Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting
Saturday, October 25, 1975
La Duquesa Room, Hilton Hotel, San Antonio, Texas

At 10:25 the Executive Committee attained a quorum and President Donald Rothblatt opened the meeting. The names of those attending the meeting are attached to these minutes.

**Item 1**
The Treasurer's report (attached) was read by Treasurer John Kleymeyer. Discussion on the report focused first on the possibility of raising the salary of the editorial assistant of the Bulletin to a level that would make it comparable to a Graduate Assistant rate at Michigan State University. This increase, plus other increasing costs due to inflation, would increase the cost of the Bulletin by 50%. Discussion was deferred since the next agenda item concerned the future of the ACSP Bulletin.

There was a short discussion about future costs for a revised edition of the Guide to Planning Education. This, too, was deferred because the Guide was the subject of a later agenda item.

Finally, there was a short discussion and reaffirmation of the policy that ACSP pay no more than one half the round trip air fare for Executive Committee members to attend Executive Committee meetings, subject to the availability of funds in the Treasury and only in those cases where the Executive Committee member could not have his or her costs covered by the institution.

The Treasurer's report was then unanimously approved by the Committee.

**Item 2**
Agenda item 2, Report on the Guide to Planning Education, was deferred until later in the meeting because Mike Brooks had not yet arrived.

**Item 3**
Agenda item 3, Future Development of the ACSP Bulletin, was turned over to Carl Goldschmidt, co-editor of the Bulletin, for discussion. Carl routinely places this item on the agenda annually so that the role of the Bulletin is constantly reviewed by the Executive Committee.

Lengthy discussion followed Carl's initial comments, focusing on whether or not the papers presented at ACSP sessions should be summarized in the Bulletin. The following three possibilities for handling the papers were presented:
(a) Ask the people who lead each session at which papers are presented prepare a written description of the sessions, to be included in the Bulletin. This has been the practice in the recent past.

(b) Charge the Vice President with editing, reviewing and reproducing the papers, which will then be offered for sale in a "working paper" series by the Association.

(c) Publish an annual yearbook or collection of papers

The consensus decision of the Committee, not voted, was that the Bulletin should remain essential as it is at the present time, but that ACSP should consider as high priority for the next round of budget decisions, the possibility of buying the time of an editor to prepare the papers for distribution and sale.

The President charged the incoming Vice President with the responsibility for preparing a specific proposal for hiring an editor for the papers, and presenting this proposal to the Executive Committee before the next Executive Committee meeting.

Following discussion about the rising costs of producing the Bulletin, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to raise the price of individual subscriptions to the ACSP Bulletin from $5.00 to $7.50.

Item 2  Mike Brooks having arrived, the Committee next took up the matter of a revised Guide to Planning Education. Mike reported that there is presently a $3,000 allocation from the ACSP budget to produce and distribute the Guide, but that will have to be increased by another $3,000 to $5,000 from the present budget for the revised Guide. If that figure is too large (and it appeared to be) then the Executive Committee should give Mike an indication of what he can expect so that he knows what he has to work with.

The Guide editors want to turn out a less bulky, less expensive product, and try to integrate it with AIP review and reporting on planning education. The reputational survey and the faculty and student observations have proven to be the most objectionable and least informative information, and they will be excluded from the revised Guide. A new set of information will be acquired from each planning school for inclusion in the Guide. This information will be factual and presumably will assist potential students in making decisions.
Following Mike Brooks' report, there was discussion about the distribution of the Guide. If the Guide goes primarily to planning schools (and some planning schools had never even heard of it) then it was perhaps getting to prospective students too late to do them any real good. It was therefore proposed that Mike Brooks look into the possibility of purchasing distribution labels from Peterson's Guide so that undergraduate advising offices would have the ACSP Guide available. It was also agreed that he should look into the possibility of contracting with ASPO and or AIP for printing and distributing the Guide.

**Item 4**

This item was placed on the agenda by Connie Lieder, but she was unable to attend the Executive Committee meeting for a discussion. It concerns the Status of Women in Planning Schools.

Don Rothblatt explained that the problem as Lieder poses it, is that most planning schools require full time or residency requirements and many women find themselves in socio-economic situations where they cannot do this. Scheduling, etc. are serious problems, particularly with children. She wishes to explore what can be done about the structure of programs (aside from vigorous recruiting, fellowships, etc.) to facilitate participation by women in the profession.

With the understanding that Connie Lieder would be present at the Business Meeting of ACSP on Sunday to make a presentation, discussion was deferred on this item.

**Item 5**

Peter Marcuse, Chairman of the ACSP Committee on Fellowships and Financial Support, then made a report to the Executive Committee. There are three issues before the Fellowship and Financial Support Committee:

- (a) The use of Sec. 701 planning funds for work-study programs -- currently the largest source of funding

- (b) The HUD Urban Fellowship Program -- provides a small number of fellowships directly to students

- (c) Language in Title VIII providing fellowship funds -- not funded and funding not requested by the Administration.
Peter Marcuse suggested that the most critical current question was the funding of Title VIII, particularly since there was a strong possibility that Sec. 701 funds might be eliminated altogether. He suggested that the members of the Executive Committee and any other interested persons meet in a strategy session at breakfast on Sunday looking forward to a meeting with Assistant Secretary Meeker (HUD) on Tuesday morning. This was agreed upon.

Item 6  Registration or credentialing of professional planners

President Rothblatt announced that the AIP Board of Governors would be discussing this matter in their meeting at 2:30 Saturday afternoon.

Larry Mann informed the Executive Committee that the AIP Committee dealing with the credentialing question had undertaken discussions with Educational Testing Service to explore what such an examination would look like and how it would be administered. A list of subjects which would likely be included in such an examination has been prepared. If the AIP Board of Governors approves, the next step would be to send these subjects out to selected people to prepare written questions.

Don Rothblatt raised the question of whether or not ACSP should take a position with respect to this subject. Concensus seemed to be that it was a legitimate area of concern to ACSP and the organization should take a position, but should wait and see what the Board of Governors does with the AIP Committee recommendations.

Item 7  Mike Brooks reported on the proceedings and activities of the AIP Educational Development Committee (of which he and Henry Hightower are members) and discussed the criteria and procedures which the Committee is applying in its recognition of planning schools. In the following discussion a strong feeling developed that the time had come for ACSP to consider the question of the criteria being applied by AIP (particularly the requirement that the Chairman be an AIP member). There was general agreement that the educational programs should not be controlled by a group of primarily non-educators.
It was agreed that this question would get a thorough airing in the Business Meeting the following day.

Item 8 Pierre Clavel had asked that a discussion of the composition of the Executive Committee be placed on the agenda and the President turned this discussion over to him. In short, Pierre wishes to broaden the representation of the Executive Committee to include a wider constituency. He feels that this will give the organization more authority when it speaks (see attached memorandum, sent to all candidates for Executive Committee positions prior to the last election).

Pierre made four proposals for consideration:

(a) That the size of the Executive Committee be expanded and that *ad hoc* members be added who have some specific responsibilities (perhaps for localized programs).

(b) That ACSP move toward separating its conferences from AIP and ASPO

(c) That ACSP move toward regional programs next fall when there is no national AIP or ASPO program

(d) That there be a commitment on the part of ACSP to broaden its constituency and consider changes in its direction

There was very short discussion on these proposals and Pierre was asked to make the same presentation to the Business Meeting, which he agreed to do.

The meeting was adjourned by the President at 12:25 P.M.
Faculty, Member Schools

Dear Colleague:

I want to draw your attention to the ACSP program sessions arranged for Saturday, October 25 at the Hilton Palacio del Rio in San Antonio, and listed on the reverse side of this page.

You will notice that this schedule sets us apart somewhat from the other programs of the annual conference of the American Institute of Planners, which gets underway the next day. The fact is this is the only way we can put on a coherent program of more than two or three sessions, due to the crowding of the regular conference programs. In general, if we want to put on substantial programs of our own, we will probably have to do it through this sort of schedule before the professional conference begins, and generate sufficient attendance to justify the effort.

There will be other meetings of special interest too. The AIP Education Department has meetings scheduled within the AIP Conference. The ACSP Executive Board will meet on Saturday morning at 10:00 (at the Hilton, La Duquesa Room), and the ACSP Business Meeting will be on Sunday at 1:00 p.m.

AIP has provided us with a small meeting room for use throughout the conference, October 26-30. Groups wishing to use this can do so, on a first come, first served basis, by arranging with me.

It will help if I can get some idea of attendance at the Luncheon, Saturday, October 25, for which we'll be collecting three dollars at the door. A postcard or call to me will help ensure the buffet doesn't run out:

Pierre Clavel
Department of City and Regional Planning
Sibley Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853
607-256-6212

See you in San Antonio!

Sincerely yours,

Pierre Clavel
Vice President and Program Chairman
October 7, 1975

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Financial Report for the Period April 7, 1975 - October 7, 1975

Bank Balance April 7, 1975 (at last report) $5,598.18

Income
Dues $7,900.00
Subscriptions, Plng. Papers, Advertisements 674.95
Sale of Guide 990.00 $9,564.95

Expenditures
Bulletin:
   Spring Issue 765.27
   Summer Issue 566.46
Covers for Plng. Papers, Letterhead, Labels 140.09
Conference Expenses - Vancouver 767.71
Allocation for Revised Guide - M. Brooks 3,000.00
Guide Advertisement 150.00
Michigan Operating Expenses:
   Telephone, Postage, Label Typing, Supplies 700.00
M.I.T. Operating Expenses:
   Postage, Telephone, Supplies 62.50
Bank Service Charge 3.98

Salaries
Co-Editor $150/mo. 900.00
Accountant $100/mo. 600.00 7,656.01

Net Income after expenses for the period April 7 - October 7, 1975 1,908.94

Bank Balance October 7, 1975 $7,507.12
Association of Collegiate Schools
of Planning

Projection for the Period October 7, 1975 - June 30, 1976

Assets
Bank Balance October 7, 1975  $7,507.12
Outstanding Membership Dues 1975-76  3,200.00
(see attached list)
Estimated Other Income
(Plng. Papers, Guides, Advertisements)  750.00
Total Assets  $11,457.12

Liabilities
Printing of Bulletin:
Fall Issue 1975 (est.)  750.00
Winter Issue 1976 (est.)  750.00
Spring Issue 1976 (est.)  750.00
Estimated Conference Expenses:
Travel for Fall Meeting  500.00
Meetings at San Antonio (per Jack)  300.00
Travel for Spring Meeting  500.00
Reimbursement due to Pierre Clavel  200.00
Operating Expenses:
Michigan (Telephone, Postage, etc.)  est. $60/mo.  540.00
M.I.T. (Telephone, Postage, etc.)  est.  75.00
Stationary, Labels, Envelopes, est.  200.00

Salaries October 1975 - June 1976
Co-Editor @ $150 mo. x 9  1,350.00
Accountant @ $100 mo. x 9  900.00
Total Liabilities  6,815.00

Projected Net Assets by June 30, 1976  $4,642.12
### Outstanding Dues for 1975-76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State College, Sonoma</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, San Jose</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter College</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsinan</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Texas State University</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson Polytechnical Institute</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $3,200.00
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning
July 1, 1975


Bank Balance July 1, 1974 $1,649.93

Income
Member Dues 10,500.00
Sale of Guide 1,974.11
Subscription and Advertisement 500.80

Total Assets $14,624.84

Expenditures
Bulletin (Summer, Fall, Winter, Spring) $2,137.09
Envelopes, Labels, Covers, Stationary (M.S.U.) 683.09
Conference Expenses: Denver 510.92
                                      Vancouver 767.71
Guide Printing - 2nd Issue 2,585.00
Guide Typing - 2nd Issue 136.80
Allocation for Revised Guide 3,000.00
Telephone, Postage, Supplies: M.S.U. 700.00
                                      M.I.T. 209.03
Bank Service Charge 3.99

Salaries
Assistant Editor $2,025
Accountant 1,050 3,075.00

Total Liabilities $13,808.63

Bank Balance June 30, 1975 $816.21
OUTLINE OF INFORMATION TO BE ACQUIRED FROM EACH PLANNING SCHOOL
FOR INCLUSION IN THE ACSP GUIDE

Draft - October 22, 1975

Basic Data

1. Name of college or university
2. Name of department or program
3. Next-higher unit of which department or program is a constituent part (examples will be given)
4. Degrees offered (if Ph.D., additional information given in later section)
5. For each degree offered:
   a. AIP-recognized? (current status; relevant dates)
   b. Year first offered
   c. Total degrees granted through August 31, 1975
   d. Number granted September 1, 1974-August 31, 1975
6. Number of graduate students in residence as of November 1, 1975
   a. Total
   b. By sex
   c. Minorities
   d. Foreign
   e. Part-time
7. Name and title of chief administrative officer

Admission Information

1. Admission requirements
   a. Grade-point average: _____ on scale of _____ for (period)
   b. GRE
      (1) Required or optional?
      (2) Minimum scores?
   c. Other tests?
   d. Letters of recommendation?
   e. Transcripts?
   f. Bachelor's degree required?
   g. Personal statement?
h. Specific course prerequisites?

i. Examples of work?

j. Other?

2. Application deadlines

3. Undergraduate majors: restrictions or preferences?

4. Application fee? Waiver possibilities?

5. Address for information and forms; telephone number

6. Data for 1975-76 academic year
   a. Number submitting complete applications
   b. Number admitted
      (1) Average GPA
      (2) Average GRE scores
   c. Number who came
      (1) Average GPA
      (2) Average GRE scores
      (3) Number who received undergraduate degree from your university
      (4) Number who received undergraduate degree from universities or colleges in your state

Financial Information

1. Tuition and fees
   a. Amount per __________ (quarter, semester, year)
   b. Other basis for calculating?
   c. In-state vs. out-of-state differences?

2. Average cost for year of study (everything)

3. Financial aid
   a. Types, with typical amounts and basis for award
   b. Distribution by classes

Curriculum

1. Formal degree requirements

2. Time needed to complete (typical)

3. Structure of curriculum
   a. Required component (describe; % of total)
   b. Non-required component (describe; % of total)
4. Specializations available
5. Internship
   a. Required or elective?
   b. Assistance provided in placement
6. Thesis or comparable project?
7. Comprehensive exam?
8. Types of courses (lecture, seminar, workshop, studio, etc.)
9. Courses outside department permitted? Maximum number?
10. Independent study possibilities?
11. Related programs and research facilities in which planning students participate
12. Any off-campus programs (domestic or overseas)?
13. Total number of distinct courses being offered by planning faculty during 1975-76 academic year

General Information

1. General approach to planning education (essay of 300 words maximum)
2. Types of planners program is intended to produce
3. Program strengths
4. Program weaknesses
5. Mode of departmental governance
   a. Formal structure
   b. Types and roles of committees
   c. Student roles in departmental affairs
6. Advising services
   a. How is advising done?
   b. How are advisors selected?
7. Placement services
   a. Description of placement activities
   b. What percentage of recent graduates (September 1, 1974-August 31, 1975) have been placed in professional positions? Major types?
   c. Of those placed, % in state? In adjacent states? Elsewhere?
8. Library
   a. Structure and location
   b. Number of items in collection
and be debated. Most planning school faculty have little idea what is involved in these issues. This is probably bad both for the schools and the profession. It is just an indication, rather than fundamental, that so few faculty members belong to either AIP or ASPO.

The proposed changes seem quite feasible to me given these developments and the apparent interest and potential participation of planning faculty members around the country. There are some possible objections which might be raised which have occurred to me, none of which seem insurmountable:

a) There isn't enough interest to support these activities. But this is in no way supported by evidence. In arranging programs within the AIP and ASPO conferences, I have found more persons interested in participating than I could possibly accommodate. There is an image problem for ACSP, as most persons see it as concerned with the problems of department chairmen, rather than the disciplinary interests of a majority of faculty members.

b) The proposed activities might drive out ACSP's present role. But the experience of other disciplinary organizations would not support this. More likely, cultivation of a larger constituency of planning faculty would give ACSP more leverage in dealing with AIP, ASPO and other organizations.

c) The proposed activities would drive a wedge between planning faculties and the professional organizations. It need not, but in any event (1) the wedge already exists and (2) getting faculties better organized would facilitate rather than reduce communication with professionals.

d) The proposed organization leaves out students. Actually, I'm just oversimplifying here. The proposed structure could include students far more easily than the present one, for the same reason that it can include junior faculty members more easily: it focuses on academic interests, which many students share; it broadens representation; it encourages regional meetings, which will cut costs.
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF PLANNING

October 9, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: Present, former, potential future members of the Executive Committee, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

FROM: Pierre Clavel

SUBJECT: Expansion of ACSP Activities

Since its beginning, ACSP has played a number of roles. These include (1) representation of the member schools' interests to professional associations, government agencies and others; (2) providing a focus for social activities and other interaction of planning educators at national professional conferences; and (3) providing a forum for papers by faculty of member schools, both in meetings and in print. I presume the priority, in the past, has been roughly in the order mentioned. I am suggesting here that these priorities be reassessed with the new emphasis on planning scholarship and research and on representation of a broader constituency of planning faculty members on the ACSP Executive Committee. I think this is appropriate given shifts in the size and composition of planning school faculties, and the inherent difficulties of maintaining an independent organization through a small cadre operating within the framework of the professional organizations, AIP and ASPO.

Shift to A Disciplinary Focus

My basic proposal is for ACSP to shift from activities mainly serving the needs of department chairmen in planning schools, to a broader role in support of the development of planning as a discipline for scholarship and research, and to organize itself accordingly. The present role is fundamentally one of liaison to the profession and various government and professional organizations. This role can better be performed on a broader base; in any event, many of these liaison functions are being taken over by the AIP Education Department. As an alternative, ACSP can move toward a discipline-based organization form. Broadly, this would mean:

a) A shift of focus toward support for scholarship and research supplementing the present focus on the organizational problems and relationships of the member schools. For example, conference programs would emphasize planning scholarship and research and be designed to interest and support rank and file faculty members and students. This would supplement, not replace, present ACSP concerns, just as the focus on research and
scholarship in the American Economic Association and similar meetings still allow plenty of time for sessions devoted to teaching, lobbying, and socializing. This would tap a broader constituency than ACSP now serves.

b) As feasibility permits, a greater emphasis on communication among planning faculty on research and scholarly concerns, through continued development of the Conference Paper series, the creation of subject matter oriented working committees, the sponsorship of regional and national conferences independent of the professional conferences (but perhaps in conjunction with them), and the development of publications such as an expanded Bulletin or annual Yearbook.

c) Evolution of organizational structure of ACSP to accommodate its more diverse constituency. Two desirable shifts are toward an expansion of the Executive Committee—now set at nine including two students—to perhaps double that number; and to supplementing the present corporate membership structure, which has each school voting and paying dues as a unit, with an individual membership structure.

**Actions to Take Now**

This new structure and set of purposes would not develop immediately, although I think we might be surprised at how fast it could develop. But if the Executive Committee is persuaded to move in this direction, there are a few steps it can take immediately, as it meets in San Antonio:

a) Appoint four additional members to the Executive Committee on an ad hoc basis, pending study of constitutional alterations.

b) Appoint a committee to study changes in the constitution with a mandate to consider (1) expansion of the Executive Committee; (2) creation of individual memberships, perhaps through a staged procedure; (3) methods of selecting additional members of the Executive Committee.

c) Resolve to move to a two day conference in Washington this spring, immediately preceding the AIP/ASPO affair, using the same quarters if possible, with separate registration or co-registration with the professional conference.

d) Resolve to encourage regional conferences next fall (there will be no fall AIP conference) hosted by member schools and organized by ad hoc or other members of the Executive Committee.
Developments Mandating the Shift in Focus

These shifts are indicated by developments in planning education and in the profession:

1) There has been much growth in the number of planning schools in the organization, and in the composition of their faculties. There are now 71 member schools in ACSP, probably 800 faculty members. This represents a lot of growth in the last ten years, probably a doubling. Also, the composition of our faculties has changed. Of the 800 faculty members, a much larger proportion than previously think of themselves as academically oriented, rather than as professionals. AIP membership is certainly not high among planning faculties; on the other hand the number of faculty members with Ph.D.s in planning or other fields is perhaps as high as 300 of the 800 total. This represents perhaps a doubling, also. The implications of all this for ACSP are quite strong. First, there is a larger and different constituency in planning school faculties than before. There is a capacity for ACSP to do things it has not previously been able to do; there is much more interest in research and scholarship of a different sort; and there is more diversity than before, so that it makes less sense than before to think of ACSP as representing any one united "planning school" viewpoint to the professional organizations or others. It also makes less sense than before for ACSP to represent its faculties mainly through the chairmen of its departments, or through a small Executive Committee that meets only occasionally, at the national meetings of the professional organizations.

2) AIP and ASPO are experiencing increasing difficulty encompassing the interests of the ACSP member schools. The professional organizations have their hands full servicing the diverse demands of their membership. For them to respond to diversification and expansion among planning faculties will be very difficult. Most likely, any activities oriented toward planning faculties will, as in the case of the AIP Education Department, be designed to provide a link to the profession rather than be free to reflect the directions dictated by the schools themselves. The difficulties of the planning schools of ACSP operating within the framework of the professional organizations have been illustrated in recent years in several contexts: the development of an AIP planning school recognition procedure, the recent shifts in AIP Journal publications policy, and the annual processes of formulation of AIP and ASPO conference programs. Each of these procedures have been carried on in ways apparently logical from the standpoint of the organizations in charge; each have involved issues vital to the planning schools; each has included formal involvement of representatives from planning schools. But in no case has it been possible for sufficient interaction to occur among the schools for their underlying interests to emerge
and be debated. Most planning school faculty have little idea what is involved in these issues. This is probably bad both for the schools and the profession. It is just an indication, rather than fundamental, that so few faculty members belong to either AIP or ASPO.

The proposed changes seem quite feasible to me given these developments and the apparent interest and potential participation of planning faculty members around the country. There are some possible objections which might be raised which have occurred to me, none of which seem insurmountable:

a) There isn't enough interest to support these activities. But this is in no way supported by evidence. In arranging programs within the AIP and ASPO conferences, I have found more persons interested in participating than I could possibly accommodate. There is an image problem for ACSP, as most persons see it as concerned with the problems of department chairmen, rather than the disciplinary interests of a majority of faculty members.

b) The proposed activities might drive out ASPO's present role. But the experience of other disciplinary organizations would not support this. More likely, cultivation of a larger constituency of planning faculty would give ACSP more leverage in dealing with AIP, ASPO and other organizations.

c) The proposed activities would drive a wedge between planning faculties and the professional organizations. It need not, but in any event (1) the wedge already exists and (2) getting faculties better organized would facilitate rather than reduce communication with professionals.

d) The proposed organization leaves out students. Actually, I'm just oversimplifying here. The proposed structure could include students far more easily than the present one, for the same reason that it can include junior faculty members more easily: it focusses on academic interests, which many students share; it broadens representation; it encourages regional meetings, which will cut costs.