

UP501 / Planning History and Theory / Fall 2020
Professor: Rolf Pendall (rpendall@illinois.edu)
TA: Faizaan Qayyum (qayyum2@illinois.edu)

Class sessions: Monday and Wednesday, 9:00-10:20 AM, 223 Temple Buell Hall and online
Office hours:

- Rolf: Mon / Thurs 3:00-4:00 PM online at <https://illinois.zoom.us/j/96223661281?pwd=MXdpcnB3UVdrdlICU1N5NkRLSWg5dz09>
Faizaan: Wed 11-12 noon, online at <https://illinois.zoom.us/j/99012009530?pwd=QzBjck-EyQ2VjTzdLektSRHBwb2RHZz09>

Planners are agents of change in neighborhoods, cities, regions, and nations. UP 501 introduces views about how that change process has worked in the past, still works today, and needs to evolve so that the field can respond to the climate emergency while also making communities more democratic, equitable, and inclusive. The course's key objective is to provide a firmer foundation as you define yourself as a change agent and enter the field of planning.

Course objectives

The course will have succeeded if, after taking it, you:

- **Understand theories of change**, combining elements of technique, policy, politics, and narrative, and begin developing your own theory of change.
- **Understand the evolution and interrelationship among key planning approaches and theoretical perspectives on them**, including (rational) comprehensive planning; incremental, strategic, and communicative planning; advocacy and equity planning; and radical/insurgent planning
- **Are familiar with the ethical codes of professional planning** in the U.S., their strengths, and their limitations

The idea(s) of the class

This class and UP 504 (Urban History and Theory) provide complementary and sometimes overlapping perspectives on how cities work and why (UP 504) and how planning developed and how it works (UP 501). Both courses are introductory, but as graduate courses they're demanding and will rarely be redundant even for students with some background in planning. We require MUP students to take them because DURP's faculty think it's important for all our students to have a common grounding in the way cities and planning work. This year, UP 501 will be taught in the first semester, followed by UP 504 in spring 2021.

Furthermore, the MUP degree is accredited by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) (<https://www.planningaccreditationboard.org/>), whose 2017 standards (https://www.planningaccreditationboard.org/index.php?s=file_download&id=500) require programs to demonstrate that every graduate has studied (among other things) certain elements of planning knowledge, skills, and values and ethics. See pp. 10-11 of the standards if you want to see the complete list. UP 501 contributes to these criteria:

1. Elements of general planning knowledge, including
 - a. Purpose and Meaning of Planning: why planning is undertaken by communities, cities, regions, and nations, and the impact planning is expected to have.
 - b. Planning Theory: behaviors and structures available to bring about sound planning outcomes.
 - c. The Future: relationships between past, present, and future in planning domains, as well as the potential for methods of design, analysis, and intervention to influence the future.

- d. Global Dimensions of Planning: interactions, flows of people and materials, cultures, and differing approaches to planning across world regions.
2. Values and ethics, including
 - a. Professional Ethics and Responsibility: key issues of planning ethics and related questions of the ethics of public decision-making, research, and client representation (including the provisions of the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, and APA's Ethical Principles in Planning).
 - b. Equity, Diversity and Social Justice: key issues in equity, diversity, and social justice that emphasize planners' role in expanding choice and opportunity for all persons, plan for the needs of the disadvantaged, reduce inequities through critical examination of past and current systems and disparities, and promote racial and economic integration.
 - c. Governance and Participation: the roles of officials, stakeholders, and community members in planned change.

UP 501 has two segments.

- **Theories of change and the future** lays out a framework for the whole class. Planners use *techniques* (like making a map or interviewing a resident) as parts of *actions* (like a neighborhood conditions survey) to yield certain *outputs* (like a neighborhood plan) meant to lead to medium- and long-term *outcomes* (like stability, environmental quality, or vitality). Planners work within the context of *policies* that provide support for actions, *politics* that yield or overturn policies, and *narratives* or stories that build agendas and fuel campaigns. This first section includes two full-week case studies, one on racial residential segregation and the other on the global climate emergency. Together, these two case-study weeks contribute material to reflect on the class's central question: **How can we make amends for past injustices while responding to the most serious threat our species has ever faced?**
- **Histories, theories, and ethics of planning**, the second section, introduces and provides historical examples of three main streams of planning: rational/comprehensive planning, equity planning, and radical or insurgent planning. Each of these streams has its own history, each often responding to perceived shortcomings of the other ways as practiced at the time. Planning ethics as understood in the PAB accreditation guidelines are embedded in the history of professional planning practice, so we learn about planning ethics within this section.

Assignments

The due dates and times for all these assignments are firm. Late submissions will be allowed only for sudden and/or severe illness, family crisis, or mental health challenges (please see below for more discussion of mental health challenges). Please check with the TA as soon as you know you may need permission to hand in a late submission. Please raise more serious issues with the professor or your advisor. Complete information about all the assignments appears at the end of this syllabus.

Chronological summary of assignments

Date	Deliverable	Submission Details	Points
8/28	Asst 1: What does planning mean to you now?	Video (4-5min) <u>or</u> text (550-700 words) Submit on Compass Discussion Board	5
9/17	Asst 3: Pick your plan	Submit on Compass Discussion Board	5
9/25	Asst 2a. Prepare and Repair	Short essay (800-1000 words) Submit on Compass Assignment link	5

10/7	Asst 3: First draft submission	Part 1: Text (1000-1500 words) Part 2: Diagram + text (500 words) Submit on Compass Discussion Board	10
10/16	Asst 3: Final submission	Revisions to first draft (Parts 1 & 2) Part 3: Text (1000-1500 words) Part 4: Text (800-1200 words) Submit on Compass Assignment link	15
10/23	Asst 2b: Formal planning & informal city-making	Short essay (800-1000 words) Submit on Compass Assignment link	7
10/30	Asst 4: High-level outline	Text outline Submit on Compass Assignment link	4
11/13	Asst 4: Draft storyboard and talking points or script	Draft storyboard for video (7 mins) Submit on Compass Assignment link	4
11/20	Asst 2c: Equity planning, planning ethics, and radical challenges	Short essay (800-1000 words) Submit on Compass Assignment link	8
12/4	Asst 4: Presentation draft of video	Draft video (7 mins) Submit on Compass Discussion Board	5
12/8	Asst 4: Peer reviews of 2 other videos	Submit on Compass Assignment link	8
12/16	Asst 4: Final cut of video	Final video (7 mins) Submit on Compass Assignment link	14
12/18	Asst 5: What does planning mean to you now?: Revised	Video (<8 mins) or text (400 words) Submit on Compass Assignment link	10

Grading: Conversion table

Converting numeric scores to letter grades

	-		+
A	90-93	94-100	N/A
B	80-83	84-86	87-89
C	70-73	74-76	77-79
D	60-63	64-66	67-69
F	NA	0-59	NA

Converting letter grades to numeric scores (if we ever grade an assignment with a letter grade)

	-		+
A	92	95	N/A
B	82	85	88
C	72	75	78
D	62	65	68
F		59	

Assignments that are not turned in at all will receive a grade of zero.

Expectations

Participation

- Build your skills in listening and conversing. Learning is a social process and collective endeavor; therefore, your primary responsibility is active participation. Active participation entails attending class, listening carefully and speaking respectfully in the classroom, and engaging in

other class activities as both a learner and a contributor to your colleagues' learning. Not everyone is assertive in class discussions, and some people are always ready to speak. My role as a professor will be to broker and guide our conversations so everyone builds their skills as listeners and as participants. The online discussions are important supplements in this process.

- Do the readings and use them as the basis of your participation.
 - Conversations about planning theory and history can't be evidenced unless everyone reads the assignments. This means everyone must do the required readings assigned to specific weeks and use them as the basis for their active participation in and beyond the classroom.
 - How to read the plans: On some weeks, the readings include one or two "example plans." Please **don't read every detail in these plans**, which are sometimes long and more specific to their situations than you need to know, but **do engage with them**. At the least, skim them and think about where they may have come from, why they were created, what their logic is, and their strengths and weaknesses as social-change documents. (This repetition of earlier text is deliberate.)
- If you're not attending synchronously, work with the TA and me to identify a time when we can have a supplementary conversation.

Inclusivity and Professionalism

The Department of Urban and Regional Planning (DURP) is committed to creating an environment of inclusion and opportunity that is rooted in the responsibility of practicing planners to adhere to the highest standards of professionalism and integrity while serving the public interest. Students who contribute to a learning environment that is respectful and inclusive are preparing to excel in a culture of ethical behavior as professionals. Urban planning students develop the knowledge and skills of professional planners in the classroom and in community based projects, where they act as planners in training. Therefore, DURP expects all students to meet the goals outlined in the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct for planners as well as standards in the University of Illinois Student Code. For more information, go to: <http://www.urban.illinois.edu/about-durp/our-mission/commitment-to-inclusion>.

Attendance

We hope everyone will be able to attend the synchronous sessions. We'll take attendance so we can stay informed about who's staying engaged with the class. We won't grade attendance or penalize anyone for not joining a synchronous session.

Some of you live in the area and intend to participate synchronously entirely online; others intend to attend in person. We'll find out during the first week of class how many people will attend in person. To attend in person, you'll need a laptop, earbuds, and a microphone good enough to pick up your voice when you're speaking at a low volume in a mask. Depending on numbers, in-person attendees will be in the classroom either every session or on a single fixed day of the week (Monday or Wednesday). For those of you attending in person (starting August 31 until the last class session before Fall Break), here's how I hope it will work.

- Arrive at TBH soon enough after it opens at 8:00 to pass the screening and visit the rest room if you need to.
- Arrive at 223 TBH by 8:45 AM.
- Find a seat and get your laptop and earbuds set up. Make sure you have a microphone sensitive enough to pick up your voice even though you're wearing a mask.
- Log in to the Zoom session.

For those of you attending synchronously from another location: I hope to log in to the class session by about 8:30 every morning, so if you want to chat before class please feel free. After fall break, we will all be entirely online.

If you usually attend synchronously but miss a synchronous session, please let the TA know the reason why you missed and have a conversation about how you can meet the learning objectives for that class session. If you usually attend synchronously but miss multiple sessions, the TA and/or the instructor will be in touch with you to ensure your progress in the class.

If you can't attend synchronously, the instructor and the TA will check in with you to figure out how we can maintain some face-to-face contact over the semester. The plenary portions of all the sessions will be recorded for Zoom playback; we may set up additional discussion sessions if that seems helpful.

Academic Integrity

Please be aware of the university guidelines regarding academic integrity, which can be found in the Student Code (<http://studentcode.illinois.edu/>). Academic dishonesty includes such things as cheating, inappropriate use of university equipment/materials, fabrication of information, plagiarism (presenting someone else's work from *any* source as your own), and so on. All forms of academic dishonesty will be considered a serious offense of university policy. Students committing any form of academic dishonesty will be reported to their home department, the College of Fine and Applied Arts, and to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline. Any student who violates the university academic integrity policy will receive a failing grade for this course.

Getting in touch outside class: Emails, office hours, other appointments

There are two main categories of things we'll take care of outside class.

Many issues will be urgencies, emergencies, clarifications, and logistical. For fast responses to questions and concerns about these issues, please always start with the TA unless you're positive the issue is something that requires my response. If the TA needs to refer the question to me, they'll forward it and let you know they've done so. I'll get back to you as soon as possible with a cc to the TA. If the TA's answers don't suffice please email me, make an appointment, or come to me during my office hours.

The other category of things to take care of outside class is "thoughtful stuff," conversations about what we're learning in class and perspectives about planning. For those conversations, when you want to talk with me, start by signing up for office hours or making an appointment with either me or your TA; we all have a lot of thoughts on this material and welcome engaging with you about yours.

Counselling Center

Resources are available on campus if you find yourself in need of mental or emotional support. The Counseling Center (<https://counselingcenter.illinois.edu/>) is committed to providing a range of services intended to help students develop improved coping skills in order to address emotional, interpersonal, and academic concerns. The Counseling Center provides individual, couples, and group counseling. All of these services are paid for through the health services fee. The Counseling Center offers primarily short-term counseling, but they do also provide referrals to the community when students could benefit from longer term services.

Course calendar and required readings

All readings are in pdfs available on Compass or linked in the syllabus.

Part 1: Theories of change and the future

Week 1 (8/24 and 8/26): Theories of change

- Monday: Introductions
 - No required readings
- Wednesday: Theories of change
 - Anderson, Andrea A. 2009. *The Community Builder's Approach to Theory of Change: A Practical Guide to Theory Development*. On-line at http://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/TOC_fac_guide.pdf.
 - Country-specific theories of change at University of Cape Town, Program for Improving Maternal Health Care (PRIME), <http://www.prime.uct.ac.za/toc>. Review the cross-country diagram and two other diagrams as directed on the Compass 2g site.

Week 2 (8/31 and 9/1): Discussion / The future

- Monday: Discussion
 - Required: read (view) at least 4 other students' submissions to the Compass discussion board; each student's assignment will be posted by the end of Friday in Week 1.
- Wednesday: The Future
 - Myers, Dowell. 2007. "Promoting the Community Future in the Contest with Present Individualism," pp. 59-78 in Lewis D. Hopkins and Marisa A. Zapata, eds., *Engaging the Future: Forecasts, Scenarios, Plans, and Projects*, Cambridge, Mass.: Lincoln Institute for Land Policy.
 - Solnit, Rebecca. 2016. "Hope is an embrace of the unknown." *The Guardian*, July 15, and available at <http://rebeccasolnit.net/essay/hope-is-a%E2%80%8Bn-embrace-of-the-unknown%E2%80%8B-rebecca-solnit-on-living-in-dark-times/>. Also available by PDF on Compass 2g.

Week 3 (9/9 only): Narrative, storytelling, and imaginaries

- Monday: Labor Day holiday
- Wednesday: Narratives, stories, and alternative futures
 - Sandercock, Leonie. 2003. "Out of the closet: The importance of stories and storytelling in planning practice." *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(1), 11-28.
 - Bates, Lisa et al. 2018. Forum, "Race and Spatial Imaginary: Planning Otherwise," from *Planning Theory & Practice*, 19:2, 254-288. DOI: 10.1080/14649357.2018.1456816. Note: This collection of **nine short articles** will repay careful reading in its entirety, but you're all busy, so everyone should read the introduction, and we'll assign two additional selections for each class member to read especially deeply before the end of Week 2.
- Supplementary readings
 - Kaufman, Sanda and Janet Smith. 1999. "Framing and Reframing in Land Use Change Conflicts." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 16(2), 164-180.
 - Roberts, Andrea R. 2018. "Performance as place preservation: The role of storytelling in the formation of Shankleville community's Black counterpublics." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 5(3), 146-165.
 - Waitt, Gordon and Gorman-Murray, Andrew. 2011. "Journeys and returns: Home, life narratives and remapping sexuality in a regional city." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(6), 1239-1255.

Week 4 (9/14 and 9/16): Racial apartheid case study

- Monday: Building racial apartheid in the U.S., and its costs (narrative)

- Coates, Ta-Nehisi. 2014. “The case for reparations.” *The Atlantic*, June. Available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/06/the-case-for-reparations/361631/>.
 - Note, my list of required readings is too long, but if you have time for just one other reading, it would be Nikole Hannah-Jones’s searing essay for the *New York Times* magazine on June 24, 2020: *What is Owed?* See <https://www.ny-times.com/interactive/2020/06/24/magazine/reparations-slavery.html>.
- Rothstein, Richard. 2017. “Racial Zoning,” Chapter 3 in *The Color of Law*, pp. 39-58. New York: Liveright Publishing Corp.
 - Suggested, not required: A conversation between Ta-Nehisi Coates and Richard Rothstein, May 21, 2017, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9Pb6y9rNKmo>. It looks really long (an hour and 20 minutes), but the conversation is only about 40 minutes because the intro is about 6 minutes and there’s a long q and a at the end.
- Garcia-Hallett, Janet, Like, Toya, Torres, Theresa, & Irazábal, Clara. 2020. “Latinxs in the Kansas City Metro Area: Policing and Criminalization in Ethnic Enclaves.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 40(2), 151–168.
- Wednesday: How can planners change racial apartheid?
 - Metropolitan Planning Council. 2017. “The Cost of Segregation.” Chicago: MPC. Available at <https://www.metroplanning.org/costofsegregation/cost.aspx>.
 - Metropolitan Planning Council. 2018. “Our Equitable Future: A Roadmap for the Chicago Region.” Chicago: MPC. Available at <https://www.metroplanning.org/uploads/cms/documents/cost-of-segregation-roadmap.pdf>.
- Recommended readings on racism and racialization
 - The *New York Times* **1619 Project**, which commemorates the arrival of the first Africans enslaved by English colonists on the shores of territory currently within the United States.*
 - The American Anthropological Society’s long standing project RACE: Are We so Different? at <http://understandingrace.org/>. This includes sections on history, human variation, and lived experience, with a short but useful video called “The Story of Race” embedded in the History section.
- Supplementary readings (many good books on the subject):
 - Danielson, Michael. 1976. *The Politics of Exclusion*.
 - Hirsch, Arnold. 1983. *Making the Second Ghetto*.
 - Jackson, Kenneth. 1985. *Crabgrass Frontier*.
 - Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid*.
 - Sugrue, Thomas. 1996. *Origins of the Urban Crisis*.
 - Thomas, June M. and Marsha Ritzdorf (eds.). 1996. *Urban Planning and the African-American Community: In the Shadows*.
 - Satter, Beryl. 2009. *Family Properties*.
 - The entirety of Rothstein 2017, *The Color of Law*.
 - Trounstein, Jessica. 2018. *Segregation by Design*.

Week 5 (9/21 and 9/23): Climate emergency case study: Narrative, politics, policy, actions

- Monday: Narratives (note: These are pretty short, and the first four resources are not on the Compass site)

* The first enslaved Africans in the Americas arrived with Spanish explorers in the early 1500s, as recounted by Ciara Torres-Spelliscy in a recent [Washington Post comment](#).

- Hayhoe, Katharine. 2016. “How do we know this climate change thing is even real?” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m50bYJX2i6I> . One of her early videos in the series “Global Weirding.” They’re all short and worth looking at.
- Moore, Patrick. 2015. “What they haven’t told you about climate change.” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RkdbSxyXftc> . This video has been viewed over 2.6 million times. I do not endorse the presenter’s views.
- Wallace-Wells, David. 2017. “The Uninhabitable Earth.” *New York Magazine*, July, <http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2017/07/climate-change-earth-too-hot-for-humans.html>.
- Chapman, D. A., Lickel, B., & Markowitz, E. M. (2017). Reassessing emotion in climate change communication. *Nature Climate Change*, 7(12), 850.
- Wednesday: Policy and action
 - Fort Collins, Colorado. Department of Environmental Services. 2015. 2015 Climate Action Plan: Framework. Available on Compass site and from <https://www.fcgov.com/climateaction/reports.php>.
- Supplementary readings for this week
 - Jacobs, Fayola. 2019. “Black feminism and radical planning: New directions for disaster planning research.” *Planning Theory*, 18(1), 24–39.
 - Kleres, J., & Wettergren, Å. 2017. Fear, hope, anger, and guilt in climate activism. *Social Movement Studies*, 16(5), 507-519.
 - Knaggård, Åsa, 2014. “What do policy-makers do with scientific uncertainty? The incremental character of Swedish climate change policy-making.” *Policy Studies*, 35(1), 22–39.
 - Davidson, D., Rollins, C., Lefsrud, L., Anders, S., & Hamann, A. 2018. “Just don’t call it climate change: Climate-skeptic farmer adoption of climate mitigative practices.” *Environmental Research Letters* 14 (034015).

Part 2: Histories and theories of planning

Week 6 (9/28 and 9/30): Planning roots: Beautiful and rational

- Monday: European/North American
 - Hall, Peter. 1992. “The Seers,” Chapter 3 in *Urban and Regional Planning*, 3d ed., pp 30-62. London: Routledge.
 - Kaiser, Edward J. and David R. Godschalk. 1995. “Twentieth Century Land Use Planning: A Stalwart Family Tree.” *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61(3), 365-385.
- Wednesday: Exporting the comprehensive-rational model
 - Macedo, Joseli. 2013. “Planning a sustainable city: The making of Curitiba, Brazil.” *Journal of Planning History*, 12(4), 334-353.
 - Miraftab, Faranak. 2012. “Colonial present: legacies of the past in contemporary urban practices in Cape Town, South Africa.” *Journal of Planning History*, 11(4), 283-307.
- Supplementary readings for this week
 - Allmendinger, Philip. 2017. “Systems and Rational Theories of Planning,” Chapter 3 in *Planning Theory*, 3d ed., pp. 53-80.
 - Black, Alan. 1990. The Chicago Area Transportation Study: Case Study of Rational Planning. *Journal of Planning Education & Research*, 10 (1): 27-37.
 - Omolo-Okalebo, Fredrick, Tigran Haas, Inga Britt Werner, and Hannington Sengendo. 2010. “Planning of Kampala city 1903-1962: the planning ideas, values, and their physical expression.” *Journal of Planning History*, 9(3), 151-169.

- Follador, Débora, Fábio Duarte, and Mario Carrier. 2020. "Institutional Arrangements and Political Shifts in Curitiba, Brazil: a comparative analysis of the 2004 and 2014 Master Plans." *Journal of Planning History*, 19(2), pp.112-128. (Useful follow-on to Macedo (2013) about comprehensive planning in Curitiba after democratic elections brought the progressive Workers' Party to power. TL;dr: Technocracy survives in the planning office.)

Week 7 (10/5 and 10/7): Alternatives to "comprehensive," "rational" planning

- Monday: Mainstream critiques and the strategic planning alternative
 - Lindblom, Charles. 1959. The Science of "Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review*, 19, 2: 79-88.
 - Altshuler, Alan. 1965. "The goals of comprehensive planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31(3), 186-195.
 - Poister, Theodore H. and Gregory Streib. 2005. "Elements of strategic planning and management in municipal government: Status after two decades." *Public Administration Review*, 65(1), 45-56.
- Wednesday: Planning critiques by government-skeptical economists
 - Moore, Terry. 1978. "Why allow planners to do what they do? A Justification from Economic Theory." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 44 (4): 387-398.
 - Lai, Lawrence Wai-Chung. 2002. "Libertarians on the road to town planning: A note on the views of Robert Mundell, Karl Popper, Friedrich Hayek, Robert Nozick, Milton Friedman and Ronald Coase towards pollution." *Town Planning Review*, 73(3), 289-310.
- Supplementary readings for this week
 - Evans, Alan W. 2003. "Shouting very loudly: economics, planning and politics." *Town Planning Review*, 74(2), 195-212.

Week 8 (10/12 and 10/14): Plan logics / "Informal" city-making

- Monday: Award-winning plans: Conversation on parts 1 and 2
 - Reading: Peer-review assignments TBA
- Wednesday: "Unplanned" and informal city-building
 - Wiese, Andrew. 1999. "The other suburbanites: African American suburbanization in the North before 1950." *The Journal of American History*, 85(4), 1495-1524.
 - Roberts, Andrea. 2017. "Documenting and preserving Texas freedom colonies." *Texas Heritage*, 2 (June), 14-19.
 - Note: If you'd like to view the Texas Freedom Colonies Atlas: <https://tamu.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=48f89e0f870c4400a990682a09cf919f>.
 - Roy, Ananya. 2005. "Urban informality: Toward an epistemology of planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71(2), 147-158.

Week 9 (10/19 and 10/21): Equity planning

- Monday: Deep roots & spreading branches of equity planning
 - Flanagan, Maureen A. 1996. "The City Profitable, the City Livable: Environmental Policy, Gender, and Power in Chicago in the 1910s." *Journal of Urban History*, 22(2), 163-190.
 - Reece, Jason W. 2018. "In pursuit of a twenty-first century just city: The evolution of equity planning theory and practice." *Journal of Planning Literature*, 33(3), 299-309.
- Wednesday: Is equity planning climbing the ladder of participation?
 - Davidoff, Paul. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31: 596-615.
 - Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder Of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35:4, 216-224, DOI: 10.1080/01944366908977225.

- Contreras, Santana. 2019. "Using Arnstein's Ladder as an Evaluative Framework for the Assessment of Participatory Work in Postdisaster Haiti." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, DOI: [10.1080/01944363.2019.1618728](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2019.1618728)

Week 10 (10/26 and 10/28): From advocacy to conflict management

- Monday: Sometimes planners manage conflict effectively...
 - Forester, John. 1989. Planning in the Face of Conflict: Mediated Negotiation Strategies in Practice. Chapter 6 in *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley University of California Press, pages 82-103.
 - Innes, Judith E. 1996. "Planning through consensus building: A new view of the comprehensive planning ideal." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62(4), 460-472.
- Wednesday: ...but it's difficult.
 - Sandercock, Leonie. 2000. When Strangers become Neighbors: Managing Cities of Difference. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 1 (1): 13-30.
 - Bollens, Scott A. 2002. Urban Planning and Intergroup Conflict: Confronting a Fractured Public Interest. *JAPA*, 68, 1: 22-42.
- Recommended
 - Innes, Judith E. 2004. "Consensus building: Clarifications for the critics." *Planning Theory*, 3(1), 5-20.

Week 11 (11/2 and 11/4): Professional planning ethics

- Monday: The code of ethics of professional planning in the U.S.
 - American Institute of Certified Planners. 2016. AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode/>
 - American Planning Association. 1992. Ethical Principles in Planning. <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicalprinciples/>.
 - Lauria, Mickey and Mellone Long. 2017. Planning Experience and Planners' Ethics. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 83 (2): 202-220.
- Wednesday: Planning ethics, practitioners, and leadership: Insights from international comparison
 - Johnson, Bonnie J. 2018. "Planners as leaders: finding their comfort zone." *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 14(3): 155-178, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-04-2018-0022>.
 - Hendler, Sue. 2005. "Towards a Feminist Code of Planning Ethics." *Planning Theory & Practice*, 6 (1): 53-69.

Week 12 (11/9 and 11/11): Challenges of ethics and equity in planning today

- Monday: In planning practice
 - American Planning Association. 2019. *Planning for Equity Policy Guide*. Approved by APA Delegate Assembly, April 14, 2019; ratified by APA Board of Directors, May 14, 2019. Chicago: American Planning Association.
 - Watch: Videos from the American Planning Association's Voices of Equity project, homepage is here: <https://planning.org/diversity/voices-of-equity/>. Please view the first video; additional videos are being developed as this syllabus is being developed.
 - Solis, Miriam. 2020. "Racial Equity in Planning Organizations." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, online first. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2020.1742189>
- Wednesday: In planning education
 - García, Ivis, April Jackson, Stacy A. Harwood, Andrew J. Greenlee, C. Aujean Lee & Benjamin Chrisinger. 2020. "Like a Fish Out of Water: The Experience of African American and Latinx Planning Students." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, DOI: 10.1080/01944363.2020.1777184

- Dearborn, Lynne M. and Harwood, Stacy A. 2011. "Teaching students about complexity: reflections about an interdisciplinary community service learning studio in East St. Louis, Illinois." *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 4(2), 127-151.
- Supplementary readings this week
 - Thomas, June Manning. 2019. "Socially responsible practice: The battle to reshape the American Institute of Planners." *Journal of Planning History*, 18(4), 258-281.

Week 13 (11/16 and 11/18): External (radical) challenges to planning within the state

- Monday: Can Marxism and planning be reconciled? If so, how? (And why?)
 - Fainstein, Norman I. and Fainstein, Susan S. 1979. "New debates in urban planning: the impact of Marxist theory within the United States." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 3(1-3), 381-403.
 - Friedmann, John. 2011. The mediations of radical planning. Chapter 4 in *Insurgencies: Essays in Planning Theory* by John Friedmann. London: Routledge, pages 60-86.
- Wednesday: Insurgent planning as a response?
 - Beard, Victoria. 2003. Learning Radical Planning: The Power of Collective Action. *Planning Theory*, 2, 1: 13-35.
 - Miraftab, Faranak. 2009. Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South. *Planning Theory*, 8(1): 32-50
 - Davy, Benjamin. 2019. "Evil Insurgency: A Comment on the Interface 'Strengthening Planning's Effectiveness in A Hyper-Polarized World'," *Planning Theory & Practice*, 20(2), 290-297.

Fall break (Monday 11/23-Friday 11/27)

NOTE: Class sessions 100% online from this point forward.

Week 14 (11/30 and 12/1): Big tensions, big pictures: Sustainability, resilience, and justice

- Monday: Sustainability / Justice / Antisubordination
 - Campbell, Scott. 1996. "Green cities, growing cities, just cities?: Urban planning and the contradictions of sustainable development." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62(3): 296-312.
 - Fainstein, Susan. 2014. "The Just City." *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 18(1), 1-18, DOI: 10.1080/12265934.2013.834643.
 - Steil, Justin. 2018. "Antisubordination planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, p.0739456X18815739.
- Wednesday: From resilience to climate justice
 - Ranganathan, Malini and Bratman, Eve. 2019. "From Urban Resilience to Abolitionist Climate Justice in Washington, DC." *Antipode*. doi:10.1111/anti.12555. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/share/TXYGFPAWQ3E3ZG3UEBC?target=10.1111/anti.12555>
 - Cohen, Daniel A. 2020. "Confronting the urban climate emergency: Critical urban studies in the age of a green new deal." *City*, 24(1-2), 52-64.
- Supplementary reading this week
 - If you like Campbell (1996) and want to read an update: Campbell, Scott D. 2016. "The Planner's Triangle Revisited: Sustainability and the Evolution of a Planning Ideal That Can't Stand Still." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 82(4), 388-397.

Week 15 (12/7 and 12/9): Student presentations & course wrap-up

Assignment 1: What do you think planning means right now, and what motivated you to study it in grad school? (Due: Friday of first week.)

Date	Assignment	Points
8/28	What does planning mean to you now?	10

This first assignment can be either:

- a 4-5 minute video of yourself (speaking casually, using a few notes or prompts for yourself, but not from a script) or
- a 550- to 700-word text statement.

Please try to stay within these ranges, because the assignment for the following Monday will be for everyone in the class to review (read or view) at least 4 other students' submissions.

Turn the assignment in on the Compass Discussion Board. For tips on how to submit a video on Compass, see <https://bbhelp.cit.cornell.edu/student-use-of-video-in-blackboard/>. (Note: Compass 2g is the University of Illinois-branded version of Blackboard.) Every student should create a new thread.

Grading rubric

10 points for completion. (Make sure you familiarize yourself with how to submit your work to the Discussion board so you don't miss the deadline.)

Assignment 2: Monthly critical essays

Date	Critical essay	Points
9/25	Assignment 2a. Prepare and Repair	5
10/23	Assignment 2b: Formal planning & informal city-making	7
11/20	Assignment 2c: Equity planning, planning ethics, and radical challenges	8
	Total points for this assignment	20

Once each in September, October, and November, write a short critical essay that focuses on your most and/or least favorite readings and class sessions. The critical essay should have a main argument, taking a point of view about something you've read or that came up in class. It should cite at least three specific readings. You don't have to summarize all the readings; in fact, you could get away with writing a critical essay entirely about one day or one week of class, though you might benefit more from thinking about contrasting ideas from different class sessions or weeks.

Please be sure to include in-text citations of all the readings (Anderson 2009) as well as any particular class sessions (Pendall 2020). Please put a list of citations at the end.[†] Please put your name on it, the date, and page numbers. Please write carefully, using topic sentences for your paragraphs. Each essay should be no more than 800-1000 words of text (not including tables, figures, or citations).

Grading rubric

	Inadequate (60-70%)	Needs Improvement (70-79%)	Good (80-89%)	Excellent (90-100%)
Content (70%)	Too short, incomplete, or inaccurate presentation of facts	Summary of evidence and arguments without providing critique or synthesis; too long	Summary, synthesis, and formative critique; some depth	Insightful critique and synthesis with deep use of sources; introduction of non-required material
Presentation (30%)	Missing any of these: Name, date, page number, citations, spell-checking. Weaknesses in at least 2 of these: grammar, paragraph structure, topic sentences, introduction and conclusion. Poor or no use of images where these are called for by the assignment.	Weaknesses in grammar, paragraph structure, or topic sentences. Acceptable use of images where called for by the assignment. Minimal introduction or conclusion.	Clear and straightforward writing, easy to follow, a few rough spots in grammar or expression. Good use of images where called for. Clear introduction and conclusion.	Flowing prose with strong, active writing style, excellent organization of ideas into paragraphs (all assignments) and sections (longer assignments). Excellent and integrated use of images where called for by assignment. Strong introduction and conclusion.

[†] Example: Anderson, A.A. 2009. The Community Builder's Approach to Theory of Change: A Practical Guide to Theory Development. On-line at http://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/TOC_fac_guide.pdf
 Pendall, R. 2020. "Another confusing presentation." UP 501, September 9, 2020.

Assignment 3: What makes plans and planning award-worthy?

Date	Assignment segment	Points
9/17	Pick your plan and post to the UP 501 discussion board on Compass, indicating whether you're working with a partner	5
10/7	First draft submission to Compass discussion board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize your example Describe and diagram the planners' or community's theory of change. 	10
10/16	Final submission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize your example Describe the planners' or community's theory of change Assess the persuasive power of the example's storytelling Will the example work? 	15
	Total points for this assignment	30

For this assignment, you may work alone or with a partner. You'll produce a written document of around 4,000 words. The assignment aims to ground you with better knowledge about the following, all of which align with the course objectives:

- the impact planning is expected to have.
- behaviors and structures available to bring about sound planning outcomes.
- the potential for methods of design, analysis, and intervention to influence the future.
- key issues in equity, diversity, and social justice.

Picking a plan

Every year, the American Planning Association convenes a jury to identify, from among hundreds of submissions, a limited number of National Planning Excellence Awards and a larger number of National Planning Achievement Awards (see <https://planning.org/awards/2020/> for the most recent ones). The national planning awards each year include both “forward-looking” and “backward-looking” examples. For this project, please choose a forward-looking example—that is, something most planners would recognize as a “plan” rather than as a “best practice” or a “completed project.” We want you to develop a reasoned assessment of whether and how the plan could come true; the examples that look backward are generally already done. For example, the 2019 National Planning Excellence awards include three that look backward or honor pioneers, and two (Northeast False Creek Plan, <https://planning.org/awards/2019/false-creek/>, and Kauai County General Plan <https://planning.org/awards/2019/kauai/>) that are better candidates because they're forward-looking. Many of the topic-specific examples from the National Planning Achievement Awards will also work well (plans for economic development planning, environmental planning, resilience, transportation). It will be harder to work with those about specific measures and programs (some of the “best practice” awards), but any of these is especially appealing to you please consult with either of us. You can also scan other years of past awards: 2018 at <https://planning.org/awards/2018/>, 2017 at <https://planning.org/awards/2017/>, and so on. Please don't use the Los Alamos County Strategic Tourism Plan, because that's an assigned reading.

Once you settle on the plan you want to analyze, please do additional online research to find and download the pertinent example. If you have trouble finding it, please use the class discussion board to get suggestions from your classmates and/or let them know you haven't found it.

Assignment parts

By October 7, first draft of these two parts:

1. Summarize the example you chose. In about 1000 to 1500 words, with specific references to the example, describe who made it, how they made it, the place or community they made it for, and what they proposed. For comprehensive plans, describe the entire work at a general level, but use one or two subject-matter areas for finer-grained details.
2. Describe the planners’ or community’s theory of change. How does your example “work” to convert knowledge to action? Create a diagram that illustrates the following, and then write an explanation of about 500 words that narrates your diagram. For comprehensive plans, please limit yourself to one or two subject-matter areas.
 - a. Which actions lead to which outputs, and in turn, to which outcomes
 - b. How policies support and sustain these actions

By October 16, revised drafts of parts 1 and 2 plus final version of these two parts:

3. Assess the persuasive power of the example’s storytelling. The question of persuasive power assumes audience. Invent a representative of one important audience (any stakeholder group, or elected officials) who you think could be swayed (persuaded) by this plan. Then, in about 1000 to 1500 words, identify narrative (storytelling) devices in the plan that you think could help and/or harm the planners’ case. Explain your reasoning: that is, why do these devices work or not on this audience?
4. Will the example work? In this last part, write 800-1200 words of assessment of how well you think the plan will work and why, including both the logic of its chain of reasoning (for example, will this economic development action lead to that increase in economic vitality?) and the plan’s persuasive power (who will and won’t be persuaded by the story the plan tells). In this part, also include some thoughts about useful amendments to the plan that could improve its likelihood of coming true.

Grading rubrics

Picking the plan and first draft of parts 1 and 2 (9/17 and 10/7: Completion (full points for a timely submission of deliverables meeting the definition of a complete assignment)

Complete assignment (10/16):

	Inadequate (60-70%)	Needs Improvement (70-79%)	Good (80-89%)	Excellent (90-100%)
Content (70%)	Too short, incomplete, or inaccurate presentation of facts	Summary of evidence and arguments without providing critique or synthesis; too long	Summary, synthesis, and formative critique; some depth	Insightful critique and synthesis with deep use of sources; introduction of non-required material
Presentation (30%)	Missing any of these: Name, date, page number, citations, spell-checking. Weaknesses in at least 2 of these: grammar, paragraph structure, topic sentences, introduction and conclusion. Poor or no use of images where these are called for by the assignment.	Weaknesses in grammar, paragraph structure, or topic sentences. Acceptable use of images where called for by the assignment. Minimal introduction or conclusion.	Clear and straightforward writing, easy to follow, a few rough spots in grammar or expression. Good use of images where called for. Clear introduction and conclusion.	Flowing prose with strong, active writing style, excellent organization of ideas into paragraphs (all assignments) and sections (longer assignments). Excellent and integrated use of images where called for by assignment. Strong introduction and conclusion.

Assignment 4: Ethics, hope, future(s)

Date	Assignment segment	Points
10/30	High-level outline: A few words each on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The spatial area where you can imagine working • The future of that area (“business as usual”) • The change you want to see • Your role as a change agent 	4
11/13	Draft storyboard and talking points or script <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storyboard: Scene-by-scene visualization of the final video • Talking points: Your narration will sound more natural if you don’t script it, but you may want to start with a script and work backward. 	4
12/4	Presentation draft of video: Post to Discussion Board	5
12/8	Peer reviews of 2 other videos	8
12/16	Final cut of video	14
	Total points for this assignment	35

This assignment focuses on ethics, hope, and future(s). There’s a relationship among these:

- Ethics are situational: they guide decisions along your journey. Ethics tell you that your canoe is steering off course; you should stop, rest, and take stock; you should portage to another river; or even that you need to end the trip, go back home, and prepare for a next recreational career as a sea-kayaker.
- Hope, extending the metaphor, tells you that tomorrow will be a fine day on the river, even as you’re falling asleep in a tent leaking from a driving rainstorm. It tells you that you could see something tomorrow that makes the whole trip worthwhile.
- The future, finally, is a precondition for both hope and ethics. The connection with hope is obvious: if we didn’t have a sense of the future, we wouldn’t hope for anything. Ethics may be situational, but we have them because we know that actions now have consequences—in the future. But hope implies uncertainty, and ethics implies that your actions will matter for the future course of events. This is why, rather than relating hope and ethics to “the future,” the assignment title refers to “future(s).”

The subject matter for the assignment is an exploration of *ethics*, *hope* and/or *the future*.

1. Think about the following, at any spatial scale you want (from neighborhood to city to region to state to nation to world):
 - your sense of what future is most likely right now for that spatial area, and what evidence leads you to that conclusion
 - your hopes for something different and why you have those hopes
 - your personal theory of change: among the actions or forces that shape the future, the role you think will fit you best in the next 10 years.
2. Then prepare a video to be shown and discussed in class on December 7, capturing all three of these elements—what the future is likely to be, what (different future) you hope for, and your personal theory of change. Make sure to spend at least 40% of the video time on the third of these (the theory of change). You will also develop peer reviews for the videos by two classmates, and receive two of your own, to help you with final edits on your draft.

In case you’re stuck, think about doing one or more of these things. (Not required.)

- Find an example from the past that gives you hope about the future: a person, a movement, an invention, a place, etc. Talk about the lessons you draw from that example that will make you more effective in bringing about the change you want to see.
- Draw on insights you've gained from your classes, readings, lectures, and so on about scenario planning, community organizing, data visualization, communication, or whatever else has struck you as both a good fit for you and an effective mechanism for driving change.
- Think about a song, story, myth, legend, movie, or other element of culture that inspires you. Draw lessons from it (even if indirect!) about ethical and hopeful work in planning.

Presentation materials

Videos: Maximum of seven minutes. Make sure your video has your name, the date, the title of the work, and an indication that it was created for UP 501.

Grading rubric

First three submissions (10/30, 11/13, 12/4): Completion (full points for a timely submission of a deliverable meeting the definition of a complete assignment)

Peer reviews (12/8): Each one will be graded (4 points each) using the following rubric:

Inadequate (60-70%)	Needs Improvement (70-79%)	Good (80-89%)	Excellent (90-100%)
Only a few words ("looks good")	A few summary comments but superficial; lacking suggestions	Clear and concise suggestions, constructive feedback	Thoughtful comments on the video, constructive feedback, ideas for further exploration

Final cut of video (12/16):

	Inadequate (60-70%)	Needs Improvement (70-79%)	Good (80-89%)	Excellent (90-100%)
Quality of message or argument (60%)	Little attention to the persuasive purpose.	Does not state main argument in the beginning. No organizing framework.	Good opening but position is not fully developed.	Powerful opening which established a framework for the rest of the video. Position is debatable – one can agree or disagree.
Quality of evidence (25%)	Digresses from the main topic and /or does not draw from personal experience.	Few relevant examples and/or supportive materials. Not persuasive.	Some relevant examples and/or supportive materials but lacks detail, need more elaboration to be persuasive.	Well-chosen examples, evidence and other supporting details. Draws from personal experiences and reading materials. Provides enough detail to be persuasive.
Presentation (15%)	Just sat in front of a camera and read a script.	Good start but lacking in a major ways, for example few visual aids, monotone speaking, low quality visuals, low quality audio.	Good work but lacking in a minor way, for example, transitions rough, pace too fast.	Speaks with confidence and shows energy and passion for the topic. Presentation supported with images, graphs, music, video clips, props, etc.

Assignment 5: What do you think planning means now?

Date	Assignment	Points
12/18	What does planning mean to you now?: Revised	10

The final assignment asks you to reflect on your first assignment by annotating your first statement.

- Watch or re-read the statement you made during the first week of class.
- If you did a video: (a) summarize your main points from Assignment 1, and (b) elaborate on or critique/correct what you said in Assignment 1. Keep it shorter than 8 minutes—shorter is fine!
- If you submitted a written response: (a) use the track changes and comment functions in MS Word to edit, comment on, and elaborate on your Assignment 1. Total new material should be about 400 words.

Grading rubric

Inadequate (60-79)	Good (80-89)	Excellent (90-100)
No evolution or critique of previous statement	Builds on previous statement with examples from class readings	Full critique of previous statement reflecting reading, class discussion, and other new learning