



**THE HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING**

1948-2001

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Early Development	4
Experimentation and Polarization (1963–1971)	5
Stabilization (1971–1978)	9
Merger and Talk of Merger (1979–1985)	11
Holding On (1985–1995)	14
New Institutional Arrangements, Additional Resources (1996–Present)	17
Conclusion	21

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much of this history of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning was prepared in the early 1990s by Professor Elizabeth Howe. Building on that base, I have edited and updated this departmental history. Constructive comments, perspectives, and suggestions from numerous URPL faculty over the years have been incorporated herein. We publish this history with the hope that it will provide a rich account of our past and “institutional memory” that helps shape the Department of the future.

Stephen M. Born, Chair
September 2001

Cover photo by Mark Stevens

Introduction

Urban planning has a long history at the University of Wisconsin, and the present program began officially in 1962. Over the years we have experimented with the curriculum and have debated basic issues such as the degree of specialization appropriate for planning education and the relationship between research and service in a professional program.

Overall, the program has evolved through six rather distinct phases, each with its own administrative and curricular structure. A developmental phase preceded the formal establishment of the department in 1962. Then the early years of the department were characterized by experimentation and polarization, particularly over curriculum, leading almost to the department's dissolution. The third phase was a period of stabilization in which members of the department came to a broad consensus on the Department's missions, particularly those related to research and Extension. The fourth phase was a period in which various mergers were considered. The fifth phase was essentially a holding pattern in which the department tried to maintain and improve the quality of the program in a period of resource constraints for the University. We are now in a sixth phase, begun in 1996 and solidified in 1998 with the establishment of a cross-college (Letters and Science/Agricultural and Life Sciences) department that added faculty and resources and represented a major institutional innovation for the campus.

Early Development

City planning as a subject was first taught at the University of Wisconsin in 1911 in the Civil Engineering Department, and for many years that department has had a dual degree in city planning and civil engineering.

In 1944, the University established an interdisciplinary regional planning program. It was developed by John Gaus who believed that, as the role of government became greater in society, it was necessary to try to improve the quality of public decision-making. One mechanism for doing this was to improve the quality of advice provided to decision-makers by training better staff planners. He viewed the planner as a generalist; and thought that an interdisciplinary program based primarily in the social sciences would be the most suitable training mechanism because staff planners should have a broad view of issues and an understanding of their political, economic and social contexts. After he had become Charles Dyer Norton Professor of Regional Planning at Harvard, he summarized some of the efforts toward this end that he was familiar with

. . . should we work to create a new type of specialist who is in a sense specially trained in a general, multiple-purpose and multiple-agency approach to public policy oriented around the task of looking for the areal, or as I am using the term, regional, aspect of decision-making? . . . The Master's Degree course in Regional Studies at the University of Wisconsin, the programs in public administration at several state universities, . . . the program at the University of Chicago Planning Institute, some of the proposals for the new program at Berkeley, the liaison program of the Graduate Schools of Design and Public Administration at Harvard, are straws in the wind. (Gaus, "Education for the Emerging Field of Regional Planning and Development," *Social Forces* 29:3(March, 1951) p. 7.)

Gaus himself left the University in 1947 for Harvard. After his departure Wisconsin's Regional Planning Program was guided by an interdisciplinary group of faculty from fields including law, business, political science, economics, rural sociology, engineering, geography and sociology. Many of the people who served on

the committee over the years were senior members of their departments such as Richard Ratcliff, eminent land economist and member of the Business School. For a program with little formal support, it was largely the commitment of these faculty members which kept it going. In 1955 the program was “recognized” by the American Institute of Planners.

In 1957 Coleman Woodbury of the Political Science Department assumed the chairmanship of the committee. In the same year Leo Jakobson joined the University as campus planner and member of the faculty of the Department of Civil Engineering. By this time the idea, originally held by Gaus, that planning should be based in the social sciences was becoming accepted nationally. Jakobson and Woodbury wanted to see the committee program transformed into a formal department, not in Engineering but in the College of Letters and Science, which included most social science departments. Since Madison never has had a school of architecture, that was never an option. It took a number of years of argument and persuasion, but in 1962, the present Department of Urban and Regional Planning was created within the College of Letters and Science.

Experimentation and Polarization (1963–1971)

The department began with a core faculty of three people from other departments on campus — Jakobson of Engineering and Woodbury and Fred Clarenbach from Political Science — along with secretary Irene Schoenewe. Soon after, Ford Foundation urban grant funds were used to hire Henry Fagin, a practicing planner and director of the Penn-Jersey Transportation Study. By 1968, the faculty had grown to nine people.

The full-time faculty retained their commitment to Gaus’ idea of an interdisciplinary program which had been embodied in the earlier committee degree. Of the 15 people who were serving on the committee at the time of the changeover, seven became adjunct faculty members of the new department. They contributed advice, particularly on the curriculum, and offered cours-

es of particular relevance to URPL students. The idea of drawing in faculty from a range of different disciplines is still key to the department's philosophy and structure. At present the department has nine affiliate faculty from fields including geography, business, agricultural and applied economics, rural sociology, women's studies, and environmental studies.

At the beginning the curriculum followed a rather similar model to the one it uses at present — the idea of training generalists with a specialty. Carrying through some of the structure of the older committee degree, the curriculum was divided into two basic tracks, *urban planning* and *regional planning*. During these early years as the faculty grew, the curriculum changed somewhat. By 1968, the core included seven to eleven courses in areas such as background, planning thought, skills and the institutional environment of planning. Specializations under urban planning included development and circulation; law and finance; socio-economic analysis and projection, and urban design; the regional planning track specializations were location and transportation; natural resources; regional development in developing countries; and human resources and social organization. In 1966 the University authorized the department to offer the Ph.D. degree.

By 1968 larger events were beginning to impinge on the department. In the field of planning as a whole, and on university campuses the late 1960's was a time of turbulence, excitement and rejection of the status quo. Riots in major cities linked a sense of crisis to a basic optimism that social and urban problems could be "solved" at least in part through planning. On campuses, the "Age of Aquarius," the anti-war movement and the black power movement came together in volatile and often violent events. The University of Wisconsin was at the forefront of this turbulence, which culminated in the bombing of Sterling Hall in the early 1970's.

Like planning departments in many other universities, the department was swept up and polarized by these larger movements. The most obvious case was the bitter and public opposition by a minority of the faculty to the department's support of a series of "non-negotiable" demands by black students concerning

control over curriculum and faculty hiring related to black studies. These demands resulted in the occupation of the campus by the national guard.

At the same time, some of the reforming energy was being channeled inward to departmental affairs as well, resulting in a major experiment with the curriculum called the “Omnibus” (Leo Jakobson et al., “The Wisconsin Omnibus Experiment,” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36:4(July, 1970) 253–260.) This effort was supported financially by the College, and resulted from a planning process involving both students and faculty.

In the fall of 1969, instead of the regular five core courses, entering students took only one combined course taught jointly by five faculty members. It included structured lectures and several extensive projects based on a substantial field trip. But the key to the Omnibus was the quintessence of the 1960’s — “experiential learning” in which students took a major responsibility for their own educations, using the faculty as a resource but exploring issues on their own and in small groups.

The Omnibus met with mixed reactions among the faculty and students. Of the students, about one third were enthusiastic, one third felt overwhelmed and negative, while the remainder had mixed feelings. Among the faculty the experiment and the related discussions about the curriculum raised issues which divided the department fundamentally along lines which somewhat paralleled those dividing them on larger campus issues such as the black student demands. Outside the department, however, the experiment apparently did have some impact; at least one other planning program adopted a similar format for their core courses.

Already in the fall of 1969, while the Omnibus was in progress, Chairman Irving Fox began to lay out the groundwork for this debate over the basic nature of planning education by posing two quite different possible directions the department might take in developing its curriculum after the experimental semester was over. The two alternatives were a generalist curriculum, embodied in the Omnibus, in which all students would take common coursework focusing on the generic characteristics of planning which could apply to any substantive area. Against this

model he posed the specialist model in which URPL would develop close ties with a series of other departments offering considerable depth of coursework in a variety of substantive areas — natural resources, or education, for example. Students would then focus on developing planning skills keyed to a particular substantive area.

By February of 1970, this issue had developed into what has come to be known as the “Fox-Jakobson debates”. Fox developed a position paper arguing the specialist side, while Jakobson defended the generalist position. Each operated from a very different idea of the role that planning could play in the political system. Fox saw planners as program specialists working to improve the quality of substantive programs in a decentralized, functionally fragmented administrative system. Jakobson saw the role of planners as generalists, helping high level leaders to design frameworks for synthesizing and coordinating a multiplicity of programs.

This debate served to increase the polarization that already existed among the faculty. While some people were exhilarated by the conflict and confrontation characteristic of the time, others became alienated from the department. By the summer of 1970 the scope of conflict had expanded to include the L & S Dean Kleene and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Irving Shain. In December the Vice Chancellor issued an ultimatum that if the department could not pull itself together, it would be dismantled. The urban aspects of the program could be merged with urban affairs at UW–Milwaukee, while the regional ones could be subsumed by the then-new Institute for Environmental Studies. On the other hand, if the department were willing to make the effort to bury old conflicts and focus on providing a more adequate program, the Vice Chancellor would provide funds for hiring a new chairman, whose job it would be to oversee the unification and rebuilding process.

The department did come together. Throughout January the faculty met together and in subcommittees to develop proposals related to all aspects of the program. Ultimately these were assembled into a departmental “white paper” which went to the Dean and the Vice Chancellor in February 1971.

In the curriculum they returned to the idea of training generalists with a specialty, represented by a core of six courses and a flexible system of concentrations which would be tailored to fit each student. By this time it was clear that Fox, the strongest advocate for the idea of specialization, would be leaving the department to take another academic post. His departure also meant that the department had to find a new Chair, preferably someone from outside, as the Vice Chancellor had suggested. The relationship with the adjunct faculty was also changed somewhat. Many of the earlier adjuncts had died or left the University. Under the new model, “associate” faculty would simply be individuals with an interest in planning. They would not represent departments, and they would not be members of URPL’s Executive Committee, though they would have most other duties and privileges of regular faculty members. Finally, responding to criticism by the Vice Chancellor, the department sought ways to increase its research activities.

On February 9, 1971, the crucial meeting was held between department faculty, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor. The white paper was accepted and the department was assured of survival. The new chairman would be Carl Runge, a distinguished senior professor in the Law School, with a strong interest in natural resources planning.

Stabilization (1971–1978)

The deep divisions created during this period of conflict were slow to heal. But the social activism and the ideas of “doing your own thing” and learning by immersion in experience had peaked. Freedom began to seem like chaos and the pendulum began to swing back to more order, consensus and structure.

The initial order of business was to revise the curriculum. The Omnibus had been followed by a somewhat reduced version dubbed the “minibus”. Aside from relying on the Omnibus for the core, the curriculum had come to be quite individualized, with students working out tailored programs with a faculty advi-

sor. But the intensity had gone out of the Omnibus idea, and the highly individualized system of concentrations also produced dissatisfactions as well. So in the wake of the Fox-Jakobson debates, the department had to agree on a workable new curriculum.

Over the next few years five new faculty – including Jerry Kaufman, Steve Born, Beth Howe and Jack Huddleston — joined the program. Clarenbach was the first of the founding generation to retire, followed in a few years by Woodbury. New faculty hired were largely assistant professors and, unlike the founding generation were required to have Ph.D.'s. Coming from somewhat different backgrounds, and facing the tenure track in a financially constrained environment, they brought a somewhat more research-oriented perspective to the faculty mix; this coincided with pressures from outside the department for a stronger research orientation. The addition of people who had not been involved in the earlier forms of the program or its conflicts also helped to create an atmosphere in which a new consensus might form.

In 1971–72, just after Runge had become Chair, the core was revised to include a more systematic approach to quantitative methods, several workshops and a synthesizing colloquium which would run throughout the student's two years in the program. This core was tried and revised over the next several years until it included four required courses plus an additional methods course. This set of requirements remained in effect until 1995 when it was modified slightly.

Additional discussions focused on the various concentrations. The older framework of having two tracks: urban and regional with several specializations in each, was dropped, and in 1975–76 a simpler and much more structured system of five concentrations was adopted. Four of these took advantage of specializations among the existing faculty, reinforced by new hires — land use, housing and growth management; natural resources and environmental planning; economic and fiscal planning; and social planning. Most had more or less formal ties with faculty in other departments who taught relevant courses and/or were associate members of the department and could add more depth to the

concentrations. The fifth “generalist” concentration moved in the opposite direction along the generalist-specialist continuum. It would allow students who did not wish to specialize to take a broad range of additional coursework.

Over the period from 1971 to 1976 when the process of curriculum revision was completed, a new consensus developed over the department’s approach to planning education. By adopting Perloff’s idea of the planner as a generalist with a specialty, it drew on elements from both sides of the Fox-Jakobson debate without the bitter divisiveness that debate had created. The new curriculum provided enough flexibility for student and faculty diversity; and enough structure to provide a sense of unity and direction. While this curriculum was modified in incremental ways in the years after 1976, it, and the consensus on which it rested, proved effective and durable. In 1995 the Generalist Concentration was eliminated and several of its courses added to an “expanded core” from which students are supposed to choose two. But this did not represent a movement away from the basic idea of training generalists with a specialty.

The latter 1970’s and early 80’s saw the department reach a size of 12 faculty members. It also brought two additional issues that raised fairly fundamental questions about the nature of planning education. Both involved possible mergers with other units, first with the Center for Public Policy and then with URPL Extension. While these could have been as divisive issues as the Fox-Jakobson debates, they were not. But they did serve to clarify the basic goals of the department in a way that “academic” or general discussions of goals often do not.

Merger and Talk of Merger (1979–1985)

As a small professional department in a large, research-oriented academic college, URPL was somewhat vulnerable, especially as resources began to be tighter in the 1970’s. This led the faculty to be receptive to the idea of merger with other units.

The issue of merger with the Center for Public Policy was raised in the later 1970's. As at many other universities, public policy grew out of political science, but had much in common with planning. Students, especially, moved freely between both programs, and a double-degree arrangement was adopted. When Carl Runge finished his term as Chair of URPL in 1973, he was asked to become Director of the Center, thus creating an additional link which suggested the possibility of a merger into some larger "La Follette School of Public Affairs". Within URPL the possible advantages of such a merger were urged most vigorously by members of the economic and social planning concentrations whose areas overlapped most with the developing field of public policy. Considerable discussion took place within the department along the lines discussed by Alterman and McRae (R. Alterman and D. McRae, "Planning and Policy Analysis: Converging or Diverging Trends," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 49:2(Spring, 1983) 200-215.) about the differences in perspective between the two fields and what the costs and benefits of merger might be for planning.

The decision was finally made to seriously explore a merger. This was done, but due to a variety of external circumstances including the premature retirement of Carl Runge for health reasons in 1981, it never came to pass at that time, though several years later the LaFollette Institute of Public Policy (now a School) was established by the State Legislature. Then, beginning in 1987, merger with the LaFollette Institute was raised again, though not in any very immediate way. While over the years we have hired joint faculty (Michael Wiseman and Sandra Hoffmann), and have had a cordial, ongoing relationship at both the faculty and student levels, any form of merger is not part of the current dialog. In the end, over time, in a department whose origins were quite different from the architecture/physical land use traditions of most planning departments, the discussion of this issue of possible merger with public policy has served to highlight and reinforce some of the distinctive characteristics of planning as a profession.

The idea of merger with URPL Extension raised a different set of issues, but in a similar way. Since Harold Jordahl had joined the department in 1969, most of the natural resources/environmental faculty had come with joint Madison Campus and Extension appointments. During the 1970's, in keeping with these joint appointments, both Jordahl and Steve Born had done active service with the State, the former on the Board of the Department of Natural Resources and the latter as Director of State Planning. Since they served as regular full-time members of URPL — teaching, serving on committees and, in the case of Born, becoming Chair in 1979, merger seemed in many ways simply a way of institutionalizing what already existed. On the other hand, the issue of merger did raise fairly fundamental issues particularly about the relationship or balance between research and service.

As professional programs, planning departments generally emphasize professional activities and service. Checkoway has argued that the new university for the new century will involve an integration of research, teaching, and service; and a democratic reciprocal relationship with communities, among other variables. This includes integrating service learning into the curriculum and outreach into essential educational functions (Checkoway, "Reinventing the Research University for Public Service", *Journal of Planning Literature* 11:3, 1997, p. 307–319). URPL was generally pursuing this approach, but in a research-oriented college of a national research university, strong pressures also exist for more traditional academic research. It is an important factor in the evaluations of both individual faculty and of programs as a whole, and URPL had increasingly felt this pressure since the crisis of 1970–71, both from the College and from some of its junior faculty.

Extension's mission supports research that can be applied. The obvious advantage of merger would be additional institutional and financial support for such research and its dissemination. The possible drawback could be a further shift in incentives away from more academic research. Again, a series of often heated discussions were held within the department on the issue. The final

outcome was a consensus that such a merger would support the applied research and outreach goals of the department without reducing the capacity of faculty members to be involved in more academic research. Moreover, there would be significant reciprocal benefits to both Extension and the resident department from merger. Lengthy negotiations over merger specifics were then conducted with Extension Administration and Letters and Science. The issue of URPL was overtaken by a larger integration of Extension functions within the Madison campus; largely as a result of that change, the URPL merger took place in the summer of 1985.

While the latter 70's and early 80's did not see basic changes in the structure of the curriculum, the department branched out in several new directions. The number of international students in the program increased substantially, stimulated in part by a \$1 million U.S. AID (Agency for International Development) project involving work in both Asia and Africa. This led to the development of a more systematic curriculum dealing with development issues, including two new courses in the core.

Holding On (1985–1995)

In the early 1980s, as the economies of Midwestern states were losing ground to those of the sunbelt, the University as a whole began to experience fiscal stringencies. Low tuition and the last members of the babyboom increased enrollments dramatically, while resources for everything from salaries and supplies to student financial aid did not keep pace. In 1986, the State, faced with a budget deficit, required budget cuts from the University. The College of Letters and Science undertook what was called the “2–4–6 Exercise” in which departments proposed possible 2, 4 and 6 percent budget reductions. URPL ultimately had a 6 percent cut, losing support for TAs, for the Research Center, for student assistance and for supplies. Since the budget stringencies on the University which gave rise to the 2–4–6 cuts were little reduced in subsequent years, this was effectively a permanent

reduction. For perhaps similar reasons, three non-Extension URPL faculty vacancies remained unfilled through the early 1990s, except for a joint appointment with the LaFollette Institute (Wiseman). Since 1986–87, the department’s budget from L&S for everything except faculty salaries has been essentially the same each year.

This fiscal situation posed a fundamental issue: the need simply to maintain the department at a viable size. Small departments throughout the University, always especially pressed when cuts were required, began to feel pressures for consolidation. As a graduate professional program with Extension ties in a college containing most of the traditional “academic” humanities, social science and science departments with large undergraduate programs, URPL was easily identified as not fitting the norm.

In 1989 the College of Letters and Science began a significant transition with the retirement of its long-time Dean. New leadership in a time of generally decreasing resources and a College budget deficit resulted in the initiation of a college-wide downsizing and strategic planning process. This produced several years of extreme uncertainty, threatening, at first, the continued existence of URPL and, then, its continuation at a size that would make it eligible for accreditation.

At the time of the 1992 reaccreditation site visit, URPL was just submitting its self-study in the “Quality Reinvestment” exercise, which was expected to provide a framework for reducing and reallocating resources across departments. Each department in the College was asked to respond to a series of sixteen questions about its teaching, research, service activities, personnel policies, support services, facilities and relationships with other departments. These were then reviewed by the Dean’s Academic Planning Committee.

In its May 1992 report, the Academic Planning Committee singled out URPL as the only department “that should be considered for departmental-wide cuts.” It cited the lack of an undergraduate program, characterized the department as “relatively weak among the social science units of the College” and as having weak students, and suggested that its program overlapped

with that of the LaFollette Institute. The Committee concluded that pending retirements raised the “possibility of reducing and perhaps eliminating the URPL program.”

URPL responded immediately and vigorously. Since a number of other departments and programs in the College had been unhappy with the Quality Reinvestment Report, the next year was spent on a second round of self-studies that resulted in June 1993 in an L&S Strategic Plan with a brief evaluation and recommendation for faculty increases or reductions for each department. The section on URPL indicated that:

“URPL was unfavorably evaluated by the QR review committee, which was not impressed by the quality of faculty or the students, and suggested it for elimination. We did not adopt that recommendation, in part because the faculty are conscientious contributors to the outreach mission of the College. However, although resources are stretched thin, some streamlining could be accomplished by such measures as eliminating the Third-World focus when the single staff member in that area retires, or eliminating the “generalist” option. URPL and the LaFollette Institute should consider consolidation, since URPL has a domestic and policy focus that could complement the Institute. The resulting savings target from this combination is 1 FTE.”

Each department was further requested to develop a strategic plan which would be submitted to the College in December 1993, which URPL did.

The final 1994 L&S Strategic Plan laid out plans for twelve “areas in which we will hold ourselves accountable [as a College] over the next five years”. These were: curriculum revision, undergraduate advising, the undergraduate Honors Program, graduate education and research, diversity of students and faculty, improved facilities, new funding sources and departmental delegation. The charge to departments with regard to reevaluation of graduate education and research suggested, in part, a shift in the traditional emphasis on research to include a greater focus on the dissemination of knowledge through campus and outreach teaching. The present Dean (who took office in June 1993) also indicated that future downsizing would not result in the elimination

of programs, though clearly budget cuts have somewhat greater impacts on small departments than large ones.

The interaction with three successive L&S deans over these reports and over the target reduction of 1 FTE no doubt contributed to a higher profile for, and ultimately greater understanding about URPL in the College administration. The 1994 College plan incorporated the plans of the individual departments and set targets, by department, for faculty reductions. The original requirement that URPL reduce its teaching faculty from 5.27 FTE to 4.27 was replaced by a targeted reduction to 5.0 FTE instead, which guided administrative staffing decisions until recently; in 2000, L&S Dean Phil Certain indicated that the 1994 plan for targeted faculty reductions would no longer guide recruitment/replacement decisions.

New Institutional Arrangements, Additional Resources (1996-Present)

Even in times of constrained resources, the department recognized that numerous opportunities existed to address its needs and strengthen the overall program. URPL's 1993 Strategic Plan identified a number of these opportunities, which existed in part because of URPL's department-wide focus on a critical set of public policy and planning issues (e.g., growth management and land use planning) and our unique integrated structure. In the time period since the 1996 PAB reaccreditation review, the department has pursued a number of these potentials aggressively.

The most profound change in URPL in recent years was the establishment in 1998, after two years of intense discussions and negotiation, of a cross-college department jointly administered by the College of Letters and Science and the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. The 1993 URPL Strategic Plan noted the close and somewhat overlapping interests between URPL and several CALS units, including the School of Natural Resources, the Center for Resource Policy, and the Department of Landscape Architecture. The Plan also noted the potential for

more formal collaboration with the Department of Landscape Architecture in course offerings, building upon respective strengths. Further, as outlined in the Plan, several faculty from CALS units had approached URPL about the possibility of transferring their appointments to the department. This interest stemmed from both turbulence in their “home” units and an attraction to URPL’s mission, structure, culture and reputation.

In spite of the administrative difficulties associated with such transfers, four senior faculty transferred their appointments and tenure to URPL as a result of the formation of the new cross-college department (Niemann, Felstehausen, Chenoweth, and LaGro). With Steve Born assuming the Chair in the fall of 1998, the ensuing years have been devoted to the blending of new colleagues and acculturation to a “new”URPL - which the department recognized would be essential to realize the many benefits associated with creating the cross-college department. Supplemental administrative and support resources also resulted from the merger.

The “new” faculty greatly expanded the department’s capabilities in land resources policy, planning and analysis; spatial analysis and GIS; resource aesthetics assessment and environment-behavior analysis; and planning methods. A fifth new CALS-funded junior faculty member (Jackson-Smith) joined the department in 1999, adding further robustness to URPL’s strength in the above areas, as well as the department’s Extension programming. With the retirements of two of these senior faculty (Niemann and Felstehausen [1/02]), Marcus Lane joined the faculty and the department is recruiting for another junior position (“vice”-Niemann) in the GIS/LIS/planning applications area. This infusion of additional faculty (and improved collaboration with the Department of Landscape Architecture, and with several cooperating CALS units involved with our comparatively new community development concentration) has expanded our curriculum and opened up additional research opportunities.

There are several examples of the symbiotic and positive consequences growing out of the relationship with the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. Professor Kaufman, and more

recently Assistant Prof. Caton Campbell, have been supported by CALS Food Systems Partnership in their work on food systems planning. Professor Jacobs has assumed the directorship of the Land Tenure Center, a venerable UW institution administered by CALS with worldwide experience in land tenure problems, offering graduate student research support and faculty funding opportunities. Similarly, the Program on Agricultural Technology and Society (PATS), which has both a research and extension mission and is housed in CALS, has provided research support and experience to URPL students. The innovative and interdisciplinary community development concentration in URPL is offered jointly by faculty in URPL, and several CALS units including Agricultural and Applied Economics, Rural Sociology, and The School of Human Ecology. Furthermore, additional faculty and student research funding opportunities have opened up as a result of the cross-college merger.

As noted in the 1993 Strategic Plan, the Extension linkage with URPL is a hallmark of the department. The department has long recognized that the culture of URPL, the “Wisconsin Idea” tradition at UW, and the very nature of planning argue for a sustained outreach/public policy education/extension role for URPL. While URPL and the L&S administration were struggling over the role of the department in the early 1990s College budget reductions, UW Extension was providing an avenue for maintaining and even increasing the department’s capacity for service and outreach. Retirements in URPL and some other Extension units provided new resources, which were not nearly as tight as were those for L&S. Extension administration was interested in developing a more coherent and active land use planning capacity and chose URPL as the institutional home for much of this focus. Between 1991 and 1993 URPL hired two 100 percent and one 70 percent Extension faculty in land use law, tourism development and land use and fiscal policy. Such joint L&S/Extension appointments were unusual and raised a variety of difficult administrative and tenure issues. Two of the three faculty hired at that time (Marcouiller and Ohm) subsequently attained tenure, with Ohm gaining statewide recognition as one of the principal archi-

tects of Wisconsin's 1999 "Smart Growth" legislation. The addition of Jackson-Smith to the faculty reflects the longstanding URPL tradition of productively meshing applied research, teaching and extension/outreach education. In spite of some dissonance over programming expectations and outputs, the integrated campus and Extension features of URPL continue to be significant attributes of the department.

The department has maintained and strengthened its relationships with other campus units, as called for in the 1993 Strategic Plan and 1995-96 PAB Site Visit Team recommendations. Victoria Beard was hired in 2000, markedly strengthening the department's international planning dimensions; Beard has an appointment in the Center for Southeast Asian Studies and has enhanced the department's relationships with International Studies. Several faculty have joined the Institute for Environmental Studies, building upon what has been a long-term cooperative and collegial set of relationships. The department's Food Systems Partnership involvement has led to close working relationships with CALS units. Linkages with the School of Business-Real Estate Program and the LaFollette School have been maintained. Such cooperative institutional ties have been critical to URPL, as illustrated by our efforts to improve our facilities and capacities related to planning applications of geographic information systems. The merger with CALS greatly strengthened our linkages to the Land Information and Computer Graphics Facility (LICGF - administered by CALS and directed by Niemann), affording students research and financial support opportunities. However, in spite of extensive discussions among campus units and administrators, we were unable to gain co-location of URPL and LICGF, a move which would have allowed synergies among involved faculty/units and provided a long-needed modern computer lab for URPL students. Working through L&S and the Department of Geography, an instructional laboratory modernization program allowed URPL to establish a dedicated computer lab for GIS and other computer-related instruction in Science Hall, only a short distance from Old Music Hall.

CONCLUSION

The period since URPL's last site visit has been a time of great change. However, for the moment, we seem to have navigated out into calmer seas. The sense of collegiality forged since the conflicts of the 1960s has held, but the nature of the department has changed and continues to change. The merger with CALS has been accomplished and the many anticipated benefits are beginning to be realized. URPL's role as a joint Campus-Extension department is supported by both L&S and CALS, and several faculty have Extension or joint appointments. The faculty who joined the department in the wake of the Fox-Jakobson debates became productive, mature scholars and contributors to the national community of planners. Now, however, the inevitable generational transition from established senior faculty to new junior faculty is well under way, with a concomitant injection of energy and fresh ideas, laying the foundation for URPL in the 21st Century.

In its nearly four decades of existence, URPL has been shaped by the convergence of several forces including turbulent outside events, the outstanding university of which it is a part, the expansion and reduction of financial resources, a diverse faculty and an often idealistic and bright group of students. The contentious years have been sandwiched in with years where we worked collaboratively to build a stronger department, in part by capitalizing on the emergence of new opportunities and linkages within the University of Wisconsin. As a result the department has a distinct identity today. Overall, the department has been more practical than theoretical, serving our region and the state through professional education, applied research and service. We also look beyond the state, as active members of the national and international community of planning academics. Our research and service extends actively to other countries, and URPL students are drawn from across the country and throughout the world.

In the past the department has faced and surmounted major problems. The past five years, not surprisingly, have brought a

new round of challenges. The department is increasingly well positioned to capitalize on emerging campus priorities outlined in recent plans and vision statements (e.g., *Targeting Tomorrow: the UW as the 21st Century Begins*), including: partial refocusing of graduate education towards more interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs and stronger professional Masters programs; amplifying the “Wisconsin Idea” for the 21st Century; and strengthening international programs in response to globalization trends. In short, URPL has continued building on the strengths of the program noted by the 1996 PAB review team: excellence in teaching and publications; new organizational structure; intensive collaborative arrangements with other units to fully take advantage of the academic resources of the entire campus, modern embodiment of the “Wisconsin Idea”, and strong international connections. We look forward to the evolution of Urban and Regional Planning at UW–Madison with optimism and enthusiasm.

Thanks to the following sponsors for their financial assistance:

Mid-America Planning Services

S. B. Friedman and Company

Schreiber/Anderson Associates

Short Elliot Hendrickson Inc.

Vandewalle and Associates

Wisconsin Chapter, American Planning Association