

Semi-Annual Governing Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, September 30, 2009
8:30AM – 4:00PM
Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel
Arlington, Virginia
Kennedy P/Q
DRAFT

Present were, Randall Crane, John Landis, Clint Andrews, Tim Chapin, Mike Neumann, Marie Howland, Chuck Connerly, Cheryl Contant, Mike Hibbard, Barry Nocks, Charles Hoch, Susan Roakes, Barbara Becker, Susan Bradbury, Ann Carpenter, Ahmed Abukhater, Nancy Frank, Weiping Wu, Curt Winkle, Enid Arvidson, Genie Birch, Stacey White, and Shonagh Merits.

Mike Hibbard called the meeting to order at 9:10.

Marie Howland stated the minutes had been approved by e-mail and the committee agreed unanimously that the circulation of the minutes prior to the meeting via e-mail worked and should be done in the future.

John Landis moved to accept the consent agenda and Barry Nocks seconded the motion.

CONSENT AGENDA

Publications

Journal of Planning Education and Research
The Guide

Standing Committee Reports

PAB Advisory

Special Committee Reports

Academy and the Profession
Doctoral Programs

Interest Group Reports

Global Planning Educators
Faculty Women's Interest Group
Senior Faculty Interest Group
Planners of Color Interest Group

OFFICERS' REPORTS

TREASURER'S Report.

Barry Nocks

We recently received the accountant's review of our revenues and expenses for the past (July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009) fiscal year. For the most part, both expenditures and revenues were close to budgeted figures. The most significant exception was for the Joint Conference in Chicago, which provided net revenue of \$82,200 compared to a budgeted loss of \$2,400. This left us with net revenue of just over \$58K rather than a budgeted net loss of \$20.6K.

Investment Committee report: As noted in the committee report distributed in your packets, our investments remain in secure CDs and money market funds. They continue to earn low interest rates, but unlike many funds

we continue to avoid any losses in these fund balances.

VICE-PRESIDENT's Report

Cheryl Contant

The main tasks of the Vice President are to oversee publications and conferences. Publications include JPER and Update. JPER report is in the consent agenda. Update will continue through this fiscal year through the hard work of Nancy Frank. We will also review whether the Update needs to continue with the advent of the new website. Special thanks were given to Clint Andrews for his work in the website revision. Conferences will be discussed later in the agenda. Cheryl noted that this is Curt Winkle's final conference as national conference committee chair. Stacey Swearingen White from the University of Kansas has agreed to serve in this role in the future.

The Vice President is also the President-Elect and takes office as President at the Business Meeting of this conference. Cheryl has been working with her Review and Appraisal committee and will be meeting with them at this conference too. Cheryl also introduced her "assistant to the president," Darla Peterson, to the Governing Board.

PRESIDENT's Report

M. Hibbard

The full report is attached.

Mike Hibbard acknowledged Nancy Frank who has served as our webmaster and Charlie Hoch for his service on the PSAP committee.

As part of our Strategic Initiatives: the New Website is up and PSAP is coming to a close. The president's priorities included increasing the visibility of planning and the National Academy of Environmental Design where Gary Hack is our representative. Tridib Banerjee is our permanent representative to the Academy of Environmental Design. The academy has not yet been approved by congress, but it is a 501C3. In addition, Mike Hibbard has met with PAB and AICP. The purpose of these meetings is to forestall any conflicts and to facilitate communication. The new president will continue these meetings probably on an annual basis.

The executive board will decide the appropriate use for the interest group's annual allocation of \$1500. This is a change of policy from the Minneapolis meeting where Mike proposed setting up an advisory committee to make recommendations.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Conference Committee

Curt Winkle

This year's conference is the 50th conference of ACSP. Registration has been strong: 529 Faculty registered, 76 students at full registration, 106 students at partial registration, 13 retired faculty, and approximately 20 practitioners.

For the future conferences, ACSP is planning:

2010 Minneapolis, MN October 7 – 10th.

2011 Salt Lake City October 26-30th. (Chuck Connerly's birthday).

2012 TBA

2013 joint with AESOP, in Europe

Clint Andrews proposed considering the role of the World Congress and how its schedule fits with ACSP and AESOP meetings.

Cheryl Contant explained our emerging process for identifying local hosts and conference locations. We are contacting hotel chains with our RFP to find out the rates that we can get from hotels in various cities and then approaching the planning schools in those locations where the rates are competitive and favorable to determine the school's interest in being a local host. This has worked well for 2011 and we are continuing this for 2012.

Finances and Investment

B. Nocks

Barry Nocks presented an analysis of income and expenses grouped by major categories. (See attached) Conference revenues are by far the major income category for ACSP, followed by dues and capitation. Similarly, conference expenses are the largest item on the cost side, with other expenses each making up less than 10% of total expenses.

In the discussion that followed, future questions to be considered by the board were suggested. These include looking at fixed versus variable costs, seeking to understand what costs do we need to worry about, how we might protect against difficulties in these expenses, what might we endow or invest in, and what implications exist for our reserve fund?

Institutional Governance

(report given by Mike Hibbard)

A number of items: question of the composition of our region. Our by-laws state that the ACSP regions should be reviewed on a periodic basis. Which states are in which region? The goal is to try to get equal representation. Currently each region includes 15 to 19 schools. The Executive Committee proposes to realign the regions. The board agreed that rather than giving the regions number, the regions should continue to have names, i.e. Northeast, West, Southeast, Midwest, etc. Rich Margerum will ask his committee to look at what the transition to the new regions will look like, i.e. how do we handle regions with less than two or more than two representatives.

Mike Neuman moved that we adopt the new proposed regional definitions. The motion was seconded by John Landis. A friendly amendment was made by Cheryl Contant to move West Virginia from the Northeast to the Southeast region, move Arkansas from the Midwest to the Central Regions. The amendment was accepted by John Landis.

Tim Chapin suggested the following names for the regions, I - Northeast; II - Southeast; III- Midwest; IV- Central, and V – West. Cheryl Contant moved that we add names. The motion was seconded by John Landis. Ten members of the committee were in favor, two opposed. The motion passed. The final list of schools and their regions is included in Appendix B.

Our by-laws say that only Programs and Departments that have planning in the title can be full members of ACSP. There are some schools that are members but don't have planning in the title. The membership fee for a full member is \$350 and \$150 for affiliate members. Therefore, we will lose \$200 per school if we impose the rule. What are our sentiments?

Should there be term limits for regional reps. Randall Crane stated we need new faces to the governing board. However, we often have trouble recruiting new faculty to run and the incumbents generally win.

We currently have three special committees. Permanent committees are specified in the by-laws. The Faculty mentoring committee and Committee on the Academy and the Profession currently have a semi-permanent status. Do we want to make them permanent?

Currently, regional representatives resign when they move, but the by-laws are silent on this. Do we want to add a decision to the by-laws?

New awards. How do we create new awards? Susan Bradbury stated there was something about awards written under Sandy Rosenbloom's presidency. Susan will look for this.

John Landis questioned whether some of the issues being passed to committees belong at the Governing Board. For example, are we sending decisions to the Institutional Governance Committee (IGC) about the by-laws that should be decided by the Governing Board? Susan Roakes stated that we can charge a group to come up with recommendations and then we can either take it or not. John Landis stated it is an issue of timing. Clint Andrews moved that we appoint a representative to the Institutional Governance Board. The motion was seconded by Susan Bradbury. Clint withdraws his motion, and Susan withdrew her second. Marie Howland suggested we go through the issues one by one, to decide if we want to discuss or send on to the Institutional Governance Committee (IGC) or membership committees.

Direction – Proxy voting send to the IGC.

Term limits to regional reps. Enid Arvidson argued there will be little institutional memory if term limits are imposed. There is a big learning curve to understanding how the organization works. John Landis suggested we send this item to the IGC – what is pattern data in number of terms served? Some term limits are desirable.

Strategic Planning; difference in the way we think of the organization. Presidents and VP is working well.

John Landis recommended we send the question of the residency requirement to the IGC.

Awards – Susan Bradbury will track down the existing information on the ACSP awards policy.

Our by-laws require that a school must have a degree in planning to be a full member. Charlie Hoch stated that ACSP is schools of planning where the department or unit is the member. Curt Winkle pointed out that because occasionally ACSP admits individual members, couldn't get tax free status. Mike Hibbard argued that we have to allow individual members, even if we have to pay taxes. Susan Bradbury stated the membership committee will address this issue. We want to protect the discipline in the domain, but want our intellectual community to be inclusive. What is the role of the affiliate members and how can we allow them to engage more robustly.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE REPORTS

Enhanced Web Presence Project

C Andrews

Website: Clint Andrews - Future enhancements are called for: we will add a feature that allows member schools to enter and update their data. Second, our conference management company is going out of business. We need to find another way to manage our conference abstracts. One option is to bring it in house. Donna Dodd stated that currently, the cost of abstract management is \$12,000. For this price, we can probably create our own. Donna was directed to pursue this option. Final policy issues are do we want to ask for advertising (not now) and do we want to enforce paper submittal and discussion standards for all of our conference tracks (yes)?

The Web Presence Project task force is asking for \$10,000 to invest in additional features, and \$5,000 for on-going maintenance. It is currently in the budget.

Introduction of Stacey White. Conference Chair

GPEAN

C. Silver/J. Looye

Jo Looye – received four proposals for the World Congress. Three are viable- Albania, Delft University in Netherlands, and the University of Western Australia in Perth. The proposal from the University of Tokyo

was not accepted.

APA/AICP News

P. Farmer

Paul Farmer –APA has a growth plan of 1500 new members a year. We have beaten this every year but this year. However, AICP is still growing. We have developed a Communication Strategy. We are communicating better on behalf of planners. We currently have 44,500 members, but have lost some.

Our package membership for Schools of Planning is doing well.

We are pleased with the student membership

Planners Press is putting out about 8 books a year.

Climate Survey

M. Wubneh

One in five minority faculty members report being discriminated against. Tim Chapin moved to accept the report and Susan Bradbury seconded the motion.. The motion passed. What is follow up? Validation of treatment? Submission to JPER and JAPA?

Student Representative Report

A. Abukhater/A. Carpenter

Ann Carpenter. There are 690 members in the bowling league. We have created a Facebook for students. This is Ahmed's last meeting. Thanks for his service. We are looking for a new PhD student representative. We have developed by-laws and created a policy statement. Ahmed moved to accept the student by-laws and Ann Carpenter seconded it. The motion passed. John Landis asked why the student representative is restricted to Ph.D. students. The answer, they are around longer. John Landis added a friendly amendment that Ph.D. students should report back to MA students.

Planning Accreditation Board

C. Hoch/E. Birch/S. Merits

PAB is a major contributor to the success of programs. We are looking at outcomes, not necessarily just inputs. We are moving away from PAB as a judge of the program and creating a formative evaluation process. We are an ally, not the enemy. Accreditation is an attractive option. A number of new schools are coming on board. PAB is independent, but not autonomous from APA. The two other issues that were discussed were:

1. PAB's Data Taskforce: reps from PAB, ACSP, AICP and APA have been working together to get meaningful AICP exam data to program chairs, expand questions on APA surveys (job analysis and membership), and get access to data from the surveys to supplement academic analysis of longitudinal/planning grads. APA has requested names of programs' grads to supplement its survey base. Not clear this can be done, legally (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) issues).
2. ACSP appointees to PAB: Bruce Stiftel is replacing Genie Birch 12/1/09, as she's who's rolling off after two 3-year terms. Charlie Hoch's 2nd term and Susan Weeks' first term expire 11/30/10.

Financial Planning for ACSP

M. Hibbard/C. Contant

We need a more exploratory discussion. Propose some changes about how we do financial planning.

We will still charge for inclusion in Guide even when it is on the Website.

Do we have a target for reserves? What is our product and what do we want it to be? How do we deliver our product in the best way? Cheryl Contant asked do we want to subsidize students to come to the conference. Where do we get the money to do that? Endowment? John Landis pointed out that our usual subsidies for conferences have disappeared. Maybe we need a development committee.

Michael Hibbard called for adjournment at 4:25 PM. Susan Bradbury moved to adjourn, Seconded by Mike Neumann. The motion passed.

Appendix A: President's Report to the Governing Board – Arlington VA 9/30/09

This is my final report to you as president of our Association. I'll use it as an opportunity to summarize the last two years and a few carry-over matters. As usual I've organized it around the three categories of strategic initiatives, responding to problems and opportunities, and system maintenance. But before I do that I want to recognize a few people, for the record.

Randy Crane. This is Randy's last meeting on the Governing Board as a regional rep. We'll greatly miss his insight and good judgment. He's saved me from myself several times. He's a model for all of us.

Nancy Frank. Nancy has been our volunteer webmaster for as long as I can remember. She did this job with grace and good humor, never complaining about the difficult demands we placed on her as our expectations for our website grew and grew. As we make the transition to a professional website, let's remember who got us to the point where we couldn't get along without one.

Charlie Hoch. When Charlie agreed to chair the Planning Schools Assessment Project task force I'm sure he didn't expect it to go on for four years. The PSAP may turn out to be one the most important things ACSP has undertaken in recent years. Charlie brought focus to the project and kept it on track. Now that it is winding down, he will help to institutionalize it in his dual roles with ACSP and PAB.

Bruce Stiftel. Bruce is giving up his position as chair of the Committee on the Academy and the Profession as assumes his new duties on the PAB. Under Bruce's leadership the CAP has played a key role in ACSP – from working with APA/AICP on certification maintenance standards and procedures to conducting an important survey of tenure and promotion policies to advocating for threatened schools, to mention only a few examples. The charge of the CAP has been so vast that probably only Bruce could have managed it. In fact, our new president is considering creating two committees to do the work.

Curt Winkle. Curt is stepping down as Conference Committee chair at the end of this conference. Under Curt's guidance our conferences have gotten better and better. We especially thank him for the joint congress last year. Not only was it a wonderful intellectual and cultural success, but he somehow turned an event that was budgeted to lose money into a financial triumph, in the midst of an international economic calamity.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

These are the president's priority issues, historically developed with the help of the Review and Appraisal Committee appointed by each President-Elect. Quick action is often difficult in an association that depends almost completely on volunteers and initiatives usually carry over into the term of the next president, so I'll begin with Mick Lauria's initiatives, which are still on the table.

Web Enhancement Project: The beautiful new website is up and running! For which we thank Clint Andrews and his committee.

Planning School Assessment Project: The PSAP is nearing completion. You'll recall that it originally envisioned three phases.

- The faculty assessment has been completed. A workshop on use of the data was presented at the Administrators' Conference in Bethesda last fall and the data are now available to program administrators and researchers.

- The consultants' final report on the student outcomes study is complete. However, some additional "data cleaning" work needs to be done. This will require some additional funding. A request is on the Fall 2009 GoBo agenda.
- The Governing Board voted to drop the third phase, a reputational study.

The next president needs to appoint a "data master" to oversee and provide appropriate access to the faculty and student data sets.

The remaining challenge with the PSAP is how to institutionalize it. The value of these data sets will quickly diminish unless we can continue to collect them, make them into time series data sets. As addition to ACSP's efforts through this task force and the Guide, the PAB and APA/AICP also routinely collect data from our member programs. A joint APA/AICP, ACSP/PAB task force has been established, chaired by Genie Birch. She will give us a report later in the agenda.

Strategic Thinking: Mick's original concept was to develop a strategic plan for the Association. However, the task force he appointed suggested that there was a need for ongoing "strategic thinking." That suggestion led to an approach that I used to develop a set of initiatives for my term. Essentially, it entails asking the GoBo and Review and Appraisal Committee to identify issues, then processing those issues into a set of priorities for the Association. Cheryl is continuing that approach as we segue into her presidency.

My priorities for ACSP and their current status is as follows.

Increase the visibility of the planning discipline and our programs in the academy:

- **The Committee on the Academy and the Profession completed its survey of tenure and promotion policies and practices in planning programs study and presented its report at the fall 2008 Administrators Conference. It is available on the ACSP website.**
- **In concert with our colleagues in architecture, landscape architecture and other environmental design fields, we continue to move ahead on the effort to establish a National Academy of Environmental Design. The NAED by-laws have been approved and a permanent board established. I have appointed Tridib Bannerjee to be ACSP's first permanent representative.**
- **Our Doctoral Committee is conducting a survey of PhD programs in planning, which will result in a "white paper" focusing especially on the PhD curriculum.**
- **The PhD committee and the Committee on the Academy and the Profession continue to monitor the National Research Council's discussion on including planning programs in their periodic evaluation of PhD programs.**
- **I have asked Susan Bradbury to revitalize the Membership Committee. She has selected new committee members and they are about to start a vigorous recruiting effort for additional institutional members.**

Diversity: The report of the climate survey that we commissioned at our Spring, 2008 meeting is being presented at this meeting of the GoBo. We will consider its recommendations and possible further action, including appoint of a task force to follow up.

Improve the quality of the conference: The intent here is to increase the scholarly rigor of the conference – essentially by accepting fewer papers and giving more time in the program to each one. There is a substantial downside to this, in terms of lost opportunities to present. I have not pushed the conference committee to act on it.

OPPORTUNITIES AND PROBLEMS

As with new initiatives, opportunities and problems often carry over from one president to the next, so some of these actually started in Mick's term. I'll take these up in chronological order.

AICP Certification Maintenance: This is about offering AICP CM credit for participating in the ACSP conference. There have been a series of issues ranging from fees to the mechanics of claiming credit. I'm happy to report that, thanks to major efforts by Bruce Stiftel and Curt Winkle, they seem to be resolved.

Planetizen's Planning School Ratings: Planetizen is gearing up for the next iteration of their guide/ratings. As with the previous version, they welcome working with the ACSP ad hoc committee on the methodology for their ratings. Mick Lauria will again chair the committee. Other members are Enid Arvidson, Ann Forsyth, John Landis, and Bruce Stiftel.

China Planning Network: CPN is an international group of scholars interested in planning issues in China, based at MIT. Mick participated in their Annual Congress in Beijing in 2007, as ACSP's official representative. I participated in a similar capacity in 2008 and 2009. As well, the International Association for China Planning is a faculty group loosely affiliated with ACSP. IACP and CPN have overlapping memberships. Both are sponsoring sessions at the 2009 conference that include prominent planning scholars based in China. I am co-hosting a reception with GPEIG for the Chinese visitors.

APA/AICP, ACSP, and PAB: One healthy outcome of the planning education "Summit Meeting" last December (for background, go to http://www.acsp.org/Announcements/PAB_summit_meeting_memo_12_10_08.pdf) is agreement to have regular meetings among the presidents of our four organizations. PAB Chair Charlie Hoch hosted the first such meeting last April in Minneapolis and there will be another one at this conference.

SYSTEM MAINTENANCE

Orientation: I've developed an Orientation Manual and associated orientation session for new Governing Board members and others interested in the workings of ACSP

Committee membership: I've "refreshed" the membership of all of our standing committees, special committees, and task forces. In doing so I've tried to bring some new faces into the leadership of the Association.

Most particularly, the Institutional Governance Committee has been dormant for the past several years and a number of issues have accumulated. I have revived it and charged it to address them.

1. Should proxy voting be allowed at either the Governing Board or Business meetings? If so, under what circumstances? And how should proxies be designated and approved?
2. The boundaries of the ACSP's regions have not been examined for many years. Do the current regional boundaries still meet the needs of the Association and its member schools? If not, what adjustments need to be made?
3. Should there be term limits for Regional Representatives?
4. Three special committees created by the Governing Board have taken on semi-permanent status, the Committee on the Academy and the Profession, the Doctoral Committee, and the Faculty Mentoring Committee. Should the by-laws be amended to make these into regular, Standing Committees?

5. There has been an effort in recent years to develop an ongoing strategic planning capacity within ACSP, to provide direction and set priorities for the Association. This effort has focused on the Vice President – President Elect and her/his Review and Appraisal Committee. Should this approach be formalized, for example by revising the charge to the Review and Appraisal Committee in the by-laws?
6. Current by laws require Regional Representatives to be faculty in a full member school in the region from which they are elected. However, the by laws are silent as to whether they can continue to represent the region if they move to a school outside the region after they are elected. Should the by laws be amended to require regional reps to be a member of the faculty of a school in the region they represent during their term of their service?
7. There is no policy or procedure for approving new awards to be given by the Association. What procedure should be followed when a new award is proposed?
8. The By laws specify that full ACSP membership is available only to schools that offer a degree in planning. Is this still a valid criterion? (NOTE: A few schools that do not offer a degree in planning have inadvertently been granted full membership in ACSP.)

Financial support for interest groups: A couple of years ago the GoBo voted to provide \$1500/year to each interest group. The interest groups are required to account for the funds but its uses are only vaguely specified. This has led to some misunderstandings and inequities. I had agreed to appoint a task force to look at this and bring recommendations to the GoBo. On further reflection this seems to me to be a diversion. The GoBo needs to approach interest group budget requests with the same rigor it uses to respond to other requests from inside the Association.

ACSP-AESOP 2013: Just to keep this on our screens, the joint ACSP-AESOP steering committee will need to be formed in 2010.

WPSC 3: The third World Planning Schools Congress is scheduled for 2011. The site selection process is nearly its conclusion. Co-chairs Jo Looye will report at this GoBo meeting.

Appendix B
ACSP Regions by State
 Approved September 30, 2009

Northeast (I)	Midwest (II)	Southeast (III)	Central (IV)	West (V)
Connecticut (0)	Illinois (2)	Alabama (3 schools)	Arkansas (0)	Alaska (0)
Maine (1 school)	Indiana (1)	Delaware (1)	Colorado (1)	Arizona (2)
Massachusetts (5)	Iowa (2)	Dist. of Columbia (1)	Kansas (2)	California (9)
New Hampshire (0)	Kentucky (1)	Florida (3)	Louisiana (1)	Hawaii (1)
New Jersey (2)	Michigan (4)	Georgia (2)	Minnesota (2)	Idaho (1)
New York (7)	Ohio (6)	Maryland (2)	Missouri (3)	Nevada (1)
Pennsylvania (3)	Tennessee (1)	Mississippi (1)	Montana (0)	Oregon (2)
Puerto Rico (1)	Wisconsin (2)	North Carolina (2)	Nebraska (1)	Utah (1)
Rhode Island (0)		South Carolina (1)	New Mexico (1)	Washington (2)
Vermont (0)		Virginia (3)	N. Dakota (0)	
	Total: 19	West Virginia (0)	Oklahoma (1)	
			Texas (4)	Total: 19
Total: 19			S. Dakota (0)	
		Total: 19	Wyoming (0)	
			Total: 16	

2009-10 Regional Reps, if this is approved

Northeast: John Landis (2008-10)
 Clint Andrews (2009-11)

Midwest: Susan Roakes (2008-10)
 Susan Bradbury (2009-11)

Southeast: Tim Chapin (2009-11)
 Vacant (2010-2011)

Central: Michael Neuman (2008-10)
 Enid Arvidson (2009-11)

West: David Sloane (2008-10)
 Tom Sanchez (2009-11)