



# PAB Newsletter

## 2017 PAB STANDARDS

After a number of drafts and two public comment periods, PAB approved revised Accreditation Standards on March 3, 2017. The 2017 Standards provide greater clarity on student and programmatic learning outcomes and a stronger focus on principles, outcomes and accountability. Distance education as a modality has been added as well as new language to improve consistency in reviews with regard to issues of diversity.

Programs submitting Self-Study Reports in 2018 will use the 2017 standards. Programs submitting Self-Study Reports and Progress Reports in 2017 and hosting Site Visits during the 2017 – 2018 academic year will be assessed using the 2012 standards. The link to the 2017 Standards is available on the [PAB website](#) and [here](#).

The Self-Study Report Manual will be revised this summer, so stay tuned. Additionally PAB staff will work with programs later this summer to ensure requirements for public information on websites is easily transitioned for January 1<sup>st</sup> compliance with the new standards.

Thank you to everyone that provided comments and suggestions for language change. Participation by both planners and academics is crucial to ensuring standards are relevant and meaningful.

## NEW NOTEWORTHY PRACTICES ADDED

We've added two new programs to the Noteworthy Practices document on the PAB website. Find out how your peers are complying with PAB Standards. If you haven't checked out this valuable resource, it is available in the Data Library section of the [PAB website](#). New Programs added include: the University of Colorado, Denver for exceptional efforts in engaging their students in the profession, particularly via the strong relationship with the APA Chapter; and the University of Oregon for its experiential learning model.

## NEW AND REVISED POLICIES

Concurrent with amending the PAB Standards, the Board reviewed Site Visit processes and procedures. After extensive benchmarking with other accreditation organizations, feed-

(Continued on page 2)

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

<a href="#">New/Revised Policies.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Resources for PA.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Assessing Assessments..</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">APA Ethics Case .....</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">Board Meeting .....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">PAB Site Visit Pool.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>



### June 15, 2017

Draft Self-Study Report due for programs with fall 2017 Site Visits

### September 1

Progress Report due (if applicable)

### September 15

Draft Self-Study Report due for programs with spring 2018 Site Visits

### September/November

Fall Site Visits

### October 12–15

PAB Fall Board Meeting at the [ACSP National Conference in Denver](#).

### December 1

Annual Fee due

### January 31, 2018

Annual Report due for all programs

For the most current calendar visit the [PAB website](#).

(Continued from page 1)

back from PAB Site Visitors, and legal review, PAB has revised the following policies and procedures, effective with the Fall 2017 Site Visits:

- ⇒ Site Visit Schedule
- ⇒ Site Visit Team Retention of Information
- ⇒ Site Visit Team Recommendations

### **Site Visit Schedule**

The Site Visit length has been reduced from 3 days to 2.5 days. The schedule changes include:

- The visit now begins on Sunday evening with a team working dinner;
- The team is finished with its meetings after lunch on Tuesday. Tuesday afternoon is dedicated to working on the draft Site Visit Report and any supplemental meetings.
- Individual faculty interviews, the library tour and meeting with career services have been eliminated;
- Faculty interviews have been replaced with group meetings;
- Alumni, APA and employers will meet with the team as one group; and
- The introductory meeting with the Provost is now optional.

### **Site Visit Retention of Information**

Site Visitors are no longer required to retain materials for one year. Site Visitors must destroy all materials connected with the Site Visit once the Site Visit Report is final.

### **Site Visit Team Recommendation**

Teams are no longer required to submit to PAB a recommendation on the length of accreditation.

### **NEW POLICY: Teach-out Plan**

A program withdrawing from accreditation and/or one whose accreditation has been revoked, must provide an annual teach-out plan concurrent with its Annual Report. The teach-out plan must provide for the equitable treatment of students to complete their education, including any teach-out agreements that the program and institution has entered into or intends to enter into with another institution. The complete policy text is found in the [PAB Policies and Procedures Manual](#).

## ***Resources for Program Administrators***

Whether you are working on your Self-Study Report or benchmarking with peer institutions, there are a variety of data sources that can help you. First and foremost, your institution's Office of Institutional Research is a treasure trove of information and data. Staff are trained in accreditation, assessment, research and planning. A common misconception is that the office is there just to serve senior leadership. That is not the case; they are there for the entire institution, so be sure to connect with them. A few other higher education data resources include:

## ***Websites***

Association for Institutional Research (AIR): [www.airweb.org](http://www.airweb.org)

Economic Development and Employer Planning Systems: [www.edeps.org](http://www.edeps.org)

National Association of College and Employers: [www.naceweb.org/job-market/graduate-outcomes/first-destination/](http://www.naceweb.org/job-market/graduate-outcomes/first-destination/)

National Center for Education Statistics: <http://nces.ed.gov>

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System: <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>

NCES College Navigator: <http://nces.ed.gov collegenavigator>

National Student Clearinghouse: [www.studentclearinghouse.org](http://www.studentclearinghouse.org)

National Survey of Student Engagement: <http://nsse.indiana.edu/>

## Assessing the Assessment: The Role of Practitioners in Student Learning Outcomes

PAB conducted a survey of 76 institutions with PAB-accredited programs. We received a 41% response rate. Of those that responded, 84% involved professionals/practitioners in assessment either formally or informally. The redacted results of the survey are available on the [PAB website](#).

PAB will hold a roundtable session on this topic at the [ACSP conference in Denver](#). We recently held a similar panel at the APA conference with Hilary Nixon, San Jose State University; Catherine Lawson, University at Albany, SUNY; Marcia Kees, University at Albany, SUNY; and Eric Kelly, Ball State University.

During Denver's roundtable, participants will discuss various ways programs are involving practitioners in their assessment of students. Panelists and participants will share the challenges and opportunities with engaging external constituents. Please visit the PAB website and conference schedule for the date and time of this roundtable.

Assessment Tool	Percent of Institutions
Internship evaluation	32%
Capstone/project jurors	26%
Alumni/employer focus groups	23%
Advisory council	19%
Employer surveys	19%
Client review of capstone projects	10%
Information communication	10%
Practitioner-in-residence	10%



## Teaching Aid for Ethics?

By Jim Peters

For the past several years, the Ethics Committee of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) has prepared an annual "Ethics Case of the Year" (COY), which is designed for educational purposes at local, state, and national planning conferences.

The COY draws on real-life examples of ethical misconduct cases from the previous year, as well as informal inquiries received by AICP's Ethics Officer. The most recent edition, which was posted on the AICP's [website](#) in early June, addresses such current and long-term topics as: gifts, inaccurate information, plagiarism, social media, special advantages, and supplemental jobs.

Each of the ethical scenarios is accompanied by a series of questions designed to generate discussion by conference attendees. Following each set of questions are slides with the relevant "rules of conduct" from the *AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*, as well as excerpts from the *Ethical Principles for Planning*, which is a document intended for anyone involved in the planning process, including appointed and elected officials.

The Ethics Case of the Year is usually presented as part of a conference session aimed at helping AICP members meet their biennial Certification Maintenance (CM) requirements for ethics training. Conference panels usually include practicing planners who have a strong familiarity with the *Ethics Code*. In some cases, those planners often serve as the Professional Development Officers (PDO) of a state chapter or local section of the American Planning Association (APA).

These PDOs are potential contacts if you are interested in finding someone to lecture on ethics in your undergraduate or graduate planning programs. To learn who your state—or area—PDO is, contact your local APA chapter or section.

*Jim Peters, FAICP, is the Ethics Officer for APA/AICP. He is an adjunct instructor in the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, as well as a former member of the Planning Accreditation Board.*

## SPRING 2017 BOARD MEETING

During the board meeting in New York, PAB granted accreditation to the following institutions:

- **University of Arizona**, Master of Science in Planning
- **University of California, Berkeley**, Master of City Planning
- **Hunter College, City University of New York**, Master of Urban Planning
- **Iowa State University**, Bachelor of Science in Community and Regional Planning and Master of Community and Regional Planning

Congratulations to the **University of Missouri – Kansas City**, Bachelor of Arts in Urban Planning + Design for receiving initial accreditation, effective January 1, 2018.

Further information on board actions and decisions is available at [Summary of Recent Actions](#) on the PAB website.

## PAB SITE VISIT POOL

Many thanks to the Spring 2017 Site Visit Teams.



### Team Chairs

Emil Malizia, Ph.D., FAICP  
George Rogers, Ph.D.  
Thomas Sanchez, Ph.D.  
Bruce Stiftel, Ph.D., FAICP  
Ana Maria Whitaker, Ph.D., AICP  
Curt Winkle, Ph.D.

### Team Members

Clint Andrews, Ph.D.  
John Betancur, Ph.D.  
Richard Bickel, FAICP  
Lee Brown, FAICP  
Michael Burayidi, Ph.D.  
Arlan Colton, FAICP  
Jeanette Dinwiddie-Moore, FAICP  
Jennifer Evans-Cowley, Ph.D., AICP  
Bob Mitchell, FAICP  
Stacey Swearingen White, Ph.D.

### Site Visitor Recognition

PAB is grateful for the hard work and dedication of all our Site Visitors. We would like to recognize the following individuals who have retired from the SV pool. Thank you for the many years of service to PAB and your contribution to the field of planning.

### Educators:

Randall Crane, Ph.D.  
Cliff Ellis, Ph.D.  
Michael Hibbard, Ph.D.  
Catherine Ross, Ph.D.

### Practitioners:

Christopher Brown, AICP  
Dennis Gordon, FAICP  
Mark Hinshaw, FAICP  
Jacquelyn Lynch, AICP  
Roger Wagoner, FAICP



### In Memoriam

*William W. Bowdy, FAICP passed away in April. He served as President of the AICP Commission from 1995 to 1997. He also served as the AICP appointee on the PAB Board for two terms from 1985 to 1991. Our deepest sympathies for his family and friends.*

PAB Panel @ APA National Conference in New York.  
Panelists (from left to right): Eric Kelly Damian, PhD, FAICP, Ball State University; Marcia Kees, University at Albany; Hilary Nixon, PhD, San Jose State University; and Catherine Lawson, PhD, University at Albany