Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning
October 27, 1988
Buffalo, New York

President Donald Krueckeborg called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

1. Roll Call

   Executive Committee Members Present:

   Donald Krueckeborg, Rutgers University
   David Forkenbrock, University of Iowa
   Alan Black, University of Kansas
   David Sawicki, Georgia Institute of Technology
   Jayanta Chatterjee, University of Cincinnati
   Thomas Galloway, Iowa State University
   Judith Innes, University of California, Berkeley
   Richard Klosterman, University of Akron
   Michael Romanos, University of Cincinnati
   Eugenie Birch, Hunter College
   Julian Wolpert, Princeton University
   Wes Hankins, East Carolina University
   Catherine Ross, Georgia Institute of Technology
   William Siembieda, University of New Mexico
   Eugene Grigsby, UCLA
   Marsha Ritzdorf, University of Oregon
   Jonathan Levine, University of California, Berkeley
   Mark Motte, Rutgers University

   ACSP Bursar:

   Rolf Engler, MIT

   Members Absent:

   Sandra Rosenbloom, University of Texas at Austin

   A quorum was present.

   Visitors:

   Kerry Donly, PAB staff
   Sheldon Edner, Portland State University
   Leon Eplan, PAB member
   Marcia Marker Feld, University of Rhode Island
   Howard Foster, University of Rhode Island
   Carl Goldschmidt, PAB Chair
   Jane Greene, PAB member
   Lewis Hopkins, University of Illinois at Urbana
   Ibrahim Jammal, SUNY at Buffalo
Seymour Mandelbaum, University of Pennsylvania
Evelyn Martin, PAB staff
Kenneth Pearlman, Ohio State University
Robert Reiman, Appalachian State University
Jay Stein, SUNY at Buffalo
Dick Williams, Association of European Schools of Planning

Mark Motte announced that Jonathan Levine had been selected as a new Student Representative and introduced him.

2. Planning Accreditation Board

Carl Goldschmidt, PAB Chair, reported that the Board was meeting for a full week at Buffalo and was in the process of considering 23 applications for accreditation. The Board is also studying a basic revision of requirements and standards with the aim of developing qualitative criteria to replace the quantitative standards used in the past. The PAB’s application for recognition by the Council on Post-Secondary Accreditation (COPA) is proceeding on schedule. A reader/observer from COPA is attending this meeting of the PAB. Currently a one-year moratorium on processing applications for accreditation is in effect. When processing resumes, there will be a more even distribution of cases over the five-year cycle.

Leon Eplan, chair of the PAB committee on standards, said a very preliminary draft of the qualitative standards had been prepared. It is hoped to have a complete draft ready by next February. This will be sent to all accredited schools for comment. If this version of the Accreditation Document is approved by summer, it will be used for the 12 schools that come up for re-accreditation in fall 1989. The other members of his committee are Judith Innes and Tom Galloway.

Innes explained that the criteria will be based on output measures. They will still be guidelines for the site visit teams, and the teams will have a bigger burden of evaluation than before. The procedure of the Board’s authorizing site visits will be eliminated: Any program that wants can have a site visit. The intent is to cut out busywork and emphasize substantive matters.

Galloway said the Board will have more flexibility in making decisions with a gradation in time periods. The maximum may be five or seven years; there may be accreditation for only three years; and there may be probationary status. This will depend on how many criteria are met; there could be fifty criteria.

Howard Foster thought that the schools will need more than five weeks to review the proposed changes. They should have at least a semester. Jay Chatterjee supported this view. Marsha Ritzdorf suggested holding a public forum at the American Planning Association conference in Atlanta next spring before the Executive Committee considers the proposal.
Krueckeberg said this will be a massive revision; the current draft is already 25 pages. But he has read it and didn’t see much controversial material. He felt it was obviously a great improvement. He favored adhering to a schedule leading to a decision at Atlanta.

Ritzdorf moved that Krueckeberg schedule a public forum on the proposal to be held at the APA conference on Saturday afternoon, before the Executive Committee meets on Sunday, and that he inform all member schools. Eugene Grigsby seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

In regard to the site visitor pool, Goldschmidt said the PAB was considering the nominations that had been made a year ago and tabled.

Chatterjee noted that this is his last meeting as ACSP representative to the PAB, and he has several continuing concerns: independence of the PAB, budget, and staffing. Innes concurred that ignorance about how the budget works has been an obstacle to PAB activities. Evelyn Martin said PAB members had never voiced interest in seeing the proposed budget.

David Forkenbrock moved that the Executive Committee direct its representatives to PAB to request that all budgetary proposals be reviewed by PAB before submission to the AICP Commission and the ACSP Executive Committee. Grigsby seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

David Sawicki asked about scheduling of the PAB’s application to COPA. Martin said COPA could vote approval at its next meeting in April 1989. Sawicki said he was concerned about budget autonomy and asked whether this could be changed after COPA approves. Martin said yes, changes could be made later.

3. Secretary’s Report

Richard Klosterman moved that minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held on May 1, 1988 be approved as submitted. Wes Hankins seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.


Rolf Engler distributed four reports (which are attached): 1) a report on the conference held in Los Angeles November 5-8, 1987; 2) a financial report for the period July 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988; 3) an activity report for the period April 20, 1988 to October 20, 1988; and 4) a projected budget for the period July 1, 1988 to June 30, 1989. He also distributed individual accounts for three projects: 1) the graduate guide, 6th edition; 2) the undergraduate guide, 2nd edition; and 3) the Journal of Planning Education and Research (JPER).

Sawicki proposed to form a committee to study long-term budget practices. He said there should be consistency; the current reports listed some items that ACSP had never paid for before. Krueckeberg said he would consider the idea and confer with Sawicki later. Krueckeberg also commended Engler for presenting very thorough reports.
5. **Membership Report**

Engler reported that there are currently 126 members, consisting of 88 full members, 13 affiliate members, 17 corresponding members, and 8 individual members. Recent changes: Syracuse University and University of Arkansas cancelled as affiliate members; University of Utah changed from full to affiliate member.

The meeting was adjourned for luncheon at 12:05 p.m. Krueckeberg reconvened the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

6. **Conferences**

Sheldon Edner gave a progress report on the conference to be held in Portland, Oregon October 5-7, 1989. It will be housed in the Portland Marriott Hotel; the room rate will be $72 for either a single or double. Because the conference will be on the West Coast, there will be a change in scheduling: Sessions will run from Thursday afternoon through Saturday afternoon. There will be no sessions on Sunday, but there will be field trips.

The next topic was the proposal to hold the annual conference in Europe in 1991. Forkenbrock distributed a written report and introduced Dick Williams, representing the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP). Williams described the organization briefly. There are 50 members in 10 countries, and the numbers are growing. The language policy is that everything is in English.

The AESOP proposal contained two options. The preferred option is to meet at the University of Oxford during the period August 31 to September 7, 1991. The second is to meet at Oxford Polytechnic Institute in mid-July. AESOP will be meeting in mid-November, at which time it could give final consent to hold a joint conference.

During discussion, several people indicated that the August 31-September 7 period would be a problem because schools on the semester system would be in the first or second week of classes. In a show of hands, a majority indicated they would be affected. It would be preferable to have the conference a week or two later.

Two other proposals were received to host the conference in either 1991 or 1992. Kenneth Pearlman summarized a proposal by Ohio State University to stage the conference in Columbus. They would prefer 1992 because there will be a continuing city-wide celebration commemorating the 500th anniversary of Columbus’s landing.

Seymour Mandelbaum summarized a proposal by the University of Pennsylvania to hold the conference in Philadelphia. They are indifferent between 1991 and 1992 and would even accept 1993. In fact, if it were in 1993, there would be a broader choice of hotels available.
(As is usual practice, the final decisions were left to the ACSP officers, who met in closed session later. At that time, the officers decided to hold the 1991 conference in England, subject to concurrence by AESOP. They awarded the 1992 conference to Ohio State University and the 1993 conference to the University of Pennsylvania.)

7. Elections

Gente Birch reported results of the election just concluded. She said 72 percent of the schools voted. The following persons were elected:

President-Elect - Carl Patton, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Regional Representatives

South Central - David Pugh, Texas A&M University
                William Siembieda, University of New Mexico

West - Fred Collignon, University of California, Berkeley
       Marsha Ritzdorf, University of Oregon

Innes and Patton submitted two motions with regard to election processes (a copy is attached). Considerable discussion followed, during which Innes moved to adopt motion #1, which would prohibit campaigning for office. Several people opposed this motion. The arguments were that it would shut out lesser known people, that it would give an advantage to incumbents, that it would infringe on First Amendment rights of free speech, and that it would prevent someone from campaigning against the Executive Committee's policies.

Forkenbrock submitted a proposal to form a committee to study election policies and procedures and make recommendations. Krueckeberg agreed and said he would appoint such a committee. Innes withdrew her motion, which will be referred to the committee.

Innes moved to adopt motion #2, which states a policy that departmental votes represent a collective decision of all the faculty. Hankins seconded. It was noted that the effect will be advisory, as ACSP cannot dictate how member programs make their choices. The ideal is for all faculty to discuss the candidates, but this will depend on timing; currently the process is often rushed. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Awards

Krueckeberg announced that the Distinguished Planning Educator Award would be presented to John Friedman at the luncheon the next day. Chatterjee moved that the Executive Committee endorse the selection. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Krueckeberg announced that the Chester Rapkin Award for the best article published in JPER would be presented to Ann Markusen. Chatterjee moved that the Executive Committee endorse the selection. Forkenbrock
seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

9. Publications

Patton reported that the 6th edition of the graduate guide had just been printed, and copies were mailed to all member schools. There are 89 programs listed in the guide. Rutgers University has agreed to purchase 750 copies, which will be resold at $14.95 each. There will be free distribution of 9,000 copies to college placement offices and undergraduate feeder programs. The price for a listing has been kept at $250 for the last three editions, but may have to be increased next time. The project is self-supporting.

Hankins reported that the second edition of the undergraduate guide will go to the printer in a week. It lists 34 degree programs and 19 non-degree programs. The cover is like that for the graduate guide except it will be printed in blue instead of red.

Lev Hopkins gave a brief report on the JPER. A computer data base of planning faculty was completed during the past summer, and the mailing list is ready for checking. He will ask all schools to update the list of their faculty members who are to receive copies of JPER.

Ibrahim Jammal said he wished to edit and publish a topical proceedings of the current conference containing papers on international planning. He asked whether he needed official sponsorship from ACSP. During discussion it was pointed out that the ACSP constitution assigns responsibility for publishing conference proceedings to the vice president. In fact, proceedings have never been published, and there did not appear to be any interest in doing so.

Klosterman moved that the Executive Committee permit publication by any individual of papers presented at an ACSP conference without requiring the sponsorship of ACSP. Birch seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Forkenbrock reported on the brochure, "Your Future in Urban and Regional Planning," that promotes the planning profession and lists the ACSP member schools. He distributed 85,000 copies of the last edition, which has been out of print for a couple of years. Following discussion, it was decided to take two actions. First, the schools will be queried to see whether there is demand for reprinting the last edition immediately. Second, a new, revised edition will be prepared; this is a project that will require considerable time. Volunteers are wanted to take charge of the two projects. Anyone willing should contact Forkenbrock or Krueckeburg.

10. Committee on Women and Minorities

Ritzdorf submitted a report on behalf of the Committee on the Retention and Recruitment of Women/Minority Faculty and Students. She said they were hampered by lack of information on exactly what the present
situation is and believed their first priority is to conduct some research. She moved that ACSP allocate $1,900 to the Committee to enable it to proceed with this research. Chatterjee seconded.

During discussion, Sawicki opposed having ACSP pay for a student research assistant. He said ACSP does not have the resources to operate in this way. Innes noted that the PAB is also interested in this problem and has some data that could be shared. The motion passed with one vote against.

11. **Planning Accreditation Board (continued)**

The Executive Committee then went into closed session to reopen discussion of PAB relationships. Visitors were asked to leave.

Following lengthy discussion, Ritzdorf made the following motion: The Executive Committee directs Krueckeberg to write to the AICP President stating that if they wish the application to COPA to go forward for action in April 1989, the staffing issue must be resolved, or a letter attached will go forward as part of ACSP comments. However, it is suggested as an alternative that the application to COPA be put off until an agreement can be achieved with regard to the issues of budget and staffing of PAB. (The letter referred to was suggested by Grigsby and would inform COPA that ACSP has a serious problem with the accreditation system as currently organized.)

Birch seconded the motion, which passed with one vote against.

Innes moved that if the ACSP President is dissatisfied with results of the negotiations with AICP over the staffing and budget of the PAB, he is empowered to delay or withdraw ACSP support for the application to COPA. Forckenbrock seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

12. **Other Business**

A standing vote of thanks was given to the retiring members of the Executive Committee who were present: Chatterjee, Grigsby, and Sawicki.

Krueckeberg adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Black, Secretary
University of Kansas