

# Growing the Profession in Canada



## Workshop Summary

CSLA/AAPC 2001 Congress  
Montreal, Quebec



Prepared for  
Canadian Society of Landscape Architects  
L'Association des architectes paysagistes du Canada  
by  
Cecelia Paine, FCSLA and Kristina Zalite  
March, 2002



L' Association des architectes paysagistes du Canada

March, 2002

President Vincent Asselin, FCSLA  
Canadian Society of Landscape Architects / L' Association des architectes paysagistes du Canada  
PO Box 870 Station B  
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5P9

**RE: Growing the Profession in Canada**

Dear President Asselin:

Please find enclosed this report, *Growing the Profession in Canada*, documenting the proceedings of the workshop held in September, 2001 as part of the annual congress of the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects / L' Association des architectes paysagistes du Canada.

This workshop drew together a cross-section of individuals, from students and young practitioners to those who have had many years of experience guiding the affairs of our profession. The purpose was to share ideas on growing the profession of landscape architecture, including means of increasing our numbers and our influence. Included here are the visions, barriers and strategies identified by workshop participants.

It is our understanding this document will be widely distributed and posted on the CSLA/AAPC Web site. The workshop and this summary report will hopefully serve to stimulate and focus actions by CSLA/AAPC, component associations, educators and individuals in support of growing landscape architecture in Canada.

Thanks are extended to you and the CSLA/AAPC Board of Governors for your endorsement of this important national initiative.

Sincerely,

Cecelia Paine, FCSLA  
CSLA/AAPC Past-president  
Workshop Coordinator

AALA . AAPQ . APALA . BCSLA . MALA . NLALA . NWTALA . OALA . SALA



## Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	1
<b>Background</b> .....	4
<b>Session Speakers</b>	
The Profession In Canada – Are We In Good Health? Cecelia Paine, FCSLA .....	5
How Big? Jim Taylor, FCSLA .....	7
The Future of the Profession, Preliminary Results of a Study Sponsored by AAPQ Richard Gaudreau, CSLA/AAPC .....	9
<b>Summary of Findings</b>	
Workshop Process and Data Summation .....	12
Visions .....	12
Barriers .....	16
Strategies .....	19
CSLA/AAPC and Component Associations .....	21
Schools and Education .....	23
Individuals .....	25
<b>Next Steps</b> .....	26
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1: Workshop Outline .....	27
Appendix 2: Individual Response Form .....	28
Appendix 3: Breakdown of Responses .....	29
Appendix 4: Workshop Participants .....	30
Appendix 5: Correspondence .....	31

## Executive Summary

CSLA/AAPC members, associates and students from across Canada, a total of 78 participants in all, gathered during the opening session of the 2001 Congress in Montreal on Friday, September 21, 2001 to focus on the topic of growing the profession in Canada. Among the concerns that generated interest in this topic were the lack of growth in the membership of professional associations over the past decade, a reduction in numbers of graduates from professional programs, and concerns over the ability of the profession to respond to emerging directions in practice.

The purpose of the workshop was to stimulate thinking on how the profession should adapt to current realities and trends, with a goal of increasing both our numbers and our influence. Specific objectives were to share insights on our visions of the profession, to identify barriers to growth, and to develop strategies to overcome these barriers.

Workshop participants worked individually, in teams and as a group to formulate and communicate their ideas. During the workshop, University of Guelph MLA students served as recorders. The results of the workshop discussions were compiled and summarized by Kristina Zalite, University of Guelph MLA candidate, and Cecelia Paine, FCSLA, workshop coordinator.

## Speakers

To set the stage for discussion, three speakers, all past-presidents of CSLA/AAPC, gave brief presentations related to the topic of growth. Cecelia Paine, FCSLA, who also served as the workshop facilitator, provided a profile of the current status of professional educational programs in Canada, pointing out that our six professional programs (BLA and MLA) now produce 27% fewer graduates than they did ten years ago. Over the same timeframe, non-accredited educational programs and numbers of graduates from these programs have increased.

CSLA/AAPC's delegate to IFLA, Jim Taylor, FCSLA, discussed numbers of practitioners and the growth of the profession internationally. In his presentation, which was based on a recent survey and application of worldwide standards, he suggested that Canada should have 5000 landscape architects to service our existing population.<sup>1</sup> This number represents an estimated growth of 66%.

Richard Gaudreau, CSLA/AAPC, presented the preliminary results of a survey he has undertaken on behalf of AAPQ and summarized what he believes the demands will be of the profession and its practitioners in the coming century: *“Landscape architects will be called upon to provide information and assistance to clients who take matters into their own hands. We will be working in a multicultural, heavily networked ephemeral working environment, where landscape architects will mainly thrive by developing personal client relationships, based on mutual trust and confidence. Networking, in an information-sharing market, will determine the future of landscape architectural practice”.*

---

<sup>1</sup> This is total number of individuals in the profession including CSLA members, associates, and non-CSLA members with professional education.

## **Visions of Landscape Architecture**

Participants were asked to reflect on their vision of the profession. The following statements summarize what participants most frequently identified as characterizing their vision of landscape architecture and its practitioners:

1. We are multidisciplinary in approach.
2. We are leaders.
3. We are publicly recognized.
4. We are broad in scope.
5. We are knowledgeable and skilled.
6. We connect people and nature.
7. We are diverse in our backgrounds.

## **Barriers to Growth**

Primary barriers to growth of the profession most frequently identified by workshop participants include the following:

1. Lack of **visibility** of the profession and public perceptions of what we do as professionals.
2. Need for more professional **education programs** across Canada, and the need for more graduates and more funding of programs.
3. Professional **identity** concerns related to the definition of landscape architecture.
4. Professional **entrance requirements** that are seen as protectionist, expensive and too restrictive.
5. Concerns around **financial support** for landscape architecture, as evidenced in salaries, fees and project funding.

## **Recommended Strategies**

In the final part of the workshop, participants identified strategies they thought would contribute to growing the profession in Canada. Those most often recommended included:

### **With respect to CSLA/AAPC and component associations:**

1. Increase public outreach and promotion activity.
2. Change professional membership entry standards to be more inclusive and allow for more diversity.
3. Expand legal regulation of the profession.
4. Expand the mandate of CSLA/AAPC to include more direct involvement in matters related to expanding and strengthening professional education programs across Canada.

### **With respect to schools and education:**

1. Expand the number of BLA and MLA professional programs.
2. Increase the number of students in the professional programs.
3. Expand the types of programs offered in support of core and specialized education.
4. Increase funding support of students and programs.

**With respect to individuals:**

1. Be passionate about who we are and what we do as landscape architects.
2. Expand our networks, build alliances and be visible, within landscape architecture and to other professions and the public.

**Next Steps**

*Growing the Profession* represents an important milestone in the development of landscape architecture in Canada. This session provided the opportunity to share insights and views with colleagues across the country. Of significance is the range of viewpoints heard from in this session, from those of first year students to those of seasoned practitioners, educators and association leaders. Yet despite these differences in background and experience, the concerns expressed were amazingly similar, with strong, clear themes emerging with respect to where the profession ought to go and how we ought to get there.

Many of the points raised in this session are ones we have heard before. Thus, the session also served to confirm what individuals and association boards may have been thinking and saying across the country, and to place these views into a broader understanding of the common concerns and visions members of our profession hold across Canada.

As we can see from the recommendations of this report, all of us as individuals, professionals (or about-to-be professionals), educators and professional leaders have a role to play in growing landscape architecture in Canada. Through this workshop, we have drawn upon our collective knowledge and wisdom, and now we must act on it, whether by taking small steps or giant leaps. Based on what we know from experience and what we heard from participants in Montreal, the time to start growing the profession is now.

Cecelia Paine, FCSLA  
CSLA/AAPC Past-president

Kristina Zalite  
MLA Candidate - University of Guelph

March, 2002

## Background

Landscape architecture has come a long way since the founding of the profession in Canada in 1934. There is growing public awareness of landscape architecture and its practitioners as evidenced through the positions we hold in private, public and academic sectors. We have excellent schools that attract good students and our graduates are in demand nationally and internationally. Our profession is well organized, with regional and national associations offering an array of programs and services. Internationally, CSLA/AAPC and its members are well respected for their professional expertise and their contributions to development of the profession.

Despite this positive profile, several conditions give rise to concerns about the health of the profession in Canada. A number of these conditions are related to growth, both in numbers and in our vision of who we are and how we want to practice. Most obvious is the fact that over the past decade, some component associations and the CSLA/AAPC have experienced non-growth in numbers of members, despite growth in the population and the economy. In the most recent economic upswing, many practitioners and departments were unable to find qualified staff to fill available positions. At the same time, the numbers of students in professional schools has declined and a high percentage of those who graduated have taken positions outside Canada. And finally, we sense that society is increasingly seeking the services of professionals with new skills and knowledge, yet our standards for entry into the profession have remained relatively constant.

These concerns led to organizing *Growing the Profession in Canada* as part of the program for the 2001 CSLA/AAPC Congress in Montreal. This venue provided the opportunity to take advantage of the knowledge and diversity of views represented by participants and to build on the momentum of similar initiatives undertaken by some of the component associations. The primary purpose was to stimulate action on growing the profession in Canada, including means of increasing our membership base, our role and our influence. Specific objectives of the Montreal session were to:

- share insights on our visions of the profession;
- provide views on barriers to growth of the profession; and
- identify strategies to overcome barriers to growth.

The workshop was organized around discussion of three questions related to growth of the profession:

- 1. What is your vision of the profession?***
- 2. What are the biggest barriers to growing the profession?***
- 3. What strategies should be pursued for growing the profession?***

Workshop participants worked individually, in teams and as a group to formulate and communicate their ideas. The results of these discussions, as presented in this report, were compiled and summarized by Kristina Zalite, University of Guelph MLA candidate, and Cecelia Paine, FCSLA, workshop coordinator. Supplementary details are found in the appendix sections.

## **Session Speakers**

Three speakers provided background relevant to the workshop discussions. CSLA/AAPC Past-president, Cecelia Paine, FCSLA, presented a profile on growth of the profession over the past decade. CSLA/AAPC Past-president and IFLA delegate, Jim Taylor, FCSLA, placed Canada in perspective with other countries with respect to numbers of landscape architects. CSLA/AAPC Past-president, Richard Gaudreau, CSLA/AAPC, presented the findings of a survey on the future of landscape architectural practice. Their texts are included here.

### **THE PROFESSION IN CANADA – ARE WE IN GOOD HEALTH?**

By Cecelia Paine, FCSLA

Signs of a healthy landscape architecture profession could be found across Canada this past year. Employment notices for entering landscape architects have been on the increase and most practitioners talk of being busy. A good indication of our vitality has been students returning to school from a summer away. A high percentage had work opportunities in professional offices and government departments across the country and speak glowingly of the experience they've gained. Busy practitioners are the most visible indicator of the profession's health.

A healthy profession, however, is more than busy firms. A profession, to survive and thrive, must have a whole system that supports it: education to prepare practitioners, professional associations that set standards and govern members, and practices that provide the opportunities to apply knowledge and serve the public. When we look at landscape architecture in Canada as a system, there are reasons to worry about our health. Two indicators that are particularly troublesome include, 1) an adequate supply of students from our professional schools, and 2) their entry into the professional ranks through membership in component associations and the CSLA/AAPC. Here's where the health of landscape architecture in Canada comes into question.

#### **Growth and Non-growth of Professional Education**

In 1992, there were approximately 550 students in total in professional programs across Canada. In 2000, there are 400 students in those same programs. To a large extent, the reduction is the result not of declining demand to study landscape architecture but rather the capacity of our schools to educate and graduate students. With the conversion of two BLA programs to MLA programs alone (UBC and UofT), we have reduced the number of graduates by 20-30 per year.

And once students graduate, what is happening to them? It appears that as many as 50% of graduates from our professional programs are leaving Canada for greener pastures in the United States or other countries.

At the same time that numbers of students in our professional programs has declined, the numbers of students in non-professional landscape architecture-related programs has been on the increase. Across Canada today, students are studying working towards degrees and diplomas at the undergraduate level that include: Environmental Planning and Design, Environmental Design, Environmental Landscape Design, Landscape Architecture Technology, Minor in Garden Design, Diploma in Landscape Design. At the graduate level, students can study in programs that are

landscape related and obtain degrees that include: Master of Science/Joint program between Landscape Architecture and Planning; Master of Urban Design; Master of Science, Landscape Option; Master of Advanced Studies in Landscape Architecture

The result of all these programs is that many jobs that might be filled with landscape architect graduates are now being filled with persons holding non-professional degrees. This is particularly worrisome in the public sector, where we have a tradition of public landscape architects creating opportunities for private sector firms. Meanwhile, landscape architecture and multi-disciplined firms are starting to find a shortage of well-prepared landscape architecture graduates to fill their needs.

### **Professional Association Membership**

What are the implications of these for our professional associations? Quite simply, our professional associations are stagnating. Membership in the CSLA/AAPC in 1984 was approximately 600. Eight years later in 1992, it had grown to 1,200. Another eight years later in 2000, CSLA/AAPC's membership was still at exactly the same number: 1,200. It's easy to see that with recent graduates leaving and non-landscape architects filling positions, growth of the profession in numbers is being seriously impacted.

These concerns about non-growth are not just about numbers. With non-growth, we are not able to supply qualified individuals to fill expanding job opportunities, such as those in the public and not-for-profit sectors and with multi-disciplinary firms. New areas of application of the landscape architects' skills go undeveloped without a constant supply of young practitioners with new combinations of education and experience.

### **Revitalizing our Health**

This workshop, *Growing the Profession in Canada*, provides the opportunity to share insights and strategies that address topics related to growth, based on the underlying assumption that growth is an indicator of good health. It is my opinion that the health of the profession must be looked at as an integrated system, one that includes educational programs, individuals and firms, and the professional associations. In looking for means to improve our health, we need to look at all parts of this system.

The next parts of this session will provide the opportunity for us to identify where we want to go as a profession, barriers to reaching those goals, and strategies for achieving them.

## **HOW BIG?**

By Jim Taylor, FCSLA

### **Critical Mass**

The question of how big should we be raises a number of other questions. How many landscape architects are there in Canada and worldwide? How do we compare with other countries? Do we have enough landscape architects? If not, how much should we grow? Should we establish a goal? And finally, the bigger question is, do we have a critical mass that will be sustainable and that will continue to serve the public in the future? This discussion is informed by recent research conducted by Julius Fabos (Fabos 2001) for the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA). The purpose of his study was to establish an estimate of landscape architects globally, patterns of growth of the profession over time, and projections for the future.

### **How Many Do We Have?**

The Fabos study estimates that there are approximately 80,000 engaged in the profession of landscape architecture around the world. This appears to be an impressive number at first glance until one begins to examine the distribution in specific countries. For example, in India with a population of one billion there is only one landscape architect for three million in population. It is no wonder that IFLA President Richard Tan of Singapore has a goal of establishing a national association of landscape architects in India.

If India has the lowest per capita number according to Fabos, then which country has the highest? Iceland, perhaps surprisingly, has a per capita ratio of 1:6,000. Although, several countries have no known landscape architects, for purposes of comparison we will consider the range as 1:3,000,000 as the lowest to 1:6,000 as the highest in the world. The United States is considered by many to be the home of landscape architecture. It was in the USA that the title “landscape architect” was firmly established, the first professional university programs developed, and the first professional association founded. This solid grounding has provided a per capita ratio in the United States of 1:6,889. Is this optimum? Fabos thinks not and would like to see further growth of the profession in the United States.

In Canada, I would estimate that there is a per capita ratio of approximately 1:10,000. This estimate includes not only full members of the CSLA/AAPC, but also includes associates and non-CSLA/AAPC members with professional education in landscape architecture. Among the developed nations, this is good but does not place us in the top tier with countries like the United States, United Kingdom, Japan and, of course, Iceland.

### **How Many Should We Have?**

Fabos concludes his paper by recommending that all nations strive for a ratio of 1:6,000. He bases this number on a number of factors such as our relative size in comparison to other professions, what has been realistically achieved in some developed countries, and what might be considered a critical mass to support sustainability of the profession.

This means that in Canada, our goal of 1:6,000 would require a growth of 66% in the profession to a total of approximately 5,000 landscape architects. Based on our current educational capacity and other constraints, this does not appear possible. This presents a great challenge, but unlike

India's task, it may be achievable. However, it will not happen without a national strategy and CSLA/AAPC is the logical organization to facilitate a plan for action.

### **Strategies for Growth**

In his paper, Fabos goes on to suggest a number of strategies to accomplish this goal:

- **Education:** It is obvious that university-based educational programs are required to provide the future practitioners for the field. Again, in India, no fully developed programs are recognized internationally. In Canada, the capacity to generate graduates in landscape architecture has actually decreased in the past ten years. For example, we currently have only two accredited BLA programs in the country. This is down from four. The lost BLA programs were converted to MLA programs yielding smaller numbers of graduates. The CSLA/AAPC must promote the expansion of landscape architecture programs in Canada if we wish to raise our per capita ratio.
- **Practice:** In many third world countries, no professional organization exists and landscape architects are not employed in many of the sectors they are trained for. In Canada, our profession is not as well established as in the United States, but we are making progress and are well positioned for growth. However, landscape architects continue not to be considered for positions they are capable (or more capable) of filling. We do not have a critical mass in most sectors.
- **Outreach to decision-makers:** Finally, Fabos recommends that we more effectively present our case to decision-makers within our respective countries. At the last IFLA Congress in Singapore, the opening session was officiated over by the Prime Minister and he personally presented the Singapore Institute of Landscape Architect's design awards.

## **THE FUTURE OF THE PROFESSION**

### **Preliminary Results of a Study Sponsored by L'Association des architectes paysagistes du Québec (AAPQ)**

By Richard Gaudreau, CSLA/AAPC

*“As the profession of landscape architecture grows, the concept and means for responsible stewardship of the land will extend to stewardship of the earth.”*

#### **What Does it Mean to be a Landscape Architect?**

Hello, my name is Richard Gaudreau and I am a landscape architect...but what does that label, landscape architect, really mean to you? I, for one, mostly define my professional identity by the knowledge that I have acquired and the projects I have contributed to. But for most of you, the only thing you know about me is that I belong to an association of landscape architects. In exploring the future of our profession I wonder if that label in itself, will be sufficient to inspire the kind of trust and confidence our clients will inevitably require from us?

Our local chapter, the Quebec Association of Landscape Architects, is currently concerned with a relatively new phenomenon that affects our organization at its entry level. The admission committee is regularly solicited by individuals with increasingly diverse and specialized practices seeking membership status as a landscape architect. A large number of these requests come from people who may or may not have a standard degree in landscape architecture but are personally and professionally concerned with landscape issues and practicing at the fringe of a more conventional landscape architecture practice. For example these people would be involved in landscape construction, plant material production and sale, building architecture, engineering, urban and regional planning, and heritage conservation. In parallel we have been observing over the past few years that an increasing number of normally eligible candidates refrain from applying for membership and engage in professional endeavours outside of the core practice of landscape architecture as we define it today. For example these individuals may be in business administration, government administration, recreational development, community development, banking, land development and law.

These situations triggered the need for a questioning of AAPQ's admission procedures and criteria. But before making any formal recommendations concerning the modification of AAPQ's admission procedure, our executive committee commended, as of last April, an internal study on the “the future of the profession”. The purpose of this ongoing study is twofold: first to help update the AAPQ's corporate marketing strategy; and secondly, to recommend appropriate changes to our admission procedures.

In order to establish a common knowledge base for this study, four working statements summarizing a few basic landscape architecture concerns were drafted. These statements cover history of the profession, current market standing for landscape architecture services, traditional and emerging paradigms influencing the growth of the profession, and a definition of landscape architecture. These statements, accompanied by a series of specific questions on the future of the profession were then sent, via e-mail, to approximately 150 AAPQ members. Forty of them accepted to participate in the survey. Three workshop meetings, two in Montreal and an other one in Quebec City, were then held, to allow for face to face discussions with 20 participants on the same issues. In parallel to consulting practicing landscape architects and students, an Internet

based delphi type survey was organised with a group of fourteen Canadian futurists listed in the Directory of Canadian Futurists available through the Policy Research Initiative Secretariat of the Canadian government. As of today, our total sample for this study is 74 participants. We hope that today's exercise will contribute to enhancing our database as we expect to identify avenues of change by the time of AAPQ's AGM scheduled for spring 2002.

### **Preliminary Results of the Survey**

The first series of interesting answers that we started to compile out of this study came from a question about the difference between landscape architecture and other similar professions. This part of the survey was mainly conducted in French. In essence, the question went like this:

In your current practice, what do you think differentiates landscape architecture from other design professions?

**56% of respondents agree on the following results, in order of importance :**

- 1. A global multidisciplinary vision**
- 2. A capacity for synthesis**
- 3. An artistic vision**
- 4. Design with plant materials**

What is interesting about these answers is that they are not necessarily profession specific. Furthermore, they are not knowledge oriented. They are more about human relationship abilities and sensitivities than technical know-how. It is revealing to me that this particular group of landscape architects characterizes the trust of their practice in terms of communicating "visions" and "synthesis". Those very human qualities can only materialize within a closely-knit relationship with clients.

A second question, on methods and theories most susceptible to influence the future practice of landscape architecture, had interesting results as well.

In that respect, local landscape architects identified three (3) sources of change:

- 1. Philosophical** - the spread of influential concepts and ideas:
  - a. Sustainable development
  - b. Biodiversity and the ecological movement
  - c. Globalization
  - d. Design style like
    - i. International style
    - ii. Plastic geometry
    - iii. Arts in the garden
- 2. Phenomenal** – the emergence of new ways of doing
  - a. The increasing speed of change
  - b. The increasing availability of information
- 3. Technical**
  - a. the Internet
  - b. Table top CAD systems

- c. The Fax machines
- d. GMO's – genetically modified organisms

Some of these concerns were echoed by our panel of futurists. Located outside the realm of our profession, these “experts on observing society’s evolution” are predicting that environmental concerns, largely responsible for the growth of landscape architecture since the early 1900’s, will continue to prevail through the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. But they are talking about “design with nature”...with a twist! Landscape architects should lead the new market of “life enhancing experiences”, exploring the market of “human emotions” and offering such visions as those of “liveable futures” for an increasingly urban population. They predict that our future lies with our capacity to develop “niche” markets in a complex inter-disciplinarily knowledge based economy. An economy that will be friendlier to professions will be based on consumer needs rather than normative or legal obligations. To use a metaphor, diversification is to the health of the profession, what biodiversity is to the health of the ecosystem. That is, there is a need for constant renewal for both ecosystems and professions. Amongst the new paradigms of landscape practice, this study invites us to consider the followings:

1. With densification, landscape architecture will increasingly become an urban profession.
2. Urban aesthetics will emerge as a major social concern and will become the norm rather than an enlightened choice.
3. Anything related to historical issues and environmental anthropology will be of major concern.
4. As we witness the transformation of our traditional agriculture, increasingly competing with organic energy productions, we will observe the growth of urban permaculture, promoting family self sufficiency of food supply, roof top and interior gardening, living walls and biomass increase initiatives.
5. Some of us will become experts at “the possibility of solitude” in an increasingly taxing informative environment.

As our cities become even more overpopulated and our population ages, issues of “secure places” and the need for a “reconnection with nature” will increase. In that context, even though there will be a strong interest in landscaping and natural settings, we should be aware that the lead in answering these issues will not come from governments, as it’s often been the case in the past, but rather from private projects and community based organisations.

### **Visions of the Future**

Landscape architects will more often be called upon to provide information and assistance to clients who take matters into their own hands. In a multicultural, heavily networked, ephemeral working environment, landscape architects will mainly thrive by developing personal client relationships, based on mutual trust and confidence. Networking in an information sharing market will determine the future of landscape architecture practice. In that respect, professional associations, such as ours, should take notice of the emergence of this new “me too” generation of practitioners, who are literally well connected, sensitive to market needs and generally disrespectful of hierarchies. We would be well advised to listen carefully to our root membership.

## Summary of Findings

### Workshop Process and Data Summation

Participants were grouped into six teams, with about ten to twelve people per team. Individuals were first asked to record their personal thoughts related to growing the profession of landscape architecture in Canada. On prepared sheets, individuals wrote down their responses to three questions:

1. *What is your vision of the profession?*
2. *What are the biggest barriers to growing the profession?*
3. *What strategies should be pursued for growing the profession?*

Next, participants were asked to share their individual responses with their team. Following this discussion, each team synthesized their ideas into group findings, which are referred to in this document as “team responses”. The teams then reported back to the entire assembly their visions of landscape architecture, barriers to achieving these visions, and recommended strategies for action, referred to as “group responses”. As they were reported to the group, strategies were categorized by the facilitators as being most relevant to CSLA/AAPC and component associations, educators and educational institutions, or individuals.

Tables in this summary indicate the combined responses from the individual, team, and group levels. (See Appendix 3 – *Breakdown of Responses*.) Responses were classified into categories and all similar ideas sorted into these categories. For instance, the group expressed three times - and in three unique ways - a vision of bridging the landscape architecture profession with other professions. The group also repeated three times that it was important for landscape architects to be multi-disciplinary. These responses made for a total of six responses within the category called “Multidisciplinary”.

### Visions

The six teams reported to the entire group their primary visions for the profession of landscape architecture. These vision statements were combined with statements from individuals and teams and have been classified into categories as noted in the table below:

<b>The group visions that were described as:</b>	<b>Were classified into the categories:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridging the profession [with other professions]</li> <li>• Being multi-disciplinary</li> </ul>	Multidisciplinary in approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership</li> </ul>	Leaders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase exposure (including more exposure to kids)</li> <li>• Lobbying, promotions</li> </ul>	Publicly recognized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the definition/Broaden the focus</li> <li>• Distinguish between discipline and profession</li> <li>• Establish new working relationships</li> </ul>	Broad in scope
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability</li> </ul>	Knowledgeable & skilled
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Added later to reflect individual &amp; team visions)</li> </ul>	Integrate people and nature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be more inclusive</li> </ul>	Diverse in background

The frequency with which each of these ideas was expressed is summarized in the following table. (For a detailed breakdown of these responses, see Appendix 3.)

Vision	Total responses from individuals, teams, and large group	
	Times Repeated	Percent of Total Responses
• Multidisciplinary in approach	36	31%
• Leaders	21	18%
• Publicly recognized	20	17%
• Broad in scope	15	13%
• Knowledgeable & Skilled	15	13%
• Connected with nature	11	9%
• Diverse in background	4	3%
Number of responses	118	100%

**VISION: WE ARE MULTISCIPLINARY IN APPROACH**

The most often reported vision, thirty-one percent of total responses, refers to how we work in conjunction with others - namely, to be connected with other professions and to be multidisciplinary. The following ideas were expressed related to this approach:

- Connected to our clients
- Connected to other landscape architects
- Connected between professional organizations
- Facilitators who bridge allied professions
- Having more inclusive relationships with other professions
- Bridging traditional practices of architecture, engineering, environmental science, planning
- Work collaboratively in multidisciplinary design teams
- Able to pull together detailed information from variety of sources

**VISION: WE ARE LEADERS**

There is a desire to see landscape architects in roles of leadership, especially when working in multidisciplinary teams. Leadership was the second most mentioned characteristic, making up eighteen percent of total responses. Ideas around being leaders described landscape architects as:

- Visionary enablers
- Highly recognized professionals by the public
- Goal-oriented, with the ego put aside
- A profession with leadership icons
- Leaders of projects and leadership on environmental issues
- Leaders of multidisciplinary environmental design teams
- In charge, with respect for other professions
- Coordinators

### **VISION: WE ARE PUBLICLY RECOGNIZED**

Another major characteristic is to be more visible in the eyes of the public. Seventeen percent of the responses reflect this idea, which was described as:

- Moving toward greater control of the land development process
- Having influence through public planning, politics, community, and corporate involvement
- A profession with a recognized name
- A profession with a recognized definition
- Recognized by the professions and the public
- Creating departments of landscape architecture in government
- Exposing the profession to kids

### **VISION: WE ARE BROAD IN SCOPE**

Expanding the scope of the landscape architecture profession was another part of the vision that emerged. For instance, groups reported their desire to see a broadly focused profession with a variety of working relationships. Thirteen percent of responses fit within this vision, expressed as:

- Broaden the base of practice
- A scope of definition that is large
- People will ask, “What aspect of landscape architecture are you involved in?”

### **VISION: WE ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE AND SKILLED**

It was envisioned that landscape architects should work responsibly, drawing on our knowledge to create safe and skillfully designed environments. Thirteen percent of total responses fit within this characterization and included:

- People with a core of knowledge, skills
- Providing solutions for an array of problems
- People with defined turf
- Established legal responsibility
- Becoming more exclusive, stronger academically
- Becoming more responsible with landscapes
- Increasing our safety concerns
- Discerning between discipline and profession
- Being identifiable, respected, trusted, diverse, and skilled

### **VISION: WE CONNECT PEOPLE AND NATURE**

Visions of having a role that is positively associated with nature and environment and a role that connects people and nature were also reported, along with use of the term ‘stewards of the land’. This characteristic appeared in nine percent of the responses. It was recommended that we take a

more holistic approach in our work, and facilitate the marriage of art and science. It was suggested that landscape architects be:

- Better stewards of the land...of the earth
- Educators about the environment
- More holistic in approach
- “The profession that deals with designing the relationship between people and nature”
- Synthesize and integrate art and science
- Combine art and science
- Design with a sense of people in the environment to include how they feel
- Integrate indoor and outdoor environments (whole environment)

### **VISION: WE ARE DIVERSE**

There is a desire to see more diversity of styles in areas of ecology, new design ideas, new plant materials, and new products. As well, there could be more diversity among individuals within the profession. Mentioned in three percent of responses was a desire to see:

- A diverse background of people
- More styles to the profession
- More inclusiveness in the membership of component

## Barriers

The barriers to growing the profession of landscape architecture are varied and numerous. Teams reported back to the large group barriers of visibility and public perception, education, self-identity, entrance into the profession and funding. These categories were created by reclassifying responses, as shown here.

<b>The barriers that were described as:</b>	<b>Were classified into the categories:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public perception, definition, and awareness-hostility from other professions</li> <li>Lack of government visibility</li> </ul>	Visibility and public perception
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education</li> <li>Lack of schools</li> <li>Lack of BLA programs</li> <li>Students: numbers vs. quality</li> <li>Uniformity in programs of study</li> </ul>	Education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self image (that also includes a historical one)</li> <li>Lack of focus</li> <li>Resistance to change</li> <li>Lack of action</li> <li>Lack of minority presence</li> <li>Size of profession</li> </ul>	Self-identity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LARE</li> <li>Legislative barriers</li> <li>Restrictions on entrance into the profession and the associations</li> <li>Lack of regional presence</li> <li>Brain drain</li> </ul>	Entrance into the profession
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding to suit the scale of projects</li> <li>Low salaries</li> <li>Funding for scholarships</li> </ul>	Funding/Financing

The five categories that emerged from this session reflect **barriers to the profession**. The frequency of responses within each of these categories is as follows. (For a complete breakdown of responses, see Appendix 3.)

<b>Barriers</b>	Total responses from individuals, teams, and large group	
	Times Repeated	Percent of Total Responses
• Visibility/Public Perception	70	31%
• Education	49	22%
• Self Identity	41	18%
• Entrance into the profession	35	16%
• Funding	29	13%
Number of responses	224	100%

## **BARRIERS OF VISIBILITY AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION**

The most significant barrier to growing the profession is public visibility and perception, as expressed in thirty-one percent of the responses. Ideas about barriers were recorded as follows:

- Society still doesn't know who we are
- Landscape architecture is not a household word
- We have an identity problem
- Landscape is perceived as an option, not a necessity
- Public awareness of the value of the profession
- Professional recognition from other professions
- Lack of visibility at higher levels of power
- Lack of visibility and stars
- Understanding and acceptance as a profession
- Second class citizens
- Hostility from other professions
- Lack of recognition, low status

## **BARRIERS OF EDUCATION**

Education was spoken about twenty-two percent of the time, the range of concerns being varied. Some of the concerns regarding education were the following:

- A lack of schools, bachelor programs, research, teachers, and graduates
- An inconsistency between quantity and quality of practitioners of landscape architecture
- A lack of uniformity and reciprocity between schools.
- Numbers too low, lack of graduates
- Lack of scholarships in schools
- Lack of hands-on skills in MLA programs
- Quality of graduates - must attract top applicants
- Funding for graduate students
- Lack of alumni base for scholarships
- Few schools and access to schools
- Inability of profession to absorb and train graduates

## **BARRIERS OF SELF-IDENTITY**

A weak self-identity within the profession of landscape architecture was reported as a barrier to growing. This was reported eighteen percent of the time, and identified as being largely due to:

- A lack of a history, focus, known responsibilities, and clarity in how we define ourselves
- The profession is resistant to change, unable to take action, and elitist
- The lack of minority presence and diversity within the profession (notably mirrored in the workshop session)
- Lack of focus, definition, and identify ("les défauts de ses qualités")

- Too narrow a definition of the profession and its scope of practice
- Lack of minority presence
- Lack of cultural appreciation
- Lack of history, loyalty, tradition, continuity
- Communication within the nation among peers because of the distance
- Geographic distance of Canada
- Legislation, lack of practice act

### **BARRIERS OF ENTRANCE INTO THE PROFESSION**

It was reported in sixteen percent of responses that entrance barriers exist that make it hard to enter the profession. Responses include:

- It is hard to enter through regional affiliation
- There is a lack of willingness to accept 'fringe' professionals
- There is also a general lack of numbers joining associations.
- Protectionism is a barrier to the discipline
- Limited number of ways to become part of the profession
- LARE and it's relevance to all aspects of the practice
- Entrance examinations
- Attraction to practice in other nations
- Lack of interest in becoming a member of professional organizations
- Provincial associations, membership is too onerous

### **BARRIERS OF FUNDING/FINANCING**

Lack of public visibility may cause a lack of funding for landscape architecture services and products. Thirteen percent of the responses noted funding as a barrier. Responses stated that funding barriers were due to:

- Lower wages compared to other 'professional disciplines'
- First to 'cut-back'
- Low salaries
- Professional fees
- MLAs don't make more money than BLAs
- Appropriate funding for the scale of projects
- Funding for education

## Strategies

The final part of the workshop identified strategies recommended to overcome the barriers previously identified. Strategies were reclassified according to the categories shown here. They have been further classified according to who should take the lead in developing and implementing the strategy. There is some overlap expressed in these strategies, particularly with respect to responsibility for education and funding.

<b>The recommended strategies that were described as:</b>	<b>Were classified into the categories:</b>
<b>CSLA/AAPC and COMPONENT ASSOCIATIONS</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visibility</li> <li>• Outreach</li> <li>• Promotion of value of the profession through marketing</li> <li>• Lobby and have political involvement</li> <li>• Mandate lobbying by CSLA/AAPC</li> <li>• Advocacy and resolution of key issues facing the profession</li> <li>• Public education</li> <li>• Unified voice</li> <li>• Communication</li> <li>• Conduct a market study of the profession</li> </ul>	Introduce mandates regarding outreach and promotion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New membership structures</li> <li>• Definitions of members should be varied</li> <li>• Alternative routes to the profession</li> <li>• Direct entry into the CSLA/AAPC</li> <li>• Dues</li> </ul>	Change the organizational and membership structure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Added to reflect individual and team responses)</li> </ul>	Expand legal regulations to other provinces and territories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive strategy for education</li> <li>• Involvement in education</li> <li>• Promotion in elementary and high schools through the component associations</li> </ul>	Increase involvement in educational institutions
<b>SCHOOLS/EDUCATION</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment of highly qualified candidates</li> <li>• Expand programs into other regions</li> <li>• Increase enrollments</li> <li>• Increase enrolments of BLA programs</li> <li>• Increase standards</li> <li>• Integrate more design and technical education in MLA schools (to expand options of members)</li> </ul>	Expand school enrollment and curriculum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase awareness of profession in high schools</li> <li>• Promote programs within universities, elementary and high schools</li> <li>• Promote programs externally through lobbying</li> <li>• Relationships within industry, CSLA/AAPC, individuals, etc.</li> </ul>	Increase outreach to and within schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase funding for research</li> <li>• Increase funding to support publications</li> <li>• Increase funding for students</li> </ul>	Increase funding for schools

<b>INDIVIDUALS</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support students</li> <li>• Formalize mentoring</li> <li>• Apprenticeships</li> <li>• Involvement in community</li> <li>• Involvement in political sphere</li> <li>• Promotions/outreach/visibility</li> <li>• Educate decision-makers</li> <li>• Promotions into niche markets</li> <li>• Promotions through other professions/alliances</li> <li>• Join professional associations</li> </ul>	Be connected!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passion for the profession...get it out there</li> <li>• Use the name 'landscape architect'</li> <li>• Take more responsibility and action on an individual level</li> <li>• Identify role models/icons</li> <li>• Demonstration</li> <li>• Competence</li> </ul>	Be passionate!

Within each category, responses were totaled and are expressed here in number of times the response was repeated and as a percent of total responses. (For a more complete breakdown of responses, see Appendix 3.)

<b>Strategies</b>	Total responses of individuals, teams, and large group	
	Times repeated	Percent of Total
<b>CSLA/AAPC and Components</b>		
• Increase outreach and promotion	66	28%
• Change organizational and membership structure	28	12%
• Expand legal regulation	14	6%
• Involvement in educational institutions	9	4%
<b>Schools/Educational Institutions</b>		
• Expand school enrollment and curriculum	52	22%
• Increase outreach to and within schools	9	4%
• Increase funding for schools	8	3%
<b>Individuals</b>		
• Be connected	35	15%
• Be passionate	13	6%
Total number of responses	234	100%

A total of ten strategies have been identified through this workshop process and are described in detail below.

## **RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES RELATED TO CSLA/AAPC AND COMPONENTS**

### **1. INCREASE OUTREACH & PROMOTION**

Outreach, promotion, campaigning and marketing of the profession by the CSLA/AAPC and component associations gained the highest amount of responses for any one recommendation, amounting to twenty-eight percent of responses. The goal of this recommendation is to increase overall knowledge and understanding of the profession by the public, governmental organizations, and educational institutions. Recommendations related to outreach include:

- Advocacy on behalf of the profession
- Promote the value of the profession
- Marketing to the public and the government
- Speak with a unified voice
- Promotion and advertising for the profession
- CSLA/AAPC/components to be politically active
- All government organizations should have an area of landscape architecture
- Government lobbying
- Have an icon or a champion as a conduit to get landscape architecture to the public
- Popularization of the profession through new media and new channels to the public
- Outreach to the public (e.g. National Landscape Architecture Day)
- Conduct a market study of the profession
- Using tools available (e.g. multimedia)
- Educate decision-makers
- Promotions into niche markets
- Higher profile jobs
- Use conferences and job fairs as ways to reach younger individuals

### **2. CHANGE THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE**

It was recommended in the large group session twelve percent of the time that the CSLA and component associations become more inclusive, essentially by opening up its membership structure and allowing various routes into the profession. By making the admittance process into professional associations easier, numbers will increase and a needed diversity of people will enter the professional organizations. Recommendations by the session groups regarding membership include:

#### New membership structure

- Membership with levels of hierarchy
- Expand membership structure
- Critical mass of members
- Increase numbers
- New 'levels' of categories
- Integration between component associations

Alternative routes to the profession

- Increase traditional enrolment
- Increase non-traditional enrolment
- Allow entrance from 'non-LA' degrees

Accessibility to the CSLA/AAPC

- Simplify admittance process to component associations and CSLA/AAPC
- Be more inclusive in the organization and the profession
- Reduce membership fees
- Reduce costs of conferences, making it more affordable

### **3. EXPAND LEGAL REGULATION**

Six percent of responses recommended increasing legal regulations to “secure our right to do our work”. It was recommended by some that the quality of standards be increased, despite possible losses in number of practitioners. Recommendations listed by the session groups regarding legal regulations included:

- Offer a practice act for all levels of practitioners
- Review and if necessary revise the LARE
- Seek expanded protection of title for visibility

### **4. INCREASE INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS**

In the large group session, it was recommended that CSLA/AAPC have more affiliation with schools and educational institutions. It was recommended that CSLA/AAPC and the component organizations promote the profession in schools. As well, assistance of CSLA/AAPC in student and recent graduate prospects was mentioned. For instance, it was noted there needs to be more recruitment of recent grads into the Canadian professional organizations. Mentorship is recommended for both the professional associations and individual landscape architecture practitioners as a means for growing the strength of the profession. Recommendations regarding CSLA/AAPC and component association involvement include:

- Formalize mentorship programs
- Organized encouragement of new grads in practice

## **RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES RELATED TO SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION**

### **1. EXPAND SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND CURRICULUM**

Increasing school enrollment was recommended twenty-two percent of the time, which accounts for the second most frequently noted recommendation. These options mostly include expanding programs that offer education in all areas of landscape architecture. There were recommendations to expand into regional areas such as the Maritimes and Alberta, where no accredited educational programs exist. Increased access into educational programs was recommended, but certainly not at the expense of high quality curricula.

Increasing school enrollment also includes recommendations to do the following: re-evaluate programs, increase BLA programs, increase research in MLA programs, increase the quality of programs, offer different types of education, and increase scholarships and funding through government lobbying. These recommendations were noted in the individual feedback sheets, as well as many comments to offer different types of training and more unique programs with technical and research curriculum. Recommendations include:

#### Enrollment

- Recruitment of highly qualified candidates
- Regional expansion
- Increase enrollments
- Increase enrolments of BLA programs
- Improve access to schools
- Try to increase number of schools
- Focus on recruitment
- Emphasis on quality, don't lower the bar
- Increase programs at educational institutions
- More space in schools
- Increase regional access to professional education

#### Curriculum

- Increase standards in curriculum
- Hybridization: expanded training/backgrounds
- Integrated education systems
- Diversified BLA curriculum
- Reduce the MLA programs
- Seniors advocate on behalf of students
- Link the degree and professional designations
- Comprehensive national strategy for education

### **2. INCREASE OUTREACH TO AND WITHIN SCHOOLS**

Children and young adults can learn about the profession of landscape architecture through school programs. This was a theme of discussion during the workshop session on how to promote the

profession and keep it growing in four percent of responses. Outreach into schools includes elementary schools, secondary schools, and university institutions. For example, it was felt that outreach needed to be conducted in elementary and high school students. It was also felt that there needed to be more promotion of landscape architecture departments within universities and colleges as well as with the communities surrounding these institutions. It was recommended that schools be involved in self-promotion and marketing. Recommendations by session groups for school outreach include:

- Increase awareness of profession in high schools
- Promote programs within schools
- Promote programs externally through lobbying
- Strengthen relationships within industry, and with CSLA/AAPC, individuals, etc.
- Educational institutions to be involved in promotions
- Self promotion
- Improve public awareness
- Public education, marketing

### **3. INCREASE FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS**

Increasing funding was recommended for schools and students in order to keep the profession growing. Three percent of responses recommended increasing funding options for schools and for students within schools. Scholarships and publications such as *Landscapes/Paysages* were recommended as important to the profession, but it was not identified who will do the lobbying for increased funding. Recommendations by session groups on increasing school funding:

- Increase funding for research
- Increase funding for publishing research
- Increase funding opportunities for students
- Create more specific scholarships
- Create teaching and research chairs
- Individual support for students

## **RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES RELATED TO INDIVIDUALS**

### **1. BE CONNECTED!**

Networking was the third most recommended response overall, making up fifteen percent of responses. This included recommendations to increase networking alliances in the profession, as well as alliances with other professions. There was strong support for working with students and formalizing mentorship programs between professionals and young practitioners and students. The individual feedback sheets revealed that there is desire to recruit graduates to stay and practice in Canada – to compete with the United States for graduates who are leaving the country. Being involved in community was mentioned as a way to increase public exposure to the profession as well as growing necessary ties with other groups and organizations. Being involved on a political sphere was also recommended for individuals as well as the CSLA/AAPC. Recommendations regarding alliances include:

- Offer apprenticeships
- Involvement in community
- Involvement in political sphere
- Demonstrate ability to do good work, competency, talent
- Community service as a route to visibility
- Mentorship – formalize it
- Promotion through other professions/alliances
- More interaction within the profession, increase email contact between professionals
- More conferences
- More connectedness between professionals
- Support for networking
- Unified voice
- Communication

### **2. BE PASSIONATE!**

This session was filled with passion and there was obvious interest in the room to keep the profession growing and alive! Six percent of responses included recommendations to be more passionate about the profession. Individual suggestions included using the name and being vocal about the work of landscape architects. Overall, there was a strong response to being leaders and taking on leadership roles in our work, to being competent and committed to excellence in our work. Recommendations regarding passion include:

- Generate passion for the profession...get it out there to the public
- Use the name 'landscape architect'
- Take more responsibility and action on an individual level
- Identify role models/icons
- Demonstrate our competence
- Create more stars
- Seek exposure

## **Next Steps**

*Growing the Profession* represents an important milestone in the development of landscape architecture in Canada. This session provided the opportunity to share insights and views with colleagues across the country. Of significance is the range of viewpoints heard from in this session, from those of first year students to those of seasoned practitioners, educators and association leaders. Yet despite these differences in background and experience, the concerns expressed were amazingly similar, with strong, clear themes emerging with respect to where the profession ought to go and how we ought to get there.

Many of the points raised in this session are ones we have heard before. Thus, the session also served to confirm what individuals and association boards may have been thinking and saying across the country, and to place these views into a broader understanding of the common concerns and visions members of our profession hold across Canada.

As we can see from the recommendations of this report, all of us as individuals, professionals (or about-to-be professionals), educators and professional leaders have a role to play in growing landscape architecture in Canada. Through this workshop, we have drawn upon our collective knowledge and wisdom, and now we must act on it, whether by taking small steps or giant leaps. Based on what we know from experience and what we heard from participants in Montreal, the time to start growing the profession is now.

## Appendix 1 – Workshop Outline

### **GROWING THE PROFESSION IN CANADA**

1:30 PM – 4:30 PM

Friday, September 21, 2001

Queen Elizabeth Hotel, Montreal, Quebec



#### **Program Description**

The profession in Canada is at a critical point. To stay healthy, the profession needs to accommodate people with a diversity of skills and knowledge. At the same time, the importance of education and licensing standards and the stature this brings to individuals and the profession needs to be recognized. This round-table workshop will provide an opportunity to share concerns and develop solutions on growing the profession in Canada. CSLA/AAPC component association leaders and CSLA/AAPC full and associate members in public, private and academic practice should plan to participate. ASLA members are welcome, too.

#### **Workshop Agenda**

- Introductions
- Background and Purpose
- Speakers
- Identify Visions, Barriers and Strategies (Individuals)
- Synthesize Visions, Barriers and Strategies (Teams)
- Break
- Report Visions and Barriers (Group)
- Report Strategies (Group)
- Final Remarks



## Appendix 2 – Individual Response Form



# the Growing Profession



*What is your **vision** of the profession?*

*What are the biggest **barriers** to growing the profession?*

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

*What **strategies** should be pursued for growing the profession?*

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.



### Appendix 3 - Breakdown of Responses

	Individual responses		Team responses		Group responses		Total Responses		
	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	
Multidisciplinary in approach	22	42%	8	17%	6	32%	36	31%	<b>Visions</b>
Leaders	10	19%	8	17%	3	16%	21	18%	
Publicly recognized	10	19%	8	17%	2	11%	20	17%	
Broad in scope	5	10%	4	9%	6	32%	15	13%	
Knowledgeable and skilled	5	10%	8	17%	2	11%	15	13%	
Connect people and nature	0	0%	11	23%	0	0%	11	9%	
Diverse in background	0	0%	3	6%	1	5%	4	3%	
Number of responses	52	100%	47	100%	19	100%	118	100%	
	Individual responses		Team responses		Group responses		Total Responses		<b>Barriers</b>
	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	
Visibility/Public perception	50	40%	12	20%	8	21%	70	31%	
Education	27	21%	13	22%	9	23%	49	22%	
Self identity	13	10%	19	32%	9	23%	41	18%	
Entrance into profession	22	17%	7	12%	6	15%	35	16%	
Funding	14	11%	8	14%	7	18%	29	13%	
Number of responses	126	100%	59	100%	39	100%	224	100%	
	Individual responses		Team responses		Group responses		Total Responses		<b>Strategies</b>
	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	Times repeated	% of Total	
<b>CSLA/AAPC and Components</b>									
Increase outreach and promotion	41	38%	10	17%	15	22%	66	28%	
Change the organizational and membership structure	8	7%	13	22%	7	10%	28	12%	
Increase legal regulations	11	10%	3	5%	0	0%	14	6%	
Increase involvement in educational institutions	3	3%	2	3%	4	6%	9	4%	
<b>Schools/Education</b>									
Expand school enrollment and curriculum	28	26%	13	22%	11	16%	52	22%	
Increase outreach to and within schools	0	0%	4	7%	5	7%	9	4%	
Increase funding for schools	0	0%	2	3%	6	9%	8	3%	
<b>Individuals</b>									
Be connected	12	11%	10	17%	13	19%	35	15%	
Be passionate	4	4%	2	3%	7	10%	13	6%	
Number of responses	107	100%	59	100%	68	100%	234	100%	

## Appendix 4 – Workshop Participants

NAME	AFFILIATION	NAME	AFFILIATION
Andersen, Heidi	AALA	Middleton, Ron, FCSLA	AALA
Arbuthnot, Blair	U of G student	Milovsoroff, Ann, FCSLA	OALA
Asselin, Vincent, FCSLA	AAPQ	Moore, Rick, FCSLA	OALA
Bell, Garth	AALA/NAIT	Neufeld, Al	BCSLA
Boerefyn, Sherry	AALA	Novak, Len, FCSLA	AALA
Brown, Adrienne	BCSLA	Obradovic, Bojan	NAIT student
Brown, Donna	AALA/NAIT	Olsen, Christy	NAIT student
Bruyere, Bev	AALA	Ondyk, Jeff	NAIT student
Carson, Garry, FCSLA	AAPQ	Owen, Mik	APLA
Cervený, Kaja	AALA	Paine, Cecelia, FCSLA	OALA/UofG
Chapman, Sharon	OALA	Pagacz, Michelle	NAIT student
Charanduk, Brian	AALA	Pihooja, Katherine	NAIT student
Charlton, A	AALA	Preston, Kathryn	NFLD
Danielson, Andrew	AALA	Prystupa, Kristina	NAIT student
Darrajh, Jane	OALA	Rault, Rhonda	AHLA
Ducheminsky, Dallas	NAIT student	Ripley, Kyle	AALA
Dyson, Cynthia	U of G student	Rolland, J.F., FCSLA	AAPQ
Ferguson, Bryan	U of G student	Sarkis, Souhaila	OALA
Fisher, Meaghan	NAIT student	Schwabenbauer, Andre	AALA
Forbes, Christine	NAIT student	Schwarz, Julia	NLALA
Forsyth, Gord	SALA	Sears, Cathy	AALA
Foster, Paul	NAIT	Sedore, Jennifer	OALA
Gagnon, Chantal	AAPQ	Shymonalci, Greg	AALA
Gaudreau, Richard	AAPQ	Sommerville, Shona	NLALA
Gerstmar, John	SALA	Taylor, Dave	U of G student
Giocoli, Barbara	NAIT student	Taylor, James R., FCSLA	OALA/UofG
Grant, Timothy	U of G student	Turner, David	BCSLA
Halfyard, Bob	NLALA	Veldkamp, Ed	U of G student
Hodgins, Myke	AAPQ	Versteeg, Ed	NFLD
Hudak, Peter	U of G student	Waddick, Paula	U of G student
Kalapaca, Virginia	OALA	Williams, Bruce	AALA/NAIT
Kaunski, Jessica	NAIT student	Williams, Ron, FCSLA	AAPQ/UofMontreal
Kenny, Michael	City of Calgary	Windolf, Peter	OALA
Kobewka, Neil	NAIT student	Wood, Dan	U of G student
Koblants, Hanita	APALA	Wright, Rob, FCSLA	OALA/UofT
Krysa, Colin	NAIT student	Wyman, Gavin	NAIT student
Lam, HT	OALA	Zalite, Kristina	U of G student
Lepage, Sally	OALA		
Lindeburgh, Brad	AALA		
MacPherson, Andrew	OALA		
Martin, Juliellen Sarver	ASLA Associate		

## Appendix 5 – Correspondence

Adrienne Brown  
Landscape Architect  
416 East Kings Road  
North Vancouver, B.C.  
Phone/Fax: 986-9058



September 28, 2001

Cecelia Paine, FCSLA  
CSLA/AAPC Past-president  
University of Guelph  
School of Landscape Architecture  
Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1

Dear Cecelia:

When Charlie Thomsen brought up the importance of passion in the workshop on Friday it hit me! Most - if not all - landscape architects have passion in spades. What they need is respect. If their passion fades over time, it's because a lack of understanding of their role is perpetually bearing down on them. This limited recognition continues to create glass ceilings, limited budgets and threatens the "turf" of LA practice.

These are my opinions of what might be done to remedy the situation, offered as a follow up to the workshop discussion:

### Legal

- Strengthen legislation and associated regulatory responsibilities across Canada. This would ideally include consultation between provinces and territories on the specifics of their bylaws etc. before title acts are brought on stream. The core knowledge, skills and responsibilities are known, and are defined in any number of places. A recent working definition of note is that included in the practice act recently established in Oregon. The argument that a practice act would limit the breadth of practice and marginalize the profession does not stand up in my mind against the risk associated with not establishing our core set of responsibilities. We keep hearing it from architects and engineers: "If you want to play with the big boys, get a practice act". They often have a hard time taking us seriously as things stand.

### Education

- Lobby both individual post-secondary institutions and provincial governments to establish or re-establish BLA and Landscape Technology programs. CSLA/AAPC could take a lead role in supporting and coordinating such work. I believe that the biggest threat to the future of Landscape Architecture in Canada today is the loss of so many undergraduate programs. I am not convinced that the MLA programs can provide the depth of training in landscape architectural that the BLA has historically offered. It is true that environmental science has become an important part of the background a new landscape architect needs, however this shouldn't necessarily set aside the need for a dedicated LA degree program. There has been much discussion among practitioners (and

prospective employers) in BC about the loss of the BLA program at UBC, and how it has impacted the profession. The general feeling is that graduates of the new program are oriented to academic concerns and research, and that this puts a burden on employers to spend an inordinate amount of time training them in other aspects of practice such as construction and horticulture. I believe the profession can ill afford the 150 places lost over the last decade. It puts Canada so far away from the ratio of graduates per capita in the USA (If we had the same support from our post secondary institutions our numbers would be closer to 5000). I am not convinced that the market for our services is limited to what we see today. I would argue that it has the potential for tremendous expansion, however the current state of affairs leaves landscape architects at a distinct disadvantage with respect to critical mass, visibility and credibility.

Another point on education is that the dominance of the MLA program has led to an older group beginning careers in landscape architecture. This makes it difficult to attract new members for our provincial component organizations (who are young and unattached, and have the time and energy to get involved), and increases the challenge of attracting the best and brightest to a profession where remuneration is often too low for entry level LAs to justify 6 years of study.

- That KSA\*s covered by the LARE\*\* be addressed explicitly in accredited LA programs such that graduates are focused on writing and passing this exam as soon as possible after finishing school. I believe it is in our best interests as a group that the LARE function well as a demonstration of minimal competence in a range of basic LA activities. Although individuals may head off in various directions beyond these activities as their careers progress, I believe the LARE can and should serve as a common starting point, and that this exam will not serve to marginalize LAs as much as a lack of agreement on what our set of concerns and expertise actually is.

#### CSLA/AAPC

- Create an associate member category for CSLA/AAPC at a nominal cost – say \$50.00 per year that would include a subscription to *Landscapes/Paysages*. Ideally, this would bring a group of trained LAs who have chosen not to become members of provincial components closer to the profession. This could lead to an increase of full membership in the long run as these individuals may find their allegiance drift back to landscape architecture as a relevant and worthwhile discipline to be associated with.
- To be wary of initiatives such as the 2003 IFLA conference, or the joint ASLA/CSLA/AAPC conference as they take too much time and energy away from the most committed members of CSLA/AAPC, and the organization then lacks the resources to focus on projects that will improve our “lot in life” in the long term. Expansion of the membership base may help this situation, however I think ongoing priorities need to be running smoothly before we commit to take part in these big events that only promote our group to other landscape architects (albeit from other parts of the world).
- Fund CSLA/AAPC to lobby Federal agencies and encourage them to specifically identify and seek out landscape architects where appropriate in RFP’s.
- That CSLA/AAPC help co-ordinate the membership categories of the provincial components so that the terms and bylaws are common across Canada wherever possible. This will serve us well in the eyes of the federal government as a response to the labour mobility initiative.
- That CSLA/AAPC approach the Governor General’s Awards for the Arts Committee with a proposal that they introduce an Award for Landscape Architecture.
- Expand the mailing list for *Landscapes/Paysages* and add names outside our membership. It could start with certain provincial ministries, mayors, federal agencies, architectural and engineering associations and environmental groups.
- Support and co-ordinate the introduction of Certificate of Assurance for LAs across Canada to use in place of Building Code Schedules which refer to architectural services only. BCSLA/AAPC has created such forms, and is in the process of having them adopted by individual municipalities throughout the province.

- That CSLA/AAPC help the provinces to revive the DesignAccess initiative. Design Access worked with Diana Wickham of the Alliance for Canadian Design for several years (until June 2000) to create a website specifically designed as a resource for school career counsellors and students. It was sponsored by Landscape Architects (BCSLA/AAPC), Industrial Design, Interior Design, Graphic Design, Architecture and Apparel (an industry association). The first phase of the project researched the content of the site, however phase 2 was derailed when HRDC came under scrutiny over their budgets and use of funds. I believe that many people don't hear about Landscape Architecture as a possible career goal early enough in their schooling. The DesignAccess initiative was launched in order to correct this situation, and it is of grave concern to me that it's been stopped in its tracks.

#### Provincial

- Work with municipalities and labour unions to increase use of the title and to ensure that the professional status be recognized by such employers. The lack of recognition of professional status in this realm is a serious problem where labels mean a great deal.
- That provincial components bring compulsory continuing education on stream in order to demonstrate that LAs are maintaining current knowledge and skills.
- That provincial components offer a site sign for their members that identifies them as members of a professional organization. BCSLA/AAPC has created such a sign that matches the dimensions and materials of the Architectural Institute of BC sign, and had 50 manufactured early this year. To date BCSLA/AAPC members have purchased 42 of these signs. They are 17" x 48", are of highway grade aluminum and are coated with reflective paint with custom cut-out reflective letters. A photo of this sign is on our website: [www.bCSLA/AAPC.org](http://www.bCSLA/AAPC.org)

#### Individual

- We need stars! Why does everybody know about Cornelia Hahn Oberlander, or Lawrence Halprin? They are self promoters and their visibility is a benefit to us all. To make stars we (as individuals) need to look for every opportunity to have our name included in an article, on a sign or in a brochure. When I visited the Montreal Botanical Garden on Tuesday I wanted to know who had designed the new First Nations Garden. The fact that there was no credit given on the signage or on the site map was not a surprise of course, and I read in LAM several days later that it was Williams, Asselin, Ackoui who was responsible for the design. Nevertheless, for anyone who doesn't read such periodicals, the designers remain anonymous. Do LAs end up with their names on bronze plaques? No they don't. Usually it's the mayor and councillor and sometimes the architect or engineers. If we actively push for this recognition, it will begin to be offered if only to oil the "squeaky wheel". Over time it could become part of the normal way of documenting a project.

If the current membership of CSLA/AAPC channels their passion effectively I believe we can make landscape architecture a profession that will be the envy of all, and a career goal of many more in coming generations.

Sincerely,

ADRIENNE BROWN