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.
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 recommended approval.


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

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

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

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

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

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