



Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Agenda

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

April 14, 2012

9:00 AM to 4:30 PM

Gold Ballroom 3, JW Marriott Live, Los Angeles

- * Written report (if available) without presentation
- ** Written report with presentation

Present:

Governing Board Members: Casey Dawkins, Kazuya Kawamura, Nisha Botchwey, Karen Umemoto, John Landis, Subhrajit "Subhro" Guhathakurta, Marlon Boarnet, Anaid Yerana, Peter Mallow, Susan Roakes, Clint Andrews, Cheryl Contant, Teresa Córdova, June Manning Thomas, Nancy Green Leigh, Chris Silver, Charles Connerly Bruce Stiftel, Barry Nocks, Barbara Becker

PAB representatives: Betsy Altmaier, Shonagh Merits, Ike Heard

Guests: Present for PAB criteria discussion: representatives from AICP: Anna Breinich, Paul Farmer and Paul Ingraham

8:00 Breakfast was served and New Member Orientation was held.

9:00 I. CALL TO ORDER {ACTION} C. Connerly

Charles Connerly called the meeting to order at 9:05.

II. ACCEPT AGENDA {ACTION}

The agenda was accepted unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING BOARD MEETING OF OCTOBER 12, 2011 {ACTION}

The version of the minutes that was circulated was not the final version; the final version will be circulated and the minutes will be approved via email.

IV. UPDATE AND STATUS OF ACSP

President's Report

C. Connerly

An MOU with AESOP was approved for 2013 Congress in Dublin. The Europeans insisted this year on a limit on how much money we could make – 10% of revenues, however, the local hosts would incur all losses. Therefore, it will not be a huge money - maker for us as Chicago was in 2008.

At the October 2011 meeting, this body approved a Special Committee on Diversity. A few months ago, Chuck appointed the committee. Karen Umemoto has agreed to Chair. Also Alphonso Morales, Mariss Zapata (consultant), Cheryl Contant, Sid Sen, and Mulu Wubneh have agreed to serve on the committee.

Chuck agreed to the request of the University of Oregon, at no cost, to co-sponsor a April 18-20, 2012 conference in Eugene, Oregon on Oregon's Sustainable City Year initiative. The Oregon Sustainable City model will also be featured in a presidential panel at the ACSP conference in Cincinnati as will another panel on distance learning, which will include representatives from the first full distance learning degree offering in planning—at the University of Florida.

On the question of ACSP receiving AICP certification maintenance credits: we have changed the abstract admission process – e.g. to specify what the learning objectives are (thus we can send this information to AICP so that it can be listed in the final program).

Paul Ingraham and Anna Breinich of the AICP Commission presented information on the process regarding the AICP's suggestion for PAB accredited tenured faculty to be eligible for AICP membership without taking the AICP examination. They reported that through the public process, there was a great deal of opposition to this proposal. They are continuing to work on ways to better the relationship between professors and practitioners. What are the hurdles, for example, "that create artificial barriers?" What are those barriers? Can we address them? What will it take for ACSP professors to become AICP members? A task force appointed by AICP President Anna Breinich, which includes Chuck Connerly, June Thomas, and Genie Birch, will continue to work on how to maintain and build the strength of the connection between AICP practitioners and ACSP professors.

A member of the Governing Board made a comment regarding his surprise that some of the comments on the APA discussion group that formed around the issue of granting

faculty the right to join AICP without taking the examination reflected “a lack of respect” for planning educators. Other comments related to the level of interest that faculty might have in joining AICP. Unless the cost is subsidized by their departments they may feel the cost is prohibitive given that it is not clear to them what the benefits are of such membership. The question of who is eligible to sit for the exam – e.g. that those not educated in planning, e.g. architects can sit for the exam; was also discussed as well as implications for the labor force issues facing planners.

Publications and Conference Planning J. Thomas (Discussion after lunch)

Conference for 2014 – The Governing Board discussed proposals for Philadelphia and Albuquerque. The University of New Mexico came forward when it appeared that we might not have a proposal for 2014. The primary concern for the Philadelphia bid was the cost of hotels. It was also stated that it was important to vary our locations by region and that we had not been to the East Coast since 2009. Consensus was reached that the consortium of schools bringing forward the Philadelphia proposal should seek conference hotels with lower rates. John Landis also indicated that they would be attempting to raise money- possibly up to \$50,000. Governing Board members also expressed an interest in going to Albuquerque in the near future, possibly 2015.

V. CONNECTIONS TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

APA/AICP News	P. Farmer
Planning Accreditation Board	I. Heard/S. Merits
PAB Advisory	J. Mullin

Vote on recommended changes to PAB
Criteria and Guidelines and Articles of Incorporation {ACTION}

An April 13 version was available and presented to the Governing Board. Chuck explained the process by which the three presidents of AICP, ACSP, and APA met with the PAB Chair on the afternoon of April 13 and addressed each party’s respective concerns and came up with a compromise and a new document for consideration. AICP has voted in favor of the April 13 revision at its meeting that evening. ACSP will now vote and then APA will either vote to consent or not. Barbara Becker indicated that there could be a task force to consider any other possible needed changes to PAB’s criteria for accreditation, which would then be brought back to the organizations.

Cheryl suggested that we needed to vote in a way that rejects the March 7, 2012 version of the PAB’s proposed criteria for accreditation and accepts the April 13 version. This is also what AICP did folding both actions into one motion.

Ike Heard pointed out that areas of “stranglehold” have been loosened in the new set of criteria. He also reminded us that the PAB is under accreditation from CHEA.

Betsy Altmaier made a plea to clarify our defined procedure and follow it, thus raising the question of whether we can consider the compromise document. A discussion ensued on the interpretation of our process. In light of our procedural document, we asked, with the proposed changes, are we making “amendments” that are within the intent of the proposed changes?

Chuck went through the “changes” and indicated that for the presidents of the organizations, “this seemed to be a way within the rules – to address concerns that had been raised through our ‘public process’.” It was also said, “We believe we were following the proper process last night.” While there was not full agreement on this, the governing board agreed to move forward, and consider the April 13th document.

The Board then considered the various changes between the April 13 and the March 7th document.

The question arose as to the method of amending this document. This led to a clarification of concerns expressed by CHEA to PAB.

CHEA provides recognition to PAB. This recognition is critical to PAB legitimacy. CHEA raised 1) the need to publish outcome measures and 2) that PAB may not be sufficiently independent from its chartering organization, e.g. the procedures that we used to adopt changes. Discussion ensued on the importance for ACSP to affirm changes that would clarify the independence of PAB as a body from its members.

Several spoke to reasons why they were enthusiastic about the new changes. Several also spoke to their acknowledgement and support for responding to CHEA concerns regarding establishing outcome measures and PAB independence.

A motion was made to have a separate motion to vote for the amendment process – the final page of the March 7 document. Cheryl made a motion and it was seconded by June, to accept the last page of March 7, i.e. Amendment and Revision Procedures. It passed unanimously 14-0.

Cheryl moved to approve the March 7 criteria. Nisha seconded the motion. This failed: 13 against, 1 abstention.

There was a move to approve the April 13 version of the PAB criteria that was approved by the AICP Commission. This was seconded by John Landis.

Discussion ensued on the issue of the minimum size of the student body as well as other issues raised by various interests groups and regions. It was agreed that a task force

would consider possible amendments, would review these concerns and that the concerns would be reflected in documents routed for further consideration through the appropriate process. Folders with comments from member schools and faculty that were submitted to ACSP Governing Board members were handed to Barbara Becker.

A vote was taken and was passed unanimously - 14-0.

Next item: Articles of Incorporation

Cheryl made a motion to approve all changes to the PAB Articles of Incorporation except the changes to Article 10. June seconded the motion and it passed 14-0.

International Programs Liaisons
Canada/GPEAN*

T. Harper/ C. Silver

Chris Silver gave a report.

VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Finances and Investments

C. Andrews

Clint provided a report on various activities including costs/revenues. He also provided a list of issues that the Board needed to consider in relation to its budget. First are the standard decisions on discretionary expenditures: funding requests for interest groups and strategic initiatives. Second are broader strategic considerations, specifically reviewing contract terms associated with JPER, conference, guide, and dues. Finally, a Finance and Investment oversight committee needs to be appointed and it should articulate an asset allocation strategy considering liquidity needs, risk profile, and choice of investment vehicles.

Membership*

S. Bradbury

Nominating and Elections

C. Contant

Conference

S. White

2011 Salt Lake City-review

2012 Cincinnati

J. Chatterjee

2013 Dublin

J. Thomas

Other Conference Issues

Institutional Governance*

R. Margerum

VII. SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE REPORTS

Each of the committees below provided reports written and/or oral:

Special Committee

Committee on the Academy*

M. Howland – Not Present

Doctoral Committee*

J. Landis

Faculty Mentoring*

V. Basolo

Diversity**

K. Umemoto - Present

Task Forces and Working Groups

Planetizen Work Group*

M. Lauria – Not Present

Undergraduate Education Task Force

D. Sloane

VIII. JOURNAL OF PLANNING EDUCATION AND RESEARCH**

S. Guhathakurta/N.G. Leigh - Present

There was a report provided.

December 31, 2012 - \$32,859 royalties from Sage – In 2012 increased by December 31, 2011 to \$51,000.

We will be re-negotiating contract with Sage – they are proposing an increase to 40% of royalties.

IX. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

P. Mallow/A. Yerena

X. INTEREST GROUP REPORTS

Faculty Women’s Interest Group*

L. Schweitzer

Global Planning Educators Interest Group*

G. Shatkin

Planners of Color Interest Groups*

J. Lowe/C. Irazabal

Senior Faculty Interest Group*

M. Feld

XI. BUDGET DISCUSSION

C. Andrews

Approval of FY 13 Budget {ACTION}

Clint presented, in detail, the proposed budget.

Cheryl made a motion for approval of the budget, as proposed. Nisha seconded it. There was a motion for an amendment made by John Landis and seconded by Karen to grant the additional

\$2,000 request by JPER editors. The issue was raised that a contract has not yet been completed with JPER. The amendment carried with 10 yes and 4 abstentions. The amended motion carried 14-0.

XII. NEW BUSINESS

No new business.

XIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND GENERAL ORDERS

Move to adjourn: 4:38 p.m. PST.

C. Connerly