



GOVERNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Fall Meeting ~ October 23, 2019, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM
Hyatt Regency, Regency FGH, Greenville, South Carolina

Governing Board members in attendance: Sandeep Agrawal (Canadian Liaison, ex officio), Awais Azhar (Student Representative), Marlon Boarnet, Mike Boswell (incoming Treasurer, non-voting), Renia Ehrenfreucht (incoming Regional Representative, non-voting), Ed Goetz (PAB, ex officio), Joe Grengs, Stacy Harwood (incoming Regional Representative, non-voting), Justin Hollander, Zenia Kotval (PAB, ex officio), Lucie Laurian, Richard Margerum, Ellie Massoomkah (Student Representative), Richard Milgrom (Canadian Liaison, ex officio), Zorica Nedovic-Budic (incoming Regional Representative, non-voting), Francis Owusu (GPEAN, ex-officio), Connie Ozawa (PAB, ex officio), Laxmi Ramasubramanian, Sherry Ryan, Tom Sanchez, Charles Santo, Siddartha Sen, Carissa Slotterback, Shannon Van Zandt, Stacey White (incoming Secretary, non-voting), Weiping Wu

Others in attendance: Joel Albizo (APA), Kurt Christianson (APA), Jaclyn Hade (PAB), Emel Ganapati (GPEIG), Cecelia Giusti (Diversity Committee), Deborah Lawler (AICP), Jesmarie Johnson (PAB), Yaminah Noonoo (APA), Mike Smart (JPER), Praveen Maghelal (GPEIG)

Staff in attendance: Donna Dodd (Executive Director)

01 Call to Order & Introductions [\[Action\]](#) W. Wu

Wu called the meeting to order at 8:10 am.

02 Approval of Agendas W. Wu

A) Consent Agenda [\[Action\]](#)

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Committee on the Academy [Box] | D. Jourdan |
| 2. Doctoral Committee [Box] | R. Norton |
| 3. Faculty Mentoring Committee [Box] | K. McClure |
| 4. Nominating & Elections Committee [Box] | L. Takahashi |
| 5. PAB Advisory Committee [no report] | B. Nock |
| 6. Review and Appraisal Committee [Box] | M. Boarnet |
| 7. 2020 Conference Focus Event Task Force [Box] | G. Sandoval |

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

Wu described the organization of the agenda, including both administrative and strategic discussion items.

MOTION – Van Zandt moved approval of the consent and regular agendas, Boarnet seconded. The motion was approved.

Wu referenced the minutes available in Box.

MOTION – Hollander moved approval of the minutes, Boarnet seconded. The motion was approved.

04 Executive Committee Reports [verbal]

A) President's Report

W. Wu

Wu described the State of the Association report, noting its intent to reflect engagement on committees, conference activities, memberships, and more. Wu referenced the recent dues increase and noted that all school members have renewed their memberships. She indicated that three new task forces and one special committee have been established. First is the Outreach and Engagement Task Force chaired by Hollander, with a focus on how ACSP can connect externally to promote the field of planning and pursue institutional research. Second is a task force chaired by Gerardo Sandoval to develop a special event at the 2020 Toronto conference focused on racial equity in planning. Third is a task force on conference location policy chaired by Slotterback. A special committee has also been established on global planning education, as a follow up to the work of the global planning task force and with a focus on implementation of the global planning task force report. The special committee, co-chaired by Lesli Hoey and Yingling Fan, will focus on global planning education and international students, among other issues. She noted that APA continues this year as a major sponsor of the conference and noted that ACSP has signed an MOA with AESOP to foster continued collaboration. Wu noted that Ramasubramanian has moved out of the Northeast Region and that she has appointed Lisa Servon to serve the remainder of her term.

B) President-Elect Report

M. Boarnet

Boarnet provided further information about the racial equity “conference within a conference” or “focus event” planned for the 2020 conference. He described the continuation of joint ACSP-AESOP sessions at the conference. He referenced the transition of JPER editorship from Rutgers to Texas A&M. Boarnet noted that the enrollment task force will share a report at the Business Meeting on recent findings related to the possibility of a STEM designation for planning programs. He previewed that the task force will report that STEM designation has not been found to increase enrollment and that achieving the designation is very uncertain, considering interaction with the federal government. Boarnet noted three areas of focus in his presidential agenda – innovation in curricula in accredited degrees and other degrees, role of climate change – ACSP as a resource for members in terms of research and education, and continuing work on equity and diversity. He referenced a handout in all conference packets that summarizes conference activities and content intended to intentionally address LGBTQ and broader inclusion issues in the conference. He acknowledged the substantial role of the interest groups and local host in contributing to this work.

C) Treasurer's Report

J. Grengs

Grengs previewed later discussions on social impact investing, reserve funds, and the recent dues increase.

D) Secretary's Report

C. Slotterback

Slotterback noted that ACSP is continuing its focus on communication, via its website, weekly emails, and social media. She encouraged ongoing feedback related to the website. She noted that the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy has continued its sponsorship of ACSP and the curriculum innovation awards. She noted that in spring 2019, the joint task force of Lincoln Institute staff and ACSP members, selected 10 \$2000 case award winners and three \$7000 curriculum innovation award winners. RFPs for the 2020 awards will be released soon. Slotterback noted that she will be chair the Conference Location Task Force, which is charged with developing a policy or decision making process.

ACTION – Slotterback will share the Lincoln Institute – ACSP Curriculum Innovation Awards RFP with the interest groups.

05 Strategic Issues (I)

W. Wu, Moderator

Wu introduced the strategic issues discussion, noting a focus in the agenda on four key issues, conference location, code of conduct, structure of regional representatives, and STEM designation for planning.

A) Task Force on Conference Location

C. Slotterback

Slotterback highlighted the background document available in Box and shared in advance of the meeting. She provided a brief summary of conference location issues associated with the travel ban and possible location change for the 2019 Greenville conference, including those from prior Governing Board conversations and a member survey. She noted the intentional engagement of interest group representatives and one of the Canadian Liaisons on the task force. She also noted that further feedback from the membership would be gathered at a listening session to be held at the conference. She posed four questions for the discussion:

1. How can ACSP ensure that its future conference location decisions are consistent with the [ACSP Values Statement](#)?
2. What are the most important factors that ACSP should consider as it makes decisions about conference locations, including but not limited to geography?
3. Are there interim measures that we should apply for the planned conferences in Toronto and Miami?
4. How important is the local host model as we consider the future of ACSP conferences?

Dodd provided background on conference attendance, indicating that 2019 Greenville attendance is at about 1,000, whereas as 2018 Buffalo was 1,200 and 2017 Denver was 1,100. Boarnet reported that he has heard from many California colleagues that they are not attending for financial and/or moral reasons. Dodd indicated that a large number of the approximately 100 papers pulled from the conference due to non-registration were from California students and faculty. Boswell indicated that the travel ban has been interpreted differently by universities in California, noting example from Cal Poly San Luis Obispo where it is possible to travel with

non-state allocated funds or with Provost approval. Azhar noted that many California students were unable to attend this year's conference. Wu described the process by which we have previously selected local hosts and locations. She noted that we have not released a RFP for local hosts in several years since the Governing Board previously selected a slate of hosts through 2021. A RFP was released in early 2019 and two responses have been received. The proposers have been notified that decisions are on hold through spring 2020. One of the proposers is in a state that is currently on the CA travel ban list.

Key discussion issues are noted below:

- Travel bans and other state policies:
 - o ACSP values statement and mission should lead our decision making, rather than state travel bans
 - o ACSP is not well positioned to get into the of state policy discussions related to travel bans
 - o Process in 2005 South Carolina conference location issue was different than 2019 travel ban issue, as ACSP should have anticipated that confederate flag issue would be problematic
 - o Need to look into cancellation insurance policies that address state policy changes that impact the viability of the conference
 - o State policy should not shape our location decisions – we can assess issues and then develop session content that highlights “problematic politics”
 - o Location policy could say that we will not move the conference once the location is selected
 - o Cities often have different policies than states – could look more at city policies in selecting locations
 - o A policy that limits locations would be antithetical to planning values, especially considering the importance of context in our field
- Local host model:
 - o RFP for local hosts could more explicitly incorporate content from the ACSP values statement
 - o Should consider whether local host model is needed, especially as local host sessions and tours have been decreased
 - o RFP should include an assessment of local conditions
 - o If local host model is not used, state APA chapters and nearby planning schools could assist with tours and locally-focused sessions
 - o Loss of local tours would be unfortunate – it is fun for local hosts to do this
 - o Local host opportunity offers a community-build experience for schools
 - o Hosting is expensive and requires a lot of work
 - o Hosting creates visibility for schools
 - o Some member schools are already unable to host due to their location in small, less accessible locations
 - o Rather than creating a new policy, RFP for local hosts could offer a framework for location decisions by gathering information about local policies and issues and how we might engage with them during the conference (e.g. Toronto – racial equity, Miami – climate change)
- Conference access and travel impacts:
 - o Virtual participation should be considered
 - o Possibility of creating an additional spring virtual conference

- Virtual participation would work well for presenting, but less so for full participation
- Virtual participation could result in loss of travel funding if schools see it as a less expensive option
- Some schools are starting to limit travel based on concerns about greenhouse gas impacts
- Virtual conference would result in participants missing other important conference features (e.g. job market, task force meetings)
- Need to continue to find ways to engage with global colleagues as well, including with AESOP and World Planning Schools Congress
- Possible need to limit conferences to cities with hub airports
- Conference venues:
 - Issues may arise with hotel chains
 - ACSP membership and prospective local hosts would benefit from know more about city and venue size/availability constraints
- Other:
 - ACSP is already behind on many conference related issues – e.g. pronouns on nametags, gender neutral restrooms
 - Potential attendees are concerned about personal comfort and safety in some locations
 - Interest groups could have a role in reviewing local host proposals

ACTION – Dodd will research the availability of conference cancellation insurance options that would cover conditions associated with a state policy change.

ACTION – Dodd will provide a list of minimum standards for host city and venue sizes required for annual conferences, as well as a list of member schools that would be precluded from hosting based on these standards.

ACTION – Slotterback and Dodd will research the costs and viability of virtual conference access.

B) Code of Conduct [\[Box\]](#)

C. Slotterback

Slotterback provided an overview of the current ACSP Code of Conduct, which was approved by the ACSP Governing Board in 2017. She indicated that when individuals sign up for the conference – they indicate their agreement to comply with the Code of Conduct. She noted that thinking is evolving relative to codes of conduct and issues of sexual harassment, and that FWIG has expressed concerns that the Code is not strong enough, particularly as it relates to reporting and processes for removal of individuals from the conference. She referenced the discussion guide provided in advance of the meeting, noting an interest in discussing possible updates to address current thinking on sexual harassment, clarity on removal of individuals reported for unacceptable behavior, the interface of ACSP and the institutions represented by conference attendees, and alignment with the ACSP Values Statement.

Per a question about responses to the online form and the availability of volunteered companion staff to support conference attendees, Wu indicated that neither had been used at the 2018 conference. The discussion highlighted the following issues:

- Enforcement mechanisms are unclear

- Hotel security may be relevant in some circumstances but not in others
- Intersection with home institution of offender needs to be addressed
- Possibility of engaging a paid ombudsperson to receive and respond to violations of Code of Conduct, including establishing a history of violations
- Need clarity on what happens when reporting occurs and what are the implications of a Code violation
- “your employer” language in Code of Conduct is ambiguous
- Opportunity to build awareness and support for bystander intervention
- Title 9 is not relevant for attendees from outside of the US
- Current FWIG Google spreadsheet list of “bad apples” was acknowledged and concerns about potential libel issues noted, as well as opportunity for ACSP leadership to talk with individuals on the list
- Possibility of adding home institution Title 9 contacts as part of registration
- Possibility of suspending someone’s conference registration as a means of removing them from the conference
- Administrators Conference training on sexual harassment was helpful and could be part of regular conference schedule, though it was acknowledged that even at the Administrators Conference, a substantial portion of attendees did not participate in the training
- Should we be concerned about bad behaviors beyond those expressed at the conference?
- Concern about having an ACSP member serve in ombudsperson role
- Emphasis that investigations of sexual harassment are long and complex, and that due process and fact finding take time
- There is a lot of room to create a more inclusive culture
- How do we address behavior that occurs outside of the conference?
- Even people who behave badly have rights
- Code of Conduct is a small tool in broader work around faculty conduct, including related to sexual harassment.

It was acknowledged that edits to the Code of Conduct may be necessary.

ACTION – Slotterback will review the discussion feedback and consult with the Executive Committee on possible next steps related to the Code of Conduct.

06 Regional Representatives Reports [\[verbal\]](#)

Sanchez reported three issues on behalf of the Southeast Representatives: conference location, PAB online reporting system, and need for data collection and reporting on graduates of our programs. The latter issue could help generate data for marketing the planning profession. Ozawa indicated that PAB has some data from schools that do alumni surveys, but does not comprehensively compile it. The possibility of releasing data was highlighted, though the challenges related to non-standardized surveys was noted.

Margerum, on behalf of the Western Representatives, reported on the Berkeley students’ letter related to conference location that was shared in advance of the meeting. Western schools remain interested in student diversity and retention and ACSP role in public commentary.

Hollander reported on behalf of Northeast Representatives, noting feedback related to conference location. He confirmed that regional representatives will sit with schools from their regions at the Business Meeting.

07 Student Representatives [\[Box\]](#)

E. Masoomkhah/A. Azhar

Azhar reported that the conference will include three student workshops related to job market, publishing, and teaching as an ally – LGBTQ inclusive classrooms. He noted that students will participate in the Presidential Session on LGBTQ research in planning and that the annual student bulletin just came out. Masoomkhah noted that the student job market clinic will be held again this year, with over 30 students participating. She noted that discussions are underway about evolving the student reception into more purposeful activities related to the conference and beyond. Wu noted that there were over 50 student volunteers at the conference, including many doctoral students.

08 Standing Committees

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

J. Grengs

Grengs noted that we have moved a portion of ACSP funds into socially responsible investments as of July 1, per the new policy. He noted an intent to track performance in coordination with the financial advisor to inform future decisions to increase the allocation to socially responsible investments. He noted a further change in investments, moving some funds from CDs to mutual funds. He indicated that the CDs have had low performance of less than 2%, relative to mutual funds that have been performing well.

B) Institutional Governance [\[Box\]](#)

L. Takahashi

Wu summarized the committee report, indicating that the committee has followed through on amendments to the bylaws, informed by a membership vote that occurred in the spring. She noted that the Governing Board will continue to discuss the structure of regional representatives.

C) National Conference Committee [\[Box\]](#)

G. Sandoval

Wu noted that the committee had considered a request from the Executive Committee to reduce the length of the conference, with a general sentiment that the current length should stay. Relative to eliminating Sunday from the conference, travel benefits were noted for non-hub airport locations. The possibility of shifting the conference to all weekdays was noted. Dodd reported that Sunday sessions tend to attract good audiences, with 15-20 attendees each. Wu noted that we continue to experiment with changes in the conference.

09 State of Association

W. Wu

Wu referenced the summary document, highlighting the efforts ACSP has taken to increase engagement, including via the Call for Volunteers. Over 300 people are involved in committees, task forces, the Governing Board, and as track chairs. She noted that we will continue the annual chairs survey. She noted strategic alliances including with the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy,

and a new agreement with the Kauffman Foundation to offer awards for best papers in planning and entrepreneurship. Wu noted that a move away from the local host model for the conference could create more opportunities for schools to sponsor the conference.

10 Allied Organizations

A) PAB [\[Box/Action\]](#)

C. Ozawa/J. Johnson

Ozawa highlighted key points from the report. First, she noted that board member transitions including departure of Bruce Knight and Pauletta Brown Bracy, to be replaced respectively by David Salazar and Dawn Terkla (Tufts University). She noted that Boarnet will be charged with appointing a new ACSP appointee to PAB next year. She referenced the PAB Task Force on Innovation and Communication in Planning Education will host a session on the value of accreditation at this year's conference and previously hosted a session at the APA conference. She noted changes in CHEA accreditation standards, which will have impacts on information provided on PAB's website. It will now be required that some descriptions of accreditation decisions (including standards partially or not met) for individual schools be posted publicly. Ozawa and Johnson explained that "not met" and "partially met" language will not be used, but rather language will be created to reflect that PAB has requested more information from the school related to these items. PAB is overhauling the annual report template, which will be shared at the program administrator information session. Johnson noted that a draft will be available soon, as well as a training webinar. She noted that a non-binary gender category has been added to the report form.

Ozawa noted that work is ongoing related to student learning outcomes and student/faculty diversity, as these are the accreditation standards that continue to represent the biggest challenges for schools. Johnson referenced the pilot with Jura to facilitate online accreditation self-study reports. She indicated that the company went out of business, thus creating challenges for schools in the accreditation process. Johnson noted that PAB is seeking an online accreditation management system that is more established and is doing so informed by feedback on the prior system. She indicated that the new system will likely be more expensive than the prior one, but it is anticipated that recent increases in dues should cover costs. A question was raised related to how to facilitate greater data aggregation, reporting, and sharing. Johnson noted that these issues are priorities as PAB seeks a new vendor. Relative to changing CHEA standards, it was acknowledged schools would be able to provide a response to standards not met and that the intent was to provide a history of accreditation decisions going forward, rather than posting prior accreditation decisions. There was a discussion about concerns about PAB compliance related to CHEA reporting of accreditation decisions and whether standards are met. Issues were noted related to:

- Will unmet standards be perceived as an indicator program quality?
- Will indication of many schools not meeting student diversity standards further contribute to lack of diversity in our programs?
- Can PAB report only unmet standards rather than including partially met?

MOTION –Grengs moved to accept the PAB report, Santos seconded. The motion was approved.

B) APA/AICP [\[Box\]](#)

K. Christiansen/D. Lawlor/J. Albizo/Y. Noonoo

Christiansen highlighted recent changes at APA, including starting his term at the beginning of 2019. He described the APA Executive Director transition and introduced Joel Albizo, the new APA Executive Director, who started in April 2019. He introduced Yaminah Noonoo, who will focus on student and academic connections. He noted that David Rouse retired, indicating that Petra Gerardo will take over as research director. She has a focus on sustainability, smart cities, and leveraging new technologies. He referenced equity, diversity, and inclusion efforts, including a new APA plan around these issues. He noted that APA has updated its mission to focus more on people – making great communities for all, versus making great communities happen. APA recently adopted its first Planning for Equity Policy Guide this year. He indicated that APA is shifting its governance and decision making approach, including a stronger focus on strategy. Artificial intelligence and planning has been identified as a strategic priority area for the current year. A question was highlighted related to APA’s engagement with climate change. Albizo indicated that AICP is looking at a targeted CM credit focused on climate. He noted a focus on climate change in the research department as well

Lawlor noted that the AICP Candidate Program is going well, with over 1,700 enrolled. She noted a 61% AICP exam pass rate for candidates, just under the overall pass rate of 66%. Program directors will be surveyed later this year to identify program promotion best practices. She noted that member school faculty can now audit the AICP exam at a low cost, in order to learn more about the exam to inform their teaching and curricula. She indicated that new CM credits are available for authoring activities.

C) GPEAN [\[Box\]](#)

F. Owusu

Owusu indicated that the annual GPEAN meeting occurred in Venice in summer 2019. At the meeting, new leaders were elected. He noted the importance of travel funds to support ACSP participation in GPEAN. He noted that the World Planning Schools conference will be held in Lisbon on July 5-9, 2021. They are seeking track co-chair nominations and invitations related to this role will come out soon. The intent is to have all of the GPEAN member association presidents serve on a panel. He noted that GPEAN is working on the seventh edition of the *Dialogues* publication and is soliciting two papers from ACSP.

D) Canadian Liaisons

R. Milgrom/S. Agrawal

Milgrom noted that Canada has not had a planning journal since 2005, but a new journal is being created. He noted that ACUPP has established standards for certification for academics and that they are updating the competencies for the profession in Canada. He noted an interest in ongoing conversations regarding integration of ACUPP and ACSP as a North American organization. He indicated the possibility for ACSP and ACUPP to connect jointly at the Toronto conference. Christiansen noted an intent to connect with the CIP leadership during the Toronto conference.

11 Special Committees

A) Committee on Diversity [\[4 files in Box/Action\]](#)

C. Giusti

Giusti referenced the 2018 Pre-Doctoral Workshop, which was held in conjunction with the annual conference. She noted that it worked well in terms of access to faculty who were already attending the conference. She noted that the committee is very interested in hosting the workshop in future. She highlighted outcomes of a survey of previous workshop participants,

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

which had a 40%+ response rate. The survey found that 20% of respondents have applied to doctoral programs in planning and related fields and that the workshop was very relevant in their decision making. She indicated that the survey suggests that the workshop is making a difference. She highlighted that Harvard once again hosted the Junior Faculty of Color Workshop, with 12 junior faculty members attended. The workshop was led by Abel Valenzuela and Lois Takahashi. She noted that most faculty who have attended the workshop are getting tenure. She referenced two sessions hosted at the 2019 Administrators Conference. She highlighted a 2018 conference workshop on promotion and a 2019 session on recruiting for diversity.

Wu referenced a funding request from the Diversity Committee and noted that a new funding model, based on integration of the Pre-Doctoral Workshop into the conference has been identified. She deferred discussion until later in the agenda.

B) Global Planning Education Committee [\[new/no report\]](#)

L. Hoey/Y. Fan

Wu noted that the committee will be chaired by Lesli Hoey and Yingling Fan. She indicated that the committee will be developing questions for inclusion on the chairs survey.

ACTION – Wu will follow up with the Global Planning Education Committee about questions for the chairs survey.

12 Task Forces

A) Task Force on Enrollment [\[2 files in Box\]](#)

C. Andrews/L. Laurian

Laurian noted the task force's focus on examining declining enrollments, strategies for addressing, and opportunities related to possible STEM designation. The task force met at the Administrators Conference and hosted a session.

She noted that masters and undergrad enrollments are declining over the past 5-10 years, especially relative to white and male students. The task force examined the intersection with the economic downturn and recovery and there appears to be an inconsistent intersection. She indicated that 10% of programs have lost 25% or more students. Previous survey data suggest that chairs are using a variety of strategies to address enrollment issues and that it is difficult to determine what is working since efforts are relatively new. Chairs survey feedback on the CIP code change was varied, with some already pursuing this and others strongly opposed. She noted that enrollments are down across many degree programs, though exceptions include health sciences and engineering. She indicated efforts to compare planning salaries to comparable fields. On the CIP code STEM designation, she indicated that architecture and landscape architecture have not yet been successful, despite significant effort. It was acknowledged that immigration laws create significant uncertainty related to international student enrollment. The task force is not offering a recommendation on a CIP code change. The task force highlighted opportunities to enhance promotion of planning field, costs of planning degree relative to salaries – including impacts on cost of the large number of required credits, comparisons in credit requirements for competing degrees, and opportunities to document salary impacts of accredited degrees and AICP certification.

B) Outreach and Engagement Task Force [\[new/no report\]](#)

J. Hollander

Hollander noted that the task force will have its first meeting at the conference. He described the focus on the task force on opportunities for engagement across schools, as well as availability of and access to data.

C) Lincoln/ACSP Curriculum Innovation Award [\[no report\]](#)

C. Slotterback

Slotterback referenced her earlier Secretary's report for details on the Lincoln Institute and ACSP collaboration. She reminded attendees about the Lincoln Institute-sponsored sessions, featuring award winners. She indicated that the Lincoln Institute has nearly finalized its online case repository and that the organization is very interested in broad dissemination of the teaching cases. Slotterback referred attendees to the soon to be released RFP. Ganapati noted that GPEIG also has an award for case studies, suggesting that there may be possible synergies with the Lincoln Institute awards.

ACTION – Slotterback will follow up with GPEIG about possible intersections between the GPEIG and Lincoln Institute case awards.

D) Kauffman Award Task Force [\[no report\]](#)

E. Malizia

Wu noted that there are student and faculty award winners this year.

13 JPER Report [\[Box\]](#)

C. Andrews/M. Smart

Smart noted that submissions are at 200 per year, with approximately 10% of submissions focused on planning education topics. Acceptance rate is approximately 1/3 desk reject, 1/3 reviewed and rejected, and 1/3 reviewed and accepted. Overall, the acceptance rate is up a bit with Rutgers editorial team. Roughly half of all submissions come from US and half from other countries, with the UK and Canada are the largest sources. The JPER impact factor continues to increase, with 2017 at 2.7, up from 1.7 in 2015. JPER is continuing the summer writing workshop and hosted 13 participants in 2019. Feedback on the workshop will be shared with Texas A&M so that they can be responsive. He noted that the number of reviewers that need to be invited to yield a sufficient number of reviewers is a growing concern. Two recent focus issues include TOD at 25 and prisons. The editorial team is continuing to investigate whether translating abstracts to Spanish and Chinese is helpful. They are working with Sage to track clicks on these abstracts and are working to determine whether this is an effective method of assessing value. Smart noted that there is a current backlog 121 articles, representing a three year wait for printing on paper. The editors are discussing this issue with Sage, including the possibility of an extra issue or adjusting the acceptance rate. Smart acknowledged the transition to Texas A&M, beginning in January 2020 with the new team taking new submissions. Per the backlog, Boarnet shared efforts to engage Sage on a permanent volume size increase. Smart noted that Sage is recommending a one or two time special or double issue to reduce the backlog and then decide on a permanent increase in issue page limit or volume size. Van Zandt noted that Sage is cautious about an increase, anticipating that the high rate of submissions and acceptances may not be able to be maintained. Van Zandt noted the possibility of moving book reviews online to accommodate one more article per issue. The discussion noted the impact of JAPA editorial issues on JPER submissions, as well as the different markets that the two journals serve, and

potential cost savings associated with eliminating the mailing of hard copies. It was acknowledged that the discussion items could offer negotiating points for the next contract.

Wu requested that the new editorial team put out a call for a new book review editor.

ACTION – Slotterback will follow up with the new JPER editorial team regarding the book review editor.

14 Interest Group Reports

A) FWIG [\[no report\]](#)

P. Doan/R. Tighe

Wu noted that a report was not submitted. She noted that FWIG has played a key role in organizing a number of special sessions at the conference.

B) GPEIG [\[Box\]](#)

E. Ganapati/P. Maghelal

Ganapati noted GPEIG's efforts to make the group more inclusive and democratic, via bylaw updates and changes to decision making structures/processes. GPEIG conducted a logo competition and has selected a new logo. They also recently conducted a survey of the GPEIG membership to better understand who their members are and what they are interested in. Top interests include international planning, economic development, and planning theory. They will be creating a member directory on the GPEIG website and recently shared new resources related to IRBs that can be used in other countries. Maghelal described an effort to identify planning associations around the world, including areas that are not represented by a planning association. GPEIG has started a global planning education committee. He summarized GPEIG awards and winners. Ganapati highlighted efforts to connect further with other ACSP interest groups, including a co-sponsored session with FWIG and POCIG.

C) POCIG [\[Box\]](#)

W. Lung-Amam/S. Simpson/I. Garcia

Giusti reported on behalf of POCIG. She highlighted POCIG's study of climate for students. A key finding is that those from underrepresented groups are more likely to perceive planning program/school climate as unwelcome. The survey also highlighted concerns that curricula do not address diversity and inclusion and that there are concerns of lack of diversity among faculty. She highlighted the POCIG business meeting and planned sessions at the conference, as well as the very successful CV book. She noted the close collaboration between the Committee on Diversity and POCIG.

15 Strategic Issues (II)

W. Wu, Moderator

A) Bylaws Changes – Regional Representatives

Wu introduced the discussion, highlighting prior issues including efforts to accomplish better representation across types and sizes of programs. Boswell, a member of the Institutional Governance Committee, noted previously highlighted concerns that regional representatives do not represent the range of interests in the association. Wu noted potential representation categories based on R1, non-R1, and minority-serving. Other options relate to degree programs offered, including PhD, master's, and undergraduate degrees. Among ACSP member programs, the distribution is as follows:

Bachelor's 42

Master's 82

PhD 38

R1 and R2 about even split

Minority serving 7-8

Issues and questions highlighted in the discussion include:

- Current regional representation structure offers opportunity to build community among schools in the regions
- There are no ACSP issues that are regional in nature
- What are distinguishing factors among groups of schools? – e.g. is having a masters distinguishing
- Representatives would not be able to distinguish representation if they have multiple programs
- Individual member numbers are growing and are not represented on the Board
- At-large representatives could work with a strong nominating committee
- Corresponding and affiliate members should have a representation on the Board
- Minority serving institutions should be called out as a priority group
- International members should have representation
- Interest groups have representation, though they may evolve over time and could create continuity challenges

Consensus emerged that the current regional representative model is insufficient. The group did a straw poll to assess support for five potential options:

Current regional representative model – 2 votes

All at large representatives – 2 votes

5 at large, 5 regional representatives – 6 votes

5 at large, 5 categorical representatives – 13 votes

5 categorical representatives, 5 regional representatives – 15 votes

It was recommended that the Institutional Governance Committee develop structures based on options 4 and 5.

ACTION – Wu will follow up with the Institutional Governance Committee to ask that they develop proposed regional representative structures for (1) 5 at large + 5 categorical, and (2) 5 categorical and 5 regional.

B) STEM

Wu offered background information, including information from the 2018 chairs survey that indicated that seven programs had switched and over 20 were considering switching. She noted prior discussions about the possibility of an ACSP effort to transition the CIP code for planning discipline to a STEM designation. She indicated that programs that have switched their CIP codes have not seen meaningful increases in enrollment and she described challenges faced by AIA and ASLA related to pursuing a CIP change.

The discussion highlighted the following issues:

- Should not change institutional aspects of our disciplines to chase international students
- There are many aspects of planning that are not STEM
- Certificates or other special programs might offer an opportunity for STEM designation
- Concern about long term trend toward programs exiting the planning CIP
- International planning students have been advocates for the change in some cases
- Carnegie metrics value STEM more highly
- Experience of AIA and ASLA suggests effort would be great
- Opportunities for collaboration with APA and AICP
- STEM content may play a greater role in planning in the future

There is a plan to ask again in this year's chairs survey how many programs have switched CIP codes so that we can better understand the trend toward shifting and the enrollment impacts. There was consensus that ACSP not pursue a STEM designation at this time and will instead continue to focus on gathering information from programs that have made changes and the impacts of them.

ACTION – Dodd will include follow-up questions on the CIP code change for the annual chairs survey.

16 Budget [\[Box/Action\]](#)

J. Grengs

Grengs summarized the budget, highlighting the documents in Box. He noted revenue of \$73,788 in the last fiscal year, compared to an anticipated deficit of \$68,555. The annual conference was the contributing factor, with lower than anticipated food/beverage expenses. JPER and the Administrators Conference were also net positive. He acknowledged that the dues increase had no impact on membership and generated no complaints. He indicated that we have \$650,000 in reserve funds, compared to our policy of maintaining at least \$250,000 and our standard practice of maintaining at least \$450,000. He noted two key issues that will require ongoing attention: (1) stability of the conference as a revenue source and (2) the viability of maintaining the management contract at the current level. Considering uncertainties, Grengs noted the importance of large reserves and a relatively high level of liquidity.

Grengs highlighted proposals for funding the Pre-Doctoral and PhD workshops. Per the Pre-Doctoral Workshop, he noted the previous model in Buffalo of the local host offering \$15,000 in funding to support the workshop. He also noted a previous failed RFP to host the Pre-Doctoral workshop, as well as the PhD Workshop. He described the proposal to roll the two workshops into the conference budget, with the PhD Workshop at the beginning and Pre-Doctoral Workshop at the end. A total of \$5,000 will be allocated for the PhD Workshop and \$22,500 will be provided for the Pre-Doctoral Workshop. Giusti, on behalf of the Diversity Committee, shared details related to the decision not to offer the Pre-Doctoral Workshop in 2019. The proposed new budget model would apply for three years.

MOTION – Grengs moved approval of the plan to integrate the PhD Workshop and Pre-Doctoral Workshop into the annual conference budget, Sen seconded. The motion was approved with two abstentions.

17 New or Unfinished Business/General Orders

W. Wu

A) Changes to Current Award Criteria?

1. Distinguished Educator Award [\[Box\]](#)
2. ACSP Student Travel [\[Box\]](#)
3. Don Schon Award [\[Box\]](#)
4. McClure Award [\[Box\]](#)
5. Kauffman Award [\[Box\]](#)

Wu summarized proposed updates to award criteria. Per the Distinguished Educator Award, the award committee recommends that the award be offered every year, that the criteria reference lifetime achievement, that nominees be rolled forward from year to year, and that the number of letters of support be limited to 10.

The discussion highlighted a number of issues including:

- It is positive that we are seeing so many nominees
- There were concerns about the stature/visibility of some nominees
- Whether a shift to lifetime achievement suggests that this is an end of career award
- Whether we should focus more awards on junior scholars
- Possibility that we are at a unique point in our field during which we have an especially large number of nominees
- Are awards valued by recipients?

MOTION – Sen moved that we increase the frequency of the Distinguished Educator Award to annually. No second was available for the motion.

MOTION – Laurian moved that the Distinguished Educator Award be evolved to recognize lifetime achievement, Hollander seconded. The motion failed.

There was consensus that the Executive Committee's recommendations be used, allowing for Distinguished Educator nominees to be rolled over to the next cycle if they request doing so and that letters of support be limited to 10.

ACTION – Dodd will follow up with the Distinguished Educator Award Committee to confirm that nominees can be rolled over to the next cycle and that letters of support should be limited to 10.

On the Kaufman Award, Wu noted that the funder initially preferred to support separate student and faculty awards. There was consensus that the Executive Committee and Kaufman Awards Committee recommendation to combine the awards into a single one available to both students and faculty.

B) Proposal for Inclusion Interest Group [\[2 files in Box/Action\]](#)

Wu noted that the proposal comes from a diverse group of faculty, thus the group name is proposed as Inclusion, rather than just focusing on the LGBTQ+ identity. Michael Frisch is leading the effort to organize the interest group. It was acknowledged that there will be intersections with other identity interest groups, including FWIG and POCIG. Wu noted that the Bylaws state that establishment of interest groups is at the discretion of the Governing Board, though ACSP has recently established a procedure, including a written request and demonstration of interest among members.

MOTION – Laurian moved that an ACSP Inclusion Interest Group be created, Azher seconded. The motion was approved.

C) Endowed Book Award

Wu noted that ACSP has been approached by a senior faculty member about a possible donation to establish an endowment, the proceeds of which would fund a book award in his name, targeted to books published in the past 10 years with a focus on professional planning practice. She noted that potential administrative and financial challenges of managing an endowment were a concern. Grengs indicated that the ACSP financial advisor suggested that we could accomplish management of an endowment via a specific mutual fund, from which proceeds could be drawn each year. The discussion highlighted issues including:

- Importance of cash awards
- Prior concerns noted by the previous awards task force about proliferation of awards
- Difficulty of responding under the donor's tight timeline
- Possibility of future need to remove names such as in cases of misconduct
- Inconsistency in some awards having cash award and others not
- Possibility of keeping a portion of funds for other ACSP activities
- Need for terms to be a way to accomplish our mission – e.g. most revenue goes to ACSP rather than to cash award
- Other named awards are were named based on stature rather than a donation
- Possibility of adding a condition that the Governing Board names the award

There was consensus that the Board have discretion in naming and the majority of the revenue go to ACSP rather than the award winner. The Executive Committee will work with the prospective donor on next steps.

ACTION – Boarnet will follow up with the prospective donor to explore the viability of ACSP's conditions related to the book award donation.

D) Tendler Fund Proposal

Wu described a proposal by former students and colleagues to establish an endowment that can be used to fund research and other activities. They are looking for an entity to host the fund and offer bookkeeping services. The discussion explored challenges and benefits associated with taking on the fund. Key concerns were noted including ACSP's capacity to serve in this role, the modest return to ACSP, and Tendler's limited engagement with ACSP.

ACTION – Boarnet will follow up with the Tendler fund group to advise them of ACSP's decision to decline hosting the endowment.

E) Spring Governing Board Meeting, April 25, 2020, Houston, TX

Wu announced the data of the spring meeting and encouraged members to attend the Business meeting on Friday, October 25.

Wu noted that outgoing members will receive acknowledgement at the Business meeting. Boarnet acknowledged Wu's contributions as President.

Milgrom highlighted the opportunity to connect with Canada. The ExCo will follow up on next steps.

ACTION – Boarnet will follow up with the Canadian Representatives to discuss opportunities to enhance connections with Canadian planning schools.

19 **Adjourn** [\[Action\]](#)

W. Wu

MOTION – Grengs moved that the meeting be adjourned, Sen seconded. The motion was approved.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:10 pm.