JAMES A. GRAASKAMP COLLECTION OF TEACHING MATERIALS
VIII. PARTICIPATION IN INDUSTRY ORGANIZATIONS
C. Urban Land Institute (ULI)
3. ULI Education Committee
b Mission of the ULI Education Committee 19977-1979: Includes some references to U.W. and James A. Graaskamp

Index

EXHIBIT A

# EVOLUTION OF ULI's EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| Introductory Remarks at April 5, 1979, Meeting: | Carla S. Crane<br>ULI Program Division Director |

This introductory statement is offered as background, outlining the historical sequence leading to the evolution of ULI's recently initiated educational outreach objectives.

As a result of the increasingly restrictive climate within which the development community has been required to operate during this decade, ULI perceived the need to attempt to ameliorate these conditions through education. As originally perceived, the objective of the program was the provision of a more comfortable environment within which both public and private sectors could effectively function.

1. Accordingly, in November, 1976, President Thomas F. Murray appointed an 11-member ULI Education Committee, stating that its primary charge was "to explore ULI's relationship to and impact on public and private education as it relates to land planning and community development in the elementary, secondary, college, and graduate levels in the United States and Canada. In part, the creation of the Committee grows out of a concern on the part of many Members that planning, law, architectural, and schools of public administration often have an inclination to describe the developer as the enemy in the process of community building."

   President Murray further stated that the initial activities selected by the Committee as most appropriate to satisfy this charge should meet the following criteria: They must be successful, visible, creditable, and capable of accomplishment within the constraints of the ULI budget (i.e. without additional ULI staff); and outlined the following as, in his opinion, appropriate activities:

   - Lectures on college campuses by ULI Members
   - Seminars for university faculty
   - Campus courses conducted by ULI Members
   - Elementary and secondary programs
   - Co-sponsorship of university seminars.

Underscoring this concern regarding the need for educational outreach programs,

2. In September, 1977, the ULI Long-Range Planning Committee recommended that ULI undertake an expanded educational effort at various academic and professional levels.

   Following a year of study, the ULI Education Committee determined that its first effort would be made at the preprofessional level through the funding of certain programs at the Harvard Graduate School of Design.

3. Accordingly, in October, 1977, the first $19,000 pilot program, funded by ULRF, was initiated at Harvard Graduate School of Design, consisting of the following elements:

| | |
|---|---|
| • Student Teaching Assistantship Program | $ 5,000 |
| • Visiting Lecture on the History of Development | $ 5,000 |
| • Computer Development Programs | $ 3,000 |
| • Business Economics for Non-Business Majors | $ 6,000 |
| Total Cost | $19,000 |

4. Subsequently, In October, 1978, an additional $15,000 ULRF-funded grant was made to HGSD, consisting of the following elements:

| | |
|---|---|
| • Student Teaching Assistant Program | $ 5,000 |
| • Suburban Development Studio | $ 5,000 |
| • Business Economics for Non-Business Majors | $ 5,000 |
| Total Cost | $15,000 |

5. As a result of the experience gained over the two years of pilot program operation, the original program thrust was expanded to encompass broader program goals aimed at providing an integrated approach to preprofessional and professional training on a national scale for persons concerned with land development policy and regulation issues.

   The preprofessional thrust was visualized as focusing on the introduction of course materials accurately and fairly reflective of the development community's contribution to, investment and interest in, this nation's built environment. The purpose was to attempt to favorably influence student attitudinal formation regarding the role and responsibility of the developer prior to the establishment of specific, and possibly negative, mindsets on these issues.

   The professional thrust was visualized as focusing on the provision of forums contributing to the continuing education of public and private practicing professionals wherein on-going dialogues among persons concerned with land development policy and regulation could be developed and sustained.

6. In the process of conducting these fledgling pilot programs, ULI learned that professors are extremely busy people and that some of the best opportunities for introduction of new course materials could exist through financial support or assistance of professors and/or Teaching Assistants to encourage either the researching of new materials or the development of new courses around esisting materials.

7. Prior to embarking on a second pilot program, ULI therefore determined the necessity for a study which would identify at certain schools which are teaching real estate-related courses (1) those schools that were contemplating course revision, (2) what assistance the schools themselves perceived as needed, and (3) where ULI might best integrate its efforts with existing opportunities.

8. As a result, in the fall of 1978 Professor Maury Seldin was appointed a ULI Professor-in-Residence during his sabbatical from American University and commissioned to conduct an Educational Curricula Study in an attempt to determine the ways in which real estate-related course materials are being presented, what they contain, in what schools they are being taught, and as a result of an analysis of the foregoing, where gaps exist which ULI might be instrumental in filling. Through this study ULI hoped to learn whether the schools do, in fact, have need of a tangible printed "product" prepared under the auspices of and disseminated by, in this instance, ULI, or whether this need is more in the form of financial assistance for professors and/or Teaching Assistants who are in the process of course revisions. This study was commenced effective January 1, 1979, with the final report to be presented to the ULI Executive and Education Committees next month in Dallas.

9. In December, 1978, a 3-year draft research and education proposal was developed by ULI staff and submitted to the ULI Education Committee and the Urban Land Research Foundation at their meetings at the Harvard Faculty Club in Cambridge, Massachusetts. At those meetings both bodies indicated their approval in principle of the general objectives of the draft prospectus but concurred that detailed consideration and refinement of all elements by both the ULI Research and Education Committees was desirable prior to formal funding approval.

10. In February, 1979, the ULI Education Committee convened at the Stanford Faculty Club at Stanford University in Palo Alto. At that meeting Chairman Robert E. Engstrom recommended the initiation of a Development Component Series aimed at producing in a concise format a tangible educational product dealing with various aspects of the development process.

11. The preliminary findings of the Educational Curricula Study will be presented today by Professor Seldin. Hopefully, these initial findings will provide some insights regarding where ULI's future educational thrust at the preprofessional level might best be directed. This will (1) enable ULI to make better informed determinations regarding which types of preprofessional programs will produce the most efficacious results and (2) enable ULRF to make more judicious decisions regarding the most mutually beneficial allocation of its limited funding resources.

    With regard to the professional thrust, it should be borne in mind that to a certain extent ULI's research efforts do contribute to the "education" of practicing public sector regulators. This education occurs in the form of on-going dialogues developed as a result of the contract research work

performed under grants from agencies such as HUD, DOT, DOE, EPA, etc. What is needed, however, are more specific educational "training" experiences for practicing professionals--regulatory and otherwise.

To accomplish this, a variety of seminars could be staged focusing on such issues as:

- An interesting integration of Federal, State, local, and private sector expertise--designed to coordinate the activities of all participants in the community development process with regard to the construction of energy-efficient communities and urban renewal projects.

  Funded by DOE, this program is designed to assist with planning for energy-conserving and orderly growth patterns through examination and analysis of growth process dynamics.

  First pioneered in an energy-impacted area in Mercer County, North Dakota, this program will be expanded to five urban locations this fall. DOE is seeking private sector input on the mechanics of this program and assistance with dissemination of its details and the successes and failures experienced--for the edification of both public and private sector audiences.

- As a result of the managed growth session to be held at the ULI 1979 Spring Meeting, a series of seminars could be developed to provide a forum for discussion of the relative merits and pitfalls of various approaches to growth management as well as recommended alternatives.

- Seminars using a ULI publication as a syllabus could be prepared in advance of publication date and stand ready for implementation immediately thereafter. A prototype seminar, using the DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT HANDBOOK as the base, has been discussed with the National League of Cities, the National Training and Develpment Service, ICMA, and IDEA. All are interested in co-sponsorship and are willing to cooperate, subject to acquisition of funding.

This then summarizes where we have been and some of the recommendations previously made.

There is no question that there are many in need of education and many ways in which to educate them. What we need today are some insights as to what you feel the Institute's educational objectives are, what you consider the target audience(s) to be, and where you feel the thrust should be--i.e., should we concentrate on educating future regulators at the preprofessional level, should we concentrate on educating public regulatory and private sector practitioners at the professional level, or should we focus on both and, if so, to what extent on each?

In conclusion, let me reiterate ULI's educational objectives focus on the creation of a more comfortable environment which encourages a healthy respect on the part of each sector for the concerns of the other and which enables both to more effectively function.

CSC/ch
4/28/79

EXHIBIT B

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DISCUSSION PAPER FOR THE APRIL 5 MEETING

The overall educational objective of the April 5 meeting is: General agreement on a mix of pre-professional and professional educational projects that is considered supportable and which can be submitted to the Education Committee in May and the approximate level of funding which can be realistically expected (discussion of preliminary recommendations on which the design for the second phase of the program can be based).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

- In terms of the pre-professional program, following a detailed analysis of the questionnaires submitted in cooperation with the Educational Curricula Study (which will be submitted in May by ULI Professor-in-Residence Maury Seldin), ULI will be in a much better position to identify:

  . where some deficiencies in the educational curricula (existing body of knowledge) which address land use and development issues exist and, subsequently, the types and topics of materials needed to fill them.

  . key individuals at the various institutions who can be instrumental in advancing ULI's educational objectives at the pre-professional level.

  . those institutions with existing or projected programs which seem to fit best into ULI's overall educational objectives, thereby enabling ULI/ULRF to make more well-informed decisions regarding the institutions and types of programs they wish to financially support. This financial support at the pre-professional level can be utilized in a number of ways, such as the funding of teaching assistantships for both faculty and students who are proficient, or who are performing research, in areas that would be useful for inclusion in the Development Component Series. The financial support could aid faculty and students in either developing new material or refining existing materials, i.e., they could act as authors or reviewers or combiners and, ultimately, as disseminators. In such a way, ULI will have produced a tangible educational product for use at both the pre-professional and professional levels, and the academic community will have been involved in the design of the materials and will have placed its imprimatur on the product, thereby enhancing its credibility.

- A most valuable piece of work can be done by publishing the Educational Curricula Study report as soon as possible after its submission so that the academic community, ULI Members, and other interested parties may be made aware of the findings.

- As the Educational Curricula Study report will not be submitted until May, for the purposes of the April 5 meeting, Professor Seldin will summarize his preliminary findings based on visitations to approximately 15 universities--following which, discussion of the following issues is appropriate:

- Discussion of the existing deficiencies in the educational curricula (existing body of knowledge), which will be summarized by Professor Seldin. It is important that a full discussion of these gaps take place, as the existing body of knowledge is injurious to the development industry as a result of these deficiencies. The initial round of university visitations has confirmed what we initially suspected--that the body of knowledge is disorganized, that there are relatively few individuals/institutions which address the teaching of land use and development issues from a multi-disciplinary stance, that the ones which do are widely dispersed, that it is very much a hand-hewn system based upon the expertise of the individual professors and what they consider to be an appropriate emphasis, and that there is therefore no real pattern of instruction or "common" approach running through the courses being taught on land use and development and related issues. As the academics approach this subject from such a variety of disciplines, the situation is analogous to attempting to coordinate the moves of the key players in basketball, football, and hockey--each has a different set of rules and each plays a different kind of game.

  It must be understood that it will take years of sustained effort to bring about change in such a widely divergent arena and that a long-term, carefully designed and carefully executed program aimed at effecting these goals needs to be undertaken. Needless to say, this long-term program requires a long-term commitment of support from both a financial and personal resource standpoint and it should not be undertaken unless those long-term commitments--to both careful design and slow and sure execution, as well as funding--can be made.

  The initial findings seem also to indicate that the content of these courses appears to be more systematized at the undergraduate level and that it is at the graduate level where more specific options are available.

  We are also finding that there is a general lack of understanding of the automatic processes of society and that in many cases archaic tools and literature are being utilized in the teaching of subjects dealing with these processes. How to bring those individuals who understand the whole together and how to develop updated materials which will correct current deficiencies is an important and difficult undertaking. One way in which a start can be made is through the development of materials for the Development Component Series. This would have a two-pronged effect of pooling the knowledge of these key individuals in the development of needed new materials and developing a tangible educational product.

  The bringing together of these key individuals is the first step. The development of the materials is the second. Dissemination is the third. Once the initial set of materials has been produced and disseminated, a fourth step could be the convening of a conference on educational alternatives at which these materials could be presented and discussed.

- Obtain consensus on a more than one-year program.

- To what extent should ULI expend limited educational resource funds in support of traditional educational processes and to what extent should it concentrate on funding programs designed to actively involve the Institute and its Members in the educational process?

- Should more emphasis be placed on pre-professional or professional programs or should the mix be equal?

- At the pre-professional level, is there agreement that ULI/ULRF will fund the efforts of both faculty and students or students only?

- Is there agreement that the target audience consists of both faculty and students in the schools of: Primarily--landscape architecture, planning, public administration; Secondarily--architecture, business, engineering, law, social sciences, physical sciences?

- To what extent should the emphasis be placed on each element of the target audience?

- Is it agreed that the Development Component Series will constitute the cornerstone of ULI's educational program for the next three years?

- If so, the following elements of the Educational Draft Proposal submitted in December, 1978, can be utilized in its accomplishment. Which of these elements do those assembled feel

  . should be undertaken

  . in what priority

  . at what scope

  . at what level of funding?

PRE-PROFESSIONAL

Funding of Teaching Assistantships, to both faculty and students, in universities identified through the Educational Curricula Survey to assist in the development of new, or refinement of existing, materials for inclusion in the Development Component Series.

University Guest Lecturer Program, wherein ULI lecturers would use the Development Component Series materials as a basis for their talks.

## PROFESSIONAL

- Development of "Barometer" workshops for private sector participants, designed to aid them in adjusting to essential changes in the managerial and regulatory climates.

- Development of technical workshop materials for practicing public administrators at varying levels--Federal, state, and local--designed to broaden their level of understanding of land economics and the operation of land development systems. ULI's unique strength in this area is its ability to work directly and credibly with key public officials and therefore to provide educational programs with a balanced "good practice" perspective that encourages a non-adversarial approach to land use regulatory issues.

- Development of specific workshop courses directed toward those who are training the trainers of urban managers, in liaison with:

  . Council of State Governments,

  . International City Management Association,

  . National Association of Counties,

  . National Conference of State Legislators,

  . National Governors Association,

  . National League of Cities,

  . U.S. Conference of Mayors,

  . International Downtown Executives Association, and

  . National Training and Development Service.

EXHIBIT C

# DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT SERIES PROPOSAL

The Education Committee proposes establishing a Development Component Series designed to provide an understanding of how the development process takes place. This series would provide continually up-dated, objective and credible materials designed as an easy-to-use reference work which will provide in laymen's language a better understanding of the various elements of the development process. It would be presented as a compact, easy-to-use, comprehensive and pragmatically focused reference work covering complex land use and development issues in a practical manner and would be issued on a regular basis, perhaps quarterly.

The series would be presented as looseleaf components, each approximately chapter size (16 pages±), punched for three-ring binding. Each component would thus be capable of continual updating, and the constant update feature would be capitalized upon as an on-going subscription service to which academic institutions, state and local governments, ULI Members, and the public-at-large may subscribe. The format thus accommodates change in the material without making the entire publication obsolete.

These components could be purchased singly or in clusters. They would be designed to fit within curricula as they currently exist or as we could reasonably expect that they could be altered. Indeed we would hope for some modification of curricula to include these materials. Where a set of components or chapters can be logically clustered to justify handcover binding, ULI could publish these as trade and/or textbooks. These materials may be marketed directly by ULI to its Members and others and by university bookstores to students. Copies of these publications would also be distributed on a complimentary basis to faculty. Additionally, we envision an aggressive marketing effort to existing state and local government professionals. This program has yet to be designed and will of course be coordinated with the ULI membership marketing program.

The distinguishing feature of this series from other ULI publications would be that we would enlist the aid of the academic leadership of leading institutions of higher learning in the process of the design and editing of these publications. We would also employ a thorough process for ULI leadership input, in terms of the content they consider necessary in order to provide educators of planners, as well as future planners themselves, an understanding of land development. We would additionally appoint a ULI/ULRF Advisory Committee for content review and authorship approval.

In recruiting the assistance of these educators as "coordinators" of clusters of the various individual components, we would ask them to be responsible for the following tasks:

- Recommendations for topics for and possible authors of individual components, for subsequent review by a ULI/ULRF Advisory Committee.
- Subsequent recruitment of these authors and oversight of their production.
- Review and editing (for content, not for style) of the authors' components.
- Endorsement of the completed cluster (their imprimatur).

In addition, we could provide for coordination of the entire project by an outside, independent editor-in-chief. To insure that the selection of materials and guidance of authors will fairly represent the land development process, the editor-in-chief could recommend appropriate section editors and authors to the ULI/ULRF Advisory Committee and negotiate arrangements on behalf of ULI/ULRF. By retaining a credible and objective buffer of this nature, ULI, while retaining the usual publisher's prerogatives, could be assured of the development of suitable and transportable materials without the necessity for its becoming involved in direct negotiations with individual section editors or authors. Eventually, ULI could strive for the publication of this Development Component Series by an independent "ULI Press."

While it will take up-front funding to initiate this Development Component Series, it is reasonable to expect that, once established, it will eventually become a revenue-producer in its own right.

As previously mentioned, the process of producing these publications (which are viewed as the cornerstone of the Education Committee program) would involve a high degree of participation from the ULI and ULRF leadership. In order to achieve their early input, their comments would be solicited by mail regarding what substantive matters, subjects, and issues they recommend for inclusion in this reference work. Additionally, the editor-in-chief responsible for the development of the series would subsequently personally visit with selected respondents in order to draw from them an elaboration of their views.

In preparation for the development of this Series, the following research would be helpful:

- The Seldin Study, designed to identify where gaps exist in educational curricula (already underway).

- Survey of where the regulatory decision-makers are educated.

    . Conduct of a mail survey of selected planning schools to obtain their lists of where graduates are employed (may also contact the following organizations for lists of their membership: APA, ICMA, NACo, NLC, USCM, etc.).

    . Survey of state and local regulators. Identify the ten states most difficult in terms of regulatory constraints and poll the employees of the various jurisdictions to determine where they were educated.

- Identification of the most pertinent body of knowledge, as perceived by the ULI leadership (Business Leaders Survey).

    . Survey the ULI Education Committee and Board of Trustees, and the ULRF Directors, regarding land use and development-related subject areas which they feel should be covered at the graduate level (what they wish the regulators knew about their businesses). In this manner, they would have an opportunity to participate in the design of the Development Component Series from its inception.

- Review of existing ULI published material (articles in URBAN LAND, ENVIRONMENTAL COMMENT, LAND USE DIGEST, Project Reference Files, research reports, Project Brochure materials) to determine their adaptability for inclusion in a Series of this nature.

  Based on the results of the foregoing research, a proposal for developing the actual structure of the Series could be prepared by the Education Committee and submitted to the ULRF for funding. This proposal would include an estimate of publication and distribution expenses, marketing, and associated costs together with a projection of estimated revenues. The initial ULRF funding would be sought as start-up seed money only, as it is anticipated that the Series will eventually not only pay for itself financially from sales of the publication but also more than pay for itself in terms of the mission of both ULI and ULRF--i.e., communicating to educators, students, and regulators what really needs to be understood in order to enable the land development industry to properly perform its function.

  This project is not intended to preclude the other elements of the draft proposal submitted in December, 1978, but rather to provide a basis upon which a cohesive program, which could eventually include a mix of those elements, may be built.

DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT SERIES

PRELIMINARY TOPIC LISTING

1. Growth Management
2. Nature of Development Industry in the U.S.
3. Private Input into Public Planning
4. Public-Private Partnerships/Joint Development
5. Redevelopment Process
6. Center City Growth and Development
*7. Fiscal Impact
8. Shopping Center Development Concepts
9. Residential Development Handbook
10. Industrial Development Handbook
11. Financing Mechanisms
*12. Financial Analysis
13. Specialized Development Types
14. Cost of Regulation
15. Case Studies in Deal Making
16. Recreational Development
17. Environmental Control
*18. Feasibility Studies & Marketing Methods
*19. Office Development
20. Community Associations

---

* Need further information developed.

TS
2/9/79
Rev. 3/15/79

EXHIBIT D

# GRADUATE EDUCATION IN LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT: A PERSPECTIVE

## Interim Report with Preliminary Findings

by Maury Seldin
Professor-in-Residence
The Urban Land Institute

This is an interim report which contains some of the results of visitations to the following universities: Harvard, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Carnegie-Mellon, Stanford, California (Berkeley), San Jose State, California (Los Angeles), Southern California, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Georgia State, Florida International, Miami, and Florida. Although there are a few additional universities to be visited, substantial additional information is expected by the return of questionnaires. Only a few of the universities have thus far returned the questionnaire. Additionally, questionnaires have been sent to fifteen other universities not on the travel schedule.

The purpose of this report is to provide a perspective of graduate education in land use and development as background to policy deliberations with regard to working with universities to develop and disseminate knowledge of urban land use and development.

Preliminary findings are provided in the form of recommendations to ULI as to policies which would be cost effective in furthering its mission of developing and disseminating knowledge which would improve land use and development.

# I. DIMENSIONS OF GRADUATE EDUCATION IN LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

## A. Survey Coverage

The selection of particular institutions for inclusion in the survey reflected the following considerations:

1. Universities known to ULI by virtue of education committee membership or other ULI relationships as well as general reputation.
2. A geographical and programmatic diversity, and
3. A clustering of potential institutions by the practical considerations of time and travel limitations.

Thus, the resulting selection is not statistically representative of anything. It does, however, include a number of leading universities and a diversity of programs. Thus, one can get an overview of graduate programs.

## B. Relevant Population

The most relevant universities and departments have not been identified. The determination should consider

- whether the target students are those preparing to be policy administrators or whether they are preparing to be staff analysts and/or functionaries,
- whether the target students are those likely to work in development impacted geographical areas in contrast to persons working in lesser growth areas with corresponding simpler problems; and

- whether the results sought are heavily weighted to the short run or whether the mix would call for substantial long run efforts.

This overview focuses on graduate planning schools and graduate schools of business. It has included visits with faculty in departments or schools of landscape architecture, architecture, government, law, and engineering.

The perspective includes both the design disciplines together with their implementors (engineers and administrators), and the social sciences including economics and administration plus the related area of law. The planning discipline straddles the other disciplines and was taken to be the major potential recipient of proposed programs.

A major educational problem was noted in the difficulty of bringing to bear interdisciplinary knowledge because of compartmentalization within universities. A second major problem is the diversity of ways in which universities organize their academic programs. The problem is confounded in that there is also a diversity of tacks taken within each of the programs that in the aggregate make up a discipline. Thus, not all planning schools have the same thrust, nor do business schools, law schools, or other disciplines.

One might envision a variety of schools of thought for each of these disciplines. In some cases we might trace their development. The significance of this diversity is two-fold:

> First, it would be an exceptionally expensive effort to develop a taxonomy of schools of thought together with an analysis of their development.
>
> Second, it would be much more cost effective to develop a presentation of a body of knowledge which, although containing a variety of schools of thought and disciplines, focuses on land use and development in its larger context.

The latter is a practical approach. It provides an opportunity to facilitate education in a number of related disciplines through a comprehensive interdisciplinary presentation of a body of knowledge.

C. The Body of Knowledge in Curricula

The body of knowledge in a university curriculum and its coverage might be described with a listing of disciplines or really departments such as urban planning, city and regional planning, landscape architecture, architecture, engineering, business administration, public administration, law, economics, sociology, political science plus some physical sciences dealing with the natural environment. All of these have relevance to land use and development and the department in which the students take

the course varies depending on how the university is organized and operated. The set of courses together with the list of topics covered in each course would identify the relevant body of knowledge. The depth of coverage could be identified by listing the number of hours devoted to the topic by the typical target student.

The listing of the courses and topics is a relatively simple matter. We can forget the typical target student program because there are such wide variations. The really big difficulty lies in comparing one curriculum to some other or to a standard curriculum. The organizations of departments and courses vary quite widely.

Visualize now that there is some "standard" curriculum and a particular university curriculum is to be described in terms of its coverage of the standard. The process then requires that the standard curriculum be described and the subject courses be compared to the standard. This involves a matching of topics within courses. The problem is further confounded by the use of different teaching methodologies. The variations among courses obscure what substantive material is actually covered.

Questionnaire responses are available for some of the universities visited. Course syllabi are sometimes included. One can get the flavor of the curricula and a view of the thrust of the program by looking at the responses. Discussions with the faculty are, however, most revealing.

For our purposes, the most relevant parts of the body of knowledge in the curricula fall into two classifications:

First, those ideas which are especially worth developing and disseminating, and

Second, those organizations of body of knowledge which are transportable.

The analysis thus far indicates that the most fruitful approach to working with the curricula of such great diversity is not to try to rationalize the diversity on a university by university basis. Rather, an effort should be made to provide a summary organization of the body of knowledge by working with a group of academic leaders. We should provide some guidance to the process to assure the development of a structure of the body of knowledge which would fairly represent land use and development. ULI would do well to facilitate the development and dissemination of such a body of knowledge by contributing to its organization. It can participate in the process. Credibility will require planners to be among those who are communicating to planners.

These dimensions indicate a complex process in which academicians are going about doing what they see appropriate as they see it. Any program designed to influence their teaching is going to have to involve them especially through their leaders. The next step is to get a view of the process by which they do their job.

## II. THE PROCESS

### A. Teaching and Learning

People make decisions on the basis of their own experience and their own frame of reference. The frame of reference may include a formal body of knowledge rigorously structured. Or, it may include a collection of beliefs not rigorously developed, yet fervently believed.

Decision makers look at the choices to be made in a particular situation and then meld their experience and frame of reference in order to forecast the outcome of various choices. Thus, the better their understanding of the system in which they operate, the better their choices. Also, the more experience they have, the better the choices. The best decisions are made by those with both a highly developed frame of reference and extensive experience with decisions.

Obviously, education historically has been oriented toward the development of the frame of reference. This process places the greatest premium on scientific knowledge because it is most reliable.

There is knowledge less scientifically developed and therefore less reliable. But, most decisions, especially decisions in the social sciences, are made in the absence of full and rigorously developed knowledge. Indeed, what gets us in most trouble is not the things we know, but rather the things we know that are not so.

In recent times, the social science education has moved toward providing experiential learning as part of the formal education process. This has long been the case in professions such as law and medicine.

In lieu of practical on line experience many institutions provide simulations or re-creations in an attempt to create the experiential learning. The techniques vary, but the process provides a reliance on melding a body of knowledge and the experience.

One of the more significant findings of the research thus far is that professors approach these experiential academic exercises without formally identifying the links to the body of knowledge in advance. They know what it is they want to teach, in general, and they respond to the situation with great flexibility. Thus, any transfer of educational materials is heavily dependent upon the professor's background and that of the students.

B. Methodology

1. The lecture approach is alive and well, but it is not alone. It is seemingly well suited for transmitting well organized bodies of knowledge, especially at the undergraduate level. It is frequently used in combination with textbooks. Sometimes, the lecture follows the text closely. Sometimes, the text

serves as a background. In both cases it is a matter of laying out the body of knowledge and providing an explanation. Graduate education in the professional area requires more than the understanding -- it requires a proficiency in doing, so graduate professorial programs generally have some doing type courses.

2. Cases are big in graduate schools of business, especially Ivy League and other prestigious schools of business. The students are well versed in the case approach which is heavily oriented to business policy decisions. The real estate, land development, and related courses are generally taught with the business policy orientation. This is in contradistinction to a design type decision which includes land use determination.

The focus of the business policy case analyses is generally finance oriented looking at the bottom line of profitability. With some rare exceptions there is little attention to market orientation which forecasts city growth and structure and assesses future markets. Thus, the projected sales prices generally use an assumed figure based upon projecting rates of appreciation without specific analyses of changes in the national or local economy and without analyses of changes in the local real estate market.

The ULI supported project at the Harvard School of Design, Department of Landscape Architecture, was a notable exception. That case views a public policy choice of alternative land uses with considerations of the typical analyses utilized by business decision makers.

3. The design schools typically use studios rather than cases. The studios are organized around projects which seek solutions much in the same way cases do.

4. Field projects are live cases and a hybrid of the case and studio. Real situations are taken which require some analysis and decision and the students participate in the process as part of the course activity.

There are innumerable varieties. In one school of business, the students find deals and put them together. The classes thus formed have raised about $2,000,000 in equity money for various projects. At the other extreme, one class went to television on a public interest issue. It was a case of multiple advocacy.

5. Simulations and games are also used. These vary from quite simple to complex. Many are computer based.

6. Guest lecturers are utilized. There is caution in bringing in outsiders but it still serves as one of the best ways of acquainting students with a great deal of experience in a very short time.

Obviously, it is not practical within the survey of the schools to inventory the methods used by the various institutions. And, no attempt was made to do so. What was done, was to get an understanding of how they are operating and how the Urban Land Institute might effectively intervene in the process.

C. Intervention

Intervention is a strong word. It is frequently used in the context of public policy intervention. That has the force of law. The intervention under discussion here does not have the force of law. It relies on the academic community welcoming the participation. Bringing money certainly helps getting a warm welcome. But cost effective participation requires a strategy which assists the faculty in doing that which they are already doing or desire to do but which is selective enough to provide an integrated plan of developing the body of knowledge.

The strategy recommended is to assist in the development and dissemination of the body of knowledge by building on existing ULI activities and by providing the real help that is needed to

organize and flesh out the body of knowledge which is essential to the proper functioning of a market system relying on private entrepreneurial initiative.

## III. PARTICIPATION

### A. Existing ULI Literature

Some schools use ULI publications, including the project reference file and handbooks. They generally consider the publications too expensive for students and in some cases faculty have dropped their personal membership because of the costs.

The project reference file is considered expensive. It would get greater use if there were low cost/quality reproductions provided at reduced prices, or if permission were granted for the universities to reproduce for distribution to students.

The handbooks are being used. Sometimes only parts of the handbook are required. It would be helpful to have sections of the book available at reduced prices.

Monographs and periodicals are particularly cherished by some faculty. They would like to have multiple copies available for students. It is recommended that ULI consider a special educational pricing and promotional system beyond the existing faculty discounts. Such considerations should note that provision of educational materials at very low prices is tangible evidence of ULI's desire to assist universities in their work. Subsidization of reproduction costs are worth considering because of the cost effectiveness potential in developing relationships with universities.

Specific items worth considering include:

1. Discount prices for students through student stores on mass purchase.
2. Complimentary copy for instructor of materials to be considered for adoption.
3. Marginal cost pricing for memberships and materials to faculty.
4. A liberal permission policy for reproduction of ULI published materials by the universities for use by students.
5. An associated university-relations promotional program which would advise faculty of such changes in pricing as has taken place and of the availability of material. Such a university-relations program would be linked to availability of guest lecturers and other cooperative efforts of ULI.

B. Development of Ideas

The universities have some people with exceptional ideas which could significantly affect the institutional environment within which the land development business functions. A few examples of those ideas follow.

1. One professor is working with the concept of the machinery of change in his curriculum development. He identifies current land use courses as having one of two thrusts.
   (a) a legal thrust, based upon statutory law and case law, and

(b) a regulatory thrust which asks how do you regulate. This regulation does not necessarily consider the act of accomplishment.

The model that would best explain the process would deal with the machinery of change that would include:

(a) public-private interaction,

(b) incentive structures, and

(c) interaction points.

The professor working with these ideas could best explain his own concepts. My interpretation is that his view of the machinery of change provides focus on the role of market and entrepreneurship. By way of contrast, many planners have been seethed in a regulatory approach in which they will administer land use and development without ever taking an entrepreneurial risk. They do not have the discipline of the market only the discipline of a civil service structure accountable to an elected official who in turn is accountable to the public.

The results of such a curriculum development would be a model of land use change and development which would provide a better understanding of the process than is now generally disseminated.

2. Another professor has been working with a systems approach in the planning process that deals with the process of change and keeping the system in balance during the change. The approach employs a strategy of constraint oriented policies rather than goal oriented policies.

Such an approach allows a wider latitude for private decision making and focuses on governmental responsibilities for providing a framework and set of public facilities.

My comments are interpretive of what is being done. But, it is the quickest way to communicate the gist of the ideas.

3. A third idea deals with development of balanced solutions through the use of the tools of regulation. Many tools are rather blunt instruments. They result in the regulatory authorities being able to exact payments as though they were thugs. The criteria used to exact payment are not really related to legislated authority. A series of chapters on the tools of land use control set in a context of achieving a balance could be a significant contribution to the educational process.

The three foregoing ideas were macro-oriented. There are some micro-oriented ideas such as

1. integration of economic feasibility in the design process, and

2. cost effective site planning.

These projects relate product design to economic criteria and could be part of a process of explaining the functioning of the system.

C. Development of the Literature

Many of the schools had extensive reading lists which required not only a great quantity of reading but a wide diversity. Many rely on reserve reading lists. Some xerox packages of materials to hand out.

At one school, an environmentally slanted text was used because it was quite inexpensive. The professor did not particularly care for the advocacy but it was convenient and low cost. There seems to be a tendency to use the literature which is readily available particularly if the faculty has had some contact which has familiarized him or her with the particular piece of literature.

The proposal on the development component series is an excellent approach to involvement with the universities. It provides the opportunity to get the faculty involved in the development of the literature which would, of course, foster its use. It provides a flexibility in enabling the faculty to select only those parts necessary to flesh out the literature needed.

Discussion of the literature needs indicated that faculty would welcome the development component series. Existing ULI publications form the base of such a series with the additional components to be developed utilizing some of the ideas just mentioned. The development component series may thus be the center piece of a program for participation with the university in the development and dissemination of the body of knowledge.

One modification to the original proposal seems worthy of consideration. That is a design flexibility for a variety of depths. As originally discussed, the concept cut an even depth in the body of knowledge and provided a broad spectrum of materials. While this facilitates faculty getting something on any of a broad range of topics, there are heavier demands for some materials of greater depth. Thus, ULI might develop in depth materials in those areas of greatest concern.

There are some implications for ULI research programs and research support in developing the multi-tier approach. These considerations have not been addressed in this project.

D. Development of Other Education Aids

Other education aids need to be developed to supplement the development component series. This puts ULI on a broad based track of cooperation with universities.

The cases are potential adjuncts to the component series. One problem with cases is the necessity for dealing with land use policy and business policy in a single case. This can be handled with use of multi-part cases. Thus, a case is used for more than one session but the focal point is a different type of decision.

The other problem of the body of knowledge and the instructor's manual could be handled by providing an instructor's manual and case notes and/or reference to the Project Reference File. Alternatives include bringing faculty together to learn the process and the cases.

The bringing together of faculty was mentioned on numerous instances. Sometimes, it was as a way of learning the use of case material and the associated body of knowledge. Other times, it was to communicate in the development of literature for dissemination. At some stage, it would be quite useful to have the personal interchange in order to get a stronger relationship with the university.

The concept of guest lecturers was generally well received. The limitations are in the way in which to integrate into the curricula. Preferences vary so widely that it is a highly individual matter.

Since ULI has so much at stake here, it would seem that it should seek to assure quality control. The quality control means

knowing that the presentation will reflect favorably on ULI in the sense of academic structure as well as not being a thinly veiled propaganda program. As an example of a method of control the ULI could review substantive material of speakers before presentation with the view to publishing it. If it is of high enough quality to present orally, one could argue that it should be of publishable quality to make it available to others.

E. Development of Program and People

The participation process is a long range proposition. It requires a multi-year program which stages the interaction.

Aside from funding level considerations the program needs to be paced so that only sure winners are attempted in the early stages, lest the whole project fall because of a minor error. The program should also be paced so that time is alloted to develop a detailed program.

The interaction system will rely heavily on literature as the key to academia. But, the involvement of people should not be overlooked. Getting the right people in actually writing the material is important. Developing other relationships through getting their counsel or inviting them to ULI programs is similarly important.

The universities visited are quite receptive to cooperative efforts. Obviously, the possibility of financial support is a

great attraction. But it is by no means the sole attraction nor should it be the sole basis of cooperative effort.

If indeed ULI is going to commit to the magnitude of involvement necessary to alter the course of events then it is necessary to understand the system. That indeed is what we are telling the universities about the land development process. And, that is what we are telling ourselves about participating with them.

I trust that this perspective of graduate education in land use and development is of some assistance to you in your deliberations here, today, with regard to the development of policies as you see appropriate.

## PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING SELECTED FOR PERSONAL VISITATIONS

### CALIFORNIA

- San Francisco State University
  San Francisco, California

- San Jose State College
  San Jose, California

- Stanford University
  Stanford, California

  . Graduate School of Business

- University of California
  Berkeley, California

  . Graduate School of Business
  . City and Regional Planning

- University of California
  Los Angeles, California

  . Graduate School of Management
  . School of Architecture and City Planning

- University of Southern California
  Los Angeles, California

  . Graduate School of Business
  . Planning Department

### CONNECTICUT

- University of Connecticut
  Storrs, Connecticut

  . School of Business

### FLORIDA

- Florida International University
  Miami, Florida

  . School of Business

- University of Florida
  Gainesville, Florida

  .School of Business
  .Planning Department

- University of Miami
  Miami, Florida

  . School of Business

-OVER-

GEORGIA

- Georgia State University
  Atlanta, Georgia

  . School of Business

INDIANA

- Indiana University
  Bloomington, Indiana

MASSACHUSETTS

- Harvard University
  Cambridge, Massachusetts

  . Business School
  . Department of City & Regional Planning
  . Department of Landscape Architecture

OHIO

- The Ohio State University
  Columbus, Ohio

  . School of Business
  . Department of Planning

PENNSYLVANIA

- Carnegie-Mellon University
  Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

  . Advanced Business Studies
  . Political Science
  . Architecture
  . Engineering

- University of Pennsylvania
  Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

  . Department of City & Regional Planning
  . Wharton School of Business

SOUTH CAROLINA

- University of South Carolina
  Columbia, South Carolina

  . Planning Department

TEXAS

- Southern Methodist University
  Dallas, Texas

WISCONSIN

- University of Wisconsin
  Madison, Wisconsin

  . Planning Department
  . School of Business

TOTAL: 20
ts

ADDITIONAL UNIVERSITIES WHICH WERE CONTACTED
BY MAIL AND REQUESTED TO COMPLETE THE EDUCATIONAL CURRICULA STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

- The Catholic University of America

  Chairman, Department of Architecture and Planning
  The Catholic University of America
  Washington, D.C. 20017

- Columbia University

  Chairman, Division of Urban Planning
  Graduate School of Architecture and Planning
  Columbia University
  New York, New York 10027

- Cornell University

  Field Representative, Graduate Field of City and Regional Planning
  College of Architecture, Art, and Planning
  Cornell University
  Ithaca, New York 14850

- The George Washington University

  Chairman, Department of Urban and Regional Planning
  School of Government and Business Administration
  The George Washington University
  Washington, D.C. 20052

- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

  Head, Department of Urban and Regional Planning
  University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
  909 West Nevada
  Urbana, Illinois 61801

- Massachusetts Institute of Technology

  Director, Undergraduate Urban Studies Program
  Massachusetts Insitute of Technology
  Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

- University of Michigan

  Chairman, Department of Urban Planning
  College of Architecture and Design
  The University of Michigan
  Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

- New York University

  Director, Program in Urban Planning
  Graduate School of Public Administration
  New York University
  New York, New York 10003

- Northwestern University

  Director, Urban and Regional Planning Program
  Department of Civil Engineering, Technological Institute
  Northwestern University
  Evanston, Illinois 60201

- Princeton University

  Dean, School of Architecture and Urban Planning
  Princeton University
  Princeton, New Jersey 08540

- University of Southern California

  Director, School of Urban and Regional Planning
  von KleinSmid Center, Room 351
  University of Southern California
  Los Angeles, California 90007

- Syracuse University

  Director, Graduate Planning Program
  Maxwell School
  Syracuse University
  Syracuse, New York 13210

- University of British Columbia

  Director, School of Community and Regional Planning
  Faculty of Graduate Studies
  University of British Columbia
  Vancouver 8, British Columbia

- University of Toronto

  Chairman, Department of Urban and Regional Planning
  University of Toronto
  230 College Street
  Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

nlg
3/12/79

EXHIBIT E

This article, detailing recent developments in the ULRF-funded HGSD program, will appear in the May, 1979, issue of URBAN LAND.

# Educating Design Professionals in Real Estate

by J. Miller Blew

An innovative effort in professional real estate education is now underway at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. With the active involvement of the Urban Land Research Foundation and a number of individual ULI members, this effort has been designed with two main objectives:

1) to increase the depth of understanding of private real estate development by the nation's future generations of public officials and land use regulators; and
2) to improve the effectiveness of design practitioners in their private sector work.

Two of the courses offered in the new program are described in some detail, below, in order to inform academicians and real estate practitioners, who may be considering similar initiatives at other graduate schools. Naturally, many aspects of such courses must be tailored specifically to their academic setting; but some general observations about these courses may suggest starting points for other programs. Course syllabi providing more detailed information will be available from the Harvard Graduate School of Design within a few months.

The author invites comment from others who are doing similar work and from those who might help us to improve our courses, case materials and methods. The author also wishes to thank the members of the ULI Education Committee for their encouragement and the Trustees of the Urban Land Research Foundation for the financial support which has contributed substantially to our progress.

## Program Overview

In two recent articles in Urban Land, John McMahon of Stanford

(September, 1977) and James A. Graaskamp of the University of Wisconsin (October, 1978), have predicted significant changes in the real estate industry of the future, and recognized the need to improve general management performance. Professor McMahon has stated that the real estate industry of the 1980's and 1990's would be "smaller, more regulated, intensely competitive, and dominated by financial institutions." Hence, "the real estate managers of the future (would) be less like the entrepreneurs of the past and more like the managers of other business enterprises." Professor Graaskamp anticipates a future of limited resources and has pointed to the need for real estate enterprise managers who can synthesize multiple disciplines. This new breed of managerial real estate developers will be trained, for the most part, in the nation's Graduate Schools of Business Administration.

The same forces that have led to the decline of the individual entrepreneur-developer will also tend to increase the roles of many other actors in the development process. Most of these "other actors"--design professionals, public officials, regulatory specialists, technicians, etc.--in the future real estate industry will be trained in the nation's Graduate Schools of Design, Planning, Law and Public Administration. Today, unfortunately, many professionals in these categories are being prepared in programs which are substantially lacking in understanding of private business roles in the development process. The new Harvard Graduate School of Design program represents an effort to correct this situation.

Peter Walker, Chairman of Harvard's Department of Landscape Architecture, presented the background for the new program in his recent article, "The Professionalization of Development Practice" (Urban Land, September, 1978). Citing the dramatic social, technological and environmental changes of the

last three decades, Professor Walker introduced Harvard's program, which would incorporate within the design education the realities and the private sector orientation of economics, law and business. This reorientation of graduate training will enable design and planning professionals to progress more rapidly beyond the roles of specialists and technicians to roles of principals and generalists, with greater levels of influence over the design and development of land.

Both the specialists and the generalists in the future real estate industry will have to be sensitive to the dramatic changes that have occurred in the 1970's. These include major changes in the economic structure, involving energy, taxes, and uncertain capital financing; changes in the political environment, regarding "no-growth" policies and tax revolts such as "Proposition 13;" and, increasingly more important, changes in the regulatory structure, such as environmental controls and historic preservation law.

At the same time, a tremendous proliferation has occurred in the methods of regulating development, and the rate of change seems to be increasing. Urban Renewal, for example, legislated in 1948, has impacted such high-growth cities as San Diego only in the 1970's. On the other hand, Environmental Impact Regulation, legislated in 1970, is already a fact of development life everywhere.

These are only a few examples of the changes which have occurred, and new public sector regulation techniques are now being tested. Public officials, planners and environmental regulators in the future are likely to see their roles as agents of change, rather than simply as enforcers of law and procedure. Techniques such as "Growth Management" and "Incentive Zoning" are well established in some locales and will be applied elsewhere in the future.

New Federal legislation will probably further diversify the methods of regulation. The Revenue (Tax) Act of 1978, for example, attempts to alter the

relative attractiveness of downtown vs. suburban investment through the simple device of a tax credit for commercial and industrial rehabilitation investment. In some cities, this will make a tremendous difference in future real property investment patterns. This same legislation also encourages energy conservation investment through a tax credit device, among many other features.

Each time a major change occurs--a piece of legislation providing for designation of historic landmarks, for example, or the 1973 oil crisis--a new real estate specialty comes into being. In case you haven't checked lately, there's an entire solar energy industry out there. Have you met a "building conservation technologist" yet? Or a "community development coordinator?"

These people are among the myriad "other actors" in the future real estate industry. They are all involved in some way in regulating, influencing, or carrying out real estate development. They come from diverse educational and specialist backgrounds, but especially from architecture, landscape architecture, planning and urban design, law, and public administration. Individually and collectively, generalists or specialists, these people bring to the process of land development many essential perspectives and skills. Increasingly these people will need to have at least a minimum background in private business and the real estate industry if they are to be effective.

## Curriculum

Harvard's new Real Estate Program is centered in the Graduate School of Design, but has attracted a handful of students each year from the John F. Kennedy School of Public Administration, Harvard Law School, and the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, as well as from area business schools. There are now three courses in the new program. One is a basic course: Development Economics for Design Professionals. The other two are "applications courses: Suburban Land Development Studio and Urban Development Process Studio. Other GSD

courses supportive of these three include Design Communications, offered by Thomas H. Holmes, a free-lance communications consultant in Boston and Toronto. An additional course, currently in the planning stages, will be based on a Field Studies format involving multidisciplinary student teams.

The Development Economics course is a case studies course, modeled after that developed at the Harvard Business School by William J. Poorvu and Howard H. Stevenson. By means of analysis and class discussion by the case method, some 60 to 70 students are exposed to about 30 different actual real estate business situations over a semester. Development Economics, described in detail below, is designed to address the needs of lawyers, public administrators, and planners, as well as designers. It is a prerequisite for those students taking the studio courses in the real estate program.

Studios are the most important component in the education of design professionals at the graduate school level. In a single studio course each semester, design students normally devote 40 to 50% of their total academic workload to working on a series of projects, each of which usually involves research, programming, design, presentations, and other aspects of professional practice. Design review critiques and "jury" sessions are the major elements of interaction between students and teachers. In our Suburban Land Development Studio, described in detail below, actual on-going real estate developments are the projects; and the actual developers and members of their development teams participate as teachers and critics.

## The Core Course: Development Economics for Design Professionals

The basic case studies course is currently in its third semester at the Graduate School of Design. By June, 1979, it will have about 200 alumni, most of whom will have career involvement in real estate. Each of these students has analysed and discussed actively a large number of case situations chosen to provide the following:

1) a working knowledge of the basic tools of financial analysis and sources of real estate information;
2) some systematic experience with a broad range of land use and investment types; and
3) an introduction to elements of the development process and to complex development programs.

The course in its latest form comprises 32 class meetings of 80 minutes each, covering about 40 cases and technical notes. One paper is required, as well as one four-hour written examination, both of which are based on cases. This quantity of work is a full one-sixth of a graduate school semester workload. (Some students have said this is a modest assessment.)

The modular format of Development Economics is a major advantage in establishing a similar course. Ideally, an instructor familiar with the case method should devise a selection and sequencing of cases and notes to meet the needs of a particular audience and institution. Our experience has shown that an attempt to integrate cases into an existing lecture course is less successful. The case method works best with full commitment to the case discussion format. This results in more active involvement of the students in class and better simulates the "real world."

Virtually all the cases and notes used are presently available from the Intercollegiate Case Clearing House at the Harvard Business School. New cases,

however, must be prepared on a continuing basis. In addition to the "classic" cases with time-honored principles, the course needs a continuous flow of new teaching materials just to keep up with changes in taxation, securities law, and the roles of financial institutions. Some cases related to real estate are now being generated at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, with financial support of the ULRF, as well as at the various business schools.

Developing new cases is a time-consuming effort. Each new case requires about one year from conception through revisions resulting from in-class testing. To date, two new cases and a new technical note have been produced in our program. Two other cases are well along. Over time, these will enrich the stock of case materials available.

Good cases require the efforts not only of faculty members but also of Teaching or Research Assistants. Financial support from the ULRF has also enabled us to assign student Teaching Assistants to write cases during the past year. Thus we have been able to offer selected design school students some systematic exposure to the private real estate industry and to the discipline of the research process.

One of the most promising aspects of our Development Economics course has been the integration of students from other professional schools with the Design School students. In the Fall semester, 1978, we had about 65 registered students and several regular auditors in this course. This is about the maximum number for one section because the case method format works efficiently only if students are able to participate actively in class discussion. Of the 70 or so total students, some 20% came from programs outside our typical design school areas. These were from the Business School (6), Law School (2), Kennedy School of Government (2), Loeb Fellows Program (2), the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts (1) and the School of Architecture and Planning at MIT (1).

These diverse viewpoints added a great deal to the quality of the case

discussions. The design-oriented people were not upstaged; in fact they were challenged to present their ideas in greater depth. A number of the real estate cases and technical notes are fully challenging even to seasoned specialists in many disciplines, including law, accounting, public regulation and finance, as well as design. Hence, while the "expert" or the "specialist" may provide useful insight, he has no monopoly on common sense. At the same time, the "generalist" is encouraged to consider explicitly these specialized constraints on real property analysis in presenting his views. This system of integrating a varied minority of non-design students into the course seems to work well; for the design students themselves are very diverse in both experience and academic objectives.

It was very interesting to compare the work done in the final exam case, across the disciplines. Each student was given a limited time in which to reach a responsible, practical decision. The processes by which students reached their decisions were as diverse as the students themselves. One student wrote a full legal "brief." Others offered extended financial analyses. Still others responded intuitively, identifying the key factors on which the "rightness" of the decision would depend. Probably the best individual student paper was of the latter type, written by a landscape architecture student with no financial background at all.

In summary, the Development Economics course is a case method course designed to provide wide coverage and the basic tools of real property analysis within a single semester. A diverse group of up to 70 students is recommended. The major reason for concentrating all the basics in a single course is to provide a common base, permitting advanced courses and independent student work to be very closely tailored to meet specialized needs.

## An Advanced Course: Suburban Land Development Studio

The Department of Landscape Architecture sponsored this studio as an advanced "applications" course for design students who had already taken Development Economics or its equivalent. Offered for the first time in the Fall semester, 1978, the studio course accommodated 18 advanced design students, both landscape architects and architects.

The Suburban Land Development Studio seeks to increase practical understanding of the development process as it takes place outside the urban core of cities,through involvement in a variety of development problems. This is achieved through a simulation of real professional situations with active developers who bring their projects to the classroom for study. The process by which the studio operates is designed to meet three objectives:

1) to provide balanced experience with a variety of suburban real estate development projects;
2) to integrate the design process with an awareness of the economic environment for development; and
3) to promote an expanded understanding of the total development process and its management.

Consistent with these objectives, the Suburban Land Development Studio was organized into five three-week segments, each focusing on a different problem. Contrary to the usual design studio focus on student teamwork and single large projects, this studio requires individual student response to design and development issues in five separate projects.

Because of the commitment to individual design work, more than one faculty member is required. A lead instructor should have substantial training and first-hand experience in development. The other faculty should be competent teachers in the particular field emphasized in the course, such as architecture,

landscape architecture or urban design.

The Suburban Land Development Studio contained five diverse problems:

1) establishment of a professional office;

2) recreational home subdivision;

3) suburban townhouse development;

4) suburban retail development; and

5) suburban industrial land development.

The initial problem introduces the course teaching methodology and familiarizes the students with the output required in subsequent problems. As an example, the professional office problem requires each student to consider himself a private practitioner performing services to the private sector. He or she designs a hypothetical organization, determines its office space needs, and designs a layout within a predetermined loft building. The final product of the problem is a loan application package to finance leasehold improvements.

The remaining modules of the course may be arranged in any convenient sequence, depending on availability of problem subjects and the schedules of outside participants. In contrast to most design school studios, written documentation of student work is given equal or greater emphasis than design graphics. Graphic representation of a physical design proposal is important, but it must be balanced and integrated with other analyses to make up a comprehensive solution from the developer's point of view.

The emphasis of this course is on the replication of real professional relationships to the extent that is practicable. This pragmatic emphasis is best served by seeking out actual development proposals in their initial stages, such as land assemblage or preliminary programming. The developer and members of the development team should participate in the module whenever possible. Once the subject is selected, it must be presented in a form which requires

the students to address the many facets of the development process with a comprehensive approach. The students must variously analyze, assimilate, interpret or create appropriate responses to the physical plan; the ownership, financial and management structure; the market conditions and costs; regulatory and environmental problems; and any other relevant aspects of the development process.

Four developers were involved as subjects in the Harvard course. They each volunteered many hours of time making initial project briefings, conducting interim reviews, and attending the final "jury." At these sessions, concluding each problem, each student presented a written report and a ten-minute oral and graphic presentation. The dual presentation format is a significant point of departure for this course and provides experience with a problem often encountered in private professional practice.

Two of these participating developers were of substantial size--the Gerald Hines Interests, with Jack Griefen and Dick Reynolds representing the Boston office, and Paul Faraca of the Mugar Group, Boston retail developers. Two other developers were very small--L. John Davidson of Queechee,Vermont, and Joseph W. Kaempfer, Jr. of the Great Northwest Land Company in Washington, D.C.

Three of those four modules of the Suburban Land Development Studio involved projects currently in the initial planning stages. In each case, the developer reported that his exposure to the richness of ideas in the student work had enhanced significantly his understanding of his "real" development options. Moreover, each developer found that this process had a tangible value many times greater than the costs he had incurred in expenses and time. In turn, at least one student has received a job offer as a result of this contact.

Preparation is the key to success of such a course. Most of the effort of the lead instructor involves finding suitable subjects and willing developer-participants. The assembling of project data and coordination of schedules must be prepared in advance. Often it is desirable to schedule presentations from members of a development team or from an outside specialist, such as a mortgage banker, broker, or construction manager. These should be scheduled to fit with a particular module and also to provide diversity over the course as a whole. Naturally, the more the developer himself takes the initiative, the better. This enhances the value of the course to a design student by giving him first-hand experience working with a real client.

In summary, the Suburban Land Development Studio places 15 to 20 advanced design students in the role of professional consultant to actual real estate developers. The students are each required to produce design and development recommendations for a series of real projects. In this process, these students learn to integrate design with the many other considerations of the development process.

*

This program has only begun. The courses described here are continuing to evolve, and at least one new course is expected: an advanced development course in which students from several disciplines will work jointly on real projects in progress. Still other courses and studios are evolving, as faculty and students become increasingly aware of the private sector.

Student interest has been very strong. A new student-organized real estate club has attracted over 30 members in its first year. This club sponsors a speaker program and has successfully attracted private business recruiters to consider hiring some of its graduating members. Students involved in the program were a feature of the "ULI Goes to College" session at the ULI meeting in San Francisco.

The Harvard Graduate School of Design hosted the recent annual meeting of the Urban Land Research Foundation and the ULI Education Committee. Following the business meetings, the members served as a jury for a series of presentations of student work. This event, in combination with the job interview process, has resulted in more coats and ties at the design school in 1979 than any year since the '50's.

J. Miller Blew is Visiting Lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. He is President of Real Property Resources Corporation, a management consulting firm in Boston specializing in public and private sector real estate operations. He is a graduate of the Harvard Business School and a registered architect.