one hand and engineering practice on the other. Engineering design is the process of devising a system, component, or process to meet desired needs. It is a decision-making process (often iterative), in which the basic sciences, mathematics, and the engineering sciences are applied to convert resources optimally to meet these stated needs.

(c) a general education component that complements the technical content of the curriculum and is consistent with the program and institution objectives.

Students must be prepared for engineering practice through a curriculum culminating in a major design experience based on the knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work and incorporating appropriate engineering standards and multiple realistic constraints.

One year is the lesser of 32 semester hours (or equivalent) or one-fourth of the total credits required for graduation.

**Criterion 6. Faculty**

The program must demonstrate that the faculty members are of sufficient number and they have the competencies to cover all of the curricular areas of the program. There must be sufficient faculty to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student advising and
PROGRAM CRITERIA FOR
CIVIL
AND SIMILARLY NAMED ENGINEERING PROGRAMS
Lead Society: American Society of Civil Engineers

These program criteria apply to engineering programs that include "civil" or similar modifiers in their titles.

1. Curriculum
The curriculum must prepare graduates to apply knowledge of mathematics through differential equations, calculus-based physics, chemistry, and at least one additional area of basic science; apply probability and statistics to address uncertainty; analyze and solve problems in at least four technical areas appropriate to civil engineering; conduct experiments in at least two technical areas of civil engineering and analyze and interpret the resulting data; design a system, component, or process in at least two civil engineering contexts; include principles of sustainability in design; explain basic concepts in project management, business, public policy, and leadership; analyze issues in professional ethics; and explain the importance of professional licensure.

2. Faculty
The program must demonstrate that faculty teaching courses that are primarily design in content are qualified to teach the subject matter by virtue of professional licensure, or by education and design experience. The program must demonstrate that it is not critically dependent on one individual.

PROGRAM CRITERIA FOR
CONSTRUCTION
AND SIMILARLY NAMED ENGINEERING PROGRAMS
Lead Society: American Society of Civil Engineers

These program criteria apply to engineering programs that include "construction" or similar modifiers in their titles.

1. Curriculum
The program must prepare graduates to apply knowledge of mathematics through differential and integral calculus, probability and statistics, general chemistry, and calculus-based physics; to analyze and design construction processes and systems in a construction engineering specialty field, applying knowledge of methods, materials, equipment, planning, scheduling, safety, and cost analysis; to explain basic legal and ethical concepts and the importance of professional engineering licensure in the construction industry; to explain basic concepts of management topics such as economics, business, accounting, communications, leadership, decision and optimization methods, engineering economics, engineering management, and cost control.

2. Faculty
The program must demonstrate that the majority of faculty teaching courses that are primarily design in content are qualified to teach the subject matter by virtue of professional licensure, or by education and design experience. The faculty must include at least one member who has had full-time experience and decision-making responsibilities in the construction industry.
6-Year Requirement: Current and Proposed Pathways

**Existing Pathways (Degree in Landscape Architecture)**

Pathways Recommended by LATC

*Extension Certificate with a four-year degree grants four years of education credit; Extension Certificate with a two-year degree in Landscape Architecture grants three years of education credit*
# Proposed Experience Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Pathway</th>
<th>Experience Credit</th>
<th>Total Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a licensed</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as, or experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a registered</td>
<td>Maximum 3 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer or a licensed Architect</td>
<td>Minimum 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience licensed as a California Licensed Landscape Contractor (C-27) or</td>
<td>Maximum 4 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Contractor licensed in another jurisdiction where the scope of practice</td>
<td>Minimum 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience directly supervised by a licensed California Landscape Contractor (C-27)</td>
<td>Maximum 1 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Landscape Contractor licensed in another jurisdiction where the scope of practice is equivalent</td>
<td>Minimum 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 year of experience must be as, or obtained under the direct supervision of a Landscape Architect licensed in a US jurisdiction*
Amend section 2620 of Article 1 of Division 26 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

§ 2620 Education and Training Credits

(a) Experience Equivalents. The Board’s evaluation of a candidate’s training and educational experience is based on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Description</th>
<th>Education Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Max. Credit Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Experience Equivalent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Degree in landscape architecture from an approved school where the degree program has been accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB).</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Degree in landscape architecture from a non-approved school where the degree program has not been accredited by LAAB and where the program consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Extension certificate in landscape architecture from an approved school. Degree in architecture, where the degree program has been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB).</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Degree in civil engineering, where the degree program has been accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET).</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Degree where the degree program consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46) Associate degree in landscape architecture from a community college which where the degree program consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Extension certificate in landscape architecture from an Extension Certificate Program that meets the requirements of section 2620.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) Extension certificate as specified in subdivision (a)(47) and a degree from a university or college which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69) Associate degree from a college specified in subdivision (a)(4) and an Extension certificate as specified in subdivision (a)(37) of this section and a degree as specified in subdivision (a)(6).</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(210) Partial completion, as defined in subsection (b)(2), of a degree in landscape architecture where the degree program has been accredited by the LAAB from an approved school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Partial completion**, as defined in subsection (b)(2), of an extension certificate in landscape architecture from an approved school—along with where the applicant has a degree from a university or college where the degree program consists of at least a four-year curriculum.

2. A degree in architecture which consists of at least a four-year curriculum that has been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board.

3. Self-employment Experience as, or employment by experience obtained under the direct supervision of, a landscape architect licensed in a United States jurisdiction or qualifying foreign country, as defined in subsection (c)(5) where the experience occurred shall be granted credit on a 100% basis.

4. Self-employment Experience as, or employment by experience obtained under the direct supervision of, an licensed architect or registered civil engineer who is licensed or registered in a United States jurisdiction or qualifying foreign country, as defined in subsection (c)(5) where the experience occurred shall be granted credit on a 100% basis.

5. Self-employment Experience as a California-licensed landscape contractor or a licensed landscape contractor licensed in another jurisdiction where the scope of practice for landscape contracting is equivalent to that allowed pursuant to section 7027.5 of the Code and section 832.27 of Article 3, Division 8, Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations shall be granted credit on a 100% basis.

6. Experience obtained under the direct supervision of a California-licensed landscape contractor or a landscape contractor licensed in another jurisdiction where the scope of practice for landscape contracting is equivalent to that allowed pursuant to section 7027.5 of the Code and section 832.27 of Article 3, Division 8, Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations.

7. Teaching in a landscape architecture degree program as specified in subdivisions (a)(1), (2), and (4) of this section, under the supervision of a licensed landscape architect and where the degree program consists of at least a two-year curriculum.

### Education Credits

- **(1)** Candidates shall possess at least one year of educational credit to be eligible for the examination.
- **(2)** A degree from a school with a landscape architecture program shall be defined as one of the following:
  - (A) Bachelor of Landscape Architecture.
  - (B) Bachelor of Science in landscape architecture.
  - (C) Bachelor of Arts in landscape architecture.
  - (D) Master's degree in landscape architecture.
- **(3)** The maximum credit which may be granted for a degree or combination of degrees from an approved school shall be four years of educational credit.
- **(4)** A degree from a school with a landscape architecture program shall be deemed to be approved by the Board if the landscape architectural curriculum has been approved by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) as specified in its publication: “Accreditation Standards And Procedures” dated February 6, 2010.
or the Board determines that the program has a curriculum equivalent to a curriculum having LAAB accreditation.

(5) For purposes of subdivisions (a)(10) and (11), “partial completion” shall mean that the candidate completed at least 80 percent of the total units required for completion of the 4-year degree or extension certificate program.

(6) Except as provided in subdivisions (a)(10) and (11), no credit shall be granted for academic units obtained without earning a degree or extension certificate under categories of subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (3) or (4) of this section.

(7) A candidate enrolled in a degree program where earning credit earned is based on work experience courses (e.g., internship or co-op program) shall not receive more than the maximum credit otherwise granted allowed for degrees under subdivisions (a)(1), (2) or (3) of this section.

(8) Except as specified in subdivision (a)(5) and (6) of this section, candidates with multiple degrees shall not be granted education credit for more than one degree.

(9) Candidates with multiple extension certificates shall not be granted education credit for more than one extension certificate.

(10) Except as provided in subdivisions (a)(8) and (9), candidates with both a degree and an extension certificate shall only be granted education credit for either the degree or the extension certificate, whichever holds the greater credit value.

(11) The maximum education credit allowed to any candidate is four years. The Board shall not grant more than four years of credit for any degree or certificate or any combination thereof for qualifying educational experience.

(c) Training Credits

(1) A candidate shall possess at least two years of training/practice credit to be eligible for the examination.

(B) At least one of the two years of training/practice credit shall be as, or under the direct supervision of, a landscape architect licensed in a United States jurisdiction, and shall be gained in one of the following forms:

1. After graduation from an educational institution specified in subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (3) or (4) of this section.

2. After completion of education experience specified in subdivisions (a)(7) and (8) of this section.

(C) A candidate shall be deemed to have met the provisions of requirements in subdivision (c)(1)(B) if the candidate possesses either:

1. a degree from a school specified in subdivision (a)(1) or an extension certificate as specified in subdivision (a)(8) and has at least two years of training/practice credit as a licensed landscape contractor as specified in subdivision (a)(14), or

2. possesses an extension certificate from a school as specified in subdivision (a)(3) and has at least four years of training/practice credit as a licensed landscape contractor as specified in subdivision (a)(14).

(2) Candidates shall be at least 18 years of age or a high school graduate before they are eligible to receive training/practice credit for work experience.

(3) Candidates may receive one year of training/practice experience credit for 1500 hours of qualifying employment. Training/practice experience candidates may be accrued training/practice credit on the basis of part-time employment. Candidates will not receive training/practice credit for employment in excess of 40 hours per week shall not be considered.

(d) Miscellaneous Information

(4) Candidates will not receive training/practice credit for independent, non-licensed practice or experience, regardless of claimed coordination, liaison, or supervision of licensed professionals shall not be considered.

(5) For purposes of subdivision (a)(12) and (13), “qualifying foreign country” shall mean a foreign country whose standards and qualifications for issuing a license or registration to practice landscape architecture, architecture, or civil engineering are equivalent to those required in this state.

(6) The Board may purge application records after five years of lack of communication or inactivity from candidates. The Board shall retain inactive applications for a five-year period. Thereafter, the Board shall purge these records.
records unless otherwise notified by the candidate. A candidate who wishes to reapply to the Board, shall be required to re-obtain submit the required documents to allow the Board to determine their current eligibility.
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A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum

Education/Experience Subcommittee (Subcommittee) Chair Marq Truscott called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m., and Vice Chair Pasqual Gutierrez called roll. Five members of the Subcommittee were present, thus a quorum was established.

B. Chair’s Procedural Remarks and Subcommittee Member Introductory Comments

Member Truscott thanked the Subcommittee members and participants for their time. He announced that: 1) Tara Welch would provide a review of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act; 2) Dennis Zanchi and Lusine Sarkisyan, from the DCA’s SOLID Office, would facilitate the discussion of Agenda Item E; and 3) Tracy Montez, Chief, DCA’s Division of Programs and Policy Review, would present examination development considerations. Lastly, member Truscott advised the Subcommittee of the voting requirements.

C. Review of the Objective of the Subcommittee (Brianna Miller, Program Manager, LATC)

Brianna Miller provided an overview of Landscape Architects Technical Committee’s (LATC) current education requirements for licensure. She reported the rejection of LATC’s reciprocity proposal at the California Architects Board’s (Board) meeting on June 15, 2017 led to the Board’s directive for the LATC to align its initial and reciprocal licensure requirements and, where possible, mirror those of the Board. Ms. Miller stated that staff proposed amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) by using the Board’s Table of Equivalents, which included related degrees, and experience-only pathways. She continued that, at the July 13, 2017 LATC meeting, the Committee approved existing and new pathways and formed the Subcommittee to define and establish education and training credits for newly proposed pathways. Ms. Miller introduced the five new pathways to be considered and advised the Subcommittee of its charge to recommend amendments to CCR § 2620 that define related degrees and non-related degrees (baccalaureate and associate) and experience-only pathways, and prescribes allowable credit for initial licensure.

Doug McCauley noted a White House report, Occupational Licensing - A Framework for Policymakers, a report from the Little Hoover Commission, and a United States Supreme Court decision (North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission) where common themes were reasonable standards in education and experience, as well as increased scrutiny to ensure states are not enacting anti-competitive policies. He also reminded the Subcommittee that policy decisions need to protect the public and be defensible.

D. Review of Applicable Open Meeting Act Requirements (Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs)

Ms. Welch provided an overview of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Act). She stated that the Subcommittee’s responsibility is to comply as individuals and as a body with the Act, which requires that actions of state agencies and deliberations be open to the public. Ms. Welch continued by discussing proper noticing of meetings and penalties for violating the Act. She
offered her assistance to any Subcommittee members and participants which may have questions or concerns.

E. Discuss and Possible Recommendation to Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) to Define and Prescribe Allowable Credit for Initial Licensure:

1. Related Degrees (Baccalaureate and Associate)
2. Non-Related Degrees (Baccalaureate and Associate)
3. Experience-Only

Ms. Miller provided an overview of the attachments for Agenda Item E contained in the meeting packet. She reiterated that Mr. Zanchi and Ms. Sarkisyan would facilitate the Subcommittee’s discussion. Mr. Zanchi explained the facilitators’ role which is to help extract the Subcommittee’s reasoning and thoughts, and help them determine a recommendation as a neutral party.

At the request of the LATC, Ms. Montez provided an overview of the Office of Professional Examinations Services (OPES), which is a unit of the Division of Programs and Policy Review. She stated that OPES’s role is to consult with boards, bureaus, and programs to ensure licensing examinations are fair, valid, and legally defensible. She continued that this standard applies to programs’ education, experience, reciprocity, and continuing education requirements. She cited Business and Professions Code section 139, which is based on national testing standards and federal guidelines for regulatory and general selection procedures. Ms. Montez offered her assistance to ensure education and experience requirements are robust, job related, and occupation related, and do not represent barriers to licensure. She reiterated that consumer protection is paramount; however, she advised being mindful of not creating barriers for those wanting to enter the profession.

Mr. Zanchi began the discussion with related bachelor’s degrees. Ms. Miller referred the Subcommittee to the cover page of Agenda Item E to review staff’s research as it pertains to related bachelor’s degrees. She advised that the Board grants two years of education credit for a four-year curriculum, and that in reference to Attachment E.3 (Pathways to Licensure Chart), 29 other states allow for a related bachelor’s degree. Ms. Miller continued that the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards’ (CLARB) draft Model Law and Model Regulations allow for related degrees in Architecture and Civil Engineering. She also noted that approximately 29 other states recognize Civil Engineering degrees as a related degree. As an aside, due to an Architecture degree being recognized in an existing pathway, Ms. Miller suggested moving it to the related degree category.

Mr. Zanchi asked the members of the Subcommittee for their comments and thoughts. In an attempt to spur the discussion, he suggested that each Subcommittee member individually designate the: 1) types of related bachelor’s degrees to consider; 2) how many years of education credit should be granted; and 3) how many years of training credit should be required.

When asked for comments from the public regarding this matter, Dustin Maxam asked the Subcommittee to consider any discipline that contributes to the planning, spatial analysis, structure, and environment as a related degree. Laura Taylor also agreed with the inclusion of an
experience-only pathway. However, she commented that if education requirements are preserved, then the LATC should consider related college courses rather than specific degrees and require ongoing professional development hours in lieu of education.

Member Nathan Lozier asked if the Board requires ongoing professional development hours. Mr. McCauley responded that a five-hour requirement exists for disabled access requirements. He added that, as part of its experience-only pathway, the Board requires a structured internship program called the Architectural Experience Program (AXP), which is administered by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, where key knowledge areas are specified and a required number of hours are accrued.

Member Gutierrez commented that he was unable to locate an AXP-like program for landscape architects. Mr. McCauley responded that LATC has requested that CLARB consider developing a similar program.

In terms of which related bachelor’s degrees to accept, member Gutierrez suggested degrees in Urban Planning and Environment Planning. Mr. Maxam suggested that the following degrees be considered as related: Engineering, Urban Planning and Design, City and Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental horticulture, Parks and Natural Resource Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning and Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, and Community Development.

Member Nicolaus commented that some of the degrees suggested by Mr. Maxam are policy-based professions. He questioned whether those degree types would encapsulate the knowledge and experience needed to design an environment. Member Gutierrez stated that collateral knowledge from those disciplines could be obtained to sit for the examination. Mr. Maxam opined that some of the degree types could fit into a different pathway such as “non-related degrees.”

In terms of accepting a Geography degree, Mr. Maxam stated that many Landscape Architecture Departments are housed within the Geography Department and many of the professors teach the same classes. He added that the core of Geography is spatial analysis. Member Truscott asked Mr. Maxam to clarify which departments are within the Geography Departments. Mr. Maxam stated that when he went to University of California (UC) Davis, the Landscape Architecture Department was within the Geography Department. Member Truscott clarified that the Landscape Architecture Department is not housed within the Geography Department at UC Davis.

Ms. Montez suggested reviewing Attachments E.5 (California Supplemental Examination – Examination Content Outline) and E.6 (Landscape Architect Registration Examination – Content Areas) in the meeting packet, for relationships between related disciplines. Ms. Miller added that, Attachment 7 (Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board [LAAB], National Architectural Accrediting Board [NAAB], and Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology [ABET] (for Civil Engineering) Curriculum Requirements), depicts curriculum requirements for those professions.

Maureen Decombe suggested the inclusion of degrees for Watershed Sciences, Environmental Restoration, Science, and Ecological Management and Restoration.
Member Gutierrez suggested encapsulating Environmental Studies, Design, and Sciences into the related degree category. Member Nicolaus opined that Environmental Horticulture is about planting design and not site design, which is not related to Landscape Architecture. Member Jacobs contested that his courses in Environmental Horticulture were taught by a landscape architect, which included residential landscape design (hardscape and softscape). In order to set the premise for related degree, the Subcommittee grouped suggested related bachelor’s degrees into related areas of study and discussed the relatedness of each degree type.

The Subcommittee then decided that the following degrees would be considered as related bachelor’s degrees:

- Architecture
- Civil Engineering
- Urban Planning and Design
- City and Regional Planning
- Environmental Design
- Parks and Natural Resources Management
- Landscape Planning
- Landscape Planning and Design
- Landscape Design

Mr. Zanchi asked the Subcommittee how many years of education credit should be granted for a related degree based on the LATC’s six-year education/experience requirement. Mr. Maxam commented that new pathways should be on an eight-year scale. Member Truscott stated that increasing the number of years could be perceived as a barrier.

Vickie Mayer referred the Subcommittee to Attachment E.2 (6-Year Requirement Graphic), which provides a visual representation of what the LATC currently allows and the credit granted. Mr. Zanchi distributed cards for each Subcommittee member to write down their suggested number of years for education credit and required experience. The Subcommittee’s suggestions ranged from one to three years for education credit and three to five years for required experience.

Member Truscott expressed support for granting two years of education credit and four years of required experience due to an Architecture degree directly relating to Landscape Architecture. He added that a NAAB-accredited Architecture degree currently receives one year of credit, and it should be elevated. Upon hearing member Truscott’s reasoning, the Subcommittee members agreed with a related degree receiving two years of education credit and four years for required experience.

Ms. Taylor commented that a degree in Landscape Architecture was not listed as an accepted degree. Ms. Miller responded that the current pathways for landscape architecture, which include Landscape Architecture degrees, will remain in place. Mr. Maxam stated that an Extension Certificate, which currently receives two years, should be worth more than a related degree. Kourtney Nation responded that the LATC grants four years of credit for a candidate who has an Extension Certificate in combination with any other four-year degree.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern that, with an education requirement, candidates seeking reciprocity who have passed a national examination would be excluded for not possessing a qualifying
degree. Member Nicolaus commented that Ms. Taylor has a valid argument. Member Truscott agreed, and stated that it would be discussed at a later time.

Ms. Mayer asked if the related degree types are accurately defined to grant credit for any school that labels it as such. Member Gutierrez commented that it would be difficult to identify every degree type across the country. He suggested a portfolio review in which a candidate could demonstrate that their coursework is in alignment with a related degree. Member Truscott advised against a portfolio review. Marcus Reinhardt stated that the Board specifically looks at the title of the degree and not the coursework.

Ms. Mayer stated that the Board accepts accredited and non-accredited degrees. Member Truscott suggested that the Subcommittee consider different amounts of credit for an accredited and non-accredited degree. He opined that an unrelated degree should receive less credit. Member Gutierrez suggested granting one and a half years of education credit for a non-accredited related degree and two years of education credit for an accredited related degree.

Mr. Maxam asked if the LAAB, NAAB, and ABET are the only accrediting bodies that the Subcommittee is acknowledging. Member Truscott responded that, for Architects and Civil Engineers, NAAB and ABET are the accrediting bodies that the Subcommittee is recognizing. The Subcommittee decided to recommend two years of education credit for an accredited related bachelor’s degree and one year of education credit for a non-accredited related bachelor’s degree.

Ms. Miller referred the Subcommittee to the cover page of Agenda Item E to review staff’s research as it pertains to related associate degrees. In reference to Attachment E.1 (Current 6-Year Requirement Graphic), Ms. Miller advised that current landscape architect education requirements consist of one year of education and five years of experience. She continued that the Board grants one year for a related associate degree, and that LATC research yielded that four states offer credit for a related associate degree. Ms. Miller added that CLARB does not offer credit for a related associate’s degree, and referred the Subcommittee to Attachment 8 (Associate Degree Requirements), which depicts the basic skills acquired by a general associate degree.

Based on the previous related degree discussion, the Subcommittee agreed to consider the following associate’s degrees as related degrees:

- Architecture
- Civil Engineering
- Urban Planning and Design
- City and Regional Planning
- Environmental Design
- Parks and Natural Resources Management
- Landscape Planning
- Landscape Planning and Design
- Landscape Design

Member Gutierrez clarified that unrelated associate degrees would not receive education credit. Member Truscott concurred. Ms. Miller commented that three of the four states that allow a related associate degree require consideration from their Board. Ms. Mayer clarified that most
states do not allow credit for an associate’s degree. Ms. Mayer also stated that states who allow for an associate’s degree may not have as strict requirements as California for regulatory approval. Member Truscott asked how much education credit should be granted for an associate degree. Member Gutierrez opined that an associate degree in Landscape Architecture and Design, Landscape Design, and Landscape Planning and Design deserve credit. Member Truscott agreed and advised the Subcommittee of the current pathway for an associate degree in Landscape Architecture.

Ms. Decombe commented that some colleges have changed the title of the Landscape Architecture associate’s degree to Environmental Design. The Subcommittee decided to grant one year of education credit and require five years of experience for the following related associate’s degrees:

- Landscape Planning
- Landscape Planning and Design
- Landscape Design
- Environmental Planning
- Environmental Planning and Design
- Environmental Design

The Subcommittee also elected to not grant education credit to an unrelated associate’s degree.

Ms. Miller referred the Subcommittee to the cover page of Agenda Item E to review staff’s research as it pertains to the experience-only pathway. She advised that the Board allows eight years of experience along with the structured internship program (the AXP) and that the LATC has advocated for CLARB to implement a similar program. Ms. Miller referenced Attachment E.3 and advised that 29 states offer an experience-only pathway to licensure.

Member Jacobs asked who the experience must be under. Ms. Mayer responded that the experience must be under a California licensed landscape architect or a licensed landscape architect from another state. Member Gutierrez expressed uncertainty in having an experience-only pathway without a structured internship program in place. Member Truscott agreed; however, he stated that CLARB would not have a program for landscape architects in the short term and that a decision is needed in the interim.

Member Gutierrez suggested using the AXP as a model for a Landscape Architecture Experience Program (LAXP). Ms. Mayer stated that the LATC could work towards a structured program; however, the Subcommittee should consider that 29 other states have an experience-only pathway without a structured internship program. Ms. Montez asked if a reciprocity candidate would still need to meet an internship program requirement. Member Gutierrez responded that candidates could submit a portfolio to demonstrate that they have accomplished the prescribed knowledge. Member Truscott stated that a portfolio review would be subjective and possibly ineffective. He suggested moving forward with the idea that a structured internship program could be implemented in the future. Ms. Montez added that the Subcommittee could re-evaluate the new pathways in the future. Member Lozier commented that experience would need to be validated for an experience-only pathway.
Member Truscott stated that, in the interim, he is comfortable with supervising licensed landscape architects verifying a candidate’s six years of experience credit. Ms. Montez suggested that an affidavit could be implemented certifying knowledge, skills, and experience. Ms. Mayer commented that such an affidavit would have to be specified in regulation. Member Nicolaus asked if the affidavit would apply to reciprocity candidates. Ms. Mayer responded that, per the LATC’s previous directive, initial licensure requirements would align with reciprocity requirements.

Member Lozier reiterated that experience should have a verifiable education component. Member Gutierrez commented that certified experience would be the same as education. Ms. Montez stated that the verifiable education component would exist in the examination plan that could be signed-off on the affidavit. She continued that it would create the defensibility for the experience-only pathway due to the examination plan connecting to a candidate’s experience. Ms. Mayer asked about candidates who do not gain experience in all the required areas. Ms. Montez responded that experience only has to be related to general areas of landscape architecture and connect to the examination plan.

Member Gutierrez expressed that knowledge is acquired through self-study in which the examination demonstrates a candidate’s competence. Member Truscott added that prior to 1997, the Board of Landscape Architecture provided an experience-only pathway.

Ms. Morgan Hollingworth commented that some candidates’ experience only consists of certain landscape aspects; therefore, she believes a timeline should be instituted. Jon Pride suggested setting a basic set of guidelines.

Ms. Sarkisyan asked the Subcommittee for their recommended number of years of experience. Member Lozier reiterated his concern with an experience-only pathway without the LAXP. Member Gutierrez expressed concern that a large number of affidavits would be submitted; therefore, a time table should be established for a structured internship program. Member Jacobs expressed the difficulty of passing the examination without the skills and knowledge even if the affidavit is provided. Member Truscott stated that the Subcommittee should focus on an experience-only pathway without the LAXP because candidates still must pass the examination. He added that he was comfortable with six years of required experience.

Ms. Sarkisyan asked the Subcommittee what their pre- and post-recommendations would be if a LAXP program was instituted. Member Jacobs reiterated that, even with a signed affidavit, it would be difficult to pass the examination and suggested six years of required experience pre-LAXP and seven years post-LAXP. Members Gutierrez, Nicolaus, and Truscott suggested six years of required experience. Member Lozier suggested six years experience pre-LAXP and seven years experience post-LAXP. Ms. Mayer asked if the Subcommittee was only deciding on landscape architecture experience. Member Truscott responded, “yes.”

Member Truscott expressed concern over discussing the LAXP as it is merely conceptual. Member Jacobs stated that the experience requirement is not structured; therefore, six years would be acceptable because the candidate still must pass the examination. Member Gutierrez asked if the current employment verification form lists the types of experience. Ms. Nation stated that the current form is time based and the employer signs-off and lists the work that was completed.
Ms. Mayer commented that the Subcommittee may need to consider experience in other professions. Ms. Morgan Hollingworth asked of the Board’s requirement. Member Gutierrez responded that the Board requires eight years of experience. Mr. Pride commented that architects are more technical; therefore, eight years of required experience for architects and six years of required experience for landscape architects is reasonable.

The Subcommittee decided to recommend six years of required experience as a landscape architect without regard to the LAXP.

Member Truscott stated the need to explore experience under an architect, civil engineer, and California licensed landscape contractor (C-27). Member Gutierrez suggested that candidates working under an architect should receive one year of experience credit. He continued that if working under any other profession, then a candidate should receive half the credit. Member Truscott commented that the work of C-27’s is relatable to landscape architects.

Member Lozier questioned the importance of requiring education if there is an experience-only pathway. Member Gutierrez responded that experience is needed to help protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Ms. Montez added that requiring a candidate to possess some amount of education and experience protects the integrity of the examination. Member Truscott suggested exploring landscape architects and C-27’s separately from architects and civil engineers.

Ms. Mayer noted that, currently, LATC grants credit for self-employment as a C-27 or a licensed landscape contractor in another jurisdiction that is comparable. Member Truscott suggested, for the experience-only pathway for landscape contractors, adding “and/or experience working under a C-27.” Member Gutierrez asked if landscape architecture is within the domain of a C-27, and if C-27s are required to understand areas of landscape architecture to obtain a license. Member Jacobs stated that aspects of landscape architecture are within the C-27 examination. He added that C-27’s design and create landscapes. Mr. Pride opined that there is a difference between the experience of an owner and an employee.

Ms. Montez expressed concern about listing landscape architect experience with C-27 experience due to the LATC not having jurisdiction over C-27’s. Ms. Decombe commented that the examination for a C-27 is completely different than the examination for a landscape architect and would like to see the experience credits separated. Member Truscott agreed and suggested separating landscape architect experience from landscape contractor experience, and altering the language to employed as a C-27. Member Jacobs commented that the C-27 examination is split into two parts (trade and laws).

Ms. Sarkisyan asked the Subcommittee for its recommendation for required C-27 experience compared to landscape architecture experience. Member Gutierrez suggested that C-27’s be granted up to three years credit. Ms. Mayer suggested clarifying the type of experience gained (i.e., experience as a licensee or employment by a licensee). Ms. Mayer further noted that by lowering the required experience to three years, the Subcommittee would be removing one year of experience credit per current requirements. Member Jacobs inquired if the Subcommittee should be reducing the years required as a C-27.

Ms. Montez suggested granting three years of credit per profession. Member Truscott agreed. Member Gutierrez stated that he was uncomfortable with a candidate receiving three years of education and three years of experience credit without working under a landscape architect.
Ms. Nation noted that currently CCR § 2620 requires one year of training to be under a licensed landscape architect.

Member Truscott suggested requiring three years maximum credit while requiring one year under a licensed landscape architect. Ms. Mayer advised that the LATC would need to justify lowering the required experience for a C-27 from four to three years. Member Gutierrez commented, due to creating a new pathway, it could be justified along with the one-year requirement working under a licensed landscape architect.

Amelia Lima asked if a person licensed as a C-27 would be ready for the California Supplemental Examination. Member Jacobs responded that it would depend on the candidate. Ms. Lima contended that required experience should not be decreased.

Member Jacobs inquired if an employee of a C-27 should receive the same amount of experience credit as an owner. Mr. Reinhardt stated that the Board gives the same credit for both. Members Truscott and Gutierrez suggested granting employees less credit. In order to align with the Board, member Lozier suggested granting half credit for each year; however, member Truscott advised against allocating half credits. Mr. Pride suggested increasing the number of years of required experience. Member Truscott stated support for reducing the maximum experience credit to two years. Member Nicolaus opined that the credit should not be reduced. Mr. Reinhardt stated that reducing to two years would be granting equal credit for landscape architects and landscape contractors. The Subcommittee decided to recommend:

1) three years maximum experience credit for candidates licensed as or employed by an architect or civil engineer;
2) three years maximum experience credit for candidates employed by a C-27; and
3) four years maximum experience credit for candidates licensed as a C-27.

Member Lozier asked if candidates would be able to combine other types of experience for the experience-only pathway. Ms. Mayer responded that it could be a combination of any other experience.

Ms. Miller referred the Subcommittee to the cover page of Agenda Item E to review staff’s research as it pertains to any bachelor’s degree. She advised that the Board grants one year of credit, and noted Attachment E.3 depicts 16 states offer credit for “any degree” of at least a four-year curriculum. Ms. Miller added that the CLARB’s draft Model Law and Model Regulations stipulates that after five years of education experience, two years of education credit is granted.

Member Jacobs suggested that a candidate with any bachelor’s degree should receive three to six months of education credit. Member Gutierrez suggested at least one year of credit. Mr. Reinhardt advised that the Board grants one year of education credit for any bachelor’s degree. Ms. Lima commented that a bachelor’s degree should be worth something. Member Gutierrez noted that a candidate with a four-year education would be on the same pathway as experience-only, when an education should be worth more. The Subcommittee decided to recommend one year of education credit for any bachelor’s degree.
Mr. Zanchi incorporated all the newly proposed pathway credits into a table, and asked the Subcommittee members to examine the totality of their recommendations. For “any associate degree,” member Jacobs suggested half a year of education credit. All other Subcommittee members suggested that such a degree does not warrant credits. Ultimately, the Subcommittee stayed with its previous decision to not allocate education credit to an unrelated associate degree.

Ms. Montez stated that the Subcommittee should distinguish a related bachelor’s degree versus any bachelor’s degree with regard to credit allocated. Due to a related bachelor’s degree encompassing more aspects of landscape architecture, member Jacobs suggested increasing the education experience for a related bachelor’s degree by half a year. Member Lozier suggested decreasing the credit for “any bachelor’s degree” and associate’s degrees in Landscape Planning and Design and Environmental Design. Member Truscott stated that the related bachelor’s degree is a focused curriculum and should receive more credit.

Ms. Decombe commented that an Environmental Design associate degree is comparable to a Landscape Architecture associate degree. In her opinion, half a year of education credit is not sufficient for that course load. Mr. Reinhardt commented that, for the Board, a related bachelor’s degree receives a quarter of the candidate’s education experience, and an associate degree in Architecture or a related field receives one year of education credit. He added that any associate degree receives half a year of education credit.

For the experience-only pathways, Ms. Miller asked if being supervised by the stated professions would be open to other states or California alone? Member Truscott stated that a C-27 is specifically for California; however, the other two professions are up for debate. Ms. Mayer suggested allowing supervision to occur across all United States jurisdictions. Member Truscott agreed.

Mr. Pride commented that C-27 should specify that the individual passed the examination. Member Lozier asked about the Board’s requirements for C-27. Ms. Mayer responded that it is under the direct supervision of a licensed architect. Member Lozier asked if the LAXP could be included. Member Truscott stated that the LAXP would not be included in the motion, but that a request could be made to the LATC.

Member Gutierrez suggested adding half a year of education credit to “any bachelor’s degree.” Member Jacobs commented that doing so would imply any bachelor’s degree is worth more than a degree specifically for landscape design. Member Truscott concurred that it would add more weight to unrelated degrees.

The Subcommittee decided to recommend to the LATC the following education and experience credits:

1) two years of education credit for a related bachelor’s degree (accredited) in Architecture or Civil Engineering;
2) one and a half years of education credit for a related bachelor’s degree (non-accredited) in Architecture, Civil Engineering, Urban Planning and Design, City and Regional Planning, Environmental Design, Parks and Natural Resource Management, Landscape Planning, Landscape Planning and Design, and Landscape Design;
3) one year of education credit for any bachelor’s degree;
4) half a year of education credit for an associate’s degree in Environmental Design, Landscape Planning, Landscape Planning and Design, and Landscape Design;
5) no education credit for any other associate’s degree;
6) up to six years of experience credit for experience as, or supervised by a licensed landscape architect;
7) maximum of three years of experience credit for experience as, or supervised by, a registered Civil Engineer or licensed Architect;
8) maximum of four years of experience credit for experience as a California licensed landscape contractor (C-27) or equivalent; and
9) maximum of three years of experience credit for experience supervised by a California licensed landscape contractor (C-27) or equivalent.

- Member Steve Lozier moved to accept and recommend the education and experience credits as presented to the LATC.

Member John Nicolaus seconded the motion.

Mr. Maxam, satisfied with the motion, thanked the Subcommittee for their effort and patience.

Members Gutierrez, Jacobs, Lozier, Nicolaus, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

F. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Montez commended the Subcommittee for taking on this project to create a fair, valid, and legally defensible licensing proposal.

G. Next Steps and Items for Discussion and Consideration; Possible Setting of Additional Subcommittee Meeting

Ms. Miller advised that the LATC will meet in Los Angeles on November 2, 2017 and, at that time, the Subcommittee’s recommendations would be presented to the LATC for their consideration. She continued that upon the LATC’s approval, the proposal would go before the Board for its consideration on December 7, 2017. Ms. Miller concluded that upon the Board’s approval, LATC staff would initiate the process to promulgate the regulations.

H. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:27 p.m.
Public Comment Received
for October 3, 2017 Education/Experience
Subcommittee Meeting
July 11, 2017

TO: LATC Board of Directors c/o LATC Program Manager

State of California Department of Consumer Affairs
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: Landscape Architecture Educational Requirements & Reciprocity

I am writing in support of the LATC’s consideration to open pathways for individuals with appropriate experience and/or education to pursue licensure that do not have a “university degree in landscape architecture.”

I have been licensed to practice landscape architecture for nearly 30 years. In my experience as a principal and employer in an award-winning landscape architectural firm, I have worked with and brought to our staff numerous individuals both licensed and unlicensed and whom have broad and diverse backgrounds. I have found that a university degree in landscape architecture while valuable is not an absolute prerequisite to a successful career.

While practicing for our firm, whether an individual is a licensed landscape architect in another state or has studied the concepts of Landscape Architecture through studies in other educational majors and fields or has no formal landscape architectural education but has learned through long-term apprenticeship, their ability sit for the LARE and the CSE should not be hindered because they may not have university degree in Landscape Architecture.

I strongly support recommending a broad and open-minded structure for reciprocity and the opening of many pathways into the profession of Landscape Architecture. I believe that the infusion of individuals with alternative experiences can only enhance and strengthen the profession’s basic core knowledgebase, capabilities and strengthen its’ fundamental contributions to the community.
Critical new ways of thinking and new experiences are desperately needed in our profession because the field has become defined by the “educational university complex” bound by red-lies drawn between the “Ivory-Tower kingdoms” of University Departments in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Urban Planning as well Civil Engineering and Plant Sciences. In fact, THE PROFESSION should allow more building and civil structures to be designed by Landscape Architects, should allow more agricultural engineering to designed by Landscape Architects, should allow more Energy and Science planning to be designed by Landscape Architects. The profession is essentially becoming too narrow, too limited and is being pushed into smaller and smaller corners by more empowered professions and the University educational infrastructure.

University Departments of Landscape Architecture nor The American Society of Landscape Architects should be the sole gatekeepers of the profession through their “educational requirement” advocacy relationship with State Licensing Boards.

I believe that the profession has become too narrow and that California can lead as it does in nearly every field and profession, by regulating in ways that are inspired, future thinking and inclusive. I urge the Board to keep this profession strong by allowing new energy to infuse the next generation of Landscape Architects when you discuss this issue at your July 13 LATC meeting in Sacramento.

Thank You

Gary Orr, Principal and Director of Design
California Landscape Architect #2621
September 27, 2017

TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager
   (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

FROM: Ronald S. Teshima, Principal
       Teshima Design Group
       San Diego, CA 92131

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.
I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Sincerely,

Ronald S. Teshima
Principal
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through
studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

I have served on the LATC and Educational Committee in the past and firmly believe that the educational requirements for eligibility to sit for the LARE are critical for the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary for a firm understanding of the practice of landscape architecture.

As landscapes become more performance-driven to improve our physical environment and quantifiably measured to prove better water, soil and air quality, the educational and scientific foundation of the landscape architecture profession will be an even more substantial requirement for meeting consumer protection standards. This is no time to diminish or moreover eliminate educational requirements or standards.

Steve Lang,
Principal and Landscape Architect #1771
MIG
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee require that the Landscape Architecture core courses and fields of study be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study “Determinants of Success” conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in Landscape Architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, the Subcommittee should consider the eligibility standards of those states with a Landscape Architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a Landscape Architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture, which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.
In order to determine whether an individual, who is a licensed Landscape Architect in another state, has mastered the core concepts of Landscape Architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Sincerely,

Daniel Herman, Principal
EM: danh@rhdo.com
I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study *Determinants of Success* conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure
that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in

Rand K. Center PLA
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Barbara Gilman, Howard Associates, Inc., San Diego CA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I would like to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.
Thank you

Barbara Gilman, CA RLA 2132
Howard Associates, Inc.
2442 Second Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
Ph. 619-718-9660 x. 103
Email: barbara@howardassoc.com
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

FROM: Jon Becker, ASLA, Project Design Consultants, San Diego, CA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and
fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Becker

Jon Becker RLA/AICP
PROJECT DESIGN CONSULTANTS
701 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
P: 619.881.3264
C: 858 231 5671
F: 619 234 0349
Jbecker@projectdesign.com | www.projectdesign.com
LinkedIn

*Please consider the environment before printing this email*
From: Kristen Koehrn <krkoehrn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 3:46 PM
To: Miller, Brianna@DCA
Subject: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

Dear Ms. Miller,

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/ Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Respectfully,

Kristen Koehrn, ASLA, LEED AP ND
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

FROM: Richard Joaquin, O'Dell Engineering, Modesto

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.
I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Regards,

Richard Joaquin
O'DELLI ENGINEERING | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
P:(209) 571-1765 ext. 138 | F:(209) 573-2465
E: rjoaquin@odelliengineering.com | W: http://www.odelliengineering.com
From: TJ Newman <TJNewman@morpd.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 3:34 PM
To: Miller, Brianna@DCA
Subject: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee

TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: TJ Newman, ASLA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study, Determinants of Success, conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and its regulatory community on which to base policy, practice, and support decisions. The study found that those who had degrees in landscape architecture had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of these states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species control, and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Thank you for your consideration.

TJ Newman, ASLA
PLA CA 5354
1952 Wright Street
Sacramento, CA 95825
Erin Dibos <edibos@ojb.com>
Wednesday, September 27, 2017 7:15 AM
Miller, Brianna@DCA
ccasl@bcsglobal.net
Retain degrees in Landscape Architecture for licensure

TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)
FROM: Erin Dibos, OJB Landscape Architecture, Solana Beach CA
RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.
I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Thank you,

Erin Dibos
ASSOCIATE

THE OFFICE OF JAMES BURNETT
550 LOMAS SANTA FE DRIVE, SUITE A | SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075
358.764.7859 DR | 858.793.6870 PH | 805.450.3816 CL
www.jjb.com
From: Brad Hilliker [mailto:bradhilliker@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 01, 2017 5:05 PM
To: LATC@DCA <LATC@dca.ca.gov>
Cc: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Fwd: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Brad Hilliker, PLA, ASLA, LEED AP BD+C

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical
experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I strongly believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3, 2017 LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Sincerely,
Brad Hilliker
Dear Landscape Architects Technical Committee and CC-ASLA,

I agree with the California Architects Board and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience alone should be able to become licensed.

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,

Dustin Maxam, RLA
325 Carrillo Street
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
Help grow our profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. The LATC is evaluating new requirements next Tuesday 10/3.

Use your voice! Let’s tell the vocal minority of California Educators and Landscape Architecture Leaders that we support new licensure pathways which would help expand and diversify our profession.

Did you know these facts about CA Licensure?
- In California you can become a Licensed Architect or Civil Engineer based on extensive experience and testing only. There are licensure pathways available for those with non-architecture degrees as well. These professionals are qualified to design buildings and structures and are entrusted with the public’s safety.

- CA Architects and Engineers, including those licensed on experience, can practice landscape architecture with their projects - as long they don’t use the term/title Landscape Architect and the work is project specific.

- The majority of states allow licensure on experience alone - these include NY, FL, AZ, NV, WA, OR, and many others. In these states persons are generally eligible for out of state licensure upon demonstrating an average of 8 years of experience prior to examination.

- There are currently California Licensed Landscape Architects practicing who would not qualify for licensure today. These professionals became licensed, in CA prior to 1997, under the previous Landscape Architect’s Board (LAB) and have varied educational backgrounds and experience.

- Per research compiled by LATC Staff the majority of States allow an option for initial licensure based on any bachelors degree and additional education credit is granted for many related degrees.

- Of CLARB’s 52 member board jurisdictions, 31 grant educational credit for accredited engineering degrees and 28 grant educational credit for any bachelor’s degree.

- Every State licensing board and committee undergoes a regular Sunset Review process and last year (2016), only 76 California applicants were granted landscape architecture licensure.

- Of the approximately 3,600 licensed landscape architects in California, nearly 50% were licensed prior to 1998 - the year the LATC came into being. Only 3,100 of these licensee live in the State (per the 2016 LATC roster). Is not possible to replace those leaving the profession without major changes.

- Currently in California, a person may become a Licensed Landscape Architect if they have earned an Associates Degree in Landscape Architecture, have worked as a Licensed Landscape Contractor for 4 years, and have only one year of experience under a Landscape Architect.

- Currently a person with a 4 year Bachelor’s Degree, regardless of related subject matter, who is licensed in another state by having passed the LARE, and showing extensive experience, is not eligible for licensure.

Won’t this devalue my Landscape Architecture degree?
Has the Landscape Architecture AA, Extension Certificate (unique to CA), or existing Licensees with Non-LA degrees hurt the value of your degree? No, because the public, employers, and clients will always perceive that someone with a degree from a prestigious school is more talented and more valuable. California Architects have long had experience only pathways and it has only strengthened and infused their profession with new ideas and technology.

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov

“I agree with the California Architects Board and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.”
From: Katrina Majewski [mailto:kjmaj26@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 1:35 PM
To: Dustin Maxam <dustin@spatialdg.com>; CCASLA@sbcglobal.net; LATC@DCA <LATC@dca.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: Help us grow CA Landscape Architecture!

Dear Dustin, Landscape Architects Technical Committee and CC-ASLA,

(My additions and comments are in red below)

I do not agree with the California Architects Board and do not want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone, as is described in the below email and attached statements. I do not believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience alone should be able to become licensed.

However, we should allow people to contest this, on an individual basis, if they believe their specific experience should permit a path to licensure.

I graduated from the accredited landscape architecture program at Rutgers University in New Jersey, and value the accreditation process.

I am happy to discuss further if desired-

Katrina Majewski

ASLA-NCC | PR Director & President-Elect

On Thu, Sep 28, 2017 at 12:55 PM, Dustin Maxam <dustin@spatialdg.com> wrote:

Attn: Katrina Majewski, ASLA, Northern California Chapter President-Elect
Hi Katrina,

The CC-ASLA is asking its members to take a stance without educating them on the issue. We value the opinions on both sides of the debate and simply want everyone involved in California Landscape Architecture to be knowledgeable on the issue. In fairness to what was sent by the CC-ASLA please consider distributing the attached counterview. If nothing else, thank you for your time and for looking this over.

We need your help to grow the Landscape Architecture profession in California!

As you may know, the California Architects Board, which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee, has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects.

**We want to share the facts about this important topic and communicate our beliefs** to the California Council of the ASLA and the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

**Act Today!** Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov

Dear Landscape Architects Technical Committee and CC-ASLA,

I agree with the California Architects Board and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience alone should be able to become licensed.

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,
Dustin Maxam, RLA

Planner/Landscape Architect

“We are a group of scrappy, highly experienced, CA Landscape Architecture Professionals who have managed to gain licensure out of state and are seeking to gain reciprocity and create positive change in our profession!”

--
Katrina Majewski
ASLA-NCC | PR Director
September 26, 2017

LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager
State of California Department of Consumer Affairs
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE). I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study “Determinants of Success” conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand

833 Dover Drive, Suite 9
Newport Beach, CA 92663
Phone: 949.548.3459
Fax: 949.548.5743
EM: design@rhdo.com
California Landscape Architect license # 2985
grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Thomas Jewell
California landscape Architect #3118
Dear Landscape Architects Technical Committee and CC-ASLA,

I agree with the California Architects Board and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience alone should be able to become licensed.

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,

John Austin
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

As a retired professor of landscape architecture and licensed landscape architect, I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you...
discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Kenneth S. Nakaba, FASLA, Prof. Emeritus (Calif. State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona, CA)
Registered Landscape Architect #1213
699 West California Blvd.
Pasadena, CA
ksnakaba@cpp.edu
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager  
FROM: Jamie Morf, Morf | Chang Landscape Architecture, Oakland CA  
RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements  

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Best,  
Jamie Morf  
CA LA #5820  

Morf | Chang Landscape Architecture  
5427 Telegraph Ave, Studio K
Public Comment: Education/ Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two- year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

Sarah Maxam

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Joe M. Turner, Engineer/Ayer
President

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Printed Name]  9-28-2017  Santa Rosa  CA  95404

Professional Designation(s)  Title

Printed Name  9-28-2017  Santa Rosa  CA  95404

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

Amanda Malm

Printed Name

Professional Designation(s)

Signature

Date

City

State

Zip Code

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Date City State Zip Code

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

(City)

(State) Zip Code

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/ Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two- year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

Printed Name: [Name]

Professional Designation(s): [Designation(s)]

City: [City]

State: [State]

Zip Code: [Zip Code]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/ Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Printed Name: Kyle Dion
Professional Designation(s):
Title:
Date: 9/13/17
City: Folsom
State: CA
Zip Code: 95630

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Printed Name: Courtney Hunden
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]
City: [City]
State: CA
Zip Code: [Zip Code]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

MARC NERIUS

Printed Name: MARC NERIUS
Professional Designation(s): SMPS, DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE, SACRAMENTO CHAPTER
Title: SMPS, DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE, SACRAMENTO CHAPTER

Date: 9/19/17
City: SACRAMENTO
State: CA
Zip Code: 95811

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely, Colleen Nemus

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Printed Name: [Name]
Professional Designation(s): [Designation]
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]
City: [City]
State: [State]
Zip Code: [Zip Code]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two- year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/ Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017
California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Description</td>
<td>Max. Credit Allowed</td>
<td>Max. Credit [Required]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two- year</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:
Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design,
Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
**Public Comment:** Education/ Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board  
Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  
Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

- Engineering
- Urban Planning & Design
- City & Regional Planning
- Geography
- Environmental Design
- Environmental Studies
- Environmental Horticulture
- Parks & Natural Resources Management
- Urban Forestry
- Landscape Planning & Design
- Landscape Design
- Agriculture
- Community Development

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/ Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. Credit Allowed</td>
<td>Max. Credit Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely, [Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

John Austin

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture: Engineering, Urban Planning & Design, City & Regional Planning, Geography, Environmental Design, Environmental Studies, Environmental Horticulture, Parks & Natural Resources Management, Urban Forestry, Landscape Planning & Design, Landscape Design, Agriculture, Community Development.

Sincerely,

DUSTIN T. MAXAM R.L.A. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Todd Kohli, PLA, ASLA
Principal
Landscape & Urban Design

SmithGroupJJR
301 Battery Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

d 415.365.3440 c 415.994.3665
todd.kohli@smithgroupjjr.com

Expect the Unexpected.
Visit www.smithgroupjjr.com
Follow us on LinkedIn | @SmithGroupJJR
To whom it may concern,

I support of the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I look forward to learning more about proposed Subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

Laura Morton, APLD
Good morning LATC Education & Experience Subcommittee-

I am in support of prospective Landscape Architects having education and experience in LA prior to qualifying for licensure in California, however, I do believe this can be achieved by having completed affiliated degrees coupled with work experience. I’m writing to you at this time because I plan on applying for reciprocity next year although I have not followed the educational process that the State of California currently requires.

As follows is my educational and professional experience background:

1) I received Masters Degrees in City & Regional Planning (MCP) and Public Health (MPH) from UC Berkeley in 1995.

2) I've worked full-time under the direct supervision of a Landscape Architect (Michael B. Dillon - CA 1910) in an active Landscape Architecture practice since 1995.

3) I've taken numerous continuing education courses from institutions such as UC Davis Extension, UC Berkeley Extension (LA Certificate Program), Cabrillo College and Merritt College.

4) I'm currently in the process of seeking licensure in the State of Hawaii since that is where I was born/raised and where I'd like to practice. The State of Hawaii licensing board has accepted my credentials and approved my application to take L.A.R.E.

5) I'm currently in the process of taking L.A.R.E. and plan on completing all sections by April 2018.

6) Once I receive licensure in Hawaii, I'd like to apply for reciprocity in the State of California.

In summation, I would greatly appreciate the LATC Education & Experience Subcommittee consider other options by which candidates may qualify for Landscape Architecture licensure in California.

Thank you.

Berry DeWaele
Dillon Design Associates
849 Almar Avenue Suite C-162
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
(831) 420-1648
www.dillondesignassociates.com
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dca.ca.gov)

FROM: James Ingels, RHAA San Francisco

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

James Ingels

James Ingels, Landscape Architect

Principal
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Christina DeMartini Reyes, UC Davis Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study *Determinants of Success* conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.
I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Sincerely,

Christina DeMartini Reyes  
Campus Landscape Architect  
California License # 5009  
Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship  
University of California, Davis  
(530) 752 – 3161  
(530) 979 - 1698 cell
Hello, My name is Scot Hayes. I am a landscape contractor for the last 16 years (CSLB # 809443). I am injured and cannot do the physical work anymore. I am going to college (West Valley College, Saratoga Ca.) to get my A.S. degree in landscape architecture. I have about one more year to complete my degree. Will I be able to use my contractor's license and A.S. degree to apply for a California Landscape Architects License? Or will this change?

History; I'm 59 years old and starting my life over. I am on disability now and have been going to school since 2013. I have earned a certificate in Historical Preservation and a certificate in Architecture. I am trying to get my certificate in Landscape architecture, A.S degree in Landscape Architecture, and an A.S. degree in Architecture. I have approximately 7 classes to go to complete my certificate and degrees. I'm currently a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects and president of the West Valley College Landscape Club.

Concern; My concern is doing all of this work and not being able to apply for a Landscape Architect License. At my age starting over is hard enough, but to not be able to reach my goal of being licensed is devastating. Please consider this in your meeting. People are working hard to accomplish their dreams. We all have different backgrounds, ages, and education please don't put the
bar too high. We could always do some kind of continuing education credits for licensed landscape architects like some other industries do. Just a thought...

Thank you for reading this. I'm sorry I am not able to attend the meeting.

Sincerely,

Scot Hayes
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Reed Dillingham, ASLA, RLA #1431  
Dillingham Associates Landscape Architects  
2927 Newbury Street / Berkeley / California 94703  
510-548-4700 / Fax 510-548-0265  
www.dillinghamlandarch.com

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Thanks for your consideration.
Hello -

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture. As a licensed Landscape Architect in California (5133) with an undergraduate degree in Landscape Architecture (SLA Rutgers 2000), I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee's research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and the ability to work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Sincerely,

DAVID GREGORY, PLA, ASLA
SKIDMORE, OWINGS & MERRILL LLP
ONE FRONT STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
T (415) 352-3817
DAVID.GREGORY@SOM.COM
The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please return it to the sender immediately and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system. If you have any questions concerning this message, please contact the sender.
I agree with the California Architects Board and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

Cielo Sichi PLA#5643
Horticulture Department Chair
American River College
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed below and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the LATC.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

I urge this subcommittee to consider the need for a workforce that works as stewards of the land and of the environment.

There is a great need for this workforce to work closely with garden owners to educate them on the new ways to garden in California. Through the use of appropriate plant material, the capture of rain water, the use of mulch and the elimination of thirsty landscapes.

I am a believer that there are many ways to become an excellent a capable landscape architect, and this belief is founded in knowing that in 1985 the American Society of Landscape Architects bestowed on Roberto Burle Marx it’s highest award, The ASLA Medal for Superior Landscape Architectural Design.

Roberto was trained as an artist and not as a landscape architect. He was a self taught horticulturist, and worked until the end of his life to protect and promote the threatened flora of his native county Brazil.

His work transcends the boundaries of the narrow discipline and brought world renown to the profession of Landscape Architecture.

Few have done more for this profession than he has, and he wasn’t even trained in the profession.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely

Amelia, APLD

Amelia B. Lima & Associates, Inc.
www.ameliab.com
Tel: (858) 243-4470
amelialima@gmail.com
APLD California Chapter Advocacy Chair
Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I am encouraged and support of the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

The California Architects Board should be commended for initiating and directing the LATC to convene this subcommittee. The goal of making the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states is a smart one and will benefit all of us who practice landscape design in California.

Varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted to those sitting for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam.

Please keep me updated about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

Patricia St. John, APLD
Owner
St. John Landscapes
patriciastjohn24@gmail.com
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105  Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed above and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely, Sean Dugan

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

Astrid Gaiser
Owner
ASTRID GAI SER GARDEN DESIGN, LLC

CLIA #85943 – Certified Landscape Irrigation Auditor (Irrigation Association)
EPA WaterSense Partner (Environmental Protection Agency)
CGBP – Certified Green Building Professional (Build It Green)
APLD Certified Landscape Designer (Association of Professional Landscape Designers)
Bay-Friendly Qualified Professional (Bay-Friendly Coalition)
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed above and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
10/2/17

Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

David Clarke, APLD

David Clarke Design
619.787.0686
david@davidclarkedesign.com
www.davidclarkedesign.com

Find me on Houzz  Follow me on Facebook
Vice-President Association of Professional Landscape Designers San Diego District | 2018 President-elect
Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Peigi Duvall, APLD, MBFL
www.indigdesign.com
650.704.3926
October 2, 2017

Marq Truscott, Chair
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: LATC Education Subcommittee

Dear Mr. Truscott,

The Board members of the San Diego Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects would like to provide feedback on topics that will be discussed at the upcoming meeting and future meetings that will address the education reciprocity requirements to sit for the LARE National Exam.

Prior to 1997, the LATC considered and approved degrees in other subject areas to help qualify for the National Exam. Since that time, a potential candidate is required to have a bachelor's degree, an extension certificate or an associate's degree along with practical experience to be considered to qualify for sitting for the exam. There are many prominent licensed landscape architects locally that would not be able to get licensed under the current requirements. We think it is appropriate that the LATC Education Committee is revisiting this requirement.

Our reasons for supporting this discussion are:

1. CLARB (Council of Landscape Architects Registration Board) has a model law that was voted upon in September, 2017 at their Annual Meeting where they are recommending that all states utilize their guidelines. Their guidelines allow any degree to be used as a partial requirement for qualifying to sit for the LARE National Exam.

2. The State of California is terminating two landscape architecture programs, Mesa Community College and University of California Berkeley Extension Certificate Program. This determination makes the education requirement even more difficult for potential landscape architecture candidates to meet the current education requirement.

3. The LATC, which is a committee under the California Architects Board (CAB), has been given direction to align with the requirements of the CAB. Currently the CAB has a pathway to licensure that has no required education component, however, it has a requirement of working under a licensed architect for eight years. The architect's internship program is robust and managed by NCARB (National Council of Architectural Registration Board). Those candidates perform well when sitting for the National Exam. We feel an option such as this would be appropriate for and beneficial to California candidates.

4. The LARE National Exam is a comprehensive exam that is vetted by many groups and held to very high standards. If a candidate can pass the exam, which tests for minimal competency,
we feel they are entitled to be licensed in that particular state. If there are particular topics or requirements that are specific to California, then they belong in the California Supplemental Exam. There are certainly topics unique to California such as MAWA Water Calculations, wildfires, soil and erosion issues to name a few.

Thank you for your consideration of our views as the San Diego ASLA Chapter on these pertinent topics.

Below are suggested career path options to licensure. As we know in today’s fast changing world, we need to be more inclusive to allow dedicated and passionate individuals opportunity to bring about change and grow our profession. This requires pathways that are not cut from the same cloth. It’s our profession’s diversity that makes Landscape Architecture one of the most exciting and relevant fields for today and the future.

We look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Nate Magnusson, PLA, ASLA, LEED AP
President
San Diego Chapter of the
American Society of Landscape Architects

**PROPOSED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS / PATH OPTIONS TO LICENSURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH 1</th>
<th>PATH 2</th>
<th>PATH 3</th>
<th>PATH 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree/Experience</strong>&lt;br&gt;LAAB-accredited program&lt;br&gt;Degree + 2 years experience</td>
<td>Non-accredited LA Degree + 3 years&lt;br&gt;OR&lt;br&gt;Associate Degree + 5 years</td>
<td>Design-related degree + 4 years&lt;br&gt;OR&lt;br&gt;Unrelated degree + 6 years</td>
<td>8 years experience only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Experience</strong>&lt;br&gt;Minimum 1 year experience under direct supervision of licensed LA; Teaching in LA program</td>
<td>Minimum 50% of experience under direct supervision of licensed LA; Teaching in LA program (can only qualify for 2 years)</td>
<td>Work experience must be in an LA, architect, engineer, land surveyor, or governmental office under direct supervision of licensed LA</td>
<td>All experience must be under direct supervision of licensed LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examination/Other Eligibility Requirements</strong>&lt;br&gt;LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 2, 2017

LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

Dear LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee,

The Board members of the San Diego Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects would like to provide feedback on topics that will be discussed at the upcoming meeting and future meetings that will address the education reciprocity requirements to sit for the LARE National Exam.

Prior to 1997, the LATC considered and approved degrees in other subject areas to help qualify for the National Exam. Since that time, a potential candidate is required to have a bachelor’s degree, an extension certificate or an associate’s degree along with practical experience to be considered to qualify for sitting for the exam. There are many prominent licensed landscape architects locally that would not be able to get licensed under the current requirements. We think it is appropriate that the LATC Education Committee is revisiting this requirement.

Our reasons for supporting this discussion are:

1. CLARB (Council of Landscape Architects Registration Board) has a model law that was voted upon in September, 2017 at their Annual Meeting where they are recommending that all states utilize their guidelines. Their guidelines allow any degree to be used as a partial requirement for qualifying to sit for the LARE National Exam.

2. The State of California is terminating two landscape architecture programs, Mesa Community College and University of California Berkeley Extension Certificate Program. This determination makes the education requirement even more difficult for potential landscape architecture candidates to meet the current education requirement.

3. The LATC, which is a committee under the California Architects Board (CAB), has been given direction to align with the requirements of the CAB. Currently the CAB has a pathway to licensure that has no required education component, however, it has a requirement of working under a licensed architect for eight years. The architect’s internship program is robust and managed by NCARB (National Council of Architectural Registration Board). Those candidates perform well when sitting for the National Exam. We feel an option such as this would be appropriate for and beneficial to California candidates.
4. The LARE National Exam is a comprehensive exam that is vetted by many groups and held to very high standards. If a candidate can pass the exam, which tests for minimal competency, we feel they are entitled to be licensed in that particular state. If there are particular topics or requirements that are specific to California, then they belong in the California Supplemental Exam. There are certainly topics unique to California such as MAWA Water Calculations, wildfires, soil and erosion issues to name a few.

Thank you for your consideration of our views as the San Diego ASLA Chapter on these pertinent topics.

Below are suggested career path options to licensure. As we know in today’s fast changing world, we need to be more inclusive to allow dedicated and passionate individuals opportunity to bring about change and grow our profession. This requires pathways that are not cut from the same cloth. It’s our profession’s diversity that makes Landscape Architecture one of the most exciting and relevant fields for today and the future.

We look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Nate Magnusson, PLA, ASLA, LEED AP
President
San Diego Chapter of the
American Society of Landscape Architects

PROPOSED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS / PATH OPTIONS TO LICENSURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree/Experience</th>
<th>PATH 1</th>
<th>PATH 2</th>
<th>PATH 3</th>
<th>PATH 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 1 year experience under direct supervision of licensed LA; Teaching in LA program</td>
<td>LAAB-accredited program Degree + 2 years experience</td>
<td>Non-accredited LA Degree + 3 years OR Associate Degree + 5 years</td>
<td>Design-related degree + 4 years OR Unrelated degree + 6 years</td>
<td>8 years experience only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Experience</td>
<td>Minimum 50% of experience under direct supervision of licensed LA; Teaching in LA program (can only qualify for 2 years)</td>
<td>Work experience must be in an LA, architect, engineer, land surveyor, or governmental office under direct supervision of licensed LA</td>
<td>All experience must be under direct supervision of licensed LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination/Other Eligibility Requirements</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
<td>LARE + CA Supplemental Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

Lee Mangus, Owner

lee@smithmangus.com
925-254-7444 OFFICE
925-890-6915 LEE
925-890-6916 RODNEY
October 3, 2017

Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Seidman
Owner
Jackie and the Beanstalk
Latc@dca

From: Maureen Decombe <maureen@decombe.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2017 6:17 AM
To: LATC@DCA
Subject: Education/Experience Subcommittee

Dear Members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee:

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted. As a retired landscape contractor, designer, and adjunct faculty for the environmental design program at Foothill College, it is my hope that the committee will carefully consider the need for diversity and expansion of the education requirements.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations, and to attending today’s meeting.

Sincerely,
Maureen Decombe
Richmond, CA
Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee.

I agree with the California Architects Board in their direction to the LATC to convene this subcommittee, with a goal to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted.

I look forward to learning more about proposed subcommittee recommendations.

Warm regards,

Bonnie Brock
Bonnie Brock Landscape Design
Hello:

I initially intended drive down to participate in this morning’s meeting regarding the above, unfortunately some veterinary issues arose that require regular attendance preventing me from being able to do so.

I am writing to voice my support for the proposed changes to the licensure requirements- particularly to allow for an “experience only” pathway.

You will find attached 3 PDFs of signed letters in support of the proposed changes to the licensure requirements from my colleagues and me. All may be contacted for verification at the office number listed below.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Jason Bisho
Public Comment: Education/Experience Subcommittee Meeting, October 3rd, 2017

California Architects Board
Landscape Architects Technical Committee
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 Sacramento, CA 95834

I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC's Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following: Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a one-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed above and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession! The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:
Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Max. Credit Allowed</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
<th>Max. Credit [Required]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please review the suggested years listed above and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)

I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:

Sincerely,

**BRIAN FIRTH**
Landscape Architect

Act Today! Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email: CCASLA@sbcglobal.net & LATC@dca.ca.gov
**I want to help grow the Landscape Architecture profession!** The California Architects Board (CAB), which oversees the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), has mandated that Landscape Architecture Licensure match the many pathways available to California Architects. I agree with the CAB and want fair and equitable Landscape Architecture licensure pathways for everyone. I believe that varying education credit for both related and non-related bachelor degrees should be granted and those with extensive experience should be able to become licensed.

**I request that the LATC’s Education/Experience Subcommittee consider the following:**

Listed below are new licensure pathways for Related Degrees, Non-Related Degrees, and Experience Only combinations. These new pathways are proposed in addition to the existing pathways which require education in Landscape Architecture or Architecture.

These combinations match the Table of Equivalents of the California Architects Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Education Equivalents</th>
<th>Training and/or Practice Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum in a field related to Landscape Architecture as defined in subsection (tbd), or units toward such a degree.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other university or college degree which consists of at least a four-year curriculum.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree or technical school certificate in a field related to Landscape Architecture.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other city/community college degree which consists of at least a two-year curriculum.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Please review the suggested years listed above and feel free to change any numbers as you see fit)*

**I propose the following degrees be considered Related Degrees to Landscape Architecture:**


Sincerely,  

[Signature]

**Act Today!** Spread the word and let the California Council of the ASLA and the LATC know what you believe, please email:  
CCASLA@sbcglobal.net  &  LATC@dca.ca.gov
For printing and bringing over

Get Outlook for Android

From: Anne-Emilie Gold - Gravel to Gold, Inc. <graveltogold@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 11:01:31 PM
To: Miller, Brianna@DCA
Subject: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Anne-Emilie Gold, Gravel To Gold, Inc., San Diego

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.
I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Thank You,

Anne-Émilie Gold, ASLA, LEED AP

Gravel To Gold, Inc.
San Diego, CA
Cell: 206.617.1353
E-Mail: aeg@graveltogold.com
Web: graveltogold.com
Public Comment Received
for November 2, 2017
LATC Meeting
TO: LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager (Brianna.Miller@dea.ca.gov)

FROM: Amy Kim, Rabben/Herman design office, Newport Beach

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Education/Experience Subcommittee determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

I understand that the California Architects Board (CAB) has asked the LATC to align its licensing approval with the CAB requirements which do not require an architect exam applicant to have a degree in architecture.

The California Council of ASLA (CCASLA) is sending the Subcommittee an executive summary of a study Determinants of Success conducted by Professional Testing, Inc. for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards. The goal of the research was to define and, if possible, weigh the determinants of successfully passing the LARE and to provide greater insights for the profession and regulatory community on which to base policy, practice and support decisions. They found that those that had degrees in landscape architecture, had higher LARE passage rates.

Approximately half of the states in the United States do require a landscape architect license exam applicant to have a degree or partial degree in landscape architecture along with other educational and job experience in order to be qualified to take the LARE.

As part of the Education/Experience Subcommittee’s research and due diligence, I recommend that in their discussions the Subcommittee consider as a model the eligibility standards of those states with a landscape architecture degree requirement, and determine what academic and practical experience should be required of applicants without a landscape architecture degree to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

I believe that core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species, grading and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through studies in other academic majors and fields, certain core courses need to be determined to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I look forward to updates from the LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee and urge you to consider my request to keep this profession strong and public consumers protected when you discuss these issues at your October 3rd LATC Education/Experience Subcommittee meeting in Sacramento.

Regards,  
Amy Kim
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Chad Kennedy, Modesto, CA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC's research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant's practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee's motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager  
RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements  

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Regards,
Stacy

Stacy Fausset  
S.A. Fausset - Landscape Architect, Inc. - ASLA  
805.340.7595 Direct  
805.642.2877 Office/Fax
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Cathy Wei, Sacramento, California

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

As a landscape architect primarily working on public works, I feel strongly my daily responsibility to keep the health and safety of the public. My formal and professional education in the field of landscape architecture is foundational and absolutely crucial to complete my daily work.

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Thanks,
Cathy Wei, PLA, ASLA  
Project Landscape Architect  
(916) 403-5732 direct
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Polly Furr, Venice Studio, Los Angeles, 90291

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Thank you very much for your good caretaking about this matter.

Best,

Polly Furr

Polly Furr
Landscape Architect
Venice Studio
310.392.5676 telephone
Dear Brianna Miller,

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Thank you,

Stephen Nunez | Senior Designer/Planner

t: 619 294-4477 x113
3916 Normal Street | San Diego, CA 92103
e: stephen@ktua.com | www.ktua.com
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Kathleen Nolan, PLA, Studio Landscape Corp., Ojai CA.

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC's research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant's practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee's motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,
Kathy Nolan

studio landscape corp.
landscape architecture . consulting . project management
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee
   c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Suzanne Baird, Perennial Designs, Westlake Village, CA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

Dear members of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee,

I support the formation of the Education/Experience Subcommittee of the Landscape Architects Technical Committee to make the experience and education requirements consistent with California law, and law in other states.

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

For qualification to sit for the LARE and California Supplemental Exam, varying education credit should be considered in conjunction with actual work experience. I strongly believe credit should be given for related course work taken and successfully completed at accredited institutions. As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture to determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice. This is particularly true since licensure covers both private residential and commercial applications.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

Additionally, I believe professional work experience in related fields either in totality or as a percentage of required work experience should be consider based on the type of work and number of years this work has been performed either as a licensed professional for a related discipline or working under the guidance of a licensed professional.

I support reciprocity for practicing license holders in states other than California. In alignment with that position, I support the acceptance of related degrees to count toward the educational requirement; with the requirement that all established core course work for licensure has been completed along with the proper work experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer. LATC will need to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.
I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee's motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Suzanne Baird, PLA ASLA
Landscape Architect

Perennial Designs
www.perennial-designs.com
C-27 Lic # 990598, CA LA Lic#6114
Tel: 818-292-4501
Fax: 818-879-8168
Dear Brianna Miller,

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant's practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Respectfully,

Kristen Koehrn, ASLA
SMP, Inc., Dana Point, CA
Dear LATC Staff,

Please forward the attached message to Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager for consideration at the November 2, 2017 Meeting at UCLA Extension.

Best regards,

Stephanie Psomas, ASLA
VICE PRESIDENT

PAMELA BURTON & COMPANY
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
1430 OLYMPIC BLVD
in SANTA MONICA, CA 90404
tel 310 828 6373
spsomas@pamelaburtonco.com
www.pamelaburtonco.com
October 25, 2017

TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Stephanie Psomas, ASLA
Pamela Burton & Company
1430 Olympic Boulevard
Santa Monica, CA 90404

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Psomas, ASLA
Landscape Architect #3414
UCLA Extension Landscape Architecture Alumna, 1988
Pamela Burton & Company
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Cheryl Fields, Landscape Architect, Arcadia, CA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Thank you,
Cheryl

---

Cheryl Fields, ASLA  
Senior Landscape Architect
Email: cheryl@socallandarch.com  Cell: 949.290.6406  Web site: www.socallandarch.com

This email is intended solely for specific person(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, transmission, dissemination or other use of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and promptly delete this email and all attachments from your computer.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Additional Requirements.

1. Knowledge of California Title 24 and Americans with Disability Act (ADA)
2. California Irrigation Design requirements AB1881. My firm provide plan check services and the lack of understanding California’s Irrigation Design requirements is a major problem in the profession.
3. Dangerous and poisonous plant that should not be used in the landscape.
4. Understanding of native plants and their preferred environment.

Thanks

PAT HIRSCH
PRESIDENT

HIRSCH & ASSOCIATES, INC.
2221 EAST WINSTON ROAD, SUITE A
ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA 92806
714-776-1340  FAX 714-776-4395
PAT@HAILANDARCH.COM

DISCLAIMER

AGREEMENT for use of DIGITAL DATA

By accepting this information, you are acknowledging that the enclosed electronic media (and hard copy, if any) are provided for the purpose of expediting input of information into the recipient’s computer. In using it, modifying it or accessing information from it, you are responsible for confirmation, accuracy and checking of the data from the media against that contained on the duplicate hard copy, and/or the physical characteristics of the project site, if applicable. Hirsch & Associates, Inc hereby disclaims any and all responsibility for any results obtained in use of this electronic media and does not guarantee any accuracy of the information. The information provided by Hirsch & Associates, Inc shall not be used for any purpose other than for the project described above and shall not be released to any other party without the written consent of Hirsch & Associates, Inc. The information contained on the electronic media is an instrument of professional services and shall remain the property of Hirsch & Associates, Inc. Please note that the information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.
I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC's research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant's practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee's motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Thank you,
Jodie Cook
From: Paul Jordan <paul@jordan-gilbert.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 12:07 PM
To: LATC@DCA; CCASLA@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements
Attachments: LETTER RE LICENSING AND REC-PAUL JORDAN.pdf

--
Paul Jordan
Jordan, Gilbert & Bain
Landscape Architects
459 No. Ventura Ave.
Ventura, CA 93001
(805) 642-3641
October 25, 2017

Landscape Architects Technical Committee
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

Reference: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

Dear Ms. Miller:

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC’s research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in Landscape Architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant’s practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee’s motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

Respectfully,
Jordan, Gilbert & Bain Landscape Architects, Inc.

Paul J. Jordan
Landscape Architect #1443
Included in public comment per sender request on 10/12/17.

From: Michelle Landis [mailto:mlandis@studiowest-land.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 8, 2017 5:40 PM
To: Martin Schmidt <marty@environs.us>; dj@trib-la.com; rich@grounded101.com; Nate Magnusson <nmagnusson@schmidttdesign.com>
Cc: Joy Lyndes <jlyndes@coastal-sage.com>; Michael Brennan <michael@cd-la.com>; Michael Watts <mwdesigns21@aol.com>; Mark Valen <myalen@swccd.edu>; donald.schultz@gcccd.edu; john.thomas@gcccd.edu; Ehrlinger, Claire <cehrlinger@miracosta.edu>; Allison, Megan <mallison@miracosta.edu>; Mink Stavenga <mstavenga@swccd.edu>
Subject: LATC history on local 2 year landscape architecture programs

Hi Nate, Marty, DJ and Rich,

I saw the ASLA SD letter that went out last week in support of maintaining the current paths to licensure and adding additional suggestions to allow reasonable ways for people to become licensed in the State of California. As this appears to once again be a hot topic, I wanted to take a minute to thank you for putting that letter together and convey some information on this topic related to actions that have threatened our student’s ability to be eligible for State licensure.

As you all may be aware, our region does not have any path to licensure that includes a Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board (LAAB) reviewed and accredited landscape architecture program. That accreditation is difficult to get for two year programs and small private four year programs because they are ranked in direct relation to established, large four year programs including being evaluated on the number of courses offered, the number of students enrolled, the academic support through having amenities like model shops and diversity. In addition, one past, local four year program that was not successful in obtaining LAAB accreditation was also incredibly expensive, which further limited the number of students who could afford to attend the program. As such, that program was not a viable financial option for my students once they graduated from our program. For those who have the family situation or finances to attend a university, my students usually transfer out of the region to one of the LAAB accredited public university programs.

I have also included Joy Lyndes on this e-mail, because she is currently on the national LAAB accreditation team. Joy has been invited to my advanced students’ presentations, and has told me in the past she believed our program operated a higher level than the typical community college program, acting as a hybrid between a typical community college program and a four year university program. She also mentioned that she believed that is likely true region wide, because we are filling this void of no public LAAB 4 year programs being available in our region.

In light of this unique regional condition, the local community colleges have long filled the void of landscape design education in our region. Currently, the State of California Landscape Architecture Practice Act gives students who complete a two year Associate in Science/ Arts in Landscape Architecture one year of educational credit, the minimum educational credit required to take the national and State CSE exams for licensure. In addition to the minimum 1 year educational credit, candidates must have a minimum of 6 years’ experience, which means our community college students must work 5 years in the industry before being approved to take the exams.
In 2012, unbeknownst to the community colleges in the region, the State of California Landscape Architecture Technical Committee (LATC) performed a “study” and recommended that all educational credits be removed from two year programs because the authors decided that two year programs were “vocational” in nature and did not teach skills adequate to the profession. This study was prepared and researched by members of LATC, who never reached out to any of our regions’ programs to review and evaluate what we were teaching. We believe this report was a political measure meant to stabilize enrollment at an extension program and remove any competition from the community college programs because this “study” was let by a member of LATC who was also the director of an extension program in landscape architecture. I have attached that report from 2012 for your review, so you can better understand the actions LATC has taken against our programs without our knowledge. It was only because Michael Watts was given this information as the ASLA student affiliate chapter President, that the local community colleges could spring into action at the 11th hour to protest this study’s recommendations. This was primarily done by our students, faculty and local practitioners writing to LATC and the State Architecture Board to prevent the recommendations of this study from being implemented, as well as members of our faculty showing up to the ASLA national convention to speak on behalf of our programs at the meeting scheduled for professional input on this study.

I have included representatives from all the local community college landscape architecture/landscape design programs in the region on this e-mail. Those include MiraCosta College, Cuyamaca College and our program at Southwestern College. We kindly ask that you keep us in the loop regarding discussions at LATC, CCASLA and ASLA SD that concern the fate of our LATC approved educational credit and the related pathways to licensure.

Please know we appreciate your support and, at moment’s notice if the need arises, are willing to have our students, faculty, administration and practitioners who have hired our students write letters of support to LATC and the Architecture Board to maintain our educational credit and related path to licensure.

If any of you are interested to see what our students are working, please feel free to schedule a visit at the schools or request a meeting with us to review projects and the topics we teach.

On that note, here is a link to the final presentation for recent project that my advanced students did for Nate’s Point Dog Park in Balboa Park, completed last May. The five students who were selected to present their complete presentation to the client were selected by their peers for categories like “best use of materials” or “best design for maintenance”:


As always, please feel free to reach out to me or any of the other community college representatives with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Michelle M. Landis
President/ Principal Landscape Architect CA RLA #5444

3645 Ruffin Rd., Suite 235, San Diego, CA 92123
Ph. 858.598.5085  C. 619.840.4363
Email mlandis@studiotwest-land.com
Web [www.studiowest-land.com]
Summary of Issues: Accreditation and Reciprocity

Introduction

In 2009-2010, ASLA’s California chapters shared with the ASLA Board of Trustees concerns regarding the current scope of accreditation and its impact on graduates of programs in California that do not award degrees. Programs at the University of California, Los Angeles and University of California, Berkeley offer certificates through the extension programs at those universities. According to the chapters, graduates of these certificate programs are then at a disadvantage for licensure outside of California and, therefore, full entry into the profession.

The Board responded by suggesting that ASLA create a task force to explore the impacts related to the lack of authority of the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) to accredit non-degree-granting programs. In May 2010, the Task Force on Accreditation and Reciprocity was formed, which included perspectives from the two major issue areas: accreditation/education and licensure. The task force charged:

Identify potential advantages, disadvantages, and challenges for expanding the role of the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) to evaluate other degree-granting and non-degree-granting programs. Specifically, the task force should review the impact of the status quo on licensure eligibility for professionals without a degree from an LAAB-accredited landscape architecture program, including graduates of the California certificate extension programs.

The Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) is currently authorized to accredit first-professional programs that offer landscape architecture degrees. LAAB is vested with authority via the ASLA Bylaws (Section 916):

There shall be a Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). The board shall consist of twelve (12) members, including one (1) appointed by the Society who shall also serve as a member of the Council on Education, one (1) appointed by the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA), and one (1) appointed by the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB). The remaining members shall be appointed according to procedures established by LAAB. The board shall be an autonomous working group with responsibility to act in matters concerning accreditation of professional landscape architecture degree programs. Fees collected by LAAB shall cover the direct costs of accreditation visits and board meetings. The Society shall provide staff support and overhead for LAAB in an amount to be determined in the annual budget of the Society as established by the Board of Trustees.

As the task force explored the issues surrounding accreditation, the task force chair asked LAAB to share its comments on the matter, which were received by the task force and reviewed in May 2011. Next, the preliminary work of the task force was shared with the Presidents’ Council at its June 2011 meeting. The Council includes leadership and staff from ASLA, LAAB, Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA), Council of Landscape Architectural Accreditation Boards (CLARB), Canadian Society of Landscape Architects (CSLA), and Landscape Architecture Foundation (LAF). The feedback received at the Presidents’ Council meeting was shared with the task force and an invitation was made to the
organizations to share additional comments in writing. The final task force meeting was held in August, when a recommendation was identified and agreed to unanimously, as follows:

The ASLA Task Force on Accreditation and Reciprocity recommends that the scope of the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board should be expanded to include non-degree-granting first-professional landscape architecture programs. These programs must be able to meet the same standards that are used to evaluate degree-granting programs. These are areas where the accreditation standards will need to recognize the institutional model of the certificate program, in the same way that the existing standards recognize the differences between bachelor's and master's degrees, and care must be taken to maintain the existing standards for accreditation of all programs. The task force believes it is essential to the integrity of accreditation that certificate programs require a bachelor's degree as a prerequisite to entry into a certificate program. This recommendation is intended to expand the eligibility for accreditation to programs that provide an education equivalent to that of degree-granting programs. The task force acknowledges that it is the responsibility of LAAB to determine whether any program meets the accreditation standards.

Scope
The task force explored the extent to which accreditation could apply to other programs – both existing and future. Many of the existing accredited landscape architecture programs reside within land grant colleges, which typically have extension programs. A sampling of these schools showed that their extension programs tend to be for continuing education with a narrow scope. It appears that the California landscape architecture extension programs are unique programs that have not been attempted elsewhere.

Other potential sources of programs include landscape design or vocational-tech associates degree programs. A review of these models indicate that these are short-term programs with limited curricula or they have a technical/trade focus rather than a comprehensive discipline. The proposed bylaws change would not expand LAAB's scope beyond professional landscape architecture programs, thereby eliminating landscape design or programs with pre-professional curricula from eligibility unless these schools decided to make significant changes.

The California extension programs at UCLA and UC-Berkeley provide the only examples of landscape architecture programs that do not grant degrees, but have educational goals similar to the accredited degree-granting programs. Graduates of both programs earn certificates.

Founded in 1982, the Berkeley Extension Program is a 3-year program designed for working adults with average time in the program 4 years. It does not require a bachelor's degree, but recommends it for candidates and most students come to the program with a bachelor's degree. The program's student body consists of approximately 1/3 career change (from varying backgrounds); 1/3 from green industry/construction background; and 1/3 are in mid/late 20s looking for a career. There are about 100 individuals taking classes that are not enrolled in the certificate program, while there are 50-60 students actively seeking a certificate. Some Berkeley students transfer to an accredited MLA program, especially younger students. The program grants 15-20 certificates each year, with many graduates going on to take the licensing exam.

Founded in 1984, the UCLA Extension Program is also designed for working adults. UCLA requires a Bachelor's degree to become a certificate candidate, but allows conditional admission for students with a
two-year Associate’s Degree. In recent years, conditional admission has been rare, typically granted to one student/year. There are two portfolio reviews – one at the end of the first year and one at the end of the third year before entering a year of thesis. The four-year program is sequenced, which means classes can only be taken in the approved sequence, with classes arranged to build on complexity and previous knowledge and skills. The program’s student body consists of about 1/2 career changers, 1/4 right out of college, and 1/4 who are just trying out the classes. Many initial students transfer to MLA programs. Almost all of the students work full-time and take a full load of classes and the program has a high proportion of single parents in its student body. The program graduates between 15-25 students a year. The program has 301 graduates, of which at least 1/3 are licensed or in the process of being licensed in California.

Issues
The following section summarizes the issues identified by the task force and allied organizations.

Reciprocity
Reciprocity has been identified as a significant problem for licensed landscape architects with certificates. Each state sets its respective requirements for licensure. California performs its own review of the certificate programs, based upon the LAAB standards, allowing the state to enable graduates of the certificate programs to earn licensure in California. Other states require an accredited degree or may allow a non-accredited degree, but do not provide for non-degree landscape architectural education. There are 31 states (see map) that allow for an experience-only path to licensure, which should be a viable route to licensure for graduates of these programs, provided that they continue to earn supervised experience for up to 12 years, depending on the state. An additional 2 states allow for credit for any bachelor’s degree along with an extended period of experience. For the remaining 17 states, some allow for non-accredited degrees to credit toward the educational component of licensure requirements, but it is not clear if a board would allow for a certificate in lieu of a degree in these cases.

The ASLA Prerequisites for Licensure Policy asserts the value of providing varied pathways to licensure. It reads, in part:

The ASLA believes that a professional degree in Landscape Architecture from a program accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board should be a prerequisite for licensing. The ASLA also believes that alternate experiences to the accredited degree could be considered as fulfilling the educational prerequisites to licensure on an individual candidate basis. These may include practical experience, alternative educational tracks, or a combination thereof.

Several states require a CLARB certificate to qualify for initial or reciprocal licensure. The Standards of Eligibility for CLARB certification require a first professional degree accredited by the LAAB (or the Canadian counterpart). There are several other ways that the education component of the standards can be met, but a certificate would not meet any of these categories and at least one year of education must be gained in an accredited degree program.

Accreditation will improve the grounds for reciprocity for those who graduate after accreditation is granted. Some additional regulatory action is likely to be necessary for states that specify a “degree” as a prerequisite; however, the task force did not anticipate the need for a national campaign to change
licensure laws and regulations. Given the scope of this issue, individual licensees who continue to find barriers will need to present their qualifications.

Impact on Degree Programs

This issue was a primary concern of the task force as it evaluated the potential outcomes of a change in LAAB scope and also a strong concern expressed by allied organizations, including CELA. The vulnerability of programs under fiscal challenges serves to heighten this issue. The task force recognized that an expansion of LAAB scope could undermine the viability of existing accredited degree-granting programs and programs under development, which potentially could be pressured to shift to a certificate program. The task force attempted to quantify this threat and turned to the example of the California extension programs as the best evidence available. The two extension programs, which are currently reviewed by the state licensing board, have coexisted for nearly 30 years with BLA and MLA programs in the state, without any evidence of adverse impact on degree-granting programs or shifting toward extension certificate programs over degree programs.
Even though there is no consideration given to developing two sets of standards for degree- and non-degree-granting programs, there could be a perceived gap between the two types of programs accredited by LAAB, downgrading the value of the accreditation credential itself. Without demonstrable evidence cited, it has been expressed through comments received that there may be a potential for adverse consequence to existing accredited programs if the standards are considered lax, including comparisons with other allied professions that do not accredit similar programs. All-in-all, this is a difficult threat to quantify in any meaningful way.

A review of LAAB standards and implementation options provides options to minimize the incentive for an institution to shift a degree program into a certificate program. LAAB has established Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status (page 5 of Standards and Procedures document). There are different standards set for undergraduate programs graduate programs, including program length and full-time faculty. LAAB would need to determine equivalent standards for certificate programs, including a statement that students in these programs must already hold at least a bachelor’s degree. Also, Standard 3 (Professional Curriculum) would need to include a section on certificates (there are sections that set different requirements for bachelor’s level, master’s level and non-baccalaureate MLA programs).

Parity with Allied Professions

Architecture accreditation is limited to degree-granting programs. Engineering accreditation includes engineering technology programs, but with separate standards. Interior Design accredited certificates, but changed this policy in 2004. There are some examples of certificate program accreditation, primarily in the medical fields. It does not appear that architecture or engineering have educational programs comparable to the UCLA and Berkeley certificate programs. LAAB raised the question of whether certificate programs are the general direction for entry into the profession, citing pre-professional certificate programs that exist at community colleges that have agreements with nearby universities who will accept these students for completion of their BLA degrees. The proposed expansion of scope to non-degree programs would continue to apply only to professional landscape architecture programs, not pre-professional programs.

Growth of the profession

Allowing for alternative paths to landscape architecture may contribute to the growth of the profession. However, if current students already enter the profession in California, will the accreditation factor actually grow the profession? Potentially, the California programs may grow as a result of accreditation. There is a greater potential for additional extension programs to be created in California with the availability of accreditation. It is less clear the extent to which this could become a national model, given the lack of similar programs elsewhere. LAAB comments suggest that new university programs are meeting the concerns of growing the profession, with the projection of 100 programs at 75 institutions by 2018. However, it is unclear the extent to which these new programs will be accessible to adults who must work full-time while pursuing education, which is a significant aspect of the certificate programs.

Defense of Licensure

The expansion of LAAB’s scope would be beneficial to protecting licensure from critics of regulation. Concerns have been raised that expanding routes to licensure serves to weaken the profession and will makes licensure less defensible. On the contrary, allowing for varied pathways to licensure demonstrates
the commitment to avoiding unnecessary barriers to entering the landscape architecture profession. Much of the dialogue surrounding deregulation stresses the negative impact of professional regulation on the ability of people who are not licensed to make a living. It strengthens the case for licensure when individuals from varied backgrounds have reasonable access to licensure, as long as all licensure candidates demonstrate competency by passing the licensing exam.

Perceptions & Reputation

While perceptions are nebulous, the task force acknowledged that there could be an impact on the profession’s reputation after an expansion of LAAB’s scope. CELA has indicated concern that the change could inhibit the ability of degree programs to recruit students, “[w]hy would a student want to pursue a discipline based upon a certificate when they can have a real degree in architecture or another field?” The reaction to the proposed change has shown that the perception of a “certificate” does not adequately represent the types of programs that could even qualify for eligibility under an expansion of LAAB, let alone achieve accreditation.

Impact on Standards

CELA commented that “many existing candidacy programs use the standards as a means to ‘push’ institutions toward providing more resources. For example, accreditation requirements for facilities and faculty may help guard against cutbacks in these areas. Lowered standards for administration and faculty have the potential to lower resource allocations for all programs currently under stress.” Most critically, it should be noted that the task force recommendation emphasized the crucial point that all programs must meet the same standards and that there is no intent to lower accreditation standards. The LAAB is entrusted to maintain the standards.

The task force acknowledged that accommodations may be needed to recognize the different delivery model in a certificate program; however, these adaptations would occur not in the standards themselves, but in the measurement of the standards. These types of adjustments are already commonly used by LAAB to handle different models in existing BLA and MLA programs. For example, Standard 3, Professional Curriculum, has some criteria that apply to all programs and some that apply only to specific types of programs (undergraduate, MLA, or non-baccalaureate MLA).

CHEA and Institutional Accreditation

CELA asked how the Council of Higher Education Accreditation’s (CHEA) accreditation of LAAB might be affected by the change. CHEA accreditation of LAAB will not be threatened by an expansion of scope. CHEA recognizes many accrediting agencies that review certificate programs and has a process in place for change of scope. LAAB would need to petition CHEA for a change in scope after it had granted accreditation to at least one certificate program.

In its correspondence, CELA also asked what organization is responsible for accrediting the parent institutions of certificate programs. LAAB requirements ensure that all parent institutions are accredited by the appropriate governing body. For the two certificate programs in California, UCLA and UC-Berkeley are the parent institutions and the extension programs are reviewed in the same process as degree programs under the institutional accreditation.
Additional Issues

The following issues were raised via correspondence with allied organizations, but do not fit into any of the major categories above:

- CELA raised a concern that the expansion will "open the door" for for-profit professional degrees. For-profit institutions are already eligible for accreditation by LAAB.
- CELA also expressed concern that the expansion of scope would imply that reasonable accommodations will be made to allow non-degree-granting institutions to achieve accreditation, thereby creating a legal risk if institutions are unable to meet accreditation. By their very nature, accreditation establishes a standard that must be met, meaning that there always will be institutions that fail to meet that standards. As long as the standards themselves are defensible and the process is fair, LAAB is well-positioned to fend off any legal challenge.

Implementation

In the event that the LAAB is empowered to grant accreditation to non-degree-granting programs, the task force identified standards that are likely to provide the greatest challenge for the programs positioned to be eligible for accreditation review. It should be noted that there are degree-granting programs that face challenges in these same areas. Fundamentally, UCLA and Berkeley extension programs believe that they can meet curriculum standards, but there are structural issues not compatible with the LAAB standards. The following provides a summary of the programs' compatibility to the LAAB standards and minimum requirements, but should not be construed as an official assessment or endorsement of the programs.

LAAB Minimum Requirements for Accreditation

In addition to the seven standards, there are minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining accredited status:

- The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture."
  - There may need to be changes made to accomplish this requirement, but it is anticipated that the schools will be able to comply with this requirement.

- An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
  - This is the primary requirement that is under consideration by the task force. If the scope of LAAB is expanded, an additional option must be provided for the certificate programs.

- Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows: An academic unit that offers a single first-professional program has at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom is full-time. An academic unit that offers first-professional programs at both bachelor's and master's levels, has at least six instructional FTE, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, and at least two of whom are full-time.
  - This requirement may be difficult for the extension programs to meet, but further study is needed to determine instructor equivalency to FTE faculty.
The parent institution is accredited by a recognized institutional accrediting agency [such as recognition by U.S. Department of Education or Council for Higher Education Accreditation].

- The task force did not identify any potential concerns for this requirement.

There is a designated program administrator responsible for the leadership and management functions for the program under review.

- Only one of the schools has a full-time program administrator. It is unlikely that accreditation could be granted without a full-time administrator.

A program accredited by LAAB shall: a. Continuously comply with accreditation standards; b. Pay the annual sustaining and other fees as required; and c. Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports.

- The institutions would need to be able to manage the costs associated with accreditation. In addition to the LAAB fee, there would likely be implementation costs to conform to accreditation standards. Initial costs could range from $5-10,000 and ongoing LAAB fees at $2,000/year.

**LAAB Standards**

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives: The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives. Intent: Using a clear concise mission statement, each landscape architecture program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes why the program exists and the needs that it seeks to fulfill. It also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.

- It is likely that both programs have the goals, objectives, and planning processes in place to meet this standard.

Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance, and Administration: The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives. Intent: Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.

- This standard includes requirements for full-time faculty. The task force believes that there may be flexibility to accommodate the instructor model of the extension programs, even though they are not considered faculty by the institutions. One possible barrier to accreditation is the requirement for three full-time faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture. This requirement can be met by showing equivalence to three full-time faculty.

Standard 3: Professional Curriculum: The first professional-degree curriculum shall include the core knowledge skills and applications of landscape architecture. Intent: The purpose of the curriculum is to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and objectives. Curriculum objectives should relate to the program’s mission and specific learning objectives. The program’s curriculum should encompass coursework and other opportunities intended to develop students’ knowledge, skills, and abilities in landscape architecture.
One part of this standard would require that certificate students hold a bachelor’s degree. UCLA currently requires this, but allows for a rare exception. Berkeley does not require a bachelor’s degree, but most students do have such a degree.

Standard 4: Student and Program Outcomes: The program shall prepare students to pursue careers in landscape architecture. Intent: Students should be prepared – through educational programs, advising, and other academic and professional opportunities – to pursue a career in landscape architecture upon graduation. Students should have demonstrated knowledge and skills in creative problem solving, critical thinking, communications, design, and organization to allow them to enter the profession of landscape architecture.

The task force did not identify any potential concerns for this standard.

Standard 5: Faculty: The qualifications, academic position, and professional activities of faculty and instructional personnel shall promote and enhance the academic mission and objectives of the program. Intent: The program should have qualified experienced faculty and other instructional personnel to instill the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students will need to pursue a career in landscape architecture. Faculty workloads, compensation, and overall support received for career development contribute to the success of the program.

As also described in Standard 2, the faculty issue is one of the most problematic areas for certificate programs.

Standard 6: Outreach to the Institution, Communities, Alumni, and Practitioners: The program shall have a record or plan of achievement for interacting with the professional community, its alumni, the institution, community, and the public at large. Intent: The program should establish an effective relationship with the institution, communities, alumni, practitioners, and the public at large in order to provide a source of service learning opportunities for students, scholarly development for faculty, and professional guidance and financial support. Documentation and dissemination of successful outreach efforts should enhance the image of the program and educate its constituencies regarding the program and the profession of landscape architecture.

The task force did not identify any potential concerns for this standard.

Standard 7: Facilities, Equipment, and Technology: Faculty, students, and staff shall have access to facilities, equipment, library, and other technologies necessary for achieving the program’s mission and objectives. Intent: The program should occupy space in designated, code-compliant facilities that support the achievement of program mission and objectives. Students, faculty, and staff should have the required tools and facilities to enable achievement of the program mission and objectives.

The task force did not identify any potential concerns for this standard.
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ASLA Policy: "Prerequisites for Licensure"

ASLA Bylaws

**Timeline**

2009-2010 Board of Trustees briefed on issue by trustees of California chapters
May 2010 ASLA creates Task Force on Accreditation and Reciprocity
May 2011 LAAB feedback presented to task force
June 2011 Work of task force presented to the Presidents’ Council (ASLA, CELA, CSLA, LARB, LAF, and LAAB), with invitation for additional comments
August 2011 Task force finished its research and reached a recommendation (unanimous) for the ASLA Board of Trustees (BOT)
October 25, 2011 CELA sends letter to BOT on the issue (ASLA responded to all 8 issues same day)
October 26, 2011 LAAF sends letter outlining its position. Most points were covered in the May 2011 communication
October 29, 2011 ASLA BOT approves the task force recommendations, which directs the development of a ASLA Bylaws amendment to implement the recommendation.
January 5, 2012 CELA message to program administers with request for its membership to “further research concerns about and potential impacts of the change.”
March 2012 Discussion at CELA Board of Directors
April 2012 ASLA Constitution and Bylaws Committee drafts bylaws change to implement the BOT action at the October 2011 meeting.
May 11, 2012 The Executive Committee proposes that the ASLA BOT defer action on the bylaws change until the 2013 Midyear meeting to allow for further exploration of these issues, including a forum at the 2012 Annual Meeting.
Public Comment Received
after November 2, 2017
LATC Meeting
TO: Landscape Architects Technical Committee  
c/o Brianna Miller, LATC Program Manager

FROM: Angela Woodward  
UCLA Extension Educator  
ima design  
Newport Beach, CA

RE: Landscape Architecture Licensing Educational and Reciprocity Requirements

I am writing to request that the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) members determine the core courses and fields of study that would be required to qualify a candidate to sit for the Landscape Architects Registration Exam (LARE) and the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

As part of the LATC's research and due diligence, I recommend that you develop a way to compare the core courses that are required to obtain a degree in landscape architecture so you can determine what courses in similar degrees should be required to assure public health, safety and welfare, and work proficiently in this field of practice.

The core educational standards provide the foundation for knowledge of the field of landscape architecture which protects the public from practitioners who do not understand grading and drainage, storm water management, vegetative fuel management, erosion control, soils, wetlands restoration, river and waterway restoration, plant water conservation, habitat restoration, invasive species and other best practices that provide a healthy environment for consumers.

In order to determine whether an individual who is a licensed landscape architect in another state has mastered the core concepts of landscape architecture through experience under the supervision of a landscape architect, architect or engineer, LATC needs to determine how to document an applicant's practices and experience to ensure that individuals meet basic reciprocity standards and are qualified to take the California Supplemental Exam.

I urge you to consider my request to determine core courses and to establish a process to document industry practices and experience to keep this profession strong and consumers protected when you discuss your Subcommittee's motion at the November 2 LATC meeting in Los Angeles.

angela woodward  
senior associate
From: Chris Kent [mailto:kent@pgadesign.com]
Sent: Friday, November 10, 2017 2:19 PM
To: LATC@DCA <LATC@dca.ca.gov>
Subject: Regarding Out of State Reciprocity

Dear Landscape Architecture Technical Committee:

I am writing over concerns that CC-ASLA is pushing LATC to enact criteria that would require out of state license reciprocity candidates to have degrees in landscape architecture or a similar field. As much as I would like to raise the bar for the profession I think doing this will be short sighted, a bit discriminatory, and put us directly in the cross hairs of the Little Hoover Commission.

The following is a goal of the Little Hoover Commissions: 
*Licensure was once a tool for consumer protection but has become a vehicle to promote a multitude of other goals. These include professionalism of occupations, standardization of services, a guarantee of quality and a means of limiting competition among practitioners. Many of these goals, though usually well intentioned, have had a larger impact of preventing Californians from working, particularly harder-to-employ groups such as former offenders and those trained or educated outside of California, including veterans, military spouses and foreign-trained workers.*

CC-ASLA sites the study 'Determinants of Success' to advance their case, it does not. Obviously those with four year degrees are going to pass at a higher rate, that is not the question. The question is whether someone who passes the exam and does not have a four year degree is capable of doing the work in a way that does not harm the public. Do we trust the exam as a gateway? If we don't then a high passing rate is pointless, if we do then passing should mean something. It should mean minimal competency.

California Architecture Board was wise to allow avenues to Architecture licensure outside the traditional four year degree. For LATC to adopt a contrary policy which would refuse licensure reciprocity to those licensed in other states whom pass the CSE and do not have a four year degrees is clearly more about limiting competition than protecting the public.

Please do not vote to bar out of state licensed landscape architect who do not have a four year degree in landscape architecture or a like profession from obtaining reciprocity in California.

Christopher Kent
Principal, ASLA

Former ASLA-NCC President (2006)
Former CC-ASLA Rep (2007)
Former ASLA-NCC Trustee (2008-2014)

PGAdesign LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
444 17th Street Oakland, CA 94612
direct 510.550.8851  main 510.465.1284
### REVIEW OF FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Communications Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Christmas Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>New Year’s Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Martin Luther King, Jr. Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>9 (Tentative)</td>
<td>Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>President’s Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Regional Summit</td>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 (Tentative)</td>
<td>LATC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>Memorial Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>American Institute of Architects Conference on Architecture 2018</td>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>NCARB Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Independence Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>10 (Tentative)</td>
<td>LATC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Labor Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Veterans Day Observed</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-16 (Tentative)</td>
<td>LATC Meeting &amp; Strategic Planning Session</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22–23</td>
<td><em>Thanksgiving Holiday</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Board Meeting &amp; Strategic Planning Session</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Christmas Day</em></td>
<td>Office Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLOSED SESSION (WILL NOT BE WEBCAST)

1. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 11126(f)(4) and 11126.1, Review and Possible Action on September 7, 2017 Closed Session Minutes

2. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate on Disciplinary Matters

3. Adjourn Closed Session
RECONVENE OPEN SESSION (WILL NOT BE WEBCAST)

The Board will reconvene open session following closed session.
AGENDA ITEM Q

ADJOURNMENT (WILL NOT BE WEBCAST)

Time: __________