

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

MINUTES

**BOARD OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL**

**December 10, 2004
Toll Free 888.461.8118 or 850.414.5775
10:00 a.m.**

Call to Order

Paul Davis called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Members Present:

Paul Davis
Phil Graham
Collene Walter
Elizabeth Gillick
Elizabeth Marshall-Beasley

Members Absent:

None

Others Present:

Juanita Chastain
Linda Tinsley
Diane Guillemette
Charles Tunnicliff
Jeff Castor
David Nam

I. Review of Continuing Education Courses

American Society of Landscape Architects/Florida Chapter
Invasive Plants Workshop – 3.5 hours
Invasive Plants Workshop – Short Course – 2 hours

Ms. Walter indicated she reviewed the courses. The first course, invasive plants workshop, is a longer version of the short course. The provider is requesting 3.5 hours for the longer version. She indicated the application is very complete with a detailed outline and she would recommend approval.

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92

MOTION: Mr. Graham moved to approve invasive plants workshop.

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Walter stated the second course is a short version of the first course. This course is for 2 hours. The difference in the shorter version is that they have eliminated the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council Perspective and the Nursery Trade’s Perspective from the outline. Ms. Walter stated the application is complete with a detailed outline and she recommends approval.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick moved to approve invasive plants workshop short course.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley called in at 10:20 a.m.

University of Florida Cooperative Extension
The Green Industries: Best Management Practices Workshop-
6.5 hours

Ms. Marshall-Beasley reviewed the course. She indicated the application was initially missing the outline which is now included. Ms. Marshall-Beasley re commended approval.

MOTION: Ms. Marshall-Beasley moved to approve The Green Industries: Best Management Practices Workshop.

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Rules

61G10-18.002, FAC – Board Approval of Continuing Education Providers

Ms. Guillemette indicated the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee indicated in an October 29, 2004 letter that they wanted a rational basis for requesting the information of only first time providers and providers who failed to timely renew their provider approval status.

Ms. Walter commented that the board wanted the information to make a better-informed decision about provider approval. Currently the

93 application simply asks for name and address. Ms. Walter indicated there
94 is not enough information to verify if they are a qualified provider. Ms.
95 Walter indicated she would go online and research the provider but the
96 board felt it important that providers submit certain information to obtain
97 how long the business and what their relationship with landscape
98 architecture.
99

100 Ms. Walter asked if Ms. Printy was objecting to having the requirements or
101 if she was only objecting to having them apply to new providers. Ms.
102 Guillemette stated she wanted a rational basis for requesting the
103 information.
104

105 Ms. Guillemette stated she would attempt to articulate the board's
106 reasoning to Ms. Printy. Ms. Guillemette informed the board that the
107 Department of Health had a provider rule challenge where the
108 administrative law judge found that the provider approval was a problem
109 and invalidated the rule that talked about provider approval. She indicated
110 that was Chapter 456, F.S. and she does not know how that might affect
111 Chapter 455, F.S.
112

113 Ms. Walter asked if wanting to know the credentials of a proposed
114 provider would be acceptable to Ms. Printy. Ms. Guillemette indicated that
115 under 455, F.S., the only thing the provider needs to show is that they can
116 provide the course and that the course is appropriate. Ms. Walter
117 indicated that with the applications they do not show that. The providers
118 simply have name and address. Mr. Graham stated the reviewer should
119 not have to go to the web to find out that information. He indicated the
120 providers should be providing the information.
121

122 Mr. Davis asked where the information was in the statute. Ms. Guillemette
123 indicated that Chapter 455.2178, F.S., addressed continuing education.
124 She stated it was not in their statute. Mr. Davis asked that Chapter 455,
125 F.S., be made a part of their booklet. Ms. Walter stated in their current
126 rule the providers must demonstrate their education or skill that sets the
127 applicant apart. Ms. Walter indicated that the current application simply
128 asks for name, address, telephone number, and type of organization
129 applying and sample copy of certificate. Ms. Walter stated the board
130 wanted to implement the provision that states "education or experience
131 necessary" so something needed to be included in the application so the
132 board could make that determination.
133

134 Ms. Walter stated the board was not looking to change the rule but to
135 further clarify the rule because the rule does require the provider to
136 demonstrate certain qualifications.
137 Ms. Guillemette commented she felt the board had the authority to look at
138 the providers' qualifications.

139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182

Ms. Guillemette asked Ms. Chastain if application for providers was a department form or a landscape architecture form. Ms. Chastain replied it was a department form.

Ms. Guillemette stated they could not change the form but could change the rule. Ms. Chastain indicated that the board discussed adding the form on the web so a provider could download the form and provide as part of the application.

Ms. Guillemette indicated she would respond to Ms. Printy and would present the board's rationale basis for asking the questions. The second part of Ms. Printy's question is why first time providers? Ms. Guillemette asked if they could just change that to "provider" and the board agreed.

Ms. Gillick stated that she thinks Ms. Printy misunderstood. It was meant for all providers.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley asked if she were a provider what would the board want to see? Ms. Guillemette went through the proposed rule. Ms. Walter felt under (e) a summary of the qualifications would be appropriate. Ms. Guillemette suggested that the rule contain "the provider applicant shall answer the following questions" and number them down. The board agreed with Ms. Guillemette's suggestion if they cannot change the form. Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that might even be better than originally discussed.

Ms. Guillemette commented that using the word "form" would be a problem and suggested that the word "list" be a better choice. The board agreed.

61G10-18.001 – Continuing Education Credit Requirements

For informational purposes. The rule was noticed and should be adopted shortly.

Ms. Guillemette asked if the board wanted to discuss the application and examination fee rule. Ms. Chastain stated it would probably be better to wait until the next agenda because the board did not have the information before them. The board agreed.

Ms. Guillemette asked the board if they had other rules they wanted opened for the next agenda. The board indicated they do not.

183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228

Discussion

Ms. Theresa Badurek – Reschedule of LARE examination.

Ms. Badurek submitted a letter requesting rescheduling of the exam because she had carpal tunnel and arthritis and could not write or draw more than a few lines at a time. Ms. Badurek also submitted doctor’s records.

MOTION: Mr. Graham moved to approve.

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

National ASLA Convention – October 7-11, 2005

Ms. Walter indicated the board had previously discussed having a board meeting in conjunction with the National convention. She also stated the board discussed having a reception. Ms. Walter stated the National convention will be holding a reception the evening of October 6 and are willing to invite past board members or board members from other states to attend the reception.

Mr. Castor indicated that the reception is titled as a host chapter reception and is attended by a large number of individuals and becomes very loud. It is not really conducive to an intimate reception to chat with members from other boards. Ms. Gillick stated that she feels the board had a good idea but is probably not workable at this meeting.

The board agreed to hold the board meeting on Thursday, October 6, 2005.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that perhaps the board could hold one in the future. Ms. Walter asked Ms. Chastain if that would be possible. Ms. Chastain indicated it would not as the state could not fund a reception.

Mr. Graham indicated he would not be able to attend the October board meeting as he had a previous commitment in New Orleans.

Ratification List

Mr. Davis read the ratification list. Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated she recalled at the last meeting asking that the principals be added to the list. Ms. Chastain indicated there was a prior discussion but the board agreed that the records check was sufficient.

229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273

Ms. Gillick commented that the board did agree not to list the principals but now feels it might be a good idea. Ms. Marshall-Beasley indicated it is important. Ms. Chastain stated she would have that information added to the ratification list.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick moved to approve ratification list.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

New Business

Mr. Davis indicated he would get his "Chairman's Article" for the newsletter to Ms. Chastain.

Ms. Chastain asked if a probable cause panel meeting could be scheduled for January 11, 2005. The members agreed to a 10:00 a.m. meeting.

Old Business

Mr. Nam asked if the board could discuss the advanced building code course approval. He indicated that the effort should be coordinated to ensure enough time to satisfy the requirement. Mr. Nam indicated people were disappointed with the core course requirement and hopes that they can effect that in the advanced course. Mr. Nam indicated Ms. Jones told him the Commission could approve accreditors now. Ms. Chastain stated the Department of Community Affairs was promulgating a rule to allow for accreditors to be approved and the Commission would then accept those courses approved by the accreditor as deemed approved by the Commission.

Ms. Walter indicated the board agreed not to move forward until the rule has actually been adopted. Ms. Walter commented the board is hesitant to be proactive and then have the rule not approved. She indicated that was basically what happened before and the board does not want to be in that situation again. Mr. Nam asked if there was some assurance from the Department of Community Affairs so the board could move forward. Ms. Walter indicated that it was a sure thing about the boards being allowed to approve. Mr. Nam indicated that would be a legislative act and this is a rule action.

Ms. Chastain stated she would contact Ms. Jones and give the board an update at the January meeting.

274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315

Ms. Walter commented that the board has been very proactive. The board was dissatisfied with the core course and wanted to make sure that the advanced courses were germane and pertinent to the profession. Ms. Gillick agreed.

Ms. Walter stated that she feels the board has done everything possible to accomplish this directive. She did comment that once the rule is in place on behalf of the board she will be the accreditor and get them processed but would not advise the board to begin the process in advance of the rule being approved.

Ms. Walter commented she asked the Building Commission attorney when the rule would be effective and he could not commit to a time. Ms. Walter commented that they are as a board ready to act but feels should wait until the rule is adopted.

Ms. Walter commented that the newsletter would have a comprehensive article about the advanced course history.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick moved to adjourn.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.