

Zoning for Equity

Syllabus launch version: August 20, 2021

Prof. Rolf Pendall, AICP / rpendall@illinois.edu

Class sessions

Thursdays from 11:00 to 12:20, Campus Instructional Facility 1035; asynchronous material to be completed each week before the Thursday in-person session.

Course introduction and background

Planners have recognized for decades that the tools, policies, and practices of land-use planning perpetuate and reinforce inequities between white, wealthy, and native-born people, on the one hand, and Black, Latino, Asian, Native, low-income, and foreign-born people on the other. This workshop course begins from the proposition that if planners helped build American Apartheid, they can and should work to overcome this inequitable legacy by building more equitable cities and metropolitan areas. Among the many domains in which planners work, none is more important—and more exclusively the responsibility of planners—than land use. Across the U.S., by far the dominant tool of land-use planning is zoning, which was invented and adopted in the 1910s and 1920s, when white supremacist and native ideologies infused the thinking and action of professionals, scholars, and elected and appointed officials at all levels of the U.S., up to and including [President Woodrow Wilson](#).

Inequities are baked into planning and zoning differently from one U.S. state to another and even within states. Therefore, there's no one-size-fits-all approach to zoning for equity. For this reason, this workshop pilots an approach in which you'll learn the general story at the national level; dig into Illinois history, laws, and planning practices to ground that story here; and compare results and work in progress with the work of students at six other campuses about their own communities. Your final project will present recommendations on how Decatur, Peoria, and Springfield, IL, can pursue zoning for equity and will be collected into a portfolio with the final projects of planning students from UCLA, University of Utah, Florida State University, UNC-Chapel Hill, The Ohio State University, and the University of Minnesota.

Learning outcomes

In this course, students will:

- Learn the contexts and outcomes of exclusionary zoning in the U.S.
- Distinguish ways that different actors have built and reinforced exclusionary zoning
- Understand how zoning for equity has worked and been won in the past
- Discover local manifestations, outcomes, and responses to zone for equity

- Formulate local proposals to zone for equity

Course structure

This class combines the following elements:

- Weekly in-person meetings most Thursdays from 11:00 to 12:20 for active learning and teamwork on workshop projects.
- Asynchronous material each week to be completed before the start of class. The asynchronous material will include pre-recorded lectures and other material (readings, videos, podcasts, interactive data sets, etc.) that together should be equivalent to one additional classroom session (1 hour and 20 minutes) plus the additional time you would expect to spend preparing for a four-credit in-person elective course for graduate and advanced undergraduate students.
- Three to four times over the semester, collaborative learning labs (CLLs) in which you will meet with and learn from students from at least 4 of the other 6 campuses (all except Minnesota and UCLA, whose schedules don't sync with ours until later in the semester). The CLLs will be held online at the following dates and times. No class sessions will be held that week and there will be little or no asynchronous material to engage.
- Over the course of the semester, completion in three parts of an ArcGIS StoryMap about zoning for equity in Peoria, Illinois.

Session overview

The course has three parts. After the introductory week, we'll spend three weeks investigating where exclusionary zoning came from and what that looks like nationally and in Illinois, followed by the first collaborative learning lab (CLL) (week 5). In the second part, we'll spend three weeks exploring past efforts to reform zoning and land-use to make it more equitable (including, again, in Illinois) and again followed by a CLL (week 9). In the third part, we'll be cutting back on asynchronous engagement to give you and your teammates more time each week to work on the final project. In-person sessions will be devoted to discussion of work in progress. We'll do one more CLL during this third part. The class will wrap up with presentations of your work along with that from the other campuses.

Getting work done: Imitating a real planning workplace

In several ways, we'll reflect the experience of working at a private-sector consulting firm when we do this work.

First, this project will rely on a kind of teamwork common to the workplace but uncomfortable in the classroom, which obscures the hierarchies that inevitably activate in the workplace. Simply put, the boss holds the power but also has ultimate accountability for finishing the work on time and on budget. More experienced employees are responsible for tasks requiring that experience, but also for managing. This management includes downward management—helping structure and guide the work of less experienced employees—as well as managing up, i.e., managing the boss so that s/he supports the team's work and keeps expectations align with the team's capacity given the constraints of too little

time and not enough budget. Less experienced employees are responsible for their tasks, and also for managing up (keeping their supervisors up-to-date on their progress and challenges, demanding accountability).

For this to work, organizations that take on big and complicated projects build project management plans (work plans) that account for the differing roles of program managers (Senior Planner or Planning Director), project managers (Planner II), and entry-level practitioners (Planner I). Often the project managers draft the work plans and the program manager approves or tweaks it (or asks for a do-over). Work plans include milestones (deadlines), lists of critical tasks necessary to meet the deadline, and assignment of individuals to their own tasks. They almost always estimate the amount of time required to complete each task (and adjust expectations based on the available budget). In this class, this means:

- Graduate students will earn grad credit for taking on project-management roles, working within their teams to help everyone excel. Grad students have two additional assignments (a second draft and a final draft of the work plan initially developed by the full class). Other projects will be weighted somewhat lower to account for the additional effort required in these two additional assignments, but the work will equal or surpass that of the undergraduate students on those other projects.
- Undergrad students will function like entry-level planners, working with project managers to scope the project and take on tasks that match their own strengths and gaps and then focusing first on their allocated tasks.

Second, and related, consulting firms thrive or die based on their ability to match the time they spend on a project to the amount of time they're being paid for. This, in turn, requires careful scoping of work to manage the client's expectations before any contract or grant agreement gets signed, striking a balance between promising something more or better than a competitor and not overpromising in ways that lead to failure. In this class, this means:

- Teams will prepare work plans with a time budget averaging 8 hours weekly for each team member for all expected work (including both project work and reading assignments for class sessions).
- Everyone will track their tasks and the hours they spend on the class in a log they submit monthly, working early and often to ensure that work is proceeding on time.

Good communication is a critical ingredient in teamwork. You have to be a good listener, no matter where you are in the hierarchy. That sometimes means taking a deep breath and thinking about it before reacting defensively. You have to communicate both concerns and affirmation readily, seeking out in-person conversations when email or text correspondence gets in the way and always remembering to express your pleasure and satisfaction (to everyone on the team when possible) when someone does a good thing. As you express your thoughts or hear those of others, the most useful rule I know is: Always assume the best of the other person. If someone didn't finish an assignment, what else is going on in their lives? If their comments on your work seem to harsh, imagine they know you can do better and want to help you see it too. And always that they're fallible just like you are. Be open to apologies, and remember that sincere apologies defuse tensions more effectively than anything except maybe chocolate.

Evaluating one another's efforts is a central part of teamwork. If you're doing good work, it's great to be told what you're doing well. If you're making mistakes, you want to learn about them early, correct them where you can, and ask for support (training, better equipment, one-on-one coaching, etc.) where you need to. But planning doesn't have a culture of critique. We're really nice, maybe even too nice. (That doesn't stop people from grumbling behind each other's backs.) Architecture is different, maybe in the opposite direction: Public reviews and critiques are part of the culture, often exposing students and practitioners to demoralizing rather than constructive criticism. For this class, this means:

- We'll work together to design an evaluation system that you think will work to instill morale, make mutual support natural, and build everyone's skills and the quality of our work. In-progress evaluation will extend all the way to the top (your instructor).

Assignments

The project for this semester will consist of your development of an ArcGIS StoryMap on Zoning for Equity in Peoria, Illinois. You'll develop the project in three segments corresponding to the three parts of the class: First, the history of exclusionary zoning in Peoria and its nearby suburbs; second, past efforts to make zoning more equitable in the Peoria region and at the state level in Illinois; third, a proposal for a strategy that will begin or continue building Zoning for Equity in Peoria. The inspiration for this StoryMap is an outstanding example from Louisville. The first week of readings includes a PDF providing an overview of the StoryMap, which is offline at the moment because it was erroneously deleted. (I'll let you know when it's available again.)

Your StoryMap will not be limited to portraying history but also presenting a Equitable Land Use Proposal for Peoria. You will develop that proposal starting in late October by using the [2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing tool and data](#) and its [associated Guidebook](#) as a starting point. This tool and the rule that prompted it were rescinded during the 2016–2020 administration but is live again on the HUD site and seems likely to play a significant role in HUD's future requirements and technical assistance to local governments that accompany their access to federal CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and other funds.

The assignment therefore aims to hone your skills in equity analysis, plan-making, and visual storytelling.

Assignments other than these public-facing deliverables include draft work plans, self-assessments, and peer assessments. All due dates are no later than 11:59 PM.

Deliverable schedule and grading

Due dates	Deliverable type	Deliverable name	UG credit	Grad credit
9/7	Individual	Draft work plan 1: Plan for the full group with your own tasks highlighted	5%	5%
9/21	Sub-groups	StoryMap general design with initial segments on Peoria history, redlining, historic zoning, past and current segregation. Placeholder images and text blocks are OK for this draft.	15%	10%

10/1	Individual	Self- and peer assessment 1: Report on performance per the work plan up to 9/30, including weekly work log	5%	5%
10/5	Work plan redraft	Second draft of the work plan, prepared by the grad student project managers (no assignment for undergrads except revision of their own tasks)	N/A	5%
10/19	Sub-groups	StoryMap elaboration with fleshed-out historic segregation and land-use policy information plus draft recap of recent federal, state, and local efforts to make land use more equitable	15%	10%
11/5	Individual	Self- and peer assessment 2: Report on performance per the work plan up to 11/4, including weekly work log	5%	5%
11/9	Work plan redraft	Final draft of the work plan, prepared by the grad student project managers (no work for undergrads except revision of their own tasks)	N/A	5%
11/16	Sub-groups	Polished version of previous draft StoryMap + Idea list for Equitable Land Use Proposal	20%	20%
12/7	Full group	Draft version of StoryMap + linked Equitable Land Use Proposal	5%	5%
12/15	Full group	Final version of StoryMap + linked Equitable Land Use Proposal	20%	20%
12/17	Individual	Self- and peer assessment 3: Report on performance per the work plan up to 12/15, including weekly work log	10%	10%

Grading for group work

A large share of the class’s final grade will be assigned based on projects developed by the full group and sub-groups. This is an inevitable part of planning work, much of which happens in teams. Your own accounting for the work you complete and your peers’ evaluation of the timeliness and quality of your work will have a bearing on your final grade. We will collaboratively create a rubric for self- and peer evaluation near the beginning of the semester, tweaking the rubric over the semester as needed.

Self- and peer assessments 1 and 2 will be graded for completeness, but the evaluations of other people will not weigh on their final grade (and vice versa). Instead, I’ll use the results as a guide so I can consult with project managers, sub-groups, and individual students and work with class members so you can make progress toward an excellent final project. I will use self- and peer assessment 3 along with my independent judgment to assign final grades using a weighting rubric decided by the class. This is equivalent to a class participation grade, but I mean it to be more transparent and formative than participation grades sometimes are.

Engagement with stakeholders

Peoria has many civic leaders who work on equity and justice. The current mayor, Hon. Rita Ali, was among those who worked last year to establish the Peoria City/County [Joint Commission on Racial Justice and Equity](#), whose Charter you can download through [this link](#). The mission, vision, and goals of the Commission make it an excellent potential audience for our work this semester. A second nascent

effort with equity goals, the [Central Illinois Living Laboratory](#), is a partnership between the Peoria office of [Hanson, Inc.](#), and [Distillery Labs](#), one of the 15 hubs in the [Illinois Innovation Network](#). You'll receive updates early in the semester on how our team will interact with both of these groups of stakeholders.

Other things on most or all syllabi

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>.

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

Meeting: Since we remain under the indoor-mask mandate, I will be happy to meet with you virtually. Considering that this is a small class and I'm not teaching other classes this semester, it will be more efficient for all of us if you email me to set up an appointment. If it's urgent, I can usually find a time to talk within a few hours, even on the weekend. If you'd like to have a longer discussion I'd be happy to walk and talk with you individually or in small groups.

Email: I'll try to keep up with your email messages but my inbox is often crowded. If you don't hear back from me within a day, please send the same message again under the same subject heading. If you need an immediate/urgent response, make the message High priority and put "URGENT" as the first word in the subject heading.

COVID-19 safety

Following University policy, all students are required to engage in appropriate behavior to protect the health and safety of the community. Students are also required to follow the campus COVID-19 protocols.

Students who feel ill must not come to class. In addition, students who test positive for COVID-19 or have had an exposure that requires testing and/or quarantine must not attend class. The University will provide information to the instructor, in a manner that complies with privacy laws, about students in these latter categories. These students are judged to have excused absences for the class period and should contact the instructor via email about making up the work.

Students who fail to abide by these rules will first be asked to comply; if they refuse, they will be required to leave the classroom immediately. If a student is asked to leave the classroom, the non-compliant student will be judged to have an unexcused absence and reported to the Office for Student Conflict Resolution for disciplinary action. Accumulation of non-compliance complaints against a student may result in dismissal from the University.

Face coverings

All students, faculty, staff, and visitors are required to wear face coverings in classrooms and university spaces. This is in accordance with CDC guidance and University policy and expected in this class.

Please refer to the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign's COVID-19 website for [further information on face coverings](#). Thank you for respecting all of our well-being so we can learn and interact together productively.

Building Access

In order to implement COVID-19-related guidelines and policies affecting university operations, instructional faculty members may ask students in the classroom to show their Building Access Status in the Safer Illinois app or the Boarding Pass. Staff members may ask students in university offices to show their Building Access Status in the Safer Illinois app or the Boarding Pass. If the Building Access Status says "Granted," that means the individual is compliant with the university's COVID-19 policies—either with a university-approved COVID-19 vaccine or with the on-campus COVID-19 testing program for unvaccinated students.

Students are required to show only the Building Access Screen, which shows compliance without specifying whether it was through COVID-19 vaccination or regular on-campus testing. To protect personal health information, this screen does not say if a person is vaccinated or not. Students are not required to show anyone the screen that displays their vaccination status. No university official, including faculty members, may ask students why they are not vaccinated or any other questions seeking personal health information.

Counseling 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 outline

The course has three main segments, preceded by an introductory week. The dates for the “weeks” all end on the day of each week’s Thursday synchronous session.

Week 1 (8/22–26) Introduction: Theory of change

Asynchronous material: Please see detailed run of show page on Canvas for step-by-step instructions to engage with the asynchronous material. The run of show includes links to lectures, readings, non-graded quizzes, discussion/reflection questions, and changemaker interviews (video, audio, and transcriptions). Readings for this week (which you should read within the sequence of the run of show to get the benefit of introductions to the material):

- Whittemore, A. H. (2021). Exclusionary Zoning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 87(2), 167–180.
- Anderson, A. (n.d.). *The Community Builder’s Approach to Theory of Change: A practical guide to theory development*. The Aspen Institute.
- Additionally, please review this presentation PowerPoint before we meet as an example of this semester's final project: [available only on Canvas]

8/26 In-class: Introductions, discussion of syllabus and semester project, theory of change and changemaker interviews.

Part 1: Origins of exclusionary zoning

Zoning arose and became popular in the U.S. in the early 1900s, a time when the ideology of White supremacy and classist, social Darwinist attitudes were entrenched among the elites who invented the professions of city planning, landscape architecture, and real state. Some of the earliest municipal zoning ordinances explicitly designated some areas for Blacks and others for Whites, while others regulated use but were clearly motivated by prejudice. The separation of housing types was paramount. Areas intended for White elites were often zoned exclusively for single-family homes, while those intended for others received more permissive designations allowing housing, industry, and commerce to mix. Other private and public actions reinforced zoning in the ensuing decades in ways that continue to reinforce the wealth, income, and power of all Whites, especially White elites.

Week 2 (8/27–9/2) Origins of exclusive single-family neighborhoods

Asynchronous material: Please see detailed run of show page on Canvas for step-by-step instructions to engage with the asynchronous material. The run of show includes links to lectures, readings, non-graded quizzes, and discussion/reflection questions. Readings for this week (which you should read within the sequence of the run of show to get the benefit of introductions to the material):

- Jackson, K. T. (1987). Chapter 3 Home, Sweet Home: The House and the Yard. In *Crabgrass frontier: The suburbanization of the United States* (pp. 45–72). Oxford University Press.
- Nightingale, C. (2012). “Camouflaging the Color Line in Chicago.” In *Segregation: A Global History of Divided Cities* (pp. 295–331).

9/2 In-class: Discussion based on run of show asynchronous material discussion questions 1 and 2; work plan(s) introduction & development

Week 3 (9/3–9) Roaring roots of exclusionary zoning: From *Euclid* to redlining

Asynchronous material: Please see detailed run of show page on Canvas for step-by-step instructions to engage with the asynchronous material. The run of show includes links to lectures, readings, non-graded quizzes, and discussion/reflection questions. Readings for this week (which you should read within the sequence of the run of show to get the benefit of introductions to the material):

- Weiss, M. A. (1989). “The rise of the community builders: The American real estate industry and urban land planning,” in Barbara M. Kelly, *Suburbia Re-examined* (New York: Greenwood Press), 145-155.
- Hirt, S. (2015). The rules of residential segregation: US housing taxonomies and their precedents. *Planning Perspectives*, 30(3), 367–395.
- 1924 Ambler Realty Co. v. Euclid_ 297 F. 307-2.pdf
- Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365 (1926)

9/7 Deliverable due (full group): Draft work plan

9/9 In-class: Discussions of Week 3 asynchronous material and draft work plan(s)

Week 4 (9/10–16) The Postwar Years and the Open Suburbs Movement

Asynchronous material: Please see detailed run of show page on Canvas for step-by-step instructions to engage with the asynchronous material. The run of show includes links to lectures, readings, non-graded quizzes, and discussion/reflection questions. Readings for this week (which you should read within the sequence of the run of show to get the benefit of introductions to the material):

- Davidoff, P., Davidoff, L., & Gold, N. N. (1970). Suburban Action: Advocate Planning For An Open Society. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 36(1), 12–21.
- Ritzdorf, M. (1997). “Locked out of Paradise.” In *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, edited by June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 43-67.

- After these asynchronous materials and before class, please also watch this [5-minute video explainer](#) of the *Village of Arlington Heights vs. Metropolitan Housing Dev. Corp.* decision (429 U.S. 252 (1977)).

9/16 In-class: Discussions of Week 4 asynchronous material; creating a rubric for self- and peer assessments; group work time on StoryMap

Week 5 (9/17–24) Comparative learning lab 1: Friday 9/24, 3-5PM EDT

This week is the first comparative learning lab. This week's class will be devoted entirely to (1.5-2 hour) meetings among students from multiple campuses. Students will compare findings from assignments and synthesize and build on knowledge across sites. You will share and reflect on outcomes from each other's assignments (e.g., commonalities, differences, etc.); address what's known/ finished/resolved and unknown/unfinished/unresolved. Facilitation will be done by Prof. Deirdre Pfeiffer, Arizona State University School of Geographical Science and Urban Planning.

9/21 Deliverable due: First work on StoryMap

9/24 Collaborative Learning Lab, 3-5 PM. All labs will be held in Prof. Pfeiffer's Zoom room.

Part 2: Zoning for equity

The Civil Rights movement that peaked in the 1950s and 1960s recognized the centrality of White supremacist (exclusionary) zoning in sustaining and justifying White power. In 1966, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., moved to Chicago to [fight discrimination in housing](#), employment, and education. After Dr. King's assassination in 1968, the U.S. passed the landmark Fair Housing Act, which banned racial discrimination in housing and obligated HUD grantees to take deliberate steps to advance racial integration, but this second mandate was never meaningfully pursued. Progressive residents and officials in only a handful of suburbs, including Oak Park (IL) and Shaker Heights (OH), invented new programs to achieve and sustain racial integration. But these suburbs were the exception; in most of the U.S., exclusion would yield only when faced by litigation and state legislative action.

Week 6 (9/25–30) Reforms and adaptations: Adoption, implementation, evolution

Asynchronous material: Run of Show coming soon. Readings will include:

- Baer, W. C. (2008). California's Fair-Share Housing 1967–2004: The Planning Approach. *Journal of Planning History*, 7(1), 48–71.
- Mandelker, D. R., Brown, C. N., Merriam, D. H., Stroud, N. E., Sullivan, E. J., & Freeman, L. (2020). Chapter 5: Mt Laurel I and II. In *Planning and control of land development: Cases and materials* (Tenth edition). Caroline Academic Press

9/30 In-class: Discussions of Week 6 asynchronous material; group work time on StoryMap

10/1 Deliverable due: Self- and peer assessment 1

Week 7 (10/1–7) Top-down approaches to equitable land use

Asynchronous material: Run of Show coming soon. Readings for all 7 campuses will include:

- Bratt, R. G., & Vladeck, A. (2014). [Addressing Restrictive Zoning for Affordable Housing: Experiences in Four States](#). *Housing Policy Debate*, 24(3), 594–636. (RI, MD, MA, NJ)
- Ramsey-Musolf, D. (2017). [State mandates, housing elements, and low-income housing production](#). *Journal of Planning Literature*, 32(2), 117-140. (CA, MN, IL, FL).

In addition, students in the University of Illinois class should read this after the instructors' run of show:

- Smith, C. S., & Smith, K. (2019). [Pathways To Affordability: Municipal Strategies To Increase Affordable Housing Supply In Illinois](#). *Illinois Municipal Policy Journal* 4(1), 71–102.

10/5 Deliverable due (grad students only): Work plan redraft 1

10/7 In-class: Discussion of asynchronous material + why Illinois is different; work progress meeting

Week 8 (10/8–15) Bottom-up solutions for equitable land use

Asynchronous material: Please see detailed run of show page on Canvas for step-by-step instructions to engage with the asynchronous material. The run of show includes links to lectures, readings, non-graded quizzes, and discussion/reflection questions. Readings for this week (which you should read within the sequence of the run of show to get the benefit of introductions to the material):

- García, I. (2018). [Community participation as a tool for conservation planning and historic preservation: The case of “Community As A Campus” \(CAAC\)](#). *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 33(3), 519–537.
- Kim, M. (2020). [Negotiation or Schedule-Based?:Examining the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Public Benefit Exaction Strategies of Boston and Seattle](#). *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 86(2), 208–221.

10/15 In-class: Discussion of asynchronous material; work progress meeting

Week 9 (10/16–22) Comparative learning lab: Past actions to zone for equity

This week is the second comparative learning lab. This week's class will be devoted entirely to (1.5-2 hour) meetings among students from multiple campuses. Students will compare findings from assignments and synthesize and build on knowledge across sites. You will share and reflect on outcomes from each other's assignments (e.g., commonalities, differences, etc.); address what's known/finished/resolved and unknown/unfinished/unresolved. Facilitation will be done by Prof. Pfeiffer.

10/19 Deliverable due: Past efforts to address inequitable zoning in Peoria

10/22 Collaborative Learning Lab, 3-5 PM. All labs will be held in Prof. Pfeiffer's Zoom room.

Part 3: Solutions for Peoria

In the final weeks of the class, students on each campus will develop equitable zoning proposals that apply to their host communities. Each proposal will each include *blueprints* and *playbooks*. The *blueprint* is the content of the reform, whether that's a specific legislative proposal (state legislative bill or draft local ordinance/bylaw) or a change in the way local practitioners manage planning and zoning in their communities. The *playbook* is a set of political steps or strategies needed to win the adoption and successful implementation of the blueprint. The final work plan will provide the details for this part of the semester.

Week 10 (10/23–28) Work week 1

Week 11 (10/29–11/4) Work week 2

11/5 Deliverable due: Self- and peer assessment 2

Week 12 (11/5–11) Work week 3

11/9 Deliverable due: Work plan redraft 2

Week 13 (11/12–19) Collaborative learning lab 3

This week is the third comparative learning lab. This week's class will be devoted entirely to (1.5-2 hour) meetings among students from multiple campuses. Students will compare findings from assignments and synthesize and build on knowledge across sites. You will share and reflect on outcomes from each other's assignments (e.g., commonalities, differences, etc.); address what's known/ finished/resolved and unknown/unfinished/unresolved. Facilitation will be done by Prof. Pfeiffer.

11/16 Deliverable due: Draft blueprint and playbook

11/19 Collaborative Learning Lab, 2-4 PM. All labs will be held in Prof. Pfeiffer's Zoom room

11/22 Thanksgiving week, no classes

Week 14 (11/29–12/2) Work week 4

Week 15 (12/3–9) Final week of class; Collaborative Learning Lab 4

The final CLL will review final or near-final drafts of projects across the seven campuses.

12/7 Deliverable due: Draft StoryMap + Equitable Land Use Proposal

12/8 Last day of classes

12/9 Collaborative Learning Lab, 2-4 PM. All labs will be held in Prof. Pfeiffer's Zoom room