

LANDSCAPE INSTITUTE FUTURE DIRECTION MEMBER'S CONSULTATION

NOTE OF MEETING WITH LANDSCAPE INSTITUTE SCOTLAND

3 DECEMBER 2014 IN GLASGOW 6.00 TO 9.00PM

1. Background

The background paper explaining the Future Direction Member's Consultation can be found at:

<http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/PDF/Contribute/FutureDirectionconsultationpaper.pdf>

The online survey and more information about the consultation can be found at :

<http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/members/index.php>

The LIS Committee recommends that you read these notes before you fill in the online survey. You may also wish to read other suggested background information at:

<http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/scotland/important-update-and-proposed-governance-changes-now-titled-future-direction-members-consultation/>

2. Record of the Meeting

It was agreed with Chris Sheridan LI Head of Education and Membership that as full a record as possible of the meeting should be made both for members to reference before filling in the on line survey and also as a future reference as the Future Direction discussions developed.

The Note covers the first part of the meeting, a video the second part and an audio file the final part (see end of Note)

3. Present at Meeting

Chris Sheridan LI Head of Education and Membership, Mark Turnbull LIS Chair, Hamish Neilson LIS Secretary, Rachel Tennant LIS Council Representative, Carol McKenzie LIS Administrator, 3 LIS Committee Members and 27 Members.

4. Introduction

Chris introduced the 5 proposals (see below) and welcomed ideas, questions, views and thoughts, suggestions about the Institute, students, landscape as a profession and organisation.

Communication Update: *Recent Activity*

Relaunched and rebranded Landscape Institute 'Be a Landscape Architect' website:

It was getting harder to update and manage the 'Want to be a Landscape Architect' website as technology was from 2008 so it has been brought up to speed with modern software that we can update; had a software launch and there is content we need to work on bring landscape up to date; we need to work on and add some depth to what landscape architecture does as a profession; work closely with our universities – get students to add new content on design to assist with informing young people about a career in architecture.' Continually refreshing new content and it will become dynamic; encouraging members to go into schools is intended to support more visitors to the website; supporting this with other activity; fine tuning to key audiences 15-19 year olds, skills and career journeys etc. and we need to use a language that is familiar to school students; we used a lot of research finding out about students – to build a map, want people to discover the profession much earlier; most of the work is going to be about getting people to use the website...

Publications

- Refining to younger audiences and to lots of different people in media, other professions,
- Videos – a good way to engage with complex ideas; trying to refining messages to politicians, employers, students etc
- Using case studies – to make it very clear about the value landscape can add when we think about how to make places more attractive – all the important messages are wrapped up in these documents

5 Consultation

Where are we doing the right thing and where do we need to improve?

Proposals

1. Increased voting rights for all members and concerns over a democratic deficit
2. Board composition should there be places for licentiate members: should any member stand for Secretary, Hon. Treasurer role – opening this up to non-members?
3. Introducing a different route to chartership – successful system? Additional routes? Broaden in increase in membership to enable LI to prosper? Could enable experienced professionals competent to apply for membership
4. Changing some or all of the categories that are not professional – students and Hon. Memberships have several different categories – change to individual member?

Diagram of membership grades: student for anyone? Should licentiate members be only for P2C folk? CMLI and FLI would stay as it is. Hon. Fellows only proposed – could recruit allies. Could add Supporter? Should students pay or opt in to membership? What would competency assessment be like?

5. Procedural changes – compliance etc – tidying up documents; Simplify nominations process; not defined in the survey

The closing date for the online survey is the 5th January. The consultation is reported to the Board/Council/EGM and into operation.

2. Summary of Proposals and Discussion

Proposals: Summary of questions raised by the LI consultation presentation

- Students as young as sixteen are able vote in Scotland. LI needs to engage more young people with wider vision. Qualifications need to be compatible with Europe. Temporary membership for visiting landscape architects e.g. USA, could more come here to stay and work?
- Competency framework: Could individual join at CMLI or P2C level?
- Education of young people concerned with global cities/smart cities and the LI needs to be clued in too

- A category of Membership that other professions could join would be a smart move for the LI in getting other professionals involved etc but not as chartered members,
- What is the key driver? Is it finance? What do I get out of it as a member?
- Should we join up with architecture or planning?
- What about lessons to learn from other countries?
- What happens to graduate students who don't join the LI? What incentive have they got to join the LI?
- Why not free student membership?
- What about reciprocity with other recognised landscape architects in countries such as Australia and New Zealand?
- What would the new route through Competency Assessment to membership look like?
- Is supporter status the same as existing affiliate category?
- Will there be voting on all proposals or individual ones?
- Licentiate category is proposed only for those on P2C (which has an 85% pass rate)
- Key concern is adjusting the standard for the Competency Assessment for non landscape architects – need to simplify content
- Although expanded to include scientists and managers but the exam system does not alter to take that into account
- There needs to be a map to guide licentiates through the system to the right destination for them
- How do we engage the next generation?
- Could some areas of study be subject to exemption for some students?
- Approval/endorsement by fellow landscape architects is accepted by many professions – could this apply to LI?
- What do landscape professions do in other countries to promote themselves?

- ASLA have kept their name and are very good at promoting themselves
- Are we consulting clients? What do they think?
- Need to keep up with children's education and school curriculum – strong links needed
- In public enquiries landscape architects are centre of case – not equalled by architects
- Fees tend not to reflect the fact that we coordinate other professions behind the scenes. Why not?
- We need to be valued more clearly. Why not use the Royal in the charter?
- Canadian landscape architects degree valid here, but not in other direction!
- There is a Member Panel to assess records of those who may not have completed a course of study.
- Very experienced people can get the P2C in 6 months – once they are licentiate members they can do P2C. We may be failing lots of licentiates who are NOT doing P2C. Why? Not known. May also be putting off Mentors as they may not practice all aspects of the profession themselves.
- Clarity: licentiates often not classed as members of the LI by HR people.
- Why become a Chartered member instead of just a licentiate member? What do we get?
- Applicant to P2C needs to find the right Mentor. The Supervisor is actually paid. Could LI get enough Mentors and Supervisors to get another 100 licentiates through the P2C?
- Therefore need to have more LI resources to getting this to happen (Supervisors not considered to be worthwhile and Mentors role also has to be looked at).
- Why not email all the 600 licentiates and ask what their situation is? – what's their problem. The LI needs to support them.
- Fees: Why don't more CMLIs go for the FLI? Some employers pay fees but few. Could we drop FLI fees? And attract more – this would demonstrate broader range of talent.

- What do we get for our fees? Belonging to a peer group? Increase status with clients or employers? Events in the south of England?
- Save money by putting the magazine online as it is only geared to members? Or opt to go paperless? Maybe possible in a few months (also able to change membership details online).

Why not survey all non-voting members – we are but what if the voting members did not support giving them the vote?

3. *Email Questions Received by the LIS*

- How does the EU Directive on mutual recognition of professional qualifications affect the acceptability of European qualifications in relation to P2C?
- Is it valid for all members, including those who are not qualified to vote on professional interests of qualified members?
- 95% of members are Design and contribute most fees. Of all scientists and managers, what has changed that suggests more will join in the future? (1 out of 3 in the Natural England Pilot passed P2C)

Chris stated that the figures may be very old but more recent survey shows folk are multi-disciplinary..

- How do these proposed changes improve the delivery of the public interest part of the LI Charter, then members interests, and then those of their clients?
- How do they help the LI adapt to a future where members are encouraged to make and use connections, are technologically aware, entrepreneurial and collaborative?
- There is a need for the Devolved Representative to be on the Board.

4. *Wider Discussion by Attendees On the Questions Raised Above*

Chris stated that LI has the highest pass rate of all professions who have chartership examinations. This was thought to be surprising hard to believe.

Going through the pathway there is a lot of paperwork. This does direct people down the line but if you're talking about people with experience you're still going to have the questions at the end. The institute expanded a long time ago to include

landscape managers, for example I have someone (a horticulturist) going through the exams, doing stuff she will not use in her day-to-day job and doing something she just will not need until she has her own practice!

It still is the institute of landscape architects and all the other ones almost come in on sufferance.

That is a good point. Some time ago the RICS for example, if you wanted to become a chartered surveyor and you've got a previous professional background, architecture etc, they'll give you the list documenting 'you're exempt from this and that exam and so on', and that might be something to think about.

That ties into what has been said here with joining up with some other institutes. Some sort of 'affiliate bundle' that you could get, subject to, that could be for many people who wanted to go through the chartered route, or take themselves up to the next level by agreed blocks or options within the route as some people will not be working in certain fields but they are highly valued within the profession. There will be some people where, almost like a stripped down important basics or at least have a general knowledge or at least, the know where the 'map' is to get to different parts of the profession, e.g. contracts sections not required so I think there is a relationship between this, the usefulness of the exam system and the professional bodies.

It sounds like to me that everybody greatly values the chartership status and it's something that needs to be protected, that people aspire to. I've heard undergraduates stating it at ESALA that they are not sure the conversion course should be giving access to P2C so there are real views about that and at the same time, there are landscape architects who are chartered who are not involved in contract work at all providing really useful landscape architectural advice and there are others who are coming to it from a different angle so what...

I would be interested in how we can respond to:

- Engaging the next generation? We may need to take approaches which are radically different from what we are used to so that students buy in and are they supportive of the changes? That's the generation that we want to attract because they are the members in 5-10 years time
- Can we look at protecting the chartership title in one way whilst making it more open and accessible for others?

If we remove exemption then that would be removing the standard.

I have colleagues who have failed the exam several times but who were granted chartered status

If people were engaging in work that is new to them, then this is about personal development plans – it's a natural process

Would it be of concern to membership if some areas could be included as exempt? So this is a concern about how we go about articulating this concern over standards...

Exemption needs the same importance as is attached to chartership status so it's not just an opt out thing, it's a decision to 'exempt'.

We are talking about two different things: the tradition of landscape architects and on the other hand, we are talking about all these other members. Now for people like that you are going to have to have an exam to suit them – that's one of the problems. So to actually get a landscape architect in, my understanding is that after exam, you are qualified to general competence. Once you get passed that, you can follow whichever line you want to and follow it through. But what we are saying is that there are lots of people who are doing contract running or whatever and have a basic on-the-ground competency.

I think as you flow from that, you need to decide, if you've got somebody who has been doing the role of landscape architect for let's say, in excess of 10 years, do I actually judge that person's competency which would be difficult and I would almost suggest that the only way to do that is that you get 3 or 4 chartered landscape architects who say, 'I recognise this guy...he's been good, he's worked for this length of time and I think he has met your standards and I think you should accept them', and that then goes before the LI Board and they can decide whether they are going to do it. I don't think you can do an exam for somebody like that.

It's a very traditional way of choosing professional people for enabling highly qualified members to come in.

We have to remember that landscape architecture is a very old discipline: inter-disciplinary working is in the blood and that we are very often asked to manage a whole range of disparate professions with different areas of expertise.

I was asked by the WWF, are we specialists? I thought this was a very interesting question because we had just taken a poll and we found we had 26 professions, very different professions, involved in macro problem solving and WWF said, we can go better than that, as we employ 32 different disciplines because we had a similar poll.

We have to remember that the inspiration we all feel, we can touch other disciplines very easily and other professions listen to us. That makes it very compelling to young people to think that they're going to join something which is much bigger than just organising open spaces within a city context.

The biggest inspiration is coming from those bigger ideas.

Another point is planning: because most of our work comes from regulation and planners impose conditions on developers; and these conditions have to be satisfied by experts and frequently they come to landscape architects because they know that not only can they [LA's] do environmental assessment/impact because they have been trained and educated to some extent and that they have got these skills, basic skills, and they have also got the skills to bring in other experts.

If we can inspire our profession to think 'Well, where is our work coming from, who are the main clients of landscape architects and how can we give a vision of this to young people – whose parents are advising them of their careers – you can't go into landscape architecture because you can't get a job – or don't go in there because it's one of the poorest paid professions around so that's a very dangerous position we are in at the moment.

Well what we are doing at the moment, is developing key messages for the universities. People are motivated by values which are not about salaries but what difference they can make and that's the positives.

In terms of this consultation, part of it is really about whether there is support for engaging wide to give members the vote. But we have an ageing membership and we need to think now about what we might need to do to address that. In 10-15 years time for example, we may soon find that there is a smaller membership because we have not been able to bring in new people. There is still a lot of work on this to be done.

We attend the graduation for students studying at Edinburgh, and we've come across the best students and quite a lot of them do not join the landscape institute. Their course finishes, they go to the graduation ceremony; they often change their address and they are then lost from the database and we are not tracking them. So this particular population, who are keen, who really want to move onto the next stage of their career, they can slip through the net.

This is a similar experience of other professions. It just matters more to us because we are a smaller profession. But, these people do tend to come back when they get their career, very often because they want to go through the pathway.

They need jobs to go to, and with little money, they are not joining the landscape institute. What incentive do they have to spend the scarce resources that they have to join the institute if they are not getting to where they want to be on the pathway?

Student membership should be an automatic thing. If you enrol on a course that is accredited by the LI, then you should be automatically a 'student member'. It's such a straightforward thing to bring in. And we [LIS] are planning on doing a lot more promotion than the LI is doing anyway.

'You're on an accredited landscape architecture course, here you are, you are a member'

It's not about them expected to do the approach...it comes from us as the LI.

In New Zealand, when I had an interview, I was a member of their institute. Can we not do the same? It took a long time for them to get this through but with our institute, it's not helping this. We could do more, we could be more open. We don't seem to have done well on that front.

The new route? Who would be able to do that assessment? Has there been any thought or discussion around that in terms of how this would be achieved in assessment terms because I think that would be a question from a lot of members because we have one route to chartership.

Individual membership could include very early career graduates and also those with 20-25 years experience so I can't see that those with lots of experience are going to be happy with the very idea that some individuals coming straight out of courses, onto pathways...so there has to be some thinking about giving greater recognition to those that want to be individual members that they have actually got a lot to offer.

Individual category membership seems to be incredibly wide.

Affiliate membership kind of has this category within it already about 52-53 in already so it is a very small membership category but it catches quite a wide group of individuals.

If we were successful in re-orientating a much wider group of people to join, then in non-professional type of categories, would it make sense to make it a lot more streamlined?

The numbers in membership terms, you are going to have to make it a lot more attractive for those categories, e.g. competency assessment, that's going to be their route if the intention is to increase the membership. Scale, numbers and marketing that is going to be key.

Is there going to be voting on individual proposals? Because I can imagine there is going to be quite a divergence as you may not get all your proposals through, you may get some through because its going to be quite a set of complicated proposals.

We are interested in finding out what individual members think. Do they agree, do they partially agree and any suggestions they might want to put in as well because when all the information and evidence comes in, we [LI] will look at it and see what shape things take. And that shape will then be put to the members to be voted on. It may look very different to what it looks like at the moment [proposals]. And that would be great because that would be demonstrating that members are shaping the kind of proposals that the LI is floating out there to see what members think.

Have you had a view about your target audience? You know, if you want to increase the membership, have you thought about where you want to increase that?

We've had quite intensive marketing to students and potential students, to see where people are coming in from and there is always going to be a percentage of those who are kind of landscape architects, such as architects or planners and you always get people who are involved in a very wide range of different things and they take an interest in joining as well as remaining a member of their own institute or professional body or something like that.

There are a lot of organisations that we would approach, for example, we ran a pilot scheme with Natural England.

If you look at some of these people, they may be landscape planners, landscape historians, archaeologists, urban designers...but one of the issues I have about chartership is that the content of the curriculum is not going to be suitable for all of them to go through our conditions of contract and other bits of coursework that are just entirely?

So people who might join, who may make fantastic job as members, due to their skills and experience, some of the core components are just irrelevant so how do we shape a competency option or a chartership option or a pathway option which is better tailored for what the outside world actually needs?

There will be many of us who are sitting in this room who are delivering landscape through their jobs that haven't had to pick up a set of documents in 20-30 years. So how do we shape an offer that is going to draw in people?

We do not have to force people to do things that they are not going to have to do in their day jobs.

This is something we are thinking about. To allow different people to demonstrate in a slightly different way.

There is a very valid point about how broad the syllabus should be. What the core areas we should be looking at and where are the areas where, if someone has a career, you know, how much should they know about contracts and knowledge – is that sufficient? It could be. The way the system works at the moment, everything could be improved and/or refined.

This is something we need to look at..why some fail...is this to do with nerves about the exam and other aspects and trying to establish that it is not necessarily something to do with the syllabus.

END: Please refer to the three additional media files in the following sequence to continue watching and listening to the consultation. These are available below by following the links set out below:

1. The first media file is a YouTube **video** of the ongoing discussion on the evening (17.45 mins) after Chris completed his presentation. To watch the video click the link [HERE](#)
2. The second file is a recording of further discussion that closes the evening and this is available on Dropbox (two files are available on the Dropbox link folder and are at this link: [Consultation Responses](#)

*When the first file is clicked on, you need to navigate your cursor to the bottom right of the screen where you will see an icon with 3 dots; right click and the 'download' option is then given. (In the second file, Dropbox automatically gives you a download screen upon right clicking the file).