

ICA – Discussion Paper of Possible Futures

for

The International CPTED Association

August 1, 2003

Dr Diane Zahm, ICA Chair (USA)
Stan Carter, ICA Board Member (USA)
Rick Draper, ICA Board Member (Australia)
Dr Tim Pasco, ICA Board Member (UK)
Macarene Rau, ICA Board Member (Chile)



BACKGROUND

It was resolved at an ICA Board Meeting on 9 May 2003, that a committee be formed to further investigate a proposal before the Board to refine the relationships between the ICA, its members, and Chapters. The committee comprised:

- Dr Diane Zahm (Chair, USA)
- Stan Carter (USA)
- Rick Draper (Australia)
- Dr Tim Pasco (UK)
- Macarene Rau (Chile)

The committee used email to facilitate discussion of related matters, and this report has been prepared by the Chair of the committee for consideration by the ICA Board.

PREAMBLE

The International CPTED Association is a relatively new organization, preparing for its 7th annual conference in September 2003. To some extent, survival has been the goal of these early years and, having survived, it is now time for the organization to positively situate itself for the long-term. Three issues must be addressed in order for this to take place. Each of them is described in greater detail below, including a recommendation for board action.

Issue #1: Conceptualization of the Organization

A basic issue is the overall concept for ICA. Four general models are possible:

1. An association of individual members.

In this model, the association does not include a requirement for membership via “chapters,” “affiliates,” “federations,” or other subgroups. Individuals join ICA directly, but may also elect to be members of other bodies. This concept does not eliminate existing groups like DOCA; they exist independently of ICA.

2. An association based on Chapter membership.

In this concept individuals join a Chapter and a portion of their chapter membership fee is targeted for ICA membership. The ICA is thus perceived as a benefit of Chapter membership. Where no Chapter exists, members are considered to be ‘at large’ and may join ICA directly.

This model is closest to ICA at present.

3. An association of individual members (with Chapter requirement).

Application to ICA requires individuals to identify a local/regional chapter or interest group (e.g., CPTED and schools, CPTED and urban design, CPTED and policing, etc.). By joining ICA, the member also joins the nominated Chapter and/or interest group. The ICA fee is the same for all members, but Chapter and interest group fees are set by individual groups. ICA collects its membership fees directly and by arrangement also collects and distributes fees relating to Chapters and interest groups. This is the American Planning Association (APA) model.

4. An association of individual members (with Chapter affiliation).

In this case, individuals would join ICA directly and without identifying membership in a chapter or interest group. Those other CPTED-related organizations that recognize the value in affiliating with ICA could establish such a relationship, based on criteria set by ICA. This model would also allow for affiliation by interest groups.

DISCUSSION

The question here is one of independence vs. interdependence. Strong chapters who now offer ICA membership as a benefit of chapter membership (DOCA, for example) see that benefit as strengthening their own organizations and are satisfied with the existing system. Other organizations, such as the Florida CPTED Network, do not offer ICA membership as a benefit to their members and have, in fact, indicated they are not interested in strengthening ties with ICA in this manner. Many individual members in the United States and elsewhere have no other CPTED-related organization available to them, so that ICA *and* chapter membership is not an option (unless individuals are forced to join a chapter that is geographically remote).

The existing chapter-to-ICA link is advantageous, in that it establishes membership for individuals who might otherwise not join ICA. Chapters also then assume significant responsibility for administration, outreach and promotion (though this may be limited to promoting the chapter and not ICA, and has clearly not resulted in membership growth over the past few years).

The opposite would be true in a case where individuals who join ICA are required to become members of a related chapter. More programs and activities are likely to take place locally/regionally, and these could potentially be interpreted as benefits of ICA membership and not of the separate chapter membership. A connection with chapters thus has its advantages, but these are minute in comparison with the membership issues the association now faces.

The Chapter based membership model places burdens on Chapters where jurisdictional requirements demand insurances and other overheads (eg. Incorporation fees) that serve to erode the available value from membership fees. This model and the legal requirements for Chapters that are inherent within it, also slows the formation of new Chapters as is evidenced by the experience in Chile.

While not optimal to some members of this committee, Model 4 is the preferred alternative, given all of the points raised during the deliberations of the committee. Implementation of this option will require a process and criteria for creating the affiliate relationships, including unincorporated Chapters. It is acknowledged that this model returns all responsibility for membership promotion and administration to ICA, and it is anticipated that technology will facilitate this within existing resources.

This recommendation should be read in conjunction with the discussion and recommendations under Issue #2.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1-1 The committee recommends that the ICA Board accept Model 4, being an association of individual members with Chapter and interest group affiliation.

Issue #2: Reorganizing ICA

The primary goal of the ICA Board should be to increase new membership and sustain membership levels over the long-term. The question is how best to organize the association and provide for representation on the Board if membership development is one of ICA's goals.

DISCUSSION

Presently the Board consists of a chair and vice-chair, seven elected international directors, and directors from each of the four existing chapters. This generally results in representation from all parts of the world (though five current board members hail from the US). It is not clear, however, that representation is truly "international," or that board members are doing all they can to develop the organization.

Section 7 of the By-Laws notes that the Board may include as many "Regional/Chapter" directors as there are "Regional/Chapter" Organizations "accepted" by the Board pursuant to Section 6 of the current By-Laws. While limitations with respect to Chapter development present inhibit expansion of the Board, the current structure would appear to be flawed in that it

does not establish any finite number of Directors, and it is conceivable that Regional/Chapter representation could greatly outweigh elected members of the Board.

To improve representation on the board and also provide greater opportunities for membership development, ICA requires better regional representation, especially in those areas of the world where Chapters have yet to be established. This might be accomplished in one of two ways: firstly, the nine elected board members (including Chair and Vice-Chair) could be assigned to, and therefore elected by, the various regions; or secondly, regional representatives could be added to the board, replacing the present Chapter representatives.

The first of these options does not seem terribly reasonable because, while nine board members may be enough for representative decision making, it is clearly not enough to tackle membership development around the world. Rather, the nine elected directors should remain at-large positions, reflecting the will of the general membership, while additional representatives should be added to the Board to focus on regional development and regional CPTED approaches.

The challenge for ICA is to establish a process through which candidates for regional representation can be best identified, and appropriately elected or otherwise appointed to the ICA Board. Under the regional model discussed by the committee, it was suggested that there be a maximum of 10 regions, and to have a Board representative, a region would need to have at least 20 ICA members.

As simply geographic groupings of ICA members, Regions would not need to be incorporated and thus not add to the cost of membership. It is acknowledged that there will be an administrative layer associated with maintaining a Regional structure, however, this is not seen as an impediment due to the facilities available through the new ICA web site and associated databases.

Where Chapters currently exist in geographically distinct areas, they would form the basis of the new Regions, and it could reasonably be expected that existing Chapter nominees to the ICA Board would, at least initially, become the Regional nominees to facilitate a smooth transition. In order to address issues relating to membership development in Regions with low membership numbers, elected members of the ICA Board should be assigned to a Region with the explicit role of regional membership development.

If the a regional structure is adopted, the new ICA Board would comprise the Chair, Vice-Chair, seven (7) Elected Directors and a maximum of ten (10) Regional Directors. Each Board member should have equal voting rights.

Regional representatives would need to be elected or appointed by their respective Regions, and would be tasked with membership development and serving as liaison between the region and the ICA Board. Regional nominations and elections can be facilitated via the ICA Web site, or other means as approved by the ICA Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

2-1 The committee recommends that the ICA establish ten (10) geographic membership regions.

2-2 The committee recommends that the composition of the ICA Board be amended to include ten (10) Regional Director's positions in place of the existing Chapter representation.

Issue #3: Membership and Benefits

A related problem discussed by the committee is that of the perceived value of membership. ICA remains a very small organization and increased membership is essential for the long-term viability of the association.

DISCUSSION

A fundamental question related to the development of the organization has yet to be adequately addressed: *if ICA is to attract more members – and especially if the association plans to move to a new concept of membership – what will members get in return for dues?* Many individuals join ICA to gain a comparative perspective on CPTED, for international networking, and to build an individual or a firm resume. Dues are relatively low and they expect few additional services. (Besides, ICA membership significantly reduces the cost for the annual conference!)

But for others the return on investment is not so simple. With limited funds available to them for memberships, they must select those organizations that give them the biggest “bang for the buck.” International networking may not be enough. The Board *has* taken steps to remedy this problem, but *The CPTED Journal* and the other membership benefits now available may not be enough to entice additional members to the association or retain existing members.¹

In fact, the low cost to join ICA and receive member benefits may work to the association’s disadvantage. The American Planning Association, for example, charges as much as US\$225 for annual membership (required, using a sliding scale based on salary; public officials and students pay less), up to US\$60 for chapter membership (required, and set by the chapters), US\$20-25 for interest group membership (optional, and set by the divisions), and US\$42 for the *Journal of the American Planning Association* (optional). Basic membership includes a monthly magazine and reduced costs for APA publications or conference fees; chapters and divisions (interest groups) usually provide a monthly or quarterly newsletter and local/regional conferences or meetings.

Certified planners pay up to US\$115 per year above regular membership for continuing certification (required, using a sliding scale based on salary). They receive a special insert in the member magazine, plus an occasional planning case studies newsletter. Everything else is offered to members on a fee-for-service basis, i.e., research, technical assistance, etc. [Of course

¹ Let me use myself (Diane) as an example. I am an academic, a tenured associate professor in urban planning. To remain employed in my tenured position, I need to publish in peer reviewed academic journals. The editorial board and the peers reviewing my submissions need to have academic credentials as well. One advantage of joining an organization/association is that it presents me with new opportunities to publish. The *ICA Journal*, as it now exists, my colleagues would consider a “magazine” rather than a “journal,” and as such, it provides no professional benefit to me.

the APA has thousands of members and a huge professional research and publications staff in Chicago, plus lobbyists in Washington DC . . .]

ASIS charges its members US\$150 in dues per year² plus a US\$20 processing fee. Membership includes the publications *Security Management*, and *Dynamics*, and a membership directory. CPP certification requires an examination (at US\$300) plus a US\$60 recertification fee, payable every three years.

Notwithstanding the recent efforts to enhance value for members through *The CPTED Journal*, enhanced newsletter, interactive web site, and certification initiatives, membership appears to have been in steady decline for the past few years.

At present, ICA does not have any plans or documents, other than its By-Laws, to support the ongoing development of the association. ICA is heavily reliant on volunteers who have many other commitments, and for the foreseeable future the association will not have the resources to employ staff. However, time needs to be set aside as a matter of priority to develop a strategic plan for ICA, so that the path to the future growth and development of the association is clearly defined.

² This has increased from US\$100, only twelve months ago.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3-1 The committee recommends that a small sub-committee be formed to consider all matters relating to dues, fees and charges, with a view to providing a report to the ICA Board in January 2004.

3-2 The committee recommends that a small sub-committee be formed to draft a strategic plan for ICA (or an ICA Board member is tasked with drafting the plan as a special project), and that this strategic plan be presented for adoption by the ICA Board in Amsterdam in September 2003.

Issue #4: By-Laws

If the above recommendations are adopted, it will be necessary to amend the By-Laws in a number of areas. It may be opportune to review other aspects of the By-Laws at this time, to build on the work already completed by Stan Carter in this area.

Discussion

As per Section 4.3.2 of the By-Laws, changes require a Special Resolution that is endorsed by 5% of the members in good standing (currently requires 18 members) or advanced by any three (3) members of the ICA Board (Section 4.3.3).

There is no defined minimum percentage of votes required to pass a Special Resolution to change the By-Laws, thus a simple majority applies. Section 9.3.1 includes provision for votes to be received electronically.

RECOMMENDATIONS

4-1 In accordance with the provisions of Section 4.3.3, the committee recommends that a sub-committee of three (3) members of the ICA Board be formed to draft the necessary changes to the By-Laws.