

**USP 541 Dynamics of Planning Practice  
Winter 2012: Tuesdays, 1:00-3:40 p.m.  
URB 270**

Dr. Connie Ozawa  
URB 350A, x5-5126  
Office Hours: By appointment  
E-mail: [ozawac@pdx.edu](mailto:ozawac@pdx.edu)

In this course, we examine the planner's role and the extent to which the individual planner bears responsibility for decisions and choices that are made during planning activities. We look at different conceptualizations of the planning process and the planner's ability to help to structure it, differing notions of why the public should be brought into planning discussions, and how issues of diversity are, or are not, addressed. Our aim is to investigate instances of planner's work to understand in practical terms the practical dilemmas that arise. Planning is not politically neutral work; in every planning decision, there are winners and losers; planning analysis shines a light on certain factors and not others, and values various factors from one group's perspective and not others. As actors in the planning arena, our actions, analysis and advice have consequences and we bear responsibility for them. The objective of the course is to increase the awareness of the ethical consequences of planner's actions, to begin to develop a framework for systematic analysis, and to encourage a personal reflection on values.

This course follows USP 540 and builds on the previous term's examination of a set of Portland regional and statewide plans. Special emphasis is given to writing clarity.

**Required Texts**

Timothy Beatley, *Ethical Land Use*, (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University.)  
Ruth Fincher and Kurt Iveson, 2008. *Planning for Diversity: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter*. NY: Palgrave, McMillan.

One of the following two (see notes below):

Judith Innes and David Booher. 2010. *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. NY: Routledge.

Susan Fainstein. 2010. *The Just City*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

**Additional Resources**

Journal articles obtainable through PSU Millar Library's electronic journals.  
All books EXCEPT Fincher and Iveson are on 2-hour reserve at Millar Library

**Written Assignments**

Unless otherwise indicated, all written submissions should be typed in **12-point font**. Late submissions will be penalized ½ point per day. (Papers are due at 1:00 p.m. on the date specified, unless otherwise noted.) Rewrites are allowed, as noted below, and due one week after papers are returned. No "rewrite" will be awarded a grade higher than an A- or its equivalent.

Plagiarism is not tolerated. If any level of plagiarism is detected, the student will

receive “zero” points for the assignment and will not be allowed to rewrite it. All excerpted material, including graphics, should be properly attributed to sources.

Note: When you write *anything*, consider who your audience is. Memos are brief communications – use the “subject” line, but also remember to set out the purpose of the memo clearly in the first paragraph. Include evidence such as statistical data, illustrative examples, or logic, to support your argument.

1. Plan Summary Memo to Planning Director – **Due January 17, 2012.**

Provide a summary of your selected “plan” to brief your new Planning Director. This memo should include a description of the “problem” the plan is meant to address, its major goals, objectives, and implementation strategies. (Group assignment, memo format, 500 words max, 10 points)

2. Values and Advocacy - **Due January 31, 2012.**

Report to Planning Director: What are the *primary* and *subsidiary values* embedded in your plan? How did these get introduced and come to dominate the final plan? Provide empirical evidence, to the extent possible. (Individual assignment, report format, 500 words max., 15 points)

3. Public Meeting Assessment – **Due February 14, 2012.**

Attend a public meeting of your choice (convened 1/10/12 – 2/12/12). Identify and explain appropriate criteria for achieving success for effective public participation. These criteria may include the purpose of the meeting, the clarity of the statement of its purpose, range of stakeholders present, quality of communications, etc. Describe the format of the meeting and who sponsored it, explain its purpose, and assess its “success.” (Memo format, 500 words max, 10 points)

4. Abstract of selected book chapters. **Due March 6, 2012.** (Individual assignment, 500 words max, 10 points.)

5. Plan Critique: The Role of the Planner(s) – **Due March 6 or March 13, 2012.**

a. Consider Fainstein’s framework of democracy, diversity and equity and Innes and Booher’s framework for collaborative planning. Evaluate your plan with regard to (2-3) values promoted by these authors. Assess the extent to which your plan achieved each, explain why this occurred and suggest ways in which these values could have been enhanced. (Group assignment, essay format, 1000 words, 25 points)

b. Presentation on an ethical dilemma – illustrate competing values promoted or protected in your plan. (Group assignment: 20 minutes plus 5 for Q&A; 5 points)

6. Open reflection on the role of the planner. – **Due March 13, 2012** (Individual assignment, 750 words max, 20 points)

**Tips for Writing Memos**

Memos are a particular form of written communication between two or more parties who are relatively familiar with a given topic of discussion. The subject line should be

informative. The first paragraph should set the context for the communication and state clearly the point of the memo. Include a summary or closing paragraph for memos longer than 1.5 page. Overall, the intention of *these* memos is to persuade your planning director that you have ideas worth considering. Pay attention also to your writing – punctuation, grammar, and so on. What may seem like minor details make a big impact on professionals who expect high quality work from their staff.

**In-Class Activities**

1. Attendance and Participation (5 points)  
 “Groundrules” for participation in this class TBD.

Assignment	Form	Group/Individual	Due Date	Points
Plan Summary	Memo	Group	1-17-12	10
Values	Paper	Individual	1-31-12	15
Public Meeting	Memo	Individual	2-14-12	10
Book chapter abstract	Memo	Individual	2-28-12	10
Plan Critique	Paper	Group	3-6 or 3-13	25
Individual – Personal reflection	Paper	Individual	3-19-12	20
Attendance and Participation	Oral	Individual	-----	5
Plan Presentation	Oral	Group	3-8 or 3-14	5
Total				100

**Ph.D. Students**

In addition to material presented to master’s students, doctoral students are expected to refine their focus on the planning field for their own line of study. That is, how do/will your research interests relate to the planning field? What can/will you contribute to the work of professional planners? Toward this end, you will identify a research area of interest to planning and prepare a preliminary literature review of the field. You should pay particular attention to how your area of interest has been addressed in planning and how it might move forward into the future. A rough outline of dates for the work is as follows:

1. Submit a two-hundred fifty word (double spaced) abstract of your USP 540 term paper. Include a statement of the purpose of the paper, approach and methodology, and findings. **Due January 24, 2012.**
2. Draft outline of USP 541 paper due **February 14, 2011.**
3. In-class presentation on **March 13, 2011.**

**CLASS SCHEDULE**  
(tentative)

	<b>Readings</b>
<b>January 10</b> <i>Introductions and Course Overview</i>	None.
<b>January 17</b> <i>Ethical Issues in Land Use Planning</i>	Beatley, pp. 33-152.
<b>January 24</b> <i>Ethical Issues in Planning</i>	Beatley, pp. 155-274. Laurian, Lucie & Mary Margaret Shaw, (2009) “Evaluation of Public Participation,” <i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i> , 28:203-309.
<b>January 31</b> <i>Planning and Professional Ethics</i> <i>Understanding Diversity</i> Guest Lecturer: Gil Kelley, Planning Consultant and TSUSP Practitioner-in-Residence	AICP Code of Ethics < <a href="http://www.planning.org/ethics/conduct.html">http://www.planning.org/ethics/conduct.html</a> > Members in each plan group will choose to read either Innes and Booher or Fainstein. Ann Fadiman, <i>The Spirit Catches You</i> , pp. 1-118
<b>February 7</b> <i>Planning with Diversity</i>	Ann Fadiman, <i>The Spirit Catches You</i> , pp. 140-288.
<b>February 14</b> <i>Dilemmas</i>	Fincher and Iverson, pp. 1-48; 84-104; 145-170. Innes and Booher, pp. 1-14. Fainstein, pp. 1-21.
<b>February 21</b> <i>The Just City –What is the Planner’s Role?</i>	Innes and Booher and Fainstein.
<b>February 28</b> <i>Planning with Complexity – What is the Planner’s Role?</i>	Innes and Booher, and Fainstein.
<b>March 6</b> <i>Planning and the Planner’s Ethical Responsibilities Reconsidered</i>	Fincher and Iverson, pp. 49 -83; 105-144; 171-223.
<b>March 13</b> Group Presentations	None.
<b>MONDAY March 19, 10:15-12:05</b> Group Presentations - Wrap-Up	None.