



## GOVERNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Spring Meeting ~ April 21, 2018, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM

Hilton New Orleans Riverside, 2 Poydras Street, New Orleans ~ Commerce Room

Governing Board members in attendance: Clint Andrews (JPER editor, non-voting), Marlon Boarnet, Edward Goetz (PAB, non-voting) Joe Grengs, Justin Hollander, Kristin Larsen, Lucie Laurian, Ellie Masoomkhah, Connie Ozawa (PAB, non-voting), Tom Sanchez, Carissa Slotterback, Lois Takahashi, Austin Troy, Shannon Van Zandt, Mary Wolfe, Weiping Wu

Others in attendance: Monica Groh, Jaclyn Hade, Jesmarie Johnson, Bruce Knight, Shonagh Merits, Bruce Stiftel

Staff in attendance: Donna Dodd

---

**I Call to Order** [\[ACTION\]](#) W. Wu  
Introductions

Wu called the meeting to order at 8:01 am. She invited attendees to introduce themselves.

**II Approval of Agendas** W. Wu  
A) Consent Agenda [\[ACTION\]](#)

a. Committee on the Academy <a href="#">[Box]</a>	D. Jourdan
b. Doctoral Committee <a href="#">[Box]</a>	R. Norton
c. Nominating and Elections Committee <a href="#">[Box]</a>	L. Takahashi
d. Institutional Governance <a href="#">[Box]</a>	L. Takahashi
e. PAB Advisory Committee <a href="#">[Box]</a>	M. Lauria
f. Faculty Mentoring Committee Report <a href="#">[Box]</a>	K. McClure
g. National Conference Committee <a href="#">[Box]</a>	G. Sandoval
h. Task Force for Future Joint Congresses <a href="#">[Box]</a>	J. Grengs

MOTION – Van Zandt moved approval of the consent agenda, Troy seconded. The motion was approved.

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

MOTION – Boarnet moved to approve the agenda, Laurian seconded. The motion was approved.

**III Approval of Minutes from October 11, 2017** [\[ACTION/Box\]](#) C. Slotterback

MOTION – Van Zandt moved to approve the minutes, Boarnet seconded. The motion was approved, with one abstention.

#### IV Strategic Issues (I)

W. Wu, Moderator

Wu introduced the two strategic issues for discussion: code of conduct and values statement. Wu described the process for creating a draft Code of Conduct, noting the engagement and advocacy of FWIG for creating a code. She noted that the staff have been gathering examples of codes of conduct from other organizations to inform a draft version of a code of conduct for review by interest groups, the conference committee, and the Governing Board. She noted that the code of conduct would be tied to conference registration as a means of highlighting it to registrants and establishing a commitment to comply with it. She noted that working groups were previously established, led by Boarnet and Slotterback, to develop a values statement for ACSP and a process for using the statement.

##### A) Values Statement [Box]

M. Boarnet & C. Slotterback

Boarnet and Slotterback provided an overview of the values statement development process. The two initially established working groups have now combined and have proposed a process for engaging the members. The process includes online focus groups to be held during May and June, an online survey, and social media engagement via Planners 2040 and ACSP's Twitter and Facebook accounts. Wu highlighted prior Governing Board and Executive Committee discussions related to key public issues and the call for ACSP to take a stand. She noted that prior discussions highlighted ACSP's limited capacity to make a statement on a regular basis, even in cases where we might want to. Citing her experience as ACSP President, Takahashi noted the difficulty of making statements without a values statement to refer to in guiding content and making decisions about when we should make a statement. She noted the need for a values statement that describes what the organization stands for and not just what it does. The discussion pointed out that establishing a values statement is an important step in the maturity of the ACSP organization and that a values statement can help in determining what we respond to and where we focus our energy.

Laurian provided an overview of the focus group format and the approach that would be used for the online focus groups. The group tested the focus group questions through its own free-flowing discussion. Notes from the discussion are provided below:

Discussion Guide Question 3 – What are the key values that should animate and inform ACSP's work?

Social equity of process and outcome

Long-term future oriented

Social justice

Open and participatory decision making

Inclusivity in discipline and process

Commitment to taking action to make change – activism

Linking knowledge to action

Global-minded – not parochial

Freely sharing knowledge

Evidence-based – research for making good decisions

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

Interdisciplinary – integrative nature of planning  
Collaborative  
Democratic governance  
Environmental and natural resource stewardship, sustainability, resilience  
Commitment to public service for the public good/interest  
Health and well-being  
Importance of higher education and its role in society  
Education as a public good – quality, access  
Knowledge generation and dissemination  
Academic freedom  
Research is important  
Valuing diverse perspectives in education  
Commitment to civil discourse  
Preparing students to work in complex political situations  
Freedom of information  
Climate change  
Freedom of speech  
Interconnectedness and systems view  
Education needs to be forward-looking and visionary

Question 4 – What are the values that matter most to ACSP?:

Threats to graduate planning education  
Proposals that have national significance and impact  
Support individual schools that are threatened – already happens via Committee on the Academy  
Focus on proposals that are decisions today that will have long-term future implications  
Changes in higher education policy that impact planning

The group discussed enhancements to the online focus group process, including opportunities to engage ACSP staff, ways to use the chat function to record and reflect back responses, and ways to measure sentiment and prioritization among ideas. The group noted that the focus groups should include a discussion of how ACSP might use the values statement. It was recommended that the process for using the values statement focus on identifying what ACSP is uniquely positioned to do, acknowledging the organization's capacity and volunteer nature, the need for consultation among the Governing Board members, and ways that members might like to be involved. The group discussed the distinctions between public policy issues and higher education issues in shaping how we might respond and it was acknowledged that the ways that we address these as an organization might be different.

The group discussed the possibility of establishing additional interest groups or using conference tracks that could play a role in developing position papers on key issues. The group noted the possibility of a future discussion or panel at a conference to discuss a greater role of interest and/or expertise groups. The group noted the existing role of the Committee on the Academy in supporting individual member schools when they are threatened. They also discussed coordination with APA relative to issuing statements in response to key issues and on the important intersections between planning practice and education. Wu noted that APA tends to focus on a few planning issues each year and does not typically issue statements unrelated to its annual legislative priorities. The group discussed the growing focus on STEM and the

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

implications for international students as a topic upon which ACSP might engage based on its value statement, as well as whether a more immediate action on behalf of ACSP and APA might be needed. Wu noted that PAB has declined to engage on this topic. The group discussed ways that ACSP might in the future evaluate whether we are living by our values. They discussed the need for IRB approval of the data collection effort if there are intentions around publication.

## B) Code of Conduct [Box]

W. Wu

The group engaged in a detailed discussion of the draft Code of Conduct. In addition, it was acknowledged that the Code is a policy and thus subject to a vote by the Governing Board, rather than the full membership. Dodd noted that many other organizations have codes of conduct. The discussion noted the following issues:

- The need for some context-setting language along with the Code to signal to existing members the reasons why the code is being created
- The need to anticipate a number of circumstances under which a conference attendee might need to be removed
- The need to clarify roles and ensure preparation of ACSP staff relative to implementing the Code
- The possible role of some Governing Board members in supporting someone who might be making a report
- Mechanisms for ensuring confidentiality
- Need to move the language around “immediate removal from the meeting without warning or refund” to section where hotel security is referenced
- Evolving the language around taking photos of presentations to indicate that photography is permitted unless denied by the presenter
- Application of the code to all ACSP conferences, workshops, and meetings
- Need to address commercial activities that promote products or services

**ACTION** – Dodd will update the code of conduct draft and share with the Governing Board for further review and a vote.

**ACTION** – Takahashi and Dodd will share a draft of the Code of Conduct along with the regional representative election ballot.

## V Executive Committee Reports President’s Report

W. Wu

Wu highlighted the three aspects of her Presidential Agenda:

- 1) diversity and globalization – there is a plan on developing a concept paper from committee on diversity as to what is underrepresentation, as well as Global Task Force’s report based on chairs survey and other data collection;
- 2) elevating public engagement – the focus is on working with APA and on the Values Statement; and
- 3) pushing curriculum into the future – the initial focus includes organizing non-reviewed sessions at the conference on curriculum development, including in collaboration with Lincoln Institute.

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

Wu highlighted efforts to enhance engagement of members, including broader promotion of opportunities to serve as track chairs and awards committee members. She noted that an annual call for participation will happen after each conference. Regional reps will also be recruited via this process, with additional support from the Nominating and Elections Committee. She noted that the Global Task Force had a high level of participation of department chairs in the survey it conducted and that we are anticipating significant engagement relative to the values statement.

#### President-Elect Report

M. Boarnet

Boarnet noted that a new JPER contract is in the works. He noted that 1121 abstracts were submitted for the 2018 ACSP conference in Buffalo. He noted that efforts remain under way to reestablish links with AESOP, including via joint sessions at the ACSP and AESOP conferences. Boarnet and Weiping organizing Big Ideas sessions for the 2018 conference including on planning and health with an international focus and another on big data and analytics. He noted that the Pre-Doctoral Workshop will be coordinated with the Committee on Diversity and will be held in conjunction with the 2018 conference. The PhD Workshop will be hosted by the UMass-Amherst in summer 2018. The Administrators Conference will be hosted by the University of Minnesota in March 2019. It was noted that an email vote to select Minnesota as the host was conducted prior to the Governing Board meeting, with approval of Minnesota as the host, with Slotterback abstaining. The Junior Faculty of Color Workshop will be held at Harvard University in summer 2018. The JPER Writing Workshop will be held at Rutgers University in summer 2018.

The group discussed whether the ACSP-AESOP collaboration can offer a structure for future enhanced collaboration with other associations. It was noted that Zorica Nedovic-Budic and Zenia Kotval have been important in moving between the two organizations and advancing collaboration.

#### Treasurer's Report

J. Grengs

Grengs noted that the budget will be discussed later in the meeting, but that there is a need for discussion about how to manage budget fluctuations, including one recent year "in the red" and an anticipated budget shortfall for the upcoming year. He indicated that the later discussion will include abbreviated discussions of smaller requests such as around interest group and committee requests, in favor of greater amount of time for more substantial discussion of how to address the budget shortfall. He noted that a new budget reporting mechanism has been developed to make it easier for the staff, Executive Committee, and Governing Board to understand the budget. He noted that we have now contracted with a new CPA, with capacities that better align with the growing complexity of the organization. The new CPA cost is approximately \$2000 higher than in previous years.

#### Secretary's Report

C. Slotterback

Slotterback noted that there is an interest in continuing to maintain or even enhance efforts to communicate with the Governing Board members between meetings. She indicated that contact information for chairs in each region are periodically sent to regional representatives. She deferred further comments to later reports.

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

**ACTION** – Slotterback will share an update email with Governing Board members following the Governing Board meeting with items that can be shared with chairs and/or members in each region.

## VI Regional Representatives Reports

Northeast

Hollander/Ramasubramanian

Hollander noted that there is an emerging interest around convening the northeast region program chairs at the ACSP conference. He discussed the potential APA idea for an academic division and noted that APA has decided not to take action at this point in time. APA has expressed interest in having the organization and engagement of academics emerge via a more grassroots effort. It was noted that the existing divisions can often provide a mechanism for academic engagement.

Southeast

Sanchez/Larsen

The Southeast representatives did not provide a report.

Midwest

Laurian/Morales

Laurian highlighted the issue of fluctuating enrollment and impacts of budgets. She indicated that funding for students is a key driver in students' selection of schools and the success of recruitment efforts.

Central

Troy/Van Zandt

Van Zandt noted that there has been little interaction in the Central region. She highlighted the impact of immigration policy and anti-immigrant attitudes as a barrier in recruiting international students. She also noted issues related to the conference tracks, including the need to review tracks including possibly considering a disaster planning and recovery and/or climate change related track. Troy inquired about the possibility of listing the schools in each region on the ACSP website.

**ACTION** – Dodd will update the website to clearly list schools by region.

West

Margerum/Lens

The West regional representatives were not in attendance.

## VII Evaluation of Operation

W. Wu, Moderator

Wu highlighted the expanded ACSP staff and the recent contract with White Picket Fence Productions, Inc. and shared details of the annual evaluation process and outcomes for the first evaluation conducted in early 2018. She noted the opportunity of the evaluation process to continue to refine staff support for the organization, identify areas for improvement, and highlight opportunities to continue to adapt to the changes in the organization.

The discussion highlighted a number of issues and questions including:

- Ways to support lower level staff in building capacity to diversify their tasks and skills
- How is the evaluation used in the contract renewal process – Wu noted that evaluation items are tied into key items in the contract and that next year’s contract renewal process will be informed by the evaluation.
- Are there annual priority goals that are set out? – Wu noted that some goals are included in evaluation document. She indicated that feedback from the Governing Board is welcome to inform future short and longer term goals.
- How is social media content generated? – Dodd described approaches used by staff to gather content from departments, members, etc.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with ACSP staff to update the Communications Guide documents for faculty and students and will share with Governing Board members.

## VIII Allied Organizations

APA [Box]

Monica Groh

Groh, Director of Emerging Professionals, provided an update on APA activities including the recent Academic Membership Task Force. APA will serve as a sponsor for the 2018 ACSP conference and will host a few sessions. APA recently changed its student membership structure to offer free memberships for students. APA has gained 3000 new student members, 500 greater than typical. The AICP Candidate Program has been successful with over 500 applicants. She recommended the opportunity to connect with the APA Ambassador Program as a way of reaching public audiences, especially children in primary and secondary schools. She noted that the report includes further detail.

The group discussed the previously explored idea of an academic division of APA. Groh described the task force recommendation related to a division and noted that further discussion was needed among a larger group of ACSP members in order to gather feedback on the value of a division. She noted that academics could start out as an interest group to assess interest before moving forward as a possible division. She also indicated that academics can get engaged with existing divisions. The possibility of an ACSP representative to the APA governance system (e.g. Division Council) was also highlighted and Groh noted that this idea is currently under discussion within APA.

A question was raised as to whether the academic membership would be expanded to non-planning academic programs. Groh noted that this has been approved by the APA Board, but it has not been implemented. Further work is anticipated by Fall 2018.

The issue of CM credit input for ACSP was highlighted. Dodd noted that 38 hours of staff time is needed to input the ACSP conference sessions for credit. Groh indicated that she would follow up as to possible improvements to this system.

Wu thanked APA for its support of ACSP, including sponsorship, as well as more broadly. She noted that the ACSP and APA leadership will meet for further discussion on April 22.

AICP

Glenn Larsen

Knight acknowledged Shonagh Merits' retirement and Johnson welcomed Jaclyn Hade as the new PAB Associate Director. Knight noted the need for a new ACSP appointee to PAB and indicated support for reappointment of Zenia Kotval. He noted that three programs have volunteered to complete reaccreditation under the updated criteria and the new online system. He noted continued efforts to train site visitors at the APA conference and via new online resources. He thanked ACSP for its support for PAB's new fee structure, which will start in 2019. He highlighted PAB's current use of reserves to fund the online system and its current deficit budget. He referred to the new strategic plan for PAB and its focus on a culture of innovation for planning and the intent to create a new communications plan. He highlighted an APA conference session and a planned session at the 2018 ACSP conference focused on exploring the culture of innovation concept. Merits noted the new site visitor training format and content used at the APA conference this year, as well as the newly developed online offerings.

**ACTION** – Dodd will get materials/outcomes from the PAB culture of innovation session following the APA conference.

MOTION – Van Zandt moved to accept the PAB report, Takahashi seconded. The motion was approved.

## IX Student Representatives [Box/Action]

M. Wolfe/E. Masoomkhah

Wolfe provided a summary of the report. She noted that there has been a significant increase in students who have completed profiles on the ACSP website. She highlighted two 2017 conference workshops, including a Preparing for the Job Market and Publishing in Planning. She indicated an intent to continue with these workshops. She noted that the students continued to offer the Graduate Student Clinic Booth - which had strong interest among students and faculty. The students hosted a reception at the conference with over 100 attendees. The students manage the PhD Bowling League website and create an annual ACSP Student Bulletin and will continue to do so in the upcoming year.

Wolfe highlighted budget requests including:

- 1) Renewal for the student reception
- 2) Renewal of support for a student rep to attend the AESOP YA conference – Wolfe noted that she has attended the conference for the last two years with the intent to strengthen the relationship between ACSP and AESOP. She met with the YA conference coordination team to explore future collaboration.
- 3) Funds for ACSP student members to attend AESOP YA conference – Wolfe noted that this could function as an ACSP – AESOP Young Researchers Exchange. AESOP has conditionally approved funding for attendance of AESOP student members at the ACSP conference.
- 4) Waiving student abstract submission fees – Wolfe acknowledged the financial implications of this for ACSP. She noted an alternative option of integrating the submission fee into the registration fee for students who have abstracts that are accepted.



- 5) Providing a discounted registration rate for recent graduates who are not in tenure track positions – Wolfe highlighted the growth in “non-traditional” faculty positions and her consultation with Donna as to potential financial implications.

Masoomkhah expressed her interest in enhancing engagement of international students in ACSP.

Grengs summarized the Finance and Investments Committee’s recommendation on the student requests. The student reception and student rep to the AESOP YA conference expenditures are supported. Grengs indicated that the discounted registration rate would not be supported, especially due to the administrative difficulty of identifying who would qualify based on title and income. The waiver of student abstract submission fees is not supported due to a likely \$10,000 financial impact, agreement that the \$25 fee is already very low, the significance of a fee to deter frivolous submissions, and the lack of evidence that the abstract fee is a deterrent. The request for students other than ACSP student reps to travel to the AESOP YA conference is not supported by the Executive Committee. It is assumed that sending a student representative is accomplishing the objective of building connections between ACSP and AESOP. Laurian asked about whether ACSP might support student travel to AESOP YA in some amount less than the requested \$3,000. After some discussion, this issue was tabled.

MOTION – Hollander moved and Boarnet seconded a motion to accept the recommendation on 1, 2, 4, and 5. The motion was approved.

**X JPER Report** [\[Box\]](#)

C. Andrews/F. Popper

Andrews referred to the submitted report. He noted that journal submissions are up. Two special issues – TOD at Age 25 and Planning, Policing, and Prisons are planned. The acceptance rate is 25%, but the editors are emphasizing courteous and efficient responses to submissions. Andrews noted the need for additional pages for the journal. The journal is now preparing to publish abstracts in Spanish and Chinese and working with students to do the translation. The intent is to attract citations and submissions. Wu acknowledged the connection between an ACSP Big Ideas session and the Planning, Policing, and Prisons special issue. She noted that there is a hope that future big ideas sessions can be tied to future special issues.

**New contract 2018-2021** [\[Box\]](#)

M. Boarnet

Boarnet noted the upcoming end of the current five-year contract with Sage. It ends in December 2018. ACSP gave notice to Sage that we would not allow the contract to automatically renew. Boarnet explored options with Taylor and Francis (T&F), as well as Sage about possible contracts. T&F shared a full proposal in response to the inquiry. While the proposal was promising, there were concerns about the loss of subscribers associated with a move to a new publisher. Sage was also asked to submit a full proposal. ACSP consulted with a publishing consultant for further feedback on the two proposals. The consultant indicated that T&F could potentially generate an additional \$8k per year – but the Executive Committee’s assessment was that this was insufficient to justify the potential risk associated with a loss in subscribers. The consultant also noted that the T&F proposal may have gone so high in the revenue sharing proposal that a future reduction in service might be anticipated as a tradeoff. Acknowledging time and staff costs, it was determined that moving to new editors was not recommended. ACSP was able to negotiate with Sage for a higher revenue return rate this year

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*

(54% vs. 50%) and a more favorable clause related to automatic renewal (just 1 year auto-renew rather than 5). Boarnet is currently working with Sage on a new contract, including highlighting opportunities for more page space and reinvigorating their marketing efforts for the journal.

The discussion noted that more articles can be appealing to journals as they make more money from article downloads. It was noted that the new contract could allow for some growth in the number of pages by lengthening issues or adding issues. Boarnet noted that for the first time, JPER has a higher impact factor than JAPA.

## XI Interest Group Reports

FWIG [\[Box/Action\]](#)

P. Doan/A. Roberts

Grengs indicated that last year FWIG proposed to do a bias in the workplace study. The study was anticipated to be completed this spring, but the deadline has been extended to August 2018. The FWIG budget requests included AV support for the luncheon and emerging scholar travel scholarships are recommended. The operations request for buttons/stickers/etc. is not recommended for support by the Executive Committee.

MOTION – Van Zandt moved, Laurian seconded a motion to accept recommendations on FWIG budget. The motion was approved.

GPEIG [\[Box/Action\]](#)

A. Das/E. Ganapati

Grengs summarized and recommended a request for AV support of the luncheon. He indicated that support for student lunch tickets and operating expenses are not recommended by the Executive Committee for support.

MOTION – Hollander moved, Laurian seconded a motion to accept the recommendations on the GPEIG budget. The motion was approved.

POCIG [\[Box/Action\]](#)

S. Simpson/A. Greenlee

Grengs summarized and recommended budget requests for student travel scholarships and NCFDD scholarships for faculty development. He noted that there is no current Executive Committee recommendation for a POCIG request to support a POCIG strategic planning retreat. Grengs noted that a request for funds for a Practitioner Climate Survey is not recommended by the Executive Committee at this time, considering that a report on a previous study was not provided. The previous study is significantly behind schedule, but the report was delivered to the Executive Committee a few days prior to this Governing Board meeting. It was noted that POCIG has already reached out to APA to explore the possibility of the practitioner survey and are conducting some data collection at the APA conference. The discussion highlighted possibilities of restricting all funding to POCIG until the prior report is completed, providing a conditional approval of the funding. The discussion noted that a new process may be needed to set clearer expectations and deadlines related to the completion of ACSP-funded studies. The importance of accountability of interest groups and committees to meet expectations of funding requests was noted. The opportunity to separate the collaboration with APA on the practitioner

survey from the survey funding request was noted. The discussion highlighted a future opportunity to provide block grants to interest groups, perhaps based on number of members.

**ACTION** – Grengs will follow up with POCIG to set clear expectations for completion of their report by August 1.

**ACTION** – Grengs and Dodd will draft guidelines for all groups for funding requests for studies, addressing issues related to data access and sharing, IRB, timelines for submission, and holds on future funding pending delivery.

MOTION – Takahashi moved, Laurian seconded approval of recommendations on items 1, 2, 3, and 4 related to the POCIG request and support for collaboration with APA. The motion was approved with one nay.

## XII Standing Committees

Finance and Investment [\[Box\]](#)

J. Grengs

Grengs referenced the report in favor of later more detailed discussions.

## XIII Special Committees

Committee on Diversity [\[Box/Action\]](#)

J. Lowe/C. Giusti

Wu summarized recommended funding including for the 2019 Junior Faculty of Color Workshop and 2019 Pre-Doctoral Workshop for Students of Color. Funding for the CV book is not recommended by the Executive Committee, as the previously awarded funding was designated as the last funding allocation for this activity. The funding request for the Administrators Conference speakers is not recommended by the Executive Committee, as speakers will be funded as part of the Administrators Conference budget.

MOTION – Hollander moved, Larsen seconded approval for recommendations on support for the two workshops. The motion was approved.

Communications Committee [\[Box/Action\]](#)

C. Slotterback

Slotterback noted that the committee has been largely inactive since the ACSP conference. Outstanding communications priorities include an experts database and media relationships, which have been explored a bit with APA. Further work is needed. One additional communications priority is the creation of a syllabi library, which has been explored preliminarily relative to the functionality of the ACSP website. Slotterback noted that strategic and oversight role of the committee relative to ACSP's website and social media activities. The committee informed the creation of the UNIVERse platform and ACSP blog, both of which have seen limited engagement. Considering ACSP's now greater staff capacity, Slotterback noted that the Communications Committee is no longer needed.

The discussion highlighted opportunities for ACSP and ACSP member authored editorials and opportunities for press releases related to key issues. The values statement could provide greater guidance for topics and focus.

MOTION – Van Zandt moved, Grengs seconded a motion to dissolve the Special Committee on Communications. The motion was approved.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will work with ACSP staff to identify prospects for a syllabi library on the ACSP website.

#### XIV Task Forces

Lincoln /ACSP Curriculum Innovation Award Task Force [\[Box\]](#) C. Slotterback

Slotterback indicated that the ongoing collaboration with the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy has been very productive. The task force includes members representing the Lincoln Institute and ACSP. The Task Force has administered an awards process for ten \$1,000 case awards and three \$10,000 curriculum awards. The Task Force recommended 17 case awards to the Lincoln Institute President and received \$7,000 in additional funding to support them. The Task Force has now made recommendations for three curriculum awards, plus an additional backup recommendation. A decision from the Lincoln Institute President is expected in early May.

Global Planning Education Task Force [\[Box/Action\]](#) G. Shatkin

Grengs summarized the request for additional funding to complete the ongoing research.

MOTION – Hollander moved, Larsen seconded to accept the recommendation for funding. The motion was approved.

Awards Policy Task Force [\[Box/Action\]](#) S. Van Zandt

Van Zandt highlighted ongoing discussions of the task force including recommendations for a consistent application process, consistent deadlines for awards, creation of a rising scholar award that acknowledges the differences in institutions in terms of research or teaching focus, and the possibility of breaking down the distinguished educator award into two awards – one for teaching excellence and one for research excellence.

Van Zandt highlighted a recommendation that the new teaching excellence award be named after David Godschalk. The discussion noted the possibility of fundraising to endow the award in his name.

Grengs summarized the budget recommendation by the Executive Committee to support the Rising Scholar Award, but with no funding to support the new awards for teaching excellence, book awards, and travel awards.

The possibility of limiting submissions to up to one per school was discussed but it was not recommended to limit in this way.

MOTION – Boarnet moved, Grengs seconded, to approve the Rising Scholar Award, with no funding associated with it. The motion was approved.

**XV Strategic Issues (II)**

W. Wu, Moderator

Outlook for ACSP Finances [\[Box\]](#)

J. Grengs

Grengs offered a summary of ACSP's budget gap. He noted that the FY 18-19 budget expects a shortfall of \$131,000. Sources of the gap include the \$82k management contract and various new or higher expenses (e.g. awards luncheon, JPER managing editor, AV equipment, legal fees, conference app). He framed the need for a discussion on how we might fill the gap. He noted three options.

- 1) Increase membership dues – Grengs noted a proposal to increase the membership fee for schools by \$50 and increase capitation by \$10 per faculty member, as well as eliminate Affiliate and Corresponding member categories. Possibilities of increasing the JPER subscription fee might be possible. Dodd noted that membership dues have not been increased in 19 years.
- 2) Increase Administrators Conference registration – Grengs noted the high value of the conference and anticipated low impact on demand associated with a higher registration fee.
- 3) Work with staff on revenue generating efforts such as sponsorships.

Grengs also highlighted the Guide as a revenue source historically. Wu noted that any increase in dues could be pushed out by a year or two in order to allow schools to anticipate the increase and to allow time for ACSP to further demonstrate value to members. The discussion noted that the fees could be increased even more and could go into effect sooner, especially considering that fees have not been increased in nearly 20 years. Relative to the affiliate and corresponding member categories, Takahashi shared feedback from the Institutional Governance committee relative to potential impacts on governance. The group highlighted the possibility of interest group membership fees as a means of generating revenue. The group discussed strategies for communicating about the fee increase, including engaging the Governing Board members in sharing information with chairs in their regions. The possibility of phasing in a fee increase each year was noted. In general there was consensus that an increase in base and capitation fees be pursued.

**ACTION** – Grengs will prepare a proposal for a dues increase for discussion at the Fall Governing Board meeting.

C) ACSP Guide [\[Box\]](#)

W. Wu

Wu recapped prior discussions about the ACSP Guide. She noted that ACSP has connected with Planetizen about possibilities for collaboration, as well as with APA related to data collection. She summarized three options:

- 1) Co-branded survey tool/instrument with Planetizen – would include questions related to undergrad and PhD programs in survey instrument, no costs to ACSP
- 2) Licensing (with modification) Planetizen's online survey instrument - \$5k fee plus professional services charge to ACSP

- 3) Limited Guide on ACSP faculty and researchers – collect data on faculty and researchers during annual membership renewal process, could charge schools to be in the Guide

Wu noted that staff time would be required for each of these options, particularly for preparing the searchable database and printable PDF. The discussion noted concerns about joining Planetizen including their openness in sharing data.

Bruce Stiftel highlighted the work of the ACSP Guide task force. He indicated that the task force agrees that restoring publication of some of form of Guide-like data is a priority. He summarized interactions with Planetizen thus far and the advantages and disadvantages of the various options. The possibility of linking the Guide to membership was highlighted. Other issues noted include the difficulty of designing a good survey, potential competition between the ACSP and Planetizen Guides, the workload required for us to collect our own data, concern about partnering with a for-profit company, prospects for putting limitations on how Planetizen uses data collected in a partnership, and concerns by APA about ACSP partnering with Planetizen as a for-profit company. Stiftel noted that the biggest downside of a partnership is that we would be collaborating with an organization that ranks our schools. The group did a straw poll to assess interest in the various options, which revealed the greatest opposition to option number 1.

**ACTION** – Wu will follow up with Chris Steins regarding the potential to work with Planetizen via a licensing agreement.

#### **XVI New or Unfinished Business/General Orders**

W. Wu

Fall Governing Board Meeting, Wednesday, October 24, 2018  
ACSP-AESOP MOU

MOTION – Hollander moved, Van Zandt seconded a motion to approve the ACSP-AESOP MOU that offers free registration for the association presidents at each other's' conferences. The motion was approved.

#### Student recruitment pipeline and STEM designation

Van Zandt recommended the formation of a task force to look into this issue and gather information for member schools and identify opportunities to collaborate with APA. The discussion pointed to a connection of STEM designation and CIP Codes to the broader issue of student recruitment and funding, as well as broader visibility of the profession. Members include Grengs, Laurian, Masoomkhah, and two members of Committee on the Academy. Dawn Jourdan was noted as an additional possibility.

**ACTION** – Slotterback will connect with the Committee on the Academy to plan for an Administrators Conference session on STEP designation for the urban planning field.

**ACTION** – Dodd will include enrollment related questions in the annual chair's survey.

**ACTION** – Wu will refine a charge and invite Student Recruitment and Enrollment Task Force members.

MOTION – There was a motion to create a Task Force on Student Recruitment and Enrollment. Motion was approved. (*Note from Secretary: the motion and second were unfortunately not captured in the minutes*)

## XVII Adjourn [ACTION]

W. Wu

Van Zandt moved to adjourn, Hollander seconded. Motion was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

Following the meeting, an email vote was conducted for final approval of the budget. While individual items were discussed and approved at the meeting, there was not a final vote on the budget nor on one remaining student representatives' request that had earlier been tabled. The details for the budget vote and final vote tallies are noted below.

### Summary for Motion 1

This past Saturday (April 21), the governing board approved \$2,000 to continue supporting one ACSP Student Governing Board Representative to attend the AESOP Young Academics conference. The student representatives requested an additional \$3,000 to support up to three other students to attend as well. The Executive Committee did not recommend this additional \$3,000 of funding. A Governing Board member asked whether we might provide some amount less than \$3,000 to support another student, perhaps the other of the two Student Governing Board Representatives, in addition to the one student representative that will attend the conference. The discussion was tabled and remains unresolved. In light of the budget discussion that followed, including proposals to cover the budget shortfall, the Executive Committee recommends not approving this additional funding.

### Respond to Motion 1

- 5 voted Yay – I approve the funding for additional students to attend AESOP Young Academics Conference.
- 7 voted Nay – I do not approve the proposed funding for additional students to attend AESOP YA.
- 1 opted to Abstain

Motion 1 fails.

### Summary for Motion 2

The Governing Board engaged in a long and productive discussion about the budget. The attached pdf document summarizes the decisions we made (the unresolved issue of item 1 above is noted in bold). The attached spreadsheet shows the full budget, and includes notes indicating key decisions we made.

### Respond to Motion 2

- 12 voted Yay – I approve the proposed budget for the Fiscal Year 2018-2019
- None voted Nay – I do not approve the proposed budget for the Fiscal Year 2018-2019
- 1 opted to Abstain

Motion 2 passes.

*Anything indicated in red is still tentative or not yet received. Items in blue can be found in the Box folder for this meeting.*