

CELA Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
Conference Call Thursday, November 29th, 2012

12:00 p.m. EST; 11:00 a.m. CST; 10:00 a.m. MST; 9:00 a.m. PST; 4:00 a.m. Sydney time

Call-in Info: The call-in number is 1-800-325-1307 for domestic callers and 1-858-244-1252 for international callers. The pass code is 361697.

Attendees: Mark Boyer, Linda Corkery, Katya Crawford, Will Green, Ryan Hargrove, Lauri Johnson, Ming-Han Li, Sean Michael, Lee-Anne Milburn, Patrick Mooney, Hala Nassar, Dave Pitt, Daniel Roehr, Allan Shearer, Pat Taylor.

Regrets: Blake Belanger, Dee Solco.

1. Welcome / orientation / roll call/ approval of previous minutes

2. VP for Research report: - (Li) Standing Committee on Research
*Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee on Strategic Planning and Faculty Support)
2013 Abstract Acceptance Report (file circulated by Patrick Mooney)

Total submitted: 451
Accepted + Accepted/Revise 327(20 Panels) = 98 concurrent sessions
Posters 77
Reject 47 (10% rejection rate)

Peer and non-peer reviewed options - are we going to do peer review of conference papers? The options under consideration are listed below:

Full Paper Options

Option 1 (Peer-review)

Based on 36 OpenConf volunteer reviewers, invite 18 authors to submit.

Pro: have reviewers, manageable, quality, peer review

Con: less can publish

Option 2 (Peer-review)

Invite oral abstracts of scores > 4.5 and require authors to review two papers, this means 129 authors to be invited.

Pro: more can publish, have reviewers, peer view

Con: labor, quality, time

Com	Edu	Imp	HTC	Land	Peop	Res	Serv	Sust	Urn	Total
6	14	2	31	12	26	18	8	4	8	129

Option 3 (Peer-review)

10% quota of accepted abstracts for each track, track chairs recommend authors to be invited. Track chairs further recruit reviewers. Authors are required to provide five reviewer names.

Pro: manageable, quality, peer review

Con: time to recruit reviewers, less can publish

Com	Edu	Imp	HTC	Land	Peop	Res	Serv	Sust	Urn	Total
2	5	1	6	2	6	4	2	2	3	33

Option 4 (non peer-review)

Invite all 404 accepted oral & poster authors. Model of TRB, ASABE, EDRA, European conferences. Publish and provide conference paper compendium DVD at the conference.

Pro: manageable, available at the conference, authors can submit for journals later

Con: all can publish, non peer review

Option 5 (non peer-review)

Invite top portion of 404 oral & poster authors.

Pro: manageable, available at the conference, authors can submit for journals later

Con: all can publish, non peer review

Future Option 6 (peer-review)

Call for Papers for future CELA conferences. Authors submit full papers (not just abstracts) for review. Presentation and / or publication review results are given. TRB model.

Pro: learning curve for CELA, participation, peer review

Con: demand for review, time

Future Option 7 (peer- review) (based on non peer-review conference papers published)

Track chairs and VPR recommend authors to *Landscape Journal* editors for peer review and then publishing a conference special issue.

Pro: peer review, connection between conference and LJ

Con: none if this is in the LJ contract

[Some people felt that this didn't work very well]

EDRA model - uses expanded abstract submission - 4 page submission, peer reviewed.

ACSP model - abstracts are peer reviewed - everyone brings a full paper with them and they are distributed informally during the course of the presentations.

Issues include the pedagogy category for which this is the best way to get peer review of their work; need for quick turn around on a paper. CELA needs a sustainable model so the members know what to expect. We need to decide if CELA, in the long term, has the capacity of doing large quantity peer review options. The non peer-review options have been adopted and applied by many other conferences. It was suggested that if CELA goes the non peer-review route that submissions and attendance at future conferences will decrease. The Peer-review process is a venue in which to get your work out.

The American society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers go through a two step process: (1) Peer-review abstracts: once those authors are accepted they are then welcome to put in full text papers. There is then a period of time for those papers to be included. Full papers are made available at the conference. The full papers can also be improved after the conference to present for journal publication. Another model to consider is to just submit full papers for conference review.

There were 76 abstract submitters for the CELA 2011 conference that followed up with full papers and 44 for the 2012 conference. Chris Ellis and Rachel Berney have been contacted but no response has been received yet. CELA needs a sustainable long term solution in place.

Need to have a decision in place soon. Chris Ellis is not planning on full paper reviews for the 2014 CELA conference in Maryland. If there is a decision to change the policy, it needs to be done soon.

Sean Michael suggested that we take a look at the stats (acceptance rates, etc) for past CELA conferences.

A suggestion was put forth that CELA include all papers on the DVD and then the peer-reviewed papers on the CELA website. We need to make sure it is a clear process. CELA has to remain a good venue for young professors.

Terry Clements announced that she currently has a paper in review by IFLA. They have a two tiered process of review for conference papers. She was required to submit papers to participate in the conference. All papers went through a cursory review to select the best of the papers. Invitations were then given to the better papers to make revisions for the final review. This is something CELA could do with track chairs.

Motion: CELA will invite all accepted authors to submit full papers for CELA 2013; we will communicate to the members that only the top selected papers will be accepted for peer review. (Motion by Ming-Han Li, Seconded by Lee-Anne Milburn - motion passed)

Action item: Patrick Mooney to work with Ming-Han Li and the Standing Committee on Research to formulate a proposed process for CELA to handle abstracts and paper submissions for 2014 and beyond for publication and bring back to the CELA board.

3. Landscape Journal Update: (Pitt)

The Halprin issue is in final galley. The delay was due to some difficulty with authors' final copy. The Spring Omnibus issue is lined up with 8 submitted manuscripts. Two of the accepted manuscripts are on studio instruction and design pedagogy. Three manuscripts are on history, one manuscript on theory and one on landscape conservation in Israel. A multifunctional issue is planned for fall 2013. LJ has had very good success on reviewer requests. Of the 60 requests sent, 48 have accepted and 7 have already submitted.

4. CELA 2013 Conference Update: (Shearer - 5 minutes)

Keynote speakers are confirmed. The CELA Fellows inaugural address will be given by John R. Stilgoe. He is a Landscape Historian from Harvard University. On Wednesday night, Amy S. Weisser, Ph.D., is the speaker. She is Director of Exhibition Development at the National September 11th Memorial and Museum. The opening speaker at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday is Rich Haag, FASLA. Due to the size of the conference, the concurrent sessions will be held in three locations; The AT&T Center, Classrooms at the Church Community Center and Goldsmith Hall in the School of Architecture. There are 11 timeslots for

concurrent sessions and we are looking at least at 10 concurrent sessions in each timeslot. Each slot has 4 presenters. The use of multiple venues will raise the issue of additional baseline costs. The details are still being worked out. The conference hotels are ready to accept reservations. It was suggested that onsite meetings of the CELA standing committees take place during the conference. Allan Shearer needs a list of the number of committees that will meet. Pat mentioned that the next conference call will be dedicated to the standing committees and this can be discussed more fully at that meeting.

5. President's Update: (Mooney - 15 minutes)

Cooperation with sister organizations: (ASLA and LAF)

Patrick has been in touch with Kristina Hill, chair of education at LAF. They would like to see more cooperation with CELA. LAF is pushing the notion of performance based measurement of landscapes. Specifically, they would like to see an online journal that gives academics credit for teaching landscape performance and producing research on that topic. They also would like the online journal to be referred. It was suggested that if LAF handle the referring, then those papers might be published as a subset of TILL. We will need to discuss with Dave Pitt. LAF would also like performance based measures of landscapes to become a part of the accreditation process. They have been in talks with Mary Myers and LAAB. In February, LAAB will meet to discuss the issue and would like to have CELA's support. No commitments on CELA's part have been made. We will not know how the LAAB board feels until after their meeting. LAF is very successful at raising funds. They have offered to share revenue where we have mutual fund raising goals. They have also offered access to board members for fundraising information and ideas. They would also like to see more LAF presence at CELA panel discussions. Ming-Han Li is on LAF's research committee and the issue was discussed at a meeting he attended. One suggestion is to include LAF staff in abstract or full review process if a paper is identified as landscape performance related. In favor of adding landscape performance measures as a track but needs more board discussion. The impact on accreditation requires a separate discussion once we know specifically what LAF has in mind. Kristina stated that LAAB wants to encourage programs to include landscape performance standards - not view it as a requirement.

Action: Pat Taylor and Patrick Mooney to discuss adding performance based measures of landscapes track and bring back a proposal to the board.

CELA/ASLA Cooperation on STEM:

Per phone conversation with Susan Apollonio, STEM is on the agenda for ASLA committee on Education meeting. Patrick found a report on The Coordinating Federal Science Technology Engineering Math - STEM Educational Investments Progress Report. It did not make it into the discussion because of a full agenda. Susan agreed to put it on the December agenda. Mark Boyer is the CELA rep on that committee. The issue of CELA cooperating with ASLA on STEM will be on the agenda for the President's Council meeting in February 2013.

ASLA/LAAB accreditation of certificate programs:

Patrick received notification from Blake Belanger that the Kentucky ASLA State Committee is going to write a formal letter to ASLA opposing the certification of non-degree programs. Karen Hanna suggested that another email be sent to all CELA administrators asking them to raise the issue again with their trustees one month before the vote. The issue also should be raised at the administrator's meeting during the CELA 2013 annual conference.

CELA Strategic Plan committees/CELA Standing Committees:

We now have reports from the Faculty Support Committee and the Research Committee. The Outreach Committee has a new chair, Sam Dennis. They met on November 16th, 2012 but have not submitted a report yet. A report from the Strategic Planning Curriculum Committee chaired by Stephanie Rolley is still outstanding. All committees have been asked to submit a report by December 12, 2012.

6. Treasurer's report (McCown, Orta):

The end of year fiscal report will be given in January 2013.

7. Report from Executive Office (Taylor/Solco):

A reminder memo will be sent to Administrators next week asking for nominations for student director. CELA is hosting the President's Council Meeting January 31st - February 2nd, 2013. To date, we have received about \$15,000 in membership dues and \$2,900 in advertising revenue. Florida A&M University no longer has its landscape program and is no longer a CELA member.

8. Past President's report (Clements):

The offices of 1st Vice President, Treasurer, Student Director and Directors for regions 3 and 6 are up for election. The call for officer nominations has gone out but no nominations have been received to date. The announcement will be sent out each week.

9. 2nd Vice President's report (Boyer):

Committee members have been secured and are eager and ready to serve. A reminder concerning the call for award nominations will be sent out.

Call ended at 12:30 p.m.