



ACSP
Connecting educators,
researchers and students

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

Meeting Minutes as of 10.15.17

Fall Meeting ~ October 11, 2017, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM

Denver Marriott City Center, 1701 California Street, Denver, CO ~ Penrose Room

Current Governing Board voting members in attendance: Michael Frisch, Joe Grengs, Kristin Larsen, Aujean Lee, Michael Lens, Richard Margerum, Alfonso Morales, Samina Raja, Laxmi Ramasubramanian, Jane Rongerude, Tom Sanchez, Carissa Slotterback, Shannon Van Zandt, Mary Wolfe, Weiping Wu

Incoming Governing Board members in attendance: Marlon Boarnet, Justin Hollander, Lucie Laurian, Austin Troy

Governing Board ex officio members: Clinton Andrews (JPER), Edward Goetz (PAB), Zenia Kotval (PAB), Jeffrey Lowe (Diversity Committee), Francis Owusu (Representative to GPEAN), Connie Ozawa (PAB),

Others in attendance: Cynthia Bowen (APA), Ashok Das (GPEIG), Donna Dodd (ACSP), Cecilia Giusti (Diversity Committee), Monica Groh (APA), Bruce Knight (PAB), Glenn Larsen (AICP), Jesmarie Johnson (PAB), Shonagh Merits (PAB), Deden Rukmana (GPEIG), Andrew Seidel (Representative of ACUPP)

I Call to Order [\[ACTION\]](#) W. Wu
Introductions/Presidential Transition

Wu called the meeting to order at 8:13 am.

Wu invited introductions from those in attendance and highlighted the voting privileges of current and incoming governing board members.

II Approval of Agendas W. Wu

- A) Consent Agenda [\[ACTION\]](#)
- Nominating and Elections Committee Report
 - Lincoln Institute/ACSP Curriculum Innovation Award Task Force Report
 - Faculty Mentoring Committee Report
 - Global Planning Education Task Force Report
 - FWIG Report
 - GPEIG Report
 - POCIG Report
 - Task Force for Future Joint Congresses Report
 - PhD Committee Report
 - Communications Committee Report

Wu summarized the content of the consent agenda.

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

As an addition to the agenda, Morales recommended reports from each of the regions and discussion of the role of regional representatives.

MOTION – Morales moved to add regional representative reports and discussion of the role of regional representatives to the agenda, Van Zandt seconded. The Motion was approved.

B) Regular Agenda [\[ACTION\]](#)

MOTION – Frisch moved to approve the Regular Agenda, Morales seconded. The Motion was approved.

III **Approval of Minutes from March 9, 2017** [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

C. Slotterback

MOTION – Slotterback moved to approve the meeting minutes from the spring 2017b GoBo meeting, Frisch seconded. The Motion was approved.

IV **Strategic Discussion Issues**

W. Wu, Moderator

Wu provided an introduction to the strategic issues discussion, encouraging engagement around challenging issues. She highlighted how the morning agenda is different from previous meeting agendas with its focus on more substantive discussion. She referred to Discussion Guidelines that can be referenced to ensure an open and inclusive discussion. She indicated that detailed minutes would not be taken; instead, the minutes will reflect key ideas and actions, rather than specifics and attributed comments.

Topic: ACSP Statements on Major Events [\[Box\]](#)
and Political Announcements/responding to member schools affected
by catastrophic events (Charlottesville, Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria)

Wu provided introductory comments on this topic, noting previous requests to ACSP officers to make statements related to political announcements and events. She described how the Executive Committee has interacted with staff and the GoBo on this topic in the past. She highlighted the consultative process used to create an initial statement relative to the travel ban and a recent statement on the events in Charlottesville. She highlighted challenges related to issuing statements including timeliness, expertise, and consultation. She also indicated that ACSP historically has only spoken as an organization when planning programs were threatened with elimination.

Slotterback provided an overview of the Governing Board discussion of this issue at the spring 2017 meeting. She also summarized the six recommendations provided in the Communications

Committee report. The recommendations were provided by the Communications Committee at the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

The group discussed a number of issues:

- Purpose of the statements (e.g. affirming connections to something bigger, communicating to students, communicating to administrators)
- The challenge of reaching consensus on values
- The possibility of offending those within and outside of ACSP
- The opportunity to draw on planners' ethics and values
- Acknowledging that the impacts on planning issues are not new and that responses need a broader focus
- Challenges of responding quickly, while ensuring that issues are fully understood and that deliberation among member schools can occur
- Planning schools are in different contexts that create different demands and threats
- Presence of a planners' code of ethics, but the lack of a code of ethics for planning academics
- Opportunity with statements to educate audiences about ways that planners have and can contribute to various issues
- Intersection with Special Committee on Communications in responding to issues and convening experts as needed
- Challenge of deciding what to respond to, since our organization and focus of our member schools is very broad
- Practices of other organizations in developing statements (e.g. vetted statements, scholarly/policy focus, presidential statements) – Law and Society Organization was noted as an informative model
- Possibility of journal special issues to address key issues, though time lag was noted
- Opportunity for planning faculty to affiliate with other groups that address issues outside of ACSP's scope
- Possibility of identifying a set of components that every statement could include (e.g. reference to values, recommended actions, role of planners, connecting to planning)

Consensus emerged around the possibility of developing a values statement to provide a longer-term expression of values, minimize urgency to respond, offer a foundation from which action can be taken, be informed by APA and PAB, set the tone for responses to issues, and highlight what makes planning values distinct. It was acknowledged that a values statement could be referenced immediately, but also inform a process to develop statements and gather feedback. Selective use of statements could be more powerful. The development of a statement could further evolve ACSP beyond an institutional focus to a substantive focus. It was recommended that a values statement include both values content, but also a process by which it would be utilized. The need to engage the full membership in developing a values statement was prioritized, with regional representatives playing a role connecting with schools in their regions. A one year timeframe for developing a values statement was supported, in order to allow for engagement and vetting. It was acknowledged that statements might be needed in the interim and could be a means for stimulating further feedback on the values statement.

It was recommended that ACSP convene a subset of the GoBo to draft a values statement and recommend a process, for review at the spring Governing Board, input from ACSP membership in spring/summer 2018, and approval of final statement at the Fall 2018 GoBo meeting. The group discussed the intersection of the Communications Committee and the Governing Board. It was determined that two groups were needed: (1) values statement group – Boarnet (chair), Laurian, Lee, Ramasubramanian, Rongerude, Van Zandt; (2) process group – Slotterback (chair), Troy, Larsen, Wolfe.

ACTION – Wu will charge the values statement and process groups with their tasks.

Topic: Data effort and ACSP Guide [Box]

Wu provided an overview of ongoing conversations related to Planetizen and highlighted prior task force related to Planetizen’s school rankings. She noted discussions of data collection issues among ACSP, PAB, APA, and Planetizen, and issues related to rankings more broadly. She also referred to the previous ACSP Guide to Schools, which has not been published since 2014. She referred to the data group report, which includes recommendations for discussion by the GoBo. Boarnet summarized the report, noting recommendations, including producing an online ACSP Guide that offers information beyond what is provided by Planetizen, ensures that the ACSP guide is a revenue generator, and produces our own data for institutional research. He noted future needs to address issues such as data quality, ACSP’s modest ongoing role in Planetizen’s rankings (that does not include a role in defining the ranking algorithm), and opportunities relative to other ranking organizations (e.g. National Research Council, Petersen’s Guide, U.S. News and World Report).

The group discussed a number of issues related to data and the Guide:

- Need for better data related to Asian and Asian American students and faculty, to better inform ACSP efforts targeted at underrepresented groups and to better characterize international vs. domestic status
- Significance of having an ACSP Guide for visibility of the planning profession and planning programs
- Opportunity to refine content that allows schools to better tell their stories (i.e. through a narrative), incorporate a regional component to position planning schools to prospective students, include information about associated faculty (i.e. individual faculty profiles rather than profiles linked to schools to ensure up to date information), and advance broader ACSP communication strategy
- Possible collaboration with Planetizen, but with assurance that ACSP can meet its needs in a partnership (it was acknowledged that APA and PAB are opposed to a partnership with Planetizen)
- Need to include full spectrum of programs – undergraduate, graduate, PhD – in the Guide
- Desire to separate rankings from program information
- Possibility of selling Guide data to Planetizen, journal editors, and others to generate revenue
- Opportunity to include student job placement data and profiles in the Guide
- Growing importance of academic analytics

- Availability of guides to schools from other associations that could serve as a model (e.g. AAG)
- Recognition that a fully online Guide will involve time and money to ensure high quality
- Opportunity for Guide to articulate and reflect commitments to ACSP's values
- Need to address inequities in institutional resources for participation, such as via a possible sliding fee scale
- Need to address inconsistencies in metrics requested to ease administrative burden
- PAB firewall that prevents data sharing could limit opportunities for collaboration

General consensus emerged around creating an ACSP Guide. It was recommended that the discussion feedback be sent back to the data group review and to inform a final report for the spring GoBo meeting.

ACTION – Boarnet will share notes from the data and Guide discussion with the data group to inform the group's future discussions and a spring 2018 GoBo report.

ACTION – Dodd will include questions about the Guide in the November 2017 survey of department/program chairs

Topic: ACSP Engagement on Diversity and Inclusion

Wu introduced the discussion, referring to ACSP's prior activities related to diversity, including the establishment of FWIG and the Diversity Committee, the presence of diversity on the Presidential Agenda since June Thomas's presidency, the creation of POCIG, a Diversity Committee report on diversity in the planning academy and faculty climate study, the ACSP Workshop for Junior Faculty of Color, and the ACSP Pre-Doctoral Workshop. She highlighted recent petitions (one of which was drafted and not submitted, and another which was submitted) related to the Diversity Committee's Planners of Color resume book and the lack of clarity and intent as to who should be included and who was being excluded. She noted that the petitions and follow-on discussion highlighted broader issues of who is underrepresented among planning students and faculty. She noted interactions between the Executive Committee and Diversity Committee that led to an updated call for resumes that clarified a broader target group for the resume book but also welcomed others to submit. She indicated that this history and these recent issues have highlighted the need for further discussion related to underrepresentation and diversity and the critical issues that ACSP should address in the next five years.

Lee offered further perspective on the two petitions and the varied perspective among Asian and Asian American students and faculty relative to the issues and content of the petitions. She noted the challenge in defining planners of color, versus underrepresented status.

The GoBo and guests were divided into small groups for discussion of two questions: (1) how do we define people of color and underrepresented groups? and (2) what are critical issues/actions that we should undertake as an association in the next five years?

Discussion notes from small groups are copied in directly, with only modest edits to format, below. These notes represent ideas that were expressed in the discussion, not actions taken by or considered by the board.

Q1: How do we define people of color and underrepresented groups?

- Subcategories under Asian
- University definitions and PAB definitions differ
- International students/faculty – you are not a minority, until you get citizenship, then you are. The issues do not change.
- Sometimes Asians do not count as “diversity hire” even in almost entirely-White departments.
- First-generation students face obstacles as well, regardless of race.
- International faculty do not “count” as “diversity hires.”
- Why not self-identification?
- Income/class matters as well
- Within the university, departments often make the case
- POCIG has a history of work on these definitions
 - o POCIG is currently more reactive
 - o Self-identification might not work
 - o We have to identify which groups are underrepresented
 - o Standard civil rights definition: African-Americans, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, Hispanic/Latinos
 - o Groups historically oppressed by the U.S. (as opposed to different countries) – could include Vietnam not China
- What are the goals?
 - o Remediating oppression
 - o Correcting underrepresentation
 - o Diversifying the profession? Student body?
- What do we want to diversify? The profession.
 - o Can you have a completely white faculty that is successful in recruiting diverse student body?
- Should we include privileged people from other societies as underrepresented?
- Maybe APA should focus on the profession, but we focus on the academy
 - o Diversifying scholarship and knowledge created by faculty research
- New demographic landscape – particularly w Asians
- Committee on Diversity – PAB data not that great, self-identification
- Is it possible to have enough nuance in the data?
- Maybe diversity is less the problem than inclusion and equity
 - o Commitment is there but outcomes – representation
- Where do we stand on the Asian question?
 - o Is there a zero-sum
 - o Asians should be included in a diverse faculty, but perhaps not an underrepresented group
 - o But French people are underrepresented, does that matter?

- Need both? You are minority and underrepresented, so you are in the target group.
 - Tiers?
- LGBTQ?
- What is the target of representation? Does each university have to reflect the U.S.? Or do you have to incorporate some regionalism into it?
- Remember folks will perceive this in different ways - some more guarded, some less
- definitions - wait and move inductively
- Data as a poor proxy for culture/climate, what other data do we need? LGBTQ
- questions associated with using data from others, e.g. PAB - visa,
- how complex the data collection matrix? should it be incorporated into the guide? how fine grained?
- Question of culture - how people are perceived - which implies stereotypes and stereotypical interpersonal interaction (micro aggressions), race / gender / LGBTQ
- Question of when people will self-select into “diversity” supporting mechanisms
- How does this articulate with the activities of members, hiring, and how articulate with institutional support?
- Diversity - advance principles or goals? assessing biases in various processes (hiring is the most obvious)
- Comparative - What’s happening in Canada?
- Question of overlaps in identity and of ‘overrepresentation’
- Question of origin or where one works, etc.
- What do we mean by diverse? First generation?
- Does ACSP GoBo define or have interest groups define? or have people self-identify?
- Faculty of Color
 - Challenge of excluding groups based on country of origin. At which date does someone’s arrival in the US distinguish them as domestic or international
 - Can be difficult in defining what this means, because some states have strict limits on these kinds of definitions
 - May be better to be broader and allow other actions to address broader concerns
- Underrepresented Minorities
 - Addressing historical oppression requires paying particular attention to people who have been traditionally excluded. If this is about overcoming historical oppression this may mean a narrower definition
 - his may be very hard to define, and ACSP may be better to be inclusive
- Do we have data for documenting who is under-represented?
 - It’s hard to define how to define faculty who are international (e.g. a person of privileged economic background from an African country may be counted as Black)
 - Definition depends on who are our constituency (are we serving a global audience or a national audience)
 - What is our objective in making these definitions? It is important to state those objectives.
 - That we include diverse perspectives and ideas in the field (brought to the field, to our students)
 - Need for role models

- Diversity and inclusion looks different in different schools
- Our goal is (high) quality
- There's lack of context (historic information) in how terms were defined initially
- The world is not binary, and we live in a fluid world - let's think about an expansive definition that encourages inclusion and also highlight in particular historically representative marginalized groups (versus 'under-represented')
- Interest in restorative justice
- What are critical issues for ACSP?
 - Inclusion and retention of marginalized and underrepresented faculty
 - It's important not just to say what we 'say' but also what 'we do'
 - Including marginalized voices/ideas makes planning scholarship better

Q2: What actions should ACSP take? What are the critical issues?

- APA initiatives, scholarships
- PAB visits – process versus outcomes
- PAB data needs to be examined – changes within schools.
- Making sure people do well once they are in positions
- Questions of how to consider 'diversity' as a positive factor, (contingent on purpose/perspective).
- Broadly similar question of process associated with this ongoing conversation, (especially with the value statement creation)
- Question of programming - what, how, when? - e.g. career webpage, how to do this, create fields or upload CV or both?
- Incorporating empirical data related to diversity initiatives into relaunching ACSP guide & connecting to also ACSP Career Center
- Being clear in differentiating type of programming, either for all "underrepresented" versus target populations
- Coordinate with FWIG and POCIG related to their previous and/or current climate studies
- Add to POCIG Resume book a statement about how they address diversity and inclusion in their scholarship, teaching and or service. The guide can then be very inclusive in terms of who is included, and recruiting programs can use these statements to identify potential candidates based on their program needs.
- Can ACSP take a stronger leadership role on the broader issues. Perhaps it should be a specific task of the Committee on Diversity to focus on racism as special initiative
- One initiative on diversity—more broad
- One initiative on racism—may be more narrow and leadership role may help attract more students to the field of planning interested in this topic
- Increase the pipeline is a key task - Not just at doctoral level - Going back to high school and undergraduate levels
- Reach out to other professional associations to better understand how they have increased the pipeline and diversify the profession (Public Administration, Public Policy, Business, Geography, Law)
- Action steps along for a supportive career pathway for faculty of color and marginalized groups

- Collect information on how programs have been successful in promoting diversity and inclusion
- Think about investing resources in POCIG and more broadly in issues of diversity and inclusion (e.g. training of staff)

V Executive Committee Reports

President’s Report [\[Verbal report\]](#)

L. Takahashi

President-Elect Report [\[Verbal report\]](#)

W. Wu

In Takahashi’s absence, Wu shared a report on Takahashi’s behalf and integrated comments with her own President-Elect report. She highlighted new features for the conference this year including a new app, new Friday afternoon activities including workshops (e.g. advocacy, funders panel, Lincoln Institute-sponsored case writing), the return of the Saturday lunch, and book signings by the Davidoff winner and Big Ideas session featured speaker.

Troy, local host committee chair, provided a welcome to the conference and a thank you to ACSP staff.

Wu invited GoBo members to the Business Meeting, during which an overview of the state of ACSP will presented. She referred to changes in ACSP staff and a new evaluation process to provide feedback on association management. Wu highlighted ongoing discussions with APA - including its sponsorship of the conference, ongoing initiatives related to data collection, outreach to AESOP, connections with GPEAN (which is meeting concurrently in Denver), and connections with UN agencies. Relative to the UN, Raja emphasized that ACSP is a recognized stakeholder to the official activities of UN Habitat.

Treasurer’s Report [\[ACTION/Box\]](#)

J. Grengs

Grengs provided an overview of new budget summary documents. He highlighted positive outcomes for investments, including mutual funds that ACSP began to purchase in 2014. Grengs highlighted ACSP’s move toward expanded staffing and new initiatives, referencing new costs associated with staff, website, marketing, the conference (e.g. wifi). These expenses also create new opportunities including sponsorships, membership, and Career Center. He previewed the need for a future discussion of membership dues increases.

MOTION – Margerum moved approval of the Treasurer’s report, Frisch seconded. The Motion was approved.

Secretary’s Report

C. Slotterback

Slotterback referenced the Communications Committee report, highlighting ongoing efforts to enhance ACSP’s web and social media presence. In addition, she shared an overview of the new Lincoln Institute of Land Policy sponsorship and its creation of Curriculum Innovation Awards. She noted the efforts of the new Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and ACSP Curriculum Innovation Awards Task Force, which includes representatives from the Lincoln Institute and ACSP. The Lincoln Institute is sponsoring three \$10k curriculum innovation awards (for courses) and 10 \$1k

case study awards. The curricula and case studies must be related to the Lincoln’s Institutes four key themes: (1) land value capture, (2) informality and urban poverty, (3) climate change, and (4) municipal fiscal health. Slotterback highlighted the Lincoln Institute session on case writing to be held during the conference.

VI Allied Organizations

APA [Box]

Cynthia Bowen

Bowen provided an update on APA’s key initiatives, including the expanded student membership program, which offers free membership to all students in any school throughout their time as students. She noted the Academic Task Force and its recommendation related to increasing diversity within the APA organization, via efforts related to pipeline and supporting free membership for all students interested in planning. She highlighted two APA sessions, one on reaching practicing planners and another on APA’s research agenda – which will highlight the key research topics that emerged from a survey of APA members (e.g. climate change, housing and community development, transportation, economic development, environment and natural resources). She indicated an openness to greater engagement with ACSP and academics, including related to research. She also mentioned the possibility of creating an APA Academic Interest Group. She highlighted updates to APA’s policy guides, including a new guide on diversity and social equity that relates to academia but also ways that planners can be engaged on these issues in their communities. She also highlighted work of the APA Diversity Committee on defining what diversity means to APA – they are currently soliciting feedback from various groups within APA. She then mentioned the Diversity Committee’s efforts around youth engagement. She noted that Planners Press has fully transitioned its publications to Routledge.

AICP

Glenn Larsen

Larsen acknowledged the key role that planning schools play in supporting students in gaining skills for planning practice. He highlighted the AICP Candidate Pilot Program and the positive reactions received so far. The program allows recent graduates of PAB accredited programs to take the exam earlier and then accumulate the necessary experience. While in the pilot program, candidates can engage in certification maintenance and work with mentors. He highlighted the AICP Ethics Committee’s work in developing a sample ethics lecture that could be used in undergraduate and graduate planning programs and noted future interest in coordinating with ACSP to finalize and disseminate. Larsen also noted that the availability of APA/AICP materials for all student members and the possibility of integrating these materials into courses. He also referred to extensive and ongoing efforts to align PAB standards and AICP core competencies.

The discussion related to APA and AICP highlighted issues including:

- Interest in data related to diversity of APA members
- Concerns that the AICP candidate program will lead academic programs to “teach to the test”
- Uptake of planning program APA membership among planning schools
- Academic engagement in divisions and interest groups

- Possibility of a sabbatical program for seasoned/retired practitioners to work in universities for a period of time
- Sharing APA data on non-ACSP schools that are enrolling students in APA membership, in order to enhance ACSP membership expansion efforts

ACUPP

A. Seidel

Seidel provided an update on program accreditation efforts by ACUPP and noted that there are 22 accredited planning programs in Canada.

PAB [ACTION/Box]

Bruce Knight

Knight highlighted the APA/AICP/PAB strategic planning discussion in New York in spring 2017. ACSP was not represented due to lack of availability of Board leaders. He highlighted the updated mission and reaffirmed the core values and goals of PAB, summarized in the PAB report. PAB has developed an online self-study report system. He previewed the requested increase in PAB fees, summarizing analyses conducted to arrive at the recommended 10% increase (and 2% per year thereafter). AICP and APA have already approved the requested increase in fees.

The discussion explored the presence of underrepresented persons in the site visitor pool, which Merits indicated was approximately 11%.

MOTION – Van Zandt recommended approval of the PAB report and fee increase, Morales seconded. The Motion was approved.

VII Student Representatives [ACTION/Box]

A. Lee/M. Wolfe

Lee summarized a request proposed by the Student Representatives to provide a reduced conference registration rate to support non-employed or part-time employed recent graduates in attending the conference. She also discussed recent changes to the bylaws that now require that student representatives be doctoral students. She noted that there will be two student workshops during the conference and a student clinic booth for review of CVs and job materials with faculty. She indicated growth in student memberships and registration on the Bowling League.

Wolfe highlighted her engagement in the AESOP Young Academics (YA) Conference and Charles Connerly's ongoing efforts to maintain connections with AESOP. She noted that the Young Academics group is relatively independent of AESOP. She reported that the YA conference is free, competitive to get into, and offers meaningful faculty feedback on students' work. Key takeaways from the conference include that the ACSP abstract fee is a deterrent to attending our conference, possible interest in a small travel grant to support a European student in attending ACSP and for a U.S. student to attend the AESOP YA conference.

Wolfe summarized Student Representative proposals for a reduced conference rate for recent PhD graduates who are not in tenure track positions, elimination of the abstract submission fee

for students, and travel grants. Wu recommended that the Finance Committee review these items since they have budget implications and discuss further at the spring 2018 meeting.

MOTION – The report is the motion. Morales seconded. The Motion was approved.

ACTION – Grengs will engage the Finance Committee in discussing a reduced conference rate for recent PhD graduates who are not in tenure track positions, elimination of the abstract submission fee for students, and travel grants.

VIII JPER Report

C. Andrews

Andrews highlighted the JPER report contents, noting an increase in the JPER impact factor from 1.051 in 2015 up to 1.69 in 2016. He referred to the successful JPER writing workshop that engaged 13 participants. He previewed the upcoming JPER publisher contract renewal and/or consideration of other publishers. Andrews noted a positive experience in working with Sage, including their efforts to improve the manuscript management and subscriptions.

The discussion explored the status of the book review editor, who is currently in Acting status. Andrews noted that JPER conducted a search for a book review editor but it was unsuccessful. They intend to reopen the search in the near future. The discussion also explored the desk rejection rate, which was at 46% for 2014-2015 submissions. Andrews noted that the typical causes for desk rejection are very weak English language content and the large number of submissions of education policy-related manuscripts that are not related to planning, and submissions of urban design-focused manuscripts that are not sufficiently connected to theory or planning. The discussion was raised as to whether JPER has a pool of copy editors that can be recommended to non-Native English speakers in need of support. It was acknowledged that there are some journals that recommend editors to early career scholars. Andrews mentioned the increasing significance of altmetrics and Sage's ongoing interest in this topic. Boarnet referred to planned discussions with Sage and other publishers as part of the contract renewal.

IX Special Committees and Task Forces

Awards Policy Task Force [\[Box\]](#)

S. Van Zandt

Van Zandt highlighted the task force's review of current awards and their report recommendations. She noted the challenge of removing named awards and the presence of a large number of international awards from GPEIG, relative to awards for other topics. The committee recommends that submission processes be made more consistent, resubmissions be limited to two cycles, selection criteria be clearly stated, review committees meet diversity criteria (e.g. rank, race/ethnicity), the profile of ACSP's awards be increased, establishing a teaching award (perhaps in part by refining the Distinguished Educator Award focus), expanding student travel awards for pre- and post-prelims, clarifying/aligning award descriptions, and enhancing communication of award opportunities, deadlines, and winners.

The discussion highlighted a strong interest in better promoting awards, interest in an Administrators Conference session on preparing successful award applications, a gap in awards for junior faculty and emerging scholars, and the opportunity to tie short-term/strategic awards programs to ACSP's values statement and possibly connected to external partners.

It was recommended that the task force consider feedback and engage with the interest groups and staff and submit an expanded report before the February Executive Committee meeting by considering additional issues related to teaching award, young scholars award, selection criteria, and possible teaching innovation competition for 2018 annual conference.

Committee on Diversity

J. Lowe/C. Giusti

Lowe indicated that the Committee decided to not release a new syllabi book, due to a low number of submissions of syllabi. He described a recent survey of participants in the first Junior Faculty of Color workshop and the need to be more consistent in conducting surveys. He noted that participants have been successful in getting tenure and in their third year reviews. Giusti provided an overview of issues of underrepresentation in planning academia and recent discussions of the intersection with international faculty. She provided a summary of the previous four Pre-Doctoral Workshops and issues for consideration:

- The Pre-Doctoral Workshop alone is insufficient to increase numbers of underrepresented students
- Upper level undergraduates and graduate students are the best fit for the workshop
- Faculty need to be active in recruiting students to participate in the workshop
- Local host contribution is critical to covering costs (ACSP has contributed \$7500 in the past and costs are ~\$20,000)
- One-to-one mentoring (as in Junior Faculty of Color Workshop) would enhance the experience of students
- The diversity of faculty leading the workshop is critical
- Many students in the workshop are interested in issues of social justice

Giusti shared the Diversity Committee's recommendations for the Pre-Doctoral Workshop:

- Offering an in-person workshop annually
- Following up with participating students, including funding an impact study
- Ensuring that host schools engage mentors/speakers who are from underrepresented groups
- Maintaining current diversity requirements for participating in the workshop

Lowe provided a summary of anecdotes and activities of a few previous participants in the Pre-Doctoral Workshop, indicating a positive experience at the workshop and ongoing success of participants.

The discussion highlighted a number of issues:

General

- ACSP's expanded diversity efforts could offer justification for an increase membership dues
- Post-workshop mentoring is needed
- Need to promote call for workshop hosts more extensively, possibly through a webinar highlighting experiences of previous hosts
- Opportunities for financial support from APA

Pre-Doctoral Workshop

- Schedule workshops further in advance so that students can plan for their participation based on location
- Resources to support students' participation/travel are required
- Greater ACSP investment is needed to cover costs of the workshop
- Possibility of hosting the workshop before the ACSP or APA conference may offer a cost savings and recruitment opportunity
- It is essential to emphasize that students are worthy of getting a PhD – this requires enthusiasm on the part of faculty participants

Junior Faculty of Color Workshop

- Need to continue promoting opportunities and engaging participants in previous workshops in other ACSP opportunities (e.g. Governing Board, Site Visitor Pool)
- One-to-one mentoring is essential, including to address personal questions (e.g. planning for a family)

MOTION – Morales moved that ACSP support the Pre-Doctoral Workshop annually for the next five years, contingent on evaluation, Raja seconded. The Motion was approved.

ACTION – Donna will prepare a RFP for Pre-Doctoral Workshop to release shortly after conference.

IX New Business

- New conference features
- Review of Dues Structure

L. Takahashi
W. Wu
J. Grengs

Grengs provided an overview of the current dues structure and indicated that the most recent dues increase was 1999. He proposed potential strategies for reviewing dues including projecting revenue relative to the cost of key initiatives and reviewing the dues of peer associations. The discussion highlighted school budget pressures, the difficulty in garnering institutional funding for the individual capitation portion of the dues, the prospect of a fee structure tied to school resources, and perceived growing inequality in faculty salaries across institutions. It was recommended that the Finance Committee review these issues and bring recommendations to the spring Governing Board meeting.

ACTION – Grengs will work with the Finance Committee to review feedback from the GoBo on a potential dues increase.

ACSP new staffing structure

D. Dodd

Dodd provided an overview of the new staffing structure and introduced the new staff. She highlighted efforts to document workflows for coordination among staff and for future planning. The discussion highlighted the need to provide more information about the evaluation process. Wu clarified the nature of the contract with White Picket Fence Productions and the intent to formalize an evaluation structure/process in the coming months, prior to renewal of the next contract. She emphasized the ongoing professionalization of ACSP's staffing and administrative structures. The group discussed potential revisions to the Organizational Chart handout shared during the meeting.

