



NOTICE OF MEETING

June 27, 2012

9:30am – 1:30pm

University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force
2420 Del Paso Road, Sequoia Room
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 575-7230

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) will hold a University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force meeting as noted above. The agenda items may not be addressed in the order noted and the meeting will be adjourned upon completion of the agenda which may be at a time earlier than that posted in this notice. The meeting is open to the public and held in a barrier free facility according to the Americans with Disabilities Act. Any person requiring a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting Maryann Moya at (916) 575-7230, emailing latc@dca.ca.gov, or sending a written request to LATC, 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, California, 95834. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

Agenda

- A. Welcome and Introductions
- B. Discuss Purpose of Task Force
- C. Public Comment Session
- D. Review Proposed Language for California Code of Regulations Section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program
- E. Review and Discuss Background Material from 2006 University of California Extension Certificate Program Reviews and Review Process
- F. Develop University of California Extension Certificate Program Review Procedures and Milestones
- G. Select Future Meeting Dates

Adjourn

Please contact Maryann Moya at (916) 575-7230 for additional information related to the meeting. Notices and agendas for LATC meetings can be found at www.latc.ca.gov.



Agenda Item A

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Christine Anderson, Chair of the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force will open the meeting with introductions and remarks.



Agenda Item B

DISCUSS PURPOSE OF TASK FORCE

The purpose of the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force is to continually review the extension programs to ensure they meet the guidelines outlined in California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program.

In 2009, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) implemented changes to the university accreditation standards, which prompted the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) to update its requirements in the regulations for an approved extension certificate program.

On January 23, 2012, LATC Chair Christine Anderson, appointed members to a task force and charged them to develop procedures for reviewing the extension certificate programs and conduct reviews of the programs utilizing the new procedures, as outlined in CCR section 2620.5.



Agenda Item C

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Members of the public may address the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force at this time. The Task Force Chair may allow public participation during other agenda items at her discretion.



Agenda Item D

REVIEW PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS SECTION 2620.5, REQUIREMENTS FOR AN APPROVED EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

The extension certificate programs are reviewed approximately every five years for compliance with accreditation standards set forth by the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC). These standards mirror the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) standards. LAAB is the accrediting organization for landscape architectural programs. LAAB develops and promulgates the accreditation standards, rules and procedures for conducting the accreditation process. To gain approval, these programs are reviewed by site teams appointed by LATC. The teams conduct site visits to determine the program's compliance with California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5.

In 2009, the LAAB implemented changes to their university accreditation standards. Prompted by the changes made by LAAB, on October 22, 2009, LATC voted to review the extension certificate program standards contained in the regulation and update them where necessary to better encompass the mission of LATC in protecting the public health, safety, and welfare; and ensure that extension programs' areas of study reflect current practice in the profession.

The review identified areas in CCR section 2620.5 that needed to be updated. Based on the results of the review, LATC made the following recommendations: retain the Board's existing extension certificate program requirements and do the following: 1) amend subsection 2620.5(a) to remove the outdated reference to section 94900 of the Education Code; 2) amend subsections 2620.5(g) and (h) to clearly specify the responsibilities of the program director and his/her qualifications; 3) update and modify the names of the areas of study and clearly identify where public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed in the course syllabus in subsections 2620.5(i) and (k); 4) amend subsection 2620.5(m) to allow instructional personnel to hold a certificate from an approved extension certificate program; 5) add a new subsection 2620.5(n) that requires extension certificate programs to submit an annual report in writing with specified information based on the date of the most recent Board approval; 6) allow the Board to evaluate changes to any of the items specified in the report or changes to the program; 7) require the

program to undergo a Board review every seven years in order to gain Board approval; and 8) allow the Board to conduct a review prior to the seven year deadline based on information received in the program's annual report.

In April 2012, LATC submitted a regulatory change package to amend CCR section 2620.5 that included the recommendations (attached) to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). The regulatory package is currently being processed by OAL and is expected to become final in 2012.

The task force is asked to review the proposed language for CCR section 2620.5, and discuss how to incorporate the proposed new standards in the development of the procedures for the review of the extension certificate programs.

REFERENCES:

1. Proposed Language for CCR Section 2620.5 – Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
PROPOSED LANGUAGE**

California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26

Amend Section 2620.5 to read as follows:

§ 2620.5 Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program

An extension certificate program shall meet the following requirements:

- (a) The educational program shall be established in an educational institution which has a four-year educational curriculum and either is approved under [a regional accrediting body](#) ~~Section 94900 of the Education Code~~ or is an institution of public higher education as defined by Section 66010 of the Education Code.
- (b) There shall be a written statement of the program's philosophy and objectives which serves as a basis for curriculum structure. Such statement shall take into consideration the broad perspective of values, missions and goals of the profession of landscape architecture. The program objectives shall provide for relationships and linkages with other disciplines and public and private landscape architectural practices. The program objectives shall be reinforced by course inclusion, emphasis and sequence in a manner which promotes achievement of program objectives.

The program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives.
- (c) The program shall have a written plan for evaluation of the total program, including admission and selection procedures, attrition and retention of students, and performance of graduates in meeting community needs.
- (d) The program shall be administered as a discrete program in landscape architecture within the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (e) There shall be an organizational chart which identifies the relationships, lines of authority and channels of communication within the program and between the program and other administrative segments of the institution with which it is affiliated.
- (f) The program shall have sufficient authority and resources to achieve its educational objectives.
- (g) The program's director shall be a [California licensed](#) landscape architect.

- (h) The program director ~~faculty~~ shall have the primary responsibility for developing policies and procedures, planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating all aspects of the program. The faculty shall be adequate in type and number to develop and implement the program approved by the Board.
- (i) The program curriculum shall provide instruction in the following areas related to landscape architecture including public health, safety and welfare:
- (1) History, design theory, ~~art~~ and critique ~~communication~~
 - (2) Natural ~~and~~ and ~~cultural~~ and social systems, and principles of sustainability
 - (3) Public policy and regulation
 - ~~(4)~~ Design, site design and planning as a process in shaping the environment
 - ~~(5)~~ Plant material and their application
 - ~~(6)~~ Construction documentation, materials, ~~and~~ techniques and implementation
 - ~~(7)~~ Professional practice methods
 - ~~(8)~~ Professional ethics and values
 - ~~(9)~~ Computer applications ~~systems~~ and advanced technology

The program's areas of study ~~curriculum~~ shall not be revised until it has been approved by the Board.

- (j) The program shall consist of at least 90 quarter units or 60 semester units.
- (k) The program shall maintain a current syllabus for each required course which includes the course objectives, content, ~~and~~ the methods of evaluating student performance, and clearly identifies where the public health, safety, and welfare issues are addressed.
- (l) The curriculum shall be offered in a timeframe which reflects the proper course sequence. Students shall be required to adhere to that sequence, and courses shall be offered in a consistent and timely manner in order that students can observe those requirements.
- (m) A program shall meet the following requirements for its instructional personnel:
- (1) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall hold a professional degree or certificate from an approved extension certificate program in landscape architecture.
 - (2) At least one half of the program's instructional personnel shall be licensed by the Board as landscape architects.
- (n) The program shall submit an annual report in writing based on the date of the most recent Board approval. The report shall include:
- (1) Any changes in curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report;

(2) Current enrollment; and

(3) Progress toward complying with the recommendations, if any, from the last approval.

The Board may choose to further evaluate changes to any of the reported items or to a program.

The Board shall review the program at least every seven years for approval. The Board may shorten the current approval based on the information received in the programs' annual reports.

Note: Authority cited: Section 5630, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 5650, Business and Professions Code.



Agenda Item E

REVIEW AND DISCUSS BACKGROUND MATERIAL FROM 2006 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM REVIEWS AND REVIEW PROCESS

The extension programs are reviewed every five years for compliance with accreditation standards set forth by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). The last review of the programs was conducted in October 2006. Since it has been over five years since a site visit has been conducted on either program, both programs were asked to provide a voluntary self-evaluation report at the Landscape Architects Technical Committee's (LATC) November 2011 meeting.

In 2006 a task force was appointed by the LATC to conduct site reviews of both extension programs. One team visited the University of California (UC) Berkeley Extension program while a second team visited the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension program. Both site teams used guidelines created by the LATC to review the programs. The site team visits lasted approximately three days each. The visits consisted of tours of the campuses and administrative offices, meeting with university Deans and various program staff, meeting with program alumni and current students, student presentations, visiting classes in progress, and daily task force site team meetings.

At the LATC's February 2007 committee meeting, the programs received an approval for five years or until the next program review in 2011. In March 2010 LAAB posted newly revised accreditation standards and based on these changes the LATC updated their own regulations governing the UC Extension program certifications. Since the regulatory process can take up to 18 months time the certification of the landscape architecture extension program reviews were postponed.

At the LATC's November 2011 committee meeting the program reviews were extended to December 2012 based on the pending regulation updates to California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program. The current certification has been extended to December 2012.

REFERENCES:

- 1.** LAAB Self-Evaluation Report Format for First Professional Programs in Landscape Architecture – February 6, 2010
- 2.** LAAB Accreditation Standards and Procedures – February 6, 2010
- 3.** Visiting Team Guidelines – LAAB – August 2010
- 4.** November 7, 2006 LATC Meeting Agenda Item O – Update and Process Clarification of Extension Certificate Program Reviews
 - 4.1.** 2006 Site Visit Activities
- 5.** LATC Letter to UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program Director – March 27, 2006
- 6.** LATC Letter to UCLA Extension Certificate Program Director – March 27, 2006
- 7.** July 20, 2007 LATC Meeting Agenda Item F – Review and Approve University of California Berkeley Extension Certificate Program Plan of Action and Timeline to Correct Unmet Standard
 - 7.1.** Letter from UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program to LATC – July 16, 2007
- 8.** Various Letters from LATC to UC Extension Certificate Programs

**Self-Evaluation Report Format for
FIRST-PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS IN
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE**



Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board

**American Society of Landscape Architects
636 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-3736**

FEBRUARY 6, 2010

REQUEST FOR REVIEW

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITATION BOARD

Date

Invitation to review is extended by: _____

Identify the program in Landscape Architecture to be reviewed and the name of the institution.

This landscape architectural program certifies that it has been in operation since _____ (date) and is legally entitled to confer the following first professional degree:

Preferred Dates for Review: Indicate first, second, and third preferences.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Please give complete address for the program requesting review. Include the name, phone number, and e-mail address for the program administrator.

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT FORMAT

First Professional Degree Programs in Landscape Architecture

INSTRUCTIONS

Preparing a self-evaluation report is a valuable part of the accreditation process. To receive the maximum benefit of the accreditation process, it is in the program's interest to examine itself carefully and present information in a clear and concise manner. The following provides a procedure where those involved with a first professional program may make a concise self-evaluation of its performance. The visiting evaluators, assigned by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board, will review this report prior to and during their visit, approaching the task as colleagues interested in understanding the program and its stated objectives within the framework of the institution and the accreditation standards.

The attached form is an outline of the *Self-Evaluation Report (SER)* to be completed by the program for which accreditation is being requested. Any supporting or related programs may be described in the appendix. They will be reviewed only with respect to their relationship to and/or effect upon the program under review.

Report Preparation

Bring as many faculty members, administrators, students, graduates, staff and employers as possible into the preparation of this self study.

Terminology

The *institution* is the university, college, institute or other parent body through which the program is administered.

The *program* is administered by some division of an institution such as a college, school, division or department responsible for the curriculum and the students enrolled.

The *program administrator* is the chairman, director, head, dean, or other official immediately responsible for the program.

SER Format

- Pages should be 8 1/2" x 11", numbered, single spaced and suitable for copying.
- Use the exact heading, numbering, and sequence for the standards as given.
- Place an extended tab, numbered to correspond to the seven accreditation standards, on each of the sections for ease of reference. Some parts of individual sections may also be in tabular form if the program deems this useful.
- The total report (excluding appendices) should not be more than 100 sheets double sided or two hundred typed pages. Brevity and concise writing is appreciated. Ancillary information that is not critical to the SER does not facilitate an effective review by the visiting team.
- One digital copy must be submitted to LAAB and each team member.

Provide digital copies of other information (examples of student work, appendix materials such as important policies, resumes, etc.). Please also note applicable websites (departmental and/or college website, important sites on the institution website such as university tenure and promotion policies, etc.) where appropriate within the report and in an appendix.

Two bound copies of the SER and digital materials must be sent to the ASLA Accreditation Manager. In addition, the program sends each visiting team member one copy of the bound SER and digital materials. These need to be received at least 45 days prior to the visit.

PROGRAM SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

For the Academic Year _____ Institution _____

Program _____

Degree Title/Degree Length _____

Chief Administrative Official
of the Institution _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the College _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the Division
(if applicable) _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the Department _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Chief Administrative Official
of the Program _____

name _____ *title* _____

_____ *address*

_____ *e-mail address* _____ *phone number*

Report Submitted by _____

name _____ *date* _____

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

For Achieving And Maintaining Accredited Status

1. The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
3. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
4. Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows:
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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.
5. The parent institution is accredited by a recognized institutional accrediting agency.
6. There is a designated program administrator responsible for the leadership and management functions for the program under review.
7. 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 program administrator shall inform LAAB if any of these factors fails to apply during an accreditation period.

The _____ program meets the minimum conditions to apply for LAAB accreditation.

Program Administrator Name

Title

Program Administrator Signature

Date

INTRODUCTION

1. History of Program.

In chronological form provide a brief history of the program being reviewed, concentrating on events since the last review.

2. Response to Previous LAAB Review.

Describe the progress that has been made on the Recommendation Affecting Accreditation from the previous accreditation visit (not applicable to those seeking initial accreditation). List each prior Recommendation verbatim and provide an updated recap of responses made on annual interim reports. List each Suggestions for Improvement and provide an update.

3. Describe current strengths and opportunities.

4. Describe current weaknesses and challenges.

5. Describe any substantial changes in the program since the last accreditation review.

6. Describe who participated (faculty, administrators, students, alumni, outside professionals, etc.) in preparing this self-evaluation and briefly state their roles. The LAAB recommends involving as many people as possible in preparing the SER, as the process of self-evaluation can be one of the greatest benefits of accreditation.

Note: Begin a new page for each standard. Insert a tab here and between all other standards.

1. PROGRAM MISSION and OBJECTIVES

STANDARD 1: *The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.*

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.*

A. Program Mission

1. State the current program mission and date adopted.
2. Describe how the mission statement reflects the purpose and values of the program and how it relates to the institution's mission statement.

B. Educational Goals

1. State the academic goals of the program.
2. Describe how the academic goals relate to the program's mission.
3. Describe how the program regularly evaluates its progress in meeting its goals.

C. Educational Objectives

1. List the educational objectives of the program.
2. Describe how educational objectives fulfill the academic goals.

D. Long Range Planning Process

1. What is the program's long-range planning process?
2. Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process.
3. Describe how the long-range plan is reviewed and revised periodically and how it presents realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission.

E. Program Disclosure

1. Describe how program information is disseminated to the public. Provide a link to material on the internet and copies of other materials to the visiting team.

2. PROGRAM AUTONOMY, GOVERNANCE & ADMINISTRATION

STANDARD 2: *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.*

A. Program Administration

1. Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?
2. Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture? If not, where is he/she appointed?
3. How does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program? Describe the primary responsibilities and authority of the administrator.

B. Institutional Support

1. Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?
2. What are student/faculty ratios in studios? How are student faculty ratios influenced by the program? What is considered normal?
3. Is funding adequate for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc?
4. Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

C. Commitment To Diversity

1. How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, full-time faculty and staff?

D. Faculty Participation

1. Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?
2. Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation, promotion and tenure of faculty?
3. Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and for tenure and promotion to all ranks?

E. Faculty Numbers

1. Does an academic unit that offers a first professional program have a minimum of 5 fulltime faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?
2. Does an academic unit that offers first professional programs at both bachelor's and master's levels have a minimum of 7 fulltime faculty, at least 5 of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?
3. Does the strategic plan or long range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?
4. Is the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

3. PROFESSIONAL CURRICULUM

STANDARD 3: *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 or/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 a and b.*

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.*

State whether paragraphs a, b, or c (above) are relevant to this review.

A. Mission And Objectives

1. How does the curriculum address the program's mission, goals, and objectives?
2. How does the program identify the knowledge, skills, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

B. Program Curriculum

1. How does the program curriculum include coverage of:
 - History, theory and criticism.
 - Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability.
 - Public policy and regulation.
 - Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading, drainage, and storm water management.
 - Site design and implementation: materials, methods, technologies, applications.
 - Construction documentation and administration.
 - Written, verbal and visual communication.
 - Professional practice.
 - Professional values and ethics.
 - Plants and ecosystems.
 - Computer applications and other advanced technologies.

2. How does the curriculum address the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and objectives?
3. How do student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession?
4. How do the curriculum and other program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?

C. Syllabi

1. How do syllabi include educational objectives, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?
2. How do syllabi identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to successfully complete the course and advance in the curriculum?

D. Curriculum Evaluation

1. How does the program evaluate how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning objectives in a timely way at the course and curriculum levels?
2. How does the program demonstrate and document ways of:
 - a. assessing students' achievements of course and program objectives in the length of time to graduation stated by the program?
 - b. reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?
 - c. maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and values of the profession?
3. How do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses, and curriculum?

E. Augmentation of Formal Educational Experience

1. How does the program provide opportunities for students to participate in internships, off campus studies, research assistantships, or practicum experiences?
2. How does the program identify the objectives and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?
3. Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

F. Coursework: (Bachelor's Level, if responding to Standard 3a or 3c, above)

1. In addition to the professional curriculum, describe how students also pursue coursework in other disciplines in accordance with institutional and program requirements.
2. Do students take courses in the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences or other disciplines?

G. Areas of Interest: (Bachelor's Level, if responding to Standard 3a or 3c, above)

1. How does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, certificates, minors, etc.?
2. How does student work incorporate academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

H. Research/Scholarly Methods: (*Master's Level, if responding to Standard 3b or 3c, above*)

1. How does the curriculum provide an introduction to research and scholarly methods and their relation to the profession of landscape architecture?
2. How does the program demonstrate that theses or terminal projects exhibit creative and independent thinking and contain a significant research/scholarly component?

4. STUDENT and PROGRAM OUTCOMES.

STANDARD 4: 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.*

A. Student Learning Outcomes

1. Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry-level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?
2. How does the program assess student work and how it demonstrates students are competent to obtain entry-level positions in the profession?
3. How do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's learning objectives, including critical and creative thinking and their ability to understand, apply and communicate the subject matter of the professional curriculum as evidenced through project definition, problem identification, information collection, analysis, synthesis, conceptualization and implementation?
4. How does the program assess the preparation of students in the above areas?

B. Student Advising

1. How does the student advising and mentoring program function?
2. How does the program assess the effectiveness of the student advising and mentoring program?
3. Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic and career development?
4. Are students aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?
5. How satisfied are students with academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

C. Participation in Extra Curricular Activities

1. What opportunities do students have to participate in institutional/college organizations, community initiatives, or other activities? How do students take advantage of these opportunities?
2. To what degree do students participate in events such as LaBash, ASLA Annual Meetings, local ASLA chapter events, and the activities of other professional societies or special interest groups?

5. FACULTY

STANDARD 5: *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.*

A. Credentials

1. Is the faculty's balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?
2. Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?
3. How are adjunct and/or part-time faculty integrated into the program's administration and curriculum evaluation/development in a coordinated and organized manner?

B. Faculty Development

1. How are faculty activities – such as scholarly inquiry, research, professional practice and service to the profession, university and community – documented and disseminated through appropriate media, such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?
2. How do faculty teaching and administrative assignments allow sufficient opportunity to pursue advancement and professional development?
3. How are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated?
4. How are the results of these evaluations used for individual and program improvement?
5. How do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc?
6. How are the activities of faculty reviewed and recognized by faculty peers?
7. How do faculty participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

C. Faculty Retention

1. Are faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition evaluated to promote faculty retention and productivity?
2. What is the rate of faculty turnover?

6. OUTREACH TO THE INSTITUTION, COMMUNITIES, ALUMNI & PRACTITIONERS

STANDARD 6: *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.*

A. Interaction with the Institution, and Public

1. How are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?
2. How are service activities documented on a regular basis?
3. How does the program interact with the institution and the public, aside from service learning?
4. How does the program assess its effectiveness in interacting with the institution and the public?

B. Interaction with the Profession, Alumni and Practitioners

1. How does the program recognize professional organizations, alumni, and practitioners as resources?
2. Does the program maintain a current registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, postgraduate study, and significant professional accomplishments?
3. Does the program use the alumni registry to interact with alumni?
4. How does the program engage alumni, practitioners, allied professionals and friends in activities such as a formal advisory board, student career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education, etc?
5. How does the program assess its effectiveness in engaging alumni and practitioners?

7 ■ FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT & TECHNOLOGY

STANDARD 7: 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.

A. Facilities

1. How are faculty, staff, and administration provided with appropriate office space?
2. How are students assigned permanent studio workstations adequate to meet the program needs?
3. How are facilities maintained to meet the needs of the program?
4. Are facilities in compliance with ADA, life-safety, and applicable building codes?
5. If known deficiencies exist, what steps is the institution taking to correct the situation? (Provide documentation on reasonable accommodation from the institution's ADA compliance office and/or facilities or risk management office.)

B. Information Systems and Technical Equipment

1. How does the program ensure that students and faculty have sufficient access to computer equipment and software?
2. What are the program's policies on the maintenance, updating, and replacement of computer hardware and software?
3. What are the hours that the computer lab (if applicable) and studios are open to students / faculty?
4. How does the program determine if these times are sufficient to serve the needs of the program?
5. How does the program assess the adequacy of equipment needed to achieve its mission and objectives?

C. Library Resources

1. What library resources are available to students, faculty, and staff?
2. How does the program determine if the library collections are adequate to meet its needs?
3. How does instructional courses integrate the library and other resources?
4. What are the hours that library is open to students and faculty?

5. How does the program determine if these hours are convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?
6. How does the program assess its library resources?

ADDENDA

A. Program Details

B. Curriculum

C. Student Information

D. Alumni Information

E. Faculty Information

F. Facilities Information

A. PROGRAM DETAILS

Faculty Resources

1. Budgeted Faculty Resources: TOTAL

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Professors						
Associates						
Assistants						
Instructors/lecturers – tenure track						
Guest faculty members/speakers						
Year-long appointments						
One-semester appointments						
Speakers						
Endowed positions						
Undergrad teaching assistantships						
Graduate teaching assistantships						
Undergrad research assistantships						
Graduate research assistantships (sponsored by your institution).						
Graduate research assistantships (sponsored by outside sources)						
Other						

2. Budgeted Faculty Resources: MALE

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Professors						
Associates						
Assistants						
Instructors/lecturers – tenure track						
Guest faculty members/speakers						
Year-long appointments						
One-semester appointments						
Speakers						
Endowed positions						
Undergrad teaching assistantships						
Graduate teaching assistantships						
Undergrad research assistantships						
Graduate research assistantships (sponsored by your institution).						
Graduate research assistantships (sponsored by outside sources)						
Other						

3. Budgeted Faculty Resources: FEMALE

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Professors						
Associates						
Assistants						
Instructors/lecturers – tenure track						
Guest faculty members/speakers						
Year-long appointments						
One-semester appointments						
Speakers						
Endowed positions						
Undergrad teaching assistantships						
Graduate teaching assistantships						
Undergrad research assistantships						
Graduate research assistantships (sponsored by your institution).						
Graduate research assistantships (sponsored by outside sources)						
Other						

4. Number Of Faculty Members With Undergraduate / MLA / Doctorate Degrees

	Undergrad degree in landscape architecture (BLA or BSLA)	MLA	Doctorate
Professors			
Associates			
Assistants			
Instructors/lecturers – tenure track			
Part-time/adjunct (non-tenure track)			

B. CURRICULUM

1. Required / Elective Courses

Total Units/Credit Hours required to graduate: ____ units or ____ credit hours

Elective Units / Credit Hours required to graduate: ____ units or ____ credit hours

Required Courses	Units/Credit Hours
Landscape Architecture	
Architecture	
City & Regional Planning	
Natural Sciences	
Horticulture	
Engineering	
Art or Design	
Computer Applications/Technology	
Other	
Other	

Group or Controlled Elective Choices	Units/Credit Hours
Natural Sciences	
Social Sciences	
English, Speech, Writing	
Other	
Free Electives	

2. Typical Program of Study

Identify length of term/semester and relation of contact hours to unit/credit hours. List courses (instructional units) for a typical program of study, using the format given below.

Instructions

- List specific LA courses required (e.g., LA 31 Landscape Architecture Studio 4). Course numbers must correspond with those used in other sections of this report.
- Show group or controlled elective requirements by title (e.g., Social Science Elective, Planning Elective).
- List free electives as "Electives."
- The sequence of courses is to be typical student coursework.
- Reproduction of appropriate pages from the program catalog may be used for this description providing they contain the required information.

C. STUDENT INFORMATION

1. Overview

Include only full-time students recorded as majors in the program being reviewed for the last five years.

Academic Year	In-State		Out-of-State		Foreign		TOTAL	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Current Year								
1 Year Ago								
2 Years Ago								
3 Years Ago								
4 Years Ago								

2. Ethnic Group/Diversity

Include only full-time current landscape architecture students.

_____ % American Indian

_____ % Hispanic

_____ % Black (non-Hispanic)

_____ % Caucasian

_____ % Asian or Pacific Islander

_____ % Other

3. Applications

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Total number of applications						
Applications from males						
Applications from females						

4. Enrollments

	Current Year	Last year	2 Years Ago	3 Years Ago	4 Years Ago	5 Years Ago
Total enrollment						
Males						
Females						

5. Student Ethnic Backgrounds

	Caucasian	African-American	African Descent	Asian/Pacific	Hispanic	Native American	Other
Total							
Males							
Females							

D. ALUMNI INFORMATION

1. Degrees Awarded

Tabulate the number of degrees awarded in the present year (estimated) and for the years since the last SER.

Academic Year	Males	Females	TOTAL
Current Year			
1 Year Ago			
2 Years Ago			
3 Years Ago			
4 Years Ago			
5 Years Ago			
6 Years Ago			

2. Record of Advanced Study

Tabulate for the years since the last SER all alumni who were or are engaged in advanced study in any field. (Include alumni who are in the process of earning an advanced degree.)

Institution	Degree	Number of Students	Year LA degree awarded	Year advanced degree awarded

3. Current Employment

Tabulate the present employment of those having the degree conferred by the program since the last SER.

Present Occupation	Males	Females	TOTAL
Advanced Study and Research			
Teaching			
Private Practice			
Public Practice			
Landscape Hort./Design Build			
Volunteer Service (Specify)			
Other (Specify)			
Unknown			
TOTAL			

E. FACULTY INFORMATION

1. Previous and Present Faculty

Tabulate faculty and staff specifically assigned and budgeted to the particular program under review. The number listed in the TOTAL column should agree with the information provided for Standard 2C (Faculty Numbers). Use the following format:

Rank/Title	Current	1 Year Ago	2 Years Ago	TOTAL
Professor/LA				
Assoc. Professor/LA				
Asst. Professor/LA				
Instructor				
Asst. Professor/Arch.				
Visiting Lecturer/ Adjunct				
TOTALS				

2. Instructional Assignments

Complete the following table for all full and part time instructors. Begin with the Program Administrator and list in order of rank.

Teaching: Percentage FTE assigned to courses taught/instruction.

Research: Include only the percentage of time specifically assigned to research and so recognized by reduction in full-time teaching load. Do not include research efforts normally considered a part or full-time faculty members' contributions.

Administration: Include only the percentage of time devoted to regularly assigned administrative responsibilities. Do not include incidental ad hoc administrative duties, i.e., committee work, visiting lecturer arrangements, student advisement.

Faculty member	Degree	Teaching %		Research %	Admin / other %	TOTAL %
		Land. Arch. Curriculum	Other programs			

3. Courses Taught by Individual Faculty Members

Complete the following table for each instructor.

Courses Taught: Use current year or last academic year, depending on time of report preparation

Term Symbols: Use the institutional terminology. For example: Fall Semester - FS, Spring Semester, SS, Fall Quarter - FQ, Winter Quarter - WQ, Spring Quarter SQ, Summer Term - ST.

Contact Hours: Actual number of scheduled contact hours per week between instructor and students.

FTE Students: Multiply credit hours by number of students and divide by 15 for undergraduate courses, 12 for graduate level courses.

Course Taught	Course Number	Term	Credit Hours	Contact Hrs / Week	Number Of Students	FTE Students

4. Visiting Lecturers/Critics

List the name, specialty, dates in attendance and the contribution of visiting critics and lecturers, resource personnel, etc. who served the program. List only persons who were brought in for the program under review. Indicate by an asterisk (*) those sponsored jointly with other departments or sponsored at the college or school level. Use the format below to list this information for the present and two preceding academic years.

Name	Field/Specialty	Date(s)	Contribution
* Edward Armor	Architecture	1/29-30/10	Lecturer (Green Architecture and Current City/County Codes) and In-studio Critic
David Crane	National Park Service Historian	2/26/10	Juror

5. Individual Teacher's Record

Name:

Rank:

Department or unit (if not part of the program under review):

Education: (College and higher)

Institution	Number of Years Attended	Degree/Date Granted
--------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------

Teaching Experience: (College level)

Institution	Years Taught	Subjects
--------------------	---------------------	-----------------

Practice Experience: (Brief listing; however, if experience in practice is lengthy and you feel strongly about presenting such, please include resume in the Appendix.)

Firm or Agency	Number of Years	Responsibilities
-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------

Professional Registration: Give profession and state/province(s).

Professional & Academic Activities. Offices held, exhibitions, competitions, committee memberships in professional societies or boards, etc., for last five years.

Publications. List significant publications, projects and/or reports covering the last five years. Identify refereed publications with an asterisk.

Contributions. Briefly describe your involvement in advancing the knowledge or capability of the profession of landscape architecture in the last five years.

F. FACILITIES INFORMATION

Instructions

1. Tabulate space data as shown below.
2. Describe any steps that are being taken to improve the spaces.
3. Include floor plan(s) on standard 8 1/2" x 11" sheets. Label these plans to identify various types of spaces and who controls/uses it.
4. If spaces are shared by other programs or departments, indicate this on the spaces affected.

Program Facilities

Room #	Size (SF)	Max. Capacity Normal Max. Users	Type of Space (studio, office, storage, etc.)	Shared Use (S) Exclusive Use (E)

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITATION BOARD

Accreditation Standards And Procedures



Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board

**American Society of Landscape Architects
636 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-3736**

FEBRUARY 6, 2010

Table of Contents

PREAMBLE

Mission, Identity, and Values	Page 1
Introduction to Accreditation	Page 1
Scope	Page 2
Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board	Page 2
Definitions, Interpretation and Application	Page 4
Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status	Page 5

STANDARDS

1. Program Mission and Objectives	Page 7
2. Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration	Page 8
3. Professional Curriculum	Page 10
4. Student and Program Outcomes	Page 12
5. Faculty	Page 13
6. Outreach to the Institution, Communities, Alumni & Practitioners	Page 14
7. Facilities, Equipment & Technology	Page 15

ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES

Initiating Accreditation	Page 16
Candidacy Status	Page 16
Self-Evaluation Report	Page 17
Roster of Visiting Evaluators	Page 17
Visiting Team Selection	Page 18
Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Visiting Team	Page 19
Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Program	Page 19
Sample Visit Schedule	Page 19
Visiting Team Report	Page 21
Institutional Response	Page 21
Vacating of Application for Accreditation	Page 21
LAAB Review and Decision	Page 21
LAAB Actions	Page 22
Notification of LAAB Action	Page 23
Confidentiality	Page 23
Reference to Accredited Status	Page 23
Annual Report	Page 24
Policy on Substantive Change	Page 24
Maintaining Good Standing	Page 25
Suspension of Accreditation	Page 25
Withdrawal of Accreditation	Page 25
Accreditation Fees	Page 26

APPEAL PROCESS

Appeal Panel	Page 27
Authority	Page 27
Hearing of Appeal	Page 28
Decision of the Appeal Panel	Page 28
Expenses of Appeal Hearing and Deposit	Page 28

COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

Page 29

PREAMBLE

Mission

The mission of the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) is to evaluate, advocate for, and advance the quality of education in landscape architectural programs.

Identity

The LAAB is the accrediting organization for landscape architectural programs. As such, the LAAB develops standards to objectively evaluate landscape architectural programs and judges whether a school's landscape architectural program is in compliance with the accreditation standards.

The LAAB is comprised of landscape architecture practitioners and academicians, representatives from landscape architecture collateral organizations, and public representatives. The collateral organizations are the:

- American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA).
- Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB).
- Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA).

Values

To achieve our mission, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board seeks to:

- Hold itself to high standards and ethical behavior.
- Uphold the standards it establishes in a non-punitive manner.
- Support diversity in all its many forms.
- Promote self-examination and self-analysis of programs and curriculum.
- Aspire to achieve educational excellence as a predicate to professional excellence.
- Encourage education that prepares students to succeed in a changing world.

Introduction to Accreditation

Accreditation is a non-governmental, voluntary system of self-regulation and self-evaluation. Accreditation can be sought at both institutional and specialized levels. Institutional accreditation is concerned with the institution as a whole; specialized accreditation with a specific program. The institution or program conducts a self-study to evaluate how well it is meeting its educational objectives. The accrediting agency then provides an independent assessment of that evaluation.

LAAB is a specialized accrediting agency that accredits educational programs leading to first professional degrees at the bachelor's or master's level. Therefore, in addition to assessing how well a program meets its own specific and institutional educational mission and objectives, accreditation evaluates all programs against standards that ensure the essential educational components leading to entry level professional competence. These standards are developed by the community of interest consensus and are regularly reviewed and assessed.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation recognition of accrediting organizations has three basic purposes:

To Advance Academic Quality, accrediting organizations must have standards that:

- Advance academic quality in higher education.
- Emphasize student achievement.
- Emphasize high expectations of teaching and learning, research, and service.
- Are developed within the framework of the institutional mission.

To Demonstrate Accountability, accrediting organizations must ensure accountability through:

- Consistent, clear, and coherent communication to the public and to the higher education community.
- Involvement of the public in accreditation decision-making.

To Encourage Purposeful Change and Needed Improvement, accrediting organizations must:

- Encourage, where needed, purposeful change and improvement.
- Anticipate and address needed change.
- Stress student achievement.
- Ensure long-range institutional viability.

LAAB has received Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) recognition and must conform to CHEA standards.

Academic Quality

LAAB accredited programs must maintain and monitor – and strive to advance – academic quality within their program and their institution. “Academic quality” at its most basic definition is that the program satisfies (meets or exceeds) student and professional expectations. However, the program must reflect the institutional mission, thus providing diversity amongst programs and fostering innovation in practice, research, and service. The program must have specific processes to determine if its quality standards are being met; this evaluation must be on-going and forward-thinking. In addition to student achievements, academic quality is also indicated by high standards of teaching, research and service. The goals and results of these activities should reflect both the institutional mission and the profession of landscape architecture.

Scope

LAAB is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) as the official accrediting body for first-professional programs in landscape architecture. LAAB is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA). CHEA reviews LAAB accreditation standards and procedures to ensure that the policies and procedures meet proper standards.

The official scope of LAAB accreditation is "...first-professional programs at the bachelor's or master's level." Others, such as pre-professional and advanced professional programs, lie outside LAAB's scope. LAAB reviews eligible programs in the United States and its territories.

The Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board is established in the ASLA bylaws:

Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board

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.

ASLA has established an administrative policy regarding the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board.

Purpose

The purpose of this policy shall be to affirm the American Society of Landscape Architects' (ASLA) commitment to and define its in-kind support for the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) as an autonomous working group with responsibility to act in matters concerning accreditation of professional landscape architecture degree programs.

Commitment

ASLA has supported accreditation since the 1920s and will continue its commitment to the viability of LAAB for as long as such support is considered beneficial to the advancement of the profession of landscape architecture.

Decision-making authority in all matters concerning accreditation shall rest solely with LAAB. This authority shall include determination of accreditation policies and procedures, establishment of accreditation fees, and allocation of those funds to achieve its mission. ASLA will exert no influence over such decisions beyond that expressed by its one vote on the accreditation board.

In the best interests of its long-term health and stability, ASLA will expect LAAB's decisions to be fiscally responsible and generally follow ASLA management guidelines. ASLA will provide LAAB with a minimum of three (3) years notice of any reduction in the amount of support provided.

In-kind Support

ASLA will provide staffing support and overhead for the administration of LAAB's affairs. Such support will include: program management, accounting, meeting planning, library/information resources, computer/technical support, reception, and mailroom services; and office space, general office supplies, Internet/web access, equipment, furniture, and fixtures. In addition, LAAB members and volunteers will be covered by applicable ASLA insurance policies.

ASLA Administrative Policy: 2005

Community of Interest

Before adopting or revising any accreditation standard, LAAB consults the "community of interest" which is defined to include:

- Chairpersons of accredited Landscape Architecture programs
- ASLA Board of Trustees
- Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture
- ASLA National Student Representative
- ASLA Student Chapters
- Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards/State Board Members
- Accrediting agencies
- ASLA members
- Roster of Visiting Evaluators (ROVE) members.
- Canadian Society of Landscape Architects
- General public

The community of interest will have a minimum of thirty days to comment on any proposed revisions. Landscape Architecture accreditation standards and procedures are reviewed by the LAAB every five years.

Membership

The Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board is responsible for judging whether a program is in compliance with the accreditation standards. The LAAB is a 12 member board that consists of representatives from the American Society of Landscape Architects, Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture, and Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards, three landscape architecture educators, three practicing landscape architects and three lay persons (non-landscape architects), all appointed for three year terms.

Appointments are arranged so the terms of no more than one educator, one practitioner, and one lay person will expire in the same year. LAAB members are limited to two consecutive terms of appointment without a break in service. LAAB members are selected by a vote of LAAB members. Educators and practitioners must have served on three accreditation visits before being appointed to the Board, with consideration also given to diverse experiences and regional representation. The three non-landscape architects are selected from nominations received at large and cannot be affiliated with a landscape architecture program. Replacement members to fill unexpired terms are appointed in the same manner as original appointees.

Definitions, Interpretation and Application

Accreditation - A voluntary process of peer review designed to evaluate programs based on their own stated objectives and the accreditation standards that follow.

First-Professional Program - A first-professional program encompasses the body of knowledge common to the profession and promotes acquisition of knowledge and skills necessary to enter the professional practice of landscape architecture:

- ...at the bachelor's level in a context enriched by the liberal arts and natural and social sciences.
- ...at the master's level by providing instruction in and application of research and or/scholarly methods.

Program - An inclusive term for the coursework and other learning experiences leading to a degree and the supporting administration, faculty, facilities and services which sponsor and provide those experiences.

Standards - Qualitative statements of the essential conditions an accredited program must meet. A program must demonstrate adequate evidence of compliance with all standards to achieve accreditation.

Intent - Explains the purpose of the standard.

Criteria - Each standard has one or more criteria statements that define the components needed to satisfy the related standard. Not satisfying a criterion does not automatically lead to an assessment of a standard as 'not met'. To be accredited a program demonstrates progress towards meeting the criteria. In this document, criteria are identified by letters (e.g., **A. Program Mission**).

Assessment - Each criterion has one or more questions that seek qualitative and quantitative evidence used to assess the level of compliance with or achievement of the related criteria.

Shall...is defined as mandatory.

Should... is defined as prescriptive.

Compliance - Achieved when the LAAB concludes, after review of relevant indicators or other evidence, that a standard is met or met with recommendation as defined below. To achieve accreditation a program must demonstrate to LAAB, through the Self-Evaluation Report, site visit, and technical accuracy review of the visiting team report, that it complies with all standards.

Standard Met - Evidence shows that overall program performance in this area meets LAAB minimum standards. A standard may be judged as met even though one or more indicators are not minimally met.

Standard Met With Recommendation - Deficiencies exist in an area directly bearing on accreditation. The problem or problems have observable effects on the overall quality of the program.

Standard Not Met - Cited deficiency is so severe that the overall quality of the program is compromised and the program's ability to deliver adequate landscape architecture education is impaired.

Recommendation Affecting Accreditation - Are issues of serious concern, directly affecting the quality of the program. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation are only made when the visiting team assesses a standard as met with recommendation or not met. Recommendations are derived from the identified areas of weakness in meeting a standard that are described in the rationale sections of the visiting team report. The program is required to report progress regularly on these issues. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation identify issues, and do not prescribe solutions.

Suggestions for Improvement - Areas where the program can build on a strength or address an area of concern that does not directly affect accreditation at the time of the LAAB review.

Minimum Requirements For Achieving And Maintaining Accredited Status

1. The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
3. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
4. Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows:
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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.

Programs	FTE Instructional Faculty	Faculty with Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture	Full Time Faculty
Single Program	3	3	1
Bachelors & Masters	6	5	2

5. 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]
6. There is a designated program administrator responsible for the leadership and management functions for the program under review.
7. 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 program administrator shall inform LAAB if any of these factors fails to apply during an accreditation period. The program administrator is responsible for reporting any substantive changes to the program when they occur. Substantive changes would be those that may affect the accreditation status of the program. Substantive change is addressed on page 24.

STANDARDS

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

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.

A. Program Mission. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relate to the institution's mission statement?

B. EDUCATIONAL GOALS. Clearly defined and formally stated academic goals reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment: Does the program have an effective procedure to determine progress in meeting its goals and is it used regularly?

C. EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES. The educational objectives specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment: Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives that describe how the goals will be met?

D. LONG-RANGE PLANNING PROCESS. The program is engaged in a long-range planning process.

Assessment 1: Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process?

Assessment 2: Is the long-range plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

Assessment 3: Does the self-evaluation report (SER) respond to recommendations and suggestions from the previous accreditation review and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

E. PROGRAM DISCLOSURE. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

Assessment: Is the program information accurate?

Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance & 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.

A. Program Administration. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program.

Assessment 1: Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Assessment 2: Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture?

Assessment 3: Does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program?

B. Institutional Support. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15:1?

Assessment 2: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Assessment 3: Is funding adequate for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc?

Assessment 4: Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

C. Commitment to Diversity. The program demonstrates commitment to diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment: How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

D. Faculty Participation. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Assessment 2: Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation, promotion and tenure of faculty?

Assessment 3: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and for tenure and promotion to all ranks?

E. Faculty Number. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program's goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in research, creative activity and scholarship and to be actively involved in professional endeavors such as presenting at conferences. To address this criterion:

1. a unit that offers a first professional program should have a minimum of five fulltime faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture; and
2. an academic unit that offers a first professional degree at both bachelor's and master's levels should have a minimum of seven fulltime faculty, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture.¹

Assessment 1: Does an academic unit that offers a first professional program have a minimum of five fulltime faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?

Assessment 2: Does an academic unit that offers first professional programs at both bachelor's and master's levels, have a minimum of seven fulltime faculty, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?

Assessment 3: Does the strategic plan or long range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?

Assessment 4: Are the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

LAAB Recommendations for First Professional Degree Programs	Full-Time Faculty	F/T Faculty with Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture
Single Program	5	5
Bachelors & Masters Program	7	5

¹ This criterion does not conflict with the numbers listed in the Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status (p. 5). Those numbers are minimums and are expected for emerging programs and programs that are becoming established to enroll a small number of students.

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 or/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 a and b.*

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.

A. Mission and Objectives. The program's curriculum addresses its mission, goals, and objectives.

Assessment: Does the program identify the knowledge, skills, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

B. Professional Curriculum. The program curriculum includes coverage of:

- History, theory and criticism.
- Natural and cultural systems including principles of sustainability.
- Public Policy and regulation.
- Design, planning and management at various scales and applications including but not limited to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading drainage and storm water management.
- Site design and Implementation: materials, methods, technologies, application.
- Construction documentation and administration.
- Written, verbal and visual communication.
- Professional practice.
- Professional values and ethics.
- Plants and ecosystems.
- Computer applications and other advanced technology.

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum address the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and objectives?

Assessment 2: Does student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession?

Assessment 3: Do curriculum and program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?

C. Syllabi. Syllabi are maintained for courses.

Assessment 1: Do syllabi include educational objectives, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?

Assessment 2: Do syllabi identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to successfully complete the course and advance in the curriculum?

D. Curriculum Evaluation. At the course and curriculum levels, the program evaluates how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning objectives in a timely way.

Assessment 1: Does the program demonstrate and document ways of:

- a. Assessing students' achievement of course and program objectives in the length of time to graduation stated by the program?*
- b. Reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?*
- c. Maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and values of the profession?*

Assessment 2: Do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses and curriculum?

E. Augmentation of Formal Educational Experience. The program provides opportunities for students to participate in internships, off campus studies, research assistantships, or practicum experiences.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide any of these opportunities?

Assessment 2: How does the program identify the objectives and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?

Assessment 3: Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

F. Coursework (Bachelor's Level). In addition to the professional curriculum, students also pursue coursework in other disciplines in accordance with institutional and program requirements.

Assessment: Do students take courses in the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences or other disciplines?

G. Areas of Interest (Bachelor's Level). The program provides opportunities for students to pursue special interests.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, certificates, minors, etc.

Assessment 2: Does student work incorporate academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

H. Research/Scholarly Methods (Master's Level). The program provides an introduction to research and scholarly methods.

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum provide an introduction to research and scholarly methods and their relation to the profession of landscape architecture?

Assessment 2: Does the program demonstrate that theses or terminal projects exhibit creative and independent thinking and contain a significant research/scholarly component?

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.

A. Student Learning Outcomes. Upon completion of the program, students are qualified to pursue a career in landscape architecture.

Assessment 1: Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?

Assessment 2: Do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's learning objectives, including critical and creative thinking and their ability to understand, apply and communicate the subject matter of the professional curriculum as evidenced through project definition, problem identification, information collection, analysis, synthesis, conceptualization and implementation?

B. Student Advising. The program provides students with effective advising and mentoring throughout their educational careers.

Assessment 1: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic development?

Assessment 2: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding career development?

Assessment 3: Are students aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?

Assessment 4: How satisfied are students with academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

C. Participation In Extra Curricular Activities. Students are encouraged and have the opportunity to participate in professional activities and institutional and community service.

Assessment 1: Do students participate in institutional/college organizations, community initiatives, or other activities?

Assessment 2: Do students participate in events such as LaBash, ASLA Annual Meetings, local ASLA chapter events and the activities of other professional societies or special interest groups?

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.*

A. Credentials. The qualifications of the faculty, instructional personnel, and teaching assistants are appropriate to their roles.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty have a balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?

Assessment 2: Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?

Assessment 3: Are adjunct and/or part-time faculty integrated into the program's administration and curriculum evaluation/development in a coordinated and organized manner?

Assessment 4: Are qualifications appropriate to responsibilities of the program as defined by the institution?

B. Faculty Development. The faculty is continuously engaged in activities leading to their professional growth and advancement, the advancement of the profession, and the effectiveness of the program.

Assessment 1: Are faculty activities such as scholarly inquiry, research, professional practice and service to the profession, university and community documented and disseminated through appropriate media such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?

Assessment 2: Do faculty teaching and administrative assignments allow sufficient opportunity to pursue advancement and professional development?

Assessment 3: Are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated, and are the results used for individual and program improvement?

Assessment 4: Do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc?

Assessment 5: Are the activities of faculty reviewed and recognized by faculty peers?

Assessment 6: Do faculty participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

C. Faculty Retention. Faculty hold academic status, have workloads, receive salaries, mentoring and support that promote productivity and retention.

Assessment 1: Are faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition evaluated to promote faculty retention and productivity?

Assessment 2: What is the rate of faculty turnover?

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.*

A. Interaction with the Profession, Institution, and Public. The program represents and advocates for the profession by interacting with the professional community, the institution, community and the public at large.

Assessment 1: Are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?

Assessment 2: Are service activities documented on a regular basis?

B. Alumni and Practitioners. The program recognizes alumni and practitioners as a resource.

Assessment 1: Does the program maintain a current registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, post graduate study, and significant professional accomplishments?

Assessment 2: Does the program engage the alumni and practitioners in activities such as a formal advisory board, student career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education etc.?

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.

A. Facilities. There are designated, code-compliant, adequately maintained spaces that serve the professional requirements of the faculty, students and staff.

Assessment 1: Are faculty, staff and administration provided with appropriate office space?

Assessment 2: Are students assigned permanent studio workstations adequate to meet the program needs?

Assessment 3: Are facilities adequately maintained and are they in compliance with ADA, life-safety and applicable building codes? (Acceptable documentation includes reasonable accommodation reports from the university ADA compliance office and/or facilities or risk management office.)

B. Information Systems And Technical Equipment. Information systems and technical equipment needed to achieve the program's mission and objectives are available to students, faculty and other instructional and administrative personnel.

Assessment 1: Does the program have sufficient access to computer equipment and software?

Assessment 2: Is the frequency of hardware and software maintenance, updating and replacement sufficient?

Assessment 3: Are the hours of use sufficient to serve faculty and students?

C. Library Resources. Library collections and other resources are sufficient to support the program's mission and educational objectives.

Assessment 1: Are collections adequate to support the program?

Assessment 2: Do courses integrate library and other resources?

Assessment 3: Are the library hours of operation convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?

ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES

Initiating Accreditation

A program can apply for accreditation whenever it meets the Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status (page 7) and has had at least one graduating class.

A program should notify LAAB of its intention to apply for initial accreditation at least four months before the anticipated visit. A program must have had one graduating class, and meet accreditation requirements 1-6 (see Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status) before a visit can be scheduled. The accreditation process is the same whether a program is applying for renewal of accreditation or initial accreditation.

Candidacy Status

To assist non-accredited programs the LAAB has developed a Candidacy Status to help programs prepare for the accreditation process. Candidacy is an accreditation classification granted to any program which is in the planning or early stages of development or an intermediate stage of program implementation. This accreditation classification provides evidence to the educational institution, licensing bodies, and the public that at the time of evaluation, the developing education program appears to have the potential for meeting the standards set forth in the requirements for an accredited educational program in landscape architecture.

The purpose of candidacy is to establish stable, constructive, ongoing, and helpful partnerships between LAAB and institutions working toward becoming accredited by LAAB. Programs designated as “candidates” have voluntarily committed to work toward LAAB accreditation. Candidacy status signifies that the program is demonstrating reasonable progress toward the attainment of accreditation. However, candidacy status does not indicate accredited status nor does it guarantee eventual accreditation.

To achieve candidacy status a program must meet the minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining accredited status except for:

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 who 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 four of who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, and at least two of who are full-time.

However, in order to apply for initial accreditation, the minimum faculty requirements listed above must be met.

After achieving candidacy status, a program must apply for initial accreditation within one year of its first graduating class. If initial accreditation is not granted, the program can retain its candidacy status for one additional year.

To achieve candidacy status, a program must submit a self-evaluation report (SER) and undergo a program review. A program review is a mini-accreditation visit where one member of LAAB or the Roster of Visiting Evaluators will review the program’s self-evaluation report and conduct a one to two day visit to the program. LAAB will review the report and determine whether the program should be granted candidacy status or not. In addition LAAB will make recommendations and suggestions on how the program can continue to advance towards meeting the accreditation standards. Programs are responsible for the expenses of the program review visitor.

LAAB will vote on whether to grant a program candidacy status at its next regularly scheduled meeting by reviewing the program's self-evaluation report and the program review report. If LAAB decides not to grant candidacy status this decision is not subject to appeal. The program will be informed in writing of the LAAB's decision.

After achieving candidacy status, programs are required to submit progress reports to LAAB annually.

Programs that have achieved candidacy status must pay an annual sustaining fee (a fee schedule can be obtained from the LAAB office).

Self-Evaluation Report

All programs applying for accreditation prepare a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) following the required LAAB format. The SER describes the program's mission and objectives, its self-assessment, and future plans; provides a detailed response to the recommendations of the previous visiting team; and details the program's compliance with each accreditation standard. It is important that faculty, administrators, and students participate in preparing the self-evaluation report. The SER must include a statement explaining the participation of each group. The LAAB accreditation administrator notifies each program of the accreditation schedule and LAAB deadlines.

Since accreditation is a voluntary process, the LAAB cannot conduct a review without an invitation or written notice of approval from the chief executive officer of the institution. This invitation and notice of preferred visit dates must be submitted at least four months prior to the review.

At least 45 days before the visit, the program submits two copies of the SER to the ASLA accreditation manager and one copy of the SER with the proposed visit schedule to each member of the visiting team.

If the documents are not submitted by this deadline, the program may be notified that the visit has been postponed. In the case of a currently accredited program, this may result in the suspension of accreditation and/or the term of accreditation expiring.

The program is responsible for all costs incurred plus an administrative fee (a fee schedule can be obtained from the LAAB office).

Roster of Visiting Evaluators (ROVE)

The LAAB maintains the Roster of Visiting Evaluators (ROVE). Visiting team members are selected from the Roster. There are three categories of evaluators:

Landscape architecture educators who hold a first-professional degree in landscape architecture, teach in an accredited program, and hold the minimum academic rank of tenured associate professor.

Academic administrators (current or former) who hold the minimum rank of assistant or associate dean, including non-landscape architects, and who hold terminal degrees in their respective fields.

Landscape architecture practitioners who have a first-professional degree in landscape architecture and at least five full years of practice experience.

Exceptions to these criteria must be approved by the LAAB chair.

To ensure wide representation of the community of interest, accredited programs are invited to nominate one landscape architecture educator and one academic administrator. Similarly, each ASLA chapter is encouraged to nominate a practitioner. The LAAB will seek nominations from other sources such as individuals and organizations (e.g., CELA and CLARB). LAAB will review nominations for ROVE and make appointments to the roster. Appointments are for five years and are renewable. Information on file for all ROVE members includes current location, school affiliations, and previous visits, as well as a resume.

Visiting Team Selection

The visiting team consists of one landscape architecture educator, one practitioner, and one academic administrator. The LAAB chair selects a proposed visiting team from the ROVE and designates one member as team chair.

Teams are selected to avoid potential conflicts of interest. For example, a previous affiliation with the program under review, or an affiliation with a program in the same geographic location with competing enrollments, monies, etc., renders an evaluator ineligible. All ROVE members participating in a review of a course of study leading to a first professional MLA degree will hold an advanced degree.

The program is advised of the proposed team, including each proposed team member's present position, experience, and areas of expertise. The program has the right to challenge one team member, with cause. For the purpose of challenge, conflict of interest can be cited if the nominee comes from the same geographic location and is affiliated with a competitive institution; if the nominee had a previous affiliation with the institution; or if the institution can demonstrate that the nominee is not competent to evaluate the program. However, the final decision on team assignments rests with the LAAB chair.

Following the program's review of potential team members, the team members are invited to serve. When the visiting team composition and date of the review are finalized, the team and the program are formally notified. Any subsequent changes in team makeup because of scheduling conflicts or emergencies are made in consultation with the program.

Where special conditions warrant, such as providing team member training or assisting with site-evaluation procedures and matters of due process, a four-person team may be assembled. At the discretion of the LAAB chair, one of the following may accompany the visiting team: an LAAB member, ASLA's director of education or accreditation manager, a landscape architecture educator who has a specialist background relevant to the program under review, an educator from a related design profession, or a ROVE member for training purposes.

Observer Responsibilities

Observers may participate in discussions as invited by the visiting team chair. For example, an educator assigned as an observer to prepare as a future visiting team member may be asked to participate in reviews of student work and ask questions at interviews that the educator member of the team would typically ask. However, the goal of the observer is to prepare to be a future team member.

Cooperation with Other Accrediting Agencies and State Agencies

LAAB seeks to reduce the burden of accreditation on landscape architecture programs by participating with other accrediting bodies if the program under review requests this. The schedule and arrangements must assure that all aspects of the landscape architecture review can be accomplished.

Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Visiting Team

The team chair is responsible for making assignments and assembling the visiting team report. Team members receive the Accreditation Standards and Procedures and the LAAB Visiting Team Guidelines and are expected to be thoroughly familiar with these documents before the accreditation visit. Each visiting team member must carefully review the Self-Evaluation Report and carry out assignments as the team chair directs.

Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Program

The accreditation manager, after conferring with the team and the institution, schedules the dates of the accreditation visit. The program is responsible for making all lodging arrangements for the visiting team. Hotel accommodations must be comfortable, reasonably priced, and, where possible, use on-campus facilities such as those for visiting faculty or guest lecturers. LAAB is responsible for the travel, lodging, and meal expenses of the visiting team. Institutions with more than one campus are responsible for the transportation costs between the campuses including additional airfare (example: team members fly into one airport and out of another) if applicable.

Sample Visit Schedule

The following is a sample schedule of activities for a visiting team of the LAAB. This includes all necessary elements and provides adequate time for report preparation.

Day 1 (Sunday)

12:00-2:00 pm Team arrival and check in.

2:00-5:00 pm Review of student work and facilities

6:00 pm Team meets with landscape architecture program administrator to finalize schedule and to discuss the program in general

8:00 pm Executive session: confirm team member assignments and plan how the team will conduct interviews and various meetings that will take place during the visit.

Day 2 (Monday)

7:30 am Breakfast with program administrator

9:00 am Meet with the chief executive officer of the institution

9:30 am Meet with the immediate supervisor of the landscape architecture program administrator.

10:00 am Familiarization tour of the landscape architectural facilities. Tour should be brief. (This should be scheduled for Saturday or Sunday depending upon team's arrival schedule).

10:30 am Curriculum review by faculty to visiting team. Reviews how program accomplishes its mission through the curriculum and a review of student work from each class and sequence.

- 12:00 Noon Lunch with recent graduates and practitioners, to be arranged at the discretion of the team and the school. Opportunity to evaluate graduates' satisfaction with the educational process and the degree to which the program prepared them to perform entry-level functions.
- 1:30 pm Interviews with students and faculty. Student interviews should be conducted with students grouped by year. It is recommended that student interviews take place before faculty interviews. Faculty interviews are usually a series of individual interviews at half-hour intervals, to discuss impressions of the program--strengths, weaknesses, faculty input, faculty development. Group faculty interviews can be conducted if more acceptable to the faculty and the team.
- 3:00 p.m. Break
- 3:15 pm Resume student and faculty interviews.
- 5:00 pm Break for day.
- 7:00 pm Team meets for dinner and executive session to review findings.
- Day 3 (Tuesday)**
- 7:30 a.m. Breakfast with program administrator
- 9:00 am Resume faculty interviews.
- 12:30 pm Lunch with other department heads
- 1:30 pm Remainder of faculty and student interviews as necessary. Inspection of library and other supporting facilities, e.g., computing center, special services, etc.
- 3:00 pm Team executive session: preparation of the report by the visiting team.
- Day 4 (Wednesday)**
- 7:30 am Breakfast meeting with program administrator to advise him/her of team's findings.
- 9:00 am Review of the team's findings with the chief executive officer of the institution.
- 9:45 am Discussions of the team's findings with the immediate supervisor of the landscape architecture program administrator.
- 10:30 am Report of team findings to landscape architecture faculty.
- 11:15 am Report of team findings to students. (Reports to faculty and students may be combined at visiting team's discretion).
- 12:00 Noon Lunch. Team departs from campus.

The program prepares the visit schedule and forwards it to the team members and the accreditation manager, along with the SER, at least forty-five days prior to the visit. The recommended schedule includes interviews with students, faculty, and administration officials, as well as alumni and local

practitioners. Team members may conduct interviews by telephone with persons who are unable to meet with them on campus, such as alumni, practitioners or faculty on leave. The chief executive officer of the campus should be interviewed both at the beginning and at the end of the team's visit. Early inspection of space and facilities and an exhibit of work produced by students in the program are vital. No evening events should be scheduled as the team needs this time to work on its report and prepare for the next day.

The team members meet in executive session to prepare a complete report in draft form, and to decide on an advisory recommendation to LAAB on the program's accredited status. The content of this report, except the advisory recommendation, is discussed with the chief executive of the institution as well as the program administrator, faculty, and students, particularly in regard to strengths and weaknesses of the program, recommendations affecting accreditation, and suggestions for program improvement.

Visiting Team Report

Before the visit, the visiting team receives the Accreditation Standards and Procedures and the Visiting Team Guidelines. The guidelines include a format for the visiting team report, which is designed to ensure a response to all the LAAB requirements and accreditation standards. The team chair makes writing assignments as necessary and is responsible for compiling the report.

Within ten days following the visit, the visiting team chair completes final editing and sends copies to the other team members and the accreditation manager, who review the report. The report may be edited for grammar, spelling and style. The team members should send any comments to the accreditation manager. Any substantive changes or additions will be referred to the team chair and may result in distributing the report to the team to review the report a second time.

Institutional Response

Within ten days of the receipt of the team report, the accreditation manager shall send copies to the chief executive officer and the program administrator of the institution for their comment and technical accuracy review.

Within fifteen days following receipt of the team report, the institution shall submit its institutional response (substantive comments and corrections) to the accreditation manager. The program shall respond to any standard that is assessed as "met with recommendation" or "not met." This response should include any documentation the program deems pertinent.

The team report and institutional response are sent to the LAAB members at least three weeks before the next scheduled LAAB meeting.

Vacating of Application for Accreditation

Any time before action by the LAAB, an institution may vacate its application for accreditation without penalty by notifying in writing both the LAAB chair and the accreditation manager. The LAAB will not refund fees and the program will be assessed for expenses incurred by LAAB.

LAAB Review and Decision

The accreditation review decision will take place at the next scheduled LAAB meeting (typically February and August). The LAAB may consult with a member of the visiting team (usually the chair) and/or the program administrator in order to clarify items in the team report or institutional response. Programs may request to appear before the LAAB to discuss the pending accreditation decision. The

LAAB's decision will be based upon the program's self-evaluation report, annual reports, visiting team report, and institutional response.

Any adverse accreditation decision, defined as either “accreditation denial,” or “withdrawal of accreditation,” will be substantiated with specific reasons, and program administrators will be notified of their right to appeal any such decision (see Appeal Process). A program which has not been granted accredited status, or a program from which accreditation has been withdrawn, may reapply for accreditation when its administrators believe the program meets current requirements.

LAAB Actions

Accreditation is granted for a period of one to six years. A program may apply for an accreditation review at any time before its term expires, but may not defer a visit to extend its term. The LAAB may vary these normal terms at its discretion. Reasons for such variance will be supplied to the program. The official action letter to the institution indicates the date on which accreditation will expire. The annually published list of accredited programs includes the accredited status of each program along with the next scheduled accreditation review.

The LAAB will publish actions of accreditation, accreditation denial, withdrawal of accreditation, suspension of accreditation, or provisional accreditation in LAND Online.

LAAB can take the following actions:

Accreditation

Granted when all standards are met or when one or more standards are met with recommendation, and continued overall program quality and conformance to standards are judged likely to be maintained.

Accreditation may be granted up to six (6) years.

A program receiving accreditation may be required to submit special progress reports at the discretion of LAAB.

Provisional Accreditation

Granted when one or more standards are met with recommendation and the cited deficiencies are such that continued overall program quality or conformance to standards is uncertain. Provisional accreditation may be granted up to two (2) years. This status shall not be granted more than twice without an intervening period of accreditation. Provisional status is not deemed to be an adverse action and is not subject to be appealed.

Initial Accreditation

Granted on a first review when all standards are at least minimally met and the program's continued development and conformance to the accreditation standards is likely. Initial accreditation may be granted for up to six (6) years.

Programs receiving initial accreditation must submit a special progress report after two or three years (time determined by LAAB). LAAB will review the progress report to determine if an accreditation review should be scheduled immediately or as originally scheduled when initial accreditation was granted.

Suspension of Accreditation

This status results if a program fails to maintain good standing for administrative reasons. Suspension of accreditation is not subject to appeal.

Accreditation Denial

This status results when one or more standards are not met. This determination is subject to appeal.

Withdrawal of Accreditation

This status results if a program fails to comply with accreditation standards. This determination is subject to appeal.

Notification of LAAB Action

The institution is officially notified of the LAAB's action with a letter. Copies of the letter are sent to the program administrator and visiting team.

The LAAB retains a copy of a program's two most recent self-evaluation reports.

Confidentiality

The LAAB treats all material generated by the program and LAAB for the accreditation review as confidential. However, the LAAB encourages the widest dissemination of all accreditation materials within the institution. The team report and self-evaluation report are considered to be the property of the institution. The LAAB reserves the right to release a complete report should the institution release a portion of the team report that might, in the judgment the LAAB, presents a biased or distorted view of the site-evaluation findings.

Reference to Accredited Status

A program's accredited status must be clearly conveyed in all program and institutional literature. In particular, if a program offers more than one course of study leading to the same degree, (e.g., first-professional and post-professional MLAs) program literature must identify which course(s) of study is (are) accredited.

Delaying a scheduled Accreditation Visit.

From time to time a program may want to delay a scheduled accreditation visit because of unexpected circumstances. LAAB will grant a site visit delay for up to one year (from spring semester 2014 to spring semester 2015 for example) if the following conditions are met:

- The program received a six year term of accreditation at its last review.
- The program is in compliance with Minimum Requirements for achieving and maintaining accredited status.
- All fees and required reports have been submitted.

To request a delay the LAAB must receive a letter from the school dean or higher-ranking administrator.

The program shall pay a visit delay fee. If the request for delay is received before visiting team selection has begun the see the LAAB fee schedule (can be obtained from the LAAB office).

If the request for delay is received after visiting team selection has begun the program must pay a fee plus any visit related expenses that have been incurred (such as non-refundable airline tickets) see the LAAB fee schedule.

If an institution is scheduled to have two programs reviewed at the same time only one delay fee is charged (both must meet above conditions). Regular annual fees still apply.

Rescheduling Visit

When the visit is rescheduled, priority for selecting visit dates will go to programs hosting visits in their regular cycle.

A delayed visit cannot be postponed again for any reason. If the rescheduled review does not take place the program's accreditation will lapse. If a program chooses to apply, it will be through the initial accreditation process.

Term of Accreditation

When LAAB takes action, the grant of accreditation will begin from the originally scheduled review date.

Annual Reports and Other Reports

Each accredited program submits an annual report to allow LAAB to monitor the program's continuing compliance with accreditation requirements. The report must include:

- a. Changes in curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and physical facilities that have occurred since the last report.
- b. Current enrollment.
- c. Number of graduates for the current year.
- d. Report on employment or enrollment in graduate school for previous year's graduates.
- e. Progress toward complying with the recommendations of the most recent accreditation review.

The LAAB may choose to alert the program administrator as well as the institution's chief executive officer of its concern for potential effects of reported changes.

Policy on Substantive Change

In order to support accredited programs as they make changes between regular accreditation visits, Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) will offer consultative reviews of proposed changes prior to submission of an official request for Substantive Change. Substantive Change will normally be included in annual reports, yet, is encouraged to be reported prior to the change. Primary responsibility for reporting Substantive Change rests with the program or institution administrator.

Substantive Change is any change that compromises a program's ability to meet one or more of the Standards approved and published by LAAB or that makes a program unable to meet any of the following Minimum Requirements for maintaining accredited status as currently stated in the 2010 LAAB Accreditation Standards and Procedures and must be reported:

1. The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
3. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.

4. Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) must be as follows:
 - a. 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.
 - b. An academic unit that offers first-professional programs at both bachelor's and master's levels, has at least six instructional FTE, at least four of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, and at least two of whom are full-time.
5. The parent institution is accredited by the institutional accrediting body of its region.
6. There is a designated program administrator for the program under review.

Procedures and forms for reporting Substantive Change may be obtained from the LAAB website www.asla.org/AccreditationLAAB.aspx. A response regarding a Substantive Change will be provided by LAAB or the accreditation manager within 30 days. The program or institution administrator must respond to the LAAB within 30 days to remain in good standing.

Other Reports

From time to time, LAAB may require programs to prepare special reports to explain or describe a certain issue or problem. These issues will be ones that the LAAB believes require additional explanation that what is included in annual reports and because of the issue the timing for submitting the report is different than the annual report due date.

Maintaining Good Standing

To maintain good standing a program must continuously meet the minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining accredited status. LAAB must be informed if any of these requirements cannot be met during an accreditation period.

Should a program fail to maintain good standing, accreditation may be suspended or withdrawn.

Suspension of Accreditation

Should a program fail to maintain good standing for administrative reasons (such as failure to pay required fees or submit required reports) accreditation may be suspended. Before this action is taken the LAAB shall send a show-cause letter requesting the program to explain why accreditation should not be suspended.

Since suspension of accreditation occurs only for administrative reasons it is not subject to appeal. A program whose term of accreditation has been suspended will be listed as such on the official list of accredited programs. Suspensions of accreditation are published in LAND Online. Students attending a program with suspended accreditation are considered to be attending an accredited program. A program can be suspended for a maximum of one year (12 months). LAAB will begin procedures to withdraw accreditation to take affect immediately when the maximum period of suspension is reached.

If evidence of remedial action is submitted and judged adequate within the one year period of suspension, reinstatement of the previous grant of accreditation may be made.

Withdrawal of Accreditation

Should a program fail to comply with accreditation standards, accreditation may be withdrawn. Before withdrawing accreditation the LAAB shall send a show-cause letter requesting the program to explain why accreditation should not be withdrawn. The LAAB may suggest to the program that an accreditation

visit is in order. Withdrawal of accreditation is an adverse action and can be appealed (see Appeals Process).

If the program's parent institution or other programs within the institution are placed on probationary status or have accreditation withdrawn by their accrediting agencies the LAAB may send a show-cause letter to the landscape architecture program to determine the program's current condition.

Accreditation Fees

The current LAAB fee schedule can be obtained from the LAAB office.

THE APPEAL PROCESS

When the LAAB takes adverse action on accreditation, specific reasons shall be provided for that action to the program administrator and the chief executive of the institution. Adverse actions include denial or withdrawal of accreditation.

Recipients of adverse action shall be advised of their right to appeal. An appeal must be based on one or more of the following issues:

1. Whether the LAAB and/or the visiting team conformed to the procedures described in this document; or
2. Whether the LAAB and /or the visiting team conformed to the Accreditation Standards.

Appeals based on challenges to accreditation standards or procedures will be dismissed. Institutions differing with LAAB on the standards and procedures established in this document are invited to contact the LAAB which regularly reviews the standards.

A written notice of appeal signed by the chief executive officer of the institution must be submitted within twenty days of notice of the LAAB's action letter. The appeal must be sent to the accreditation manager who shall notify the chair of LAAB. The program must submit within sixty days of LAAB's action a "comprehensive written statement" of all the reasons for the appeal. Failure to submit this statement within sixty days of notice of LAAB's action is equivalent to withdrawing the appeal. During the appeal period, the accredited status of the program before the adverse action will not change. The record of the appeal upon which the appeal is based shall be limited to the material which was presented to the LAAB at its scheduled meeting from which the final accreditation report consisting of the action letter from LAAB is issued. The program bears the cost of the appeal.

Appeal Panel

The Chair of LAAB shall appoint an appeal panel comprised of three persons, including its chair. Each person must have knowledge of and experience with the accreditation of educational institutions or programs. One member of the appeal panel may be a former member of LAAB. One member of the Appeal Panel may be challenged by the institution for cause and the chair of LAAB shall appoint a replacement. Panel members may serve concurrently on other ASLA committees, councils, or boards, excluding only the LAAB.

Authority

The appeal panel by concurrence of a majority of the members, may either affirm LAAB's decision or recommend to LAAB that it reconsider the decision.

The LAAB must review the case if the appeal panel recommends reconsideration of the decision. Reasonable scheduling is at the discretion of the LAAB. In any case remanded to the LAAB, the recommendations of the appeal panel shall not bind or limit the LAAB in any way. The final decision on accreditation rests with LAAB.

The appeal panel may promulgate additional rules of procedure for the scheduling and conduct of hearings, provided they are consistent with these procedures. The appeal panel has no jurisdiction or authority over the reasonableness of the accreditation standards and procedures, which is a matter properly in the exclusive jurisdiction of the LAAB.

No adverse action is published until the resolution of any appeal.

Hearing of Appeal

The chair of the appeal panel designates the time and place of the hearing which takes place no later than 45 days after receipt of the program's comprehensive written statement.

The chair presides at the hearing and rules on all procedural matters. All three members of the panel must be present.

Both the institution and the LAAB may submit briefs before the hearing in a manner prescribed by the appeal panel. The Appeal Panel will review the documents that LAAB had at the time it made its original decision: visiting team report, self-evaluation report and institution's technical accuracy review comments.

The hearing shall be as informal as is reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances. A party may appear by or with counsel or other representative. The institution may waive personal appearance, in which case the matter will be decided solely on briefs and the written statement. The final decision on accreditation rests with LAAB.

Decision of the Appeal Panel

Every decision must have the concurrence of a majority of the appeal panel members. Within thirty days after the conclusion of the hearing, the appeal panel shall issue a written decision stating its reasons and recommendations, if any, to the LAAB. The decision will indicate the members of the appeal panel concurring. Dissenting opinions may be filed. The LAAB will furnish the majority decision with dissenting opinions, if any, to the institution.

If the appeal panel affirms the LAAB decision, there is no further remedy available within these procedures.

If the appeal panel recommends reconsideration of the decision, the determination thereafter by the LAAB shall be final.

Expenses of Appeal Hearing and Deposit

The program will bear the following expenses in connection with the appeal:

1. Travel and subsistence for the appeal panel members and others such as team chair and LAAB representative, and
2. Cost of the hearing room.

A deposit must be made with the LAAB at the time of the filing of the notice of appeal. This deposit shall be applied to the expenses listed above. Before the hearing, the LAAB may increase the amount of deposit required to meet a realistic estimate of the expenses involved.

COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

A complaint is defined as a written statement submitted by persons expressing substantial dissatisfaction with the quality of a program or its review as set forth by current accreditation standards and procedures. Copies of all correspondence shall always be sent to these four concerned parties: complainant, program administrator, chief executive officer of the institution, and the LAAB accreditation administrator. When an institution adheres to sound due process procedures within its own organization, it is unlikely that LAAB will become involved. Each institution is encouraged to develop effective procedures for responding to faculty or student queries and problems, alleviating dissatisfaction, and averting the need for external intervention by any outside agency. Emphasis on cooperative attitudes and prompt action plays a significant role in fair resolution of faculty or student dissatisfaction.

A complaint shall be processed in stages as follows:

Stage A: The aggrieved party shall submit the complaint, with documentary evidence, to the program administrator. The program administrator shall make a thorough investigation of the complaint and within thirty days respond to the aggrieved party.

Stage B: Should the complainant not be satisfied by the action resulting from Stage A, the written complaint should be filed within thirty days with the chair of the LAAB. At its next regular or special meeting, the LAAB will consider the complaint, as well as the response of the institution, and then decide on its merits, providing all parties with notice of that decision.

VISITING TEAM GUIDELINES

**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITATION BOARD
(LAAB)**

REVISED

August 2010

Effective September 1, 2010

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for volunteering to serve as a visiting team member representing the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board. The accreditation process could not succeed without dedicated volunteers like you. As a member of the Visiting Team, team members are acting as a liaison between LAAB and the institution seeking accreditation for its program. Therefore you are a representative of LAAB.

Please refer to the Accreditation Standards and Procedures document to find details on the accreditation process. The site visit is a vital part of the accreditation process.

VISITING TEAM MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

The following guidelines provide general information regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Visiting Team and its members. While it is not possible to put everything into writing, the following guidelines will give the Visiting Team members a better understanding of their role, duties and responsibilities.

Accreditation reviews provide an important external assessment for programs of landscape architecture. These reviews should provide proactive, constructive, and positive insights focused on improving the quality of landscape architectural education. A great deal of the success of accreditation reviews depends on how members of the visiting team prepare and conduct themselves during the review.

Team members need to be well prepared by reading and reviewing all documents (including student work provided) prior to the visit and by communicating with each other before arriving at the institution. The manner in which the team conduct interviews, reviews work and facilities, the care taken in determining findings and crafting the visiting team report, and the way that findings are presented to the various constituents of the host institution impact the perception, quality and

thus, the success of the visit. Every step in the process requires a thoughtful professional demeanor.

Visit Preparation

Read the entire Self Evaluation Report (SER)

- Know your assignment (given by the visiting team chair) and focus on those standards in the SER
- Identify any additional information (not provided in the SER) you may require to properly evaluate standards assigned to you.
- Formulate questions that need to be asked to properly assess standards assigned to you.

During the visit:

- Be punctual for all meetings.
- Be a good listener; do not overly insert yourself into the discussion.
- Ensure that the team has access to representative examples of student work
- Be objective; your role is to observe, analyze and report. Do not express views that could be interpreted as a bias about program content and outcomes.
- Have a positive attitude and tone in the interviews.
- Keep confidences; this will encourage candor.
- Focus on important issues; stay away from small problems.
- Seek a balanced view of issues; do not let a small faction skew the team's perception of an issue.
- Be thorough in searching for the truth about an issue.
- Identify important issues early (at the conclusion of the first day) so you can revisit them and gather additional information that will or will not support them.
- Write clearly, concisely and provide factual information to support any recommendations; avoid vague terms – “some faculty said...”, “it was reported...”, etc.

- During the exit interviews, be prepared to discuss the rationale for any recommendations or suggestions in the standards.

OVERVIEW OF THE SITE VISIT

The site visit has four principal objectives:

- To verify information in the Self-Evaluation Report (SER);
- To gather new information through observation and interviews;
- To assess whether the program under review meets LAAB's accreditation standards; and
- To identify/verify program strengths and areas for improvement.

Visit Outcomes

- **Verbal feedback to the program:** the exit interviews conducted on the last day of the visit;
- **Team Report:** a written report completed after the visit that is shared with the program, the administration, and LAAB, and
- **Recommendation to LAAB:** the team's consensus of the appropriate accreditation status for the program, based on their observations. This recommendation is **confidential** and **is not disclosed** to the program during the visit.

TEAM REPORT

A rough draft of the team report should be completed by the conclusion of the visit. The team report follows the Visiting Team Report Template that is sent to the chair of each visiting team. The team report has four sections.

1. Overall analysis.
2. Report on each standard.
3. Summary of recommendations and suggestions to the program.
4. Confidential recommendation to LAAB.

SECTION 1: OVERALL ANALYSIS

The overall analysis includes two sections:

- A. An introduction that sets the tone of the report and provides the reader with a sense of the program's institutional and regional context and a brief summary (two pages at most) of the team's findings. The assessment should include a statement about the focus of the program and its unique characteristics, a summary of its strengths and challenges.
- B. A review of each Recommendation Affecting Accreditation and Suggestion for Improvement from the last accreditation review, with the team's assessment of whether the issue has been adequately addressed. If any of these items are still of concern, they should be addressed in the appropriate section of the report.

SECTION 2: REPORT ON EACH STANDARD

The team must report on each standard. See the Accreditation Standards and Procedures document for definitions. This section has five parts:

- A. Statement of Standard (included in template)
- B. Assessment of Program Compliance with each Standard (included in template)
- C. Team's Assessment
- D. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation (if applicable)
- E. Suggestions for Improvement (if applicable)

B. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM COMPLIANCE WITH EACH STANDARD

The team indicates one of three conclusions about the program's compliance with the standard: met, met with recommendation(s), or not met.

Standard Met - Evidence shows that overall program performance in this area meets LAAB minimum standards. A standard may be judged as met even though one or more criteria are not minimally met.

Standard Met With Recommendation - Deficiencies exist in an area directly bearing on accreditation. The problem or problems have observable effects on the overall quality of the program.

A finding of "met with recommendation" must be justified in the rationale section by stating the evidence the team considered, what deficiencies were found, and why, in the team's view, the deficiencies have a serious impact on overall program quality. Since one or more findings of "met with recommendation" may result in provisional accreditation by the Board, the team must provide justification of its assessment.

Standard Not Met - Cited deficiency is so severe that the overall quality of the program is compromised and the program's ability to deliver adequate landscape architecture education is impaired.

A finding of "not met" must be supported by evidence that the deficiencies in this area are so severe that overall program quality is unacceptably compromised. A program that has even one standard assessed as not met will be denied accreditation.

C. TEAM ASSESSMENT

The rationale section provides justification for the team's assessment.

Each standard has one or more criteria statements that define the components needed to satisfy the related standard. Not satisfying a criterion does not automatically lead to an assessment of a

standard as 'not met'. To be accredited a program demonstrates progress towards meeting the criteria. In this document, criteria are identified by letters (e.g., A. Program Mission).

Each criterion has one or more questions that seek qualitative and quantitative evidence used to assess the level of compliance with or achievement of the related criteria.

The visiting team must report on each criterion following the format in the example section of this document.

For a finding of "standard met," the rationale may appropriately cite areas of strength as well as concern.

A finding of "not met" must be supported by evidence that the deficiencies in this area are so severe that overall program quality is unacceptably compromised.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING ACCREDITATION (IF APPLICABLE)

Are issues of serious concern, directly affecting the quality of the program. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation are only made when the visiting team assesses a standard as met with recommendation or not met. Recommendations are derived from the identified areas of weakness in meeting a standard that are described in the rationale sections of the visiting team report. The program is required to report progress regularly on these issues. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation identify issues, and do not prescribe solutions.

E. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Areas where the program can build on strength or address an area of concern that does not directly affect accreditation at the time of the LAAB review. Some suggestions may derive from the team's view that if left unattended these concerns could lead to a future determination that it has become serious enough to warrant a finding of "met with recommendation". Although programs are not required to take action on suggestions, they must report their response to them which could range from dismissing them to reporting progress in addressing them. Other suggestions may derive from items that the team's opinion that an area can become a greater strength or provide improvement to the program.

Suggestions should be a very useful part of the peer review process. It is important to keep suggestions to a minimum. The maximum number of suggestions shall be **seven (7)**. A team may direct more than one suggestion to a particular standard but the total number may not exceed seven. Suggestions, unlike recommendations, may be prescriptive but they should be supported by evidence found in the rationale.

SECTION 3: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS TO PROGRAMS

This section summarizes all recommendations affecting accreditation and suggestions for improvement from the reports on each standard. There cannot be any recommendations or suggestions for improvement that were not previously identified.

SECTION 4: CONFIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATION TO LAAB

The team should agree on its recommendation to LAAB of the type of accreditation action. This recommendation is **advisory** only and should be kept confidential. **Do not disclose it in the exit interview(s)**. The recommendation sheet must be completed and signed (**by all visiting team members**) before leaving the campus. The team's recommendation is advisory as the program has the opportunity to respond to the team report and supply additional information to LAAB. The team's recommendation must be supported by the report's text.

COMPLETION SCHEDULE

The visiting team should complete a draft of their report prior to the end of the visit. One way to expedite this process is for team members to bring their own computers.

Within **ten working days** of the visit, the team chair shall send draft copies of the visiting team report to the accreditation manager and to the other team members. The report will be forwarded to the LAAB principal reader. The team chair will be contacted by the principal reader shortly thereafter to discuss the team findings and any questions he/she may have concerning the site visit. The principal reader may also contact the other members of the visiting team. The draft

report may be edited for grammar, spelling, and style before being sent to the program for technical accuracy review and comment.

If there are any difficulties in producing the report or submitting it within the required ten days, the team chair should contact the accreditation manager and provide a revised submission date for the report.

INTERVIEWS

Coming into contact with those who bring the institution to life is one of the most important dimensions of the site visit. The interviews can yield the greatest dividends if appropriate preparation is undertaken.

The visiting team chair and the program chair should confer about the visit schedule as soon as the assignment of the team chair is confirmed. A schedule is printed in the Standards and Procedures document. The schedule should insure the availability of key university administrative officials. Meeting with subordinate administrative staff for primary interviews is not an acceptable substitute. Not being able to meet with the key university administration dilutes the team's potential effectiveness to help the program. In addition, the schedule should be arranged to allow the visiting team to develop a good understanding of all facets of the program by the end the first full day of the visit.

It is important that the interviews be consistent. This document includes sample questions for each group (administrators, faculty, students, alumni and practitioners). The team should agree in advance on the core questions that will be asked in each interview and by whom. The team chair may, at his/her discretion, decide to conduct interviews on an individual basis rather than as a team; if so, it is even more important to agree on the ground rules. Teams should identify the most important areas to cover, leave time in each interview to probe areas of concern, and allow the interviewee the chance to ask any questions he or she may have. The team should extend an invitation to all faculty and students to meet with the team or a member of the team individually (under conditions of anonymity) to discuss specific issues of concern.

EXIT INTERVIEW

There are four exit interviews in a typical accreditation visit: an informal one with program chair at breakfast; a private one with the president or other high-level administrator; a private one with the dean; and a group interview with the program's faculty and students.

The team chair normally conducts the exit interviews. The exit interview should provide a balanced picture of the team's findings. Each Recommendation Affecting Accreditation and Suggestion for Improvement should be reported to all groups. It is best to read the recommendations and suggestions to avoid reporting them differently to different audiences which could leave them open to different interpretations by the various groups. The program should never be surprised by a recommendation or suggestion in the team's written report that was not mentioned in the exit interview.

The team's recommendation on accredited status to LAAB should not be disclosed to anyone.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR THE VISITING TEAM

(Questions which elicit information already provided in the Self-Evaluation Report generally should be avoided. These questions are examples, to generate conversation and to make sure key areas of the program are discussed. **It is not expected that all questions will be asked. Visiting team members should discuss questions in advance of meetings to determine what questions may be most efficient in providing the team with information to make an assessment of the program.** Questions and responses can be used for the team to comment on more than one standard or criterion. **Team members should listen more than they speak.**

QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. How is the program regarded by other elements of the institution?
2. How does the program contribute to the institution's mission and record of achievement?
3. How is the future of the program regarded by others in the institution?

4. How is the program's faculty regarded academically and as contributors to the leadership (committee) structure of the institution?
5. Are there some issues or questions that the team should pay particular attention to during the visit?
6. How is the program perceived within the community outside of the institution?

QUESTIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT HEAD/PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR

1. Has the department's long-range planning effort influenced recent policy decisions? How?
2. What has been the influence of alumni and practitioner contact in facilitating the program's mission?
3. Are there special efforts underway to recruit able students, particularly women and minorities? How successful have these efforts been? What is the main draw for students who enroll in the program?
4. How do the standards for faculty selection, development, promotion, tenure, salary determination, etc., support the goals of the program?
5. Is there a strategy to assist the faculty in its research and professional development objectives? Is it working?
6. What efforts have been undertaken to update and strengthen the curriculum? What prompted these efforts?
7. Do you think the curriculum addresses contemporary issues?
8. How does the program assist in preparing graduates for employment or additional education opportunities? Does the program have an advisory board comprised of a variety of experts (both LA and non-LA) to provide feedback and direction to the program?

9. Is the advisory board effective in facilitating fundraising efforts for the program? Does the program have other fund raising mechanisms in place?
10. (If not clearly defined in the SER) How do you assess course effectiveness?
11. How do you assess how effective courses are in addressing curriculum goals?
12. How often and by what means (assessment techniques) do you evaluate how well the curriculum is addressing your program mission and goals?
13. How and how often do you assess the overall program mission and goals?
14. How are your assessment/evaluation efforts working? Do you anticipate any revisions? Does the university have resources to help you in these areas?
15. How does the program contribute to the institution's mission?

QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

1. What are the dean's (program director's) expectations for the program? Have these expectations lead to faculty debate? Is this debate healthy or divisive?
2. What is the faculty's role in the objective-setting process?
3. What effect has long-range planning had on important policy decisions, particularly those involving faculty committee considerations? Have the program's objectives influenced these considerations?
4. How were faculty members involved in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report?
5. Are the standards for faculty selection, development, promotion, tenure, salary determination pulling the program in the right direction?
6. Are you pleased with the students attracted to this program?
7. What are your current teaching-research-service interests? What assistance is available in pursuing these professional interests?
8. What is the greatest source of satisfaction in serving on this faculty?

9. Is your long-term professional growth well served by remaining on this faculty?
10. Do you understand the policies and procedures that lead to your next level of advancement and do you have the mentoring and support to do so?
11. Are administrative and support personnel resources generally adequate?
12. What do you think of the current curriculum?
13. Do you think any changes are necessary in the curriculum?
14. Are the computer and library resources satisfactory for your teaching and research interests?
15. How effective is your program's assessment/evaluation process? For courses? For determining how courses support curriculum goals? How curriculum supports program mission and goals?
16. Are you excited about any current innovative efforts in the institution?
17. How successful are graduates in getting seeking employment? Are they satisfied with the types of positions they obtain?
18. Are you satisfied with the physical facilities that house the program?
19. How effective are the adjunct faculty members?
20. How is the program's relationship with other programs?

QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

1. What caused you to select this program and this institution?
2. Would you recommend this program to others?
3. To what extent are students involved in the policy-making decisions of the school? Have good ideas advanced from such student involvement been implemented?
4. Were students involved in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report?
5. How soon after initial enrollment are career and placement counseling opportunities made known to students? Are these services adequate? Is the academic advising adequate?
For graduate students, are professional staff and faculty members available as research advisors?

6. Do you think this program attracts able students?
7. What do you think of the capabilities of other students in the program?
8. If faculty evaluation forms are available to students, have the results of these questionnaires made any difference? If they don't exist, should they?
9. Do you get a sense of the profession from your instructors?
10. Do faculty seem concerned about their teaching performance? Does the program emphasize good teaching?
11. How are faculty research and scholarship introduced into the curriculum?
12. Are course prerequisites enforced?
13. What single learning experience has been most exciting and memorable?
14. Have you been expected to utilize the library resources in your courses? Computer resources?
15. Are the program's handbook, website, and course literature accurate in describing the course content from year to year? Is this material effective in helping you select classes to meet your educational objectives?
16. What are the plusses and minuses of the physical facilities? Are you satisfied with them?
17. How effective are the adjunct faculty members?
18. What is the program's relationship with other programs?
- 19. How effective are the adjunct faculty members?**

Questions for Practitioners and Alumni

Alumni

1. How did the program prepare you for your career in LA?
2. Were you prepared to handle the work expectations upon graduation? 5 years? Now?
3. What sorts of contact do you have with the department, school and college? If any, what have you heard, experienced or gathered?
4. Have you hired any alumni recently? If not, would you recommend hiring a grad?
5. Are you in contact with any of your classmates?
6. What do you see as the program's strengths and weaknesses?
7. If requested, and you were available, would you consider advising, participating in the program and or serving on an Advisory Board?
8. How were faculty research and scholarship introduced into the curriculum?

Practitioners

1. What type of practice do you have?
2. What kind of contact do you have with the program?
3. What do you see as the program's strengths and weaknesses?
4. Have you employed graduates from this program and if so, how are they doing in your office?
5. What is their contribution? Do they meet your expectations?
6. How do they compare with employees who graduated from other schools?

Intern - Practitioners

1. What type of contact did you have with the intern?
2. Do you actively recruit interns from (school) and why?
3. What is their contribution? Do they meet your expectations?
4. How do they compare with employees who graduated from other schools?

Advisory Boards

1. What type of contact did you have with the program?
2. Do you meet frequently, what is the setting and who sets the agenda?
3. Do you find that your input is considered by the program and what sorts of issues do you find most important to it.
4. Does the board review of student work?

EXAMPLE

PART I

OVERALL ANALYSIS

A. Introduction

The Bachelor of Landscape Architecture program resides in the five department College of Design at XXXXX University in xxxxxx. The Department of Landscape Architecture shares the college with the Departments of Architecture, Art + Design, Graphic Design, and Industrial Design.

The Department of Landscape Architecture has two degree programs; the BLA and the MLA. Both programs are approximately the same size at 40 students each. This five year BLA program graduates approximately 10 students per year and there is no pressure from the university or college to increase the program enrollment. At this size the faculty/student ratio for the BLA Program is well within the standard of 15:1.

xxxxxx University is located in a university town in the state's central region. The area attracts industry and associated research and development from around the world. This highly developed area is rich in both cultural and environmental amenities. It also has a significant number of landscape architects who have been enlisted by the department in teaching and in the formal mentoring and advising of students. The department has recently developed excellent relationships with other college departments, the professional community and with the city and state-wide municipalities.

The College of Design has developed a rich interdisciplinary curriculum that is unusually progressive in the mixing of students and faculty with a curriculum that engages all college members with a *First Year Experience* that is truly interdepartmental and a later *Swing Studio* that requires mid-curriculum students to enroll in a studio in another college unit.

The college is led by Dean xxxxxx who has provided strong and enlightened leadership by both building the college infrastructure (excellent facilities and IT equipment and support) and a college leadership team and faculty that irreversibly values cross-disciplinary teaching and learning. In 20xx, Professor xxxxxx was appointed Department Head. Previous issues of program isolation, lack of external interaction and support and curriculum issues have been addressed and corrected. The visiting team commends his tireless and highly effective leadership efforts.

As is the case with all academic programs in this time of budget uncertainties, the future will be difficult but with the university, college and external support, and the able college and departmental leadership, this program should be able to meet the challenges ahead.

All cohorts interviewed and evidence presented suggest that the BLA Program at xxxxx University has met the LAAB Standards and satisfied the two recommendations coming out of the 20XX accreditation report.

The overall evaluation of the present BLA professional program's direction is commendable.

B. Confirmation that Minimum Requirements for Accreditation are Satisfied

1. The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
3. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
4. Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows:
 - a. *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.*
 - b. 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.

Programs	FTE Instructional Faculty	Faculty with Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture	Full Time Faculty
Single Program	3	3	1
Bachelors & Masters	6	5	2

5. The parent institution is accredited by a recognized institutional accrediting agency. [such as recognition by the U.S. Department of Education or Council for Higher Education Accreditation]

6. There is a designated program administrator responsible for the leadership and management functions for the program under review.

Does the program meet the minimum requirements listed above?

The visiting team has seen evidence to show that the BLA program at XXX University meets the minimum requirements.

B. Review of Each Recommendation Affecting Accreditation Identified by the Previous Review in XXX

The Visiting Team made three recommendations as part of the 20xx visit. They are

Recommendation 1

Review the balance of hand graphics and computer technology in design and design implementation courses such that the use of computer technology is more fully integrated into all courses (Standard 3).

Response from the Visiting Team:

After a thorough examination of the revised curriculum, discussions with students, faculty, and the department head, and through a careful review of displayed student work, the visiting team concluded that this recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 2

Expand and solidify the professional practice content on the curriculum (Standard 3).

Through the initiation of a formal Mentorship program which teams a student (both BLA and MLA) with a local practitioner and the professional practice course the team concluded that this recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 3

Provide the L.A. Department with office and studio space that gives the program more visibility and greater access to other departments and the College facilities (Standard 7).

There have been no changes in the program's facilities and the team concluded that this recommendation has not been satisfied. See the rationale following Standard 7.

C. Review of Each Suggestion for Improvement From the Previous Review in XXXX (for programs reviewed after September 1, 2010)

1. Consider adding references to scholarship/research and interdisciplinary programs in its mission statement (Standard 1).

The mission statement has been updated to include references to interdisciplinary programs and research. See Standard 1 for more input on the mission statement.

2. Consider a comprehensive narrative or equivalent of each curriculum sequence to aid faculty as to the context of their course in the curriculum (Standard 3).

The program developed a narrative of each curriculum sequence which has been helpful to students and faculty. See Standard 3 on curriculum for more details.

EXAMPLES

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

Assessment:

_____ Met X Met With Recommendation _____ Not Met

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.

A. Program Mission. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relates to the institution's mission statement?

Team comments: Yes. The program mission statement in the program's 2007 strategic plan focuses primarily on the stewardship and enhancement of the urban environment in an effort to improve the quality of life for the urban populous - principally in the northwestern region of the country. This focus is also articulated in the institution's mission statement and appropriate to the urban environment in which the institution is located.

B. EDUCATIONAL GOALS. Clearly defined and formally stated academic goals reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment: Does the program have an effective procedure to determine progress in meeting its goals and is it used regularly?

Team Comments: Collectively, the faculty reviews the work in each course as a means of evaluating how well each course is addressing the program's goals. Reviews are scheduled for about one third of the curriculum each year. At the reviews, faculty also discusses how general education courses and elective choices support program goals.

C. EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES. The educational objectives specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment: Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives that describe how the goals will be met?

Team Comments: Yes. The objectives describe how the sequence of courses, the focus of specific courses, the relationship between courses during the semester, field trips, study abroad programs and internships work together to achieve the academic goals. In addition, the faculty as a whole annually reviews the objectives to determine if they are appropriate and realistic as a vehicle to achieving program goals.

D. LONG-RANGE PLANNING PROCESS. The program is engaged in a long-range planning process.

Assessment 1: Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process?

Team Comments: The program has been engaged in long-range planning. The strategic plan defines goals and objectives for a five-year period. The goals addressing the curriculum have a set of objectives which are successfully guiding its development. The objectives supporting the goals that address student recruitment and facilities are weak.

Assessment 2: Is the long-range plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

Team Comments: The long-range plan is reviewed annually at a faculty retreat just prior to the start of fall semester. It has been an important and effective guide for curriculum development but less so guiding student recruitment and facilities (individual faculty offices, crit/seminar space and computer technology).

Assessment 3: Does the self-evaluation report (SER) respond to recommendations and suggestions from the previous accreditation review and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

Team Comments: LAAB made four recommendations after the last visit. The SER reported on the progress made to resolve all four. Two of the recommendations (strategic planning and curriculum development) have been resolved. Recommendations about student recruitment and facilities although addressed to some degree, need additional attention.

E. PROGRAM DISCLOSURE. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

Assessment: Is the program information accurate?

Team Comments: All program media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

F. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

1. Clearly articulate the Program's mission; and identify supporting educational objective the attainment of which can be demonstrated.

Suggestions for Improvement:

1. Develop a stronger statement of objectives related to outreach and scholarship and the measures that should be used to evaluate progress towards their attainment.

EXAMPLE**Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration#**

The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.

Assessment:

_____Met _____Met With Recommendation _____Not Met

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.*

A. Program Administration. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program.

Assessment 1: Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Team Comments: Administrators from department heads to the Provost, said the LA program was a discrete and important unit in the college and university. However, the program is a small “program” with less than 50 students, in the much larger Department of Architecture with over 300 students which is the smallest department in the College of Design. The program is not very visible. The only sign on the outside or inside of the building that says Landscape Architecture is in the listing of programs on the Department of Architecture’s office door. In addition, LA students do not have their own studio space. They are in architecture studio space. LA faculty and students don’t see themselves as being a very discrete unit in the department or college.

Assessment 2: Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture?

Team Comments: The program administrator has a faculty appointment in landscape architecture.

Assessment 3: Does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program?

Team Comments: The department head has the authority and responsibility to lead and manage the department. The department head reports directly to the dean of the college and participates, along with other department heads, in discussions on resource allocations and management of the college.

B. Institutional Support. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15:1?

Team Comments: At the present time, student/faculty ratios are 11:1; down from the 18:1 that the program has historically had. While the lower ratios have their positive side, there was concern expressed by the department head and the dean that a continued decline in enrollment may well lead to a loss of resources.

Assessment 2: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Team Comments: Funding for faculty development is available but it's limited. All requests for supported travel have to be made to the provost's office. The university's first priority is to fund travel associated with gaining funded research grants. Second is funding for untenured faculty to present (not just attend) at conferences. Funds for computers, software and other technical support are available. Students pay a per credit hour fee to the university and the college to support technology.

Assessment 3: Is funding adequate for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc?

Team Comments: Funding for scholarships has historically been adequate. Normally, the program has about 30 scholarships to award among its 100 students. Funds for these scholarships come from the department endowment, the college, and university and off-campus organizations like the garden club. However, the recent turn-down in the economy has reduced this number and last year, the department awarded 13 scholarships. The department has five work-study positions.

Assessment 4: Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

Team Comments: The department has adequate support personal. It has two support staff members whose responsibilities center on ("herding cats") student course advising, receiving and managing applications and assisting the department head with clerical tasks. The college provides computer support and some assistance with accounting.

C. Commitment to Diversity. The program demonstrates commitment to diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment: How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

Team Comments: While the department has achieved gender balance of students and faculty, recruitment of minority students and faculty has been largely unsuccessful. There are no minority faculty members and of the 120 students, two are African-American, two are Hispanic, one is Asian and one is from India. The department advertises each faculty position in all LA and related professional media

and request alumni, friends at other universities and practitioners nominate candidates, especially minority candidates for positions.

D. Faculty Participation. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Team Comments: Faculty discusses and makes recommendations on the allocation of resources but the principle responsibility lies with the department head. Faculty also have input on some of the operating practices of the department and a significant role evaluating and modifying the curriculum.

Assessment 2: Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation, promotion and tenure of faculty?

Team Comments: The department's criteria for annual evaluation have been "on the books" for many years and faculty have participated in making minor adjustments to it. The promotion and tenure guidelines went through a major revision two years ago. A faculty committee was responsible for the revisions which were then approved by the faculty. The need for the revision was triggered by a university requirement to add a post-tenure review process.

Assessment 3: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and for tenure and promotion to all ranks?

Team Comments: The department does not have a formal mentor program. Some untenured faculty admitted they didn't know what the expectations for gaining tenure were and said the department head hadn't discussed it with them. They also seemed a bit uncomfortable when the visiting team seemed to know more about the expectations than they did. The policies and procedures are clearly spelled out in the department, college and university faculty handbooks and on line.

E. Faculty Number. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program’s goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in research, creative activity and scholarship and to be actively involved in professional endeavors such as presenting at conferences. To address this criterion:

1. a unit that offers a first professional program should have a minimum of five fulltime faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture; and
2. an academic unit that offers a first professional degree at both bachelor’s and master’s levels should have a minimum of seven fulltime faculty, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture.¹

Assessment 1: Does an academic unit that offers a first professional program have a minimum of five fulltime faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?

Team Comments: Yes; three professors, two associate professors and four assistant professors all with at least one degree in landscape architecture and five are licensed.

Assessment 2: Does an academic unit that offers first professional programs at both bachelor’s and master’s levels, have a minimum of seven fulltime faculty, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture?

Team Comments: Yes; two professors, two associate professors, four assistant professors and three adjunct professors. All faculty except one associate and one adjunct professor have at least one degree in landscape architecture and five are licensed landscape architects and one is a licensed architect.

¹ This criterion does not conflict with the numbers listed in the Minimum Requirements for Achieving and Maintaining Accredited Status (p. 5). Those numbers are minimums and are expected for emerging programs and programs that are becoming established to enroll a small number of students.

Assessment 3: Does the strategic plan or long range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number of faculty?

Team Comments: The strategic plan does not adequately address the number or expertise of faculty needed for the new and emerging Master's Program as envisioned by the department.

Assessment 4: Are the number of faculty adequate to achieve the program's mission and goals and individual faculty development?

Team Comments: The program has adequate faculty to appropriately address all of its responsibilities.

F. OTHER RELEVANT ASSESSMENTS. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

Recommendation affecting accreditation:

The published requirements in item (2) Scholarship of 3.3.2 Tenure Guidelines and Procedures of the School of Architecture should be examined and potentially revised to reflect the expectations in keeping with the scholarship mission of the university. Increased clarity is imperative for the consistent interpretation of scholarly expectations for promotion and tenure at all levels of review.

Suggestions for Improvement:

1. Develop a Memorandum of Understanding, comparable to that developed for the Community Planning Program (also located in the School of Architecture) to ensure that the necessary authority of the Program Administrator and faculty be formally recognized.

Examples of Appropriate Recommendations Affecting Accreditation:

Arrange the curriculum with greater flexibility and less conflict in order to meet both major objectives of the MLA curriculum; providing "basic competency in the fundamental aspects of design and technology," and "advanced study in an area of concentration."

A specific plan for the full use and maintenance of computer technology for faculty and students should be developed and implemented.

Integrate the use of computers into the curriculum.

Develop a clear set of measurable objectives for the program which are linked to the curriculum.

Improve balance between theory and practice within the curriculum.

Examples of Inappropriate Recommendations Affecting Accreditation

Add a GIS course to ensure all students have knowledge of GIS.

Hire two additional landscape architecture faculty to reduce student/faculty ratios in studios.

Increase funds allocated to program for purchase of computer hardware and software.

Change the administrative structure to make landscape architecture a separate department.

Require all students to participate in a study abroad program.

Convert the program from a four year to five year program.

Team Member Misconduct

Conduct

LAAB expects all visiting team members to act as professionals. Visiting team members must refrain from engaging in any conduct which might be deemed unprofessional or inappropriate. For example, no team member should make any statement or engage in any activity which might offend the reasonable sensibilities of representatives of the program. Conduct which will not be tolerated under any circumstances includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Comments that might be construed as showing disrespect for the program, its representatives or the sponsoring institution.
- Comments or actions that may be otherwise inappropriate for workplace settings, such as:
 - Offensive or demeaning terms of a sexual, racial, ethnic, or similar nature;
 - Unwelcome suggestions regarding, or invitations to, social engagements or work-related social events.
 - The deliberate or careless creation of an atmosphere of sexual harassment or personal intimidation; or
 - The deliberate or careless expression of jokes or remarks of a sexual, racial, ethnic, or similar nature to or in the presence of individuals who may find such jokes or remarks offensive.

Any team member who fails to act in a professional and respectful manner at all times may be dismissed immediately from the team by the team chair.

Appendix A**TEAM CHAIR VISIT CHECK LIST****BEFORE VISIT**

1. ___ Make travel arrangements and notify program.
2. ___ Review Self-Evaluation Report (should arrive about 45 days before visit.) Expect to be contacted by LAAB Principal Reader
3. ___ Contact other team members, discuss assignments.
4. ___ Discuss schedule with program.
5. ___ Review Accreditation Standards and Procedures and Visiting Team Guidelines.
6. ___ Exchange home phone numbers with team members, program head and accreditation manager to be used in case of emergency.

DURING VISIT

1. ___ Introduction and orientation session with the team, review SER and other materials.
2. ___ Review team member responsibilities and potential interview questions.
3. ___ Complete and sign Recommendation Form.

AFTER VISIT

1. ___ Complete team report within 10 days.
2. ___ Send copies of report to team members and accreditation manager.
3. ___ Submit expense voucher to LAAB

Appendix B

ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION TO THE
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITATION BOARD

Date of Visit _____

Institution _____

Degree Title _____

Visiting Team Recommendation

- _____ Initial Accreditation
- _____ Accreditation
- _____ Provisional Accreditation
- _____ Accreditation Denial.

Signatures:

Accreditation

Granted when all standards are met or when one or more standards are met with recommendation, and continued overall program quality and conformance to standards are judged likely to be maintained.

Accreditation may be granted up to six (6) years.

A program receiving accreditation may be required to submit special progress reports at the discretion of LAAB.

Provisional Accreditation

Granted when one or more standards are met with recommendation and the cited deficiencies are such that continued overall program quality or conformance to standards is uncertain. Provisional accreditation may be granted up to two (2) years. This status shall not be granted more than twice without an intervening period of accreditation. Provisional status is not deemed to be an adverse action and is not subject to be appealed.

Initial Accreditation

Granted on a first review when all standards are at least minimally met and the program's continued development and conformance to the accreditation standards is likely. Initial accreditation may be granted for up to six (6) years. Programs receiving initial accreditation must submit a special progress report after two or three years (time determined by LAAB). LAAB will review the progress report to determine if an accreditation review should be scheduled immediately or as originally scheduled when initial accreditation was granted.

Accreditation Denial

This status results when one or more standards are not met. This determination is subject to appeal.

Appendix C

**LAAB ACCREDITATION VISIT
EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT VOUCHER**

Please type or print clearly. This information is needed to process your reimbursement.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS**:

** Please indicate if this is a new address: ____ yes ____ no

PROGRAM VISITED: _____

DATE OF VISIT: _____

REIMBURSEMENT REQUEST

Transportation: _____

Airfare: _____

Local Costs: _____

Lodging: _____

Meals: _____

Other: _____

TOTAL REIMBURSEMENT: _____

Signature: _____

**Return this voucher with all receipts to: Accreditation Manager, American Society of
Landscape Architects, 636 Eye Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001-3736**



Agenda Item O

UPDATE AND PROCESS CLARIFICATION OF EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

The 2005 Strategic Plan directs the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) to create a standard format for preparing the University of California, Extension Certificate Program reports. California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, sets forth the requirements for approved extension certificate programs in landscape architecture.

The programs are reviewed every five years for compliance with accreditation standards set forth by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). LAAB's mission is to evaluate, advocate for, and advance the quality of education in landscape architectural programs.

A timeline of the 2006 site visits is attached for the LATC's review of the process followed. Team leaders for the University of California Berkeley and University of California Los Angeles Extension Certificate Programs, Christine Anderson and Linda Gates, will provide an update of reviews conducted on October 4-6, and October 25-27, 2006. The final reports will be presented at the next LATC meeting for review and approval.

Background

In March 2000, the LATC sent a formal letter to the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) recommending that the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) consider developing and administering a uniform national evaluation and approval process for landscape architects extension certificate programs.

On July 27, 2005, LATC staff contacted Ron Leighton, ASLA Education Director, regarding the above request. Mr. Leighton indicated that the LAAB had briefly discussed making certificate programs eligible to apply for accreditation. However, one hindrance is that certificate programs exist only in California. Mr. Leighton stated that reviewing certificate programs is an item for LAAB discussion; however, it will probably not be a major topic for another year or two based on LAAB's heavy agenda in 2005-06. He also indicated that he believed the next discussion would take place at the next review of standards and procedures, which was to take place during the Fall of the 2006-07 academic year. Ideally, LAAB would solicit proposed changes to the accreditation standards by March 2007 with the goal of implementing changes by January 1, 2008.

At the August 2005 LATC meeting, Sandra Gonzalez (former LATC chair, past President of the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards, and member of the 2001 Site Visiting Team for the UCB Extension Certificate Program), provided a summary of the site team visit process and discussed her recommendations regarding the report format, process, and guidelines for conducting a site visit.

During the meeting, the LATC reviewed: 1) the Self Evaluation Report (SER) Format which was used during the 2001 site visit and sent to the programs for use in preparing the 2001 SER, 2) the Visiting Team Guidelines Draft to be used by the Site Visiting Teams, and 3) the Executive Summary Report that was produced in 2001 as a result of the Site Visit to UCLA.

Staff was directed to make changes as discussed and the corrections were presented to the LATC and approved during the January 2006 meeting for use at the 2006 Site Visits.

2006 SITE VISIT ACTIVITIES

SELF EVALUATION REPORTS

3/27/2006	Self Evaluation Report (SER) format sent to Extension Certificate Programs (UCLA and UCB)
9/1/2006	SER's due from Programs (UCLA requested extension of time)
9/1/2006	Received UCB's SER including Agenda
9/11/2006	Sent UCB's SER and Agenda to Team Members
9/27/2006	Received UCLA's SER including Agenda
10/11/2006	Sent UCLA's SER and Agenda to Team Members

SELECTION OF TEAM MEMBERS

4/10/2006	Notice sent to LATC (current and past) Members with synopsis and request for volunteers
4/10/2006	Email Request for Volunteers from 2001 survey which included overview of project and volunteer parameters
various	Received Notices of Interest from Volunteers
4/12/2006	Sent project detail to volunteers expressing an interest and request resume/bio
5/9/2006	LATC appoints volunteers LATC meeting
6/2/2006	Volunteers notified they were appointed and additional information would be forthcoming
6/2/2006	Volunteers notified they were not appointed

TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS

8/11/2006	Flight Reservations
8/30/2006	Hotel Reservations - also initiated exception to State travel policy (lodging for less than 50 miles) request for DCA Director approval

PRE SITE VISIT ARRANGEMENTS AND MATERIALS

8/9/2006	Materials sent to Site Team: 1) List of Contacts 2) Volunteer Service Agreement 3) Travel Expense Claim 4) 2001 Site Visit Reports 5) 2006 Visiting Team Guidelines 6) 2006 Visiting Team Checklist
----------	---

9/11/2006	UCB SER and Agenda to Team Members
-----------	------------------------------------

10/11/2006	UCLA SER and Agenda to Team Members
------------	-------------------------------------

BILLING

9/26/2006	Sent Request for Invoice to DCA's Cashiering unit (\$600 in accordance with BP Section 5650 and 5681(h))
-----------	--

SITE VISITS

10/4-6/2006	UCB Site Visit
-------------	----------------

10/24/2006	UCLA Welcome Reception
------------	------------------------

10/25-27/2006	UCLA Site Visit
---------------	-----------------

11/6/2006	Report due from the UCB Site Visit Team
-----------	---

11/27/2006	UCLA report due from Site Visit due to LATC
------------	---

POST SITE VISITS

January 2007 LATC meeting	Site Visit Report and Recommendation presented to the Committee during the first meeting following the site visit report submitted to the LATC. The Committee will vote to approve or reject the site visit teams' recommendations on the Extension Certificate Programs
------------------------------	--

Within 30 days after meeting	Send Notice of Approval or Non-Compliance to programs along with Summary Report of Program
---------------------------------	--

Within 30 days after notice	If applicable, Program of Non-Compliance submit an action plan to bring program into compliance.
--------------------------------	--



Attachment E.5
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

March 27, 2006

Heather Clendenin, Director
University of California, Berkeley Extension Certificate Program
Landscape Architecture Program
1995 University Avenue
Berkeley CA 94702-7002

Dear Ms. Clendenin:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) intends to review the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) Extension Certificate Program in Landscape Architecture for compliance with California Code of Regulations section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, which specifies the requirements for approved extension certificate programs in landscape architecture.

At present, California is the only state with extension certificate programs in landscape architecture. The University of California Extension Certificate Programs are reviewed every five years for compliance with standards developed by the LATC based on the standards used by the national Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board. The last review and approval of the two existing extension certificate programs occurred in 2001.

Enclosed is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) to be completed for your program and submitted to the LATC no later than September 1, 2006. At the time of submittal, your program will be invoiced a \$600 application fee for review of the UCB Extension Certificate Program.

The LATC will select a visiting team to review the SER and conduct a site visit for the current review cycle which will take place over three (3) days around October 2006 with an anticipated completion by December 31, 2006. The site visit itinerary is established by the host program and forwarded to the LATC along with the SER. In addition, we ask that the host program provide a list of hotels in the area. The LATC will make travel and lodging accommodations for the site visit team members and is responsible for travel, lodging and meal reimbursement for the site visit team members.

The essential components of the itinerary include, but are not limited to the following:

- Orientation to the program by the director/head
 - Background
 - Curriculum overview
 - Program strengths
 - Program concerns
 - Orientation to administrative operating context

2420 Del Paso Road ♦ Suite 105 ♦ Sacramento, CA 95834

T 916.575.7230 ♦ F 916.575.7285

latc@dca.ca.gov ♦ www.latc.ca.gov

- Discussion/Interviews with instructional personnel
Opportunity for team interaction with instructional personnel
- Discussion/Interaction/Interviews with students
Opportunity for students to discuss program strengths and suggestions for improvement from the students' perspective
- Tour of instructional areas and relevant campus support facilities
Examples of teaching spaces, equipment and support available to meet instructional mission
- Review recent samples of student project assignments – comprehensive curricular example set
Outcomes based review – comparisons with course syllabi in the following areas
History, art and communication
Natural, cultural and social systems
Design as a process in shaping the environment
Plant material and its application
Construction materials and techniques
Professional practice methods
Professional ethics and values
Computer systems and advanced technology
- Team visits to in-session classes
Direct observation of instructional methodologies
- Discussion/Interaction/Interviews with alumni and practitioners familiar with the program
Preparation for licensure and career
Opportunities for continued involvement with the program
- Interviews with appropriate administrative hierarchy
Administrative view of the program including such areas as funding stability, growth potential, relationships with other programs, degree of autonomy, etc.
- Wrap-up session with program director/head/instructional personnel

Additional components you feel are essential may be included.

Should you have questions as you complete the report, please contact me at (916) 575-7231 or by e-mail to Mary_Ann_Aguayo@dca.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Aguayo
Program Manager

Enclosure



Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

March 27, 2006

Alexis Slafer, Director
University of California, Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program
Landscape Architecture Program
414 UNEX
Los Angeles CA 90024

Dear Ms. Slafer:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) intends to review the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Program in Landscape Architecture for compliance with California Code of Regulations section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, which specifies the requirements for approved extension certificate programs in landscape architecture.

At present, California is the only state with extension certificate programs in landscape architecture. The University of California Extension Certificate Programs are reviewed every five years for compliance with standards developed by the LATC based on the standards used by the national Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board. The last review and approval of the two existing extension certificate programs occurred in 2001.

Enclosed is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) to be completed for your program and submitted to the LATC no later than September 1, 2006. At the time of submittal, your program will be invoiced a \$600 application fee for review of the UCLA Extension Certificate Program.

The LATC will select a visiting team to review the SER and conduct a site visit for the current review cycle which will take place over three (3) days around October 2006 with an anticipated completion by December 31, 2006. The site visit itinerary is established by the host program and forwarded to the LATC along with the SER. In addition, we ask that the host program provide a list of hotels in the area. The LATC will make travel and lodging accommodations for the site visit team members and is responsible for travel, lodging and meal reimbursement for the site visit team members.

The essential components of the itinerary include, but are not limited to the following:

- Orientation to the program by the director/head
 - Background
 - Curriculum overview
 - Program strengths
 - Program concerns
 - Orientation to administrative operating context

- Discussion/Interviews with instructional personnel
Opportunity for team interaction with instructional personnel
- Discussion/Interaction/Interviews with students
Opportunity for students to discuss program strengths and suggestions for improvement from the students' perspective
- Tour of instructional areas and relevant campus support facilities
Examples of teaching spaces, equipment and support available to meet instructional mission
- Review recent samples of student project assignments – comprehensive curricular example set
Outcomes based review – comparisons with course syllabi in the following areas
History, art and communication
Natural, cultural and social systems
Design as a process in shaping the environment
Plant material and its application
Construction materials and techniques
Professional practice methods
Professional ethics and values
Computer systems and advanced technology
- Team visits to in-session classes
Direct observation of instructional methodologies
- Discussion/Interaction/Interviews with alumni and practitioners familiar with the program
Preparation for licensure and career
Opportunities for continued involvement with the program
- Interviews with appropriate administrative hierarchy
Administrative view of the program including such areas as funding stability, growth potential, relationships with other programs, degree of autonomy, etc.
- Wrap-up session with program director/head/instructional personnel

Additional components you feel are essential may be included.

Should you have questions as you complete the report, please contact me at (916) 575-7231 or by e-mail to Mary_Ann_Aguayo@dca.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Aguayo
Program Manager

Enclosure



Agenda Item F

REVIEW AND APPROVE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM PLAN OF ACTION AND TIMELINE TO CORRECT UNMET STANDARD

The 2005 Strategic Plan directed the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) to create a standard format for preparing the University of California, Extension Certificate Program reports. California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, sets forth the requirements for approved extension certificate programs in landscape architecture.

The Extension Programs are reviewed every five years for compliance with accreditation standards set forth by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). LAAB's mission is to evaluate, advocate for, and advance the quality of education in landscape architectural programs.

LAAB Summary

In March 2000, the LATC sent a formal letter to the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) recommending that the LAAB consider developing and administering a uniform national evaluation and approval process for landscape architects extension certificate programs.

On July 27, 2005, LATC staff contacted Ron Leighton, ASLA Education Director, regarding the above request. Mr. Leighton indicated that the LAAB had briefly discussed making certificate programs eligible to apply for accreditation. However, one hindrance is that certificate programs exist only in California. Mr. Leighton stated that reviewing certificate programs is an item for LAAB discussion; however, it would probably not be a major topic for another year or two based on LAAB's heavy agenda in 2005-06. He also indicated that he anticipated the next discussion would take place at the next review of standards and procedures Fall of the 2006-07 academic year.

In December 2006, LAAB sent a survey of open-ended questions on accreditation and the scope of accreditation to each state licensure board through Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) newsletter. LAAB discussed the survey results during their January 2007 meeting and anticipated preparing a document of potential changes for comments to the entire community of interest by the end of April 2007. Mr. Leighton indicated the next step is conducting two or three focus groups on the

accreditation standards and process. Their role would be to further refine the information from the survey and work on the plans for revising accreditation standards and the possibility of changing the scope of accreditation will be part of those discussions. In addition, to potentially revising the scope to include certificate programs, LAAB is considering accrediting advanced programs and possibly reviewing programs internationally.

February 2007, staff sent a letter to the LAAB indicating an interest in participating in the focus groups. On March 1, 2007 the LAAB provided the LATC with the survey results titled *2006 ASLA LAAB Study Executive Summary*. In addition, Mr. Leighton indicated that the survey is not a representative sample of any particular group and that LAAB was looking for some feedback from some of those interested in accreditation. Mr. Leighton responded indicating the development of focus groups and that they would keep the LATC's interest in mind. The LAAB is next scheduled to meet on July 20 and 21, 2007.

Extension Review Summary

At the August 2005 LATC meeting, Sandra Gonzalez (former LATC chair, past CLARB President, and member of the 2001 Site Visiting Team for the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) Extension Certificate Program, provided a summary of the site team visit process and discussed her recommendations regarding the report format, process, and guidelines for conducting a site visit.

During the meeting, the LATC reviewed the: 1) Self Evaluation Report (SER) Format which was used during the 2001 site visit and sent it to the programs for use in preparing the 2001 SER, 2) Visiting Team Guidelines Draft to be used by the Site Visiting Teams, and 3) Executive Summary Report that was produced in 2001 as a result of the Site Visit to University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Program.

Staff was directed to make changes as discussed and the corrections were presented to the LATC and approved during the January 2006 meeting for use at the 2006 Site Visits.

In March 2006, the SER was sent to the UCB Extension Certificate Program. The Extension Program submitted its Evaluation Report in September 2006.

Three members (one LATC member and two volunteers) for the site team were appointed at the May 9, 2006 LATC meeting. The UCB Site Visit was held on October 4-6, 2006. The team report was submitted to the LATC in December 2006. The draft team report was sent to the Extension Program on December 22, 2006 for review and comment. In addition, a post review meeting was held with the LATC team leader on January 5, 2007 to recap the review process and to further improve the process for the 2011 reviews. Comments from the UCB Extension Program and the draft report were presented to the LATC for a January 16, 2007 teleconference meeting. The LATC reviewed and discussed the comments and the Site Visit Team Leader Christine Anderson opted to incorporate clarification and address concerns into the final reports.

At the February 7, 2007 LATC meeting, the final report incorporating changes was presented and it was noted that the UCB Extension Certificate Program report did not include a Summary of Findings. The LATC discussed the appropriate course of action to remedy this issues and an appropriate timeline for the UCB Extension Certificate Program to respond to the LATC's concern of non-compliance.

On February 14, 2007, a Notice of Non-Compliance and the final report was mailed to UCB indicating an 18-month conditional approval with a stipulation that a plan of action be submitted to the LATC by March 19, 2007. The plan should include a time line for complying with the regulatory requirements specifically addressing the standard not met:

The number of instructional personnel is adequate to achieve the program's mission and objectives. The program has adequate personnel and support staff to accomplish the program's mission and objectives.

The timeline must extend no further than 18 months and a report of correction shall be submitted to the LATC no later than August 18, 2008. The report shall indicate corrective actions taken by the Program and will be reviewed by the LATC to approve the Program or rescind the conditional approval. The Extension Program was granted an extension until March 30, 2007 to submit the plan of action. On March 29, 2007, the LATC received an Action Plan in Response to the Notice of Non-Compliance. In addition, Heather Clendenin, UCB Program Director, provided the following estimates: with the closure of the Garden Design Program there would be approximately 10% of Ms. Clendenin's time and 10% of the Program Assistant's time made available within their existing 50% positions to the administration of the Landscape Architecture program. In addition, a 25% work study position hired on an as needed basis would bring the total percentage of proposed program support to: Program Director: 50%

Program Assistance: 50% +15% =65% (+25% for specific projects =90%)

At the May 4, 2007 LATC meeting, the UCB Extension Program presented their response to the LATC's request for a plan of action. Ms. Clendenin spoke about UCB's proposed increase in staff time devoted to the extension certificate program and a planned market survey to address future program challenges. The LATC approved the Extension Program's presented proposal to increase staff and administrative personnel time and directed UCB to submit the completed plan of action and timeline for accomplishing its stated goals. The LATC will further need to approve a report of correction by UCB within the 18-month conditional approval period.

Requested Action

At today's meeting the LATC is asked to review and approve UCB Extension Certificate Program plan of action and timeline to correct the unmet standard.

Attachments

The plan of action and timeline will be provided at the meeting by UCB.

July 16, 2007

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

Dear Members of the LATC:

This letter will provide a timeline for actions planned and/or accomplished by UC Berkeley Extension toward compliance with California Code of Regulations, Section 2620.5, (f) and (h) as detailed in the LATC Site Visit Report, standard 2, pages 8-9.

The recommendations as stated in the Site Visit Team Final Report are as follows:

Recommendation:

- **The Extension program requires a full time administrator and dedicated staff personnel assigned to career counseling and placement; tracking and maintenance of alumni; distribution of materials; deal with day-to-day student issues; address needs of prospective students; develop and maintain an interactive, dedicated website; create student and alumni database system; build continuity within the program; and build relationships with instructors, students and administrators.**

Response:

Actions already taken to increase the administrative staff time assigned to the Landscape Architecture Certificate Program include the reassignment of job duties of the Program Assistant II which provides a minimum of 15% FTE additional support to the landscape architecture program. This change took effect *as of November 2006*.

We plan to hire a work-study position at 50% to provide additional support to the Landscape Architecture Certificate Program *as of August 2007*.

The Garden Design Certificate Program, which had been administered by Heather Clendenin, was discontinued in *March 2007*. With the closure of this program, the assigned time of the Program Director and Program Assistant positions will be fully dedicated to the administration and support the Landscape Architecture Certificate Program. With this change, approximately 10% FTE of the Program Director position and 10% FTE of the Program Assistant III position will be made available to the Landscape Architecture Certificate Program. The phase-out of the Garden Design Certificate Program will be complete *as of June 2008*.

The Professional Sequence in Sustainable Environmental Design and Stewardship, which had formerly been administered through the landscape architecture portfolio, is now managed by the

new Program Director for Sustainable Design. Beginning *April 2007*, this change has supported the landscape architecture program by providing oversight for the professional sequence as well as research and development of new courses in sustainable environmental design.

We expect that these actions will provide the staffing support required to effectively address the following LATC recommendations:

...career counseling and placement;

This function has been largely handled by the program director and by individual instructors on an as-needed basis or by appointment. In an effort to enhance the career counseling and placement opportunities for our students, we are currently researching resources available through the Career Center at UC Berkeley. The Career Center offers career counseling, peer advising, career fairs, and job search tools for students entering the professional arena.

...tracking and maintenance of alumni;

The program currently maintains contact information for approximately 250 alumni in a database created in preparation for the 2006 site visit. The program assistants will update this database with contact information for new alumni each semester. Extra staffing provided by the work study position will be utilized to conduct an annual survey of past alumni. The information gathered will be analyzed by the Program Director to track alumni career paths and create connections that enhance career networking opportunities for new alumni. This may include annual alumni events organized to encourage better communication and exchange of information. Annual alumni surveys will begin *as of January 2008*.

...distribution of materials;

The distribution of materials is currently addressed within the scope of job duties assigned to the program assistants. Additional assistance will be provided by the work-study assistant on an as-needed basis.

...deal with day-to-day student issues;

Dealing with day-to-day student issues is currently addressed within the scope of job duties assigned to the Program Director and program assistants. Additional training will be provided on an ongoing basis to the program assistants to improve their ability to respond quickly to student needs.

...address needs of prospective students;

Addressing the needs of prospective students is currently addressed within the scope of job duties assigned to the Program Director and program assistants. Additional training will be provided on an ongoing basis to the program assistants to improve their ability to respond quickly to student needs. Also, additional information useful to prospective students will be made available on the UC Berkeley Extension website *as of October 2007*.

...develop and maintain an interactive, dedicated website;

This is currently being addressed by the Catalog and Marketing Services department at UC Berkeley Extension. A project is currently underway to make the Landscape Architecture

Certificate program guide available online and to expand program specific information on the institutional website *as of October 2007*.

In addition to the institutional website, many instructors have created unique websites for their courses which has proven popular and valuable in terms of sharing information and ideas. The student chapter of the ASLA currently maintains a website and it is used as a key communication tool amongst the students.

...create student and alumni database system;

The creation of a certificate student database will be supervised by the Program Director with support from the program assistant and work-study staff and completed *as of November 2007*. Updates to the existing alumni database will be complete *as of December 2007*.

...build continuity within the program; and build relationships with instructors, students and administrators.

Until a new Program Director has been hired, the Acting Dean and the Director of the Department of Art and Design will work to maintain continuity and build relationships with instructors, students, advisory committee members and campus colleagues. Regular communication with instructors, students and advisory committee members will be a critical priority for the new Program Director.

- **The Extension program should include a full time person for students to call for assistance and to assist in the coordination of staff and required staff resources.**

The Program Assistant III and the Program Assistant II providing support to the Landscape Architecture Certificate Program are both full-time employees. The program assistants are available Monday through Friday between 8am and 6pm to assist landscape architecture students and instructors. In addition, Customer Service Associates are available on-site to assist instructors and students year-round between 9am and 10pm Monday through Thursday and 9am to 5pm on Friday and Saturday.

- **The Extension program administrator should be full time in addition to school hours (cover normal 8-5 work week in addition to night school hours).**

Program staff are available during regular office hours from 8am until 6pm. The Program Director/Interim Director will also be available for additional evening office hours *as of September 2007*.

- **The Extension program should include standard staff to student, staff to instructor, and instructor to student ratios concurrent with similar degree programs requiring equivalent units of study.**

Staff members providing support to the Landscape Architecture Certificate Program include:

Program Director for Landscape Architecture (vacant – during interim, Anastasia Meadors)
 Program Director for Sustainable Design (Michael Sammett)
 Program Assistant III (Erica Thomas)
 Program Assistant II (Emad Jaghab)
 Office Manager (Brett O'Hara)

Included below is a timeline of actions taken and/or planned toward compliance with the LATC recommendations described above.

We are committed to continually improving and refining the integral quality of this unique and invaluable program of study and trust that this plan of action and timeline will meet with your approval.

Sincerely,

Diana Wu
Acting Dean

Anastasia Meadors
Director, Department of Art and Design

ACTION TIMELINE

Reallocate job duties of Program Assistant II to support landscape architecture program	November 2006
Discontinue Garden Design Certificate Program	March 2007
Hire 25% FTE Program Manager to support sustainable design programs	April 2007
Research career counseling and placement resources available through the UC Berkeley Career Center	July 2007
Hire 50% Work-Study position	August 2007
Schedule evening office hours	September 2007
Expanded program specific information available on institutional website	October 2007
Create certificate student database	November 2007
Update alumni database	December 2007
Distribute alumni surveys	January 2008
Complete phase-out of Garden Design Certificate Program	June 2008
Submit progress report to LATC	August 2008



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

February 14, 2007

Alexis Slafer, Director
University of California, Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program
Landscape Architecture Program
414 UNEX
Los Angeles CA 90024

Dear Ms. Slafer:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) has completed its review of the University of California, Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program in Landscape Architecture, and finds the program to be in compliance with Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 2620.5. Therefore, at its meeting on February 7, 2007, the LATC approved the program for a period of five years. The next review will occur in 2011.

Attached is the final Site Visit Team Report for your records.

On behalf of the LATC, thank you for your enthusiasm and dedication to the profession of landscape architecture.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Aguayo
LATC Program Manager

Enclosure



Arnold Schwarzenegger
GOVERNOR

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

February 14, 2007

Heather Clendenin, Program Director
University of California Berkeley, Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program
95 Third Street
San Francisco CA 94103

RE: Notice of Non-Compliance

Dear Ms. Clendenin:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) has completed its review of the University of California, Berkeley (UCB), Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program and notes there are certain areas where the program is out of compliance with Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) 2620.5 requirements. Specifically, the program is not in compliance with CCR section 2620.5, (f) and (h). Standards not met are identified in the enclosed December 2006 Site Visit Team Report, Section 2, second standard on pages eight and nine.

The LATC has granted an 18 month conditional approval of the UCB Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program with the stipulation that a plan of action be submitted to the LATC by March 19, 2007. This plan shall include a time line for complying with the regulatory requirements, specifically addressing the standard not met. The time line must extend no further than 18 months and a report of correction shall be submitted to the LATC no later than August 18, 2008. The report shall indicate corrective action(s) taken by the Program and will be reviewed by the LATC to approve the Program or rescind the conditional approval.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 575-7231.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Aguayo
LATC Program Manager

Enclosure



August 12, 2010

UCB Extension Certificate Program
JC Miller, Program Director
95 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) has determined that the certification review of the University of California at Berkeley, Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program will be postponed until 2012.

In March of this year, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) posted newly revised accreditation standards. Based on these changes, the LATC voted to update their own regulations governing UC Extension Program certification. In order to implement any regulation changes, the LATC would need up to 18 months time to allow for the legislative processes. Hence, it is anticipated that the certification of the landscape architecture extension program should be postponed until the new regulations have become effective.

Your current certification is now valid until the 2012 certification review is completed.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (916) 575-7231.

Sincerely,

Trish Rodriguez
Program Manager



August 12, 2010

UCLA Extension Certificate Program
Stephanie Landregan, Program Director
10995 Le Conte Ave, Ste 414
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1333

Dear Ms. Landregan:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) has determined that the certification review of the University of California at Los Angeles, Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program will be postponed until 2012.

In March of this year, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) posted newly revised accreditation standards. Based on these changes, the LATC voted to update their own regulations governing UC Extension Program certification. In order to implement any regulation changes, the LATC would need up to 18 months time to allow for the legislative processes. Hence, it is anticipated that the certification of the landscape architecture extension program should be postponed until the new regulations have become effective.

Your current certification is now valid until the 2012 certification review is completed.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (916) 575-7231.

Sincerely,

Trish Rodriguez
Program Manager



January 6, 2012

University of California, Berkeley
Extension Certificate Program
JC Miller, Program Director
95 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) has extended the certification approval of the University of California at Berkeley, Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program through December 2013. The extension is due in part to pending regulation updates to California Code of Regulations (CCR) 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certification Program. In order to allow sufficient time for the regulation review and approval process, an extension for the current University of California certification will be provided through December 2013.

In March 2010, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board posted newly revised accreditation standards. Based on these changes, the LATC voted to update their own regulations governing the University of California Extension Program certification. The regulation package for CCR 2620.5 contains recent changes which will be the basis for the next certification review.

The last review of the extension program at UC Berkeley was October 4 – 6, 2006. At this time the LATC is requesting a voluntary update of UC Berkeley's certificate program to be provided by March 30, 2012.

Your current certification has been extended until December 31, 2013. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 575-7231.

Sincerely,

Trish Rodriguez
Program Manager



Governor
Edmund G. Brown Jr.

January 6, 2012

University of California, Los Angeles
Extension Certificate Program
Stephanie Landregan, Program Director
10995 Le Conte Ave, Ste. 414
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1333

Dear Ms. Landregan:

The Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) has extended the certification approval of the University of California, Los Angeles, (UCLA) Landscape Architecture Extension Certificate Program through December 2013. The extension is due in part to pending regulation updates to California Code of Regulations (CCR) 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certification Program. In order to allow sufficient time for the regulation review and approval process, an extension for the current University of California certification will be provided through December 2013.

In March 2010, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board posted newly revised accreditation standards. Based on these changes, the LATC voted to update their own regulations governing the University of California Extension Program certification. The regulation package for CCR 2620.5 contains recent changes which will be the basis for the next certification review.

The last review of the extension program at UCLA was October 25 – 27, 2006. At this time the LATC is requesting a voluntary update of UCLA's certificate program to be provided by March 30, 2012.

Your current certification has been extended until December 31, 2013. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 575-7231.

Sincerely,


Trish Rodriguez
Program Manager



Agenda Item F

DEVELOP UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES AND MILESTONES

The University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force is charged with developing the procedures for review of the extension certificate programs. The procedures will incorporate new standards outlined in the proposed language for California Code of Regulations section 2620.5 – Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program.

The task force is asked to develop the procedures to conduct reviews of the extension certificate programs and identify key milestones for the process.



Agenda Item G

SELECT FUTURE MEETING DATES

June

11-12	Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) Sections C & E Administration	Various
14	California Architects Board (Board) Meeting	Sacramento
20-22	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards Annual Meeting and Conference	Minneapolis, MN

July

4	<i>Independence Day</i>	<i>Office Closed</i>
---	-------------------------	----------------------

August

14	Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting	Sacramento
----	--	------------

September

3	<i>Labor Day</i>	<i>Office Closed</i>
6-8	Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards Annual Meeting	San Francisco
10-22	LARE Sections 1 & 2 Administration	Various

Continued Next Page

September
(continued)

13	Board Meeting	Los Angeles
28-1	American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) Annual Meeting	Phoenix, AZ

October

1	ASLA Annual Meeting (cont'd)	Phoenix, AZ
18	Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force Meeting	Sacramento

November

12	<i>Veteran's Day Observed</i>	<i>Office Closed</i>
22-23	<i>Thanksgiving Holiday</i>	<i>Office Closed</i>

December

3-15	LARE Sections 3 & 4 Administration	Various
5-6	Board Meeting/Strategic Planning	San Francisco
25	<i>Christmas</i>	<i>Office Closed</i>