



Prospects For Urban Planning Education

Thomas E. Nutt , Lawrence E. Susskind & Nicholas P. Retsinas

To cite this article: Thomas E. Nutt , Lawrence E. Susskind & Nicholas P. Retsinas (1970) Prospects For Urban Planning Education, Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 36:4, 229-241, DOI: [10.1080/01944367008977315](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944367008977315)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944367008977315>



Published online: 26 Nov 2007.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 58



View related articles [↗](#)

PROSPECTS FOR URBAN PLANNING EDUCATION

Thomas E. Nutt and Lawrence E. Susskind

with Nicholas P. Retsinas

This article summarizes the current prospects for urban planning education. Working from nationwide surveys of planning students and planning departments as well as from the National Conference on Urban Planning Education, the authors find that many students are dissatisfied with the style and content of planning education and that many planning departments are unable to articulate the educational objectives of their programs. Survey responses from planning programs reveal a distinct dichotomy between schools mentioning societal change and schools oriented toward meeting current professional needs. Very few departments have developed innovative curricula or teaching methods, and, in general, only a few schools seem willing to take the risks involved in experimenting with new models of planning education.

In 1954, a total of 187 students were enrolled in graduate urban planning programs, and only fifty-nine students were enrolled in undergraduate professional degree programs in the United States. Up to that time, 538 people in the United States had graduated from the twenty-one schools of planning offering city and regional planning degrees.¹ During the 1968-69 academic year, total enrollment in urban planning programs had increased to roughly 2,500 full and part-time students, and in 1969 over 875 planning and planning-related degrees were granted by more than sixty schools.² Assuming current planning school enrollments continue to grow at the present rate, it seems likely that 35,000 planners will be educated over the next fifty years.³ In light of this expected "population explosion," thoughtful planning for the future of planning education would seem to be in order.

Over the past fifteen to twenty years the objectives and priorities of planning education have shifted in response to changes that have occurred in the planning profession.⁴ These changes reflect a heightening of certain national sensitivities, such as concern about racial conflict, a desire to broaden

participation in decision-making processes, and realization of the importance of maintaining the quality of the environment. The continuing shift in the emphasis and objectives of planning education away from a stress on physical design as a means for pre-determining social interaction, for example, has created a great deal of confusion in the minds of students and faculty who are trying to understand what planning in the 1970's is all about.

With the dramatic increase in enrollment, planning students have begun to make their voices heard.⁵ In the past few years, planning students at various schools have pressed for the abolition of curriculum requirements; they have demanded a greater role in departmental decision-making (hiring and firing of faculty, tenure and promotion decisions, setting admissions policy, budgetary decisions); they have sought a louder voice within professional planning societies; they have attempted to increase minority group enrollment in planning programs; and, most of all, they have challenged the traditional precepts of planning education ("expertise," notions of planning "in the public interest," the relevance of engineering, structural, and design skills to contemporary urban problem-solving).

While some of this recent dissatisfaction can be attributed to the growing disenchantment students feel with American education in general, many student criticisms are specifically related to the faults and weaknesses of urban planning education. In an effort to characterize the current state of planning education, we undertook a survey in the spring of 1969 of all full-time students enrolled in planning schools in the United States.⁶ In November 1969, a National Conference on Urban Planning Education was held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and was attended by over 300 students and faculty members from practically every school of planning in the country.⁷ One of the resolutions approved by the Conference called on each planning department to prepare and submit a statement describing the goals and objectives of its educational program.⁸ We have tried in this article to summarize and interpret the results of this post-Conference survey, the pre-Conference survey, the resolutions passed at the Conference, and the reactions and attitudes of students and faculty

In June, Thomas E. Nutt completed his studies at Harvard where he was enrolled in a dual degree program in the Graduate School of Design (city planning) and the Divinity School (ethics). He was president of the Graduate School of Design Student Senate and was elected by the National Conference on Urban Planning Education to the National Student Steering Committee.

Lawrence E. Susskind received his MCP degree from MIT in June 1970. He was co-director of the National Conference on Urban Planning Education and helped to develop MIT's "Undergraduate Program in Urban Studies."

Nicholas P. Retsinas is a third year student in the Department of City and Regional Planning, Harvard Graduate School of Design.

TABLE 1 *Personal Data on Current Planning Students*

Category	Percent	Category	Percent
<i>Sex</i>		<i>Work experience</i>	
Male	79	None	33
Female	21	At least 1 year	27
<i>Race</i>		More than 1 year	40
White	92	<i>Father's occupation</i>	
Negro	4	Laborer	16
Other	4	Clerical	21
<i>Age</i>		Technical, managerial, professional	63
Under 24	44	<i>Annual family income</i>	
24-29	39	\$0-7,499	21
Over 29	17	\$7,500-9,999	19
<i>Citizenship</i>		\$10,000 and over	60
U.S.	93	<i>Childhood residence</i>	
Other	7	Core city	12
<i>Undergraduate degree</i>		Suburbs	52
B.A.	63	Rural	36
Other	37		
<i>Other graduate degree</i>			
Yes	20		
No	80		

Source: Pre-Conference Survey

currently involved in attempts to improve planning education.

The Planning Student and His Views

Current Planning Student Profile As indicated by the data in Table 1, the typical planning student is: white; male; in his mid-twenties; from a middle or upper middle class suburban background; and has a liberal arts undergraduate degree.⁹

In planning schools across the country there is little deviation from the norm. Only 4 percent of the students currently enrolled are black. Not only do 79 percent of the students come from families with annual incomes of \$10,000 or more per year, but also about one out of every four students comes from a family with an annual income of \$20,000 or more.

Student Views Few subjects raise the ire of students as much as the alleged "irrelevancy" of planning curricula. While 85 percent of the students responding to the pre-Conference survey said that their departments had a core curriculum or a set of required courses, only 30 percent of the students consider these courses to be essential. Therefore, we looked with great interest at the departmental responses to post-Conference survey questions on this issue. Most departments that have a core curriculum (only nine do not) provided as their rationale the necessity for transmitting "basic planning knowledge." Most of the core courses mentioned were themes and variations on planning

theory, planning methods, and planning techniques. New York University's Department of Public Administration, for example, said that since its program seeks to train generalists, "this calls for a common body of knowledge that articulates the field of planning. Thus, required courses include planning law and land use regulation, planning history, housing, the structure of the urban system, and the theoretic/rational basis of planning, and metropolitan administration, finance and economics."

For most departments, required core courses constitute one-third to two-thirds of the program. Yet, no particular thrust or structure guides the formulation or intent of the core curriculum, except perhaps the notion that a planner is to be all things to all people. The rationale seems to be that a planner ought to know "a little of this and a little of that." Courses apparently are added incrementally; few are ever dropped from the required list. A few schools have attempted to rework course requirements by presenting the core curriculum within the framework of one major seminar: for example, Rhode Island's introductory planning seminar or Cincinnati's year-long community workshop.¹⁰

At a few schools, such as MIT, where, for all practical purposes, required courses have been abolished, students design their own interdisciplinary program (field work, seminars, individual research, classes, group research projects) around a chosen specialization (social and political aspects of planning, economics and planning, city design, transportation planning, quantitative methods in urban and regional planning, planning problems of developing countries). It should be pointed out that students are not entirely happy with the curriculum at those schools that do not have a required set of courses, as evidenced by the post-Conference survey response of one student at the University of Texas:

At the present time, the program is not encumbered with a rigid curriculum, but rather the difficulty lies in that it is frustratingly without form or structure, with courses offered in isolation and unrelated in any systematic manner.

It is clear that students rebel when a set of courses is imposed on them by a department. From the students' point of view, it makes little sense to require a specific set of courses (which it is assumed will equip a planner in a certain way) when it is commonly agreed that there is not a single kind of planner. On the other hand, students are ambivalent about the kinds of planning skills

they would like to acquire. For example, there is some feeling that planning should become more "scientific" in its approach (that is, it should become more analytical, more systematic), but when it is suggested that students try to apply such techniques as operations research, decision theory, computer technologies, and information theory to the solution of urban problems, these recommendations are often rejected on the grounds that such "hard" approaches are insensitive to the critical social and political aspects of human behavior.

The issue of field work versus simulated studio courses also very much concerns students. Over 80 percent of the students said their programs required studio courses, but fully one-third of the students felt that studio topics were not relevant to actual planning problems; and 40 percent said they thought their faculty would not rank studios as an essential part of the curriculum. It is somewhat surprising that only about one-half of the students reported that they are permitted to receive academic credit for field work undertaken during the school year. In a professional program basically preparing students for practical performance, this seems curious. It was with these general concerns in mind that the conference resolved that "required courses should be completely abolished in favor of a program where each student with his faculty advisor develops a program suited to his particular needs."¹¹ And as a specific curriculum recommendation the Conference resolved that "each department should offer a community-based

advocacy program as an option to traditional studios."¹²

One of the students' sharpest criticisms centers on what they feel is the inability of junior and senior faculty members to teach planning effectively. According to the pre-Conference survey, one-third of the students feel that half of both their junior and senior faculty are ill-equipped to teach the courses they are presently offering. In addition, well over half the students feel that if the curriculum were overhauled or remodeled, most of the faculty would still not be capable of teaching adequately in this improved situation. It is interesting to note that junior and senior faculty members were rated just about evenly in this regard. Since students do recognize the importance of a strong faculty, and since students do not put a great deal of faith in the ability of present faculty members to adapt to innovative experiments in planning education, they are anxious to play a more significant role in establishing the criteria for faculty selection. The Conference passed a resolution calling for "all new faculty appointments, promotions, and contract terminations to be decided by a body in which students and faculty are equally represented."¹³

Involvement of students in departmental decision-making has also been a hotly debated issue. We asked students to evaluate departmental practices in six areas. (See Table 2.) Five of the areas (faculty selection, faculty promotion and tenure, admissions, financial aid, and discipline) have in the past been solely within the purview of administrators. In almost every case, students preferred increased participation, because, in most instances, they now play virtually no role even though these matters dramatically affect their education.

With respect to decision-making in planning departments, the Conference approved the following resolution:

We cannot avoid the realization that society is changing in fundamental ways; that the socially disenfranchised are demanding self-determination in the future direction of their lives and that there is a revolutionary awareness among youth concerning how their society should function. This should signify to the planning profession and planning students that fundamental societal change—and the role of planners within society—can finally begin to be implemented.

Therefore planning students must begin to affect institutions in preparation for this change, and in particular the departments of city planning. To do this, however, we are

TABLE 2 *Student Responses on Participation in Departmental Affairs*

	No student involvement (%)	Students in advisory role (%)	Students actively involved in decision-making (%)
<i>Selection of faculty</i>			
Present situation	74	24	2
Preferred situation	7	73	20
<i>Promotion and tenure of faculty</i>			
Present situation	94	6	0
Preferred situation	14	55	31
<i>Educational policy</i>			
Present situation	24	66	10
Preferred situation	1	52	48
<i>Admissions</i>			
Present situation	85	10	5
Preferred situation	31	49	20
<i>Financial aid</i>			
Present situation	94	5	1
Preferred situation	37	44	19
<i>Discipline</i>			
Present situation	89	7	4
Preferred situation	19	40	41

Source: Pre-Conference Survey

TABLE 3 *Post-Conference Survey Responses from Graduate Planning Programs*

School ^a (date of department founding)	Required core curriculum	Policy-making mechanism	Minority group recruit- ment program to meet the 25 percent enrollment criterion ^b	Student involvement in answering this survey	Students enrolled (full- and part- time) ^c	Indicated orientation to social change	Planner type
University of Arizona (1965)	Yes	Administrative	No	No	20	No	Generalist with a specialty
Auburn University (1968)	Yes	Administrative	Yes	No	8	No	Generalist with a specialty
University of California (Berkeley) (1948)	Yes	Faculty	Yes	No	82	Yes	Special role
University of British Columbia (n.a.)	Yes	Administrative	No	No	48	No	Generalist
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute (1965)	No	Administrative	No	Yes	NA	No	Technical planner in specific field
Catholic University (1965)	Yes	Faculty; students advisory	Yes	No	16	No	Generalist with a specialty
University of Cincinnati (1963)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes (19%)	Yes	43	Yes	Change agent
Columbia University (1935)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	63	Yes	Special role
Cornell University (1936)	No	Faculty; students advisory	Yes	Yes	42	No	Generalist
Florida State University (1966)	Yes	Faculty; students advisory	Yes	Yes	50	No	Generalist with a specialty
Fresno State College (1968)	Yes	Administrative	Yes	No	28	No	Generalist with a specialty
George Washington University (1965)	Yes	Administrative	Yes	No	6	No	Generalist
Harvard University (1931)	Yes	Administrative	Yes	No	52	No	Generalist
Hunter College (1965)	No	Students and Faculty	Yes	No	61	Yes	Change agent
University of Illinois (1945)	Yes	Faculty; students advisory	Yes	Yes	36	No	Generalist
Iowa State University (1949)	Yes	Faculty; students advisory	Yes (30%)	Yes	8	No	Generalist with a specialty
Kansas State University (1959) (Reevaluating)	23
University of Massachusetts (1969)	NA	Faculty; students advisory	Yes	No	NA	No	Generalist
University of Michigan (1968)	NA	Administrative	Yes	No	19	No	Generalist with a specialty
University of Mississippi (1958)	Yes	Faculty	No	No	18	No	Generalist
MIT (1934)	No	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	44	Yes	Special role
New York University (1959)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	80	No	Generalist
University of North Carolina (1946)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	74	No	Generalist with a specialty
Northwestern University (1964)	No	Students and Faculty	No	Yes	10	No	Technical planner in specific field
Ohio State University (1957)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes (25%)	Yes	40	Yes	Generalist with a specialty
University of Oregon (1955) (Reevaluating)	48
University of Pennsylvania (1951)	No	Students and Faculty	Yes (25%)	Yes	106	Yes	Special role
Pennsylvania State University (1956)	NA	Faculty	Yes	No	25	No	Technical planner in specific field
University of Pittsburgh (1962)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes (23%)	Yes	34	Yes	Special role
Pratt Institute (1957)	Yes	Faculty; students advisory	Yes (25%)	No	94	No	Generalist
University of Rhode Island (1963)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	38	No	Special role
Rutgers University (1954)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes (25%)	Yes	45	Yes	Change agent
University of Texas (1951)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	25	Yes	Generalist with a specialty
Texas A&M (1965)	Yes	Students and Faculty	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Generalist
University of Toronto (1963)	Yes	Students and Faculty	No	No	40	No	Generalist
UCLA (1968)	Yes	Faculty; students advisory	Yes (25%)	Yes	NA	Yes	Special role
Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1957)	Yes	Administrative	Yes	No	15	No	Generalist with a specialty
University of Washington (1941) (Reevaluating)	76
Wayne State University (1957)	No	Faculty	Yes	Yes	97	No	Special role
University of Wisconsin (1941)	Yes	Students and Faculty	No	Yes	61	Yes	Special role
Yale University (1951)	No	Indefinite	Yes	Yes	35	Yes	Special role

^a Schools failing to respond: Illinois Institute of Technology, University of Virginia, Howard University, University of Iowa, University of Southern California, University of Tennessee, Syracuse University, and Georgia Institute of Technology.

^b Figures in parentheses indicate 1969-1970 minority group enrollment.

^c Based on 1968 ASPO survey of planning schools.

convinced that fundamental structural change must be instituted to allow the university to function as a true community of equal learners and teachers. Advisory or token participation is unacceptable. It is resolved that:

1. That there be full participation by all professors, students, and non-academic personnel of planning departments in all departmental policy decisions and also in the school and the university of which it is a part.
2. These changes be reflected in a formalized structural manner.¹⁴

Student Aspirations Our initial assumption was that planning students could be characterized as being generally unhappy with the quality and direction of planning education. Nonetheless, the career expectations of most students seem to be traditional, and the majority are willing to accept whatever curriculum they are offered. (This may be a decision based on expediency, two years being too short a time in which to reform the system.) One half of the students responding to the survey thought that they would be involved in traditional planning jobs (such as urban renewal, municipal finance, or open space planning).¹⁵ When we asked students to outline the basic components of an "ideal" city planning curriculum, it was not surprising that their proposals were noticeably similar (with slight incremental improvements) to existing curricula.

However, it is also clear that a fairly sizeable segment of the student population (close to 20 percent) is anxious to pursue new alternatives and is willing to fight for significant changes in current programs. It was this group which appeared in number at the National Conference and which, in light of subsequent activities, seems to be growing. The feelings of this vocal minority are characterized by the report of the Conference delegates from the University of Wisconsin:

. . . Planning students are indeed a part of the mainstream of student social consciousness—we are unhappy with societal ills, impatient with the slow pace of change in the universities, disgusted with the conceptual poverty in the profession, and unnerved by our own floundering and/or seeming inability to cope with the problems without help from the "outside." In short, planning students, like the rest, are restless.¹⁶

Despite their great sense of social urgency, students are still confused as to whom they will

ultimately work for. Will the student be an "agent of social change" (current jargon for social reformer)? Will the student be an information processor, that is, will he defer to the politician when it comes to making decisions? Will he forever generate alternatives in the "public interest," or will he advocate a particular alternative or the interests of a particular client group? Much of this confusion can be traced to the lack, among planning departments, of a clear understanding of the goals and objectives of planning education.

The Planning Departments View Themselves

The student response to the pre-Conference survey and the reactions to the National Conference suggest that to deal effectively with the concerns of students and faculty members, we must think in terms of a different type of planning education—different in content, locus, and modus operandi from the type of education currently offered.

The National Conference set in motion a process of self-examination and critical evaluation that may lead to innovation and constructive experimentation in the design of curriculum and in the development of new teaching techniques. The post-Conference survey of departmental goals and programs provides an examination of the present state of affairs.¹⁷ (See Table 3.) Our hope is that by establishing a data base the processes of updating information and of evaluating subsequent experiments will be greatly facilitated. Because it is difficult to do justice in tabular form to the questionnaire replies, a number of quotes from the responses are also included.

PURPOSES OF PLANNING EDUCATION

Each school was asked to indicate the specific goals of its planning program and to specify the rationale for these goals. Rarely do planning schools admit (and often it is not apparent) that planning education is a deliberate attempt at professional socialization. It has been said that in offering graduate training, "We do more than merely provide an opportunity for the student to pursue his spontaneous interests. We stand for something; we try to convey a certain set of values, to prepare the student for certain social roles, and to build a program that is deliberately designed to transform the student into a professional."¹⁸

Thus, while it may appear that a planning student is only picking up certain functional tools while at the university, he is, in fact, being taught an outlook, a set of concepts, a methodology; he is developing an evaluative framework that will cir-

cumscribe and direct his activities throughout his professional existence. Not many schools or departments admit nor are they conscious of the fact that this socialization process goes on. Rarely do academic institutions externalize and come to grips with their value orientations and the rhetoric of their educational programs.

A comparison of two statements, written fifteen years apart, shows that we have achieved little in the way of clarity of definition regarding what planning is all about. In 1954, Professor Frederick J. Adams wrote:

Urban planning as it is practiced in the United States today is carried on openly through the democratic processes of local governing bodies, advised by official planning agencies which usually have little authority in themselves. There can be no basic conflict between planning and democracy as long as citizens, through their elected representatives, determine the social and economic objectives toward which the plans for physical development are oriented.

The relationship of design for physical development to the social and economic aspects of urban planning may be clarified by making a distinction between the four major phases of the planning process: 1) goal formulation, 2) survey and analysis, 3) plan preparation, and 4) plan effectuation. Sound physical planning must be based on an accepted social purpose, and the determination of such a purpose therefore becomes an important first step in a planning program.

Primary emphasis has generally been placed by planning agencies on the phases of survey and analysis and plan preparation, leaving goal formulation to the various legislative bodies concerned. However, these three phases are complementary and interacting. The planner must take a responsible part in the identification of and agreement by the community upon social and economic goals as well as their translation into a three dimensional physical pattern.¹⁹

In 1969, the Student-Faculty Council of the Division of Urban Planning at Columbia University adopted the following definition of planning:

Planning is a process of identifying, reconciling, and refining the goals of each of the client publics in the realm of environment; discovering the strategic elements in the present situation through which it can be influenced; devising courses of action to realize

these goals and continually reviewing the situation.

The response of the planner to the needs of the future involves basic consideration concerning the proper role of the planner and the nature of the systems with which he is concerned and his approach to them. Since the planner's field is man and his environment, and his function is that of an interventionist into this eco-system and its subsystem, proper planning education must reflect this.

Proper planning practice is an exercise in attempting to optimize social decision-making. The planner as an agent of change must understand the operation of the total system with which he is working.

This concept of planning implies the need for planners with an understanding of the operation of total systems, with the highest degree of technical competence, and with a dedication to constructive social intervention, and with a knowledge of the ways in which this dedication can be put to work. Appreciable understanding of other disciplines is a necessary condition for the satisfactory performance of a given specialty. Specialized knowledge then, should be oriented on a systems theme. This is the challenge of a proper educational policy for planning students.²⁰

Several other examples of broad goal statements follow. Hunter College indicated that its goal is:

... to provide professional competence in a wide variety of planning activities and the capacity to perform in a pluralistic planning environment. This training is raised on the foundation of a philosophy which stresses the planner's concern and responsibility for the elimination of inequities in our society.

The Department of City and Regional Planning at Harvard indicated that:

... city and regional planning are concerned with the improvement of the environment in which men live. Each of these professions is concerned with 'design' as represented by the synthesis of the relationships between the factors and forces shaping our environment.

The responses to the post-Conference survey seem to suggest that most planning schools are either (1) trying to train planners who can be effective in terms of the present needs of municipal, regional, state and private employers desperate for "trained professionals"; or (2) attempting to equip students to define new planning and policy-making roles for themselves and to act as "inter-

ventionists" or "social change agents" in the future. Schools whose responses emphasized the former goal might be described as tending toward "societal constancy." Schools whose responses emphasized the latter goal might be considered as tending toward "societal change."²¹

The University of Cincinnati, Ohio State University, and Rutgers are examples of schools that made statements about social change. The goals of Cincinnati's program are:

... to create an environment for learning the processes of planning for change in community and human resources. The specific types of learning are threefold: 1) process learning, wherein concepts, techniques, and strategies of planned community change are learned; 2) *interdisciplinary* learning, wherein the viewpoints of the individual helping professions and the social and design sciences are merged for a general understanding of their roles in community problem-solving; and 3) *intradisciplinary* learning, wherein one of the professions or disciplines is selected in order to obtain special, in-depth knowledge. The rationale for these goals recognizes that planners being trained for tomorrow must be both specialists and generalists who are able to effect community change in a technician-helper relationship with client groups.

The rationale for this type of orientation recognizes purposeful and intentional community change as the unique and central viewpoint of the community or urban planner. Ohio State University indicated:

One objective of our planning program is to assure that the Master of City Planning degree recipient, upon completion of the program, has a basic competence in those skills and abilities commonly and currently associated with the term City Planner as defined by the unspecialized demands of current practice in urban planning agencies throughout the United States. The planner has an accepted role in our society at present that each planner must be capable of fulfilling if he is called upon to do so—whether our faculty agrees with this role or not. In many cases we do not.

Another objective of our program is to provide the student with the opportunity to redefine city planning as he believes appropriate to future roles of the field (both short and long range) and/or to specialize in an area that he believes to be most relevant to our societal needs and his personal self-fulfill-

ment. Planning has always been a dynamic field, restructuring itself each decade in order to respond to societal change. We believe that each student must have the opportunity to redefine for himself the needs of the profession of the future, to equip himself with understandings and capability to match his enthusiasm for change, and to act as an effective agent of change.

Rutgers University's Department of City Planning said:

The goal of our program is to provide, on a non-elitist basis, the opportunity for a theoretically and technically sound graduate-level education for "urban planners," very broadly viewed as agents of positive urban change. [In addition we would hope] to develop a faculty able both to offer such an education and also to arrive at new understandings of urban phenomena and problems of all kinds.

Cornell University, the University of Mississippi, and the University of Toronto exemplify schools that tend to operate along the lines of societal constancy. Each justified its program on the basis of the current need for professional planners. Cornell University said:

The masters program is to prepare students for professional practice of planning in public service or with private organizations.

The University of Mississippi said its goal was:

... to give the student a well rounded education in *all* of the fundamentals of the planning process. All our faculty have extensive practical experience and are aware of what will be expected of the student as a new employee in any agency.

The University of Toronto described its program as:

... designed to equip the student for professional life and to provide a foundation for those who wish to continue with education. ... These are the normal academic goals of any university department.

In response to the question, "What type (or types) of planner is your program designed to produce and what is the rationale for this orientation?", those schools attempting to define new roles for the planner and to train interventionists typify the societal change orientation. The University of Pennsylvania wrote:

The goals [of our department] are to produce persons who are capable and desirous of bringing about or assisting in bringing about

desirable social and institutional changes. Each student, moreover, should be provided the opportunity to engage the implicit social, institutional, and other problems on his own terms, and he must be aware of the terms of reference that he and others bring to these problems.

Schools stressing societal constancy, as we define it for purposes of this article, tend to produce planners to fill established planning jobs. The faculty response from the University of Illinois stated:

The present program is designed to produce planners with competent professional training in the planning of municipalities, metropolitan areas, states and regions.

George Washington University indicated:

... the rationale for the goals of the planning program is provided by the obvious urgent needs of government and industry for professionals whose range of skills and understanding of social environmental, economic and physical development problems and resources is organized and oriented toward directing the forces of growth and change toward constructive purposes.

The "generalist with a specialty" approach proposed by Harvey Perloff in an influential book published in 1957²² persists in numerous statements similar to that of the University of Arizona:

The goal of this program is to produce generalists in the field of urban planning with a specialty in some area of planning. The rationale for this is based on the fact that in local planning departments these students are able to fit into a working situation almost immediately.

Auburn University wrote:

... our program is designed to produce a generalist with a specialty—transportation planning, urban renewal, social planning, etc.; one who knows how he aids the decision maker by developing and suggesting plans, programs and policies. Orientation is based on the belief that a planner should have a generalist's knowledge of the various elements that comprise an urban or regional system. . . .

Virginia Polytechnic Institute indicated that its program is aimed primarily at the "generalist-with-a-concentration," with opportunities for "further specialization in certain areas, such as housing, transportation, regional resources, urban design..." The majority of schools offering a program for the generalist planner usually indicated a hope that he will also acquire

some area of specialization, as noted by the University of Texas:

... our program is not likely to produce a "type of planner," but rather we are interested in producing a general specialist or a generalist with some area of specialty. The rationale for these types of planners is that a planner should be capable of translating community goals into effective actions and results.

However, many schools are willing to tailor programs to student interest and ability at the cost of not necessarily providing the student with certain marketable skills. One student at Yale, describing the planning program at that school, wrote:

We are interested in producing a planner who has confidence in his ability to think for himself and to really explore alternative life styles and who is able to present these as alternative choices through various methods from technical skill to art and theatre. This requires an ability to reflect on possible futures and how social change might relate to alternative futures.

In summary, planning department survey responses seemed to indicate training for five different types of planners, of which only the last two can be directly associated with a societal change orientation:

1. The *generalist or comprehensive planner* is equipped with "traditional planning knowledge," and is generally acquainted with analytic presentation and design techniques, special techniques for projecting land use and population distribution, and the basic tools of the municipal planning official's trade.

2. The *generalist planner with a specialty* has, in addition to a general comprehensive background, some specific competency in a functional area such as housing, zoning, health planning, community service and facility planning, capital budgeting, or health services. He will probably specialize in the particular area during his career.

3. The *technical planner trained in a specific field* usually does not have a general/comprehensive background, but seeks to develop technical skills such as transportation planning, health planning, computer application, and quantitative analysis. The planner trained in a specific technical field does not necessarily have as broad a background as the generalist planner with a specialty, but does have a great deal more skill and depth in a specific field.

4. The *planner trained for a special role*

does not usually have a general/comprehensive planning background; more often than not, he has been trained in a planning-related discipline and spends little of his time acquiring the skills of a planner with a specialty or a technical planner. The advocate planner, the program administrator, the urban sociologist, the urban lawyer are all planners trained for a specific role. They seek to acquire expertise in related disciplines such as management, sociology, law, and architecture, and often are not based in planning departments during their graduate education.

5. The *change agent* (who might also be classified as another type of planner trained for a special role) is primarily educated in the processes of deliberate social change. Educational programs designed to train change agents concentrate heavily on actual field experience and community organization, as well as on the psychology of the environment and the dynamics of the learning process.

The post-Conference survey indicated that twenty-two schools are training generalists or generalists with a specialty. Eleven schools stated that they are preparing generalist planners; eleven schools are preparing generalists with a specialty. Technical planners trained in a special field were mentioned in the responses of three departments. Planners trained for a special role were mentioned by ten schools, and change agents by three schools. Of the forty-one respondents, three were reevaluating their programs.

While we are primarily interested in encouraging the development of schools to train social change agents, we also recognize the importance of developing high quality schools that stress training for the competent generalist and technical planner. These different types of goals are similar to Forrester's distinction between "excellence . . . work on the forefront of accepted fields but not sufficiently far in advance nor sufficiently different to invalidate judgment by peer groups following the accepted and conventional avenues," and "innovation . . . a break with the present, representing a marked change in direction or the opening of a new aspect of the field." He also notes that ". . . excellence by itself is not a negative factor. Continuous and recurring innovation will lead to excellence . . ." ²³

We suggest that schools of planning need to decide whether or not they will stress societal change or societal constancy and to consider how best to measure their success at achieving these ends. Whatever their orientation, at present few

departments have any idea of the appropriate criteria by which to judge their efforts. For a professional discipline such as planning, the problem of evaluation is particularly acute. Standards should be devised to measure educational performance as well as the profession's ability to apply its skills to achieve positive change. In this broader sense, planning departments are woefully failing to consider what it is they wish to achieve and how best to measure that achievement. In an even more limited sense, departments use only the most offhand sorts of measures of program effectiveness, despite Meyerson's dictum that planning "must depend heavily on the feedback-review function in order to guide future action." ²⁴

CHANGE MECHANISMS/STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Each department was asked to indicate the means for implementing change in the content and direction of its program. In the schools that see the planner as an agent of change in society, "change mechanisms" are most often an important concern within the context of the university or department. Most of the societal change oriented schools included students in the decision-making apparatus of their departments. Many schools, in fact, stress that the success of their programs depends largely on student input. Hunter College indicated that its goal is the achievement of "collegiality" between faculty and students. This attitude is an indication of the emphasis placed on student involvement (in many cases on an equal level with faculty) in schools tending toward societal change. At the University of Cincinnati, for example, students constitute a majority of the admissions committee. The University of Pennsylvania recently offered students equal representation on committees that will make recommendations regarding the hiring and firing of faculty as well as the selection of a new departmental chairman, and that will review all course offerings.

Schools tending toward societal constancy, on the other hand, are much less likely to allow student participation in departmental decision-making. (In many cases they did not include students in the preparation of the survey response.) This, too, is understandable. Given such a framework, change is understood mainly as "minor tinkering" with a basically adequate academic and administrative model. Moreover, many students are willing to operate in this framework; most apparently accepting society as it is and anticipating the time when they will assume traditional planning roles.

New Directions and Priorities

In our view, a fundamental shift away from the dominant approach to planning education is required. Efforts to find more efficient ways to teach what we already know should be minimized. New educational paradigms and new teaching, learning, and research techniques are needed. The emphasis in planning education should be on experimentation and innovation. Although we are primarily concerned with improvements in the "quality" of instruction and curriculum content, we cannot completely ignore the structural element in the design of planning education. That is, the environment in which planning education occurs, the interdisciplinary and interpersonal arrangements in which the content of education is embedded also deserve our attention. A rigid and ill-conceived structure can inhibit innovation, while a carefully designed and controlled environment can encourage experimentation and enforce positive steps in more fruitful directions. Planning departments are trying to teach a very broad and constantly changing expanding field of learning and doing, but what a planner "has to know" to meet professional standards is not clear. Since this is the case, departments wishing to innovate would seem to have great latitude.

We begin with the assumption that, since they are relatively small, planning departments cannot (and should not) hope to offer the full range of courses that planners and urban affairs specialists might desire: departments of economics, political science, civil engineering, management, architecture, as well as other graduate faculties and departments, employ people who are fully competent to offer this instruction.²⁵ There is every reason to believe that they can do a better job with an introduction to the fundamentals in these areas than can planning departments. It may be necessary to create different administrative and (intra-university or interuniversity) budgetary arrangements to permit this greater reliance on other faculties, but that should not be a barrier to making needed changes.

There will doubtless be some courses given by other departments and schools that will be particularly central to certain planning specialties (urban economics, transportation, regional resource management, economics of public finance, public investment, econometrics, statistics, urban politics, bureaucracy and public administration, technological transfer and development, problems of population, computer application, problems of air and water pollution, and so on). Students

taking these courses could arrange to meet with one planning department faculty member (possibly of their own choosing) on a regular basis, to discuss course materials and relate them more specifically to city planning problems and concerns. This should be treated as a formal adjunct to the basic course, with the possibility of additional work assignments, readings, papers, and research topics developed as part of these seminars.

A few major courses should be offered by the planning department to its own students and to the rest of the university. What these should be needs a good deal of discussion, but for openers we would list: an introduction to urban planning; planning law and administration; urban information management; and a few substantive courses not offered elsewhere in the university (such as housing and community facilities). This list must be thought through very carefully; every one of these major departmental offerings should be uniquely within departmental competence and should be prepared and taught at a level equal to the highest level of instruction. A special projects and research program could be based on the classical notion of apprenticeships. Students would work *with* faculty members (no more than a few students per faculty member) on research currently being carried out by their professors. During the course of the two-year masters program,²⁶ the student would work with several members of the faculty for varying lengths of time. Projects would not have to conform to regular academic schedules, but might begin and terminate on a logical, demand basis. Planning techniques would be learned in practice and not in a vacuum. A collegial environment could be developed, and students might be given the option of taking extensive urban field work or of traveling to another university for a semester if no one on the faculty was pursuing a project of interest to them.

Finally, planning departments should be prepared to offer, at any given time, a greater number and variety of small seminars and reading courses individually tailored to specific interests of students and experiences or interests of faculty. These courses should not necessarily be regarded as permanent. Every effort should be made to accommodate live ideas for learning with rapidity and a minimum of bureaucratic effort. Ideally, the content of the curriculum should be constantly in flux, with courses (a far too restrictive word) being created and abandoned on a fairly regular basis.

A program of the type just described would not, in all probability, increase the teaching load of the department faculty at all; it would certainly create

an atmosphere where people were teaching what they were most competent to teach and most interested in teaching, with the materials constantly changing as the faculty, student body, and field change and with new materials, ideas, and courses of instruction being frequently introduced. Each student would be free to devise his own individual program leading to a Master's degree (and to revise this program as he chooses), subject to the approval of his faculty advisor. There would be no prescribed courses and no set program, not even a prescribed number of courses, since the approach suggested might have courses of very different time spans, ranging from an excursion into the details of filing model cities, urban renewal, or general grant applications (which might last one to two weeks), to a general planning (or field research) problem that could conceivably involve over half the student's time for three or four semesters.

The Master's thesis should be replaced by the preparation of a publishable article (instead of a library document) that would make a contribution to the field, the profession, and the solution of urgent social problems.

The structure of planning education—its basic aims, objectives, and educational procedures—will best evolve out of a redefinition of what it is that students and faculty are trying to accomplish. If our image of planning education, which emphasizes departmental specialization, student initiated coursework, a heavy reliance on research and field experience as learning devices and which de-emphasizes classroom exercises and the training of comprehensive/generalists, has any merit, then the appropriate structure for its operation will emerge. But small-scale experimentation must proceed at many schools. At this point in the history of planning education we would seem to be better off trying to maximize innovation.

Postscript

The Conference spawned a series of decentralized efforts to induce significant change into the style and content of planning education. It seems appropriate to mention several of these concrete steps in this article. Two of the students' basic concerns were pinpointed by AIP's Director of Manpower and Student Programs in an issue of the *AIP Newsletter* published shortly after the Conference:

The Conference made clear, as should have been expected, that there is no universal student consensus on all issues. There were two issues, however, on which there was

agreement. The first was that there must be a more intensive action to recruit and admit minority group students in substantially greater numbers into planning programs. The second was that the planning education community is made up of both faculty and students, and that the two should play equal roles in determining, and effectuating the planning programs.²⁷

Recognizing that planning has more often than not caused hardships for minority groups and that few changes can be expected unless the planning field is more broadly representative of the consumers of planning services, the Conference passed the following resolution:

Each school should concentrate on the recruitment of minority students with a minimum objective of 25% of incoming students within the next academic year and further increases in minority enrollment in subsequent years. 50% of the incoming students should be women. The emphasis should be on the student's potential to become effective in dealing with community problems, i.e. his capacity for leadership and commitment. Funds should be sought to support the recruitment programs, for scholarships, and establishment of new planning programs for minority students.²⁸

Seven schools stated they had no program to meet the 25 percent minimum. Twenty-three schools which have not as yet met the 25 percent minimum for minority group enrollment in the entering class said they had established programs to meet the objective as set by the Conference. Nine schools (seven of which are societal change oriented) have already met that minimum—Pittsburgh, Iowa State, Kansas State, Ohio, Rutgers, UCLA, Yale, and the University of Pennsylvania—though few were willing to commit themselves to this figure for any specific length of time and few had funds to provide the support required.²⁹ Several years will have to pass before the extent and depth of each department's commitment can be evaluated.

The Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh held a series of caucuses during the second week in January at which time an Urban Affairs Constitution Drafting Committee was elected. In the several months following, extensive discussion and debate resulted in the formation of an Urban Affairs Cabinet and the establishment of an elected policy-making body composed of four students, four faculty members, and the departmental chairman. Such

constitutional conventions and the establishment of similar student-faculty policy-making bodies can either achieve student support such as at the University of Pennsylvania; or, in situations where attempts to achieve student involvement are obviously a sham (students are not given decision-making power in policy considerations), the students may refuse to participate.³⁰

A number of centralized efforts to achieve changes in planning education were also induced by the National Conference. A walk-out by sixty black students attending the National Conference on Urban Planning Education led to the formation of an organization for minority group individuals in planning. One of the first actions taken by the organization, which calls itself the National Black Planning Network, was to demand that the American Institute of Planners and the American Society of Planning Officials raise ten million dollars for programs outlined by the National Black Planning Network. (A similar demand was made on the American Institute of Architects by a group of black architecture students at its annual convention in Chicago in June 1969. Then, a coalition of black and white architecture students reached agreement with the 23,000 member organization that fifteen million dollars would be raised to be applied by the AIA to the solution of urban problems.) The ten million dollar demand, which was drawn up with assistance from black staff members of the American Institute of Planners and the American Society of Planning Officials, included the following items: four million dollars to develop planning programs at predominantly black and other minority universities; four million dollars for scholarships to planning schools for minority students; and two million dollars to develop black planning network and neighborhood planning centers. In addition to the ten million dollar demand, AIP and ASPO were asked to deny recognition to planning schools that are found to practice overt or de facto discrimination against minorities in admissions or hiring policies. While the walkout by the black students created a major source of discussion and argument among white students and faculty attending the Conference, a general meeting did produce a resolution supporting the black students' demands.³¹

A National Student Steering Committee was established to carry on the work of the Conference and to act in the best interests of planning students nationally. That committee includes representatives of the National Black Planning Network, a

student member of the American Institute of Planners, a student member from the American Society of Planning Officials, and a representative of Planning Network.³²

It is more than likely that effective pressure for educational innovation will come primarily from students and faculty working on a decentralized, departmental basis. The National Student Steering Committee can work in many ways to insure student feedback and can inspire in the professional planning organizations a greater responsiveness to current student needs, but innovation and experimentation can best be brought about on a school-to-school rather than a nationwide basis.

Author's Note: *Funds for the National Conference on Urban Planning Education were made available through the American Institute of Planners, the American Society of Planning Officials, the Harvard Department of City and Regional Planning, and the MIT School of Architecture and Planning. Funds for the pre-Conference survey were provided by the Harvard Department of City and Regional Planning and the Experiment in Student Administered Research (ESAR) sponsored by the Urban Systems Laboratory at MIT. Part of the research for this article was carried out under a HUD Urban Studies Fellowship.*

NOTES

¹ Frederick J. Adams, *Urban Planning Education in the United States* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Alfred Bettman Foundation, 1954), includes a description of planning courses offered as of 1954, comments by graduates of planning schools, and comments by employers of planning school graduates.

² American Society of Planning Officials, "1968 Survey of Planning Schools" (Chicago: ASPO, 1968).

³ Jack Meltzer, "Manpower Needs for Planning for the Next Fifty Years," in William Ewald (ed.), *Environment and Policy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968), p. 245. This projection is based on the extension of current ratios of planning students to future total enrollments at four year colleges and graduate schools.

⁴ "It took the national crisis of the Great Depression to shift the dominant concern in planning from the physical to the social and economic focus. Swings of the pendulum continued thereafter, moving once again to the physical focus in post-war urban renewal programs and back again to the social focus with the rediscovery of poverty and racism in the 1960's. It should of course be made clear at the outset that these swings of the pendulum note dominant themes, but not to the exclusion of often provocative variations." Robert Heifetz, "An Annotated Bibliography on the Changing Scope of Urban Planning in the United States," *Exchange Bibliography* 86 (Monticello, Ill.: Council of Planning Librarians, 1969).

⁵ The 1968 Annual Conference of the American Institute of Planners in Pittsburgh was the first occasion in recent years at which students were organized sufficiently to present a series of demands. Also, in the fall of 1968 a conference in New York City run by the National Association of Student Planners and Architects brought together a group of students (many of them black) in an attempt to organize student sentiment for change in the profession. These two events marked the beginning of the current student movement in planning education.

⁶ In May 1969, questionnaires were sent to every U.S. school offering a planning degree, plus several schools in Canada (in numbers equal to the number of full-time enrolled students). Eighteen hundred questionnaires were mailed. Eight schools in the United States and five in Canada either received the questionnaires after exams had begun or did not receive them at all, which meant that, in effect, we were drawing on a pool of 1,340 students who received questionnaires. Three hundred and forty-one questionnaires were returned (a 26 percent sample: 268 males, 73 females). Of the 341 responses, 35 percent were from the East; 22 percent were from the South; 27 percent were from the Mid-west; and 16 percent were from the West. Fifty-eight percent were from first year students; 30 percent were from second year students; 6 percent were from third

year students; 5 percent were from fourth year; 1 percent from fifth year. Twenty-three percent were enrolled in MCP programs; 26 percent in MUP; 10 percent in MRP; 12 percent in MS; 4 percent in BCP; 5 percent in PhD; 9 percent in dual degree; and 11 percent in other programs.

The data collected covered five areas:

1. basic demographic information on race, age, education, work experience, family and financial background;
2. an appraisal of academic emphases, curricula, students' roles in departmental policy-making, and teaching quality in each department;
3. students' attitudes on planning theories and social issues;
4. students' beliefs, preferences, and expectations with respect to the planning profession; and
5. students' views on professional planning organizations.

The findings are presented in detail in a paper by Tom Nutt, Nic Retsinas, and Lawrence Susskind, "The Current State of Urban Planning Education: Survey and Analysis," prepared for the National Conference on Urban Planning Education, November 1969, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

7 The National Conference on Urban Planning Education was held November 20–November 23, 1969. The conference was financed by MIT and Harvard University (Departments of City Planning); AIP and ASPO provided funds to subsidize student transportation. The four days were spent in small group discussions, plenary sessions, and general debate among the students, faculty members, resource people, and Boston community people in attendance.

8 An open-ended questionnaire was mailed to each planning school in the United States requesting specific information about each school's planning program. In accordance with the Conference resolution mandating the study, schools were asked to establish a joint student-faculty task force to complete the questionnaire. It was the intent of the Conference that each school should undertake a thorough reevaluation of its objectives and its programs in light of the resolutions passed at the Conference. In those schools where such efforts had already begun, the questionnaire was intended to focus and extend debate.

9 Since the history of planning is closely linked with design and engineering, the current generation of planning students would appear to represent a major break with this tradition. Nearly two-thirds of the students have a liberal arts background, the remainder represent a variety of scientific, architectural, and engineering backgrounds. Undergraduate degrees in architecture are held by only 12 percent of the planning students. The ASPO 1968-69 survey showed that in the past seven years the percentage of students with architectural and engineering backgrounds has decreased while the percentage of students with sociology, political science, and liberal arts degrees has increased.

10 The Rhode Island Department of Community Planning and Area Development offers an interdisciplinary seminar in "Contemporary U.S. Environment" that occupies roughly half of each first-year student's time. The course is a comprehensive survey of "structural change in American society and its environmental settings, as well as the universal perspectives in terms of which technical planning skills must be developed and employed." The University of Cincinnati offers an "interdisciplinary planning seminar on the problems of change in Urban America" which includes "intensive reading and dialectical discussion of selected urban problems and planned change concepts and is taught by faculty members from twelve different departments in the University."

11 Conference resolution #1, part 3.

12 Conference resolution #1, part 4

13 Conference resolution #1, part 2

14 Conference resolution #3.

15 Forty-one percent of the students responding to the pre-Conference survey indicated that they expected to be involved in new town planning. Thirty-six percent said they expected to use computers during their professional careers. While only 21 percent said they expected to teach full-time, almost half plan to teach part-time. Though most prospective planners will not run for public office (one-quarter said they would), 45 percent are willing to be assistants to elected officials. In an era of increased state and local reliance on federal funds, it is interesting that only 15 percent of all students thought they would be involved in "grantsmanship."

16 Peter Sartorius and Howard Landsman, "Conference Mandate: On Wisconsin!" A memorandum to the Department of City and Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin (Madison), undated.

17 Of the fifty-six schools (graduate and undergraduate) receiving survey forms, forty-five replied: forty-one graduate programs and four undergraduate programs. Three universities were inadvertently excluded from the survey: Michigan State University, University of Oklahoma, and University of Puerto Rico. They had failed to send representatives to the National Conference and therefore were neglected in the post-Conference survey. The replies ranged

from extremely thorough to extremely perfunctory. In some cases, departments undertook intensive analyses of their programs with full student and faculty involvement. In several schools the questionnaire sparked the establishment of student-faculty involvement in departmental decision-making. Unfortunately, due to the short time allowed for completion of the questionnaire, many responses were drafted entirely by the department chairman or by a single faculty member and were submitted without even minimal consultation with students. Notwithstanding the somewhat arbitrary responses received in several cases, it is our feeling that the responses generally caught the thrust and direction of virtually all departments in a fairly reasonable way. In several cases, separate student and faculty responses were received, and in these instances, we have attempted to synthesize the information. Undergraduate programs were not evaluated because of the small number of responses and because our focus is on graduate planning programs.

18 Herbert C. Kelman, *A Time to Speak* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), p. 178. Kelman, who is a social psychologist, discusses graduate education for social psychologists and deals particularly with the values he feels should be conveyed in graduate training.

19 Adams, *Urban Planning Education*, p. 1.

20 Presented in "The Urban Planning Student-Faculty Council: the Beginning Phase, Summer and Fall, 1968" (Division of Urban Planning, School of Architecture, Columbia University, July 1969), p. 9.

21 In the cases where little or no mention was made of the "ends" a school was espousing, it was impossible to classify a responding department as being oriented either toward societal change or toward societal constancy. Such schools, judging solely from their responses to the post-Conference survey, seem primarily concerned with achieving "technical adequacy." They are "means-oriented"; for these schools technical adequacy is a basic goal, whereas in most schools, although technical adequacy is an intermediate objective, it is more often than not subservient to a more general purpose.

22 Harvey S. Perloff, *Education for Planning: City, State, and Regional* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1957).

23 Memo from Professor Jay Forrester, School of Management at Massachusetts Institute of Technology to the MIT Graduate School Study Committee, June 15, 1967. This special commission was established by the president of the Institute to chart a course for the future of graduate education at MIT.

24 Martin Meyerson, "Building the Middle Range Bridge for Comprehensive Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXII (Spring 1956), 58-64. At best, departments presently use job placement or employers' reactions to measure their effectiveness. Only Florida State University indicated use of a formal study of the relevance of its planning education to its graduates' professional activities.

25 This proposed model was presented to the MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning by Lawrence Susskind in a memo on October 22, 1969. Many of the ideas and much of the language came from a proposal presented to the Harvard Department of City and Regional Planning by Professor Chester Hartman in May 1968.

26 We do not believe that a reasonable case can be made for a master's program of more than two years' duration.

27 Gordon Jacoby, "The National Conference on Urban Planning Education," *AIP Newsletter*, IV (December 1969).

28 Conference resolution #1, parts 6, 7, and 8.

29 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) sponsors a "Minorities in Planning Program," which is essentially a work-study operation jointly run by a professional planning agency and a university. This program seems to be a key factor for many schools in financing minority group admissions. Fresno State College expects its first minority group students under this program next fall, and in the Washington, D.C. area, George Washington University, Catholic University, and Howard University are jointly operating such a program.

30 At Harvard in the Department of City and Regional Planning, the students rejected a proposed constitution (drawn up by a student-faculty task force) because they felt that the "devolution of power" from the administration to the students had not been sufficient (spring 1969).

31 Conference resolution #2: "We support the Black Planning Network demands and ask that both AIP and ASPO give top priority to fulfilling these demands within the coming fiscal year by using their financial resources and their influence in Washington and with the major scholarship funds."

32 Planning Network is a national student planners group established in 1969 through the efforts of Norman Spaulding, a student at the University of Iowa. Network has since published a newsletter (*THANG*) and identified student contacts at more than half the schools of planning in the United States. There are no membership fees or enrollment procedures. Network is an information exchange system and as such it will become part of the National Steering Committee.