

PUP 520 – Syllabus
PLANNING THEORY and PROCESSES
School of Planning – ASU
Version 1.0 (August 10, 2007)
- FALL 2007 -

Class schedule: Tuesdays 6:05-8:55 PM
Classroom: CDN62

=====

Instructor: Carlos Balsas, PhD, AICP

Office: CDN#77

Office hours: Tuesdays & Thursdays 1:45-2:45 PM or by appointment

Office phone number: (480) 727-7336

Email: balsas@asu.edu

Home page: <http://www.public.asu.edu/~cbalsas/>

=====

1. CATALOG DESCRIPTION: This course reviews past and current theoretical developments related to perspectives about planned environments, the role and ethics of planners.

2. PREREQUISITES: This course is designed for graduate students. Advanced undergraduates may also enroll in this course with instructor approval.

3. GENERAL DESCRIPTION: Planning theory, processes and ethics are critical dimensions of the urban and regional planning profession. Planning theory enables our understanding of why we do things in a certain way and not in another. It provides a rationale for professional practice. Planning is an active and continuous set of processes about how we enable or constrain decisions about the use of land, the allocation of scarce resources, the building of new facilities and the renovation of older ones, etc. Planning ethics and values guide our professional choices. In fact, the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) certification requires that we practice planning in accordance with the Institute's code of ethics. This is the bylaw which you will turn to when dealing with the subject (e.g. different planning specializations, such as housing, urban growth, transportation, land use, etc.) and processes (e.g. methods, plans and decision making, public participation, scenario analysis, policy recommendations, etc.) of the profession. By the end of the semester you are expected to recognize that planning theories, processes and ethics are not auxiliary subjects that you had to study in order to get your degree but frameworks which will enable and guide your future professional practice.

4. LEARNING GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

- To understand the meaning of planning and its diversity of subjects and processes
- To examine the relevance of planning theories and ethics
- To characterize, compare and discuss contemporary planning theories, their applications, shortcomings and evolutionary trends
- To develop a meaningful and well articulated personal position on why we need planning ethics and theory
- To know the main principles of the AICP code of ethics and to critically use them to assess different types and scales of urban and regional problems

5. GROUND RULES: You are required to attend ALL classes and actively participate in discussions. You should be punctual and not be disruptive. Class absence will only be accepted in

case of major emergency or University-sanctioned activities. In accordance with the University's policy, students should notify the instructor before missing a class.

You are bound by the student code of conduct (see: http://www.abor.asu.edu/1_the_regents/policymanual/chap5/chapter_v.htm#5-308) and will be held responsible for any infringements to it (e.g. academic dishonesty, cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, etc.). Students with disabilities who have special needs should see the Disability Resource Center (DRC) office (see: <http://www.asu.edu/studentaffairs/ed/drc/>). Before requesting special accommodations to the instructor, students must obtain a written document stating their disability from the DRC office.

6. COMMUNICATION and ASSIGNMENTS: Outside of classroom, communication between students and instructors will be done through MyASU, email, in person during office hours or by appointment. Assignments should be uploaded on the digital drop box on the due date before class starts. In addition, you must turn in a (double-sided) hard copy in class. I will collect all your email addresses and other pertinent information on the first day of classes. You must check your email and the announcements page on MyASU website everyday. I will post and /or send you regular updates, links to relevant online articles, events and organizations, etc. To ensure delivery, please make sure that your mailbox is not full. All emails should indicate the course number on the subject line (PUP520) and be followed by a very short description of its content.

7. REQUIRED READINGS: This course uses a collection of journal, magazine, conference and newspaper articles. All reading materials can be found on the course's blackboard MyASU website. These materials are downloadable and printable PDF files.

8. EVALUATION, ASSIGNMENTS and CLASS PARTICIPATION

Your grade will be calculated according to the following grid:

	% of final grade	Deliverable due date
6 Short papers on the readings	25	Ongoing
Assignment #1	25	October 23
Assignment #2	35	December 6
Class participation	15	Ongoing
TOTAL	100	

- Grade Categories:
- A+ 99-100%
 - A 93-98%
 - A- 90-92%
 - B+ 88-89%
 - B 83-87%
 - B- 80-82%
 - C+ 78-79%
 - C 70-77%
 - D 60-69%
 - E 0-59%

All assignments are individual. No group assignments will be allowed since you will have ample opportunity for group discussions and activities during class time. Late assignments are penalized by 20% per day after the due date. All assignments should be sent in a WORD document file, with a line

spacing of 1.5 and an indication of the total number of words. All assignments should be proofread and carefully checked for spelling errors.

8.1 Six Short Papers on the Readings: You should read and prepare the required readings prior to class. You should submit 6 typed 2-page papers on the central ideas of the readings (about 700-750 words). You choose when to write these assignments. These short essays should not only summarize the readings but also include your personal opinions but also critically discuss their content and their applicability to real world situations and to your own understanding of planning theory and practice. You should give personal and/or professional examples to illustrate the main ideas of those papers. I will collect them immediately after class. The purpose of writing these short papers is to make sure that you read the articles before class and also that you are able to actively participate in class discussions and group activities.

8.2 Assignment #1 – Great Planning Theory Book or Great Urban Intellectual: This assignment allows you to either analyze a great planning theory book or to discuss the contribution of a great urban intellectual to the planning profession and to societal knowledge. No matter which topic you choose, your assignment must be between 2,500 and 3,000 words (approximately 7 pages with 1.5 spacing).

8.2.1 Assignment #1A – Great Planning Theory Book: You can choose a book from a list that I will provide you in class or you can propose your own book. Students should give preference to books by a single author, but edited volumes with multiple authors will be accepted. All books have to be approved by the instructor. You can use a book review format (for tips on writing professional book reviews see: <http://www.geo-publishing.org/>) but you must do it in a critical and engaging manner. Simply describing or reiterating the book's content will not be acceptable.

Some of the questions you must answer in this assignment are:

- What is/are the author(s) main claim(s) or argument(s)?
- What planning theory does (s)he discuss?
- How is the book organized?
- Does (s)he present or contrast an evolutionary perspective of planning theories or does (s)he propose a totally new theory?
- Does (s)he provide enough evidence of the need to maintain / revamp a certain planning theory?
- Does (s)he take into consideration current planning practice and contemporary societal phenomena such as: globalization, new technologies, social equity and diversity, sustainable development, citizenship, etc?

8.2.2 Assignment #1B – Great Urban Intellectual: There is disagreement across disciplinary boundaries on what constitutes an “urban intellectual”. In fact, different publics portray the relevance of those who shape their scholarly and practice agendas differently. Nonetheless, an intellectual is commonly understood to be a thinker, a scholar, someone capable of articulating and reasoning a theory, of conveying a vision, a major idea or simply a concept. Urban intellectuals can have great political influence. Their ideas are used to legitimize (or oppose) public interventions in cities and nations. Many critical public decisions at all levels of intervention are taken based on the influence of intellectuals' proposals and ideas. And huge amounts of funds are diverted to projects that would not be funded otherwise.

Some of the topics you can address in this assignment are:

- Why do you consider her/him a great urban intellectual?
- What is/are the intellectual's main contribution(s) to the field of urban and regional planning?
- What are her/his main ideas, concepts and claims? Would you call her/him a visionary?

- Did her/his ideas represent a break with the dominant vision and established order of her/his time?
- How did your chosen intellectual shape or influence urban development and the planning profession?
- How prevalent are her/his ideas? What allowed or inhibited the proliferation of her/his ideas?
- What are the three major works (e.g. plans, books, videos, articles) that best describe your intellectual?
- Does your intellectual incorporate theoretical and/or ethical considerations in her/his work and writings?
- Which of your findings about the contribution of your intellectual surprised you the most and why?

8.3 Assignment #2 – Main Research Paper: This assignment enables you to articulate in a concise and coherent way your own theory of planning. How many times have we all used the expression: “if I were God?!... I would do [this...and that...].” I want you to take this opportunity to write your own *grand* planning theory. You should write between 5000 and 5500 words (approximately 15 pages with 1.5 spacing). This total does not include your reference list. In your writing you are required to explicitly engage with 7 of the class readings and use 12-15 other references of your own choice. 7 of your own references should have been published during or after 2000.

8.4 Class Participation: Attendance and active participation is a significant requirement of this course. Class participation has to be meaningful and respectful of other’s opinions. You should read and prepare the readings prior to class. This way you will always be ready to answer instructor’s questions and participate in class discussions and group activities.

9. CLASS SCHEDULE, LECTURE TOPICS AND READINGS

NOTE: Syllabus entries are subject to modification as needed. Guest speakers will be invited to address specific topics. And we might have a field trip as well. Details will be provided later.

1st WEEK – August 21 Introduction and syllabus overview

2nd WEEK – August 28 Evolution of American city planning and introduction to planning theory

Required readings:

- Hall, P. (1989) The turbulent eighth decade: challenges to American city planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 55(3): 275-282.
- Stiftel, B. (2000) Planning theory (pp.4-12). In: American Institute of Certified Planners. *The National AICP Examination Course Guidebook 2000*. Washington D.C.: AICP.
- Balsas, C. (2007) *Encyclopedia entry - City Planning* (v.1 pp.157-160). Goldfield, D. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of American Urban History*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.

Suggested readings:

- Teitz, M. (1997) American Planning in the 1990s: Evolution, Debate and Challenges. *Urban Studies*, 33(4-5), 649-672.
- Teitz, M. (1997) American Planning in the 1990s: The Dilemma of the Cities. *Urban Studies*, 34(5-6), 775-796.

3rd WEEK – September 4 Guest presentation on library resources by Deborah Koshinsky; Justifications for planning, market-oriented planning and complexity

Required readings:

- Klosterman, R. (1985) Arguments for and against planning. *Town Planning Review*, 56(1): 5-20.
- Staley, S. and Scarlett, L. (1998) Market-oriented planning: principles and tools for the 21st century. *Planning Markets*, 1(1): online (<http://www-pam.usc.edu/volume1/v1i1a5s1.html>).

- Richardson, H. and Gordon, P. (1993) Market planning: Oxymoron or common sense? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59(3): 347-52.
- Banerjee, T. (1993) Market Planning, Market Planners and Planned Markets: A Commentary, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59(3): 353-360.

Suggested readings:

- Christensen, K. (1999) Ch.7 Conducting public policy in conditions of uncertainty. (pp.115-149). *Cities and Complexity, making intergovernmental decisions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Fainstein, S. (2005) Planning theory and the city. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 25: 121-130.

➔ ASSIGNMENT #1 - 1st deliverable due (proposed theory BOOK [#1A] or urban INTELLECTUAL [1B])

4th WEEK – September 11 Rational-comprehensive planning and incrementalism

Required readings:

- Lindblom, C. (original 1959) The science of ‘muddling through’ (pp.196-209). Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. – Eds. (2003) *Readings in planning theory*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Brooks, M. (2002) Ch.6 Centralized rationality: the planner as applied scientist (pp.81-96). *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Washington D.C.: Planners Press.
- Brooks, M. (2002) Ch.7 Centralized non-rationality: the planner confronts politics (pp.97-106). *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Washington D.C.: Planners Press.

Suggested readings:

- Harris, B. (1985) Rationality and its enemies. (pp.60-76). In: Breheny, M. and Hooper, A. (Eds.) *Rationality in Planning: Critical Essays on the Role of Rationality in Urban and Regional Planning*. London: Pion.

5th WEEK – September 18 Policy analysis, scientific approaches and wicked problems

Required readings:

- Etzioni, A. (1967) Mixed-scanning: a ‘third approach to decision-making. *Public Administration Review*, 27: 385-392.
- Sawicki, D. (1988) Ch.3 Policy analysis (pp.54-74). In: Catanese, A. and Snyder, J. (Eds.) *Urban Planning* (second edition). San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Rittel, H. and Webber, M. (1973) Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2): 155-169.

Suggested readings:

- Bryson, J. and Crosby, B. (1996) Planning and the design and use of forums, arenas and courts (pp.462-482). In: Mandelbaum, S.; Mazza, L. and Burchell, R. (Eds). *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

6th WEEK – September 25 Advocacy, equity and progressive planning

Required readings:

- Davidoff, P. (original 1965) Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning (pp.421-432). In: Legates, R. and Stout, F. (1996) *The City Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Krumholz, N. (original 1999) Equitable approaches to local economic development (p.224-236). In: Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. – Eds. (2003) *Readings in planning theory*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Campbell, S. (2005) Is ‘Progress’ No Longer Progressive? Reclaiming the Ideology of Progress in Planning. Forthcoming in *the Journal of the American Planning Association*. (see: <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~sdcamp/up540/Campbell,progress,draft.pdf>)

Suggested readings:

- Harvey, D. (1992) Social justice, postmodernism and the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 16(4): 588-601.

➔ ASSIGNMENT #1 - 2nd deliverable DUE (a 500 word preliminary overview of your approved theory BOOK [#1A] or approved urban INTELLECTUAL [#1B])

7th WEEK – October 2 Planning as argumentation and strategic planning

Required readings:

- Forester, J. (original 1989) Planning in the face of power (pp. 437-456). In: Stein, J. – Ed. (1995) *Classic Readings in Urban Planning*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Kaufman, J. and Harvey, J. (1987) A public planning perspective on strategic planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 53(1): 23-33.
- Forester, J. (1996) Argument, power and passion in planning practice. (pp.241-262). In: Mandelbaum, S.; Mazza, L. and Burchell, R. (Eds). *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Suggested readings:

- Healey, P. (2002) From Collaborative Planning, shaping places in fragmented societies. (pp.490-501). In: Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (Eds.) *The Blackwell City Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

8th WEEK – October 9 Planning and politics

Required readings:

- Levy, J. (2006) Planning and politics (pp.82-93 + pp.355-360). *Contemporary Urban Planning*, seventh edition. Uppersaddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Krumholz, N. and Forester, J. (1995) To be professionally effective, to be politically articulate (pp.456-468). In: Stein, J. (Ed.) *Classic Readings in Urban Planning*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Brooks, M. (1996) Planning and political power: toward a strategy for coping (pp.116-133). In: Mandelbaum, S.; Mazza, L. and Burchell, R. (Eds). *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Suggested readings:

- Hoch, C. (1994) Planning deliberation and politics (pp.291-318). *What planners do – power, politics and persuasion*. Washington D.C.: Planners Press.

➔ ASSIGNMENT #2 - Email a 500-word synopsis of your RESEARCH PAPER to the instructor.

9th WEEK – October 16 Postmodernism planning and urbanism

Required readings:

- Harvey, D. (1994) *The Condition of Postmodernity – an enquire into the origins of cultural challenge*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers (pp.66-98).
- Ellin, N. (1999) Ch.5 Themes of postmodern urbanism (pp.155-193). *Postmodern Urbanism – revised edition*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Sandercock, L. (2003) The modernist city, the modern state, and modernist planning (pp.27-35). *Cosmopolis II – Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century*. New York City: Continuum.

Suggested readings:

- Sandercock, L. (1999) A portrait of postmodern planning: Anti-hero and/or passionate pilgrim. *Plan Canada*, 39(2):12-15.

10th WEEK – October 23 Diversity issues in planning theory

Required readings:

- Sandercock, L. and Forsyth, A. (original 1992) A gender agenda: new directions for planning theory (pp.407-420). In: Legates, R. and Stout, F. (1996) *The City Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Fainstein, S. (2005) Cities and Diversity, Should We Want It? Can We Plan For It? *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(1): 3-19.
- Spain, D. (2005) What happened to gender relations on the way from Chicago to Los Angeles? (pp.15-30). In: Fainstein, S. and Servon, L. – Ed. *Gender and Planning*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Suggested readings:

- Reeves, D. (2001) *The 50/50 profession and mainstreaming – how will this change the context of planning?* (see: <http://www.asu.edu/caed/proceedings01/REEVES/reeves.htm>) Proceedings of the 2001 APA Conference in New Orleans.
- Jonas, M. (2007) The downside of diversity. *The Boston Globe*, August 5.

➔ASSIGNMENT #1 – 3rd deliverable: FINAL ASSIGNMENT DUE (theory BOOK [#1A] or urban INTELLECTUAL [1B])

11th WEEK – October 30 Communicative and collaborative planning theory, consensus building

Required readings:

- Innes, J. (1995) Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(3): 183-189.
- Healey, P. (2003) Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory*, 2(2): 101-123.
- Innes, J. and Booher, D. (1999) Consensus building and complex adaptive systems, a framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(4): 412-423.

Suggested readings:

- Innes, J. (2004) Consensus building, Clarifications for the critics. *Planning Theory*, 3(1): 5-20.

12th WEEK – November 6 (New) directions in planning theory, utopian planning and power

Required readings:

- Fainstein, S. (2000) New directions in planning theory. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(4): 451-478.
- Friedmann, J. (2000) The good city: in defense of utopian thinking. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(2): 460-472.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2003) Bringing power to planning research, one researcher's praxis story. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21(4): 353-366.

Suggested readings:

- Roy, A. (2006) Praxis in the time of empire. *Planning Theory*, 5(1): 7-29.
- Fainstein, S. (2006) Planning and the Just City. Paper presented at the conference Searching for the Just City. Columbia University. April 29. (see: <http://www.columbia.edu/~jwp70/justcity.html>)

13th WEEK – November 13 Planning ethics and values

Required readings:

- Kelly, E. and Becker, B. (2000) Ch.21 Planning ethics and values (pp.423-442). *Community Planning – an introduction to the comprehensive plan*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- AICP (2005) AICP Code of ethics and professional conduct. (see: <http://www.planning.org/ethics/conduct.html>).
- Grant, J. (2005) Rethinking the public interest as a planning concept. *Plan Canada*, Summer: 48-50.

Suggested readings:

- Hendler, S. (1996) On the use of models in planning ethics. (pp.400-413). In: Mandelbaum, S.; Mazza, L. and Burchell, R. (Eds). *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Watson, V. (2006) Deep Difference: Diversity, Planning and Ethics. *Planning Theory*, 5(1): 31-50.

➔ ASSIGNMENT #2 - 2nd deliverable DUE (a 2000-word overview of your research paper).

14th WEEK – November 20 Planning ethics and sustainable development

Required readings:

- Newman, P. and Kenworthy, J. (1999) Ch. 6 Promoting sustainable urban change (pp.285-305) In: *Sustainability and Cities – overcoming automobile dependence*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Campbell, S. (original 1996) Green cities, growing cities, just cities? Urban planning and the contradictions of sustainable development (pp.435-458). Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S. – Eds. (2003) *Readings in planning theory*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Beatley, T. (1994) Principles of ethical land use (pp.261-274). In: *Ethical Land Use: Principles of Policy and Planning*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Suggested readings:

- Roseland, M. (2000) Sustainable community development: integrating environmental, economic, and social objectives. *Progress in Planning*, 54(2): 73-132

15th WEEK – November 27 Creative cities and planning challenges

Required readings:

- Florida, R. (2003) Cities and the Creative Class. *City and Community*, 2(1): 3-19.
- Fainstein, S. (1999) Can we make the cities we want? (pp.249-272). In: Beauregard, R. and Body-Gendrot, S. (Eds.) *The urban moment: cosmopolitan essays on the late-20th-century city*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sanyal, B. (2000) Planning's three challenges (pp.312-333). In: Rodwin, L. and Sanyal, B. (Eds.) *The Profession of City Planning: Changes, Images and Challenges 1950-2000*. New Brunswick: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Suggested readings:

- Peck, J. (2005) Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4): 740–770.
- Sandercock, L. (2004) Towards a planning imagination for the 21st century. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(2): 133-141.

16th WEEK

➔ ASSIGNMENT #2 (Final Research Paper) DUE at 5:00PM on Thursday, December 6.