



# Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

## Minutes

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning  
Semi-Annual Governing Board Meeting  
April 13, 2013  
9:00 AM to 5:00 PM  
Hyatt Regency Hotel, Acapulco Room  
151 East Wacker Drive, Chicago 60601

\* Written report (if available) without presentation

\*\* Written report with presentation

### Present:

GOBO Members: Charles Connerly, June Manning Thomas, Clint Andrews, Teresa Córdova, Kazuya Kawamura, Michael Frisch, Carissa-Schively-Slotterback, Nisha Botchway, Susan Roakes, Casey Dawkins, Karen Umemoto (via Skype)

Student Rep: Sophonie Joseph, Anaid Yerena

Ex Officio Members: JPER editors, Subhrajit "Subhro" Guhathakurta

PAB Representatives Barbara Becker, Bruce Stiftel, Barry Nocks, Shonagh Merits, Jesmarie Johnson, Marty Sharpe, Jessie Taliaferro

AICP representative: not present for morning session, Anna Breinich arrived at approximately 11:00 a.m. to provide report.

APA representative: not present for morning session

GPEAN Representative: Chris Silver

Staff: Donna Dodd, Pam Butler

8:00 Breakfast Served

9:00 **I. CALL TO ORDER** {ACTION}

C. Connerly

Meeting called to order 9:07 a.m.

**II. ACCEPT AGENDA** {ACTION}

Agenda accepted unanimously.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING BOARD MEETING OF October 31, 2012** {ACTION}

Minutes were accepted unanimously.

**IV. UPDATE AND STATUS OF ACSP**

**President's Report**

C. Connerly

At this point the Dublin conference will not be used for any official ACSP business.

Planetizen contacted Chuck as they are planning a 4<sup>th</sup> edition of a Guide to Planning Schools. They have asked him to appoint a committee that will advise Planetizen on their methodology.

**Award Schedule**—for 2013 and during annual conference

The awards committees did not like the idea of presenting student awards in Dublin and faculty awards in Columbus. So all awards for 2013 will be announced at the Administrator's Conference in November 2013. Both the 2013 and 2014 awards will be presented in 2014 at ACSP conference, though publicity for 2013 will come sooner. Adjustments are being made for rotating the awards in any given year so as not to overwhelm awards luncheon and plenaries. At the Saturday luncheon, Friedmann Award (see below) and Chatterjee Award will be presented in even-numbered years and Davidoff and Distinguished Educator awards will be presented in odd years. Other faculty awards will be presented at plenary session. Executive committee is recommending that student awards not be presented at plenary session. No disapproval was expressed.

**Web Enhancement Task Force**

The website has been enhanced so there is no need for the Web Enhancement Task Force to continue. Thus the Executive Committee recommended eliminating the Task Force. The motion was moved and seconded and adopted unanimously.

## **ACSP-AESOP and WPSC**

The topic of whether ACSP should join forces with WPSC in 2016 was discussed. Thoughts included in the discussion:

- Does it/should it make a difference in ACSP's involvement if it's not in North America?
- Chris Silver (GPEAN) said a decision on the location of the 2016 WPSC should be known in June.
- If it is in North America, what model would be used – theirs or ACSP's? If theirs is used some of the functions of ACSP would not likely be met. Even so, it doesn't mean that ACSP can't have some type of conference to fill in those gaps.
- Financial consequences of not having a separate conference. If conference is not planned by Donna, she and her staff have no income from the conference.
- The importance of connecting to the scholarly community on an international level.

Chuck asked that everyone be thinking about these issues and to expect to vote on it in November at the Administrator's Conference.

## **PAB Minimum Size Rule Petition**

The Petition letters are asking PAB to reconsider their criterion 2.C - size of student body where it states that Graduate Programs should have a student body of 20 or more FTE in order to have a sufficient number to constitute a community of inquiry. Discussion ensued and included the following:

- PAB questioned whether it was appropriate for these petitions to come to ACSP rather than directly to PAB.
- It was expressed that it shouldn't be a problem if ACSP has a member that comes to ACSP with a concern. This concern could then be forwarded to PAB along with any weigh-ins/comments that ACSP has about the concern.
- PAB's Marty Sharpe said that although it is fine if an individual's program message to PAB is sent by ACSP rather than the Program, they want ACSP members to be aware that they can contact PAB anytime. They want to hear from everybody!
- PAB indicated that the number 20 is not an arbitrary number and that an extensive process led to this revision. While a program would not be denied the maximum extension of 7 years due to a lower than 20 class size alone, smaller FTE's do

sometimes point to why some of the other criteria have not been met.

- PAB's sense is that programs with fewer than 20 students would likely be closed down by their Universities anyway.
- Concerns that if PAB pointed out concerns about a smaller class size in their reports, Universities **would** be more apt to consider shutting down the program.
- Departments should be able to (or given the opportunity to) avoid these problems regardless of the size of the student body.
- The petitioners would like to go back to the previous language.
- A request was made that PAB put something in writing about the weight that this 20 minimum rule would carry.

A motion was made and seconded but subsequently withdrawn that ACSP endorse this petition.

Another motion was made and seconded that ACSP forward the petition to PAB encouraging PAB to have more communication with ACSP between the petitioners and PAB. The motion passed – 12 in favor 0 opposed and 2 abstentions.

### **Publications**

June finally received a new version of the Sage contract and as reported at the last GoBo meeting, ACSP's royalty fee is going up from 30% to 50%. Some requests for changes made, such as ACSP address and money for reviewer awards; still no final version sent but this is expected soon.

### **Conference Planning**

More on conference planning will be addressed later but June encouraged everyone that if you are contacted about hosting an ACSP conference – please say “yes!”

June spoke briefly about her upcoming transition to ACSP President. She said she has been working closely with Chuck so the transition to her Presidency should be relatively smooth. The transfer will happen at the Administrator's conference in November.

She and Chuck have identified some good candidates for Vice President/President Elect. The VP appoints the review and appraisal committee and the new members have been appointed and are listed on the web page. This committee will meet with June either in Dublin,

or the Administrator's meeting and/or via e-mail to discuss the goals of the presidency as it moves forward.

**Proposal for New Book Award {ACTION}**

June proposed, on behalf of the executive committee, a new book award named for John Friedman. This award would be presented to a book or comparable work that best exemplifies scholarship in the area of *planning sustainability*.

A motion was moved and seconded to adopt this new book award. 11 in favor, 0 no's and 3 abstentions.

**V. CONNECTIONS TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

**APA**

P. Farmer

Paul Farmer was not present for report.

Discussion ensued regarding a financial issue with APA (\$3,000) that has not yet been paid/resolved. Barbara Becker said that half PAB's budget comes from ACSP and the other half from AICP and APA and if APA continues to not pay their share, ACSP would have to cover their portion. This led to a discussion on whether PAB should only be an academic operation, but this notion was dismissed as it was felt that it was preferable to improve the relationship by building trust.

**Planning Accreditation Board**

B. Becker/S. Merits

Barbara Becker reported that she will be visiting CHEA in June and that they should be in good standing with them now.

PAB report in drop box was reviewed. It was moved and seconded to accept the report. The vote was unanimous.

It was also reported that the new standards will be on the website.

Also they are still ironing out issues related to the articles of incorporation with APA and AICP.

Visits under the new PAB criteria will begin in the Fall 2013 semester. The beta period is over after the spring 2013 visits.

Barbara suggested that PAB Board Members should receive free registration at the ACSP conferences if they are not presenting papers.

Discussion ensued. After some discussion a motion was made to have a special registration fee that covers PAB Board members to attend sessions. They would still need to pay for anything requiring a ticket such as the awards luncheon and reception. The motion was seconded and the vote passed with 11 in favor, 1 no and 2 abstentions.

### **AICP**

A. Breinich

Anna Breinich expressed pleasure in working with Chuck and June and presented some of their various initiatives:

- Working with Chuck and June on the Faculty Engagement Task Force.
- Controversy over recognizing the tenure process as a substitute for taking the AICP exam.
- Pilot program which is an ambassador program that encourages faculty to reach out the APA if you have a certain specialty, for example.
- The Early Career Program has been expanded. They are proposing that practitioners be allowed to take the AICP exam before the two year apprenticeship has been completed. Those doing that would not be able to use the credential, however, until the two years are up.

A motion was made that the ACSP Governing Board asks APA state chapters' leadership to appoint faculty liaisons to their boards. It was moved and seconded and approved unanimously.

Chuck asked Anna if there is a venue through APA that could help support those trying to do more continuing education. Anna suggested he contact Utah. They are part of a consortium that deals with this issue. She believes everyone chips in and pays part of the registrations.

**International Programs Liaisons**  
**Canada/GPEAN\*\***

C. Silver

GPEAN ratified a charter change creating a single Governing Council; and implementation of the new organizational structure will be a key issue at the upcoming Governing Council meeting in Recife, Brazil.

Chris indicated that Turkey and Indonesia are interested in joining GPEAN and he was unsure of what the process it for joining.

Chris feels that GPEAN is a good forum for international scholars to come together. They are currently discussing an on-line open access journal. Chris reports that GPEAN is thriving despite no budget and no staff.

**Public Health & Community Design**  
**Workforce Development**

N. Botchwey

Nisha provided information from the draft of their report (which can be found on Drop Box.) In compiling this report the panel's charge was "recommending ways to ensure that current and future professionals in the public health, planning and community design sectors are able to identify and respond to new and emerging opportunities and threats in the built environment that impact population health."

**VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Finances and Investments\*\*

C. Andrews

Clint gave a report on fiscal status. He said that fiscal year 2012 had total revenues of \$569,483, total expenditures of \$511,452, a net surplus of \$58,031, and ending total assets of \$418,644. Fiscal Year 2013 is still in progress but our position looks to improve upon FY2012. These assets are adequate for reserves as required by the bylaws, JPER editorial transitions, and some strategic initiatives.

Our asset allocation is extremely conservative, with \$42,494.73 in a Merrill Lynch money market account, \$198,067.09 in CDs, and the remainder in a checking account. Interest earned thus far this calendar year is \$515.09. The goal is to investigate investment options that offer higher potential returns but Clint said not to expect a major change in the current conservative asset allocation strategy.

Membership\* S. Bradbury

Nominating and Elections\* C. Contant

Cheryl assured Chuck that there will be an election coming soon and that schools need to vote!

Conference\*\* S. White

2013 Dublin Z. Nedovic-Budic/C.Connerly

2013 Columbus Admin. Conf. S. Cowley,

2014 Philadelphia J. Landis

2015 Houston J. Thomas

2016 WPSC? C. Connerly

PAB Advisory\* J. Mullin

Barbara encouraged everyone to be in the site visit pool. Besides providing a valuable service to the program having the site visit, it is a very good learning experience to take back to your program.

## **VII. SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE REPORTS**

### *Special Committee*

Committee on the Academy\* M. Howland

Since this committee is responsible for finding the location for the next Administrator's Conference, and the next one will be in the Spring of 2015, a committee is needed soon.

June moved that this task be taken up by the Executive Committee for further consideration. It was seconded and approved unanimously.

Doctoral Committee\* J. Landis

Faculty Mentoring\* V. Basolo

Diversity\*\* K. Umemoto

Karen and June are advisory to USC and Marlon. They noted and have passed on to Marlon POCIG leadership's concerns. Marlon's report articulates the efforts to reach out to possible participants and to address issues raised by POCIG. Raised was the issue of POCIG's concerns such as lack of prior consultation with POCIG leadership and the larger issues of tenure cases and Ph.Ds. not finding tenure track positions. June noted that Jeffrey Lowe from POCIG would be attending the meeting later in the afternoon and that her sense was that the tone had shifted to one of an olive branch. Karen agreed

that there were larger issues to address and that there was also the issue, given ACSP's financial contribution, whether other universities should have had the opportunity to be funded to do such a program. Discussion also led to agreement that there should be communication in the future of the diversity committee with the Governing Board and POCIG. Other discussion points included:

- Main initiative for next year is to make sure the workshop process is known to all groups to avoid repeating past conflicts.
- Make sure funding for workshop is in this year's budget cycle.
- The Diversity Committee submitted money for the retreat and also wanted \$10,000 set aside for those that want to enhance their diversity.
- Karen seeks to streamline the process of applying for the funds and would hope that the funds would be matched by the Universities.
- Karen will write up details for the Executive Committee so they can act on this issue before having to wait for a whole other year.

#### Report on PhD Workshop

John's report included the following:

- It's very worthwhile for PhD candidates to have as many "eyes" on their dissertation as possible.
- After the \$200 financial aid, the workshop usually costs each student around \$200.
- They try to move the workshop around the country. In August it is at MIT.
- The theme for the 2014 Annual Conference is Planning 3.0 and they are trying to raise \$30,000.
- John asked for help identifying 8 topics of interest for the 2014 conference..

Undergraduate Education Task Force\*

D. Sloane

David did a survey and will be presenting the results at the Administrator's Conference in November.

#### **VIII. JOURNAL OF PLANNING EDUCATION AND RESEARCH\*\***

S. Guhathakurta/N.G. Leigh

Subro said that the state of JPER is strong - thanks to June for getting a great new contract. Submissions are up and the Editorial Board is also excellent. Because submissions are up they can be more selective.

New scholars' applications for workshops have been up as well. They have to be submitted and reviewed before they are accepted.

Finally Subhro said that there is increasing movement to go to open source venues. Sage has started a "Sage Open" which is also a peer review process. How JPER could handle a request for Open Source was discussed. One suggestion would be that once the article has been peer reviewed it could go to "SAGE Open". The fee would have to be paid by the author @\$1500 each. This has been pushed by Leah at Sage on several occasions. She suspects there wouldn't be much interest by planning academics.

Or it could be kept at JPER for a year for example, then moved to SAGE. Some grants however, do require things to be published on Open Source.

12:30 LUNCH

## **IX. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

S. Joseph/A. Yerena

Restoration of Ph.D. Jamboree

Developing a replacement program for the Pre-Candidate Doctoral Workshop (previously the PhD Jamboree) was discussed. Thoughts included:

- Having 2 tracks for the workshop – one track for those close to completing their PhD and the other for those earlier in the process.
- Identifying people who could take over for Leonna Sandercock and John Friedmann.
- The Jamboree had been an application process – how many were accepted and rejected?

Anaid will try to come up with three solid options and bring to the next governing board meeting.

Student Network

Anaid said that it is difficult to manage the list serve. It currently has some 1000 members but there is no effective way to make sure it stays current. There was also concern expressed that students from the Bowling League are not always moving from there to the PLANET list serve.

Anaid would like a cutoff date of say five years. Then the person would be contacted to see if they are still a student. If not, they would be directed to subscribe to Planet.

Link between AESOP YA and ACSP--

Anaid said that the PhD Bowling League and the AESOP Young Academics would like to meet as a group in Dublin. This would not be just be a social event, but would include a program as well. They have submitted a budget request of \$3000.

## **X. INTEREST GROUP REPORTS**

Faculty Women's Interest Group\*  
Global Planning Educators Interest  
Group\*

L. Schweitzer

J. Macedo

Planners of Color Interest Group\*\*

J. Lowe/C. Irazabal

Jeffrey handed out a hard copy of a document prepared for and approved by the POCIG Executive Board. He brought up the following main points:

- Make sure that POCIG is included in decisions affecting them.
- Recognize limitations in dealing with diversity issues. Members of POCIG should be brought in for their expertise.
- Allocate the appropriate resources in order to achieve maximum success. Give the balance in ACSP's budget; the \$5000 set aside for them was too little.

Comments included:

- POCIG needs to be represented at the meetings in order to be active and informed on POCIG issues.
- How can the Governing Board make decisions concerning POCIG when they are not represented at the meetings?
- It was proposed that ACSP allocate \$10,000 to the Diversity Committee.
- Given that the Diversity Committee and POCIG have five members that serve on both committees, why is this information not being shared?
- There was a motion made to create a liaison person of the Diversity Committee to make sure there is communication between that committee and POCIG leadership. The motion was seconded and approved with 11 yes, and 0 no's.

## **XI. BUDGET DISCUSSION**

C. Andrews

Clint discussed the budget and highlights included:

- He is in favor of raising ACSP dues- not this year, but possibly next year – as dues have not been raised in years. The next discussion of this will be at the Administrator's Conference in November.
- Even though ACSP is not having their separate national conference this year (due to AESOP/ ACSP Joint Congress) there are still expenses. Donna and her staff still need to be paid.
- JPER is now a net positive venture rather than having to be subsidized by ACSP. This is huge!
- The Guide needs to go online in an easy to use manner. Departments need to be able to update their tables online, and users will want to be able to sort it.

Therefore, ACSP needs to “up their game” as we’re in direct competition with Planetizen. The other option would be to simply abort the Guide but people are buying it and therefore still seem to want it. Clint proposed \$10000 as a starting point to begin working on an on-line guide. The guide data is the same data that PAB collects. ACSP does not want to get in to ranking.

June moved that the Board inform the Diversity Committee that we are proposing that \$7500 be allocated for the Pre-Doctoral Workshop and that they work with POCIG leadership on the details. This motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

There was a motion that the diversity committee be funded \$10000 for competitive seed money to develop diversity initiatives that are transferrable to other ACSP schools. This motion was seconded, however did not pass.

It was moved that the above motion be modified to \$7000. This motion was seconded and passed 11 yes, and the remainder no’s and/or abstentions.

Approval of FY 14 Budget {ACTION}

After some discussion of the proposed budget, there was a motion that the budget be accepted. It was moved and seconded and passed unanimously.

## **XII. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

## **XIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND GENERAL ORDERS**

C. Connerly

There was no unfinished business.

A motion was made and seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 4:39 pm.