



# Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

## Minutes

Semi-Annual Governing Board Meeting

October 29, 2014

8:00 AM to 5:00 PM

Washington AB, Loew's Hotel, Philadelphia

\* written report (if available) without presentation

\*\* written report with presentation

### I. OPENING THE MEETING - June Thomas

June called the meeting to order at 9:04 and asked for all to introduce themselves.

Attendance: Bruce Stiftel, Carissa, Kazuya Kayumara, Kurt Paulsen, Bill Goldsmith, Michael Frisch, Karen Umemoto, Clint Andrews, Lois Takahashi, June Thomas, Avis Vidal, Christine Bae, Sophonie Joseph, Vincent Reina, Marlon Boarnet, Mickey Lauria, Barry Nocks, Barbara Becker, Deden Rukmana, Chris Silver, Subhro Guhathakurta, Nancey Green Leigh, Donna Dodd

Guests: Jim Drinan, Lee Brown, Jesmarie Johnson, Shonagh Merits, Andrew Seidel (Canadian schools substitute)

Consent Agenda—POCIG Report\*; FWIG Report\*; GPEIG Report.

MOTION: The consent agenda was adopted unanimously.

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 26, 2014

MOTION: The minutes were approved unanimously.

### III. REGULAR AGENDA – June Thomas

June added a report by Andy Seidel representing the Canadian Institute of Planners to the presentations by Allied Organizations, and discussion of funds for proposed improvements to the ACSP website, the organization's awards policy, and staffing needs to New Business. MOTION: The amended agenda was approved unanimously.

#### IV. UPDATE AND STATUS OF ACSP

##### A. President's Report\*\* - June Thomas

June updated the Board on recent trends and events. First, PAB figures indicate that enrollments in accredited programs have been declining, down 28% over the past five years. This raises the question of where planning and planning education stand, and especially what the public face of the field is and the role of planning education. Second, ACSP's international connections, notably the relationship with AESOP, remain uncertain.

Third, the organization has experienced several operating difficulties, especially since the Atlanta meeting. These include (a) the web site is on its last legs (6 years old!) and needs to be rebuilt. It contains numerous large PDFs, most notably the Guide, but these do not provide the organization with useful data bases that can be searched and managed. (b) Staff capacity is stretched very thin. Donna is seriously over-extended during certain times of the year, especially around the conference, and we have no back-up if she should become unavailable. The presidential assistant role has been difficult for a long time—the notion of each president finding someone to do this has not worked out well. One result is that the officers have been assuming roles that should be covered by staff. (c) ACSP now has a large number of committees. That means many appointments need to be made, and the committees require some oversight. Hence, the officer portfolio has very unbalanced with the president taking on a lot.

June has a visionary agenda that includes making things better for subsequent presidents, but these issues have presented challenges, and several will be discussed later in the meeting. June has asked the interest groups to help with some specific issues, such as recruitment for Rio attendance, but they haven't always been able to, and several seem to be struggling with leadership. To produce new by-laws, the organization needed to rejuvenate the Institutional Governance Committee, which June asked Chuck to Chair; the committee had a long list of issues to address, and she gave them clearer priorities and a time frame. One of the big changes in the by-laws was to balance out the officer portfolio by shifting some of the President's duties to the Secretary. If the staffing issues are addressed, that should enable June and upcoming Presidents to focus more on the President's agenda during the year rather than logistics.

##### B. Vice President's Report – Lois Takahashi

Lois made brief remarks, noting that her major issues, e.g. the web page and conferences, will be discussed later.

##### C. Treasurer's Report\*\* - Clint Andrews

Clint summarized ACSP's financial position over the past 8 years. On average, the conference accounts for about half of the organization's expenditures and revenues, followed by JPER, which accounts for about one fifth. Dues and the Guide are the other notable sources of income. Conference revenue varies considerably, JPER income has risen, and dues have been flat. Expenditures are more stable, although JPER costs have been rising. The result is that net income has been quite variable, and income from JPER

may be delayed because of the bankruptcy of the agent who manages our subscriptions. Assets have gone up fairly steadily, and are now approaching \$600,000. As discussed at the last Board meeting, under the new investment strategy, 30% of non-working capital is being gradually shifted from money markets to mutual funds, and so far fluctuations in money market income have been about \$1,500/month.

Avis asked why the net income trend in recent years has been positive whereas before four years ago we had up and down years. Clint attributed this to good management and to a difference in the economic climate, as well as the fact that JPER is becoming more profitable. A question was asked about the correct reserve level. Clint summarized the two main philosophies about how to set the level of reserves, and indicated that the current reserve level of \$125,000 is fairly close to both targets. Christine asked whether the declining enrollments at planning schools will have an impact on our revenues and reserves. That is hard to anticipate, but Clint indicated that any impact due to the recession would occur with a lag, and so far things are about where one would expect given the recovery cycle. June also pointed out that association management costs have been flat over the last seven years despite the growth in net revenues. Donna was asked about whether she could add a second full time staff person; she indicated that she planned to add staff, but probably not full time.

#### D. Secretary's Report – Bylaws Update\*\* - Avis Vidal

Avis reported that the proposed changes to the bylaws sent to the member schools in September were approved, with only one dissenting vote. She summarized the major changes, and noted that because the bylaws had not been modified for such a long time prior to this set of amendments, the organization will likely want to consider further changes in the not-too-distant future. She has summarized the issues that came up in the process of getting the proposed changes ready for the membership to vote on, in the form of a report for June to consider, and that report includes the issue raised by the member school that voted “nay.”

She also called the Board's attention to the fact that the 20<sup>th</sup> edition of the Guide does not include the career profiles. These used to be part of the Guide in addition to being printed separately in the Careers in Planning booklet. They were dropped because they have become quite dated; they need to better reflect the diversity of planning and planning related careers, and to be presented in a more engaging manner. She will begin work on this as soon, with the goal of having new profiles ready for the next edition of the Guide.

Karen suggested that the profiles might be done in cooperation with the APA as they have a site for this purpose. Can we have it on the APA site and linked to our materials?

Bill asked whether the capitation rule means that he is not eligible to serve on the Board; he is retired from Cornell. Donna responded that it depends on whether the school is paying his capitation fee. It was suggested that the Institutional Governance Committee should review this policy, but in addition he could simply sign up as an individual member.

## V. ACSP AGENDA 2013-15 (i.e., PRESIDENT'S AGENDA)

### A. Overall Agenda Update – June Thomas

June discussed the three connections among planning schools and faculty, to diverse people, and to the profession and the public. In the last few months, because of the enrollment issue, she has also focused on increasing enrollments.

### B. Diversity Initiatives – Pre-Doctoral Workshop 2015\*\* - Chuck Connerly

Chuck reported on the pre-doctoral workshop for students of color potentially interested in pursuing a doctorate, regardless of whether they are interested in planning. Two previous workshops have been successful, with about 25 students each. This summer's workshop will be in Oklahoma City; University of Oklahoma and Texas A&M will co-host. The hope of the selection committee is that the central location will make it easier for students from all parts of the country to attend.

The Board was interested in whether the students are actually applying to PhD programs, and what the yield is for planning. Marlon reported that UCLA got some information from the program assessment students completed. Many participants apparently did not apply to programs right away (although two applied to UCLA), and said they would likely work a year or two before applying. Vincent said students realized that the PhD application process is very competitive, and they needed more time to be better prepared. Some decided they needed the MUP first. Lois noted that the applicant pools for the two rounds were different: the 2014 pool was smaller, and had more undergraduates.

There was broad agreement that ACSP should follow up with participants, and Marlon suggested giving the names, which he has, to the Diversity Committee, but June indicated that the Diversity Committee already has a very full plate, including the diversity workshop, and the new workshop for junior faculty of color. Chuck suggested that follow-up might better be done by staff.

Karen noted that the Diversity Committee was more involved in the first workshop and there was a lot more "buzz" about it, and that could account for the larger applicant pool in 2013. She emphasized that it takes a lot of effort on the faculty's part to encourage master's students and others to think of going on for a Ph.D.—they otherwise would have never considered this. She recommended messaging to the schools so that there are people in the departments doing this kind of mentoring.

Barbara believes that faculty members don't necessarily know how to mentor and recommended training on how to mentor students. Karen suggested that ACSP should get help with this, and said she knows places to go to get this kind of help.

Karen asked what the Diversity Committee is doing for Master's programs, and Christine noted that at Washington they have difficulty recruiting master's level students with diverse backgrounds. June responded that this would be part of marketing planning education.



### C. Enrollments – Bruce Stiftel

Bruce summarized the major trends in US planning program enrollments between 2002 and 2014, noting enrollments rose early in this period, then declined from that peak (peak was 2008 for undergrads, 2010 for grads), with undergraduate enrollments falling much more sharply than graduate ones. Bachelors are down 27% from peak and masters are down 12% from peak. This masks the fact that at the master's level, US enrollment is down 18% while foreign enrollment rose 46%.

Barbara urged that it would be useful to compare these trends to national patterns. Mickey argued that the analysis overstates the decline as a possible long term pattern because the peak coincided with the recession. Bruce agreed, but noted that data have been compiled only since 2008, and going farther back would be very time consuming. He also noted that the pattern at the master's level since 2008 is less dramatic, but still very clear: US students fell 11.5%, foreign students rose 51%, so overall graduate enrollment was basically flat.

Bruce argued that one contributor to the pattern of past enrollment, and a major factor affecting future ones, will be that non-planners are increasingly involved in urban issues, and there are many new programs that compete with planning, e.g., sustainability, international development, urban design, and city management. He noted the Scientific American article by two physicists on urban efficiency as well as the urban informatics initiative at NYU that won the Bloomberg Award. More broadly, urban issues still get lots of media attention, but planners are not in the mix.

Michael reported that in Missouri and Kansas, the licensing boards in landscape architecture, architecture, and engineering are all grabbing slices of planning, and thinks this should be an AICP issue.

Marlon believes that this is more structural than messaging, although messaging is important. If this is an urban world, all issues are urban; it's not clear what planning's claim is, but it is clear decision-makers don't come to us. Do we not have adequate scale, or not do enough relevant research? Why are we not being engaged—for example in Atlantic Cities or CityLab?

Deden agreed, noting that when he tries to recruit students, it's hard to point to role models.

Carissa feels this is much bigger than another committee, and thinks what's needed is leadership meetings of APA, AICP, PAB, and ACSP to develop a visionary strategy.

Bill said decline could have to do with long waves and the decline of the public sector, which could turn around, but recommended that we also do more marketing.

Andrew Seidel said that the structure of planning in Canada is better than in the US and so their numbers are better, but he noted that undergraduates in Canada have no idea what planning is. There are many publications that are exuberant about sustainability, but most are not evidence based, and that poses a dilemma for the planning field since we value quality and rigor.

June will use her time in the business meeting to have this type of discussion.

#### D. Web Update and Educational Outreach – Lois Takahashi

Lois congratulated APA on their recent grant from the CDC, awarded jointly with American Public Health Association (APHA, like APA but larger because also includes other participants like advocates). The Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health (ASPPH, and ACSP's counterpart, which used to do accrediting) also got a grant from CDC for a major campaign to sell public health. It was very catchy, and featured a slot machine that brought up profiles. Their accrediting body is now the Council on Education for Public Health; their information is searchable, and includes links back to accredited programs – and they also reach out to planners.

Lois summarized what the Executive Committee has done about improving the website with the aid of a consultant (Lara) identified by Donna, and referred the Board to an Overview in Dropbox about the process and goals. In addition to making all current web functions technically current, the three foci are to (a) create a searchable Guide, (b) improve the abstract management system to make conference track chairs' jobs easier, and (c) improve how we present ACSP and planning to the outside world.

Based on these goals, Lara identified four potential firms with which to conduct an initial round of telephone interviews: Blackbaud, Urban Insights, DreamCo, and 3WStudios, our current vendor (who does not seem very interested). Lara, June, and Lois did all the interviews, Donna sat in on some of them, Avis participated on one.

Blackbaud came unprepared, and they are focused mainly on nonprofits whose major concern is fundraising. DreamCo is interested solving all problems in one way; this approach could address our issues with the Guide and conference management, but they mainly do web design and did not have a lot to say about marketing.

They asked Urban Insights about their relationship to Planetizen. Planetizen is a division of Urban Insights; they use it as a way to test drive business services before offering them to clients. Chris Steins recommended a number of items. For the Guide he recommended using hotlinked PDFs for obtaining information from members rather than having members load information directly to a data management system (they tried this, and too many schools can't do it). They have no experience doing conference or abstract management.

He had lots of ideas about marketing, and emphasized the revenue generating potential of the web site, which could cover the costs of marketing (need \$5-10K/mo), e.g. letting schools advertise on web site, charging for job postings, encouraging other organizations to post job notices for a fee, selling banner ads for the web site, and partnering with Planetizen to post jobs on the Planetizen and APA web sites. He urged us to look at Google's \$10K/month grant for non-profits to place ads on Google. His other suggestions included videotaping high profile conference sessions for the web; holding a competition with a monetary award (up to \$10,000) to engage students; conducting a thoughtful marketing campaign based on crowdsource information about what our current students are thinking and what they think would attract others; (4) putting conference abstracts directly on the web site rather than in a pdf to double the number of visits to the site; (5) convert the Guide to an on-line school directory; (6)

strategic outreach to media, e.g. get them to conference, regularly pitch material like our top papers pitched to them; (7) partner with Planetizen to launch on-line courses.

At this point the Executive Committee is dropping Blackbaud and 3WStudios and pursuing conversations with Urban Insight and DreamCo. To interest other firms to help us—like the agency that helped Public Health—we would need to devote more money to attract these firms to do the marketing we wish.

June then asked for guidance and advice—what should we do next?

Barbara expressed concern that we not lose sight of what we want our web site to do. Letting schools advertise is very different from presenting prospective students with an even-handed choice. She also wondered whether Google ads might send a desperate signal.

Deden supported the idea of putting the abstracts on our website. The more key words we have on our web site, the more likely traffic will come to us.

Mickey liked the direction, but urged caution on charging for items on the web site that would be paid for by our programs and thus be selective rather than treating them all equally.

Avis wondered which would have more value added for planning education: doing on our web site things that are similar to what others are doing on theirs (increased volume pays off?), or doing something that is different that also has value added (assuming we could figure out what that is)—complementary rather than simply amplifying what they are doing.

Marlon feels that we are talking about elements—like enrollment problems—that could lead to a strategic plan. We have a large surplus, but also unstable revenues; this is a precarious foundation for an investment strategy. All these pieces are interrelated, so we should therefore want to develop a real strategic plan.

Vincent urged us to do some basic social media things like hash tags and tweeting from conferences; this is low hanging fruit in the broader agenda of thinking about fitting into a larger ecology.

June pointed out that ACSP may also have a branding problem with our name. It doesn't mean anything, and the acronym ACSP is used by others, and they generally come up first in searches!

Michael agreed with Marlon that we need a strategic plan. He would connect this to the issue of the waning pool of site visitors for PAB.

June responded that we have a strategic plan, it is the President's Agenda and this is guiding us. It is a modest agenda, but that is all we can handle.

Barry said we need to think about what the web site and marketing plan will do for us.

Karen feels that it will take hiring a firm or planner to research basic trends in planning and planning jobs, followed by 1 or 2 Board retreats, to do this well.

Christine urges caution in hiring firms to do strategic planning; she has not had good experiences with such firms, and thinks we know us better than anybody. She would like us to do this work internally, e.g. through a task force. She pointed out that many big issues affect the regions very differently, and strategic planning would need to take this into account.

Avis observed that a meaningful strategic plan would need to transcend the boundaries of individual presidents. Otherwise it can't really be strategic about the big, long term issues that have been discussed.

Bruce sees ACSP's issues as being the same as the members' issues, and they have larger budgets. He would like to see ACSP help planning schools to move to a larger stage to be more impactful; others have done a much better job of this, and we should get them to help us. We have been talking to ourselves for too long and should be talking to others outside ACSP.

Carissa said we can't work in isolation.

## VI. ALLIED ORGANIZATIONS

### A. APA – Jim Drinan

Jim introduced himself as the new Executive Director of APA; he started over the summer. He has a background in association management rather than urban planning, with experience in government relations, participation between professionals and academics, and accreditation. He would like APA to be ACSP's best partner, based on dialog.

Major current items on the APA agenda include: (1) APA, jointly with APHA, just received a \$9 million, three-year grant from CDC. They are required to give at least 75% of the money to state chapters in partnership with APHA chapters; the available funds should support 10-12 state grants in each cohort. This presents major opportunities for connections at the local level, and they will be looking at what state chapters have done in this area. His outreach meetings with other fields, e.g. AIA, landscape architecture, engineering, have all mentioned health. (2) HUD has a natural disaster resiliency competition -- \$1 billion channeled thru CDBG. Any state that has had a disaster in the last four years is eligible, and up to now planners have not been involved. APA will hold webinars to inform members about this opportunity. (3) There is increased emphasis on APA being a more nimble, transparent, and helpful partner. Toward that end, they are open to adding capacity that would be helpful to others, e.g. offering a national web platform for partner groups, hosting websites, and facilitating communications as part of work that they do.

Their experience might be helpful regarding the issues Lois discussed earlier. APA did the Google ads, and it was their number one revenue source for the 10-12 months they got it. Blackbaud has mainly been used by fundraisers; they have branched out, but that's their real area of expertise. Bottom line, ACSP needs to be clear about what you want to do. If you want to drive traffic to your web site, APA may be able to help. He recommended that we move to the next step of further defining what we want with our web site and other marketing efforts. He is very open to advice as well as explorations of how

APA could be providing services to ACSP. Both groups have an interest in maintaining a good professional pipeline. APA might be able to be a better resource in the education process, e.g. providing free access to journals or other materials to help with the school-to-profession transition. He urged ACSP to think about whether there are things APA could do to drive more traffic to ACSP and member schools, and about whether we are present in APA's media work and conferences as we would like to be. What is it APA can do for you that could make you a life time member?

He suggested that the outreach issue might best be handled by doing a mini strategic plan to clarify goals and choices: what do you know, what are your choices, and what should you do. It's not necessary to invest two years in this.

Kazuya reported that Illinois is graduating more planners, but they are concerned that jobs are not keeping pace. How does APA feel about planners in non-planning jobs? About foreign students?

Jim responded that planning includes many member categories, e.g. lawyers who are doing planning rather than practicing law. They are open to the possibility of expanding membership to other fields. He thinks it is a good idea to focus more on international planning work, and APA is doing this, e.g. getting Lincoln Land Institute to have a larger presence at the APA conference.

Michael asked whether APA has any outreach to high school students. Jim responded that they don't have anything aimed at high school level. They do more at the elementary school level, and have some presence at the university level. . He promised to get back to us in about two weeks to clarify the outreach issue, and with his ideas about how the two organizations might collaborate.

#### B. AICP – Lee Brown

AICP is now doing a comprehensive review of the AICP exam; this is beyond their regular update of the questions related to the PAB core competencies. The exam prep course is now an on line course; the price is unchanged. They want to broaden the pool of panels of experts to help update the exam. Lee would like to see more academics involved in this process.

They want to make certification more valuable to their members. Now the most valuable part of the process is completing the application, which makes applicants think hard about how to sell their qualifications. They are moving toward a process of reviewing the applications with PAB. They receive about 600 applications twice a year to sit for the exam, and need more people for the pool of peer reviewers.

The Certification Maintenance program has matured, and members are complying in a more timely manner. They survey providers regularly, and face a trade-off between making opportunities geographically available and putting people out of business. They are now setting up a pre-qualification process for providers like ACSP so they can self-designate activities that earn credits rather than waiting for staff review.

The Community Planning Assistance Team program is expanding. They have a queue of six communities, and need more pool members. This service carries no CM credits, but provides an opportunity for members to meet their ethical responsibilities.

#### LUNCH BREAK, LATER THAN SCHEDULED; LEE RESUMED AFTER LUNCH

Like ACSP, APA and AICP are concerned about the number of students coming into planning programs. Both are dependent on the pipeline. Jim and Lee are working on how they can have students and faculty in APA from day one. They recognize that AICP is not just a 15,000 member group, but needs to also look at planning students and future planners; they have a responsibility to develop a supply of planners to serve communities whether they become members or not.

AICP is considering whether the exam might be taken prior to gaining practical experience. Their concern is that this would set up the student for failure, resulting in low pass rates and higher certification costs. They are wondering if there might be a transition to certification like the Engineer in Training designation, e.g. an AICP Candidate status.

Finally, they continue to be open to data sharing, and Lee asked whether there is any data AICP has, or could assemble, that would be useful to ACSP and/or member schools.

June asked whether there is a service component for academics, other than teaching CM courses, to earn CM credits, e.g. presentations to high schools. Jim said no; they require that members give back service to the community without credit. Right now they require AICP members to perform service, but they don't give them credit. How can AICP help track the graduates of our planning schools?

Bruce asked how AICP can help track the graduates of our planning programs. He noted that schools have to report to AICP about graduates who take the AICP exam, and the number who pass, but the schools have no way to track this, and the AICP on-line directory provides little helpful information. If the accreditation portfolio is useful to applicants, it might be useful to schools, too (like My APA Profile). This could help planning schools identify their alumni. Lee responded that the directory now has an opt-in personal profile segment that members can use.

Jim said this information could be provided by APA to the schools. Their data bases could be used to provide these reports to planning schools.

Nancey Green Leigh asked why no AICP credit is given for the writing of text books that are adopted by accredited planning programs and urged that this be reexamined. She has also been disturbed by what she sees as limited opportunities to earn ethics and law credits; ethics content is weak even at APA.

Lee said AICP will look into the text book issue. Jim said he will look into that.

#### C. CIP – Andrew Seidel

Planning education programs in Canada train many fewer students than ACSP members (about one tenth as many students) but face similar challenges, especially re enrollments.

#### D. PAB – Barbara Becker\*\*

PAB had a challenging time getting re-accredited last time; one reason was its perceived lack of independence from ACSP. That has been taken care of, but other issues remain. These include “Public Member definition; officer elections; changes to Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation; funding obligations of sponsoring institutions.”

PAB is developing a draft policy regarding informing schools about the reasons for their non-accreditation (in “if not, why not” report). PAB needs site visitors and has been working with the PAB Advisory Committee. In particular, the educator pool is at a 10-year low (see list on last page of report). To help address this issue, they now send thank you letters to site visitors, with copies to the educator’s Provost and Dean, and they would like ideas about other ways to encourage faculty to volunteer.

PAB continues to work on making more of its data publicly available. They now have an on-line searchable student database, and updated information about school programs is in the pipeline.

Their audit was completed, and they were under-budget – they moved their office out of the CBD to economize.

There have been changes in the Board’s membership. Barbara’s term is expiring, and Connie Ozawa will join the Board in November. They held an early Board meeting to elect a new chair: Barry Knox. Two members (a public member and a higher education representative) resigned over the issue of waiving the procedure for rotating the chair between an ACSP appointed member and the AICP appointed member; ACSP was notified of the issue but June chose to ratify the officer election, as did APA President.

Bill asked about the burden of preparing the self-study report, and whether it could be made less onerous. Barbara said completing the report is much less demanding with the new criteria.

Shonagh called the Board’s attention to the fact that historical information about accreditation (number of programs reviewed, period of re-accreditation) is posted on the web.

Marlon asked about the future of international accreditation by PAB. Investigating the feasibility of expanding beyond North America is part of the PAB strategic plan, but the staff has not been able to start the work yet. However, US programs that have programs abroad can get them accredited, although PAB has not developed a procedure for this yet.

A hearty round of applause was given in thanks to Barbara for her leadership and service on PAB.

#### E. GPEAN – Chris Silver

GPEAN has now added a 10<sup>th</sup> member from Turkey and an 11<sup>th</sup> from Indonesia is in the offing.

The Congress meeting will be in Rio, July 3 through 8, 2016, sponsored by the Federal University of Rio and hosted at the University. There will be 20 tracks, with three chairs for each. The call for abstracts will go out in summer 2015; acceptance will be announced by November to allow time for participants to get visas. The visa process is not trivial; the process is easy, but the paperwork is demanding.

A site visit has been completed. They are confident that the hotel rates will be acceptable, but contracts on hotels in Rio are not made until about six months prior to the event. Chris has insisted that there be a reasonable student rate.

Michael would like to see program to program contacts and joint partnerships; perhaps there could be an app for that?

Dialogues publication will continue; Chris will share information as it becomes available.

## VII. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES – Sophonie Joseph, Vincent Reina

Sophonie reported recent accomplishments, including a successful meeting with AESOP Young Academics (YA made possible by the scholarships from ACSP. Bowling League is up and running as normal. They are sponsoring the pre-conference Doctoral Workshop and a student reception at this conference. This is Sophonie's last meeting, and she received a good round of applause thanking her for her service.

Vincent asked what the students can do to be useful to the Board. Their current ideas include creating webinars to make available without travel some of the supports now offered at workshops, faculty mentoring from faculty at other universities, perhaps organized at the conference as APPAM does.

They now have a bimonthly meeting with the AESOP YA group. Impressed by what AESOP has done to bring students into the association, including a significant list of resources they provide. The students will be looking into what might be done here.

Carissa reiterated that the differing perspectives of young academics are important to the vitality and future of ACSP. In particular, the Board needs information about what attracts people to the profession, and technology options for learning about this and reaching out to new prospective students (e.g. hashtags).

June suggested using Survey Monkey to ask planning students about what the student members should be working on and how to move ACSP forward in attracting people to the profession.

## VIII. STANDING COMMITTEES

### A. Finances and Investments\*\* - Clint Andrews

This report was included in the Treasurer's Report.

### B. Nominating and Elections – Chuck Connerly

Chuck congratulated the new regional members of the Board: Christine Bae, University of Washington; Michael Frisch, University of Missouri at Kansas City; Bill Goldsmith, Cornell; Sanda Kaufman, Cleveland State; and Mickey Lauria, Clemson. Five additional regional representatives and three officers will need to be elected in 2015; the call for nominations will be issued soon – please get names in to the

committee early, especially for national positions. He hopes to hold an early election in January or February.

#### C. Institutional Governance – Chuck Connerly

The major changes to the Bylaws were changes in the duties of the Secretary, what should happen when a regional representative on the Board retires or changes schools, and allowing participation at Board meetings via teleconferencing. The concern expressed about the last change at the Spring meeting was that introducing this option might make it tempting for Board members to opt out of coming.

Karen was concerned that the conditions under which teleconferencing is permitted are too limited. Budget cuts at member schools could mean that Board members can't come, or that fewer schools can afford to have their faculty run. One way to make the language less restrictive would be to eliminate the "out of country" provision. This would possibly enable us to meet more often if we become a more active Board.

#### D. PAB Advisory\* - June Thomas

The number of faculty in the PAB site visitor pool is low, and it includes many senior faculty who will probably be retiring in the not too distant future. John Mullin, who chairs this committee, has been doing all the work of recruiting new members of the pool. He wrote a memo to June on August 21 (see copy in Dropbox) expressing his concern that the size of the pool is down; the need for site visitors is up; the pool not representative by race, gender, or age; and the top schools are seriously under-represented. Barbara has also expressed her concern, and sees it as a major issue in the next academic year.

The Executive Committee discussed this issue at its last meeting, including the idea of the President sending letters to Chairs to encourage faculty participation (instead of having requests come only from the committee), and the idea of sending letters to Chairs to commend members of their faculty who have served (timed to follow the letters from PAB) when we have more staff capacity. This issue will also be on the agenda of the Administrator's Conference. We need suggestions about other ways to build the pool.

Kazuya recommended sending the call for site visitors to all planning program faculty members, rather than just to chairs, so they could be more aware of the opportunity for site visitor service, and June agreed.

Carissa suggested that ACSP could accept applications on an ongoing basis, and allow faculty to apply via the web site, with a link to the Committee Chair. Some Board members had concerns that faculty who were not ready might apply, and getting turned down might work against them when they came up for tenure, or that junior faculty might apply even though it is not in their best interest because it is very time consuming and doesn't count toward tenure. The sense of the meeting was that these are not likely to be a problem. Faculty don't have to tell others in their Department when they apply, so nobody will know if they are turned down. If junior faculty ask a Chair or mentor for advice and are told they

aren't ready, or that it is not in their interest, they are not likely to apply. If they do, it's their choice, and the Committee can assess their qualifications.

Clint felt that site visitor service was most helpful to the faculty member when that person was a new chair, since it provides insight into alternative ways to do things.

June asked for volunteers to serve on the PAB advisory committee to help John implement these ideas. Mickey volunteered to serve on the committee.

E. Conferences \*\* – Rayman Mohamed

1. 2014, Philadelphia – Rayman Mohamed

Rayman was not present to present his report, so a discussion of the conference took place briefly.

2. 2015, Houston & 2016, Portland – Lois Takahashi

ACSP now has a signed MOU signed with Texas Southern and Texas A&M for the 2015 conference in Houston. We also have a contract with the hotel for the 2016 conference in Portland. The 2017 conference will be in Denver, but it is too early to have paperwork in place.

Kurt and others reiterated: Avoid Halloween!! Donna explained that we sometimes end up holding the conference on Halloween because that's what enables us to get quality hotels, and get them at prices that work for us.

3. 2016, Rio

When the Board decided not to hold our conference jointly with the Rio Congress, there was broad agreement that ACSP should be active in promoting attendance by faculty and students from member schools. Bruce asked particularly about efforts to assist young scholars to attend Rio; the Board discussed trying to raise funds for this. Clint, Carissa and Sophonie volunteered to form a committee to help with promoting the conference. Dave Amborski was suggested, and somebody needs to check with him. GPEIG will host a film screening on Saturday, and Chris will see if they have ideas.

F. Membership – June Thomas

June reported that this committee has still not been constituted, and explained the dilemma it presents. The committee could be looking at the benefits of membership and whether they can be improved, possibly beefing up the package. We are addressing that, tangentially, in other ways. It could be tapping the views of the members to see what's wanted, but we don't have the organizational capacity to take on anything else. We have 13 committees and task forces, 7-8 travel scholarships, and 16 awards; all need to have members appointed and receive some oversight and staff support, including maintaining their web presence. The organization is overly complex given the administrative support available. The secretary is responsible now for Membership and she can move forward.

IX. SPECIAL COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

A. ACSP/PLANETIZEN\* - Mickey Lauria

Mickey answered questions about the Committee's relationship with Planetizen, and about the rankings. Planetizen has been accommodating about the requests made by the Committee. Mickey tried to get the rankings listed in the report after the program profiles, but they have it now after the student profiles but before the school profiles. Because reputation is a criterion, about 30% of the ratings change in any given year. Votes from alums and former faculty have diminished in importance. The percentage of schools that participate has risen, and they are using more PAB-type data because the chairs already have it.

Bill asked Mickey for his observations about a possible collaboration between ACSP and Planetizen. He said the relationship with Chris Steins is good; he is very open, straightforward, and candid. Bruce thinks he is a very competent and honest professional.

Michael asked how the rankings are being used. Mickey said they primarily direct the rankings to students, but he's not sure if employers or APA use them or not.

Christine said both current and prospective students are very interested in this; most of her students have checked their guide and found it useful.

Deden asked why they only rank top 25 programs. Bruce noted that it would not be received well to list the bottom 25, and participation would likely drop substantially.

Kazuya asked if they included specializations in the rankings. Mickey said they had considered it, but concluded they couldn't do it because programs define their specializations in so many different ways.

B. Committee on the Academy – Spring Administrator's Conference – This item moved to follow the discussion of JPER

C. Diversity\*, Doctoral, and Mentoring – No presentation or discussion.

X. JOURNAL OF PLANNING EDUCATION AND RESEARCH\*\* - Subhro Guhathakurta & Nancey Green Leigh

Subhro and Nancey will complete their term as editors soon. The Chester Rapkin award winners have been decided: Bill Lester for Volume 32 and Gerardo Sandoval for Volume 33. Submissions are up to 160-170 per year. Acceptance rates are about 16-17%. Sage says the impact factor is down slightly now (to 1.38 this year, from 1.5 last year), but they expect it will go back up next year. The average review time is down to 67 days. They have started blogging on Planetizen about particular articles; this is driving more traffic to the web site, and their Twitter following is growing.

The JPER workshop has done well. They admitted 16 people to the most recent one; 13 attended, and the feedback was very good. The mentors are Nisha, Nancey, Bruce, and Subhro.

Two more Focus Issues are in the queue. One on equity, with 6 articles, will be out soon. The final one will be on land use and climate change, edited by Phil Berke. This will link planning to other fields, and that should lead to increased readership.

Lois reported that ACSP was recently notified by Sage that the aggregator who handles JPER subscriptions (and many others) has declared bankruptcy. This will disrupt subscriptions. Sage is working hard to address the problems, but ACSP's royalty payments may be delayed; it is not clear how long the delays might be.

Sophonie noted that the JPER website ranks higher than ACSP's. They have hired a PhD editorial assistant to work on it, and ACSP might want to consider following their example.

#### IX. B. Committee on the Academy – Spring Administrators Conference – Lois Takahashi

The Administrator's Conference will be held in Boise, March 25-28. Lois will start working on the MOU with Boise State soon.

At Temple, the dean overseeing urban planning informed Deborah Howe that the planning program at the Ambler campus will be eliminated, and the two tenured faculty members at Ambler will be moved to Geography and Urban Studies. Board members expressed concern and asked whether the Board should do something to support the program, but Deb Howe has indicated that they have good local support and she thinks pursuing the matter internally is the best course.

#### XI. INTEREST GROUPS – Included in the Consent Agenda

#### XII. NEW BUSINESS – June Thomas

##### A. Web / Educational Outreach / Funding

Our conversations with prospective vendors indicate that the \$37,000 appropriated for improved technology will not be enough to pay for the work we want done. 3WStudios recommended that we do a market study before doing substantial new work on the web site; Blackbaud indicated that the amount we have would only cover the cost of rebuilding the site with its existing functionalities. Even more money would be needed to get the attention of firms that have done impressive marketing efforts, e.g. for public health. June asked whether the Board would support spending more for the work so the Executive Committee would have more options moving forward in conversations with vendors, and opened the floor for discussion.

Karen recommended that a technical person be included in the conversations with vendors, and several others supported this idea. Clint pointed out that the previous task force on improving the Guide did include a tech person, and he brought a different perspective. Carissa encouraged widening the conversation, e.g. by reaching out to the task force June had appointed.

Kurt wondered whether a member university with a good site would be willing to host ACSP; this would probably be cheaper. The Executive Committee could send a call to the members to see if any are willing to discuss this. Board members noted, however, that you can't fire the consultant or web manager of a member if you are satisfied with them, and a university won't do content management, which will likely carry a fee of \$30-50K. Kurt also suggested checking with the firm (American Eagle) that handles the

APPAM site, which is very good. Chris recommended thinking about individuals, not just firms, because there is so much talent out there.

Vincent, Carissa, Karen, and others recommended going back to using an RFP rather than simply negotiating with vendors because ACSP is more likely to get a good price. The draft RFP prepared initially could be updated based on the conversations with vendors; Lara might be able to do this.

Marlon made a MOTION, seconded by Chuck, that the Executive Committee be authorized to increase the amount that can be used in discussions with vendors to \$60,000. The motion carried with a show of hands and no “nay” votes.

#### B. ACSP Awards Policy

This year there are twice as many awards as usual to be presented at the awards lunch because last year’s awards were not presented at the joint conference with AESOP. The time set aside for the lunch is longer than usual, but even so, getting everything onto the agenda has been difficult, and by the time we realized how tight the time was, we had already locked in a speaker. Fewer people are being allowed to speak, and speakers have been given strict time limits. Board members should be forewarned that some people are hurt because they are not being recognized as well as they feel they should.

The bigger issue is the proliferation of awards, and the fact that awards committees are increasingly making multiple awards (ties) or designating honorable mentions, which takes up additional time.

Avis shared the fact that the Urban Affairs Association, anticipating pressure to create many new awards as well-regarded “baby boom” members begin to retire, created an honor roll. A new cohort is inducted each year at the conference. Bill liked that idea, since awards are clearly a benefit of membership that people care about.

June indicated that the Executive Committee is looking at the awards issue and expects to propose an awards policy at the next meeting.

#### C. Staff for ACSP

As discussed in the President’s Report, the tradition of having each president identify an assistant has not worked well. In addition, Donna and her staff are over-burdened. Donna and June have developed a plan that consolidates several staff functions, and Donna will hire a second staff person in her office whose duties will include being the president’s assistant. She will continue to use the same consultant to assist with the conference, and will have a half-time person to keep up the website and twitter, etc.

### XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Sophonie asked for an update on the PLANET list serve and the fact that post-docs have a hard time getting on. Marlon notes that young ACSP members sometimes say they feel excluded; perhaps this contributes to that feeling. June said she is hesitant about making any changes to PLANET until it is clear

how it will be folded into the broader process of developing the new web site and communications strategy. The Executive Committee will be looking into this issue between now and the next meeting.