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**Course Description**

The course examines the praxis of planning: the link between planning theory, ethics, and practice. It covers the evolution of various models within the planning field and how ethical positions shape the use of those models. We will start from the positivist rational planning model emphasizing a comprehensive framework and review key components of that model as well as its fundamental critiques. The first part of the course traces the evolution of other planning models: the comprehensive planning model; the incremental perspective; the advocacy approach; communicative rationality, and complexity theory. The second part of the course focuses on planners’ ethical positions and how the theoretical models covered in the first part of the class are used to further a planners’ values. The courses’ main objective is to bridge planning praxis by emphasizing the importance of ethics and the use of planning models for future planning practitioners.

**Objectives**

* Exposure to key theories and ethical positions shaping the field of planning.
* Understand how planning models are used to advocate a planners’ ethical position.
* Identify the evolution and debates within planning theory.
* Familiarize students with competing theoretical dialogues in planning scholarship.
* Critique each planning model and understand both its’ strengths and shortcomings.
* Develop students’ understanding of the American Planning Association ethical principles.
* Improve students’ ability engage a planning model and identify analytical approaches to solving wicked problems.
* Understand how various planning models shape a planners’ practice.
* Help students develop their own ethical stance to planning issues.
* Encourage students to ask critical questions relevant to planning ethics.
* Explore planning's’ ethical responsibility to social justice and equity; and
* Make competing planning models useful to students who will be future planning practitioners.

**The Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) Criteria**

PAB approves curriculum criteria for the School of PPPM Community and Regional Planning Master’s Degree program. This course focuses on general planning knowledge and values and ethics addressing the following PAB approved PPPM curriculum standards:

General Planning Knowledge: The comprehension, representation, and use of

ideas and information in the planning field, including appropriate perspectives

from history, social science, and design and other allied fields.

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.

Values and Ethics: Values inform ethical and normative principles used to guide planning in a democratic society. The Program shall incorporate values and ethics into required courses of the curriculum, 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.

**Planning Models Explored**

Rational planning; comprehensive planning; incremental planning; advocacy planning; planning from a political economic perspective, planning for difference; sustainability and planning; communicative rationality; collaborative planning; planning for social justice; equity planning, planning with complexity, and radical planning. Students are also encouraged to identify other alternative planning models and incorporate those to critical planning ethical positions.

**Evaluated Activities**

Each student’s grade for the class will be based on the following: **first assignment** (5%), **participation** (5%) by **leading a group presentation** (30%), a take-home **mid-term assignment** (30%) and **term paper** (30%).

* **Class participation.** This is a seminar; hence the key to having a good discussion will revolve around students having done the readings and being prepared to discuss relevant points. In order to encourage full class participation during the student presentations, *students who miss more than one of those seminars will receive a zero on their 5%* participation grade.
* **40-min group presentations.** Starting in week 4, students will work in groups of 4 to lead a 40-min presentation. Each team will be responsible for leading a presentation that draws on that week’s topic. The objective of the seminar is to apply planning models to a practical planning project or a planning ethical conflict - depending on whether the presentation occurs during the first or second part of the course. The topic is your choice but should draw from the following general areas:
  + 1) the role of planners in public decision processes, from expert advice-giver to facilitator of public involvement to collaborator to community organizer; 2) the idea(s) of planning - physical determinism, economic determinism, social equity, environmentalism, etc.
  + The institutional framework (economic, social and political) within which planning is practiced, and how institutions shape what planning is and what it can (and cannot) do
  + Equity and social justice – the **ethical mandate of planning** and planners to advance equity and social justice, and the opportunities and limitations to respond to that mandate
  + The challenges of working across cultures or in multi-cultural contexts, both in the U.S. and internationally
  + The social, historical, and ecological legacies of planning – the successes and failures of past planning actions and their lessons for future planning
* **Assignments.** Your first assignment will be given during the first day of class and will assess your ability to identify a planning theory or model of your interest and explain that theory or model in class.
* Take-home Mid-Term Assignment will assess student understanding of key models within planning.
* **Term Paper: *Ethics and Theory in Planning Assignment.*** Students will prepare a report (8-10 double spaced pages) presenting an ethical situation in planning and explain how two planning theories would apply in that situation (use at least one theory covered in class). The presentation of the situation should include both the physical environment and the socioeconomic and political context of planning in that community. Students should illustrate the differences in planner’s roles and actions, and suggest likely implications for knowledge, participation, and the understanding of the public interest. The work should be based in a community in which the student is interested, and to the extent possible derive from a current planning ethical conflict (within the last five years). Appropriate topics would be those in which there would likely be conflicting values and opinions in the community, possible wicked problems, and might include:
  + Planners involvement in social issues such as homelessness or special needs populations in a particular community
  + Planners involvement with environmental and economic issues such as climate change or sustainability in a particular community
  + Planners involvement with redevelopment in an area affected by gentrification
  + Planners involved in disaster management issues in low income populations
  + Other interesting, current and relevant ethical topics to planning.

**Synchronous vs Asynchronous Course Delivery**

The delivery of instruction for the course will be synchronous.

**Content and Structure of Sessions: (Subject to Modification)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Date** | **Topic** | **Reading/**  **Assignments DUE** |
| 1 | Sept 29  Oct 1 | Introduction:  From Theory to Practice | Hall, Peter (re-read chapter 10 in Cities of Tomorrow)  Read for Assignment 1 |
| **PART I: PLANNING MODELS** | | | |
| 2 | Oct 6  Oct 8 | Rational Planning | ***Assignment 1***  ***Due in class (Oct 8)*** |
| 3 | Oct 13  Oct 15 (film) | Rational Planning’s Limits  *The Fog of War* | Innes; Judy Ch. 1-2  Clavel, Pierre |
| 4 | Oct 20  Oct 22  (1st student pres) | Comprehensive/ Incremental Planning | Altshuler, Alan  Lindblom, Charles |
| 5 | Oct 27  Oct 29  (2nd student pres) | Advocacy/ Communicative Planning | Davidoff, Paul  Innes; Judy Ch. 3-5  Machter and Milz  ***Take-home midterm***  ***DUE (Oct 31)*** |
| 6 | Nov 3  Nov 5 – ACSP Conference (no class) | Complexity Planning | Innes, Judy: Ch 6-8  Encouraged to attend ACSP’s Racial Justice Focal Event |
| PART II: PLANNING ETHICS | | | |
| 7 | Nov 10  Nov 12 LCDC meeting (no class) | Ethics/APA | Howe, Elizabeth  Boland, Richard  Wachs, Martin  Encouraged to watch meeting online as example of rational comprehensive planning |
| 8 | Nov 17  Nov 19  (3rd student pres) | Ethics/Justice | Young, Iris Marion  Ugarte, Magdalena |
| 9 | Nov 24  (4th student pres)  Nov 26 (Holiday) | Ethics/Equity | Krumholtz, Norman and  Wertheim, Katheryn  Zapata, Marisa and Bates, Lisa  Krumholtz, Norman |
| 10 | Dec 1  (5th student pres)  Dec 3 | Ethics/Vocation | Friedman, John  ***Term Paper DUE (Dec 8th)*** |

**Book:**

Innes, Judith & Booher, David, (2018), Planning with Complexity: An introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy,2nd Edition, New York, NY: Routledge.
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**Course Policies**

**The grading scale for your class grade is as follows:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | x ≥ 94 | C | 77 > x ≥ 74 |
| A- | 94 >x ≥ 90 | C- | 74 > x ≥ 70 |
| B+ | 90 >x ≥ 87 | D+ | 70 > x ≥ 67 |
| B | 87 >x ≥ 84 | D | 67 > x ≥ 64 |
| B- | 84 >x ≥ 80 | D- | 64 > x ≥ 60 |
| C+ | 80 >x ≥ 77 | F | 60 > x |

**A** – Outstanding performance relative to that required to meet course requirements; demonstrates a mastery of course content at the highest level.

**B** – Performance that is significantly above that required to meet course requirements; demonstrates a mastery of course content at a high level.

**C** – Performance that meets the course requirements in every respect; demonstrates an adequate understanding of course content.

**D** – Performance that is at the minimal level necessary to pass the course but does not fully meet the course requirements; demonstrates a marginal understanding of course content.

**F** – Performance in the course, for whatever reason, is unacceptable and does not meet the course requirements; demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the course content.

**Missed Class Policy**

If you miss a class, please arrange to get class notes from a classmate or ask instructor for lecture notes.

**Incomplete Policy**

Students are expected to behave in a professional manner and to turn in all materials at the designated time. In accordance with university regulations, an incomplete will only be given when “the quality of work is satisfactory, but a minor yet essential requirement of the course has not been completed for reasons acceptable to the instructor.”

**Academic Misconduct**

You are expected at all times to do your own work. Copying or obtaining content from other students or other persons and submitting it as your own work is grounds for failing the class. The University Student Conduct Code (available at conduct.uoregon.edu) defines academic misconduct. Students are prohibited from committing or attempting to commit any act that constitutes academic misconduct.

**Plagiarism**

Students should properly acknowledge and document all sources of information (e.g. quotations, paraphrases, ideas, data, analyses). If there is any reasonable question about whether an act constitutes academic misconduct, it is the student’s obligation to clarify the question with the instructor before committing or attempting to commit the act. Additional information about a common form of academic misconduct, plagiarism, is available at: <http://library.uoregon.edu/guides/plagiarism/students/index.html>

**Discrimination**

All students are expected to adhere to University of Oregon policies related to discrimination based upon ethnicity, heritage, gender, sexual orientation, ability, socio-economic standing, cultural beliefs and traditions.

**Documented Disability**

If you have a documented disability and anticipate needing accommodations in the course, please make the necessary arrangements. You may contact the Accessible Education Center, <https://aec.uoregon.edu>. Please contact Professor Sandoval early in the semester so that your learning needs are appropriately met.

**Inclusion Statement**  
The College of Design is a community that values inclusion. We are committed to equal opportunities for all faculty, staff and students to develop individually, professionally, and academically regardless of ethnicity, heritage, gender, sexual orientation, ability, socio-economic standing, cultural beliefs and traditions. We are dedicated to an environment that is inclusive and fosters awareness, understanding, and respect for diversity. If you feel excluded or threatened, please contact Professor Sandoval and/or school head Professor Rich Margerum.