



Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Meeting Notes – REVISED DRAFT

Spring Governing Board Meeting ~ April 2, 2016, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM

Sheraton Grand Phoenix Hotel ~ Phoenix, Arizona ~ Phoenix Ballroom D

Current Board Member in attendance: Clinton Andrews, Michael Frisch, William Goldsmith, Dawn Jourdan, Sanda Kaufman, Mickey Lauria, Aujean Lee, Samina Raja, Jane Rongerude, Carissa Slotterback, Lois Takahashi, June Thomas, James Wood, Weiping Wu

Future Board Members in attendance: Joe Grengs (incoming Treasurer)

Others in attendance: Cheryl Contant (consultant to PAB), Donna Dodd (ACSP), Jim Drinan (APA), Monica Groh (APA), Valerie Hubbard (AICP), Zenia Kotval (PAB), Shonagh Merits (PAB), Barry Nocks (PAB), Connie Ozawa (PAB), Carol Rhea (APA), Chris Silver (GPEAN), Niraj Verma (Committee on the Academy)

I Opening the meeting and Call to Order {ACTION}

L. Takahashi

Takahashi called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. She reviewed the consent agenda and referred to relevant materials in the Dropbox.

Introductions

Approval of Consent Agenda (suggestions below) {ACTION}

Minutes October 21, 2015 (Dropbox)

Doctoral Committee Report (Dropbox)

Institutional Governance Committee Report (Dropbox)

Nominating and Elections Committee Report (Dropbox)

Faculty Mentoring Committee Report (Dropbox)

ACUPP Report (Dropbox)

2016 Conference Committee Report (Dropbox)

MOTION – Goldsmith moved approval of the consent agenda, Thomas seconded. The Motion was approved.

Acceptance of Regular Agenda {ACTION}

MOTION – Jourdan moved approval of the regular agenda, Frisch seconded. The Motion was approved.

II Update and Status of ACSP

President's Report (verbal report)

L. Takahashi

Email voting for Governing Board {ACTION}

Takahashi provided an overview of the opportunity, per the ACSP Bylaws, to pursue email voting for the Governing Board. Takahashi noted that issues/decisions may arise between meetings

that need more immediate discussion and decision making between Governing Board meetings. The discussion focused on issues such as how it might be handled if a significant proportion of the Governing Board members preferred that email voting not be allowed on a particular issue. Conference call, video conference, and email discussion were highlighted as options. The discussion also highlighted the prospect of two separate votes for issues that arise between meetings: (1) one with a decision to do an email vote, (2) one with a decision on the issue at hand.

MOTION – Jourdan moved, Raja seconded that the ACSP Governing Board can vote on priority issues that emerge between Governing Board meetings. Votes can be administered via email and could be preceded by a conference call at the request of a GoBo member. Decisions to vote outside of Governing Board meetings must first include a vote to conduct a discussion on the topic/issue and then can a vote on the actual topic/issue. The Motion was approved.

ACSP Presidential Agenda 2013-15 (Dropbox)
Planning Enrollment Task Force Report (Dropbox)

Takahashi summarized the work of the Planning Enrollment Task Force, with additional comments offered by other Task Force members. As summarized, the Task Force affirmed that this issue is complex and that there is variation. The ACSP, APA, AICP, and PAB presidents/chairs will continue to discuss and make further efforts to coordinate discussions. ACSP has committed to sharing the strategies that are being used by schools that are not declining and will work to collect them from schools in a manner that is consistent and not duplicative of previous efforts to gather information. The Task Force has been dissolved. The Presidents discussed continuing to explore opportunities for connections with K-12 schools to address pipeline concerns. Ozawa and Goldsmith noted that if we're going to gather information on recruitment, which we need to make sure we're being consistent in asking for information. It was recommended that the Administrators' Conference could be a good venue for gathering information on recruitment/enrollment strategies through an organized session.

ACTION – GoBo members will share the report with schools in their regions. Slotterback will remind them.

ACTION – Takahashi will direct the Committee on the Academy to organize a session for the Administrators' Conference to collect information on enrollment/recruitment strategies.

ACTION – Takahashi will review survey information gathered so far and explore ways to disseminate it for further review by survey respondents and consider needs for additional information.

MOTION – Lauria moved and Goldsmith seconded acceptance of the report as information. The motion was approved.

Vice-President's Report (verbal report)

W. Wu

Wu deferred detailed discussion of conferences until later in the agenda, acknowledging a strong slate of potential conference sites. She highlighted that the 2016 Portland conference will include two big ideas sessions, plus two President's sessions. She highlighted a successful transition of the JPER editorship from Georgia Tech to Rutgers University. She also noted that the ACSP Guide is transitioning to an online guide. To facilitate better planning and budgeting by potential host schools, RFPs for ACSP Workshops will be made available after the fall conference. She highlighted upcoming workshops, offering updates on the Pre-Doctoral Workshop at USC and the Job Market Workshop. There will be no Junior Faculty of Color Workshop in 2016, as the workshop is now planned to rotate with Pre-Doctoral Workshop. Wu highlighted discussions by the Executive Committee to convening an ad hoc Task Force on Global Education in Planning. The Task Force is expected to focus on curriculum/instruction preparation for international students, US students traveling/working abroad, and recruitment of international students. Per Wu's report and specific to upcoming meetings and workshops, it was recommended that ACSP develop a three-year running calendar with GoBo meetings, conferences, workshops, etc.

ACTION – Wu and Dodd will work together to develop a 3-year calendar for the ACSP website.

Treasurer's Report

C. Andrews

Andrews provided a brief update on the overall state of the ACSP budget, deferring detailed discussion until later in the agenda. Andrews announced that Grengs will be transitioning to the role of Treasurer at the end of the spring 2016 GoBo meeting.

Secretary's Report

C. Slotterback

Slotterback deferred her report to the discussion of the Task Force on Professional Dialogue later on the agenda.

III Student Representatives (verbal report/Dropbox) **{ACTION}**

J. Wood/A. Lee

Increased funding for student representative travel

Job Market Workshop for Portland

Student financial support for international conferences

Wood highlighted the issue of ACSP funding to support student representative travel to the ACSP Governing Board meetings. He noted that it has been a challenge to recruit student representatives, especially from smaller schools, which often have fewer resources. The student representatives have proposed that ACSP fully fund travel for the two student representatives for the spring and fall meetings. The proposal was addressed in the later budget discussion.

Wood highlighted student engagement in the Rio Global Planning Schools conference and student travel scholarships available to students through GPEAN. He noted that students who receive funding would be required to write a brief narrative for posting in the Student section of the new ACSP website.

Lee highlighted a proposed networking opportunity for students at the ACSP conference, including opportunities to meet with faculty in "office hours" to review their job market

materials. Lee raised a concern about the cancellation of the Job Market Workshop and Takahashi noted issues with meeting demand and delivering the workshop on an annual basis. It was noted that the office hours idea could be held in 2016 as an alternative to the Job Market Workshop. It was further recommended that the students explore the opportunity to develop a slate of faculty who are willing to review job search materials, even outside of the conference and potentially facilitated via the website. Lee advocated continuing to host the Job Market Workshop each year and it was recommended that the student representatives consult previous student representatives and the Doctoral Committee for further insight on next steps. It was recommended that ACSP try to maintain communication among current and previous student representatives.

A possible motion to alternatively require or make a recommendation related to the 2016 Job Market Workshop was discussed. The proposed motion was ultimately tabled.

ACTION – The student representatives, with support from Takahashi, will coordinate the Office Hours idea for the 2016 conference, develop of a slate of faculty to review job materials for students, and work with the Doctoral Committee to decide on a potential 2016 Job Market Workshop.

MOTION – Frisch moved and Andrews seconded acceptance of the Student Representatives' report. The motion was approved.

IV Journal of Planning Education and Research (Dropbox)

C. Andrews/F. Popper
S. Guhathakurtha/N. Green Leigh

Andrews, speaking as JPER Co-Editor, highlighted the transition of the journal from Georgia Tech to Rutgers University. He referred to the JPER report from Guhathakurtha and Green Leigh and noted key outcomes including a high rejection rate, a quarterly publication schedule, and royalties received thus far from Sage. The report also highlights lessons learned including a challenge in that there is little citation of the articles about pedagogy. Andrews noted that the new editors are considering ways to address this issue, including a reduced word limit manuscript format for pedagogy articles. It was reported that submissions through the end of 2015 included a wide range of topics, including submissions from international authors, and a number of pedagogy articles. The next JPER Writers Workshop will be held in July at Rutgers. Twenty-seven viable applications were received and 20 can be accommodated, thus there are 7 on the waiting list. The most junior scholars have been waitlisted, under the presumption that they can reapply next year. Faculty have been recruited to contribute to the workshop.

The discussion highlighted an increase in the number of “desk rejections” by the JPER editors and noted that such a rate may be undermining the peer review process. Per a question about the nature of desk rejections, Andrews referred to conversations with the prior editors on this issue and acknowledged that the recent desk rejection rate has been lower. Key issues in desk rejections were highlighted as language, off-target manuscripts, and extremely weak methods. The current editors are tailoring the desk reject letters to more specifically highlight the reason for rejection. The discussion further recommended that the JPER website make it clear that authors are encouraged to seek their own editorial support prior to submission. The upcoming

JPER Writer's Workshop was also noted as a potential opportunity, as it should yield new, high quality manuscripts from junior faculty that could be competitive for future publication. It was also recommended that JPER consider providing feedback on weak manuscripts with potential prior to initiating peer review, in a manner consistent with the Journal of Urban Affairs. It was acknowledged that retaining a pool of senior faculty to offer feedback on such manuscripts might be an effective strategy.

Andrews announced a planned roundtable featuring various journal editors, including the JPER editors, at the 2016 Portland conference.

V Allied Organizations

APA (Dropbox)
AICP

J. Drinan/M. Groh
V. Hubbard

Rhea, APA President, highlighted the importance of partnerships and the priority that APA sees in its relationship with ACSP. The Student/New Planner Task Force is recommending expanding student membership to two years and reduced cost, phased-in early career memberships. She reported that the APA Foundation will be re-launched with these priorities: (1) scholarships/fellowships with a particular focus on diversity and underrepresented populations, (2) funding a symposium to bring together top thinkers to prioritize research agenda, (3) funding more CPATS and disaster relief efforts, and (4) supporting updates of PAS program that will make it available to all APA members, including students. APA will be hiring a new staff member to develop the Foundation and enhance fundraising activities. It was acknowledged that fundraising will drive the amount of support available for scholarships/fellowships. It was also reported that the APA Membership Committee is taking a look at academic memberships, including how to encourage more faculty memberships, as well as retaining retired members. APA may come back with recommended action(s) in the fall. The discussion highlighted the high cost of APA membership for academic members.

Hubbard, AICP President, highlighted efforts to reassess and potentially modify the path to certification for AICP and completion of the exam. Relative to path, they have advanced a new concept for moving to certification that would better target students and young planners. The concept would allow students to become "AICP candidates" in their second year of graduate school. The students would start doing certification maintenance while they are in school (at half of the required credits of AICP members) and once they graduate, they would be able to take the AICP exam sooner than the current two-year period. Graduates of accredited graduate planning programs would be required to have just one year of experience before taking the exam. Relative to the AICP exam itself, Hubbard noted that the test is being updated. She noted that AICP has refreshed the questions over the past few years and are now doing a full update based on a job survey and the previously approved core competencies. Feedback from the academic community is sought related to the exam update and potential certification pathway changes. The discussion highlighted the need to consider certification pathways for students in undergraduate planning programs, as well as those in related programs such as urban studies. The AICP specialty certifications were also discussed, with comments by Hubbard suggesting that interest in the specialties has been low. The discussion pointed to the opportunity for AICP to consider creating a mini/pre-exam that could help demystify the exam for students and early

career planners. Hubbard noted that this issue is not currently being considered, due to the cost of developing a separate exam. The discussion also highlighted challenges related to encouraging faculty members to become AICP members. Hubbard noted that there were no current efforts being pursued on this issue, but encouraged GoBo members to offer feedback on how to address these issues.

Groh, Director of Emerging Professionals, highlighted the high level of energy and positive interaction regarding ACSP and APA coordination around students and faculty in planning. She is seeing APA staff members, division leaders, state chapters, etc. talking more about faculty and academic issues. Groh noted her work with the APA Ambassadors program, the goal of which is to introduce planning to the public (including via K-12 schools). She noted that the pilot program has been popular and can be helpful in addressing pipeline issues. She highlighted APA's recent hire of a Career Services staff member at APA and encouraged GoBo members to share insights on how APA can help planning programs further develop planning graduates for the job market. Groh also referred to a new webinar series targeted to students and new professionals. She encouraged GoBo members to reach out to her as a key point of contact at APA. The discussion included a recommendation that APA consider developing awards for high schools students to create incentives for connecting to the planning field.

Drinan, APA Executive Director, further emphasized the great partnership between APA and ACSP and highlighted the opportunity for even further collaboration between APA, AICP, and ACSP. He highlighted an aspiration that every planning student can easily become student members of APA, can easily participate in conferences, and can transition to full membership. The follow-on discussion emphasized the need for more diversity in planning practice and among students. Takahashi noted that at the organizational President's meeting, that there was a discussion about further connecting with HBCUs and urban-serving universities. Last, it was recommended in the discussion that APA and ACSP explicitly identify liaisons for each key shared initiative to address disconnects that often occur at the implementation level, even when there are strong connections at the leadership level.

VI Standing Committees

Finances and Investments (Dropbox)

C. Andrews

Andrews referred to the report in the Dropbox. He noted that as of April 2, 2016, ACSP has \$580k in assets, including \$133k in mutual funds, \$146k in CDs, and \$300k in checking. The Finances and Investments Committee met recently and discussed recent expenditures on strategic initiatives. The Committee highlighted a need to better and more consistently evaluate the outcomes of strategic initiative investments. Evaluation measures might include whether the initiative became financially self-supporting and whether benefits accrued to planning practice or the planning academy. Andrews acknowledged that focusing on "benefits to the planning academy" alone may represent a slippery slope, making it easy to justify strategic investments without being positioned to critically evaluate actual impacts/outcomes. It was recommended that impacts/outcomes be considered when strategic initiative investment decisions are being made. The Finances and Investments Committee sees a role for itself in continuing to monitor outcomes of strategic initiatives. The discussion included a recommendation that the ExCo offer very brief annual reports on the status/impacts/outcomes

of strategic initiatives at each meeting. An additional recommendation called for the development of a proposal template to use for strategic initiative request in order to gather consistent information about the initiatives, their budgets, and anticipated impacts/outcomes. It was also recommended that a strategic initiatives budget be identified proactively as a means of better controlling the process and planning relative to the overall budget. Last, it was acknowledged that many initiatives have become part of ACSP's ongoing work and that there should be mechanisms for identifying these and transitioning them from "one off" to "regular" items.

ACTION – Dodd will review the budget request form to add a question about potential impacts of the requested funds/initiative.

ACTION – The ExCo will report back to the Board on strategic initiatives at the Fall 2016 GoBo meeting.

MOTION – Lauria moved to accept the report and Thomas seconded. The motion was approved.

Nominating and Elections (Dropbox)	J. Thomas
Institutional Governance (Dropbox)	J. Thomas
PAB Advisory	M. Lauria
Membership	M. Frisch

Takahashi announced that Frisch has been appointed as chair of the ACSP Membership Committee.

Conferences	
2016 Portland (Dropbox)	W. Wu/R. Mohamed
2017 Denver	W. Wu
Proposals for 2018, 2019, 2020 (Dropbox/verbal) {ACTION}	W. Wu

Wu noted that a recent RFP for conference hosts for 2018 and 2019 yielded four proposals. Dodd indicated that all proposed sites were vetted and are viable from a space perspective. The following proposals were received and were recommended by the ExCo for the following years.

2018 – Buffalo, NY - SUNY Buffalo
2019 – Greenville, SC - Clemson University
2020 – Toronto, ON - Toronto/Ryerson/York
2021 – Miami, FL - Florida State/Florida/Florida Atlantic/University of South Florida

The discussion focused on whether it would be a good idea to plan for a four-year slate, without allowing other schools to propose for these future years that extended beyond the dates announced in the previous RFP. The group also considered whether four years of conferences east of the MS River was a good strategy. Airport costs and access, as well as the costs associated with hotels in the various cities, were discussed. Hurricane risk was acknowledged for the Miami conference and it was advised that ACSP consult with Florida APA for advice on preferred dates for the 2021 conference.

ACTION – The ExCo will issue a new RFP before 2020 to ensure that we can maintain a five-year slate.

MOTION – Thomas moved and Lauria seconded approval of Buffalo for 2018 and Greenville for 2019. The motion was approved.

MOTION – Andrews moved and Lauria seconded approval of Toronto for 2020 and Miami for 2021. The motion was approved.

ACTION – For Toronto conference, Raja will work with ACSP staff to draft a one-pager for use by international students as they submit visa applications for use in travel to the conference.

VII Special Committees and Task Forces

Ad Hoc Task Force on Professional Dialogue

C. Slotterback

Slotterback provided an overview of the Task Force report in the Dropbox. Wood and Goldsmith are members of the Task Force and were present at this meeting. The focus is on proactively advancing professional dialogue. Two conference calls so far have raised a wide range of issues such as: identifying the capabilities of the new web site; defining what we mean by professional dialogue; finding out who we want to be serving with this forum; making sure that we are proactively including and addressing diverse viewpoints. The report outlines recommendations and further questions. The Task Force will require more time for further deliberations and gathering feedback. Dodd provided details throughout the discussion as to the capabilities of the ACSP website.

The discussion was extensive and addressed a wide range of issues summarized below:

- ACSP should develop a central forum, in addition to interest groups that already have their forums. It was acknowledged the PhD students and practitioners are relevant participants, as well as non-members of ACSP. At the same time, it was acknowledged that too many lists may be difficult for users to manage.
- Potential redundancy with other lists – e.g. Bowling League, Planetizen. It was acknowledged the Bowling League is now largely inactive.
- A netiquette approach is preferred to active moderation. Agreement with netiquette guidelines could be required. List members will play a role in “keeping each other in line.” Recommendations previously shared by Judith Innes, as well as guidelines advanced for the Planners 2040 website would be informative.
- A “like” function similar to what is available on Planners 2040 on Facebook is preferred.
- There were varied recommendations related to content for the central forum – including dialogue, job postings, news. Other ACSP web features were acknowledged as potentially useful in sharing a range of different information types.
- The goals of the central forum, and criteria for evaluation, should be clear.
- A key concern with PLANET was exclusivity and thus ACSP should err on the side of the openness. It was acknowledged that many people left PLANET over the years and ACSP’s forum could help bring them back.

- There is an interest in daily or periodic digests of postings that flow to email. The emails could include a link to access the ACSP website.
- Familiarity and comfort with technology was acknowledged as an issue for some faculty.
- It was recommended that a faculty-only forum was not needed, as ACSP can contact members directly.
- A search function on the forum is recommended, as well as archive.
- It was recommended that the Task Force explore budget implications – e.g. staff time, technology, that would be required to implement its recommendations.
- It is necessary to have someone in a position of authority who can remove a posting or indicate that something is improper.
- It is recommended that the netiquette guidelines be approved by the GoBo.

Based on the discussion, the following Next Steps will be pursued by the Task Force:

- Develop objectives/guidelines related to who/what for open/central forum
- Develop goals for the forum
- Develop criteria for evaluating the forum
- Develop a strategy for addressing complaints
- Work with Dodd to further explore web features, especially related to integrating the various website features
- Work with Dodd to continue to provide guidance for web access and use
- Provide an update to ACSP-mail and other lists as to the Task Force activities and GoBo discussion
- Convene the Blog Subcommittee to develop recommendations related to integrating the blog with a central forum
- Convene a Netiquette Subcommittee to develop netiquette guidelines
- Convene a Task Force conference call in mid-April
- Recommend objectives for the Communications Committee

MOTION – Slotterback moved and Wu seconded the establishment of a Special Committee on Communications to be established after the Task Force on Professional Dialogue ends its work. The objectives for the Special Committee will be recommended by the Task Force and the Chair will be appointed at a later date. The motion was approved.

MOTION – Frisch moved and Rongerud seconded the development of a non-moderated open/central forum open to member/non-member faculty, retired faculty, international faculty, PhD students, practitioners, and post-docs. The forum would include a complaint mechanism. The motion was approved.

The discussion pointed out that the motion related to an open/central forum does not preclude development of other forums. Further, the Task Force should develop criteria for evaluating the forum. Relative to practitioner access, it was acknowledged that practitioner access amounts to opening the forum to everyone. The discussion suggested that there is unlikely to be substantial practitioner interest. If a Faculty-only forum is established, it was recommended that the forum be open to ACSP members only.

ACTION – Takahashi will appoint a chair of the Special Committee on Communications after the Task Force has completed its final recommendations.

VII Special Committees and Task Forces continued

Global Education Task Force (Dropbox)

W. Wu

Committee on the Academy (*forthcoming Dropbox*)

N. Verma

Verma summarized the report from the Dropbox. He highlighted the intent to delink the Administrators' Conference from individual schools. The Committee on the Academy recommends that conference will be in the DC area in March or April 2017. The New Chairs School will again be integrated into the Administrators' Conference. A budget has been submitted to ACSP that is relatively consistent with previous conferences. The conference is anticipated to be self-supporting. The Diversity Retreat is also planned for the Administrators' Conference. The discussion highlighted a recommendation that the findings from the Task Force on enrollment be highlighted in a session at the conference, with a focus on successful strategies that programs are using to advance enrollment/recruitment. It was recommended that collaborations with HBCUs be addressed in some manner at the conference. It was also recommended that NIH and NSF project director meetings be considered as Conference dates are being explored. Takahashi confirmed that the Governing Board will meet in spring 2017 at the Administrators' Conference.

ACTION – Committee on the Academy will send a save the date by early May to all of the chairs, center directors, and other administrators.

Doctoral (Dropbox)

R. Norton

Anticipated cancellation of the workshop this summer

Takahashi offered a summary of the report in Dropbox. She indicated that UIC had submitted a proposal for the workshop, but can no longer host due to an issue with the planned space for the workshop. Potential options for addressing this issue include: (1) hosting the workshop on the day prior to the start of the ACSP 2016 conference – potentially following the 1-day model previously used by John Landis, (2) trying to do the workshop in the summer (Krizek has offered to host in Denver, but cannot deliver the program), (3) hosting the workshop in Denver in 2017 with Krizek in the lead, or (4) pursuing hosting in Chicago at a location other than the UIC campus. Takahashi reported that the Doctoral Committee is enthusiastic about hosting the workshop in Denver in 2016. The discussion highlighted opportunities related to partnering with APA on space in Chicago or exploring other meeting locations in Chicago. It was also recommended that building the workshop into the ACSP conference would be most efficient. It was acknowledged that the multi-day workshop model offers the advantage of reinforcing the cohort experience. If the workshop were integrated into the conference, it was acknowledged that this cohort experience could be accomplished by linking to activities that continue throughout the conference.

MOTION – Lauria moved and Raja seconded that the 2016 workshop be pursued as a 1-day workshop (possibly with additional conference activities for participants) prior to the Portland

conference. It was recommended that the Doctoral Committee work with Donna Dodd to secure space. The motion was approved.

ACTION – Takahashi/Wu should follow up with Doctoral Committee to report on next steps for the Doctoral Workshop.

ACTION – The Student Reps should check in the Doctoral Committee to ensure linkages across doctoral student focused activities at the conference.

Faculty Mentoring (Dropbox)	A. Garde
Marketing (Dropbox)	L. Takahashi/S. Creamer
Branding Creative Brief & Timeline (Verbal/Dropbox)	
Marketing Strategy Creative Brief & Timeline (Verbal/Dropbox)	
New name ideas (Dropbox)	

Dodd and Takahashi presented six options of proposed names that were generated by the consultant Screamer Co. Thomas reminded the group that this effort originated some four years ago, that ACSP solicited many proposals from about 100 consultants, that many months of discussion went into this, and that Screamer is recommending that a large-scale change is the most effective way of getting beyond the limits of our current situation. The group discussed a range of issues including, for example: expressing some resistance about having to turn to marketing at all, various concerns about the proposed names, suggestions for changing how we use technology for promoting ourselves rather than through branding and names, questions about what the goal should be, concerns about how the “student profiles” were generated and whether we should be accepting this as how we should target our efforts. The ExCo will go back to the consultant and have more to report in the fall.

MOTION – A motion was made and seconded that we not change the name at this time. The vote was 13 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Diversity (Dropbox) {ACTION}	J. Lowe/G. Sandoval
Faculty of Color Workshop	

Takahashi reported that the Faculty of Color Workshop will not be offered in 2016 and will move to an every other year scheduled starting in 2017.

Pre-Doctoral Workshop (Dropbox)

Discussion of a funding request for the Pre-Doctoral Workshop was deferred to the budget discussion.

V Allied Organizations continued

ACUPP (Dropbox)	M. Seasons
GPEAN (verbal and Dropbox)	C. Silver
World Planning Schools Congress, Rio, 2016	

Student Travel Scholarships

Silver summarized key points from a written report provided to the Board. He received 21 applications from students for financial support to attend the Rio conference, with several ineligible. GPEAN has \$4,000 to provide funding for students, but this would only provide partial coverage to the eligible students. He is requesting \$2,000 from ACSP, to augment GPEAN's funds, so that GPEAN could fund all eligible students at \$650. He noted that it is unlikely that all student applicants will ultimately go to the conference. Silver also reported that GPEAN now has 11 association members. In summer 2016, Francis Owusu at Iowa State University will be taking over leadership of GPEAN.

PAB

PAB funding request {ACTION} (Dropbox and verbal)
Acknowledgement of PAB's report (Dropbox)

B. Nocks
C. Contant

Nocks summarized the role of PAB and highlighted several items from a report provided to the Board. They have developed draft standards and received a great deal of feedback and the redrafted the standards. They are waiting for the University of Texas Supreme Court decision and will be seeking consultation from an additional legal expert on how to address the legal issues. They will present their most current findings at the next GoBo meeting in Portland.

Nocks and Lauria (PAB Advisory Committee Chair) addressed the issue of PAB site visitors. They need more site visitors in the pool, and they would like broader coverage from a wider range of schools. To address this, they have been approaching program chairs directly and asking for nominations. They have also made efforts to show that the site visits are not as onerous as is commonly believed, and have been emphasizing the many benefits of participating. The group discussed ways to achieve a larger pool of site visitors, including: local practitioners might shadow a team so that they can learn the process and later participate in others; shift the view of responsibility away from individuals and instead on schools: require all accredited programs to devote some percentage of faculty to the site visitor pool; target more retired professors, despite ongoing concerns from teams and programs that they might not be fully engaged.

Nocks introduced the issue of student learning and program outcomes, and explained that the PAB is developing a training session. PAB is requesting that ACSP provide financial support of approximately \$4,400 annually to cover the costs of the training program to be led by Cheryl Contant. Contant provided a summary of the issues and the need for a training program, with the aim of developing new tools for site visitors and also providing assistance to course instructors to place more emphasis on student learning outcomes.

MOTION - A motion was made and seconded to accept the PAB report. The motion was approved.

VIII Interest Groups

POCIG (Dropbox)
FWIG (Dropbox)
GPEIG (Dropbox)

C. Acey/S. Shipp
M. Nguyen/K. Quick
M. Tewari/D. Rukmana

Proposal: amend by-laws and extend Governing Board voting rights to one representative from each interest group

The group discussed the GPEIG proposal to amend the bylaws to extend voting rights to interest groups, and several concerns were raised. Extending voting rights might cause long term consequences because we currently do not have a set number of interest groups but rather interest groups come into existence when meeting the needs of particular interests are proposed and justified. It was acknowledged that interest groups are diverse, with some larger than others, some more active than others, so allocating votes may be challenging. Representation on the GoBo is currently on the basis of schools, not interests. Shifting voting privileges to interests would be a large deviation from long held practice of representing member schools. Special committees and interest groups are not currently mentioned in the bylaws and keeping bylaws flexible is an important goal.

ACTION – Takahashi will reconnect with GPEIG with the GoBo’s feedback and encourage GPEIG involvement in other ways.

IX Budget (Dropbox)

C. Andrews/J. Grengs

Andrews offered an overview of the budget as represented in the proposed budget spreadsheet and summary powerpoint in Dropbox. The ACSP budget, based on a five year average, is approximately \$.5 million per year, with the conference as the biggest proportion, followed by JPER, and the Guide. On revenue side, Capitation and base dues comes from the member schools. On expenditure side, Association management, Governing Board, and website are other key expenditures. Over the past five years, there is sometimes a surplus, but in other years there is a loss. We have been accumulating total assets since FY 2007. The conference and JPER revenues are key drivers of increases in assets over time. It was acknowledged that the reserve is essential to covering our costs over the course of a year, to address unforeseen circumstances. The current bylaws require only a \$125,000 reserve. Andrews offered an overview of the general budget and its organization. A summary of key budget items and associated discussion is included below:

GPEAN – Request to spend \$4000 of their own money, plus \$2000 from ACSP to support student travel to Rio. This request could be connected to the Student Representatives request for \$5000 for student travel support. The total request would then thus be \$2000 to GPEAN to augment their request to spend \$4000 of their own money. The student representatives would expect the student travel grant recipients would write blog posts highlighting their experience.

GPEIG – The group has a long running balance of funds. The group is planning activities including organizing an event and providing student scholarships, a new case study prize, special issue support, and a contribution to a Friedmann event.

POCIG – The group is requesting \$6170, including \$2500 to support year 2 of a student climate study. The ExCo asked for an explanation of what the initial \$2500 was spent for and this was provided. The current request would support additional student time to finish the project. The

discussion explored the purpose/outcomes of NCFDD memberships, distinguishing between institutional and individual memberships. It was noted that NCFDD individual memberships have been targeted to faculty at schools who do not currently have institutional memberships.

FWIG – The group is requesting \$2400 for a speaker honorarium, av for the FWIG lunch, and student lunch subsidies. The group has a carry forward balance of \$1200. The group will coordinate with POCIG on a speaker for the 2016 conference.

Guide – The request reflects a change to an entirely online Guide. The fee is shifting to a flat fee per participating program. The ultimate result is that revenues will decline slightly, but will be easier to explain and understand. There is a small increase in expenditures due to marketing and a software fee to connect to the website. The proposed budget reflects an estimate of what will be needed to market the Guide and the broader website. Marketing might include optimizing search outcomes and targeted ads based on visits to the online Guide. The \$40,000 request is a target and aligns with the current budget capability. The ExCo will continue to consult with the marketing firm as to next steps and will spend up to \$40,000. The ExCo will continue conversations as to establishing baseline metrics, relevant targets, and costs associated with reaching those targets. ACSP does not have a contract with Screamer Co related to execution of the marketing plan.

Administrators' Conference – The conference is scheduled for spring 2017. A request of \$3000 from the general fund is proposed as seed funding. Registration fees cover the bulk of the expenditures. The conference is designed to nearly break even, with the exception of the \$3000 general fund investment.

PhD Workshop – It was envisioned that the workshop would require \$5000 from the general fund, per the initial plan of a 2.5 day workshop. If we adjust the workshop to a one-day pre-conference workshop, the costs will be reduced. It is recommended that the \$5000 be budgeted, to allow for flexibility. The key expenses in past years have been scholarships and housing. If it shifts to a 1-day workshop, speaker travel and committee travel will likely be reduced. Room costs may increase.

Annual Conference – There are proposed changes to the registration fee structure reflected in the budget. The changes reflect the unpredictability of the opening reception and the awards lunch. The events have significant costs and unpredictability in terms of actual participation. It is proposed that the reception and awards lunch be separate ticketed events, including the increased likelihood of using tickets if one pays for them. Another issue is that student registration fees are vastly less than the actual cost of their participation in the conference. It is proposed that student fees be increased slightly, relative to the faculty fees to reduce the cross-subsidy slightly. The discussion focused on the potential lack of interest in the awards lunch under the proposed fee change, and whether registration fees would be reduced, in association with separating out the ticketed events. Dodd reported that the proposal is to reduce registration fees slightly. The discussion highlighted concerns about losing event participants due to the costs, issues with reimbursement associated with separately ticketed meals, and nominal meal ticket costs to facilitate a commitment to attendance. It was recommended that a basic fee be charged with reductions for not attending events. Event reductions could be tied to

per diem costs. Dodd highlighted the true costs associated with each person who attend the conference. The true cost is approximately \$330 for each person. Student fees have been substantially lower than this in recent years. Issues have arisen as the number of students has increased and the cross-subsidy by faculty has become insufficient. It was also acknowledged that we should also be considering the attractiveness of the various events and their ability to contribute to conference cost viability. Marc Edwards from Virginia Tech has been recruited as a potential conference speaker, but is asking for \$10k for an honorarium, plus travel costs. The discussion suggested that we recruit programs to serve as sponsors for the event or sell tickets to local people. A straw vote suggested that \$5k, rather than \$10k seemed to be an appropriate maximum amount that we should make available for recruitment of conference speakers.

JPER – Proposed revenues and expenditures are largely contractually mandated.

Student Representative Travel – The proposal calls for an increase to \$5000 to fully cover costs for two student representatives (\$1250 each for each trip) for travel to the spring and fall GoBo meetings.

Global Education in Planning Task Force – The Task Force has requested \$1500 to support a student to assist with a survey of planning programs related to international planning education topics. The discussion highlighted the lack of a formal proposal submission and inconsistencies in how we might address this issue relative to how we have addressed requests from other interest groups, task forces, etc. It was also recommended that a coordinated survey across multiple issues might be more productive as we reach out to programs and faculty across a wide range of issues. It was recommended that the Task Force develop a more formal proposal that would be voted on by email at a later date. It was recommended that the Task Force timeline be extended to accommodate further development of a proposal and completion of the proposed activities. The proposed \$1500 expenditure is not supported, but will likely be requested for the future fiscal year.

PAB – There is a request of \$4400 to support training for planning programs related to PAB accreditation. The training would be targeted to all faculty at the ACSP conference, considering that they have a role in outcomes assessment. It was discussed that the training might not be needed over the long-term, rather the focus would be on near term offerings to build capacity. It was noted by PAB members that the training is part of a broader phased plan for outcomes assessment and the new standards. PAB will be partnering with APA on web-based delivery. It was recommended that the training occur at the Administrators' Conference rather than at the ACSP Conference. The concern was raised as to whether faculty would actually engage with training at the ACSP Conference and whether a better strategy would be to focus on chairs, positioning them to train their faculty. It was further argued that there is pressure from universities and other accrediting bodies for faculty to develop outcome assessments and thus there may be interest. It was argued that the development of best practices be part of the work that Contant would complete. It was decided that the training be conducted at the Administrators' Conference in 2017 and that funding be provided.

Staff Labor for Web Publicity, Promotions, and Marketing – There is a request for \$26,046 to support labor costs and YM conference travel to further implement website and marketing activities, for which we have contracted.

MOTION – Andrews moved and Jourdan seconded approval of the budget as amended per the discussion noted above. The motion was approved.

ACTION – Takahashi will follow up with Marc Edwards to offer \$5000 for a conference presentation.

ACTION – Takahashi will appoint a subcommittee to develop a registration fee strategy to provide an appropriate cross-subsidy between faculty and student registrations. Raja will serve on the subcommittee.

ACTION – Grengs will communicate with the interest groups regarding approved budget requests.

ACTION – Takahashi/Wu will extend timeline for Global Education in Planning Task Force for an additional year.

ACTION – Dodd will track and request the \$1000 Blakely funds each year for the POCIG account.

X **New Business** L. Takahashi

XI **Unfinished Business/General Orders** L. Takahashi

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.