

# ACSP Governing Board Semi-Annual Meeting

October 23, 2003

Amelia Island, Florida

(Draft: December 10, 2003)

## Members And Others Present/Participating:

Officers: Wim Wiewel, President; Chris Silver, Vice President/President-Elect; Thomas Clark, Secretary/Treasurer and Incoming Treasurer; Patricia Pollack, Incoming Secretary.

Regional Representatives: Rolf Pendall, Northeast regional representative; Robin Boyle, North Central regional representative; Mulatu Wubneh, Southeast regional representative; Elise Bright and Mickey Lauria (Incoming Vice-President/President Elect) South Central regional representatives; and Barbara Becker, and Dowell Myers (West regional representatives).

Student Representatives: Laura Lanza and Raymond Massenburg.

Others Attending: Michael Hibbard JPER Co-Editor; Nancy Frank, UPDATE Editor and ACSP web master; Frederick Steiner, Cheryl Contant, Tridib Banerjee and Beatrice Clupper, PAB; Sandra Rosenbloom, Nominating Committee and the Guide to Undergraduate and Graduate Education in Urban and Regional Planning; Joyce Levine (Incoming South Central regional representative); Barry Nocks (Incoming Southeast regional representative); Ken Reardon (Incoming Northeast regional representative); Karen Christiansen (Incoming JPER Co-Editor); and Donna Dodd, Bursar and Conference Manager. Susan Bradbury was also in attendance. Staff members Kristen Kepnick and Glenda Fischer were also present.

The meeting was called to order by President Wiewel at 9:00 am. The day's consent agenda was adopted without change.

Approval of Minutes: The Minutes from the last ACSP Governing Board meeting that was held Saturday, March 29, 2003, Denver, Colorado Tom Clark, Secretary/Treasurer.

Motion: To accept the minutes, as amended, of the Governing Board Meeting of March 29, 2003 in Denver, Colorado (Motion, Becker; Second, Bright). Passed without dissent.

Treasurer's Report: Tom Clark/Donna Dodd

bullet Tom Clark, Secretary/Treasurer, reviewed our continuing progress in implementing ACSP's new financial system. He also provided a summary of our financial position as of June 30, 2003, the end of FY03. At year end total assets amounted to \$292,563.18. The bulk of these are retained in our AmSouth Money Market Account, \$163,425.11, with an additional sum of \$90,351.76 held in a CD

with Cambridge Bank. We intend to consolidate our holdings as our various instruments reach maturity. He noted as well the pre-payment in FY03 of conference expenses totaling \$24,260.72. Accounts receivable, anticipated income, totaled \$2,765, and delinquent accounts are being pursued in several ways. Current liabilities at year end totaled \$32,600 in deferred revenues, offsetting pre-paid expenses. Total liabilities and assets amounted to \$292,340.13.

bullet Tom observed that our carry-forward is substantial—well in excess of the amount our By-laws require to be maintained as a reserve--, and that the Board might at some point wish to consider its options in managing the account. Among these would be to expand the scope of our activities, and in so doing to spend down some portion of the aggregate. Another would be to maintain the account in its current posture, anticipating a time when, for one reason or another, our main revenue generator—the Annual Conference—might fail to cover its fixed front-end expenses. He argued against any reduction in dues and capitation fees, but could see reasons for retaining current rates even as expenses mount. The result would, of course, be to draw down our carry-forward from one year to the next. He also noted that FY04 is not going to achieve the level of increase in our base as was realized during FY03 since we will not be sponsoring a domestic conference, and instead opted to co-sponsor the ACSP/AESOP Joint Congress in Leuven (July 2003) and the Administrator’s Conference on Amelia Island, Florida in October 2003. Each had been anticipated to have negligible effect on our FY04 revenue stream. It now appears that the former may yield a modest shortfall in net revenue if certain donations anticipated by AESOP from other European organizations are not forthcoming.

Vice President’s Report: Chris Silver

bullet Chris reported that ACSP had indeed applied for incorporation this past year and did in fact secure this legal status. It then was required to reapply for the same tax exempt status it had enjoyed in past years, as a 501 (c)(3). It was successful in this regard as well. On the way to achieving this first result we had to revise our By-laws, and these revisions, he noted, had previously been approved by the organization and are now available on the ACSP web site. We are now, “ACSP, Inc.” he observed, though “ACSP” alone should suffice in most instances. Incorporation, he reminded the Board, has the effect of reducing the legal exposure of Officers and Board Members.

President’s Report: Wim Wiewel

bullet Wim noted this meeting would be his last as President, and Chris would assume the Presidency at the upcoming Business Meeting, also on Amelia Island. He then offered a brief summary of progress realized during his term of office in attaining each of the four major objectives that he had placed before us at the start of his term: (1) promote global awareness, (2) increase planning’s visibility, (3) promote diversity, and (4) strengthen ties to the profession. A synopsis of the progress appears in his written report “ACSP Presidency, 2001-2003”. Global awareness has indeed been heightened as a result of the important work of the President’s special Planning Globally Task Force. Thirty-three people volunteered to serve on this Task Force, and it has sought to continue as a standing committee of

the organization in future years. This body, he noted, was never intended to eclipse the Association's Global Planning Educators' Interest Group (GPEIG), but rather to aid in fashioning policy and implementing suggestions of the GPEIG. His original charge to the Task Force, he noted, was to help planners to broaden the arsenal of tools available for domestic planning, to sensitize planning students to planning matters outside the United States, to expand the horizons of the professoriate, to attune domestic planning and planners to the broad array of global concerns having domestic impacts, and finally help to foster within the discipline theories and methods that are more conversant with global realities and global diversity

bullet Regarding the second item on his Presidential agenda, he noted the important work of the Strategic Communications Committee and the Committee on the Academy and the Profession, accomplishments of individual faculty members in winning public recognition of their work (e.g. Gary Hack's work with Daniel Liebeskind on the World Trade Tower project in New York), and the four topics he will feature in his ten-minute address to the APA in Denver (March, 2003). These four included: planning curricula, joint (ACSP/APA) public relations, fund-raising for applied research, and collaborations in continuing education. Regarding the third, he noted the report of the Diversity Committee. The Committee also has commenced discussions with APA regarding the creation of internships for minority students within larger planning agencies. Still, progress has been limited and considerably more must be done in the years ahead.

bullet And regarding the fourth, he noted his role as co-editor (with Garrit Knaap) of the EPA-sponsored book on university-community collaborations. Seventy chapters have been proposed of which just 12-15 will be selected. Ten-thousand dollars received for this work flowed as general overhead into ACSP coffers. At the same time he observed the persistence of the challenges we must face head-on in crafting a workable and positive relation with the APA. These past two years, he noted, found us at loggerheads with both APA and AICP leaders over the operation and direction of the PAB. But now these issues seem to have been resolved in a manner that will allow us to enter into fruitful collaborations with APA, while maintaining the integrity of our own organization, the ACSP. One recent event, the APA's Education Summit, offered to all an opportunity to recraft our relationship. Today, new joint committees are being formed to move forward initiatives related to curriculum, education, and public relations.

bullet And looking to the future, Wim observed that we are but a volunteer organization, and that we will be well-advised in the future to do those things very well that are at the core of our work—our conference, JPER, and oversight of the education of planners. We must choose our targets with great care, achieve focus, and mete our scarce collective energies while in no way jeopardizing our core responsibilities.

Conference Reports

bullet Robin Boyle next reported on the next AESOP/ACSP Joint Congress held in Leuven, Belgium in July 8-12, 2003. This is the third such event, the first having

been in Oxford and the second, Toronto. Attendance at the Leuven event was favorable if not exceptional: ACSP and AESOP members (312), Non-members (143), Students (126), and one-day attendees and guests (15). Louis Albrecht and Seymour Mandelbaum are assembling an edited volume based on selected conference presentations, featuring the “network society” and its implications for planning. The next such joint meeting will be held in North America in 2009.

bullet Bruce Stiftel next provided an overview of the Administrators’ Conference held concurrently on Amelia Island, Florida. Gary Hack had overseen the last, two years ago. This is the fourth such event, generally a biannual occurrence. New this year is the “New Chairs School”. Overall the current event hosts four keynote speakers, 45 presenters, and 110 registrants. Total participation approached 130 attendees. He noted also that 47 spouses and children accompanied these attendees. Dowell Meyers expressed his general support for a fall date for the next such conference. But most eventually agreed that the next should occur in the spring of 2005, concurrent with the national APA Conference.

bullet Johanna Looye turned our attention to the next World Planning Schools Congress to be held in 2006, the subject of her memo dated October 19, 2003. The first such conference was held in Shanghai in 2001. Four schools bid for rights to the next, but Mexico City’s UNAM (Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico) may emerge as the final choice in deference to the LDC’s. UNAM, in turn, estimates it will require \$325,000 (US) to host the event. UNAM itself would apparently provide some seed money and seek to raise more contributions from other sources. But if UNAM’s latest proposal is found lacking any of the other contestants might win out in the end. Both Louis Albrecht and Johanna Looye did indeed visit UNAM recently to assess its capacities. We were reminded that ACSP’s own annual conference will proceed as usual in the fall following this July 10-16, 2006 event. Johanna, seeking the sense of ACSP’s Governing Board, then proposed that we endorse the UNAM host proposal, and that we cover the expense of the registration fees for between two and five members of the WPSC steering committee in order for them to attend our own annual ACSP Conference.

DECISION: Wim then called for a show of hands indicating our position on the choice of UNAM (All voting, but one, expressed support). Mickey Lauria (Becker seconding) then moved that we refer the matter of free registration to our own conference committee, urging only that it be judicious in meting out our largess. No limits on the number of free registrations were specified. Approval was unanimous.

bullet Chris Silver then turned to a brief overview of upcoming conferences. Portland is set to serve as the October 21-24, 2004 host. A hotel contract is now in place at the Marriott. This city was last a host to ACSP in 1989. Cheryl Contant, successor to Seymour Mandelbaum as Conference Chair then reported that we have now reached agreement (an MOU) with Portland State, regarding its specific responsibilities. Fannie Mae hopes also to support the Portland Conference, having pledged \$7000 toward the Joint Congress in Leuven. Portland State has committed \$5000 in support of the Conference. It has further been determined that our event

will “co-locate” with APA’s Leadership Conference. Co-location, Cheryl noted, is concurrency not co-habitation in a singular joint event. This, of course, is not the APA’s major annual conference, but rather a secondary event. Mobile workshops will be scheduled throughout the conference. Finally, organizers hope to have as many as five data projectors on hand for presentation support. Cheryl also noted that the Call for Papers would be issued for the October Portland event in December, 2003. Abstracts will be due February 16, 2003. Also planned is a new paper track called the “Emerging Topics Track”, devoted in the first instance to the subject of “Planning and Human Health and Safety”. Ethan Stetzer then brought greetings from Portland State and expressed its strong support for this upcoming conference.

bullet Cheryl Contant next turned to the subject of post-Portland events. Parenthetically, during our last Board Meeting we tentatively determined to convene in Charlestown, S.C. in 2005. Clemson would serve as the local host, it had been expected. Fort Worth or Dallas was earmarked as the 2006 venue, and Milwaukee, as host in the 2007. But at our last Board meeting it was reported that the NAACP “flag” boycott was still in effect in South Carolina. As a result some Board members were concerned, at our last meeting, that we might later be forced to revisit this site choice. The current plan, at the time of that last meeting, had been to use the Charleston Convention Center for meetings, and rely on area hotels for lodging. But it was noted at our last meeting that it might still be necessary for us to juggle the sequence of conference cities, finding a substitute for Charleston if the boycott were to persist.

bullet Chris Silver then sought further input regarding the current state of affairs in South Carolina, citing first a memo of March 10, 2003 from James Baker, Clemson University President, and then calling on Barry Nock, Associate Dean at Clemson (author of a second memo regarding the “flag” issue, dated March 17, 2003), to provide an update. Barry reported that the flag had been removed from the capitol dome, and that it had been relocated in a confederate memorial. The South Carolina chapter of the NAACP had accepted this, he said, but the national NAACP had not. The relocation of the flag was, he said, a compromise developed within South Carolina and it was acceptable to the local NAACP Chapter. Joyce Levine of Jackson State University then spoke, indicating she was not sure how her own colleagues would respond to the prospect of attending a conference in South Carolina, even under the auspices of the compromise Barry had just reported.

bullet Cheryl Contant then foresaw our need to be able to explain our decision to the ACSP membership at large in a way that would win its support and attendance. Mulatu Wubneh of East Carolina University expressed his concern that the national NAACP did not accept the compromise. Mickey Lauria framed the issue as state versus national NAACP. Pat Pollack said the issue “could go either way”, and suggested we might wish to consider a conference theme or track on the subject of diversity in order to demonstrate our willingness to enter the fray and to entertain multiple viewpoints. Rolf Pendall indicated he might feel “uncomfortable” were we to go to Charleston since board attendance is “mandatory”. Fritz Steiner noted he

had attended another conference in South Carolina. “Can we be a ‘change agent’?” has asked.

bullet Elise Bright: Can we delay a decision or postpone to a later year while waiting resolution in South Carolina? Ken Reardon: NAACP has stood alone on various issues, we need to support them. Pat Pollack: I was not aware of the boycott. Would we be setting a precedent in scrutinizing local political conflicts as we try to site later conferences? Mulatu Wubneh: We shouldn’t go to South Carolina. Dowell Meyers: We’re confusing past and present. The flag issue is a battle over the past, i.e. the Confederacy. But blacks are making significant strides in the new South.

MOVED: Barbara Becker moved (Chris Silver seconding) that we locate the 2005 ACSP Annual Conference in Charleston, South Carolina.

YES (5), No (4), Abstain (2).

Mickey Lauria then suggested we might wish to reconsider given the closeness of the outcome. Wim indicated he’d raise the issue once again as “New Business” later in the day.

bullet We next considered the site of the 2006 Conference.

MOVED: That the 2006 ACSP Conference be held in the Dallas-Ft. Worth region. This passed without dissent or abstention.

#### Publications

bullet JPER: Mike Hibbard, outgoing JPER Editor, announced the appointment of Karen Christensen and Karen Chapple as the new JPER Co-Editors. Karen Christensen expressed her gratitude and commitment, and noted that the new editors will continue the JPER-sponsored writing workshop. Mike said ACSP should provide a special subsidy for this purpose.

bullet Mike then introduced Alison Labbate, of SAGE, who in turn presented hardcopy of the publisher’s overview on the status of current efforts. Submissions are up as are abstracting and indexing of the journal’s articles. Sage has gone to an electronic system to facilitate interaction with authors. Mike noted a recent survey of journals found that the JPER had recorded the most rapid increase in citations of all reviewed. Alison made brief mention of the bankruptcy of one contract marketing firm and that this would in turn provoke a \$500 charge against royalties in calendar year 2004. Overall SAGE’s projected return to ACSP may be \$16,370 in CY03 and \$18,260 in CY04.

bullet Chris Silver argued we will need to do more to promote institutional subscriptions, especially in member units’ campus libraries.

Planning Accreditation Board:

bullet Fritz Steiner reported good progress in resolving some vexing issues regarding the management and direction of the PAB. At their root has been a seeming divergence between academicians at large, and some portion of the APA and the AICP membership and leadership. But these differences may be more apparent than real, and as we provide more information regarding the education of planners these may narrow further.

bullet Several topics have of late won the attention of the PAB. A first is a proposal to substitute AICP membership for the Ph.D. as the designated terminal accomplishment of the field. Fritz spoke of the advantages to all of gaining AICP status. A second concerns a broader and more complex proposal for sweeping change in PAB criteria. This matter is being referred to a Joint Taskforce composed of six—two each from ACSP (Don Krueckeberg and Lew Hopkins), APA and AICP. It is to issue its report to the PAB in the spring of 2004. A third issue concerns the matter of a rotating chairpersonship for the PAB—a matter now apparently satisfactorily resolved. It was noted subsequently that the PAB has now resolved to require rotation but allow waiver of the provision upon the approval of at least six PAB members.

• And the fourth addresses the subject of international accreditation. Schools in both Turkey and Saudi Arabia, Fritz noted, have inquired about the possibility of securing accreditation under PAB. But PAB will not confer accreditation outside the United States he noted. NAFTA, he supposed, might later change this, but for now all PAB might consider doing would be to aid other nations or regions in setting up their own processes for accreditation.

bullet Parenthetically, Rolf Pendall suggested that ACSP might wish to consider forming affiliations with other professional entities as a complement to ours with APA—an acknowledgment of the growing breadth of our subject and of the spheres of knowledge and action we address.

bullet In the face of these various, potentially controversial proposals, Fritz was quick to observe that any revision to the official Accreditation Document must proceed through a well defined set of actions, commencing with an initial proposal to the PAB, and proceed to 30-day reviews by the presidents of both the ACSP and the AICP. The “planning community” thereafter must assess the proposal and the Presidents’ comments. The PAB then receives these appraisals and must decide whether to forward recommended amendments to the AICP Commission and the ACSP Governing Board. If both entities are supportive, the PAB then would forward the proposal to the APA Board. Finally the PAB receives the APA Board’s recommendation and votes itself on whether or not to adopt the proposal and revise the Accreditation Document. Clearly, the path is arduous and radical departures will face tough scrutiny.

bullet Fritz next circulated the proposed PAB budget. He observed that PAB derives equal shares of its revenue base from member school payments to PAB and an annual APA grant. ACSP, however, does not approve the PAB budget, but it does monitor and approve the fee schedule for participating institutions. The PAB now

anticipates a deficit in FY04 of \$11,000, which would increase to \$20,000 in FY05. As a result it seeks an increase of the institutional fee of \$200 per annum—from \$1400 to \$1600—commencing in FY06. The APA, it was reported would consider elevating its own contribution to maintain parity in light of the 50/50 formula if ACSP agrees to the requested increase. But we do not have absolute assurances that it will in the end agree to do so.

bullet **MOVED:** Robyn Boyle moved, with Rolf Pendall seconding, that ACSP endorse an increase in the institutional PAB fee by \$200 per annum in FY06. The motion carried, receiving 9 supporting votes, with one abstention.

**UPDATE:**

bullet Nancy Frank reported briefly regarding the ACSP website. She said all was working smoothly. In a show of hands 6 were found to favor our no longer mailing out paper copy of UPDATE, but continuing to post it on our website. Two respondents favored our continuing to offer both hard and electronic copy.

**ACSP GUIDE/INSTITUTIONAL DATA PROJECT:**

bullet Plans to prepare a new Guide to Undergraduate and Graduate Education in Urban and Regional Planning, a 12th Edition, in 2003. This effort, which was delayed until the end of FY03, is a result of Governing Board decisions in Baltimore.

bullet It was again noted that the Guide and the Institutional Data Project operate in fiscal tandem. These two share information, and are financially interdependent. Revenues from the Guide support the IDP. Indeed, those schools willing to respond out the IDP survey will be entitled to a reduce rate for the Guide. These provisions are available in the FY04 Budget sub-account for the Guide and IDP. It was noted that APA sold around 400 copies of the Guide's 11th Edition (2000), and retained an unsold inventory of around 100 thereafter, having first secured 500 in all. But ACSP is no longer send out free copies of the Guide. When last done, 11,000 were mailed at some expense, and as the weight per volume increases so would future mailing costs. At the same time, in lieu of mailing the Guide, ACSP will send out around 22,000 Recruitment Brochures, two to each recipient. And this Brochure will tout the availability of the Guide, on-line.

· Sandi Rosenbloom is now undertaking to test the survey instrument in support of the Guide and the IDP, with a sample set of responding schools.

**Standing Committee Reports**

bullet **Membership:** Elise Bright (no report issued)

bullet **Nominating:** Sandi Rosenbloom, it was reported, would address this matter at the Business Meeting. As noted in previous minutes several positions were filled during the spring 2003 elections. These are indicated below.

o Sandi noted that during the spring of 2003, three officer positions were addressed in elections: Secretary, Treasurer (these two are separate under our newly adopted By-Laws), and Vice President. Sixty-six member schools voted, or

about 65% of all eligible. Tom Clark, running unopposed, will return as Treasurer for another term. Patty Pollack will serve as Secretary, and Mickey Lauria will serve as Vice President/President Elect. Board elections brought to the Board these new Regional Representatives: Sanda Kaufman (Cleveland State University, North Central), Ken Reardon (Cornell, Northeast), Joyce Levine (Iowa, South Central), Barry Nocks (Clemson University, South East), and Connie Ozawa, Portland State University, Western).

- PAB Site Visitor Pool: No Report.
- Review and Appraisal Committee:
  - o Chris Silver, incoming President, notes there will be considerable continuity following the course of action set during Wim Wiewal's Presidential term. He indicated he would address the work of this newly constituted committee in his Presidential Address to be given at the Business Meeting.

#### Special Committees

- Academy and the Profession
  - o Gary Hack was to report later.
- ACSP/AICP Joint Task Force on Planning Education and Practice
  - o Wim Wiewel addressed the work of this Committee which has not been active over the last 12 months. It was to have responded to various proposals from APA and the AICP regarding the establishment of an "Academic" Division in APA and to the establishment of a mentoring program. Recall that Floyd Lapp discussed a mentoring program overseen in part by the College of Fellows (FAICP). He has chaired its mentoring committee. He stressed collaboration amongst many different groups to insure the success of such efforts. Wim had asked Floyd at our last meeting to provide to ACSP a summary of these activities and said they would be shared with all chairs of member schools. Floyd was to link school locations with fellow locations. Chris Silver then observed that ACSP should establish its own committee to explore service-based learning in order to insure our views are fully developed and properly presented to APA.
  - o Wim noted the recent issuance of a new report entitled "Practitioners and Planning Education". Eugenie Birch et al. have collected data confirming the fact that ACSP schools do indeed engage in a lot of service work in their respective communities. But once that work was finished Eugenie and those with who she had worked on this project resigned as co-chairs.
- Diversity

- o This Committee once again tried to survey programs on the subject of diversity, but the response rate was quite low. John-Jairo Betancur, Chair, was not present.

- Doctoral Committee

- o Brief mention was made of the Committee's continuing to offer its doctoral workshop. Indeed the last was offered at UC Berkeley. Overseen by John Landis, this event occurred July 31-August 2, 2003. Instructors included Karen Chapple, John Landis, Rolf Pendall, and Sandi Rosenbloom. Mention was also made of the Joint ACSP/AESOP Doctoral Workshop held in Leuven, Belgium this past summer.

- Faculty Mentoring

- o Chuck Connerly, Chair, called on ACSP to be pro-active in facilitation the preparation of future planning educators, the prime subject of a major recent report assembled by this Committee. Numerous recommendations appear in this report "Preparing Planning Educators ....". Wim asked Chuck to present such suggestions to the ACSP Board as actionable items. Pat Pollack noted FWIG would like to put Barbara Becker, a FWIG representative, on this Committee.

- Institutional Governance

- o Pat Pollack indicated there was no activity to report.

- Planning Globally Taskforce

- o Bruce Stiftel, in the absence of Ruth Yabes, reported on the work of the Conference Committee of the Taskforce, one of President Wiewel's major initiatives these past two years. Bruce's comments addressed the work of the Taskforce's Curriculum and Study Abroad Sub-committees. He also covered issues addressed at the recent ANPUR meeting in Belo Horizonte, Brazil. Bruce also brought to our attention a proposed charter for a Global Planning Educator's Network.

- o Also underway is development of an "International Best Papers Series. Nineteen submissions have been received thus far. Rutledge will publish these in summer, 2004.

- o Bruce noted these several objectives of the organization: First, to transform the "Taskforce" into an ACSP Committee having a five-year term of existence. Second, to complete the Taskforce's study abroad report. Third, for ACSP to ratify the GPEAN Charter. Fourth, to assess and recommend new accreditation criteria to the PAB regarding global planning matters (See previous section of these Minutes addressing the procedure by which such changes become adopted as official accreditation criteria). And Fifth, for ACSP to develop a general stance regarding the waiver of ACSP fees for persons from the world of developing nations seeking to attend our conferences.

o ACTIONS:

- To transform the Planning Globally Taskforce into a “Special Committee” having a five-year term. Moved by Wim Wiewel. Passed without dissent or abstention
- To drop stipulation that this Committee would expire or face renewal in five years. Moved by Chris Silver. Passed without dissent or abstention.
- Reconsideration of the first in light of the second. Passed without dissent or abstention. Result: A new Special Committee on Planning Globally shall be created and it shall have an indefinite term.
- To fund a Research Assistant who would in turn complete the Taskforce (now Special Committee) report on study abroad. Moved by Mickey Lauria. Passed: four supporting, two opposed.
- To accept the draft Charter establishing a Global Planning Education Association Network formed of the ACSP and other like entities (copies circulated). Passed without dissent or abstention.
- Finally, it was resolved—as a general consensus—that the ACSP Conference Committee preparing for our Portland event will work with Bruce Stiftel and create a venue at that event for the representation of global concerns in contemporary planning curricula both in the United States and abroad.
- Reassessing Scholarship
- o Linda Dalton is the new Chair of this Committee. No report was received.
- Strategic Communications
- o No report.
- Technology
- o No report.

Interest Group Reports

bullet Faculty Women

bullet Barbara Becker briefly noted FWIG’s continuing efforts to make available resume books to be available on line and in hardcopy. FWIG will continue to explore new ways of communicating amongst its members and with the ACSP and profession. New officers are to be elected later this year.

## Liaison Reports

- o Canada: A written report was made available.

## Student Representatives

- Laura Lanza had noted previously the need for both student representatives to serve on ACSP's Doctoral Committee. She said recent doctoral workshops were very well received. More will be done to encourage doctoral students to participate in the doctoral students' "Bowling League".
- Raymond Massenberg then noted that "pre-sessions" will be organized at the Portland ACSP Conference to allow doctoral students to make "dry runs" of their paper presentations. The student web page is now operational and will contain student profiles for viewing by potential employers. He then discussed the Job Bank. Wim noted none would be held in Leuven, due to location and timing. But in the future the local host should help staff the Job Bank to allow students—who would otherwise have to serve as staff—to attend paper sessions.

## AICP/APA Issues

- o Wim Wiewel then addressed matters concerning our relations with our professional counterparts in the APA and with the AICP. An "Education Summit" was sponsored during the early fall of 2003 in Chicago to which were invited the ACSP Officers and others. Wim, Chris and Fritz attended. Wim found most of the APA members with whom he met were wholly supportive of our efforts. He also spoke at some length with Mark Kay Peck, APA President, regarding our relations. Chris Silver indicated he would, as President, name a new internal ACSP Committee to address these issues. Thereafter we may wish to participate in a Joint ACSP/APA Committee regarding matters of mutual concern such as APA's effort to establish a new Division of Planning Education. Ken Reardon urged that we not allow the APA Conference to be our sole link with the APA. Tom Clark expressed his concern that such a Division might eventually come to oversee APA Conference sessions that would draw only planning educators: better that planning educators be integrated in the mainstream conference panels and paper sessions.

### Unfinished Business:

- bullet Elise Bright provided a brief overview of the recent work of the Membership Committee. A newly revised form by which schools can seek ACSP membership will be posted on the Web.

- bullet Mickey Lauria as Mike Hibbard if JPER/SAGE planned to again do a fall mailing to promote subscriptions and memberships to students.

- bullet Tom Clark, circulated the FY04 budget sheets.

bullet Elise Bright put forward a novel approach to APA—namely that ACSP should ask APA to advocate that new agency hires should possess a formal degree in planning in exchange for ACSP’s faculty members reciprocating through involvement in the AICP.

bullet Chris Silver asked the Board officially to adopt the wording provided in acknowledgement of the achievements of Eric Freund. Approved without dissent.

Continuing Agenda: Further Discussion Regarding Charleston, South Carolina’s bid to host the annual ACSP meeting in 2005.

o Wim Wiewel had pledged to return to this issue—already discussed—once again at the end of the Governing Board Meeting. An informal poll was taken of incoming Board Members and Officers not yet formally eligible to vote: Pat Pollack, Ken Reardon, Joyce Levine, and Barry Nocks. Two supported Charleston’s bid and two did not.

o Thereafter a new vote was taken regarding the choice of Charleston for the 2005 Annual Conference. Eligible voters cast five votes in support. Four were opposed and two abstained.

ADJOURNMENT: 4:00 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by  
Thomas Clark  
Secretary/Treasurer, ACSP