

A QUICKIE CHRONOLOGY OF ACSP

My first relevant notes date from March 16, 1957. On this Saturday, preceding the San Francisco ASPO Conference, planning educators met at the University of California in Berkeley. The morning session, chaired by Fran Violich, was entitled "The City Planning Curriculum: Comparative Reports". Those reports were from Penn by Bill Wheaton, from USC by Si Eisner, and from California by Jack Kent; Don Foley moderated. The presentations were to concentrate on five points: (1) Goals and Philosophy Behind the Curriculum, (2) The Major Emphasis in the Coursework and Field Experience, (3) The Educational Experiences Provided by the Curriculum, (4) The Sequence of Courses and Experience; The Supporting Rationale, and (5) Problems, Experimental Efforts, or Future Hopes Re Curriculum. The afternoon session, moderated by Coleman Woodbury, dealt with a possibility of exchanging information with respect to research activities, Ph.D programs in, or related to Planning, Undergraduate Courses and Degree Programs, and Community Service Activities.

Prior to the next meeting of the educators at the Chicago AIP Conference in October of 1957, a list of items for possible consideration and drafting an agenda was compiled. This is what it looked like:

Items for Possible Consideration in Drafting an Agenda for the Meeting of Planning Educators at the AIP Conference in Chicago October, 1957

1. Means to stimulate increase in enrollment in existing planning curricula (particularly graduate level).
2. Development of guidance facilities for universities interested in establishing planning curricula.
3. The proper scope of a complete curriculum what kinds of learning experiences should the student have had during his tenure as a student.
4. Exploration of planning material that might be incorporated into "core" or "basic" courses (both undergraduate and graduate) material common to any aspect of planning knowledge.
5. Content of studio, workshop, or laboratory projects involving government and other assistance programs that are of current importance to a community. (eg: urban renewal, urban thoroughfares).
6. The "practical" versus the highly theoretical character of course content.
7. Practicality of in-service training of planners.
8. Development of workable and useful criteria for "recognizing" competent university programs. Accreditation?
9. Some criteria for measuring usefulness and acceptability of the so-called related fields currently a most obscure and undefined catch-all category that weakens planning curricula and the profession perceptibly.
10. The imperialism within a university of related fields, such as, political science, sociology, economics, geography, education, engineering and resource development. The trends of such fields taking over activities that are more properly the jurisdiction of urban planning.

Note: Most of these fields are long-established in academic communities, and are, thereby, of stronger administrative influence than more recent ones. The relative paucity of opportunities in some of them may be the reason for the increasing activity by them in operations distinctly urban planning in nature. It is the opinion of some qualified observers that such an inadequate job is being done by these related fields that the stature of urban planning is being seriously discredited. It might be valuable to compare notes on such experiences.

11. What should be the proper role of planning faculty and students in a university within the whole area of planning activity? For example, the relationship of research and off-campus service to the content of courses and the participation of students.
12. Development of a consulting team to serve as advisors to federal and state legislative committees relative to any proposals that might affect planning education.
13. The desirability and need for Ph.D degree-holding planning instructors.
14. The need for Ph.D programs what is the demand, how should it be structured, what are requirements for eligibility, etc.?

There is in my notes no evidence that the actual program reflected the agenda suggested as noted above. The morning session was devoted to three presentations on the studio course. Jack Parker and Mike Wolfe made presentations on the studio courses at their respective institutions. Bill Goodman presented the results of a questionnaire concerning the studio courses at 16 universities. The afternoon session, moderated by Lou Wetmore, heard Harvey Perloff discussing the subject of an association among planning schools. Unless someone else recorded Harvey's remarks, they may never be recaptured.

After a hiatus during 1958, there appear minutes of a meeting held May 10, 1959 at the Hotel Leamington in Minneapolis of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. Eighteen schools were represented at the meeting, which heard an announcement that nineteen had certified that they met AIP recognition requirements. Bob Mitchell chaired the meeting. The following actions were taken authorized:

- (1) Appointment by the Chairman of a three member committee from the schools to work jointly with a three member committee from AIP to interpret AIP specifications for "Reorganized Planning Schools," to determine the need for changes in the requirements for membership in the Educator's Organization, and to recommend changes in such requirements. The Educator's Committee members appointed were Bill Goodman, Hugh Pomeroy, and Coleman Woodbury, Chairman; AIP Committee members were Don Graham, Perry Norton and Doug Carroll, Chairman.
- (2) The purposes of the new Association were adopted; these are identical to those presently in ACSP's Constitution.
- (3) The voting procedures were adopted, as they are now specified in Article 5 of the Constitution.
- (4) The name Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning was adopted.
- (5) The approval of dues of \$50.00, or such other amount as may be fixed by the governing body of the organization, were approved.
- (6) The following officers were approved for the Association: President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, President-Elect; these, plus two others to be named by them, constitute the Executive Committee of the Association.
- (7) A resolution was adopted to transmit to the Executive Committee instructions to seek geographical representation among the officers and other members of the Committee.
- (8) The appointment of a committee on the Constitution was authorized, which Committee was to report to the Association at the Seattle AIP Conference in July.
- (9) The nominating committee was appointed consisting of Reg Isaacs, Leonard Logan, and Mel Webber, Chairman.
- (10) A resolution was approved requesting AIP to act as secretariat of the Association during the period of organization. No action was taken, although there was discussion of accreditation of planning schools, and relation to the impending possible adoption of registration of practitioners within the states.

The Association next met on July 26, 1969 on the campus of the University of Washington in Seattle. The morning session was entitled "The Master's Thesis in Planning - To Be or Not To Be". The views expressed ranged from strong support of the thesis (by Peter Oberlander), through ambivalence (by Jack Kent), to strong opposition (by Bob Mitchell). The afternoon panel discussed the role of legal research in the planning curriculum. The legal profession's view was represented by the Dean of the University of Washington's School of Law and two members of its faculty.

The business session of ACSP on the following Tuesday evening, July 28, suffered from lack of a quorum. Thus, all votes were simply expressions of the sense of the meeting. The announcement was made of the officers elected by previous mail ballot: Bob Mitchell, President; Jack Howard, President-Elect; Peter Oberlander, Vice-President; Lou Wetmore, Secretary; and Howard Menhinick, Treasurer. A letter from Coleman Woodbury was the basis for some hilarious discussion concerning other and perhaps preferable names for the organization. Some of the suggestions included Association for Professional Education in Planning, Association for University Education and Planning, Association of University Programs and Planning, and Association for Planning Research and Education. There was absolutely no consensus; so it was finally decided that all of the suggested names would be submitted to the membership for its choice. The constitution draft prepared as a result of the Minneapolis meeting was presented, and was worked over in detail. Most of the discussion was on the membership criteria, since the revisions to the original draft which were suggested suffered from some ambiguities in terminology. For example, as they were presented, these requirements would not permit Harvard to qualify for "Active" membership; this feature was, therefore, applauded by some of those present. The sense of the meeting was that the substance of these revisions be recommended to the membership after necessary rewording by the committee which drafted them.

Those present voted unanimously against having a display by each school at the 1960 ASPO Conference. In conclusion, Lou Wetmore suggested that one aim of the Association should be to attempt to establish more scholarship programs a la Sears. It was voted that this matter be explored further with ACTION. Twenty schools were represented, not all of whom have subsequently become members of the association.

Next appears the meeting one year and a few months later, on October 23, 1960 in Philadelphia. The morning was devoted to a business meeting, on which I have no notes. The afternoon meeting was devoted to two topics. The first, "The Role of Sponsored Research in Planning Education: The Hopes, Aspirations, and Success for Such Research Within Established Schools of Planning", heard presentations by Bill Goodman, Mike Wolfe, Britt Harris, and Alan Armstrong of CMHC. The second topic was to be an introduction to a proposed study of the Association entitled "The Role of the Thesis in Planning Education."

Roughly a year later, on November 26, 1961, the Association met in Detroit. The agenda indicates that the Secretary reported on a census of enrollments, and also presented to the members the first (and so far only) directory of the faculties of the member schools. The Executive Committee reported on fellowship policies, and its position on the AIP Student Award. The election results were announced; Howard Menhinick was the President, moving up from President-Elect; Lou Wetmore, President-Elect; Mike Wolfe, Vice-President; Bill Doebele, Secretary; and Myles Boylan, Treasurer. Eight items were suggested for ACSP's program for 1961-62: (1) Newsletter, (2) Training Foreign Students, (3) Study of Planning Education, (4) Comparative Compilation of Course Offerings as the Ultimate Basis for Evaluation of Curricula, (5) Testing of Applicants; Evaluation of Graduate Record Exams, (6) Job Market in Teaching for Ph.D.'s, (7) Circulation of a List of Job Applicants in Planning Education, and (8) Financial Aid Policies. Thirteen member schools were represented.

In March of 1962, ACSP's membership consisted of eighteen schools holding full membership, and four schools holding affiliate membership.

It is interesting to note that in August of 1962, Bud Dutton, then AIP Executive Director, wrote a long letter to Howard Menhinick, then ACSP President, concerning several areas in which the two organizations could easily co-operate: (1) A Vocational Guidance Brochure, (2) statistical data on the education of planners, and financial

aid requirements, (3) AIP materials to be made available to planning students through schools, (4) professionalism in the planning curriculum, (5) students' organizations within planning schools and their possible AIP affiliation, (6) study of examination procedure for AIP membership, (7) continuing education needs of the planning profession, (8) research needs and communications of findings.

I am not aware of any follow-up to this letter.

The 1962 meeting was held on September 17, in connection with the annual AIP meeting in Los Angeles. The morning was devoted to the annual business meeting, with no notes extant.

The afternoon was devoted to the topic "The Training of Foreign Planning Students". It was chaired by Mike Wolfe; discussants included Peter Oberlander, Fran Violich, and Bill Doebele. Fran Violich reported on a survey of 26 U.S. and Canadian Planning Schools concerning their students from Latin America. The information obtained included the name and country of origin of students who had completed one or two years of study at the school, the number of years the student studied in the program and whether or not he received the master's degree, and his present position and place of work.

In the next year the ACSP Bulletin made its appearance. Since that time all matters of importance (or, we hope, all) concerning ACSP have appeared in its pages. Therefore what follows are excerpts from seven and one-half years of Bulletin publication, mostly the minutes of ACSP meetings.

CG
July 27, 1970