

Minutes

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Semi-Annual Governing Board Meeting

April 22, 2006

San Antonio, Texas

Marriott River Center conference rooms 3 & 4

Approved, November 8, 2006

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members:

Present: Officers: Mickey Lauria (Pres.), **Michael Hibbard** (Vice Pres.-Pres. Elect), **Patricia Pollak** (Secretary), **Barry Nocks** (Treasurer), **Chris Silver** (Past-Pres.),
Regional Representatives: Susan Bradbury (NC), **Robin Boyle** (NC), **Elise Bright** (SC),
Jim Cohen (SE), **Sharon Gaber** (SC), **Emil Malizia** (SE), **Lynn McCormick** (NE),
Dowell Myers (W), **Connie Ozawa** (W), **Rolf Pendall** (NE),
Students: Chuck Fisher (PSU)

Number Present: 16

Absent: Lester King (Stu-TSU). (*I*)

Non-Voting Members:

Present: Tridib Banerjee (PAB), **Eugenie Birch** (PAB), **Karen Christensen** (JPER),
Cheryl Contant (Conference Chair), **Charles Hoch** (PAB).

Absent: David Amborski (Canadian Liaison), **Karen Chappel** (JPER)

Guests:

Hemalata Dandekar (Arch & Planning TF), **Donna Dodd** (ACSP Admin.), **Glenda Fisher**
(ACSP President's Assistant), **Nancy Frank** (*UPDATE* and website),
Bruce Stiftel (Academy & Profession), **Ruth Yabes** (Planning Globally TF),
Eric Moran (Sage Publications), **Linda Dalton** (Admin. Conference),
William Siembieda (Admin. Conference), **Shonagh Merits** (PAB), **Fritz Steiner**,
Marlon Boarnet.

I. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER by President **Mickey Lauria** at 9:00 AM. President Lauria presented an agenda to the Governing Board.

Motion: To adopt the agenda as amended. (J. Cohen, moved; S. Bradbury, second.) Passed unanimously.

II. OFFICER'S REPORTS

Secretary's Report: Secretary Patricia Pollak reported. The Minutes of Kansas City, MO meeting were read.

Motion: To accept the Minutes of the Governing Board meeting in Kansas City, Mo, of October 26, 2005, with corrections. Passed unanimously.

Treasurer's Report: Treasurer Barry Nocks presented a summary history of the development and implementation of the ACSP budget. He reported that as of July 2005 ACSP had \$250,000 in assets. Our budget is now in *Quickbooks* format. This permits us to now have actual figures to date as presented in the "ACSP Budget History" document, 4-20-06. We will continue to have actual up-to-date figures from now on.

Barry Nocks responded to a question about an audit review of our books by saying that that type of review is what has now been done.

Motion: To send a second note of appreciation to:

1. The KCMO Conference Committee
2. The KCMO Local Host committee.

Moved: R. Pendall

Moved to Table: G. Birch

Rational: Since we do not have the KCMO figures before us a motion to table the main motion until after we have the KCMO Conference Report was made.

The Motion to Table passed by unanimous consent.

Treasurer Nocks reported that we have \$335,000 in assets. Some are not liquid now, but we do have roughly \$200,000 to invest. Barry suggested that we invest half this money in 7-day and half the money in 28-day AAA rated instruments, known as variable rate preferred bonds (VRPs). There is a \$150 annual fee for an account at Merrill-Lynch.

We will then have approximately \$80,000 immediately accessible; \$100,000 accessible with a week's notice and \$100,000 within a month.

Motion: To put the funds into an account with Merrill-Lynch and invest half in 7-day and half in 28-day VRPs.

Moved: Barry Nocks

Second: S. Bradbury.

The motion passed unanimously.

Vice President's Report: Michael Hibbard reported:

Two responsibilities of the Vice-President are:

1. ACSP publications, and
2. ACSP Conferences.

Conferences will be discussed later during the Conference Committee report.

Publications: Our contract with SAGE ends next summer. An ad-hoc committee to address the SAGE/JPER contract composed of Mike Hibbard, Karen Christensen, Chris Silver, and Bruce Stiffler will examine the issue/s and will present a report and appropriate recommendations to the Governing Board at the Fall meeting in Ft. Worth.

Mike reported that SAGE is creating electronic files of back issues of *JPER*, at SAGE's expense. SAGE has agreed to give ACSP the files if ACSP decides to go with another publisher in the future and will not charge ACSP for the cost of preparing the files. SAGE also has agreed that ACSP members will have access to these files at no cost. **Mike Hibbard** introduced **Eric Moran**, our SAGE representative, to the Governing Board.

President's Report: Mickey Lauria reported.

President **Lauria** reported that:

ACSP has received two grants of financial assistance. One from the Fannie Mae Foundation Inc. in the amount of \$20,000 and a second in the amount of \$10,000 from the Lincoln Institute; The PAB revisions are in Phase II review. The time for comments on this phase has been extended 30 days;

Certificates of Appreciation will be awarded to those whose term of service has ended at the Annual Meeting in Fort Worth.

Mickey thanked **Chris Rengert** of the Fannie Mae Foundation, Inc. for his continuing support of ACSP. **G. Birch** suggested that an ACSP representative visit the Fannie Mae Foundation to discuss their continuing support of ACSP and our relationship with them. A request was made for the names of any other groups that ACSP might consider approaching for similar support.

Mickey stated that later in the day we will discuss:

1. ACSP strategic planning,
2. Website enhancement,
3. Budget set-asides from our discretionary funds, and
4. Planning School Assessment.

III. PUBLICATIONS

1. Journal of Planning Education and Research (JPER)

Karen Christensen reported (written report attached)

JPER has experienced a 20% increase in manuscript submissions over last year and another 20% increase in submissions in the first quarter of this year. She reported that it takes approximately one year for an article to reach publication in JPER.

Karen also said that the writing skills workshop for new scholars has gone very well. The program was fortunate to have Louise Dunlap, a writing teacher, present at the workshop.

Karen also reported that a press in China has indicated an interest in JPER. Cautions were raised about difficulties in translation, in particular with technical terms; the reputation of various educational presses in China; and, differences in copyright protection enforcement procedures between the U.S. and China. **Karen** discussed the matter with SAGE and said that at this time SAGE was not interested in pursuing the matter. SAGE will be opening an office in Asia later this year and perhaps after that the discussion could continue.

2. UPDATE/Website

Nancy Frank reported. (No written report.)

Nancy requested that Governing Board members assist with assuring that items are submitted to UPDATE. She also requested to be present at discussions about improving the website.

3. Guide/Institutional Data Project

Mickey Lauria reported for **Sandi Rosenbloom**. **Mickey** reported that *The Guide* is now completed and that the data included is up-to-date at least as of April 2005. Some schools have provided data current as of January 2006.

There is \$39,000 in the budget for printing and distributing *The Guide*. Arrangements need to be made for this. *The Guide* will also be published on the ACSP website.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Membership: **Elise Bright** reported. (Written report attached.) The committee reviewed the dues structure and recommends no change. Membership applications should go to Donna Dodd. Membership forms should be posted on the website.

Three member schools have dropped membership: Princeton, Boston University, and Indiana. The committee requested that Donna Dodd inform affiliate members of the eligibility requirements for full membership.

Nominating and Elections: **Genie Birch** reporting for **Randy Crane**. (Written report attached.)

The Governing Board was reminded that new members need to be appointed to the Nominations and Elections committee. A written compilation of the procedures of the committee has been prepared.

Finances and Investments: **Barry Nocks** reported. He raised the question of reconsidering the amount of money we should keep in a reserve fund. The Committee will take this up and report at the next meeting.

Institutional Governance: **Patricia Pollak** reported that several items have been brought forward and will be considered by the Committee during the Fall meeting. Governing Board members were requested to forward input on any of the following to her:

1. Proxy voting at both the Governing Board and Business meetings,
2. Regional boundaries,
3. Awards policies,
4. The election timing issue raised by the Nominations and Elections committee's report, and
5. Term Limits for Regional Representatives.

Conferences:

2006 Ft. Worth, November 9-12. **Cheryl Contant** reported. (Written report attached.)

Cheryl reported that when a student abstract is rejected for presentation, the applicant will be encouraged to submit his or her work for presentation in a poster session.

The committee has established a process for naming Track Chairs and set Track Chair terms.

President **Lauria** asked for unanimous consent from the Governing Board to thank **Cheryl** for a job well done as Conference Chairperson.

A suggestion was made that a regular conference session be set aside to highlight students' research.

2006 World Planning Schools Congress: **Bruce Stiftel** reported.

More than 700 abstracts have been received as of January. Acceptances and rejection notices will be sent in March. Hotel booking closes on May 15.

The School of Architecture in Mexico City will pursue a solution to the site accessibility situation. There will be a series of meetings of like officers from the various organizations to exchange ideas. These will include Conference Chairs, Journal Editors, Curriculum and Accreditation bodies, Secretary and Treasurers, and Presidents.

Mickey Lauria extended the appreciation of ACSP to **Johanna Looye** for her extraordinary efforts on behalf of ACSP to make this World Congress a success. **Unanimous consent.**

He also thanked **Louis Albrecht** for his service in developing the World Congress.

ACSP Administrators Conference 2007: San Luis Obispo. **Bill Siembieda** reported.

The conference committee is: **Linda Dalton, Bill Siembieda** and **David Conn.** **Bill Siembieda** will have the role of Local Host for accommodations, meeting rooms etc. He has arranged for the meeting to be held at Shore Cliffs Lodge in Pismo Beach, CA.

Linda Dalton will seek program input through the web.

The New Chair's School will be on March 22. The Administrators' Conference will be March 23-24, 2007.

2007 Conference Milwaukee: **Nancy Frank** reported that the conference is in the early stage of planning.

2008 Joint Conference with AESOP: **Mike Hibbard** reported.

Mike said that there have been expressions of interest from several schools. **Mike** recommends the University of Illinois in Chicago as the Local Host with a meeting in July 2007. The AESOP Conference Committee supports this recommendation.

Moved by **Mike Hibbard.**

Second by **E. Bright.**

Motion passed unanimously.

PAB Revision II: **Genie Birch** and **Charles Hoch** reported.

Genie and **Charlie** reminded us that the purpose of the PAB is assure that planning programs accomplish the purpose of preparing students to be planning professionals. PAB is part of a larger community of accreditors and the PAB itself will be up for accreditation next year by the Council of Higher Education Accreditation. Externally, the PAB's authority comes from the CHEA. The PAB is reviewed on its procedures. Trends within the CHEA focus on learning outcomes from programs and for the students to be trained (See the CHEA handout.). Internally, the PAB's authority comes from ACSP, APA, and AICP. These bodies approve the budget, membership, and actions of the PAB itself. Five years ago, a committee was formed to look at the PAB. The Divisions Council of APA formed a Task Force to make recommendations as well. This Task force presented a detailed report and made specific recommendations for amending the PAB accreditation criteria. PAB is obligated to review the recommendations and create a committee to review the report and make recommendations.

The non-curricula items formed Phase I of the review. The PAB guidelines and criteria now contain language reinforcing planning as professional education. AICP, in particular, recommended

language and requirements for Planning Department Chairs. ACSP also had concerns and suggested revisions and these are now before the APA Board for approval.

Phase II contains the curricular revisions. The draft has been submitted with very particular language. The PAB committee reviewed the recommendations, interpreted them, and revised the recommendations. That document is now under review.

The PAB Task Force report, in mark-up version, is on the PAB website. The underlying spirit of it addresses how well we are preparing students to be effective planners. Specific AICP membership is included as an example but is not a defining criterion. The PAB's role is to oversee the institutional provision of minimum standards for professional education. The idea is that PAB should define less specific substance and institutions should define their own objectives and describe how well the institution meets those objectives. The revised document also addresses the requirement that planning programs have a defined mission.

Comment: the revisions allow for variations in the concepts and ideas about planning practice.

See the "PAB recommended changes to the Accreditation Document-February 2006," handout.

The recommended changes are now in the open public comment phase. The PAB is the official vehicle to receive comments. In the Fall, a final version will be ready. There is a process for further revision if there are to be material changes to the draft in circulation.

Questions from the Governing Board were:

Q.: Are there standard measures for evaluating educational outcomes?

Answer: Yes.

Q.: Why haven't APA and AICP been willing to share AICP exam pass rates with the schools?

Answer: APA and AICP are not sharing this information at the request of the schools.

Q.: Why is the PAB document weaker on value statements than the APA and AICP value statements?

Answer: The PAB role is to examine how knowledge and skills are taught. The PAB works at the most basic level.

Q.: Did the committee examine workplace learning?

Answer: The document discusses learning activities not courses. Language has been proposed to permit various ways to impart knowledge and skills in addition to the traditional course method.

Comments:

This document is a step removed from previous PAB standards that were direct on particular values. The suggestion that removing language about particular values from the document be done with caution.

The current PAB document includes language that is explicit on measures of diversity, environmental justice, and social justice. This is important back up with administrators, particularly in design schools.

PAB: Shonagh Merits (PAB Executive Director.)

Shonagh distributed a list of schools, site visits, number of faculty in the site visitor pool and participation rates. Next year PAB will need 68 site visitors. Shonagh reminded the Governing

Board of the process for nominating people to the PAB site visitor pool. Within ACSP, nominations first go to **Chuck Connerly**.

V. SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Faculty Mentoring: Chuck Connerly reported. The committee has developed a format for establishing mentor pairs that will be initiated prior to the Fall meeting.

Planning Globally Task Force: Ruth Yabes reported. (Written report attached.)

Ruth requested that the Governing Board accept the recommendations of the Planning Globally Task Force that the relationship between GPEAN and ACSP be formalized.

With the report submitted, The Planning Globally Task force has completed its business.

By unanimous acclamation, the Governing Board expressed its thanks to **Ruth Yabes** and the Task Force members.

Task Force on Architecture and Planning: (Hemalata Dandekar, Co-Chair) No report at this time.

Academy and the Profession: Bruce Stiftel reported. (Written report attached.)

1. The Committee recommends that a permanent ACSP Higher Education Leadership Award Committee be named by the ACSP President in time to solicit nominations for an award presentation at the Administrators Conference in Spring 2007.

2. The Committee recommends that ACSP initiate a program of Planning School Performance Measurement based on the proposal of its Working Group and consisting of three studies (Reputation, Faculty Accomplishment, and Student Data) to take place in a six-year cycle. We further recommend that a committee be assigned to prepare a Request for Qualifications for contractors to undertake a Reputation study, with the intent that the Governing Board would select the contractor at its Fall 2006 meeting.

3. The Committee requests budget authorization for the 2007 ACSP Administrators' Conference based on projection of \$18,000 in revenues and \$18,000 in expenditures.

The Working Group on Planning Schools Performance Measurement (Bruce Stiftel reported.)

The members of the Working Group are **Linda Dalton, Fritz Steiner, Nohad Toulan, Bruce Stiftel, Anne Forsyth** and, **Dawn Terkla**. The planning school performance measurement proposal is downloadable from

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/%7Ebstiftel/Urban%20Planning%20School%20Performance%20Measurement.html>

Bruce provided a review of the rationale behind performance measures. These include information to planning program and University administrators as well as comparability with information available about educational programs in other fields,

The committee recommends that three studies be made repeating in a six-year cycle: one on reputation; one on faculty work including scholarship, design, and outreach; and, one on student data.

Questions were raised.

Q.: Cost?

A.: Approximately \$24,000 for the reputation study, \$30,000 for the Faculty study and \$30,000 for the student study.

Q.: Would this lead to a ranking of Planning Programs?

A.: There will be 30 measures in three areas. There will be no weighting of measures.

Q.: Why do the reputation study first?

A.: The ACSP Guide and a student data study have been recently done. There has also been a recent faculty study.

Motion: We take a straw poll to determine how much feedback we have received on this proposal.

Moved: Jim Cohen.

Second: Lynn McCormick.

Discussion:

ACSP Governing Board members should address this as leaders, not reflecting the interests of the schools we represent.

Poll:

Discussion and input received 6

No discussion or input: 7

Abstain: 1

Comment: Performance measures focus on outcomes. Each school has different inputs. For example, faculty output depends on capital, the number of faculty, the teaching load, sabbaticals, and salary. We would need to normalize outputs by inputs.

Comment: These factors could be included in the data

Comment: There is a concern for the imposition of the data collection effort.

Comment: Regardless of rhetoric, the reports will result in ranking.

Comment: The reports will allow people outside the schools to make decisions about the schools.

Comment: Rankings tend to become fixed.

Comment: New faculty could place a higher value on higher ranked schools.

North East representative **R. Pendall** reported on his constituency.

MIT Department Chair, **Larry Vale** was very negative.

Columbia was very unsupportive.

Univ. of Buffalo Chair had not enough time to consider the proposal.

Cornell faculty members were very opposed to the proposal.

He had not seen, heard, or read a single encouraging word.

He said that

1. There is strong opposition to ranking or rating

2. There has been a series of comments that the British research assessment experience has led to a negative impact on schools.

3. The ratings will favor those schools with more resources.

4. Specific measures will hinder innovation and decisions will focus on the impact on ratings.

5. From a pragmatic perspective, it will take a great deal of time to approve and adopt criteria and measures.

He reported that one Chair suggested preferring

- A. To document important contributions that faculty and students have made to improving cities and communities.
- B. To use the money to develop marketing strategies to increase schools and programs visibility.
- C. To reinforce the Academy and the Profession Committee's ability to help troubled schools.

South East representative **Jim Cohen** reported that the Maryland faculty was divided and that the Florida State faculty was positive about the proposal.

West representative **Connie Ozawa** reported that some constituent programs had questions, such as:

Is there a need for this?

Would the study get ahead of a trend or contribute to it?

Would rankings make the field rigid to the detriment of its flexibility?

How would we examine and approve the indicators to be used?

Comment: The Board should take favorable action because the data would be valuable to Department Chairs especially those in schools where departments are encouraged to provide benchmark data.

Comment: Output measures permit schools to compare themselves to self-defined peers.

Comment: University administrators look to *US News and World Reports'* rankings as outside data. An ACSP initiated study would allow us to take the lead in this endeavor.

Comment: An institutional database has been needed for a long time, but this proposed study goes beyond the development of an institutional database. How would the measures or indicators used be established and approved? How would they be summarized? How would no activity in a particular area be accounted for?

Comment: Would a rating system guide what planning schools would address?

Comment: We need to be sure that indicators capture what we think are valuable measures of performance.

Motion: That ACSP initiate a program of Planning Schools Measurement, including a reputation study, a study of faculty accomplishments and, a study of students. A committee will be established to develop and disseminate a RFQ. The Governing Board will select a contractor at the Fall meeting.

Moved, Robin Boyle

Second, Dowell Myers

Vote

For: 8

Against: 7

Motion carries.

VI. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

Chuck Fisher (PSU) reported. (No written report.) As a new member of the Governing Board, **Chuck** brought the Student's budget request of \$1000. To support a student reception, to the meeting. Discussion ensued and an allocation of \$2,000. was recommended.

VII. INTEREST GROUP REPORTS

Global Planning Educators S.Sen/Mike Hibbard. No report at this time.

FWIG: Susan Bradbury reported for **Sanda Kaufman.**

FWIG will sponsor a Professional Development Workshop and a networking luncheon at the Fall Ft. Worth conference. The Annual FWIG resume guide was prepared and is available on the ACSP website. FWIG now has its own website. The FWIG e-list continues as the means of communication among members.

FWIG had already submitted a budget request for \$1500. [This is the traditional amount of ACSP support for the women's faculty group that was established, when ACSP was short of funds, in lieu of full support for the annual FWIG reception and luncheon.] The budget request is for the annual networking luncheon, workshop, resume guide, and other activities beneficial to the women of ACSP.

A new budget request for \$3500. was presented at the meeting. Discussion ensued. The Governing Board allocated FWIG \$1500. in support of its activities for the coming year.

VIII. Canadian Liaison Report No report at this time.

IX. New Business Mickey Lauria reporting.

Mickey reiterated that one of his primary interests, as President of ACSP is to move strategically to make the ACSP more valuable to its member schools. He reminded us of what ACSP does well: *JPER*, our Annual Conference, Planning Program Accreditation – PAB, and Mentoring (FWIG, Administrators' Conference, Doctoral Workshop, Writing Workshop). He then went on to make several proposals.

1. First, we need to plan strategically for our own organizational development. To support this, **Mickey** proposed a budget of \$10,000 to conduct a strategic planning session at the Administrator's conference in San Luis Obispo in Spring 2007.

Motion: To conduct a strategic planning session at the ACSP Administrators Conference in Spring, 2007 in San Luis Obispo and to allocate a budget of \$10,000. therefore.

Moved: R. Pendall.

Second, D. Myers.

Discussion:

Q.: What is the reason for doing this?

A.: \$10,000. is to bring in a facilitator to conduct the session at the Administrators Conference in San Luis Obispo.

Comment: We need to assure that there is input from the membership (schools) In particular; we need to get input, in advance, of any strategic planning effort.

Comment: We should hire a facilitator to quickly design a process and move this along in advance of the Fall meeting in Ft. Worth.

Vote:

YES: 15

No: 1

The motion passed.

2. Second, we need to develop a Web-based Knowledge Management System. To accomplish this **Mickey** proposed a \$10,000 allocation for Web-site Expansion Phase I.

In concept, the web site would be our archives – minutes, committee reports, conference programs, and historical reports, by-laws, Articles of Incorporation, presidential addresses, addresses from the Distinguished Educator, strategic plan, etc.

The website would include our publications. There would be a searchable *Guide* updated constantly; the *Update* newsletter with association business and activity related articles and researched member-activities posted with more frequency; A faculty Resume Book and separate student Resume Book with members only access; searchable conference programs; searchable conference abstracts; and, winning student award papers

The website would also facilitate our internal communications, including officers, Governing Board members, committees, members, and staff links. Also: on-line conference registration, abstract submission, conference schedule and activities local area and other conference promotions, track descriptions and chair links, etc. Membership applications, dues payment, etc.

Motion: To move ahead with an ACSP knowledge-based web system and to appoint a Task force for this purpose soon.

Moved, R. Boyle.

Second, C. Silver.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. Third, Mickey suggested that we invest a specific amount of money (beyond the required reserve) and plan to use the income generated from this investment to fund student travel scholarships to our annual conference and the Ph.D. workshop.

Motion: To invest a portion of our funds beyond the (to be adjusted) reserve. The income generated from this investment would be used to fund student travel to the Annual Conference and the Ph.D. workshop.

Moved, R. Boyle.

Second, Emil Malizia.

Discussion:

- How much of an investment is required to get an adequate yield to accomplish the stated goals?

- We have already made a decision about investing the funds we currently have. Where would these funds come from?
- Should we wait until we have the report on the new recommended reserve amount?
- Should we wait to decide how to spend such income until after the upcoming strategic planning session?

Motion withdrawn.

Revised Motion: Ask the Finance and Investment Committee to explore the possibility of creating an ACSP endowment from new contributions.

Moved, M. Hibbard.

Second, R. Pendall.

Motion passed unanimously.

4. Last, Mickey proposed to allocate FY 2006-07 funds for \$16,500 for the Planning Schools Reputation Study.

[All budget figures are proposed as inclusive of all direct and indirect costs and expenses.]

2006-2007 Schools Reputation Study - Year 1

Schedule of Tasks

May 2006	Request for Qualifications
August 2006	RFQ Responses Due
November 2006	Governing Board selects contractor for Reputation Study
December 2006	Draft Reputation Study Design submitted by Contractor
January 2006	Governing Board approves Reputation Study Design
January/March 2007	Survey of Faculty
April/May 2007	Data Analysis
October 2007	Draft Report reviewed by Governing Board
December 2007	Design, Printing and Distribution of Final Report.

Budget: \$16,500. Total inclusive of direct, indirect, materials, supplies, sub-contracts, design, shipping, etc.

2007-08 Schools Reputation Study – Year 2.

Tasks

- Draft report preparation
- Presentation to Governing Board
- Revisions to report; report production and distribution.

Budget: \$7,650, inclusive.

2007-2008 Faculty Scholarship, Design and Outreach Study Year 1

Schedule of Tasks

Spring 2007	Request for Qualifications
Summer 2007	RFQ Responses Due
Fall 2007	Selection of Contractor by Governing Board

Spring 2008 Study Design Reviewed by Governing Board.

Budget: \$2,575, inclusive.

2008-2009 Faculty Scholarship, Design and Outreach Study Year 2

Schedule of Tasks

Fall 2008 Survey of Faculty (n=800, approx.)
Fall/Sp 2009 Data collection from national sources
Spring 2009 Survey of Schools (n-75, approx.)
Spring 2009 Data Analysis

Budget: \$25,835 inclusive.

2009-2010 Faculty Scholarship, Design and Outreach Study Year 3

Schedule of Tasks

Fall 2009 Preliminary draft reviewed by Governing Board
Winter 2009/10 Revisions, design, printing, distribution of Final Report

Budget: \$8,250 inclusive

2009-2010 Student Data Study Year 1

Schedule of Tasks

Spring 2009 Request for Qualifications
Summer 2009 RFQ Responses Due
Fall 2009 Selection of Contractor by Governing Board
Spring 2010 Study Design Reviewed by Governing Board

Budget: \$2,650 inclusive

2010-2011 Student Data Study Year 2

Fall 2010 Data collection from national sources
Fall 2010 Survey of Schools (n-75, approx.)
Spring 2011 Data Analysis
Spring 2011 Preliminary draft reviewed by Governing Board
Spring 2011 Revisions, design, printing, distribution of Final Report

Budget: \$27,525 inclusive

Comments:

- Since we need a great deal of input from our members about indicators, why start with the student data study?
- Would there be more interest and less controversy if we did faculty output first?
- How will inputs such as school resources weight the outputs?

- Outputs would be per capita and would control for size of faculty.
- It is difficult to get budget data and to get budget data in comparable fashion.
- How will the study account for differences in staff support? In addition, differences in teaching load.
- This project needs time to gain acceptance. Compliance will be critical. We do not have a good record of accomplishment in getting data from our members.
- PAB has a great deal of data but is not allowed to share it.
- Can we bridge how PAB looks at the schools and develop measures?
- In PAB accreditation documents schools set their own goals and establish ways to measure progress toward goals. This allows great flexibility to accommodate a variety of programs.
- Do we want to set up an Implementation Committee to write the specs for an RFP?
- Do we want to put out an RFP for a contractor to work with an implementation Committee?
- These studies should include a sensitivity analysis.
- An Implementation Committee will need a budget to operate.
- What deliverable do we expect in 6 months at the Ft. Worth meeting?
- The deliverable should be the RFP for the first study, including measures and sensitivity tests.
- Can we charge the task Force to use PAB indicators?
- Is there a way to connect this to the knowledge-based web site?

Motion: ACSP should establish a broad-based Task Force to develop input measures and indicators, incorporating the concerns raised today, to develop an RFQ disseminate the RFQ, review applicants and recommend to the board a consultant to conduct the faculty assessment phase of the project.

Moved, R. Pendall.

Second, D. Myers.

Vote:

Yes: 13

No: 0

Abstain: 2.

Motion passed.

X. Budget

Treasurer **Barry Nocks** reported. A preliminary budget was presented. Selected items discussed and adjusted. [See attached.]

Motion: To adopt the budget, as attached, for FY 2006-07.

Moved, E. Bright. Second, S. Gaber.

Motion passed unanimously.

XI. Unfinished Business and General Orders

Motion: To adjourn.

Moved, **C. Fisher**. Second, **R. Boyle**.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Pollak, Secretary