



PLANNING ACCREDITATION BOARD – SPRING 2017 REPORT TO AICP, APA, and ACSP

dated February 27, 2017

ACSP, AICP and APA minutes must document acceptance of PAB report for compliance with Iowa not-for-profit law

MISSION STATEMENT: ENSURING HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION FOR FUTURE URBAN PLANNERS

PAB is a standalone 501(C)3 organization jointly sponsored by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP), the American Planning Association (APA), and APA's professional institute, the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP). This collaboration reflects an assumption that all parties to the planning enterprise - practitioners, educators, students, elected officials, and citizens - have a vital stake in the quality of the nation's programs of planning education. Sponsoring organizations appoint the 8-member board and match-fund the operations.

Accreditation is a system for recognizing educational institutions and professional programs for performance, integrity and quality. This recognition is extended primarily through non-governmental, voluntary associations. Accreditors establish standards for accreditation, arrange peer-review based visits, evaluate institutions and professional programs, and confer a specific term of accreditation.

While accreditors encourage excellence, accreditation is a threshold test of the standards. Accreditation is not a ranking; no program is "better" than another. Accreditation is not prescriptive – universities and programs have unique missions, goals, and objectives, and are responsible for achievement thereof.

PAB currently accredits 88 planning programs (72 graduate / 16 undergraduate) at 76 North American universities.

Recognized by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), PAB is also a member of the Association of Professional and Specialized Accreditors (ASPA) and adheres to its Member Code of Good Practice.

Table of Contents	Page Number
Discussion Items.....	1 - 3
Request for Action.....	3
Strategic Plan.....	3
Candidacy Pipeline.....	4
Board Members – Terms and Appointment Information.....	4

Exhibits:

- A ACSP institutional representation in PAB's Site Visitor Pool
- B - ASPA (Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors) newsletter

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Accreditation Standards – update on Release of 2017 Standards

Nov 2014 and Apr 2015	Open forum on PAB's 2012 standards and processes
Sept and Oct 2015	Draft 1 of Amendment to Accreditation Standards released
Nov – Dec 2015	First 30-day public comment period
Sept and Nov 2016	Draft 2 of Amendment to Accreditation Standards released
Nov – Dec 2016	Second 30-day public comment period
December 2016	Advisory recommendations from PAB's sponsoring organizations and public

	comments received
Dec 2016 – Feb 2017	Standards Committee work and PAB review of revised draft amendment
March 2017	PAB releases 2017 Accreditation Standards
January 2018	Effective date for implementation of 2017 Standards. Programs with fall 2018 Site Visits will be first official cohort.

B. Online Self-Study Report Submission launch

PAB has been building reserves in anticipation of development cost of a proprietary system for online submission of Self-Study Reports. Development of such a system was a goal in PAB's 2012 strategic plan. The goal was delayed, however, in favor of spending funds to overhaul Site Visitor training and outsource the delivery of it.

PAB recently took advantage of an opportunity to serve as a beta adopter of a "pre-packaged" system which will negate spending virtually all of its non-reserved cash for software development. The ongoing annual cost of supporting the data will result in net losses going forward. Exacerbating projected 2018 losses are costs associated with new computer hardware for PAB staff and a comprehensive update to PAB's 10-year old website.

Three programs going through accreditation in 2017 – 2018 have been selected to serve as "beta" testers of both the new standards and the new software. All programs going through accreditation in 2018 will be using the online system and the new standards.

C. Fiscal 2018 Budget Increase Request

Information has been redacted

D. Site Visitor Recruitment

PAB sends a 3-member Site Visit Team (SVT) to a university to conduct an accreditation review. The SVT is comprised of 2 planning educators and 1 professional planner. ACSP and AICP committees recruit and vet for their respective President's nominations of potential Site Visitors for PAB review and acceptance. Planning educators from institutions with no or under-representation have been the targeted for recruitment for several years.

AICP

There are currently 57 practitioner members in the pool, 10 of whom have not yet been on a Site Visit. Eight practitioners were most recently recruited in 2015. PAB conducts Site Visitor training every other [even] year during the APA national conference. PAB anticipates requesting its next pool of practitioner members in 2020.

ACSP

There are currently 127 academic members in the pool, following a very strong recruitment class in 2016 when 15 nominees were admitted to the pool – 5 from institutions without representation and 10 from those with under-representation. An ideal pool size, based on the 5-year average number of visits, would be a minimum of 142. Excluding two programs which were granted accreditation as of January 1, 2017, 15% of PAB-accredited programs at 11 universities had no representation in the pool. This all-time high level of participation reflects successful 2016 targeted recruitment by the ACSP committee. An additional 30% of programs (at 23 universities) are "under-represented" based on the average faculty participation rate of 15%. PAB will again work closely with ACSP's committee to make continued progress in 2017. Annual recruitment efforts typically begin in the spring.

The successful recruitment effort in 2016 included personal contact by the ACSP committee to targeted institutions. PAB has recently made changes to its Site Visit schedule which will shorten visits by ½ day. It is hoped this will enhance future recruitment efforts.

Since 2014 PAB has provided letters of appreciation to Site Visitors' deans and provosts, in addition to department heads, in an effort to increase recognition of Site Visitors in their home institutions. The ACSP President supplemented those efforts with correspondence of her own. In 2015 PAB modified its website to (a)

simplify the information regarding applying for the pool; (b) provide direct contact information to the ACSP and AICP Committees and (c) expanded the timeline for ACSP applicants to year-round. It's unclear that these efforts have assisted in recruitment, however. Based on results from 2016, it appears the personal touch from the ACSP committee members makes the greatest impact.

Attached as Exhibit A is the listing ACSP Site Visitors by institution. PAB and the ACSP Site Visitor Recruitment Committee welcome recruitment ideas to attract new visitors, particularly from non- and under-represented institutions.

E. Accreditation Trends

PAB is one of roughly 50 specialized accreditors recognized by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Just as PAB has standards for accreditation which change periodically and with which programs are expected to maintain compliance, CHEA has recognition standards for the accrediting agencies it recognizes.

CHEA Standards and Impact on PAB Operations

PAB has made multiple changes in recent years to its operations and standards in order to comply with CHEA standards related to: public information requirements of accredited programs; demonstrated independence from sponsoring organizations; transparency in operations and decision-making; and consistency of decision-making.

Attached as Exhibit B is a November 2016 e-newsletter from the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) summarizing issues and questions raised during the most recent meeting of CHEA's Committee on Recognition.

CHEA Mid-term Reporting

In July 2016 PAB submitted its first of two mid-term reports to CHEA wherein updated status on compliance with all standards was reported. CHEA requested additional information to supplement the report, which PAB provided in February 2017.

F. Student Learning and Programmatic Outcomes Training

Concurrent with three strategic initiatives related to academic excellence and improved Site Visitor performance, PAB has hired a third party expert to deliver training on student learning and programmatic outcomes assessment to program administrators and site visitors. PAB is very satisfied with the results and attendees provide very positive reviews. In 2016 ACSP was asked to "take over" such introductory training for educators so that PAB could focus on training of Site Visitors. ACSP's initial effort will take place during the Spring 2017 ACSP Administrators' Conference.

REQUEST FOR ACTION

None at this time.

STRATEGIC PLAN

PAB's strategic plan expired at the end of 2016. The Board is very pleased with the outcomes related to the plan goals, as listed below. A new plan will be the outcome of a facilitated PAB retreat in May at which leadership of ACSP, AICP, and APA will participate.

2012 -2016 Strategic Plan Goals

1. Increase the quality of Site Visitor training to achieve consistency and add value in the Site Visit process.
2. Motivate programs to achieve excellence.
3. Achieve impact regarding planning program outcomes.
4. Promote and encourage a systematic approach to diversity and multi-cultural understanding.
5. Explore the feasibility of expanding activities beyond North America, including, but not limited to, accreditation, substantial equivalency, and/or consulting.

6. Prepare PAB to accredit a planning program delivered in a distance education format.
7. Enhance data collection, analysis, and dissemination regarding planning programs and planning education.
8. Ensure success and excellence in education from weak and/or at-risk programs.
9. Serve as a bridge between the practitioner and academic communities.
10. Maintain a collaborative, collegial and productive relationship with APA / AICP.
11. Ensure operational procedures are efficient and effective, and outcomes / output relevant.

PROGRAMS IN THE CANDIDACY PIPELINE

Institution	Degree	Potential PAB Action
<i>Programs with Candidacy Status with completed Site Visits; Spring 2017 Board Action</i>		
University of Missouri Kansas City	(B) Urban Planning and Design	Candidacy Status 2016 – 2017 Accreditation effective 1/1/18
<i>Programs with Candidacy Status; Scheduled for fall 2017 Site Visits and Spring 2018 Board Action</i>		
George Washington University	(M) Sustainable Urban Planning	Candidacy Status 2017 – 2018 Accreditation effective 1/1/19
University of Texas San Antonio	(M) Urban and Regional Planning	Same
<i>Anticipated Letters of Intent –note: this information is confidential</i>		
<i>Information has been redacted</i>		

PAB BOARD MEMBERS – TERMS AND APPOINTMENT INFORMATION

Pauletta Brown Bracy, Ph.D.
Director and Professor
Office of University Accreditation
North Carolina Central University
ACSP Higher Ed Administrator 2014– 2019

Bruce Knight, FAICP (Chair)
Planning and Development Director
City Of Champaign, IL
AICP Planning Practitioner 2014- 2019

Zenia Kotval, Ph.D., FAICP
Professor
Michigan State University
ACSP Planning Educator 2015 – 2018

Alexander K. Lieber, AICP
Planner - AKRF, Inc.
New York, NY
AICP Young Planner 2015 - 2018

Ed Goetz, Ph.D.
Professor
University of Minnesota
ACSP Planning Educator 2016 - 2019

Connie Ozawa, Ph.D. (Vice Chair) (1)
Professor and Director
Portland State University
ACSP Planning Educator 2014 - 2017

Barry Schultz (2)
Senior Counsel
Stutz ArtianoShinoff& Holtz
San Diego, CA
APA Public Member 2014 - 2017

Sue Schwartz, FAICP (3)
Planning & Community Dev Director
Greensboro, NC
AICP Planning Practitioner 2011- 2017

(1) Ozawa's 1st term expires 11/30/17; she is eligible for reappointment

(2) Schultz's 1st term expires 11/30/17; he will need to be replaced

(3) Schwartz's 2nd term expires 11/30/17; she will need to be replaced

Staff
Shonagh Merits – Executive Director
Jesmarie S. Johnson – Associate Director
2334 W. Lawrence Ave – Suite 209
Chicago, IL 60625; (773) 334.7200/7210

February 2017 Educators in PAB's SV Pool

Faculty data from 2016 PAB Annual Report

	Institution	Site Visitors	2016 FT Faculty	Participation Rate
	No Participation			
1	University of California, Berkeley	0	11	0%
2	University of Maryland at College Park	0	7	0%
3	University of Arizona	0	7	0%
4	Columbia University	0	7	0%
5	* Western Washington University	0	6	0%
6	Texas Southern University	0	6	0%
7	Jackson State University	0	6	0%
8	University of Oklahoma	0	5	0%
9	Pratt Institute	0	5	0%
10	* University of Georgia	0	4	0%
11	Temple University	0	3	0%
12	Alabama A & M University (2 programs)	0	3	0%
13	Eastern Michigan University	0	2	0%
	* accredited as of 1/1/2017; data from 2015 Self-Study Report			
	Below Average Participation			
1	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	1	27	4%
2	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	2	34	6%
3	University of California, Irvine	1	16	6%
4	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	1	15	7%
5	University at Buffalo, State University of New York	1	15	7%
6	University of Washington	1	13	8%
7	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	1	13	8%
8	Iowa State University (2 programs)	1	12	8%
9	Arizona State University	1	12	8%
10	Virginia Commonwealth University	1	11	9%
11	Portland State University	2	21	10%
12	University of Puerto Rico	1	10	10%
13	University of California, Los Angeles	2	18	11%
14	University of New Mexico	1	9	11%
15	University of Louisville	1	9	11%
16	University of Virginia (2 programs)	1	8	13%
17	Tufts University	2	14	14%
18	Harvard University	2	14	14%
19	Cornell University	2	14	14%
20	University of Utah	1	7	14%
21	Florida Atlantic University	1	7	14%
22	University of Michigan	2	13	15%
23	The Ohio State University (2 programs)	2	13	15%
	Average and Above Participation			
1	University of Illinois at Chicago	3	19	16%
2	University of Texas at Austin	2	12	17%
3	Florida State University	2	12	17%
4	University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	1	6	17%
5	San Jose State University	1	6	17%
6	Kansas State University	1	6	17%
7	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2 programs)	3	15	20%
8	University of Wisconsin - Madison	2	10	20%
9	University of Southern California	2	10	20%
10	University of Hawaii at Manoa	2	10	20%
11	University of British Columbia	2	10	20%
12	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	1	5	20%

	Institution	Site Visitors	2016 FT Faculty	Participation Rate
13	University of Memphis	1	5	20%
14	University of Colorado Denver	1	5	20%
15	University at Albany, State University of New York	1	5	20%
16	Indiana University Pennsylvania	1	5	20%
17	University of Pennsylvania	3	14	21%
18	University of Cincinnati (2 programs)	3	14	21%
19	Hunter College, City University of New York	2	9	22%
20	California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (2 programs)	2	9	22%
21	University of Minnesota	2	8	25%
22	University of Iowa	2	8	25%
23	Ball State University (2 programs)	2	8	25%
24	University of Oregon	1	4	25%
25	East Carolina University	1	4	25%
26	Cleveland State University	3	11	27%
27	Texas A & M University	4	14	29%
28	University of Massachusetts at Amherst	2	7	29%
29	New York University	2	7	29%
30	California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (2 programs)	2	7	29%
31	Wayne State University	2	6	33%
32	University of New Orleans	2	6	33%
33	Missouri State University	1	3	33%
34	Eastern Washington University (2 programs)	1	3	33%
35	Michigan State University (2 programs)	3	8	38%
36	Clemson University	3	8	38%
37	University of Texas at Arlington	2	5	40%
38	Morgan State University	2	5	40%
39	Georgia Institute of Technology	5	12	42%
40	University of Florida	4	8	50%
41	University of Kansas	2	4	50%
SV from PAB-accredited programs		115	730	16%
SV from non-accredited programs		12	12	avg participation
Total Site Visitors		127	742	

Other Facts about Site Visitor Pool		Year	# of SV	Educators Needed
2007	20% Assoc Prof; 15% Emeritus; 36% Female; 47% AICP	2013 - 2014	18	36
2017	29% Assoc Prof; 6% Emeritus; 36% Female; 38% AICP	2014 - 2015	15	30
		2015 - 2016	10	20
		2016 - 2017	11	22
		2017 - 2018	17	34
		5 year cycle	71	142

Year	Pool Size	Unis w/o SVs
2005	109	36%
2009	141	26%
2012	125	22%
2013	120	23%
2014	115	22%
2015	114	18%
2016	127	15%



November 28, 2016

Last week's recognition activity:

CHEA Committee on Recognition

The Committee on Recognition of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation held a public session on November 21, 2016 to review three accreditors for recognition: one for recognition review and two returning with responses to deferrals.

Issues raised and questions posed during the session included:

- **10. RECOGNIZED SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION** - a clear statement of proposed scope of accreditation activity:
 - Scope of accreditation should be consistently and clearly stated across various documents.
- **Policy 12B.1 - DEMONSTRATES ACCOUNTABILITY** - accreditation standards or policies that require institutions or programs routinely to provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement as determined by the institution or program:
 - CHEA expects evidence of a preponderance of programs in compliance.
 - How does the accreditor ensure that schools provide information that is useful to students, and how easy is it to find?
 - How does the accreditor verify the data reported by programs?
 - What is the process to monitor compliance with this requirement?
- **Policy 12B.3 - DEMONSTRATES ACCOUNTABILITY** - accreditation standards or policies that require institutions to distinguish accurately between programs that have achieved accredited status and those that have not:
 - Differentiation of institutional accreditation from programmatic accreditation: there is an expectation of clarity in public information provided by the institutions and the accreditor.
- **Policy 12B.4 - DEMONSTRATES ACCOUNTABILITY** - policies and procedures that include representatives of the public in decision making and policy setting:
 - The accreditor's definition of a public member did not align with the CHEA definition.

- **Policy 12B.5 - DEMONSTRATES ACCOUNTABILITY** - policies or procedures, developed in consultation with institutions or programs, to inform the public of the basis for final decisions to grant or reaffirm accreditation and, in the case of denial or withdrawal of accreditation, to provide specific reasons for the decision accompanied by a response, related to the final decision, from the institution or program:
 - Does the accreditor require institutions to make this information public?
- **Policy 12D.2 - EMPLOYS APPROPRIATE AND FAIR PROCEDURES IN DECISION MAKING** - foster reasonable consistency in reviews of institutions or programs while respecting varying institution or program purposes and mission:
 - The accreditor was questioned about inconsistency in the composition of site visitor teams.
- Can programs be accredited without meeting all standards? What are the consequences for non-compliance and associated time frames?
- What are the most critical issues facing the accreditor?

Best regards,

Joseph Vibert
Executive Director

