

November 2008

Guidelines for Proposals to Host the Third World Planning Schools Congress (WPSC'11)

I. Purpose

In July 2001 the First World Planning Schools Congress (WPSC'01) was held in Shanghai, China, under the joint sponsorship of the Asian Planning Schools Association (APSA), the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP), the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP), and the Australia and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools (ANZAPS). In addition to the Congress itself being a resounding success, meetings held among the participating Associations' leadership led to the Shanghai Statement, which called for the development of a Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN) and for the preparation of a second World Planning Schools Congress, which was held in Mexico City in 2006 (WPSC'06).

This set of general guidelines has been prepared to assist institutions to prepare competitive proposals to host the Third World Planning Schools Congress in 2011. Responding to the items contained in these guidelines will ensure that your proposal covers all of the necessary matters required in the two-stage submission process. Adhering to these guidelines should make it possible for interested institutions to prepare initial proposals without investing unnecessary time and expense. It should be emphasized that being selected as an Organizing Institution for the Third WPSC carries significant responsibilities. Yet, the previous Organizing Institutions—Tongji University, Shanghai, China, and the Autonomous University of Mexico—attest that the investment of time and resources is an extremely worthwhile undertaking for faculty, students and for the host institution.

II. General Congress Management Arrangements

The GPEAN Steering Committee for the WPSC is comprised of representatives from nine associations participating in the GPEAN (See Appendix II for a list of associations and their representatives on the steering committee). Its primary goal is to ensure the success of the WPSC. Thus, its purpose is to prepare and disseminate a call for proposals; select the successful Organizing Institution(s) and Congress location; select paper-track chairs (and co-chairs); monitor the progress of Congress preparations; and advise and assist the Organizing Institution in putting on a successful congress.

An Organizing Institution(s) (OI), and the GPEAN Steering Committee (SC), each of which has defined responsibilities, will jointly plan the Third World Planning Schools Congress. The OI, which will be one or more academic institutions affiliated with one of the nine GPEAN associations, is to propose the theme, the organizational structure, and actual delivery of the Congress, while the SC is to represent each participating association by providing academic oversight and exercising overall strategic leadership and international facilitation. This arrangement was initiated with the WPSC'01 in Shanghai and was effective in hosting a Congress that drew in excess

of 700 participants. It was carried on in Mexico City, with a congress with more than 100 sessions and more than 600 papers. By 2011 (or 2012), it is reasonable to expect that the draw may exceed 1,000 persons. The OI, through a system of Track Chairs set in place by the SC, coordinates the abstract submission and approval processes. The OI Chair (and/or Vice-Chairs) will participate in structuring the final program, but the SC will have overall responsibility for that important task. It is the primary role of the OI to ensure that all of the local arrangements are handled thoroughly and competently in support of the Congress program. The SC Chair (Professor Johanna LOOYE) and Co-Chairs (Professor David AMBORSKI and Professor Roberto Luis de Melo MONTE-MÓR) will provide continuous support to the OI, as will the entire SC.

This process is intended to emphasize the collaborative nature of the work of the OI and the SC. While primary responsibility for organizing the Congress rests with the OI, the SC functions in an advisory capacity – especially with regard to organizational structure, budgeting, marketing, and academic organization – to ensure a viable and robust process that leads to a successful Congress.

III. The Proposal Process (and Dates)

Proposals to host Third WPSC will be submitted via a two-stage process taking a total of three months (November 2008 through January 2009). In the first phase (Deadline: January 30, 2009), applicants will submit a preliminary proposal. At this point, the SC will make a preliminary selection of viable Congress proposals and invite institutions to prepare a full proposal (Deadline: July 15, 2009). Each of the nine GPEAN associations will have an opportunity to provide input into the preliminary and final selection. The final selection will be made by the nine representatives to the GPEAN SC. In the case when the current representative to the SC is a member of an institution submitting a proposal, the regional/national association will *either* suggest an alternative representative *or* the current representative will be excluded from the deliberations, leaving any regional/national association's letter of endorsement to serve as the only input to the selection process. Following selection, the GPEAN Steering Committee will evaluate the suitability of the venue, proven financial ability (including acceptance of all credit cards from all over the world, institutional support), website operability, logistics, etc.

IV. Items to be Addressed in the Preliminary Proposal

The SC encourages a creative approach to the proposal process. Within the guidelines of using English as the primary language and permitting registrants an opportunity to present their own work, the actual schedule, organizational structure, funding, and sponsorship, etc. are not pre-determined. Therefore, there is no prescribed format and stipulated length for responsive proposals from a potential Organizing Institution, although it is expected that the preliminary proposal should not exceed 10 pages (excluding supporting documents). The GPEAN Steering Committee will consider the following when selecting an initial proposal for second stage short-listing: how effectively the proposal addresses the items discussed in this section of the Guidelines; evidence that there is a commitment to carry out the program that will be honored in 2011; creativity and innovation in Congress activities (while upholding a tradition of wide ranging scholarly exchange in planning education); and the quality of the Congress site and facilities. The preliminary

proposal must contain the elements indicated in following sub-sections A-F. These seek information on Congress venue, transportation and accommodation facilities, organizing institution committee, Congress theme, and evidence of the financial viability of the proposal (an “indicative budget”).

The final proposal of those short-listed will contain expanded information with greater detail (see the attached Checklist) after discussion with the SC. This is to allow sufficient information to be available to permit due diligence to be undertaken by the SC as to the robustness of the final proposal and viability of the OI to deliver a successful Congress.

A. Congress Dates

A July Congress date is preferred in 2011 , although the primary concern is to accommodate academic schedules of the nine participating associations to the greatest extent possible. Also, it is preferred that the Congress dates not conflict with other related Congresses. While the proposal should provide specific Congress dates (which are necessary to determine availability of Congress venues and sleeping rooms), the final decision on the Congress dates rests with the SC. It should be noted that the Congress should fall within a one-week core period (Monday to Sunday), including pre-Congress activities, to permit participants to work within their academic schedules. It is also recommended that the schedule about a weekend, to permit registrants to take advantage of any airlines’ pricing for a “Saturday Night Stay,” which may be of particular relevance for domestic travel in many markets. Further, applicants should be mindful of travel times for international Congress participants, i.e. when they have to leave their homes in order to participate in the Congress.

The proposed dates should include at least three full days of full parallel track sessions, not including mobile workshops or plenary sessions. Additional days may be included for mobile workshops, plenary sessions and pre- and post-Congress activities.

B. Congress Venue

In order to accommodate the WPSC, it is necessary to identify facilities that can accommodate 15-20 breakout rooms with an average seating of 50 persons, capacity for a plenary session(s) of 1,000 or more people, and a facility/arrangement that accommodates 1,000 or more for lunch. Finally, it is recommended that the proposal include a dinner venue or reception for 1,000 or more people. Cost of the venue should be presented.

C. Transportation and Accommodation Facilities

It is necessary in the initial proposal to identify and briefly assess available transportation facilities that serve the Congress site (air carriers, rail service, etc), with some attention to typical costs (round trip) between major urban centers as well as frequency of service. (Include at least prices for travel *from* the following origins *to* the proposed Congress site: New York, Los Angeles, Toronto, London, Paris, Shanghai, Tokyo, Auckland, Sydney, Johannesburg, Rio de Janeiro, Mexico City. (Be mindful that prices may vary according to where the ticket is sold.)

It is necessary in the initial proposal to identify facilities that can accommodate 75% of the participants in sleeping rooms (or more) with both single and double occupancy, as well as some arrangements for student accommodation. The per night

room costs are important to Congress registrants and it is important to identify a range of appropriate venues at different price points that provide superior service. Accommodation cost will be a consideration in the Congress site selection. Fixed price room quotes in US\$ or Euros are preferable to those incorporating inflation, or currency adjustment mechanisms.

D. Organizing Institution (OI) and Available Resources

It is necessary to provide information about the resources the organizing institution can provide and the structures that would be put in place to ensure the success of the WPSC. The initial proposal should address: What is the general schedule of the Congress? What are the key preparatory activities? Who is responsible for them (starting when, for how long, at what cost)?

The proposing institution is expected to have the capacity to build and/or host a specific web site for the WPSC.

It is expected in the initial proposal that the chief academic officer(s) of the bidding institution(s) will provide a letter of endorsement to the proposal indicating the full backing of the institution, including assuring the availability of the human and other resources necessary to mobilize for the WPSC'11.

E. Conference Theme

The initial proposal should indicate a proposed conference theme of interest to the world community and its rationale. It should discuss suggested special sessions and mobile workshops that highlight the conference theme. The theme should be international in scope, yet reflective of local insights, experiences, conditions, etc. The SC suggests that the general theme should somehow be consistent with the “Where does planning go from here?” “World Agenda for Planners in 2011 and Beyond,” or “State of the Art and the Near Future for Planning” rubric.

F. Financial Issues

The OI takes full financial responsibility for the WPSC. The nine participating associations will endeavor to be active and involved in assisting the OI in obtaining funding for the Congress, especially in strategizing and in fundraising, but they will not assume legal and financial responsibility for the Congress.

The initial proposal should provide an indicative budget, including details of in-kind contributions, in a reasonably itemized format. It should specify registration fees and subsidy sponsorship. All figures used at all stages of the proposal should be presented in either US dollars or in Euros. (The value of faculty—teaching and research staff—time may *not* be included in in-kind contribution calculations.)

The OI should expect careful collaboration and oversight from the SC throughout the Congress preparation process, to ensure the success of the overall effort.

Please note that the Organizing Institution will have to cover costs of several members of the SC to the Congress site for at least three preparatory visits. It is expected that, from the operations of the Third WPSC, some seed money will be made available for the SC of a Fourth WPSC (as was done with WPSC'01 for WPSC'06).

V. Preliminary Proposal Submission Process

For full consideration, one original paper copy of the complete proposal, along with accompanying attachments (hotel booklets, local promotional information, etc.) should be express mailed by no later than Monday, January 30, 2009, to:

Johanna W. LOOYE, Associate Professor
School of Planning
University of Cincinnati
PO Box 210016 (or 346 Clifton Court)
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0016
USA

In addition, electronic copies (.pdf files) should be forwarded by the proposing institution to *each* of the nine representatives on the Steering Committee (identified in Appendix I).

Any questions about the proposal preparation process should go to the WPSC Chair, Johanna LOOYE <johanna.looye@uc.edu>, and Co-Chairs, David AMBORSKI <amborski@ryerson.ca> and Roberto Luis de Melo MONTE-MÓR <montemor@cedeplar.ufmg.br>, *simultaneously* (preferably via e-mail).

At any point in the process, the SC may ask for additional information and the proposing institution may request clarification of these Guidelines for Proposals.

CHECKLIST

The following checklist is indicative of the depth of information required to be supplied to the SC during the two-stage submission process. Applicants are encouraged to incorporate as much information as possible in the preliminary first stage proposal from material readily at hand, including all information identified as necessary for the initial submission within this “Guidelines for Proposal” document. The SC may also seek additional information, not listed here, in discussion with the bidding institution(s) as part of the second stage of the selection process, to ensure sufficient information to allow due diligence and effective planning for the Congress.

1. Organizational and External Support / Capacity

Evidence of support from institution('s / s') chief academic officer(s).

Evidence of external public and private sector support, including national and regional planning school associations.

Evidence of potential sponsorship support.

Record of comparable conference provision and financial viability.

2. Proposed Structure of Congress

Suggested theme.

Suggested date and schedule of Congress, including draft program.

Draft mobile workshop program.

Draft cultural activity program (particularly for accompanying persons).

Draft pre/post Congress program.

3. Structure of Organizing Institution Congress Committee

CVs of Congress OI Chair, Vice-Chair(s), formal members.

Evidence of prior conference organizing experience.

Availability / expected time commitment (in person-hours) prior to Congress.

4. Congress Management

Line budget, including proposed registration charges and other sources of income (including “in kind” contributions).

The budget should include fixed and variable cost components. Also, it should include a sensitivity analysis showing the financial outcome based on the targeted number of attendees and for 10-15% lower participation and 10-15% higher participation.

Secretariat service resources / structure to be deployed.

Insurance cover to be deployed.

Proposed formal staffing and voluntary support (prior to and during Congress).

Identity of commercial conference service provider(s) / professional conference organizer, including evidence of track record, stability, capacity (if to be used).

Identity of professional abstract manager with a system to distribute to co-chairs for evaluation of paper/panel proposals, and which allows co-chairs to communicate, preferably accommodating more than one language.

Furthermore, the system should allow coherent sessions to be composed or organized.

Management timeline / critical path / key dates in preparation.

Final statement of accounts must be submitted by the local Organizing Institution within one year of the Congress.

5. Infrastructure and Resources

Venue capacity, features and costs, barrier-free access.

Proposed catering provision, capacity to meet special dietary needs.

Accommodation capacity, costs and locations in regards to venue(s).

Intra-Congress transportation provision between venue, workshops, dinners, etc.

Proximity of accommodation/venue to airports and other major transport infrastructure (in travel time and costs).

Language translation capacity. Translation may be appropriate for keynote speakers or other events, but the SC understands that the cost may prohibitive for other Congress events.

Resources allocated for provision of Congress website.

Internet and other promotion methods proposed to be used.

Desirability of on-line abstract submission and review.

6. Appeal of Host Location

Tourism appeal and tourist costs.

Accessibility by national and international transport and costs.

Compelling planning issues.

Potential issues of perceived public safety / public hygiene / health provision / travel visas, etc. that may need to be addressed, including personnel who can handle crises such as robbery involving loss of travel documents, medical services.

APPENDIX I: Shanghai Statement, July 15, 2001

Representatives of national and international planning education associations gathered at Tongji University in Shanghai and agreed on the goal of increasing mutual communication in order to improve the quality and visibility of planning and planning education. To achieve this, it was agreed to establish a global planning education association network and a committee to plan holding the second World Planning Schools Congress and to develop an inclusive communication network.

Remarks by Bruce STIFTEL, President of ACSP

Thank you, Prof. ALBRECHTS (Chair, International Steering Committee, WPSC'01) Congress Delegates:

Nineteen representatives of ten planning schools associations took part in discussions during the WPSC. The associations represented were:

- The Asian Planning Schools Association (APSA)
- The Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP)
- The Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP, USA)
- The Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP)
- The Association of Schools of Planning, Indonesia
- The Australian & New Zealand Association of Planning Schools (ANZAPS)
- The Interim Coordinating Committee for the Revitalization of Planning Education in Africa
- The Latin-America Association of Schools of Urbanism and Planning (ALEUP)
- The National Association of Post-Graduate and Research Programs in Urban and Regional Planning, Brazil (ANPUR, Brazil)
- The French International Association of Planning Schools (APERAU)

We shared information on the organization and the ambitions of our various associations and considered common objectives and possible future actions.

The association representatives prepared the following resolution:

“The Leaders of the various planning school associations assembled in Shanghai express deep gratitude and appreciation to: Prof. WU Zhiqiang, Secretary General of the 1st WPSC; The WPSC Organizing Committee, chaired by Prof. WU Qidi, President of Tongji University; The WPSC Program Committee, chaired by Prof. Michael Hibbard and Prof. Tingwei Zhang; Together with the faculty, students, and administrators of Tongji University, for their extraordinary capability, energy and success in preparing and executing an overwhelmingly successful First World Planning Schools Congress.”

Will the members of the Organizing, Steering and Program Committees and Tongji faculty and administration please stand. Please join me in saluting them.

Additionally, the association leaders unanimously supported a resolution setting the stage for a second congress and opening communications on other matters.

We further agreed: that the second World Planning School Congress would be held in the year 2006; that the various planning school associations would have until December 2001 to endorse and join the preparations for the 2nd WPSC; and that a call for proposals to host the 2nd WPSC would be issued by December 2002.

Finally, we agreed that the Congress website would remain in operation, providing follow-up information on the Congress and links to other planning school association resources, until it can be replaced by a more permanent international planning school association web facility.

Signatories to the Shanghai Statement:

- APSA, Chang-Ho YIM, President of APSA, Seoul National University
- ACUPP, Thomas HARPER, Past President of ACUPP, the University of Calgary
- ACSP, Bruce STIFTEL, President of ACSP, Florida State University
- AESOP, Hans MASTOP, President of AESOP, the University of Neimeigen
- The Association of Schools of Planning, Indonesia, Leksono SUBANU, Vice President, Gadjah Mada University
- ANZAPS, Prof. Susan THOMPSON, ANZAPS, the University of New South Wales
- APERAU, Alain MOTTE, President of APERAU, Université de Droit, d'économie et des Sciences d'Aix-Marseille
- The Interim Coordinating Committee for the Revitalization of Planning Education in Africa, Prof. Tumsiph NNKYA, the University of Dar es Salaam
- ALEUP, Roberto Rodriguez, President of ALEUP, the Universidad Simon Bolivar
- ANPUR, Prof. Geraldo Magela COSTA, ANPUR, the Federal University of Minas Gerais

APPENDIX II: Members of GPEAN Steering Committee

AAPS - Faustin Kalabamu <kalabamu@mopipi.ub.bw>

ACSP - Johanna W. Looye <Johanna.Looye@uc.edu> (Chair)

ACUPP - David Amborski <amborski@ryerson.ca> (Co-Chair)

AESOP - Andrea Frank <franka@cardiff.ac.uk>

ALEUP - Sergio Flores Peña <floregra@prodigy.net.mx>

ANPUR - Roberto Luis de Melo Monte-Mór
<montemor@cedeplar.ufmg.br> (Co-Chair)

ANZAPS - Johanna Rosier <jrosier@usc.edu.au>

APERAU - Didier Paris <didier.paris@univ-lille1.fr>

APSA - Wu Zhiqiang <drwuchen@public2.sta.net.cn>