ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF PLANNING

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 25, 1971
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Present: Deines, Corey, Hightower, Clavel, Steiss, Goldschmidt
Guests: Newhart, Leone (representatives from NSSC)

Deines opened the meeting by welcoming the two student representatives from the National Student Steering Committee: Bob Newhart (Cal. Poly. at San Luis Obispo) and Phil Leone (Virginia Tech). Deines reviewed the recommendations arising from the previous day's Business Meeting and asked the Secretary to identify specific motions that were made or items discussed that require further action by the Executive Committee.

Relationship with NASPAA

A number of points were raised concerning the possible affiliation of ACSP with NASPAA, such as ACSP membership on the Executive Committee of NASPAA, the notion that member schools in ACSP could "piggy back" their membership in NASPAA (i.e., for the cost of an association membership, ACSP could distribute NASPAA information to all member schools), the advantages of affiliation in terms of the "lobbying" ability of NASPAA, and so forth. It was concluded that an explicit statement was needed from NASPAA regarding ACSP involvement. Deines will write a letter to Laurie Henry, NASPAA president, suggesting the need for such clarification and will recommend that Henry discuss these matters with Steiss, since both are in Virginia.

Conference on Environmental Education

Goldschmidt reported that $1,250.00 has been made available from NSF funds to help underwrite participation of ACSP representatives in the conference. The Executive Committee reviewed the list of interested individuals from member schools and established a "ranking," authorizing the Executive Director to contact each of these individuals in turn to see if they could support a part of their expenses. Corey will attend as the representative from the Executive Committee; hopefully, the funds from NSF will enable five or six other representatives to attend. An effort will be made to coordinate the attendees so that each of the five workshop sessions will be covered. ACSP representatives receiving partial support will be expected to prepare brief written reports on the conference for use in the ACSP Bulletin.

Letter to HUD Regarding Fellowship Distribution

In response to the motion from the floor of the Business Meeting, it was suggested that a more positive tone be adopted for the letter to HUD. The issues of the selection committee composition and the need for more extensive funding, in particular, should be emphasized. Deines and Goldschmidt will get together before the end of the AIP conference to draft such a letter.
Meeting with ASPO and AIP

Hightower and Goldschmidt will represent ASCP in the joint meeting with ASPO and AIP concerning planning education. It was suggested that the two representatives from the NSSC also attend to expand the concerns of this joint committee.

Relations with NSSC

Deines reviewed the suggestions emerging from the previous day's Business Meeting concerning representation from the National Students Steering Committee on the ASCP Executive Committee. NSSC representatives are invited to sit in on the Executive Committee meetings. Each member school has been asked to develop more formal procedures for involving students in the affairs of ACSP. The question of "vote-splitting" was discussed, whereby each school might divide its institutional membership vote between the faculty and students. It was suggested that the student representatives have the responsibility to "bug" their departmental chairman to gain a voice in the voting procedures. Each school will be asked to identify its procedures for student involvement in order to take a "straw vote" on the question prior to the Detroit meeting. As to student representation on the ACSP Executive Committee, a two-pronged approach will be taken, with the Executive Committee discussing the question with member schools and the NSSC with students. Recommendations for action will be formulated prior to the Detroit meeting.

Call for Papers

The Executive Director will issue a call for papers on the substantive issues and priorities raised during the Sunday morning workshop session. Corey will work with Goldschmidt in developing this "call."

Executive Committee Members at Large

A number of names were reviewed in connection with the two "at large" positions on the Executive Committee. It was recommended that Larry Mann (Harvard) and Larry Susskind (MIT) be asked to serve for the coming year.

AIP Examination Procedures

The issue of AIP examination procedures was raised in connection with the interests of some faculty members to gain exemption for those individuals holding a Ph.D. in planning. It was suggested that the whole AIP examination procedures should be re-evaluated in terms of exempting graduates from recognized schools of planning (i.e., certification of competence by a recognized school should qualify graduates for membership in AIP). It also was suggested that ACSP should be more directly involved in establishing the guidelines for the exams, since there seems to be a growing disparity between the subjects covered, the "knowledge of the literature" required, and the approaches to planning education being taken by the various member schools.

Alan W. Steiss
Secretary
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF PLANNING

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 1971
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

1. Program Meeting

Kenneth Corey, President-Elect of ACSF, opened the morning session by discussing the objectives of the workshop and the desire of the Executive Committee to actively involve the membership in the affairs of the Association. The format for the workshop emerged out of discussions following the ACSF meeting in New Orleans last April. Corey outlined the goals of ACSF, noting that the semi-annual meetings of the Association provide an excellent opportunity for interaction and the exchange of ideas on planning education. The workshop format was chosen to achieve a high degree of mix and production among participants. Corey expressed the hope that out of this workshop would emerge a program with priorities that could form the basis for activities of the Association between now and the next meeting in Detroit.

Following this overview, participants were divided into three groups, each with the assignment to discuss the operational goals of the Association, the linkages of ACSF purposes with the interests and objectives of individual member schools, and questions of resources and constraints in terms of the programs of ACSF. After an hour of lively discussion, the meeting reconvened in plenary session to review the suggestions emerging from these "encounter groups.

Group One reported that their discussion began with the question of the need for planners in terms of the shifting definition of the field. Where does the information on emerging needs come from--ACSF, AIP, or ASPO? It was suggested that there would be great utility in strengthening the information-exchange process so that individual departments could be better armed to defend these needs in their universities. Such information should include quantitative data on where graduates are going (the market question) and what different schools are doing to prepare students for emerging and continuing professional responsibilities. A need for follow-up reports on new programs outlined in the ACSF Bulletin also was suggested to provide time-phased information on relative success with innovation. In a similar context, the question was raised as to where innovative schools report their progress, suggesting the need for a series of ACSF sessions in which papers on planning education could be presented and discussed.

Group Two approached many of the same topics: (1) the issue of a national policy for the promotion of planning; (2) emerging conflict between urban planners (as products of planning schools) and urban managers (as products of schools of public administration); (3) shifts in the definition of the field; and (4) relations with other urban-oriented fields. It was observed that there may be regional variations among member schools and that it would be useful to identify these "variations on a theme" as well as the common ground among schools. Again the need for strengthening information-exchange mechanisms was discussed. The issue was raised as to whether the Association should continue as a forum of exchange or should begin to assume the role of a "vehicle for accomplishment" as an Association (e.g., undertake research as the SA and AAG have done). The general consensus of Group Two was that ACSF should continue to function in the former role. It was recommended, however, that a series
of position papers be developed on such topics as appropriate faculty-student ratios, research missions of planning faculty, guidelines for new educational programs, and so forth. In summary, it was suggested that ACSP should identify its appropriate domain of interests and take steps to protect the right to this domain.

Group Three echoed the points raised in the previous two group reports, emphasizing the need for an improved information-exchange system, methods for evaluating teaching and research in planning schools, programs for student recruitment, and the need for visiting teams to assist new programs in their formation. It again was suggested that the development of a series of position papers on "what is planning education" would be an appropriate task for ACSP during the coming years.

Following the group reports, the floor was opened for general discussion out of which emerged a call for draft position papers on four or five priority items to be circulated among member schools prior to the Detroit meeting and then to be presented and discussed at that meeting. Representatives from Harvard, Cornell, Pittsburgh, and Arizona volunteered to take the lead in this connection with Ken Corey serving as the chairman of an ad hoc committee to organize the various inputs. It also was suggested that contributions to these papers be solicited from students. It was concluded that a call for papers should be issued by the Executive Director, outlining the topical areas to be addressed based on the suggestions emerging from the group discussions.

2. Business Meeting

At the conclusion of the workshop session, President Deines asked that the business meeting, scheduled for the afternoon, be convened at this time. The new Executive Committee was introduced and President Deines indicated that the two members at large would be selected before the AIP conference concluded. It was announced that Carl Goldschmidt has been elected an officer of the AIP Planning Education Department, thereby insuring ACSP a continued link with this group. President Deines also announced that representatives of the Executive Committee would meet the following day with representatives of ASPO and AIP to continue discussions of areas of mutual interest.

The possible affiliation of ACSP with other professional associations was discussed. Carl Goldschmidt provided a background report on the Environmental Educators Conference to be held in Key Biscayne, Florida, November 11-13. This conference, sponsored jointly by ACSA, NCILA, and ACSP, emerged out of a joint meeting of these three associations in Minneapolis last October. A modest level of funding has been secured from the National Science Foundation to support the participants in this conference. Representatives from member schools interested in attending were asked to contact the Executive Committee, which in turn would work out some system for allocating the limited funds available.

President Deines reported on the Denver meeting of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. Considerable discussion followed concerning the possible link-up of ACSP with NASPAA. Members of ACSP have been invited to participate in the Annual Conference of NASPAA to be held March 20-22 in New York.
It was concluded that the Executive Committee should circulate more information to member schools concerning possible ACSP involvement with NASPAA, to be followed by a mailed ballot regarding formal affiliation.

A question was raised concerning the HUD Fellowship Program and the apparent policy of the current administration to award these fellowships to students in non-planning programs. It was suggested that a strong letter be sent to HUD "decrying the way in which the funds have been dissoluted" and suggesting ways for improving the allocation process.

The relationship with the National Student Steering Committee was discussed and various approaches for involving students more fully in the activities of ACSP were suggested. It was noted that the membership in ACSP is on an institution basis, with each member school having one vote. It was suggested that individual schools may wish to devise means of splitting their vote between faculty and students. This approach, however, would not resolve the question of representation of students on the Executive Committee of ACSP. Adding students to the Executive Committee will require a change in the ACSP Constitution. It was recommended that the Executive Committee meet with the appointed representatives of NSSC to continue efforts to work out a mutually acceptable arrangement for a more formal basis for student participation in the affairs of ACSP.

The Business Meeting concluded with reports from the Treasurer and the Executive Director. In the past year, the Association has received $6,000 in income and has had expenditures of approximately $6,500, necessitating the use of reserve funds for operations. For the coming year, projected income from dues and the sale of ACSP Bulletins is estimated at $8,000, with projected expenditures of $7,200 (for the publication of the Bulletin and salary of the Executive Director). The report of the Executive Director indicated that presently there are 47 member and 8 affiliate schools in the Association, an increase of 16 members since April.

Alan W. Steiss
Secretary