

## Department Faculty Meeting

December 1, 2015

Noon – 1:20 Gould 208J

### Agenda items

12:00 — 12:05	<b>Vote:</b> To approve 11/17/15 meeting minutes	Campbell
12:05 — 12:10	<b>Discussion:</b> To appoint Mary Roderick, Affiliate Instructor, MIPM	Campbell
12:10 — 12:25	<b>Visitor:</b> Steve Butler on potential UDP collaboration with WA APA k-12 efforts	Campbell
12:25 — 12:35	<b>Discussion:</b> MUP application “supplemental form”	Siembor
12:35 — 12:50	<b>Update:</b> Curriculum Committee	Abramson
12:50 — 1:05	<b>Discussion:</b> Response to proposed changes to PAB diversity criteria	Born
1:05 — 1:20	<b>Updates:</b> Other business	Campbell/others

**Present:** Christopher Campbell, Larissa Maziak, Sofia Dermisi, Bob Mugerauer, Don Miller, Phil Hurvitz, Dan Abramson, Jan Whittington, Christine Bae, Bob Freitag, Qing Shen, Rachel Berney, Manish Chalana, Himanshu Grover

PSA Rep: Jacob Brett

CEP Rep: Mihai Baltatescu

**Vote to approve Nov 17 minutes:**

Phil moves Qing second

Vote: 9 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain

**Discussion: To appoint Mary Roderick, Affiliate Instructor, MIPM**

Dan Carlson has been teaching this course that deals with policy analysis and strategic planning in the MIPM core but has decided to longer teach this course. We want to spend more time looking for a permanent replacement but Mary is familiar with the content of the MIPM program and is a suitable person for this quarter. Since she is a current PhD student, we do not need to appoint her as an affiliate faculty.

Discussion: Bob Freitag asks if it's possible for a Dr. Snyder to act as a consultant/ part time teacher for this course with Mary. Christopher says they discuss off line.

**Visitor: Steve Butler on potential UDP collaboration with WA APA k-12 efforts**

Steve works with MRSC and provides advice to planners

On the side he serves on the UDP professionals council and also sits on the APA youth in planning where a major focus right now is looking at involvement with K-12 students and planners

Is there a way to get the MUP's involved in the k-12 classroom?

One possibility is to go into a classroom and look at ancient civilizations, how cities grow over time, then create a new city

This is more involved than just a career day.

**Discussion:**

Are there any ambassadors linked to the our local native tribes?

Dan is currently working with coastal communities on tsunami preparedness and tribal communities would make sense to reach out

What about Safe route to school as a potential topic? What matters to students?

In WA schools, there is a focus on Washington state history as well as sustainability...is there a way to work with the teachers who are creating the curriculum to work the planning aspect in? Community service is another way to tap into curriculum

Does Seattle have a ULI chapter? They bring urban labs bring in HS students to get together with planners and Legos...making cities

What about focusing on food, transportation and hazard mitigation in addition to just planning

UW has summer school programs K-12 would it be possible for us to put together summer school offering with this

The College and Architecture has offered some but how can the department get involved. Maybe check in with Abby?

A challenge is defining what you want to get out of it? Is it current or is it aspirational? Is planning just white and building for the status quo? If you are building for a diverse community, what will that look like...what's the relevance in communities of color?

What do communities of color want...and how would they want to learn that?

If anyone has any ideas and wants to move forward with Steve, email him at sbutler@mrsc.org

### **Discussion: MUP application “supplemental form”**

When people apply they fill out a supplemental form, which asks questions about whether or not they could come to the program if we are unable to provide them financial aid

We think the form is not helpful to us and it's confusing to the applicants who wonder...how they should answer. Are the answers helpful?

Are the faculty looking at these answers? Is it helping us and if not should we get rid of this

The student perspective is that in state has a harder time getting in

Qing thinks this data could actually be useful if we look at data versus matriculation rates

Why do we ask these questions? Does it really help us determine if students need financial aid

The department does have a little bit of money to dole out for the following

1. Students who have the best academic records
2. Good students who are in underrepresented groups

Could it be helpful to put a disclaimer on how the answers /data will be used in the future?

**Update: Curriculum Committee: No updates at this time**

## **Discussion: Response to proposed changes to PAB diversity criteria**

Standards have been weakened...there are implications of the changes will have a larger impact than the PAB thought.

Remove requirement for faculty to track this information

Replacing language with values and ethics really misses the point

Below are Branden's proposed changes\*

Diversity committee members/students are involved. Last day to comment on the PAB changes is **Dec 15**.

The more organizations that step forward it makes a strong point.

It's important to take a position as a faculty.

Let's take a vote to submit this statement, once the changes and comments have been implemented, as a faculty

Himanshu motions to approve Don seconds

Yes 13

No 0

Abstain 0

APA Holiday event on Thursday at El Gaucho

**\*Draft statement opposing the changes to the proposed PAB changes to accreditation standards**

### **MEMO**

To: UDP Faculty

Fr: Branden Born

Re: Proposed changes to PAB Diversity and Equity Standards

Date: 12/1/15

---

This memo is to update the faculty on the recent proposed changes to the PAB Diversity and Equity standards for accreditation, and to suggest a departmental statement in opposition of the changes. The statement has been shared with the UDP Diversity Committee. The public comment period ends December 15, 2015, which is why this is being brought to the faculty for immediate consideration, not in accordance with our general meeting procedures.

A valuable resource in understanding the proposed changes is the analysis done by ACSP's POCIG shared through the PLANET list serve (see Charisma Acey's email of November 24, 2015). POCIG is strongly opposed to the changes, which can best be summarized as weakening and making more ambiguous the standards accredited programs are to be held to with regard to student, faculty, and curriculum diversity considerations.

POCIG has drafted a statement, appended at the end of this document, for faculty and departments to comment or sign on in support for submittal to ACSP and PAB. To demonstrate the kind of revisions the PAB is seeking to implement, and the commentary provided by POCIG on them, sections on Students and Faculty are excerpted herein. Similarly, the faculty of UIUC DURP have submitted comments opposing the changes.

Included you will find:

1. Proposed language for a UDP response (page 2)
2. Examples of PAB proposed changes, POCIG comments (pages 3-4)
3. Statement of opposition from UIUC DURP (page 5)
4. Statement of opposition from Planners of Color Interest Group (POCIG) (pages 6-7)

## Proposed statement from UDP

The proposal is that we draft a similar statement as that of UIUC for submittal to PAB and ACSP. The suggested text is as follows:

\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*

The Department of Urban Design and Planning at the University of Washington does not support the proposed changes to the PAB accreditation standards with regard to diversity and social justice.

The changes weaken the standards and thus undercut the necessary and difficult work that programs need to do to recruit and retain students and faculty from historically underrepresented populations in the US. They cloak in linguistic ambiguity the political and economic elements of planning practice, and fail to recognize the history of oppression and domination in the United States and globally, as well as the importance of that history on equity issues of today. In a time of growing domestic and global inequity, in a world in which diversity is rapidly transforming our cities and regions, these changes are an unacceptable step backwards.

Specifically on faculty diversity and curriculum, the proposed changes are quite problematic. The connection of educational content and the background of the faculty is a strong one, and we agree with statement of the faculty of the University of Illinois, "By requiring core course content to critically examine planning practice, programs engage in the issues that will attract students of diverse backgrounds. To offer such courses, programs must recruit diverse faculty." The changes proposed will make this more difficult to do, and to track. Accordingly, metrics for tracking diversity should be clear, ambitious, and applied to faculty and students alike. Departments that fail to make progress on diversity measures should be held accountable. With respect to the curricular proposals, we would just note that the exchange of "diversity and social justice" with "values and ethics" is not an equal one, and is also an unacceptable regression in policy.

We also would like to acknowledge the Planners of Color Interest Group for doing pathbreaking analysis on the proposed changes, and bringing them to our attention through the PLANET list serve.

We hereby state our opposition to the PAB's proposed revisions.

Approved by the Department of Urban Design and Planning on XX/XX/XXXX

## Examples of proposed changes and POCIG commentary

POCIG categorized the changes in the document as GOOD, BAD, and UGLY, and provided an annotated response. Excerpts below (sic):

Students (p. 6 of 17)

\*The following text...

"Because students will join an increasingly diverse workforce, and work in diverse communities affected by global pressures, the student body should be diverse."

has been changed to...

"Because students will join an increasingly diverse workforce, and work in diverse communities affected by global pressures, policies and practices should be in place to promote a diverse student body."

Policies and practices = good. AND don't drop "student body should be diverse"!

Two separate measures that should both be in place and kept distinct.

One of the worst changes follows in the next paragraph, where the following is stricken:

"The Program should strive to attract a student population, particularly from groups historically lacking access to, and under-represented in, higher education, as well as representative of the type of mixtures of ethnic, racial, and economic groups to be found in the settings where planners often practice."

in favor of modifying the prior sentence to state...

"The approach to diversity should reflect the Program's mission, strategic plan, and intended geographic scope (e.g., local, regional, national, international)."

Why weaken this area? We are training professionals, and our programs strive for "excellence" as it states in the preamble (see p. 4 "Goals must be meaningful in the sense that they aim toward excellence beyond that which may already exist").

For example, AICP code of ethics clearly states under the following categories

1. Our responsibility to the public

f) We shall seek social justice by working to expand choice and opportunity for all persons,

recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged and to promote racial and economic integration. We shall urge the alteration of policies, institutions, and decisions that oppose such needs.

2. Our Responsibility to our profession and colleagues

g) We shall increase the opportunities for members of underrepresented groups to become professional planners and help them advance in the profession.

Are these kinds of metrics not measures of excellence? Demonstrations of how graduates and faculty impact the community and scholarship.

## B. Faculty Diversity (BAD)

There is new language: "Programs should track data which makes possible review and discussion of diversity issues in faculty recruitment and retention."

Instead, it could be more definite:

"Programs should track data on diversity in faculty/student recruitment and retention."

Maybe a separate point on "collecting supplemental data that allows for discussion of issues..." as the new language requires.

Most changes on Faculty Diversity fall under 'ugly' below...

## UGLY

### 3. Faculty

#### 3.B. Faculty Diversity

Before, the statements on student and faculty diversity were identical. The revision adds a paragraph that programs should "track data...[on] diversity issues in faculty recruitment and retention."

It is unclear, what the tracking of 'issues' means or would look like in practice.

What is DROPPED from the new standards:

"Programs collect data which makes tracking of diversity issues in faculty recruitment and retention possible. "

"Full-time faculty members demonstrate diversity with respect to age, race, ethnicity, gender, and state or country of origin."

"Policies and procedures are in place and followed to further equal employment opportunities."



## UIUC Statement of opposition

The faculty of UIUC has written a statement opposing the changes, shared by Robert Olshansky on PLANET, that reads as follows:

The Department of Urban & Regional Planning (DURP) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign does not support the proposed changes to language related to diversity and social justice in PAB accreditation standards.

The proposed changes dilute efforts to recruit and retain students and faculty from historically underrepresented populations. Programs should be required to track diversity in specific ways as outlined in the current PAB guidelines. These metrics will demonstrate the effectiveness of a program's diversity goals and plans. If programs fail to show progress, they should be held accountable. Vague diversity standards do not provide any incentive to change.

The proposed changes in the curriculum section attempt to depoliticize the inherent power struggles embedded in planning education and practice. Requiring course content to only include differing beliefs and not social justice effectively erases conversations about power and domination of one group over another. Replacing social justice with "values and ethics" is a step backwards rather than pushing programs to engage with the complexities of planning in a rapidly changing world of growing diversity and deepening inequalities.

Diversity of the student body and faculty are intertwined with the content of planning education. By requiring core course content to critically examine planning practice, programs engage in the issues that will attract students of diverse backgrounds. To offer such courses, programs must recruit diverse faculty.

We express our gratitude to Planners of Color Interest Group (POCIG) for bringing these changes to our attention.

We hereby state our opposition to the PAB's proposed revisions.

Approved by the Department of Urban & Regional Planning on 11-23-15

## PAB'S LATEST ACCREDITATION CHANGES: NOT MINOR AT ALL!

This letter is an appeal to all who value and care about planning education and creating an inclusive environment that embraces diversity in planning programs and in practice settings at a time where the segmentation of urban space by class and race continues to be a long-standing problem now receiving heightened awareness across US society. If you care about the recruitment and retention of a diverse student and faculty body and whether the content of planning courses relates to issues of racial or social justice, then you want to read this article, and **respond between November 16 and December 15** (see below).

The Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) regulates accredited urban planning degree programs in the U.S.; it is supported by APA, AICP, and ACSP. PAB's "Accreditation Document" specifies standards for faculty and student composition and what content needs to be covered in required planning courses. Site visitors travel to each university every few years and check to make sure that programs are meeting these standards. After years of fighting for standards that better reflect social consciousness culminating in significant changes to the standards used in reviews from 2013, the document is currently under revision. The new version, under the guise of responding to "state and federal legal concerns" takes significant backwards steps with respect to faculty and student diversity and social justice and equity in the curriculum.

As a result we call for the proposed changes (see attachments) to the standards that relate to diversity in faculty and student recruitment and retention, and social justice and equity in the curriculum be removed at this time. The PAB needs to seek appropriate consultation on the supposed "legal concerns" from those with legal expertise in this area, as well as actively seek broader input from its own Diversity Task Force and the members of the organizations it regulates before revising the language.

Below is a summary of our analysis of the new document:

1. The changes **go far beyond** addressing the sole legally questionable statement that PAB has identified ('programs shall have diversity.....' representative of regional population).

**2. Student and faculty diversity:** Departments would no longer have to demonstrate outcomes for racial and gender diversity in recruitment and retention of their student body or their faculty. Instead, they should "promote diversity" but with their own definitions of what diversity means. But most of the schools responding to PAB's diversity survey either don't have diversity goals, or their goals don't include race and ethnicity. PAB says the profession sets the standards, but AICP values and principles on expanding choice and opportunity for disadvantaged groups and increasing opportunities for underrepresented groups in planning would be weakened with these proposed changes.

**3. Curriculum:** Currently, PAB requires that all core courses incorporate issues of "diversity and social justice." Proposed changes removes social justice from being in the core and replace it with the words "values and ethics". While the changes include promoting practice settings that are diverse, diversity does not specifically mean in under-represented and under-served communities, but could simply mean those with different 'values or politics.' Curriculum is critical. These changes are lessening the emphasis on social justice and diversity in our curriculum (for no known legal reason!). The statements on learning how to deal with diversity in planning don't meet other professional standards for cultural competency (nor is that term used) and there is no statement equivalent to the AICP code on expanding choice and opportunity, a special responsibility for the disadvantaged, and reducing economic and social segregation.

**4. Leaving definitions for diversity and diversity actions to the schools does not work.** The PAB diversity task force found that half of schools either do not have any diversity goals, or have goals that are just about 'perspectives' and 'specializations' being diverse, not about race/ethnicity, gender

or other under-represented identities. Many of our schools are only doing this work because PAB is holding them accountable! We cannot leave goals and strategies up to schools alone.

Overall, the proposed changes to diversity standards for faculty and students and curriculum changes are out of step with the values and ethics of ACSP, APA and AICP and what society requires of emerging planning professionals. Further, they are out of step with current trends in the planning academy, given the POCIG Climate survey, published in JPER, which found there are too many planning schools where faculty of color report feeling marginalized and that their colleagues or institutions are unreceptive and antagonistic towards their scholarship, teaching, and service, the continued low numbers of faculty of color as documented in the ACSP Committee on Diversity report on diversity among planning faculty and students for accredited PAB programs, 2008-13, and the continued problem of loss of scholars of color in the planning academy (due to programs not hiring graduates or faculty being let go in the process of mid-career review or at tenure promotion), and the need for more diversity among planning practitioners and graduates with cultural competence, committed to upholding the ethics and responsibility they have to the public.

Please Note: We have no objection to proposed changes to standards for size of student body or for consolidation of standards 1, 6 and 7. In fact, POCIG has advocated for PAB to drop the minimum program size requirement altogether, as doing so would be a positive change for the programs that serve the most diverse student populations: programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and at urban-serving universities.

Responses by a few faculty members may not lead to the necessary action (stopping these proposed revisions, engaging in appropriate and proactive broader consultation). We need members of the academy, the various divisions within APA and AICP, allied organizations and the practitioner community to respond as well! Please go to the web page that contains the document and write the PAB board about your opinion. See a fuller “call for responses,” in a separate block below. Direct comments to [pab@planning.org](mailto:pab@planning.org)

Signed,

The Executive Board of the Planners of Color Interest Group (POCIG)  
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning <http://www.acsp.org/aboutpocig>

“The mission of the Planners of Color Interest Group (POCIG) is to advance the interest and concerns of people and communities of color within the planning academy and the profession.”

Attachments:  
PAB Proposed Revisions  
POCIG Detailed Analysis of Proposed Revisions

