Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning
May 1, 1988
San Antonio, Texas

President Donald Krueckebberg called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m.

1. **Roll Call**

**Executive Committee Members Present:**

Donald Krueckebberg, 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
Richard Klosterman, University of Akron
Michael Romanos, University of Cincinnati
Eugenie Birch, Hunter College
Wes Hankins, East Carolina University
Sandra Rosenbloom, University of Texas at Austin
William Siembieda, University of New Mexico
Eugene Grigsby, UCLA
Marsha Ritzdorf, University of Oregon
Nancy Leigh-Preston, University of California, Berkeley

**ACSP Bursar:**

Rolf Engler, MIT

**Members Absent:**

Judith de Neufville, University of California, Berkeley
Julian Wolpert, Princeton University
Catherine Ross, Georgia Institute of Technology
Mark Motte, Rutgers University

A quorum was present.

**Visitors:**

Ernest Alexander, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Ed Blakely, University of California, Berkeley
William Bowdy, AICP Commissioner and PAB member
Jose Caban, Clemson University
Robert Catlin, Florida Atlantic University
Amy Glasmeier, University of Texas at Austin
Lewis Hopkins, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Evelyn Martin, AICP staff
Dorn McGrath, George Washington University
Gerardo Navas, University of Puerto Rico
William Page, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee
Carl Patton, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee
David Perry, SUNY at Buffalo
David Prosperi, University of Cincinnati
Robert Reiman, Appalachian State University
Carla Vlaskamp, PAB staff
Martin Wachs, UCLA

2. Research on Recent Planning Graduates

Amy Glasmeier distributed copies of a report prepared by her and Terry Kahn titled "Non-Traditional Employment of Recent Planning Graduates: Preliminary Survey Results" and gave an oral summary. There were about 1,200 usable responses to a mail survey of graduates in the last five years; 48 percent of these persons had non-traditional jobs. A sample of 40 planners with non-traditional jobs was interviewed by telephone, as was a sample of 40 planners with traditional jobs.

Discussion followed. Questions were raised about the classification into traditional and non-traditional areas. It was noted that economic development and environmental planning were considered non-traditional whereas social planning was considered traditional. Glasmeier said the classification was based on when the areas became prominent in planning, and that it would change over time. She said most of those interviewed by phone agreed with the way they were classified.

Tom Galloway, chair of the committee conducting research on student recruitment, discussed the purpose of the survey. He thought the results represented a positive statement about planning education because a high percentage of respondents expressed satisfaction with their schooling. He would like to see the results published, perhaps in Planning magazine, the Journal of Planning Education and Research, or the Chronicle of Higher Education. He suggested that a new committee be formed to focus on publication of the results. He felt this goes beyond the charge given to his committee, but he is willing to help.

Jay Chatterjee moved that the report be accepted and gratitude be extended to Professor Glasmeier and her associates at the University of Texas at Austin who worked on the survey. Dick Klosterman seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Glasmeier suggested that the study be repeated in the future and recommended a longitudinal study as well. When pressed for specifics, she suggested doing a cross-section study every five years, but she wasn't certain of the right time frame for a longitudinal study.

3. Policy on Accreditation

Krueckeburger introduced Evelyn Martin, Staff Director of the Planning Accreditation Board, who in turn introduced William Bowdy, a member of the Board, and Carla Vlaskamp of the staff. Martin then described the
proposed amendments to the Accreditation Document that require action by the ACSP Executive Committee. These were listed in Attachment A of the PAB report that was mailed to Executive Committee members in early April. They had just been considered by the AICP Commission.

The amendment on page 3, Section D.1, involves membership on the PAB. Krueckeberg explained that the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) objected to the present membership because it requires public representation by someone with no ties to the profession or field. The PAB could not resolve the issue, but a solution was worked out by the Presidents of ACSP and AICP.

As proposed, the Board would still consist of eight members. ACSP would select four: three educators and a public member who has no connection with planning (and is not an APA member). AICP would select three members, including one who recently graduated from a planning program (within the previous two years). APA would select one member, a "planning commissioner type."

Sandi Rosenbloom asked about the criteria for the public member. Krueckeberg said that hadn't been worked out. Martin said COPA has a list of suitable people, including lawyers and retired college presidents. She said there will be a vacancy on the Board as of December 1, and the public member could be named by June and listed in the PAB's application to COPA this summer.

Bowdy noted that AICP would give up one spot on the Board, but they didn't object. This amendment was approved by the AICP Commission.

William Siembieda moved that the amendment be adopted, Michael Romanos seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendment on page 4, Section D.6, concerned staff support and would remove references to AICP's Executive Director, AICP, and location of PAB's office in Washington. This change was not approved by the AICP Commission, so the proposed amendment is now moot.

Nevertheless, considerable discussion followed. Chatterjee said the document should be generic and such specific references are not necessary. He noted that PAB approved this amendment unanimously. David Sawicki agreed; he would like to remove references to AICP from the document. Bowdy said the AICP Commission wanted to retain accountability of the PAB staff to them.

Inquiry was made as to COPA's view. Martin said this matter was of no interest to COPA, but it would be inadvisable to show disension between ACSP and AICP. Sawicki suggested that the application to COPA be postponed until agreement is reached on this issue. Martin said this would be awkward since they had previously asked COPA to expedite the process, and COPA had agreed.
Klosterman moved that the Executive Committee express support for the spirit of the amendment and direct our PAB representatives to attempt to resolve the issue before the submission to COPA. Galloway seconded. The motion carried by a vote of 8 in favor, 5 opposed.

Chatterjee moved that the submission to COPA not be put forward until this issue is resolved. Sawicki seconded. Discussion followed on whether it would be possible to accomplish this by June. Krueckeberg said it is conceivable, but he did not think it likely. The motion failed by a vote of 2 in favor, 11 opposed, and one abstention.

It had been noted that there is no existing procedure to settle disputes between the AICP Commission and the ACSP Executive Committee. Both must approve changes to the Accreditation Document. Genie Birch moved to direct PAB to create an adjudication procedure to work out disagreements between AICP and ACSP in a timely fashion. Marsha Ritzdorf seconded. The motion passed with one abstention.

Chatterjee moved that the Executive Committee accept PAB's recommendation to reword this section of the Accreditation Document as shown in Attachment A. Romanos seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendment on page 5, Section F.1, would involve the schools in the review of future important amendments to the Accreditation Document. Martin said this change was suggested by COPA.

David Forkenbrock asked why it doesn't specify the ACSP Executive Committee, instead of just ACSP. He moved that throughout the Accreditation Document, wherever "ACSP" is referred to in parallel with "AICP Commission," it be changed to "ACSP Executive Committee." Klosterman seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Eugene Grigsby moved to adopt the amendment on page 5. Sawicki seconded, and the motion passed with one abstention.

The amendment on page 7, Section C.4, would end the practice of sending a school's self-study report to the local APA chapter, in order to preserve confidentiality. Birch moved to adopt the amendment, Siembieda seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendment on page 9, Section D.5, would request confidentiality for the self-study on the part of the students. Birch moved to adopt the amendment, Siembieda seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendment on page 9, Section E.1, is to give more flexibility in scheduling the site visit. Klosterman moved that the amendment be adopted, Wes Hankins seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendment on page 10, Section E.2, first paragraph, would give flexibility in the number of team members. This amendment was approved by the AICP Commission. Chatterjee said this was a serious issue. ACSP has always insisted that the majority of any team be educators.
Forkenbrock moved to adopt the amendment as shown in Attachment A so it would say, "The site visit team shall normally consist of three planners—two educators and one practitioner." Romanos seconded. The motion was rejected unanimously.

Klosterman moved to add the sentence, "Additional members may be appointed as long as educators form the majority of the site team." Hankins seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendment on page 10, Section E.2, third paragraph, would prevent any team members coming from the same state as the school visited. Forkenbrock moved to adopt the amendment, Ritzdorf seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendments on pages 15-15d, Section H, would replace the current appeal procedures. One important change is that overturning a PAB decision would require a 3-0 vote by the appeal panel instead of a 2-1 vote. Klosterman moved to adopt the set of amendments, Grigsby seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The amendments on page 16, Section I, all deal with interim activities. Grigsby moved to adopt all three paragraphs, Siembieda seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned for luncheon at 12:20 p.m. Krueckeb erg reconvened the meeting at 1:55 p.m.

4. Site Visitor Pool

Krueckeb erg reported that new candidates for the pool nominated by ACSP were temporarily held up by PAB while it reassesses its procedures. Meanwhile, there are about ten names in the pipeline. He read a memorandum from David Godschalk and a letter from Martin Wachs, both of ACSP's screening committee. They declined to spend further time on the matter because PAB had taken no action on their previous nominations.

Bowdy said PAB wanted to review its qualifications for site visitors. He is chair of the committee doing this. It was not the intention to turn down the recommendations, but only to table them.

However, some nominees did receive a letter that implied they had been rejected. In a few cases this came as an unpleasant surprise because the individuals were not even aware they were being considered.

Krueckeb erg opined that the PAB should have proceeded with the pending nominations under the old rules, but they didn't. He will write to the candidates who are currently "in limbo" and explain the situation.

Black asked about the proposal to suspend site visits for a year. Martin explained that this will even out the number of schools visited in each year of the five-year cycle. COPA approved the plan. Krueckeb erg said he had been consulted, and he agreed with it.
Wachs requested that membership on the screening committee for the site visitor pool be rotated since the same people have been doing it for several years.

5. Extra Costs for PAB

Krueckeb erg reported that COPA appointed a reader/observer who went on a site visit to the University of Puerto Rico and will attend the PAB meeting in Buffalo this fall. The costs for this had not been anticipated and were not budgeted. They are estimated at $3,000 to $3,700. It is proposed to split these costs with AICP. There was no discussion.

6. Secretary's Report

Chatterjee moved that minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held on November 5, 1987 be approved as submitted. Siembieda seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

7. Financial Report

Rolf Engler distributed an activity report for the period October 31, 1987 to April 20, 1988. He also distributed a report on projected operation for the period April 20, 1988 to June 30, 1988. (The reports are attached.)

Sawicki suggested that separate accounts be kept for major projects such as JPER and the guides to planning schools. Krueckeb erg agreed this should be done. Engler said he had received no report from the organizers of the Los Angeles conference. Forkenbrock said conference finances should be monitored more closely in the future.

Birch moved that the financial reports be accepted. Klosterman seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

8. Research Committee

David Perry said the committee has just completed analysis of its survey of planning research centers, which received 90 responses. A final report of the findings is being prepared. This will include a directory of the research centers. This should be ready for the Buffalo meeting.

Perry said the biggest problem is not external funding, but insufficient internal or operating funds. The leverage from internal funds is only about 1.5, which is very low from the point of view of universities. He said the major source of external funds is local government, then state government, then federal government. Very little money is obtained from foundations.

In regard to the support from local government, Black asked whether consulting was distinguished from research. Perry said any money that went through a university unit was included; probably some was for
community service rather than academic research. Consulting contracts with individual faculty members were not included.

9. Future Conference Sites

Forkenbrock said Ohio State University has expressed a strong interest in hosting the 1992 conference. There is a proposal to hold the 1991 conference in Europe. A column on this will appear in the next issue of Update. Then a survey form will appear in the July issue of Update. No action is needed now, but a decision will have to be made at Buffalo.

Krueckeborg said the idea for an international conference came from the Committee of Review and Appraisal and was approved in principle at Los Angeles. His European counterpart has suggested several sites, including Amsterdam, Paris, Venice, Cambridge, and Oxford.

There was discussion on how the costs of foreign travel would affect young faculty. Some universities will not fund foreign travel. Hence attendance could be low. Several suggestions were made on soliciting grants from host countries or international organizations.

10. Graduate and Undergraduate Guides

Carl Patton gave an update on the status of the sixth edition of the graduate guide. It is planned to print 10,000 copies and distribute them free to feeder schools. Currently 87 schools have committed to being included, of which eight are new. He said data collection must end in the next few days because the project is a month behind schedule.

Krueckeborg noted that distribution will no longer be handled by the American Planning Association, as in the past. An agreement has been signed with the Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University. They will buy 750 copies of the graduate guide and 700 copies of the undergraduate guide. These will be marketed as a package and will have a common cover design.

Hankins reported that the undergraduate guide will appear six to eight months behind schedule because of difficulty in getting information from the schools. He expects it to be printed in July.

11. Salary Study

David Prosperi reported on a 1987-88 faculty salary survey prepared at Oklahoma State University. He was skeptical of the results because there were many biases in the survey. It covered only about 10 percent of the planning faculty in the U.S.

Discussion followed. Chatterjee and Galloway felt such surveys are very important to deans. Some people disagreed with Prosperi and thought this report had some credibility. Forkenbrock suggested that a committee be formed to rethink the annual salary survey and perhaps build on what Oklahoma State has done. Finally Krueckeborg agreed to take the
matter under advisement and decide later whether to form a committee or follow up himself.

12. Commission on Undergraduate Education

Krueckeberg reported he had appointed a commission, chaired by Paul Niebanck, and given them a charge. They will meet in Washington this September and later in Oregon. They have requested a budget of $1,500.

13. McClure Prize

Romanos noted that under changes made last year, this prize is to be awarded every year instead of every other year. He said he planned to mail letters and posters announcing the student paper competition next week. However, it was suggested that it is too late to hold the contest this year; perhaps the timetable should be revised.

After discussion, Ritzdorf moved that we do not offer the prize for 1987-88, that we defer the yearly cycle until next year, that posters go out in January with a deadline in June, and that the $500 budgeted for this year's prize be used to develop a good, attention-getting poster. Nancy Leigh-Preston seconded. Romanos said the next prize then should cover a two-year period, instead of one. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Outstanding Educator Award

Rosenbloom, who chairs the selection committee, said she will soon send letters to all program chairs soliciting nominations. They will be accepted until August 1.

15. Student Representation

Leigh-Preston reported that Mark Motte had sent out notices soliciting nominations for the position of student representation on the ACSP Executive Committee. Candidates must submit applications by June 1.

16. Davidoff Award

Krueckeberg reported that he had appointed Barry Checkoway chair of this committee.

17. Journal of Planning Education and Research

Lew Hopkins reported that Ernest Alexander has been selected as Book Review Editor. He submitted a budget request for Volume 8 with the total increased from $17,000 to $19,650. Chatterjee moved to approve an increase of $2,650 in the budget. Galloway seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Hopkins said he wasn't sure how to handle requests for complimentary subscriptions from foreign countries, especially Third World countries. After discussion, Rosenbloom moved to budget an additional $350 to
enable the editors to give complimentary subscriptions to institutions that, in their opinion, are unable to afford them. Forkenbrock seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Hopkins presented a proposal to develop and maintain a database to handle various ACSP functions, including mailing lists and preparation of a new membership roster. He requested $1,000 to pay a student assistant to implement the proposal this summer. Forkenbrock moved to approve expenditure of $1,000 for this purpose. Siembieda seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

18. Update

Forkenbrock said that the new database should correct many past problems with the Update mailing list. It won't be ready for the next issue, which is about to be mailed, but should be in place for the summer issue. June 20 is the deadline for material for the summer issue; September 10, for the fall issue. He intends to produce three issues a year.

19. Budget Requests

Krueckeberg brought up two financial requests that had been made earlier. In regard to extra costs for COPA, Birch moved to approve expenditure of an additional $1,700. Forkenbrock seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

In regard to the Commission on Undergraduate Education, Chatterjee moved to approve $1,500 for its expenses. Rosenbloom seconded. A question was raised as to why this body should receive travel expenses when other ACSP committees do not. Krueckeberg felt that this activity is unique, like the research project at the University of Texas. He explained that the commission's meetings will be piggybacked on conferences, and only marginal costs will be paid by ACSP. The motion passed with one abstention.

20. Other Business

Krueckeberg reported that Ritzdorf has agreed to form a committee on the recruitment and retention of minority and women students and faculty.

Chatterjee noted that he had begun an ACSP archives at the University of Cincinnati, but he had had no time to add to it in the past two years. Forkenbrock moved to authorize Chatterjee to discuss the possibility of moving the archives to Cornell University or any other school that is interested. Klosterman seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Chatterjee noted that the ACSP constitution needs to be "cleaned up" because some of the provisions are no longer relevant. Birch moved to appoint Chatterjee and Sawicki as a committee to review the constitution and propose revisions at the fall meeting in Buffalo. Siembieda seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.
Black reported that the pamphlet, "Guidelines on Evaluation of Planning Faculty for Promotion and Tenure," was printed last fall. A copy was sent to every member school, and requests for 120 additional copies were filled. He has about 200 copies left. Interest seems to be seasonal; he will publicize availability of the pamphlet again next fall.

Krueckeberg adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Black, Secretary
University of Kansas