Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Agenda

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning
Semi-Annual Governing Board Meeting
April 26, 2014
8:00 AM to 5:00 PM
Marriott Atlanta Marquis, Room M104 located on the Marquis Level, Atlanta, GA

* written report (if available) without presentation
** written report with presentation

Present:

8:00 Breakfast Served

9:00 I. CALL TO ORDER {ACTION} J. Thomas
The meeting was called to order at 9:05 AM

II. CONSENT AGENDA {ACTION}
Approval of minutes November 13, 2013
GPEAN report* – will be presented orally
Faculty Mentoring*
Doctoral Committee*

The agenda was accepted unanimously.

The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. REGULAR AGENDA APPROVED {ACTION}
The agenda was accepted unanimously.
IV. UPDATE AND STATUS OF ACSP

President’s Report**  J. Thomas
New Board members
Key agenda items

June established the 3 President’s initiatives: connections among planning schools and faculty, with diverse people, and with the public and the profession. ACSP is currently strongest in the first category, which is supported by the conference and sponsorship of the journal. Areas where the organization might be able to do more include enhancing the workshops offered, new activities with AESOP (discussed later as an agenda item), and taking over the management of PLANET (also a later agenda item). She asked the Board for any additional ideas on how to enhance connections among schools and faculty, and the Board discussed the possibility of jointly-sponsored activities among programs in each region, giving the regions more of an identity.

Connections with diverse people had a head start in the pre-doctoral workshops; the most recent one was excellent. ACSP continues to support POCIG. FWIG expressed concern about their role; June, Lois and Avis had a conversation with them to see what more might be done to support them, and Clarissa has agreed to serve as an informal advisor to them, as needed. More broadly, there is the question of how ACSP can support the interest groups to build positive agendas.

Connections between ACSP academics and professionals and the public are the weakest. Interaction is mainly through the presidents of ACSP, AICP, and APA. Some type of marketing to connect with the public is a possibility, but there are currently no specific proposals.

June welcomed new Board members Kurt Paulsen and Vincent Reina, who could not attend because he is at home with a new baby.

June indicated that she has found it a pleasure to serve as Vice-President, and that assuming the Presidency feels like a continuation of that work, in great part because of Chuck’s excellent mentoring and effort to involve her in key initiatives.

Vice-President’s Report*  L. Takahashi

Lois stated that she has been learning and will continue to learn.

Treasurer’s Report**  C. Andrews

Please see PowerPoint presentation called Treasurer’s Report in Dropbox. Clint gave an overview of the report. ACSP has been accumulating a surplus over time. Revenues have been trending upwards, although revenue from conferences bounces around, and overall revenues are down this year because the joint conference with AESOP generated much less income than
the regular fall conference. Revenue from the journal is on an upswing, largely thanks to June, who negotiated a new deal with the publisher under which ACSP will start receiving royalties. Expenditures have also generally trended upwards, but are down this year because conference expenditures disappeared. Other expenditures remain fairly stable.

Current assets are about $540. This includes reserves, required by the bylaws, of about $125K. Part of the money must be set aside as working capital for ongoing activities; funds are set aside annually to cover the lump sum costs associated with the editorial transition of the journal, and about $200K in working capital is need to run conferences.

There will be an action item later.

10:00  V. CONNECTIONS TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

GPEAN: Chris Silver: See report in Dropbox.
The World Planning Congress is in 2016. The Governing Board had a long discussion about this last year. The Steering Committee had positive comments on the arrangements in Rio. It is too early to contract with hotels because Brazilian hotels do not do advance contracts; this needs to be revisited in late 2014 or early 2015. The Committee is positive about conference organizing. ACSP’s delegate is pushing for the registration fees to be low because the cost of travel will be high. All is going well so far.

Dialogues: A whole new team needs to be established. One French speaking member and one Turkish speaking member have agreed to participate, and would like a third team member. Previous issues of Dialogues will be coming out in paperback. A cloth version will be released for Dialogues 5, and Dialogues 6 will be released in paperback.

UN Habitat: There has been a lot of activity. A global discussion is occurring right now, with the goals framed all over the world. GPEAN wants to make sure the goals include specific reference to cities and settlements. Habitat will hold a meeting in about 6 weeks to make preliminary decisions about narrowing the list of goals. This is a big discussion and ACSP should get involved. Genie distributed a brief document to Lois and June so the Governing Board could review it over lunch, and it was agreed that this would be discussed under New Business.

Bruce: UN Habitat
In the World Urban Campaign (Genie is Chair), North America has the lowest membership. The only obligation of membership is submitting a letter once a year on what you’ve done. The US has 8 research hubs. Bruce indicated that there is a good pay off to membership, and encouraged other ACSP schools to consider joining.

Urban Lecture Series: There are 25 video lectures that are available on this website. The Habitat 3 conference will convene in 2016. This will be the moment when the UN will present its plan for the next 20 years. Bruce and Genie requested that ACSP open a conversation with our government. June suggested appointing Bruce and Genie to represent ACSP on this matter,
but Bruce indicated that would not be appropriate because they were already engaged in other roles. GPEIG has no current active involvement.

Planning Accreditation Board **{ACTION}** B. Becker/S. Merits

There was a Motion to accept the report. The Motion carried. Please see report in Dropbox.

PAB is implementing new standards, and will be holding an open forum to get input on how they are working. The Board is anticipating that a few changes will need to be made. PAB has instituted some new fees and re-written some public forms. Barbara Becker had no specific requests of ACSP, but noted that she will be stepping off as Chair of the Board in November. There will be a new person appointed representing ACSP – Connie Ozawa. Connie has consented to serve.

PAB conducts about 15–20 accreditation reviews a year. The annual budget of about $300K covers staff, conferences, housing while visiting schools undergoing accreditation review, rent, and office supplies. The ACSP Governing Board receives a report on the budget, and PAB can provide another detailed report. June confirmed that she received and reviewed this year’s the budget. She explained that PAB’s money comes from the individual schools, not from ACSP. It is becoming increasingly independent because of requirements placed on them by the national organization that accredits accreditation organizations. June agreed to post the audited budget, but noted that the ACSP Governing Board does not have oversight of PAB’s budget.

Several Board members noted that the process that universities go through for PAB includes onerous reporting. Barbara responded that they have new streamlined processes.

Board members raised questions about whether there is a trend towards shorter windows of accreditation, and whether information is available about the reasons that schools that did not get accreditation were denied. Barbara stated that the accreditation periods have not been getting shorter, and that PAB takes care to be sure its standards and policies are consistent. The website lists the schools and their accreditation review results; lots of schools are getting 7 years. If accreditation is not awarded, information about why is not publically reported, and usually a combination of factors, rather than a single problem, leads to probation.

June will be writing a formal letter of appointment to Connie making specific requests. If there are any concerns or issues Board members would like her to include, please send them to June in the next 2 or 3 days; now is the only time to raise such matters, since once Connie is appointed, she is required to be independent.

AICP/APA Update L. Brown/W. Anderson/P. Farmer

AICP President Lee Brown reported on their committee’s meeting. AICP will enrich their blog which provides a year-round conversation. AICP adopted a change in their membership requirements yesterday. They now require 32 CM credits bi-annually for members. Feedback from members who are approaching retirement also led them to accommodate life members.
The requirement for life members is 16 CM credits, which must include 1.5 credits in law and ethics. To be eligible for life membership, members must be active and current for 25 years. Another class of Fellows will be inducted tomorrow afternoon. AICP is looking at posting a letter online for the candidates to be able to pull off instead of waiting for a hard copy letter in the mail.

Lee distributed a handout summarizing the AICP core competencies. The AICP exam covers skills professionals are using in practice. It took about 2 years to write and design the exam.

APA Executive Director Paul Farmer reported that APA surveyed its members about their preferences regarding the scheduling of the national conference -- 4 days vs 5 days. There are advantages and disadvantages to both, but APA will be moving to a 4-day model, which was the members’ preference. The Seattle conference will be held Saturday through Tuesday. Subsequent conferences will run Friday to Monday.

APA President Bill Anderson told the Board that Paul Farmer had announced his retirement, and observed that Paul has played a pivotal role in shaping APA during his years of service. APA is looking for input and ideas on how to strengthen the relationship between APA/AICP and ACSP, and would appreciate suggestions before its planned retreat in July with the new Executive Director, who will be selected and on board by then. June agreed to work with Bill to get more information on what APA is doing.

AESOP

J. Thomas

Please see the report in Dropbox under Connections with Other Organizations, and the memo from AESOP. Over the last couple of years, communication with AESOP has been by phone; the memo is the only written statement of AESOP’s proposals for continuing the ACSP/AESOP relationship now that joint congresses every 5 years have been discontinued. One possibility ACSP suggested was to have joint, cross-Atlantic webinars on special topics of mutual interest, such as shrinking cities or growth management, but AESOP’s governing board had concerns about the quality and stability of webinars. They have started a digital platform that they are working to expand, suggest that ACSP might participate in some of them. Two current ones are a recently approved open access journal, requested by their Young Academics, and MOOCS; they are thinking about some that might serve many schools, e.g. planning theory, and some to explore special topics, like complexity in planning and planning and the law. Whether ACSP academics and PhD students would be interested in an online journal, in which authors pay to have items uploaded, is an open question.

Board members generally felt that it was a good thing for ACSP to have an international presence, and to try to be supportive, but some concern about the open access journal, especially as a vehicle for PhD students, who might run into problems at their universities by publishing portions of their dissertations before their defense. The group felt that more information was needed about what PhD students and post docs want and need before the Board could do anything. June cautioned that because AESOP is active on so many fronts, ACSP
needs to be strategic about making choices, and asked for volunteers to brainstorm with her about the options on the table before she has another phone call with Gert at AESOP. Sophonie, Clint, and Carissa volunteered.

12:00 LUNCH

Introduction of ACSP staff member: Lauren Harris

10:45 VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS (Actually convened at 12:46)

Finances and Investments C. Andrews

The report is in the Standing Committee section of Dropbox. Last fiscal year ACSP had net surplus of about $125K and total assets of about $550K. This year at the end of February, assets were in the $639K range, but they have since then as expenses have been incurred. The Committee thinks the organization might want to treat the investments more seriously, and has 3 proposals.

- Revise our investment strategy: the current investment strategy is very conservative and earns only a few hundred dollars a year in interest. The Committee proposes shifting 30% of current assets, ~$130K, from working capital into mutual funds to take advantage of bigger returns. This carries some additional risk, but it is still modest and prudent. The shift would be made gradually, in equal installments over six months. ACSP’s investment broker recommended dividing the money between 2 actively managed funds that are well managed but have different investment philosophies: a Fidelity fund and First Eagle Global Fund.

- If the new strategy is adopted, the Committee would like to have professional expertise available at its meetings, and proposes that ACSP’s accountant and investment broker be added to the committee as non-voting, ex-officio members. Their participation would be pro bona. This would not require changing the bylaws.

- What should ACSP do with its resources? As a nonprofit, ACSP should not collect money for its own sake, but should be creating endowments or making investments to build its capacity to serve its members, and should do this systematically. The Committee proposes that the Board direct the Committee to propose a budget target for strategic investments for discussion at the next Board meeting.

The recommended target for this year of ~$130K is intended as an initial step; in the future the Committee will look into the possibility of establishing a percentage target. The current plan is to do an annual re-balancing that could be shifting back and forth between CDs and mutual funds if ACSP’s financial position changes. All decisions about such changes will be made by the Committee, with approval from the Board, as needed; the broker will not make any investment decisions.
The Committee did not discuss social investing, but several Board members felt this might be a good idea, and consistent with ACSP’s values, if the broker could identify an appropriate social fund. Board members were interested in the possibility of using ACSP’s assets to create endowments for established priorities, or to invest in strategic initiatives, but Clint noted that a broader conversation is needed about what should count as an investment as opposed to an expense.

Nominating and Elections          C. Connerly

ACSP is about ready to have an election. There are 5 regional openings, and at least 2 candidates are running in each region; the bylaws require a minimum of 2. The election will commence as soon the candidate statements are received (hopefully in 10 days).

Institutional Governance          C. Connerly

The last time the bylaws were updated was in 2004. A number of issues have been raised, including the possibility of adopting term limits, what should be done when a Regional Representative resigns or moves out of the region, whether we still need a membership committee, whether/how the duties of the Secretary should be changed to reflect our current staffing, and what kind of Governing Board representation, if any, should we have for people who are not faculty and not doctoral students (e.g., post-docs). The Committee will be meeting after the election and will recommend any proposed changes by fall. The goal is to have proposed changes ready far enough in advance of the Annual Business Meeting to give adequate notice to the membership, as required when we amend the bylaws, and to try voting by mail.

Conference

2014 Philadelphia                 R. Mohamed

The conference received 957 abstract submissions (counting individual submissions). In 2012 the conference received 927. The rejection rate is projected to be about 20% this year given the number of submissions and the number of available slots (estimating 4 papers per panel). There are 23 roundtable submissions. Poster submissions have set a record. The theme for the 2014 annual conference is “Big Ideas, Global impact,” and there are 27 “big idea” individual papers and 1 poster. Please see report in Dropbox. The quality of PhD submissions suggests that it would benefit students to communicate with their advisors more.

Rayman and Donna will work on selecting a vendor to provide an app that will allow conference participants to download the program, customize their schedule electronically, and contact other participants.

2015 Houston                      L. Takahashi
No update
2016 Portland {ACTION} L. Takahashi
Please see the Portland proposal in Dropbox. The proposed conference theme is “Planning, Pedagogy and Place.”

Motion presented to approve Portland as the conference site in 2016. They last hosted the conference in 2004. Motion approved.

2016 Rio J. Thomas
It will soon be time to begin the activities discussed at the last Governing Board meeting to elevate interest in Rio and encourage members to attend the conference. Work needs to start this summer, and June is asking Dave Amborski to work more with the local host committee to answer questions on costs and lodging; this information is needed well in advance because it will take time to make international travel arrangements, and especially to get visas. There is a lot of construction going on in Rio which makes it difficult to navigate. They will be using downtown facilities, not those at the university, and the downtown facilities are very nice. The best way to encourage attendance would be to nail down hotels. Chris will relay questions and concerns and information should be available by September 1.

2017 Denver {ACTION} L. Takahashi
The Denver proposal is in Dropbox, and looks good. The local hosts are very enthusiastic.

Motion: Approve Denver as the conference site for 2017. The Motion was approved.

Membership {discussion item} J. Thomas
The Executive Committee has not appointed a membership committee. Membership is an important issue, but it’s not clear whether the committee is it necessary, given the duties it has traditionally been assigned. We need to look at the benefits of membership, and what can we do to enhance the benefits of membership.

11:30 VII. SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE REPORTS

Committee on the Academy* M. Conroy
Spring 2015 Administrator’s conference {ACTION}

Please review the Committee report in Dropbox. The Governing Board needs to decide on the location. There are 2 proposals: University of Florida and Boise State. The Committee felt Boise had a slight edge, but there are pros and cons to both. Boise is slightly more expensive in terms of both travel time and cost, but various locations are in walking distance of the conference venue. Boise State is very interested, since the department is trying to establish itself. University of Florida is the safe choice since it has hosted before, so has experience and is a known quantity. Boise averages temperatures in the mid 50s in March, Florida averages in the low 70s.
A secret vote by paper ballot recorded 9 votes for Boise and 5 votes for Florida. ACSP will ask whether University of Florida would be willing host in 2017.

Diversity* S. Sen

June provided an update, since Sid was not present. Several items from the Committee are posted in Dropbox. Karen Umemoto, the former Chair, has stepped down from the Committee, and Hazel Edwards has been appointed in her stead. The Executive Committee is paying careful attention to this committee and wants to see them succeed.

Welcome to Jay Chatterjee.

Marketing & other strategic needs (PLANET) J. Thomas

June communicated with Bill Page, who signaled that he is ready to entertain a proposal for ACSP to take over management of PLANET. This would give ACSP two email list serves, PLANET and the ACSP mail list; the Bowling League is now Google Groups. Part of preparing a proposal will entail figuring out how it should be run; it needs to be self-governing, not moderated, and filter out spam. One issue is whether the management of PLANET should shift to Donna or to the ACSP President’s Assistant.

Discussion raised the issues of whether Donna has enough staff to take this task on, and that depends, in part, on how much time it takes to manage the list serve. The time commitment varies, since the biggest task is processing new memberships. Google may be an attractive option because it is easy to control access. The Executive Committee and the staff are in the process of looking at software for the ACSP list as part of rebuilding the web site, but that list can stay at FSU as long as FSU continues to support the software.

Marketing has become a concern. In the past ACSP has relied on The Guide and the Careers brochure. June feels ACSP should move on this, but the Governing Board needs to discuss the marketing strategy and how to organize it. Discussion: Options for organizing the effort include establishing a task force, or establishing it as an initiative. Reliance on Facebook, Twitter, and other social media is a possibility, and creating a more engaging ACSP website would be helpful. Whatever effort is launched needs to clear about what ACSP is marketing, and to whom; if there are multiple audiences, the messages need to be consistent to avoid confusion. Small schools would benefit from having more information available about planning education. APA has many ways to communicate with public, and might be helpful, or at least provide some examples. June will move forward with establishing a task force. Please refer anyone who is knowledgeable about marketing to her.
There has been a change in the task of reimagining the Guide. It now has two components. The first is a technical upgrade that will make it easier to access, and make it searchable on the website. It will also include web links to the schools. The second is to improve the front material. Donna and Avis made substantial improvements when they updated the front material for the on-going edition, but more needs to done to make the field look more interesting and compelling. The Guide also needs updated career profiles, since the current ones are pretty old; they will be re-integrated into the Guide to illustrate that a planning degree can lead to a variety of career paths.

12:45  VIII. JOURNAL OF PLANNING EDUCATION AND RESEARCH**  S. Guhathakurta/N.G. Leigh

JPER is attracting more manuscripts every year. Please see report on Dropbox. If the growth continues as it has been, additional resources may be needed. The manuscripts are of good quality, and are coming from very diverse places. There are 5 new inductees to the editorial board. There is one small mistake in the report – the amount for the Writing Workshop should be $7,500 not $7K. The number is correct in the budget. The Workshop will be on August 7-8, 2014 at Georgia Tech. The new Focus issue will be coming out on Green Health. Increasing use of blogs and social media is generating a lot of interest. Subhro and Nancey will be stepping down on June 30, 2016, so the search for new editors should get started in January 2015.

1:15  IX. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**  S. Joseph/V. Reina

The students would like ACSP to help support student travel. A request for $5K will be included in the budget discussion.

1:45  X. INTEREST GROUP REPORTS

Faculty Women’s Interest Group*  C. S. Slotterback
FWIG child care request  L. Takahashi

Please see reports in Dropbox folder 10. Rayman contacted FWIG about whether childcare is needed at the annual conference, and they surveyed their members. (Carissa is here on behalf of FWIG). The quick takeaway is that many people are interested in having child care available, but not many people will need the services at the upcoming conference. APA no longer supplies this service. Other organizations that supply this service charge a substantial amount more for registration to subsidize it.

There was broad agreement that the issue is important, and a sentiment that it would be appropriate to poll the entire membership, including Bowling League, in any further assessment of both need and willingness to pay, since there is a considerable cost. More information...
would also be needed about alternative ways to provide the service, and liability issues. The Board could take the issue up again when that information is available.

Planners of Color Interest Group*  L. Bates/C. Irazabal

Update on National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity  L. Takahashi
Please see report in Dropbox. The Executive Committee asked POCIG to report on the mentoring scholarships. The mentoring committee report (in Dropbox) indicates that everyone was satisfied with the support provided, and notes that some of the webinars offered by the Center are only available for members. ACSP pays $1250 for 4 memberships for a year. At the suggestion of members of the Board, POCIG agreed to explore the option of purchasing memberships for a semester only, and will try to recruit more applicants from among post docs and faculty.

POCIG is looking at the possibility of establishing regional student representation. The POCIG report requests support for a networking event at the conference.

The Board discussed the desirability of making sure that department chairs are aware of the National Center, since programs, or even entire universities, might want to purchase memberships. This could be done at the Administrator’s Conference.

Lois requested a short report on the Diversity conference recently held at University of Michigan. June gave a synopsis of the event, which included a lot of very good discussion. Diversity efforts thus far, and those proposed, cover 3 different kinds of initiatives: PhD workshops, workshops for young faculty members of color who are just starting out, and mentoring. There is a real need to train people on how to mentor. ACSP could consider holding a mentoring workshop; it might be useful to check on the feedback received from any of such workshops.

GPEIG  J. Macedo

GPEIG will be holding an election before the conference and needs nominees for a new co-chair. GPEIG hosted a conference at MIT in May last year. Before the conference, the GPEIG co-chairs conducted a survey of international planning students, and the results, which were presented at the workshop, were very well received, so they may do another survey. The group is considering a roundtable in Philadelphia, and will be making awards; the winners are on the web and will be recognized in Philadelphia.

The big issue on the table is the GPEIG website, which is 10 years old and needs to be rebuilt. It has been maintained by a few volunteers, but there have been problems with access and servers. Their recommendation is to hire a professional consultant to create a new website. GPEIG’s understanding is that with the newer platforms, the management is not high maintenance. GPEIG can find server space, but wouldn’t have access because of security, or could be part of the ACSP website.
Clint reviewed a large spreadsheet of the budget (hard copy distributed). It shows that for FY 2013-14, as of the end of February, ACSP was almost exactly on budget; changes since that time increased revenue by $11K.

For FY 2014-15, many items in the budget are similar to previous years. Clint explained all the new or unusual items, and then opened the floor for discussion.

Revenues: Royalty payments from Sage (line 35) should start coming in next year, and should increase the following year. Conference revenue is quite variable (line 32); there is more conference detail on a separate sheet. There is no need to consider an increase in dues at this time. As discussed this morning, the Board needs to consider what should be done with the organization’s assets, current about $540K.

Expenditures: Items discussed earlier in the meeting will add over $100K to the budget. The cost of rebuilding the ACSP website, estimated at $25K (line 76), should cover the existing functionality. The current plan is to issue an RFP for that work. Adding GPEIG to the website would increase the cost. The idea is to have the Guide, in a searchable form, housed on the new website. This will add a major new functionality, not covered by the $25K; part of that additional cost could be covered by the $10K of unspent funds allocated as the first installment toward reimagining the Guide. The Guide allocation also includes $20K for printing the Careers brochure, and a separate item for shipping them; more might be needed, since member schools wanted more than were printed last year. Only $2K of the $8K allocated for Promotion and Publicity has been spent, and that could also be rolled into the funds available for the online Guide.

There is a separate allocation for marketing planning education (line 79); this number is a placeholder. The “first step” idea is to develop and show a video at the fall conference. Deden has volunteered for the marketing committee.

The Diversity Committee (line 69) hasn’t spent down most of what was allocated for this year. One question for the Board is whether that money should be carried over to the coming year. This could help pay for a session they want to hold in Philadelphia, and they would also like to hold a mentoring workshop.

The students requested $500 for an event at the conference. Their allocation of $3K is included in the annual conference fund; traditionally it has been $2K.

Transfers for interest groups (line 84) come out of the general fund; $1500 is the magic number for each interest group, except for the GPEIG website. The Senior Faculty Interest Group has not requested any monies.
Two items still need to be added to the spreadsheet: $5K for PhD students to travel to meet with AESOP young academics, and funds to rebuild the GPEIG website, estimated at $15K.

Motion: Approve the budget. The motion carried.

4:00   XII. NEW BUSINESS  
       
       L. Takahashi

Guest Genie Birch and Ex-Officio member Bruce Stiftel presented background on UN Habitat and the World Urban Campaign. As discussed earlier in the meeting, there are active efforts to develop sustainability development goals, and Bruce and Genie asked that ACSP add its support to their efforts to assure that cities or human settlements are explicitly referenced in those goals. This would include contacting HUD and the US State Department to offer ACSP member expertise on preparing the US National Report for Habitat III. Bruce is a member of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Guidelines on Territory and Planning.

Motion: ACSP should support the creation of Sustainability Development Goals for cities and invite its members to advocate as appropriate.

The Motion carried.

Motion: ACSP should write a letter to HUD and to the US Department of State to offer expertise in preparing the US National Report for Habitat III, which is due in August 2014.

The Motion carried.

4:30   XIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND GENERAL ORDERS  
       
       L. Takahashi

There was no additional business. The meeting was adjourned.