



**ACSP**  
Connecting educators,  
researchers and students.

## Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

### DRAFT MINUTES ~ 03.09.2017

Spring Governing Board Meeting ~ March 9, 2017, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM  
Hyatt Regency Reston ~ Reston, VA ~ Reston ABC Room

---

Current Governing Board members in attendance: Jennifer Evans-Cowley, Michael Frisch, Joe Grengs, Kristin Larsen, Aujean Lee, Mike Lens, Richard Margerum, Laxmi Ramasubramanian, Tom Sanchez, Carissa Slotterback, Lois Takahashi, Shannon Van Zandt, Mary Wolfe, Weiping Wu

Others in attendance: Cheryl Contant (Consultant), Donna Dodd (ACSP), Ed Goetz (PAB), Bruce Knight (PAB), Shonagh Merits (PAB), Connie Ozawa (PAB), Bruce Stiftel (Committee on the Academy), Niraj Verma (Committee on the Academy)

- I Opening the meeting and Call to Order** [ACTION] L. Takahashi
- Introductions
  - Approval of Consent Agenda (suggestions below) [ACTION]
    - Nominating & Elections Committee
    - Faculty Mentoring Committee
    - Annual Conference Committee
    - JPER Report

MOTION – Ramasubramanian moved approval of the consent agenda, Van Zandt seconded. The Motion was approved.

Acceptance of Regular Agenda [ACTION/Box]

Takahashi provided an overview of the agenda, including shifts in the schedule. She previewed key discussion items in the New Business section of the agenda.

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

- II Update and Status of ACSP**
- President's Report [Verbal report] L. Takahashi

Takahashi deferred her report, as her content relates to later agenda items.

President-Elect Report [Verbal report] W. Wu

Wu highlighted a number of conference and workshop related items, including:

- The Administrators Conference has over 80 attendees, including a number of Deans.
- The Call for Abstracts for the Denver conference will open on Monday.
- The Diversity Committee is actively planning the Junior Faculty of Color Workshop, to be hosted at Harvard for the second time.

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

- The student reps have recommended that ACSP do the preparing for the job market sessions throughout the 2017 Denver conference. The Doctoral Committee is available to assist with this workshop. The Pre-Doctoral Workshop will be discussed later in the agenda.
- The Diversity Committee is interested in hosting this workshop every year, rather than every other year.
- The JPER workshop occurs on an annual schedule. will happen each year.
- The conference and workshop calendar available on the website.

Wu also noted that the JPER contract with Sage will end in 2018 and she indicated the importance of beginning to think about contract negotiations as soon as new officers are elected.

Treasurer's Report [Verbal report]

J. Grengs

Grengs provided a brief overview of the budget. He indicated that ACSP is in good shape with a \$0.5 million dollar typical budget. Investments are doing well. He noted that the organization is experiencing some change and is taking on new initiatives that have financial implications.

Secretary's Report [Verbal report]

C. Slotterback

Slotterback deferred her report, as her content relates to later agenda items.

Approval of Minutes [[ACTION/Box](#)]

MOTION – Margerum moved approval of the minutes, Lens seconded. The Motion was approved.

Role of Regional Representatives

This topic was deferred until later in the agenda relative to the Institutional Governance Committee discussion.

**III Student Representatives** [[Verbal report/Box/Action](#)]

A. Lee/M. Wolfe

Introduction of Mary Wolfe

The group welcomed Mary Wolfe, the new Student Representative. Lee highlighted 2016 conference activities including the two student workshops, student reception, and graduate student office hours booth. She described a new student bulletin that is helping to introduce students to ACSP and highlight student accomplishments. The students are working on a student website. Lee referenced a budget request and proposed motions to be discussed later.

Wolfe noted opportunities to bridge ACSP students with Young Academics in AESOP, including her planned attendance at the AESOP Young Academics conference, as well as ongoing conversations about future collaboration. She noted a particular interest in how AESOP engages students through its website and other online platforms.

The discussion included an inquiry as to whether masters' students were represented by the student representatives. Takahashi noted that the representatives focus on PhD students. The discussion also addressed feedback on the conference job market sessions and it was noted that integrating them into the conference makes student participation easier and less expensive. The group discussed how PhD students are identified and ways that they might be more engaged and their knowledge of ACSP increased, including through an overview of ACSP at future PhD workshops. The group discussed barriers to getting information about ACSP and possible strategies including contacting chairs to encourage them to share information with their PhD students.

Relative to previously expressed concerns about the timing of announcement of awards, Dodd indicated that decisions would be made in advance of the 2017 conference early registration deadline. She noted that rather than a student awards session at the conference, there will be a media blitz to share information about the student awards and winners.

**ACTION** – Donna will share list of chair contacts for schools with doctoral programs with the student reps, so that they can contact chairs with details about how their students can connect with ACSP.

**IV Journal of Planning Education and Research** [Consent Agenda/Box] C. Andrews/F. Popper

**V Interest Groups**  
POCIG [ACTION/Box] S. Shipp/T. Sanders

Takahashi referred the attendees to the written report.

FWIG [ACTION/Box] M. Nguyen/C. Slotterback

Slotterback, on behalf of Nguyen, provided an overview of the FWIG report and proposed budget requests.

GPEIG [ACTION/Box] M. Tewari/D. Rukmana

Takahashi referred the attendees to the written report.

**VI Allied Organizations**  
PAB [ACTION/Box] S. Merits

Takahashi introduced the new PAB chair, Bruce Knight. Knight highlighted his experience in planning practice and as an adjunct at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, as well as his motivations related to being engaged with PAB. Knight summarized the PAB report, including

- Efforts to develop online site visitor training
- Likely future consideration of a fee increase
- Preparations for a new round of strategic planning to inform new initiatives and identify potential budget implications – at the 2017 APA conference in New York they will go through strategic planning process, with participation by Takahashi for a portion of the session

- Anticipated budget proposal to ACSP in the future
- Completed update of accreditation standards, based on two rounds of input
- Recruitment of site visitors has been strong, especially via ACSP's efforts to reach out to institutions with few to no site visitors
- Ongoing work with the PAB Diversity Task Force in coordination with APA, AICP, and ACSP; Task Force is documenting best practices from institutions related to addressing diversity

Takahashi noted that the declining enrollment report and issue will continue to be discussed with PAB, AICP, and APA. She noted that enrollment is an issue of concern, but there is not a consistent pattern. The discussion indicated an interest in continuing to track enrollment numbers.

**ACTION** – Dodd and Slotterback will share the declining enrollment report and powerpoint with the GoBo members and chairs.

MOTION – Evans-Cowley moved acceptance of the PAB report, Frisch seconded. The Motion was approved.

Professional Development Proposal [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

C. Contant

Contant indicated that her proposal for professional development is from her, but is submitted with PAB's support. She noted that PAB has previously contracted with her as part of site visitor and chair training efforts, including on student learning outcomes. She highlighted the previous proposal in spring 2016 for ACSP to fund professional development for program administrators on student learning outcomes. She will conduct two professional development sessions at the Administrators Conference. She intends to do evaluations of the conference sessions and will share the results with ACSP. She is requesting funding for 2017-2018 to continue to do student learning outcomes training at the 2017 conference. The proposal also includes an effort to gather information on the current state of practice in student learning outcomes among PAB member schools. She noted that PAB has this information but that it is confidential due to its inclusion in self-study documents. Proposed costs are associated with Contant's time and participation in the conferences.

The discussion included an expression of interest in a paper in JPER related to student learning outcomes, as well as whether it is possible to make some content from self-study documents available in a de-identified format, or with a focus on the measurement instruments rather than more sensitive outcome data. There was an expression of broader interest in having a more unified set of measures across ACSP and PAB and greater information sharing. Merits noted that PAB has some documents/guidance on its website related to program public information required by PAB. It was noted that university institutional research offices are an important audience for student learning outcomes. Ozawa noted that PAB has identified and documented "noteworthy practices" related to student learning outcomes, suggesting that this information would be complementary to that gathered by Contant.

APA [\[Box\]](#)

J. Drinan/M. Groh

Takahashi referred attendees to the written report.

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

Takahashi indicated that Connerly is providing insight on enhancing potential connections with AESOP. She also noted that a task force, chaired by Grengs, has been established to explore opportunities and financial implications associated with reinstating a joint ACSP and AESOP conference.

Wu noted that GPEAN will be hosting its annual meeting at the 2017 ACSP conference in Denver. Stiftel, in Owusu's absence, noted that Owusu is ACSP's representative to the GPEAN council, a network of 11 planning school associations. He indicated that GPEAN organizes the World Planning Schools Congress, for which a call for hosts will be released soon. The next Congress will be held in 2021. Stiftel indicated that GPEAN meets annually at the conference of one of its planning school associations. GPEAN was last hosted by ACSP at the Chicago ACSP/AESOP conference. Between 10-12 GPEAN representatives will be attending the ACSP conference and will receive waived registration fees. The discussion noted an interest in the state of the GPEAN organization and key issues. Stiftel noted issues including planning for the next Congress, developing and maintaining a new website, and engagement with efforts around Habitat III. He noted that GPEAN is relatively informal, but that they will likely have a budget in the future. He noted that Rayman Mohamed, ACSP Conference Chair, has indicated an interest in serving on the Congress planning committee. He noted that the website has been an ongoing challenge in terms of content, funding, and coordinating volunteer efforts.

## VII Standing Committees

Grengs provided an overview of the Committee and its activities. He indicated that ACSP's bottom line is in flux since books are still open for the current fiscal year. He noted that \$320,000 in investments have been shifted to mutual funds, with great performance thus far (15% return over three years). ACSP has about \$600,000 in assets. He noted an effort to better track the outcomes of ACSP's budget investments, with the committee involved in ongoing tracking.

### Conference Fee International – Proposal [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

Takahashi noted that she charged the Finances and Investment Committee with considering the implications of providing reduced conference fees for international attendees at the ACSP conference. Grengs highlighted the recommendation that we implement a discount (to the student rate) for international attendees from low income countries. In arriving at this recommendation, the Committee reviewed practices of other associations (e.g. Regional Studies Association) and reviewed the performance of the 2016 change in conference fees that breaks out meals/events to a greater extent. The proposed eligibility for the reduced rate relies on World Bank data to designate "Low Income" and "Lower-Middle Income" economies. A total of

about 100 countries fall into this category. A review of 2016 conference attendance data suggests that there were no attendees from these designated countries, potentially indicating that there is a cost barrier for attendance.

The discussion explored potential financial impacts on ACSP and the opportunity to strengthen global ties. It was noted that the typical student rate is about \$100 less than the actual cost of conference attendance. It was indicated that the Conference Committee would implement this practice and track the implications of this new fee structure. Future conference locations were acknowledged as potentially impacting future attendance rates. Promotion of the new registration rate through GPEIG and GPEAN was recommended. The group called for revisiting the issues in Spring 2018, based on data from the 2017 conference.

**ACTION** – Dodd will send notification of the new fee to GPEIG and GPEAN for promotion to international colleagues.

**ACTION** – Grengs will send Donna the final list of countries and other provisions of the approved reduced conference registration rate.

MOTION – Margerum moved approval of the discounted rate for international attendees from designated countries as described in the Committee proposal, Frisch seconded. The motion was approved.

Nominating and Elections [\[Consent Agenda/Box\]](#)

J. Thomas

Takahashi reminded attendees to have their departments vote in the ongoing election.

Institutional Governance

J. Thomas/C. Slotterback

Slotterback presented the Committee's report on behalf of June Thomas. She highlighted the proposed bylaw changes and the procedure for changing the bylaws. The group discussed whether the student representative role should be further formalized in the bylaws, though it was acknowledged that the bylaws should offer a base set of expectations that can be expanded based on the interests and capacity of future student representatives. The group discussed the possibility of allowing electronic voting, as opposed to email or mail voting, for bylaw changes. To encourage higher response rates, it was recommended that future bylaw change votes be conducted at the same time as ACSP elections.

**ACTION** – The student representatives will review the bylaws and draft edits for review by the Institutional Governance Committee.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will propose a further edit to the bylaws to clarify that electronic voting is allowed for bylaw changes.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with the Institutional Governance Committee to conduct a vote on the proposed bylaw changes, to be completed prior to the 2017 conference.

**ACTION** – Dodd will update the orientation manual to reflect the role of student representatives more clearly.

The group also had a broader discussion about the role of regional representatives and ways that they might be more engaged between meetings. The group discussed the possibility of phone or videoconference meetings on a monthly or quarterly basis and also the need to avoid redundancy in regional representative communication relative to ACSP's broader communication efforts. It was determined that phone or videoconference meetings would be pursued as needed. An online forum via the ACSP website was also discussed, though it was acknowledged that legal issues regarding privacy should be considered before launching such a forum. In connecting with chairs and members in the regions, it was acknowledged that there is a gap in understanding what ACSP does. Takahashi noted a recent effort to highlight appointments to the GoBo, committees, etc. to chairs and Deans. It was recommended that regional representatives sit with chairs from their regions at the annual Business Meeting in Denver, in order to facilitate personal connections.

**ACTION** – Dodd will pre-schedule a pre-GoBo meeting in advance of the ExCo meeting.

**ACTION** – Dodd will consult with the ACSP attorney to gather feedback on privacy of discussion on a GoBo online forum.

**ACTION** – Dodd will invite regional representatives to the Business Meeting in Denver and organize seating by regions.

#### Travel for Governing Board Members [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

Slotterback summarized the Committee's proposal for travel support for Governing Board members from lower resource schools was introduced, in anticipation of further discussion relative to the ACSP budget.

#### Membership [\[Verbal/ Box\]](#)

M. Frisch

Frisch reported that he has worked with ACSP staff to develop template letters to send to non-ACSP member schools that are producing planners (e.g. Northwest Missouri State), based on ACSP conference attendance records and the Planetizen planning school list.

Frisch encouraged regional reps to identify schools in their regions to identify potential school/program/individual members. It was recommended that ACSP get data from AICP as to the institutions of students who take the exam.

Takahashi summarized current membership data, indicating an increase in membership, especially among students and individual members.

The discussion raised issues including how ACSP, including regional reps, can connect more fully with individual members, as they are potential sources of students for our graduate programs. It was noted that information about where individual members are working is useful to doctoral students as they think about their job prospects. It was recommended that ACSP continue to monitor individual membership data, including their institutions and domestic vs. international location.

**ACTION** – Dodd will share individual member data, by region, with regional representatives.

**ACTION** – Takahashi will talk with AICP about data sharing, including related to the institutions of individuals taking the AICP exam.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with ACSP staff to analyze individual membership data to gain further insight on where new members are located and what schools they are coming from.

**ACTION** – Takahashi will follow up after the membership data analysis to direct the Membership Committee and add more members.

### Conferences

Dodd noted that call for abstracts went out last week and abstract submission opens on Monday. Takahashi highlighted some changes to the conference, informed by the post-conference survey. Changes include bringing back the Saturday lunch, using media to promote the local host rather than more tours and local host sessions, workshop options for Friday afternoon (e.g. Lincoln Institute sessions, funders panel, journal editors panel, public communication workshop), poster session with food, and modified presidential sessions with engaging, innovative speakers.

### Sponsorship Development

W. Wu

Wu highlighted the unique financial success of Portland Conference tied to sponsorship. She noted that ACSP is working on potential sponsorships for future conferences. Lincoln Institute is likely returning as a sponsor with planned curriculum design and case studies workshops. PolicyMap is tentatively committed as well. Wu noted the importance of engaging sponsors with faculty and the intellectual activities at the conference. She noted that ACSP has basic sponsorship packages, but can also develop tailored packages for potential sponsors. GoBo members are encouraged to think about potential conference sponsors, in particular potential sponsors for which members have specific contacts. ESRI, Qualtrics, NeighborWorks, and Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC) were identified as potential sponsors. The group discussed publishers as potential sponsors, but also noted their limited financial resources.

### Awards

W. Wu

Wu described GoBo discussions in previous years related to the proliferation of awards. She indicated that the Review and Appraisal committee is interested in awards related to teaching. The ExCo has expressed interest in taking the time to review our current awards and additional award opportunities, including issues related to funding, recruitment of nominations, simplifying nomination packets, and addressing interest group awards. The group discussed the possibility of having a Task Force to consider a possible award policy that would address issues noted above and how to address new awards. The discussion highlighted the significance of awards in faculty academic analytics systems and how we can get ACSP's awards on the analytics systems. New Awards Policy Task Force members include Van Zandt (chair), Goetz, Ramasubramanian, Larsen, and Wolfe. The discussion highlighted opportunities for publishing the work of award winners, engaging them in writing blogs, and highlighting them on the website. The Task Force will offer a report at next GoBo meeting and the new awards policy will be implemented for the 2018 conference.

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*



**ACTION** – Takahashi will follow up with the Awards Policy Task Force on its charge and timeline.

**ACTION** – Dodd will share a list of all of the awards and data on nominations from last year. She will also reach out to experienced award committee chairs to gather insights on previous nominations.

2017 Denver <a href="#">[Consent Agenda/Box]</a>	W. Wu/ R. Mohamed
2018, 2019, 2020 & 2021	W. Wu
ACSP/PAB Advisory Committee Report <a href="#">[no report]</a>	M. Lauria

## VII Standing Committees continued if necessary

## VIII Special Committees and Task Forces

Communications Committee <a href="#">[Verbal/Box]</a>	C. Slotterback
Web Analytics <a href="#">[Box]</a>	
Social Media Statistics <a href="#">[Box]</a>	

Slotterback shared an overview of the Communications Committee report, including highlighting ACSP communication tools (e.g. UNIVerse, the ACSP blog, and social media). She also highlighted the guide to ACSP communication tools that will be shared with Administrators Conference attendees. The discussion highlighted interest in sharing the guide with all program chairs and faculty, including with all attendees at the 2017 conference. The discussion highlighted that ACSP members and others interested in planning education and research are more distributed and are connecting with the organization and each other in different ways, suggesting that a single communication tool might not be viable. The group expressed general interest in developing a communications survey to learn more about communication preferences. The group also discussed strategies for connecting with student members.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with the Communications Committee to develop a communications survey.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with the student representatives to develop a student-focused guide to ACSP’s communication tools.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with GoBo members and ACSP staff to distribute the guide to ACSP’s communication tools.

Logo Guidelines [\[Box\]](#)

Slotterback noted that logo guidelines and a policy have been discussed with ACSP staff and that there is a plan to develop guidelines for using and modifying the ACSP logo for interest groups, committees, and other uses.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will follow up with ACSP staff to finalize the Logo Guidelines and Policy.

Related to Marketing, Takahashi noted that a marketing plan has been received from the consultant. She will work with ACSP staff to modify the marketing plan to make it relevant and understandable to the ACSP audience.

**ACTION** – Takahashi will work with ACSP staff to develop a summary of the marketing plan to share with member schools. The marketing plan will be shared at the Business Meeting.

Committee on the Academy [\[Verbal\]](#)

B. Stiftel/N. Verma

Verma provided an overview of the Administrators Conference and Stiftel highlighted the history of the conference.

Doctoral Committee [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

R. Norton

Takahashi noted that a possible proposal may come in for a summer Doctoral Workshop. Last year ACSP delivered a pre-conference Doctoral Workshop and it was successful. She noted that it has been difficult in recent years to get a host for the summer workshop and to follow through on commitments to organize and support the workshop, along with the Doctoral Committee. There has also been difficulty in recruiting faculty to participate in the workshop. Lee noted the challenge of logistics, time, and cost associated with a summer workshop. Wolfe noted that the 2016 conference worked well due to co-locating the workshop with the conference, due to travel and convenience, but also the social aspect of connecting with other students and faculty at the workshop that then continues through the conference. It was determined that the ExCo would continue to work with the Doctoral Committee on scheduling the next workshop.

**ACTION** – Wu will follow up with Dick Norton, Chair, ACSP Doctoral Committee, to finalize the details for the Doctoral Workshop.

Faculty Mentoring [\[Consent Agenda/Box\]](#)

A. Garde

Committee on Diversity [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

J. Lowe

Takahashi provided a summary of the report. She noted that the Committee has organized two sessions at the Administrators Conference. They are also organizing the Junior Faculty of Color Workshop as well. They are working on race, ethnicity and foreign origin report by the end of 2017 and a Resume Book for the 2017 job market season. Wu noted that the Junior Faculty of Color Workshop for summer 2017 did not go through the typical ACSP RFP process, since planning for it was already underway at the time the RFP process was institutionalized.

Takahashi indicated that the Diversity Committee is interested in pursuing the Pre-Doctoral Workshop in summer 2018, moving back to an annual schedule. They have emphasized that building the pipeline is an important strategy for enhancing diversity and that an annual schedule will facilitate pipeline development. It was acknowledged that recruitment for the workshop has varied in terms of process and outcomes. The group discussed the challenge in following up with previous participants to better understand workshop outcomes, the need for diverse faculty to participate in the workshop, the opportunity to connect the Pre-Doctoral and Doctoral Workshops, the challenge of annually recruiting a sufficient and high quality pool of Pre-Doctoral Workshop attendees, the appropriateness of undergraduate vs. master's students in the workshop, the possibility of a distributed web conference, the advantages of an in-person

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

workshop, the option of recording portions of the workshop for sharing online, the significance of intense/immersive experiences in recruiting, the prospect of an alternative fellowship program to support pre-doctoral students in working with faculty, the possibility of coordinating with other organizations, and recruitment strategies related to McNair Scholars and Honors students at our universities.

**ACTION** – Takahashi will share the GoBo feedback with the Diversity Committee and ask them to identify the goals of the Pre-Doctoral workshop and how it aligns with the structure, participants, and timing of the workshop, and how we can better understand and track outcomes of the workshop. Jeffrey Lowe, Chair, ACSP Diversity Committee, will be invited to the fall GoBo meeting.

**ACTION** – Dodd will request names of attendees of previous Pre-Doctoral Workshops and ACSP staff will attempt to determine whether attendees have entered doctoral programs in planning.

**ACTION** – Dodd will develop a form to standardize procedures for workshops to require that they provide a report on outcomes.

Global Education Task Force **[ACTION/Box]**

G. Shatkin/W. Wu

Wu indicated that the Task Force started in Fall 2016 and thus has no results to report at this point. She summarized the areas of focus of the Global Education Task Force and referred to efforts of two prior task forces that have addressed global education. Wu noted that this Task Force will differ in its focus, with an emphasis on documenting the practices of schools. The Task Force will administer a survey of students (working with GPEIG) and survey of planning schools, conduct interviews, and connect with relevant institutions/organizations to explore ways for ACSP to connect more fully with the global urban agenda.

**IX Budget [ACTION/Box]**

J. Grengs

Grengs provided a summary of the budget, including the distribution of revenues and expenditures. The budget data emphasize the significance of the annual conference to ACSP's overall budget, as well as the significance of JPER and the Guide to Schools. He noted fluctuations in our budget, but a general increase in our assets over time. He indicated that ACSP is changing and growing more complex, creating the need for an improved budget/accounting system that tracks financial activities based on personnel rather than tasks. The discussion explored a net negative budget in 2016, which Grengs explained was associated with changes in the JPER contract and the Guide. The 2017 budget year is predicted to be negative as well, associated with expenditures on strategic initiatives. The 2016 conference was particularly successful due to a significant contribution by the local hosts, greater sponsorship, increased practitioner registration, significantly increased student and faculty registration, and cancelling the awards luncheon. He noted that we are not likely to see this kind of revenue in the future. Grengs highlighted the content and organization of the budget spreadsheet, including its limitations as a decision making tool.

Grengs noted key budget issues for the next year:

- GPEIG has requested funding for student lunch funding and AV

- POCIG is requesting funding for student travel scholarships, NCFDD membership, and a strategic planning retreat
- FWIG is requesting more than they have in past years, including for AV, emerging scholar scholarships, and a study on gender bias and discrimination in the academic workplace

The group discussed the cost of previous surveys and how they compared to the FWIG budget request. The group discussed the need to require that data collected be appropriately de-identified and provided to ACSP.

**ACTION** – Dodd and Grengs will work together to explore a policy related to committee, interest group, and ACSP surveys to ensure that collected data are de-identified and provided to ACSP for future use.

- Doctoral Committee requests funding for the workshop
- Diversity Committee requests funding for Junior Faculty of Color Workshop and resume book.

Grengs noted that this will be the last year for funding the resume book, since the Career Center will be able to provide an equivalent product in future years.

- PAB, via Cheryl Contant, requests funding for training and research on student learning objectives

The group discussed the challenge of deciding on a future funding request prior to completion and evaluation of the previously funded activity. There was a discussion of information that would be available from PAB, with an emphasis on the need to share instruments for getting to measures, rather than the measures themselves. Ozawa indicated that PAB could address the issue of sharing information/practices across schools. She also noted that there are not very many good examples of student learning assessment. She noted that each round of self-study often engages a new chair, which suggests the need for ongoing training for chairs. Ongoing training for site visitors was noted as a priority as well.

The discussion pointed to the need to gather insights from failures, not just best practices. It was also acknowledged that there are often internal university student learning outcome measurement expectations that compete with PAB requirements. The importance of tapping into emerging institutional knowledge in our association relative to the development of measures was noted, as well as the significance of understanding context and implementation of outcome data collection. The possibility of ACSP collecting examples of student learning evaluation instruments/approaches was discussed. The group discussed a potential concern about conflict of interest associated with providing funding to a past ACSP President.

The group determined that the Contant funding request would be approved, contingent on the results of the evaluations of the training to be provided at the Administrators Conference. The ExCo would have the discretion to modify the training proposal if the funding is provided.

**ACTION** – Takahashi will follow up with APA, AICP, and PAB to explore a joint task force on student learning outcomes.

**ACTION** – Dodd will follow up Shonagh Merits, PAB Executive Director, related to evaluations for the student learning outcomes workshops at the Administrators Conference.

- Institutional Governance Committee requests travel support

The discussion highlighted the possibility that GoBo participation could be facilitated by videoconference or conference call, in order to minimize travel costs. It was also noted that all GoBo members have need. It was noted that targeted travel support could potentially increase interest from underrepresented schools. The challenge associated with administering the funding was noted. The group discussed limiting the funding to the 1<sup>st</sup> priority: minority serving institutions. They noted the importance of connecting this effort to recruitment for potential GoBo members. They also explored the possibility of providing more funding for a fewer number of people.

It was decided that ACSP would provide funding for GoBo members from minority-serving institutions (HBCUs, Hispanic-serving, Asian-serving, and Native American/Alaska Native-serving) up to \$600 for up to 2 people for the spring meeting.

**ACTION** – Grengs and Dodd will develop a policy/procedure related to distributing the GoBo member travel funding, including a list of relevant schools and an application.

**ACTION** – Dodd will work with the Nominating and Elections Committee in 2017 to ensure that notification of this funding will be included in the call for nominees for GoBo and ExCo positions.

- Student representatives request funding for the student reception
- Annual conference budget

Grengs highlighted new costs associated with the conference budget including wifi, photography, and the app. Takahashi noted that feedback from the post-conference survey was informative to changes in the conference and the associated budget. Potential app vendors have been identified and are being evaluated. Takahashi indicated that wifi will be provided for the conference and the awards lunch will be reinstated. The lunch will include a compelling keynote that will be connected to big ideas sessions.

- ACSP staff

Takahashi indicated that the organization has changed and is becoming increasingly complex, thus motivating a need for a review of staffing patterns and increased professionalization of our organization. She discussed conversations with Dodd to develop a budget based on personnel rather than a budget based on tasks/activities. She noted that this change will also regularize staffing and better distribute responsibilities for key activities. The proposal outlines specific position descriptions and associated costs. The proposal increases staffing costs by about \$70,000, including approximately \$45,000 for a new conference manager. The group discussed implications of the proposed costs relative to potential revenues. The possibility of increasing dues was noted in the future. The proposal was noted as increasing our ability to deliver services to members and to potentially increase revenues. The group discussed the need for periodic increases in Donna's salary. A question was raised as to whether we have association goals related to revenue (e.g. from sponsorships). Takahashi indicated that Dodd has been starting to

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

do this work and will be spending more time on it under the new structure. It was acknowledged that the ExCo could do more to identify performance metrics and use them in evaluating future contracts and outcomes for the association.

**ACTION** – Wu and Grengs will work together with ACSP staff to set targets for membership, sponsorships, etc., and report back to the GoBo in the fall.

Grengs concluded the budget discussion by acknowledging that the recommended budget would require an investment of \$90,000, with the anticipation that the investment would produce long-term benefits. This investment would retain approximately \$460,000 in assets. The investment is well within the \$40-50k range of strategic investments and the \$125,000 reserve requirement.

**ACTION** – Grengs will contact interest groups, committees, and others related to approved budget items.

**MOTION** – Van Zandt moved approval of the budget, Evans-Cowley seconded. The Motion was approved.

**X      New Business**

L. Takahashi

ACSP Statement/General Approach to Political Responses [\[Box\]](#)

Takahashi described efforts to draft the statement and challenges associated with making such statements. The group discussed issues including potential threats to our programs, the significance of the work we do in making the world better, the threats (especially in some states) to planning schools, changes in research funding, impacts of immigration policies related to students and more generally, the challenge of balancing statements and actions, the pressure for members to take stands, the significance of process in the way that planners and ACSP work, the limitations of ACSP in taking action, opportunities that ACSP has to support members in taking action, acknowledgement that individual members can take action, and the acknowledgement that we were are limited in putting forth a unified voice.

It was recommended that ACSP identify specific actions that we can take, including developing a list of media contacts and sharing it with media outlets, sharing innovative examples from our members about our work in the current political climate, and reaching out to other organizations.

**ACTION** – Wu will connect with Stephanie Vance at APA on possible training on communications at the 2017 conference.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with the Communications Committee to explore an approach to organizing planning academic expertise relative to media and legislative opportunities.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will revise the statement to add greater specificity about actions and then share with the GoBo to determine whether we should send out the statement.

NAACP endorsement of AAG letter [\[Box\]](#)  
Staffing Positions  
The Guide

Takahashi noted that input would be sought on Guide and the conversations would continue with APA and Planetizen.

#### Career Center

Takahashi noted that the new Career Center interface is up and running.

**XI Unfinished Business/General Orders**

L. Takahashi

#### **Adjourn**

MOTION – Ramasubramanian moved to adjourn and Margerum seconded. The Motion was approved.

The meeting concluded at approximately 5:00 pm.