



Report of the Awards Review Committee

In 2011 the American Planning Association (APA) Louisiana Chapter initiated a review of its planning awards. A desired outcome was a recommendation for an award program with detailed components: categories, criteria, eligibility and submission requirements, judging guidelines, and related items such as fees and award type.

This report documents the review and recommendation of the 2011 APA-LA Awards Review Committee. Based on existing national and state practices, it presents a recommendation for a streamlined group of awards subject to established criteria for judging the merit of award nominees. The following section summarizes the committee's recommendation, and subsequent sections provide the recommendation in detail as developed during the committee's meetings.

Executive Summary

Each year, the American Planning Association Louisiana Chapter (APA-LA) recognizes outstanding efforts in planning and planning leadership through the state's planning awards. After reviewing the types of awards and the process for determining winners, the 2011 APA-LA Awards Review Committee makes the following recommendation for the determination and presentation of seven meaningful awards that honor excellence in Louisiana plans, individuals, and organizations.

1. Create a category entitled "Louisiana Planning Excellence Awards" that comprise four awards subject to criteria summarized in this table:

APA-Louisiana Planning Excellence Awards and Criteria				
Award Type	Plan	Plan Implementation	Planning Process	Education or Advocacy
Criteria				
Originality and innovation	√	√	√	√
Transferability	√	√	√	√
Quality	√	√	√	√
Comprehensiveness	√	√	√	√
Public participation or education	√	√	√	√
Role of planners	√	√	√	
Implementation strategy and funding	√	√	√	
Effectiveness, results, or sustained improvement	√	√	√	√



2. Create a category entitled "Louisiana Planning Achievement Awards" that comprise two awards subject to criteria summarized in this table:

APA-Louisiana Planning Achievement Awards and Criteria		
Award Type	Planning Leadership	Enriching a Community's Quality of Life in Honor of Francis P. Keevers
Criteria		
Support of planning or planners	√	√
Collaboration	√	√
Effectiveness, results, and influence	√	√
Ethical practice	√	
Social and economic concerns		√

3. Create a category entitled "Award for a Louisiana Student Project" subject to criteria summarized in this table:

Criteria for APA-Louisiana Student Project Award
Originality and innovation
Transferability
Quality
Implementation
Comprehensiveness

4. Impose the following eligibility requirements:

Eligibility Requirements	
For Entry	For Nominator
Must have been completed or implemented within 3 years of submission	Must not self nominate
Must be entered in only one category	Must not be related by blood or marriage to individual s/he wants to nominate
Must be judged as submitted by deadline date	Must not be a member of the Awards Jury or an officer of the APA-LA Chapter
May be moved to another category by judges	May not make changes to entry after submission deadline
For an individual, is ineligible for 10 yrs. for same award	For planning leadership award, must be an APA member in good standing
For planning excellence awards, may be either APA member or nonmember	For student project award, must be either head of university division or PSO student representative
For planning leadership award, must be	



Eligibility Requirements	
For Entry	For Nominator
APA member in good standing and is earning or have earned a living as professional planner or over a sustained period of time as a planning educator in a PAB accredited program	
For Francis Keevers award, must not be APA member or earn living as professional planner	
For student project award, must be from LA university with planning or related program, and only one per program; must not have received the award already; and must not include student holding APA office	

5. Impose a flat \$50.00 fee per entry, excluding the Francis Keevers award and the student project award, with the entry fee linked to the award type on a cost recovery basis
6. Provide an award that is a stand-up, personalized, glass or acrylic trophy to the winner and at least one certificate depending on the size of the team, all of which contains the APA-LA logo in accordance with APA Brand Guidelines
7. Impose the following jury guidelines and judging process:

Jury and Juror Requirements	
Composition	5 jurors: 1 from each chapter section and 1 who is a faculty member of a PAB-accredited planning program
Representation (from Sections, assigned on a rotational basis)	At least 1 juror employed by a local government planning agency At least 1 juror employed by a private firm engaged in urban planning At least 1 juror working or residing in a jurisdiction with a population under 50,000 At least 1 juror working or residing in a jurisdiction with a population over 50,000
Qualifications	AICP certification, except faculty member Current membership in good standing with AICP, APA and LA Chapter Minimum of 5 years experience
Appointment	Chapter section jurors each appointed by respective chapter officer University juror appointed by division head Confidentiality of appointments required Each juror appointed for 1-year term



General Procedural Requirements for Judging
By unanimous vote, jurors may move a nomination from one category to a more appropriate category
Jurors are under no obligation to select winners in all categories
Jurors may not create new award categories
Jurors may not communicate with nominators or representatives of nominated efforts
Jurors must disclose direct involvement with a nominated effort and must not participate in deliberations or voting regarding the nomination
Jurors must maintain confidentiality

Judging Responsibilities and Guidelines	
For Jury Coordinator	For Jurors and Jury
Distributes materials to jurors and provides jurors with logistical information	Designates a foreman to facilitate meetings
Ensures that adequate time is provided for nominations and jurors	Uses a 2-part judging process: 1 st round—via conference call during which judges evaluate each nomination against applicable awards criteria and at least 3 out of 5 judges must vote to advance the nomination to the final round; 2 nd round—in person during which judges debate the nominations and 5 out of 5 judges must vote for each winner
Does not participate in jury deliberations or convey any communication between nominators and jurors	
Ensures that jurors' expenses are paid by APA-LA	

Committee Background

In May 2011, the APA Louisiana Chapter established the Awards Review Committee composed of six members who represent the chapter's elected officers, general membership, and four sections. Chapter leadership requested that the committee review and make a recommendation that streamlines and clarifies the chapter's annual planning awards, and further that the committee deliver the final report in time for the August 27, 2011 meeting of the chapter's Executive Committee. The members of the awards committee met via conference call four times during a six-week period to make the August 27 deadline and accomplish the committee's goals, as the following table documents:



Awards Review Committee Members and Meetings					
Name	Chapter Representation	June 21	July 5	July 19	Aug. 2
Bill Bailey, AICP	Northern Louisiana	√		√	√
Jeff Leuenberger, AICP	Officers	√	√	√	√
Jessica Keasler	Capital Area	√	√	√	√
Mike Hollier, AICP	Acadiana	√	√	√	√
Rafe Rabalais	Metro New Orleans	√		√	√
Terri Wilkinson, AICP	Members	√	√	√	√

To guide the committee a work program stated two specific goals: 1) Establish award categories and criteria, submission requirements, and a jury process; and 2) Establish the type of award to be given (e.g., trophy, plaque) and media coverage for award recipients. An overall goal was conformance to national APA brand guidelines in awards procedures and materials (Appendix).

The following sections summarize the results of each meeting of the Awards Review Committee and provide the overall recommendation of the committee to realize excellence in state planning awards.

Meeting 1: Establish Award Categories

During meeting 1 on June 21, 2011, the Awards Review Committee made introductions and confirmed its broad charge and the specific goal for this meeting: establish award categories. After discussion, the committee agreed on this overarching principle for chapter awards:

Limit the number of award categories so that each award is meaningful and distinctive and all awards comprise a select group

The committee reasoned that national APA solicits nominations from the entire country for a select number of awards, and manages to make distinctions among the multiple nominations from varied communities, organizations and individuals. As well as increasing the value of each award, limiting the number of award categories befits Louisiana, a relatively small state and chapter.

The committee discussed related matters and determined that during subsequent meetings it would further discuss and make a recommendation for policies to address issues such as whether every award must be given every year.

Based on materials sent to each member a week earlier, the Awards Review Committee discussed the award categories of national APA and



the states of Louisiana, Indiana and Washington. It then proposed the following list of APA-Louisiana chapter award categories:

1. A Plan

For a comprehensive plan, or a separate plan that addresses a specific area such as a neighborhood, downtown, corridor, redevelopment area, or critical and sensitive area, or a specific topic such as transportation, housing, economic development, community facilities, parks and open space, or hazards mitigation; with an emphasis on plans that advance the science and art of planning

2. Plan Implementation

For a planning technology, program, project, or tool, such as a land development regulation, incentive, financial initiative, or similar measure, that is ensuring the realization of proposals advanced in a plan and accomplishing positive change with medium- to long-term, measurable results through continuous effect for a minimum of four years

3. Planning Process

For an initiative, program, or project that illustrates how a community uses citizen participation and the planning process to create a plan or realize an implementation strategy under the traditional scope of planning, or to address a need extending beyond the traditional scope of planning in new or different settings; with an emphasis on the involvement of people in the creation and management of their built and natural environments

4. Education or Advocacy

For an individual, program, or project that uses information and advocates education about the value of planning to create greater awareness among citizens or the public and inspire interest and participation in planning

5. Leadership

For a professional planner who earns or has earned their living in planning, who contributes significantly to the advancement of planning practice or academic education over a sustained period through exemplary leadership and substantial accomplishments, as a credit to the American Planning Association



6. Enriching a Community's Quality of Life in Honor of Francis P. Keevers

For an individual, elected or appointed official, group, or organization that promotes planning through sustained commitment to a project, program or plan; addresses community concerns through special actions or significant contributions to planning initiatives; or demonstrates exceptional collaboration with diverse interests to improve a community's quality of life. Honors the late Frank Keevers for his contributions to improving the quality of life of a community through civic and business endeavors

7. Student Project

For an outstanding class project or paper by a student or group of students in a planning or related program that embodies good planning practice or applied research and contributes to advances in planning

Meeting 2: Establish Eligibility and Criteria

During meeting 2 of the Awards Review Committee on July 5, 2011, the first order of business was consideration of the award categories. The committee agreed that no major changes are necessary to the list and descriptions of the award categories compiled from meeting 1. It then voted to adopt the categories listed above as the recommendation of the committee.

The committee's second order of business was consideration of eligibility requirements and criteria for the awards. As the basis of discussion the committee used a compilation of current eligibility requirements and criteria for national and state planning awards. It reasoned that the national criteria and requirements are relevant because the country's top professional planning organization sanctions their use and applies them with success to a wide variety of award nominations from throughout the country. Current state criteria reflect national ones, thereby maintaining consistency and connection between the two levels of APA. The committee proceeded with this premise for eligibility and criteria:

Apply established and still relevant national and state criteria to ensure continuity and consistency in determining award recipients

The committee applied each criterion and its description to each of the seven award categories, and expanded its recommendation from meeting one with the following proposal for eligibility requirements and criteria:



General Eligibility Requirements

The following general eligibility requirements apply to all of the award categories except the Student Project Award, which is subject to separate requirements listed under the student project award section later in this report.

- With the exception of the Plan Implementation award category, any plan, project, program, tool, technology, process, report, or ordinance must have been published, implemented, or completed within three years of the date of submission.
- Any plan, project, program, tool, technology, process, report, or ordinance may only be entered in one award category per award year. No changes will be allowed by the nominator after the submission deadline. By unanimous vote, jurors may choose to move a nomination from the submitted category to a different category.
- Recipients of either of the state Planning Achievement Awards are ineligible to receive the same award for 10 years after accepting it.
- Individuals may not self-nominate and only APA members may nominate individuals for the Achievement Award for Planning Leadership.
- Nominators may not be related by blood or marriage to any individual they want to nominate for awards for Planning Education or Advocacy, Leadership, or in Honor of Francis P. Keevers.
- Members of the Louisiana Awards Jury or officers of the APA Louisiana Chapter are not eligible to enter or receive individual awards during their terms.

APA-Louisiana Planning Excellence Awards

The Louisiana Planning Excellence Awards include these four awards: Plan; Plan Implementation; Planning Process; and Planning Education or Advocacy.

Excellence Awards for a Plan, Plan Implementation, or Planning Process

Excellence Awards for a Plan, Plan Implementation, and Planning Process recognize group achievement by a planning agency, planning team or firm, community group, or local authority, regardless of the size of the jurisdiction. Each of these awards is subject to the following eligibility and criteria:

Eligibility: Open to APA members and non-APA members. There are no limits on the size of jurisdiction.



Criteria: Each nomination must address all of the following criteria:

Originality and innovation. Document how your entry presents a visionary approach or innovative concept to address needs. Explain how it broadens accepted planning principles within the context of the situation.

Transferability. Illustrate how the nominated plan, implementation strategy, or planning process has potential application for others and how wider use of the entry's components and methodology would further the cause of good planning.

Quality. Indicate how your entry represents excellence of thought, analysis, writing, and graphics throughout the plan, implementation strategy, or planning process, regardless of budgetary limitations. Indicate how available resources were used in a thoughtful, well-conceived, and ethical process.

Comprehensiveness. Specify how your entry observed planning principles, especially in consideration of its effects on other public objectives.

Public participation. Explain the extent to which your entry involved various public interests and fostered strong communication to help meet goals and objectives. Show how the nominated plan, implementation strategy, or planning process demonstrates a strong effort to obtain or maintain public and private support, including: input from those who historically have not participated in or have been left out of the planning process; participation of the widest variety of residents and stakeholders; and engagement and commitment of community leaders and local officials. For the planning process award, elaborate on how strategic partnerships or alliances were developed in support of the planning effort.

Role of planners. Describe the role, significance, and participation of planners. Demonstrate the connection between your entry's success and increased awareness in the community of planners and planning.

Implementation strategy and funding. Address what steps your entry took or is taking to build or maintain momentum and public support for creating, following, and implementing the plan. Identify funding challenges or support for the planning effort. Report any political changes that might effect, for better or worse, long-term funding for updating or implementing the plan, including continued public participation.



Effectiveness, results, and sustained improvement. State how your entry addressed the need or issue that prompted its initiation. Be explicit about how the results have made a difference in the lives of the people affected. For the plan implementation award, indicate the level of consistency of this effort since its start and the effectiveness it can have over time. Detail any changes, derailments, or improvements throughout plan implementation.

Examples: Plans, regulations and codes, tax initiatives, design guidelines, transferable development rights programs, land acquisition efforts, technology applications, handbooks, public art or cultural efforts, community festivals, environmental or conservation initiatives, focused tourism ventures, capital improvements programs.

Excellence Award for Education or Advocacy

The Excellence Award for Education or Advocacy recognizes individual or group achievement, and is subject to the following eligibility and criteria:

Eligibility: Open to APA and non-APA members

Criteria: Each nomination must address all of the following criteria:

Originality and innovation. Document how your entry presents a visionary approach or innovative concept to address needs. Explain how it broadens accepted planning principles within the context of the situation.

Transferability. Illustrate how your entry has potential application for others and how widespread application would be in the interest of the planning profession and would further the cause of good planning.

Quality. Indicate how your entry represents excellence of thought, analysis, writing, graphics, and overall presentation, mindful of the targeted audience and regardless of budgetary limitations. Indicate how available resources were used in a thoughtful, well-conceived, and ethical process.

Comprehensiveness. Specify how your entry observed planning principles, especially in consideration of its effects on public objectives.

Effectiveness and results. State how your entry addressed the need or problem that prompted its initiation; be explicit about how the results have made a difference in the lives of the people affected. Describe the extent that your entry has been effective in formulating and implementing plans and ideas in support of good planning. Identify the level of influence and effectiveness achieved by the nominee within



different segments of the community; provide measurable results if possible or appropriate (for example, pre- or post-outreach effort poll results).

Education and public participation. Establish how your entry has engaged persons in planning and influenced public awareness and understanding of planning beyond those persons immediately affected. Describe how your entry encouraged community leaders to revise their opinions about the varied uses and broad applications of planning. Show how your entry has increased the understanding of planning principles, the planning process, and the role of planners. Explain how the results have been measured and internalized.

Examples: Engaged citizens, citizen activists, or neighborhood leaders demonstrating outstanding leadership in a community, region, or state; members of planning commissions or advisory boards; boards of appeal, economic development boards, environmental or historic preservation boards, or other appointed officials; elected officials holding office at the local, regional, or state level; broad community efforts showing how planning can make a difference, curricula designed to teach children about planning, neighborhood empowerment programs, use of technology to expand public participation in planning

APA-Louisiana Planning Achievement Awards

The Louisiana Planning Achievement Awards include these two awards: Planning Leadership and Enriching a Community's Quality of Life in Honor of Francis P. Keevers. They honor individuals for outstanding, significant, and sustained contributions to, and in support of, planning or the planning profession. They are subject to the following eligibility and criteria:

Achievement Award for Leadership

Eligibility: Individuals may not self-nominate and must earn or have earned their living in planning as professional planners or over a sustained period of time as a planning educator in a PAB accredited program. Open only to APA members in good standing.

Criteria: Each nomination must address all of the following criteria:

Support of planning and planners. Illustrate how the nominee's work has increased the understanding of the planning profession and planning process. Indicate how the nominee has shown support for and a thorough knowledge and clear understanding of the role of planners in public life.



Collaboration. Describe how the nominee has developed or fostered strategic partnerships or alliances to help meet planning goals and objectives, change the working dynamic, and expand the support for planning.

Effectiveness, results, and influence. Describe the extent that the nominee has been effective in formulating and implementing plans, programs, projects, technologies, and ideas in support of good planning. Identify the level of influence and effectiveness achieved by the nominee within different segments of the community. Demonstrate the nominee's positive influence on the direction and professional advancement of planning.

Ethical practice. Show how your nominee consistently upholds and champions the highest standards of professional ethics in terms of the public trust and guides and educates staff, students, stakeholders, or colleagues on the importance of high ethical practice.

Achievement Award for Enriching a Community's Quality of Life in Honor of Francis P. Keevers

Eligibility: Individuals may not self-nominate and must not earn or have earned their living in planning as a professional planner. Open only to non-APA members.

Criteria: Each nomination must address all of the following criteria:

Support of planning. Illustrate how the nominee's work has increased the understanding of the planning process. Indicate how the nominee has shown a clear understanding of, and support for, the role of planning in improving a community's quality of life.

Collaboration. Describe how the nominee has developed or fostered strategic partnerships or alliances to help meet planning goals and objectives.

Effectiveness, results, and influence. Describe the extent that the nominee has been effective in formulating and implementing plans, programs, projects, technologies, and ideas in support of improved quality of life. Identify the level of influence and effectiveness achieved by the nominee within different segments of the community. Demonstrate your nominee's positive influence on the advancement of planning.

Social and economic concerns. Explain how the nominee's efforts have addressed not only a community's physical realm, but also its social and economic or civic and business concerns and issues. Describe how



the nominee's efforts have improved a community's overall quality of life.

APA-Louisiana Student Project Award

The APA-Louisiana Student Project Award recognizes outstanding class projects or papers by a student or group of students and intends to recognize exceptional work that advances the field of urban planning, work primarily by the student(s) with minimal, appropriate guidance by faculty. It is subject to the following eligibility and criteria:

Eligibility:

A paper or project completed within the previous three years from a student or group of students in a Louisiana university urban planning program, or a related program such as architecture, landscape architecture, geography, environmental sciences, or public policy, may receive this award one time in one of three categories: 1) contribution of urban planning to contemporary issues, or how the related field supported planning's contribution to contemporary issues; 2) application of the planning process; and 3) applied research that supports urban planning. A program may submit only one nomination. A nomination from a program related to urban planning must clearly demonstrate its application to and support for urban planning. If a student holds an elected or appointed office in national or Louisiana Chapter APA, her or his work or the work of the group in which s(he) participated is not eligible during the student's term of service. A nomination for this award may be submitted by either: 1) the head of the Louisiana university division that contains the urban planning or related program; or (2) the duly elected or appointed Planning Student Organization (PSO) Student Representative of the Louisiana university planning program.

Criteria: Each nomination must address all of the following criteria:

Originality and innovation. Originality of concept or appreciable refinement of existing techniques or procedures

Transferability. Potential application to other locations, projects, or areas of planning interest

Quality. Excellence of thought, analysis, writing, graphics, and character of presentation

Implementation. Proposals of the paper or project have been carried out, show promise of being carried out, or demonstrate an effective implementation technique



Comprehensiveness. The paper or project observes planning principles, especially in considering effects on public objectives

Meeting 3: Establish Submission Requirements

During meeting three of the Awards Review Committee on July 19, 2011, the first order of business was consideration of the awards eligibility and criteria. The committee discussed the collaboration criterion and its relevance to the excellence awards, and recognized the differences between public participation and collaboration. It agreed to expand the student project eligibility requirements beyond a PAB-accredited planning program to encompass related programs that make contributions to planning and the communities in which they do projects. Because criteria and eligibility related to these issues needed clarification, the committee decided to vote on the final eligibility and criteria at the next meeting.

The committee's second order of business was consideration of the submission requirements including fees. The committee established an overall goal of simplification, through this approach for requirements:

Specify type and format of submission materials to allow the awards jury to evaluate nominations in a standardized manner, and establish one amount for the entry fee to standardize application and simplify processing

The committee unanimously agreed that digital submissions should continue, and that the state chapter's website should be the vehicle for submissions to the maximum extent possible. It discussed the benefits of mandatory online submission through the chapter's website, similar to national APA's requirement, including the ability to cut out the email correspondence in the current process that allows nominators to make direct contact. *The committee recognized that current limitations of the chapter's website make a total online process problematic at this time, but encourage APA-LA to use of such a process in the future.*

After reviewing current state submission requirements, as well as the requirements of national APA and other state chapters, the Awards Review Committee proposed the following submission requirements.



General Submission Requirements

- All of the nominations must be submitted through the appropriate online form (only active during the nomination period) and via the process described online
- Communication with the webmaster or Jury Coordinator accepting the nomination materials is limited to technical issues of the digital submission process
- Any communication with jurors on behalf of an entry is prohibited and is reason for disqualification
- Entries received after the deadline date that is specified online or without all of the required materials will not be considered
- Materials associated with an award nomination will not be returned
- Photo collages and PowerPoint presentations are not accepted, although persons associated with winning entries may be asked to submit additional information and materials including PowerPoint slides for the awards presentation ceremony

Submission Requirements for All Award Categories

All award categories are subject to the following submission requirements:

- One-page summary of the entry; i.e., the plan, program, project, tool, technology, process, or in the case of an individual, a one page resume;
- Two-page explanation of how the submission meets each of the stated criteria;
- Three letters of support in accordance with these guidelines
 - Letters should be addressed to the Awards Jury
 - Letters should offer support for the value of the nominated effort in terms of the criteria
 - Letters may not be written by the nominator of the submission, by the nominated individual, or by anyone who directly worked on the project; instead written by a party outside the entrant team
 - For the student project award, at least one letter of support must come from a faculty member and another letter must come from an LA-APA member
 - Client letters are acceptable
 - Comments from Louisiana APA chapter sections, divisions, members, and other stakeholders involved with the subject of the nomination are encouraged
- Supporting materials including digital images, in accordance with these guidelines:
 - Images must not be copyrighted and must be reproducible without a fee, charge, or copyright infringement



- Images should provide context, show the award nomination's positive or intended outcomes, and supplement what exists in the written summary and criteria sections
- Images must be limited to the format and size specified in online instructions
- Each image must include a photo caption between 15 and 25 words each
- No more than ten digital images may be included for the planning excellence and student project awards and no more than five digital images may be included for the planning achievement awards, although one recent photo of an individual nominated for an award must be included
- Supplemental materials to add support to the nomination may include media clips, brochures, posters, fact sheets, etc.
- Supplemental materials may be attached or linked to the nomination form; or provided by five duplicate copies of a CD or DVD, each labeled with the name or title of the nomination and award category, and mailed to:
 - American Planning Association
Louisiana Chapter
(Address provided online with nomination form)
- If the nomination is about a plan, include a copy of the plan



Acrylic Award: A6739 5"x8.25" \$39.75

Award Fee and Type

The committee's final order of business was to recommend an award type. The committee agreed that the entry fee assessed for each submission should be linked to the award type on a cost recovery basis. It considered fees and costs for the 2011 APA-LA Chapter awards, and opted to recommend one flat fee based on the costs of glass or acrylic awards for the primary recipient and certificates for supporting members of the entry's team, if applicable.



The Awards Review Committee recommended the following fee and award:

- An entry fee of \$50.00 per nomination for the Planning Excellence Awards and the Achievement Award for Planning Leadership, and no fee for the Achievement Award for Enriching a Community's Quality of Life in Honor of Francis P. Keevers and the Student Project Award
- In accordance with Brand Guidelines of the American Planning Association, a medium-to-large, personalized glass or acrylic award with the APA-LA logo presented to each winner, along with one or more certificates, depending on the size of the entrant's team if applicable (Award photos shown are from Jack Petty Awards, where APA-LA has a contract with all of its art on file)
- Winners presented their awards at APA-LA annual conference and featured in a multimedia presentation at the conference and in the APA-LA Chapter newsletter

Meeting 4: Update Jury Process

During meeting four of the Awards Review Committee on August 2, 2011, the first order of business was final review of the awards eligibility and criteria. After considering minor changes, the committee voted to approve the proposed eligibility requirements and criteria as well as the type of award and amount of submission fee.

Having reviewed jury guidelines and procedures from national and state APA, the committee then considered guidelines for judges and the process for judging, and agreed to this overall goal:

Ensure the integrity of awards by using a representative and qualified panel of judges and a judging process that incorporates defined guidelines and fair implementation

In its deliberations the committee emphasized the need for fairness and objectivity in the judging process. It noted past problems caused partly by a lack of well-defined or executed guidelines for jury selection and the judging process. In considering possible improvements, the committee discussed both the advantages and disadvantages of using jurors from a nearby state, e.g., Mississippi or Texas, as a way to ensure fairness and objectivity since out-of-state jurors are less



Glass Award: G2605 5"x7.25 \$36.00; G2606 6"x8.25 \$39.75; G2607 \$43.50



likely to have personal or professional ties to Louisiana nominees.

The committee opted not to recommend an out-of-state approach at this time; instead, for the upcoming annual awards it recommended the in-state jury process summarized below. *However, if problems with the jury process persist, the Awards Review Committee recommended that the APA-LA revisit the process via a committee that thoroughly evaluates the idea of using jurors from a nearby state in a process that occurs out of state.*

After discussion, the Awards Review Committee proposed the following guidelines and procedures for judging nominations and determining winners.

Jury Composition and Juror Requirements

The committee recommended these requirements for the awards jury and individual jurors:

- Composition of Jury
 - Five jurors, as follows:
 - Four jurors from Louisiana Chapter Sections
 - 1 from Acadiana
 - 1 from Capital Area
 - 1 from New Orleans Metro
 - 1 from Northern Louisiana
 - One juror who is a faculty member in a Louisiana urban planning program accredited by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB)
- Representation of Jurors¹
 - At least one juror employed by a planning agency of a local government in Louisiana
 - At least one juror employed by a private firm engaged in urban planning in Louisiana
 - At least one juror working or residing in a small-scale Louisiana jurisdiction (population less than 50,000)
 - At least one juror working or residing in a large-scale Louisiana jurisdiction (population greater than 50,000)

¹ Population as defined by the US Census (and subsequent US Census projections). Jurisdiction, for the purposes of this definition includes a Village, Town, City, CDP, Parish, identifiable institution (Military Base) or Indian Tribal Government Reservation.



Sections will supply jurors based upon the following sequence:

Juror Rotation between Sections

Maintained in sequence unless modified by official action of the APA LA Executive Committee

Category	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4
Employed by a Planning Agency of a Local Government in Louisiana	Acadiana	Capital	Metro NO	North LA
Employed by a Private Firm engaged in urban planning in Louisiana	Capital	Metro NO	North LA	Acadiana
Working/Residing in a small-scale Louisiana jurisdiction (population of less than 50,000)	Metro NO	North LA	Acadiana	Capital
Working/Residing in a large-scale Louisiana jurisdiction (population of greater than 50,000)	North LA	Acadiana	Capital	Metro NO

- Qualifications of Jurors
 - All jurors, except university faculty, are required to be certified as AICP. All are to be registered as current members in good standing of the American Institute of Certified Planners, the American Planning Association, and the Louisiana Chapter of the American Planning Association
 - Jurors appointed from chapter sections experienced with a minimum of five years of professional work in urban planning, and the juror appointed from a university experienced with a minimum of five years teaching in an urban planning program
- Appointment of Jurors
 - Each juror from a chapter section appointed by the respective officers of the chapter section
 - The juror from the university appointed by the head of the division that contains the planning program
 - All officers and division heads making appointments required to keep confidential the names of all jurors
 - The resume documenting the credentials of each appointed juror forwarded to the President of the APA-LA Chapter and the Jury Coordinator so they can certify the composition, representation, and qualifications of the jury
 - Each juror appointed for a one-year term

Jury Proceedings

The committee recommended the following procedures for the judging of nominations and selection of winners:



General Procedural Requirements and Guidelines

- By unanimous vote of approval, jurors may move a nomination from the category in which it was nominated to another, more appropriate category
- Jurors are under no obligation to select winners in all categories and may decide not to grant an award in any category
- Jurors may not create new award categories or divide categories into subcategories by award type, size or type of jurisdiction, or similar characteristics
- Any communication with nominators or representatives of nominated efforts on behalf of an entry is prohibited and reason for disqualification
- Any juror directly involved with a nominated effort must disclose the involvement at the outset of the jury process and may not be present during deliberations or cast a vote regarding the nomination
- Jurors must keep their names, meeting dates and places, deliberations and votes confidential

Procedures for Jury Deliberations

- The **Jury Coordinator**, who is determined by the APA-LA, has these responsibilities:
 - Confirms whether individuals nominated for awards are either members or non-members of APA, as applicable, and provides this information to jurors
 - Distributes all materials submitted with a nomination to all jurors
 - Provides jurors with all of the logistical information they need to conduct their meetings and report their decisions confidentially, information such as meeting time and place, conference call access code, awards criteria, judging guidelines and procedures
 - Ensures that adequate time, no less than the amount allocated for national awards, is provided for nominators to prepare and submit their entries and for judges to review nominations and select winners
 - Does not participate in any jury deliberations, attend any meeting of the jury, or convey any communication between persons associated with nominations and jurors
 - Working with APA-LA, ensures that jurors' expenses for judging are paid by APA-LA
- The **Jury** has these responsibilities:
 - Designates a foreman who facilitates the meetings, ensures fair and objective deliberation and voting, and compiles and



reports the jury's final selections of winners simultaneously to the Jury Coordinator and the President of the APA Louisiana Chapter

- o Uses a two-part judging process, as follows:
 - 1st round
 - Individually judges review each nomination to determine if the entry satisfies the eligibility requirements and criteria of the awards category
 - All judges participate in a conference call during which they discuss whether each nomination meets the eligibility and criteria, and at least three out of the five judges must vote to advance the nomination to the 2nd round
 - 2nd round
 - The full jury of five judges meet in person to debate each nomination that advanced to the 2nd round
 - Five out of five judges must vote for each winner; judges must select the winners by unanimous vote of all judges

Conclusion

After meeting four of the Awards Review Committee, the committee concluded its work via email communication. It reviewed the proposals regarding the awards jury and judging process that resulted from meeting four, and voted to approve them and the entire final report.

From the outset of its deliberations, the Awards Review Committee sought to clarify and streamline the APA-LA annual awards process in order to ensure the integrity of awards and the fairness and objectivity of judging. The committee believes that the recommendations contained in this report and submitted to the Executive Committee of the APA-LA Chapter work toward these objectives, and, finally, it encourages regular evaluation of the awards program to maintain the overarching goal of awards with value and meaning.



Appendix: Awards Committee Work Program (2011)

Goal #1: Establish award types and criteria, submission requirements, and jury process; and when applicable conform to national APA branding requirements.

Key Threshold Dates:

- August 5, for report to chapter president;
- August 15, for inclusion within Executive Committee meeting packet
- August 27, Executive Committee Meeting

Meeting Times: 4 meetings via conference call every 2 weeks of approximately 1 hour duration for each meeting, with specific times TBD through email and/or phone calls to members

Meeting 1 - Establish Award Categories

Time Period: June 13 through June 24

Preparation: Review current APA national and LA award categories, national policies/suggestions, and other state programs (all provided).

Agenda Summary

Discuss and determine number and type of categories.

Final Goal

Identify each award category, and ensure these categories are specific and defined to a standard that will advance the planning profession in the state.

Follow Up

The chairs will compile all discussion and present a finalized list for approval either via email or phone during Meeting 2.

Meeting 2 - Establish General Eligibility and Criteria for Awards

Time Period: June 27 to July 8

Preparation:

Review current APA national and LA award criteria (other states will be provided for ideas) to determine how the jury should judge each category.

Agenda Summary

- a. Approve award categories;
- b. Discuss award eligibility and criteria

Final Goal

Complete a list of specific eligibility requirements and criteria for each category that will ensure each award selected will support strong planning principles.



Follow Up

The chairs will compile all discussion and present a finalized list for approval either via email or phone during Meeting 3.

Meeting 3 - Establish Submission Requirements and Entry Fees, if Applicable

Time Period: July 11 through 22

Preparation: Review current APA national and LA award submission requirements, and identify what materials are needed to judge each submission.

Agenda Summary

- a. Approve award criteria;
- b. Discuss digital submission of awards in lieu of hard copies; and
- c. Discuss submission requirements for each award criteria.

Final Goal

Establish a submission process and policies, and complete a list of submission requirements for each category, including entry fee, if applicable.

Follow Up

The chairs will compile all discussion and present a finalized list for approval either via email or phone during Meeting 4.

Meeting 4 - Update Jury Process for Award Selection

Time Period: July 25 through August 5

Preparation: National and state guidelines and processes will be provided to the committee.

Agenda Summary

- a. Approve submission requirements;
 - b. Determine jury selection process and guidelines for selection of winners; and
 - c. Determine how each applicant will be contacted after the award is selected.
-

Goal Two: *Conform to national APA branding requirements while establishing type of award to be given (e.g., trophy, plaque) and media coverage for award recipients.*

Timeline for completion
Following Executive Committee approved of the new award process.