ACSP Executive Committee Meeting  
(ASPO Conference, Indianapolis)  
April 30, 1978

The meeting was called to order by President Goldschmidt. Seven board members and 14 additional persons were present.

Minutes: Ann DeWitt Watts (VPI)

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved as read.

Financial Report: Ross Engler (MIT)

The financial report for the period September 30, 1977-April 24, 1978 was given. Starting with a cash balance of $10,650, there were reported $5,850.02 in income and $9,938.77 in expenses, leaving a current balance of $6,561.44. Projections for the period April 24, 1978-June 30, 1978 include $10,529.44 in expenditures less $7,600 in liabilities leaving us with $2,929.44 at the end of the period. (See attachment A for details.)

A detailed analysis of the costs and income from the 1974 and 1976 Guide was also presented. (See attachments B and C.)

NEDC: Mike Brooks (Illinois)

Mike Brooks reported on the recent voting of recommendations modifying a few of the recognition criteria. Forty schools voted. Each of the six items passed by an overwhelming margin. These recommendations were to be made known to NEDC at the Conference.

A meeting of NEDC was to have been held concurrent with the ASPO Conference. Due to staff changes at AIP the material on the various schools was not ready. There will be a meeting in late May and 14 schools will be considered.

ACSP Bulletin: John Mullin (Michigan State)

There will be a new format to the Bulletin which should be out the first part of May. This format includes new paper and larger size. Approximately $300 per issue can be saved this way and there will be more room for news, information and articles. The basic topical orientation of the Bulletin will remain the same as this seems to be what members want.

ACSP Guide: Roger Hamlin (Michigan State)

The following changes have occurred in the new guide: slightly smaller size, different print, moving to a tabular format to show school specializations. The camera ready copy will be complete
this summer. The Guide should be available in the fall.

Fall Conference: Ed Kaiser (No. Carolina)

A preliminary conference schedule was presented for discussion (Attachment D)

A number of questions arose but the main one dealt with the timing of our conference with that of AIP. This year AIP will run from Wednesday through Saturday. The questions then are: should we hold ours before, during, or after AIP? Normally we would hold it before, and this would be a Saturday and Sunday. Holding it before (Tuesday-Wednesday) means that most of an entire week of classes would be consumed. Holding it during AIP's Conference means competing for attendance. (There is also some doubt as to the availability of space during the main conference days). Holding it afterwards means the possibility of losing a number of people who will not stay. Please send your preference on this and other issues directly to Ed Kaiser.

Faculty Salaries: There was some discussion on the need to obtain data on the range of faculty salaries in planning. This was conceded to be useful by several of those present. Carl Goldschmidt will try to obtain this.

School Review Committee: A long discussion was undertaken on the School Review Committee, its continued existence and its possible functions. The committee felt that there was little point in continuing its original charge since it had done all it could do along that line.

After some discussion it was moved by Brown and Susskind that: ACSP should create a Committee that will:

1. Continue the efforts of the ACSP School Review Committee to develop criteria for evaluating the performance of educational programs in planning.

2. Draft and circulate an RFP seeking individuals who will prepare studies of particular planning education departments that

   a. describe curriculum objectives;
   b. discuss the criteria used by the department(s) being studied to measure their performance (i.e., successful implementation of curricula objectives);
   c. analyze the obstacles to effective implementation of curricula objectives.

3. Prepare a proposal seeking funds to support these and other similar studies.

4. Contract with several individuals to prepare these studies at
a cost not to exceed (amount to be decided by President Goldschmidt).

5. Organize ACSP-sponsored discussions of these studies.

6. Based on these studies and the discussion of them, the Committee moved to recommend criteria for evaluating planning education programs or, at least, continue the process of working toward criteria for evaluating planning education programs.

The motion was seconded by Hightower and passed unanimously.

A second motion was made by Brown that:

A committee charged with (1) a review of alternative institutions for evaluating the quality of planning education; (2) monitoring the present institutional arrangement for School Recognition and reporting on the implications of potential changes in the institutions; and (3) bringing suggestions and recommendations on the appropriate institutional arrangements to ACSP.

The motion was seconded by Hightower and passed unanimously.

NEDC Representatives: The process of selecting future NEDC representatives was discussed. It was moved by Brown that:

The selection of ACSP's representative to NEDC be nominated by the nominating committee and voted upon by the entire membership.

The motion was seconded by McGraw. It passed.

Nominating Committee: A nominating committee has been named. It will provide nominations for the president-elect and the NEDC Representative to replace Mike Brooks. The election should occur this summer.

Miscellaneous:

1) A resolution was presented by Hamlin suggesting that ACSP recommend that Ph.D. programs not be subject to AIP recognition. (See Attachment E) A motion was made by Watts that this be recommended to NEDC. It was seconded by Kaiser. Motion passed.

2) Berkman suggested that ACSP should be looking into the implications of other organizations such as NAHRO and ASPO getting into the area of training.

3) The South-Central Regional Meeting will be held outside of New Orleans on June 1-2. Everyone is welcome. For information contact David Pugh.

4) Jim Brown suggested that a small amount of money be pro-
vided by ACSP to regions to use in establishing the regional meeting. Twenty-five dollars per school was suggested. This will be presented to the general meeting in the fall.

At 12:05 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Ann DeWitt Watts
Secretary Treasurer.
GUIDE TO GRADUATE EDUCATION IN URBAN REGIONAL PLANNING

Cost Analysis - 1976 Edition

M. Brooks, Editor

April 25, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Costs to ACSP</th>
<th>Income to ACSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation to Editor -</td>
<td>Royalties Received $ 607.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Data</td>
<td>Guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see attached breakdown)</td>
<td>Additional Royalties 2,418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,025.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Costs

The original allocation of $4,500.00 was exceeded by costs of $240.96. Amount was absorbed by the University of Illinois.

Faculty time by M. Brooks plus 25% effort of a Research Assistant for one term.

Based on the above income, 289 copies at a unit cost of $10.45 must have been sold on behalf of ACSP. In order for ACSP to recover the additional original investment, 141 more copies must be sold. Based on information received, however, sales are slowing down. ASPO recovered its costs of $2,633.00. Therefore, it appears that total sales of the Guide come to 924 copies.
GUIDE TO GRADUATE EDUCATION IN URBAN REGIONAL PLANNING

Cost Analysis - 1974 Edition

L. Susskind, Editor

April 25, 1978

Direct Costs ACSP

Allocation to Editor - Compile Data
(see attached breakdown) $3,000.00

Typing and Preparation:
1st and 2nd Printing 773.80

Printing Charges:
1st Printing 500 copies 2,016.00
2nd Printing 500 copies 2,585.00

Mailing and Supply Costs 480.00

Publicity 150.00

Total Direct $9,004.80

Income to ACSP

Contributions

University of Waterloo $ 500.00
M.I.T., School of Architecture and Planning 340.00

Sale of Copies

A.I.P. 265.00
Student Planning Network 322.00
Individuals 3,700.00

$5,127.00

The difference of $3,877.80 was absorbed by ACSP.

Other Costs

Of the original $3,000.00 allocation, costs exceeded by $306.00. Amount was absorbed by M.I.T. Faculty effort by L. Susskind plus time by R. Engler for shipping and billing procedures.
January 30, 1974

TO: Lawrence Susskind

FROM: Rolf R. Engler

RE: Guide Expenditures

Below is a breakdown of actual expenditures incurred up until December 31, 1973, in connection with the GUIDE Project.

Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial and Administrative Support</td>
<td>1,693.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>293.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total personnel costs 1,986.00

Material and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Services</td>
<td>580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll Calls</td>
<td>295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Material and Services 1,320.00

Grant Total $3,306.00

This depletes the allocated $3,000 funded for the GUIDE project.

cc: file
RRE/tm

The amount of $306.00 was absorbed by MIT, Urban Studies