9/27 Introduction
"Why do we produce and implement plans when, where, in the manner, and with the objects that we do?"

10/4 History of Urban and Regional Planning
*Eugenie Birch and Christopher Silver, “One Hundred Years of City Planning’s Enduring and Evolving Connections.” JAPA, 75, 2, Spring, 2009. 113-122.


Group meetings to discuss work plans.


Cliff Ellis, "Interstate Highways, Regional Planning and the Reshaping of Metropolitan America." Planning Practice and Research, 16, 3-4, 2001. 247-269.
Jeffrey Brown, "From Traffic Regulation to Limited Ways: The Effort to Build a Science of Transportation Planning." JPH, 5, 1, February, 2006. 3-34.

*James Scott, Seeing Like a State. Chapter 4: "The High-Modernist City: An Experiment and a Critique." Yale University, 1998. 103-146.
*Alexander von Hoffman, "Housing and Planning." JAPA, 75, 2, Spring, 2009. 231-244.
Michael Dudley, “Sprawl As Strategy: City Planners Face the Bomb.” JPER, 21,1, Fall, 2001. 52-63.

11/8 Planning Theory
*Nigel Taylor, Urban Planning Theory since 1945, Sage, 1998, Parts I and II.

11/15 Implementation Alternatives
*Taylor, Parts III and IV.
*Iris Marion Young, “City Life and Difference.” In Campbell/Fainstein.
*Howell Baum, “Planning and the problem of evil.” PT, 10, 2, 2011. 103-123.
Norman Krumholz, “Equitable Approaches to Local Economic Development,” in Campbell/Fainstein.

Group Meetings to Discuss Third Memos, Presentations, and Papers

11/22 Approaches to Implementation Analysis

11/29 Presentations

12/6 Presentations

Course Requirements:
I. Adopt a Plan and write three memos (2 pages for each of the first two memos; 3 pages for the third memo, double-spaced, 11- or 12-point type) about the following topics as each relates to the plan you’ve adopted:
   (1) Historical analysis due 11/1 in class
   (2) Political analysis due 11/15 in class
   (3) Implementation alternatives analysis due 11/29 in class

The following readings are aimed specifically at assisting you to write these memos:
Karen Christensen, “Teaching Savvy,” JPER, 12, 3, 1993
Paul Davidoff, “Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning,” in both Stein and Campbell/Fainstein;
Harvey Molotch, “The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place,” in Stein;
Frank Fischer, “Risk Assessment and Environmental Crisis: Toward an Integration of Science and Participation.” In Campbell/Fainstein.
(3) Daniel Mazmanian and Paul Sabatier, Implementation and Public Policy with a New Postscript, University Press of America, 1989, Chapters 1 and 2;

For the first two memos assume that you are the director of planning of the agency producing the plan, and you are addressing your recently assembled staff. You are at the beginning of the planning process, and are about to start. For the third memo you are the director of planning addressing the official body in charge of the plan, and staff analyses of several alternatives have been completed.

The main questions to be addressed in the first memo are: What circumstances have given rise to this mandate to plan? In other words, Why are we going to do this plan now? What differences will these circumstances make for the plan we are about to produce? What are the strategic implications of the historical background for the work that lies ahead?

The main questions to be addressed in the second memo are: What is the political-economic context within which this plan will be produced? Who are the relevant stakeholders who ought to be involved in our planning process? What are their interests in the plan that will be produced, and how influential are various stakeholders likely to be? How should stakeholders be involved in our planning process?

The main questions to be addressed in the third memo are: What are alternative ways of achieving an important goal of the plan? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the alternative approaches to implementation that have been analyzed? Which implementation alternative(s) is(are) recommended for adoption? What evidence is there in the scholarly and practice literatures that sheds light on the causal relationship between the alternative(s) we are recommending and the goal we want to reach? How confident are we in the data and the methods of data analysis that we have used to examine alternatives?

Each group must prepare a work plan by 10/10 and schedule a meeting with me to discuss it.

Each student will write memos. The first and second memos may be revised (once) and resubmitted by 12/6.

II. A class presentation during one of the last two sessions. This will be a group project, and there will be a group grade for the presentation. Each group will assume that it is presenting the results of its planning process and making recommendations at a public hearing. The presentation will be videotaped. A meeting to view and discuss the taped performance will be scheduled during the period between terms or early winter term.

III. Write a critique of the plan (no more than 8 pages, double spaced, 11- or 12-point type). This is also a group project: one paper per group. Due 12/6. The paper should discuss strengths and weaknesses of the plan and the process used to
produce it. The following readings are aimed at assisting you to write the critique: Lucie Laurian, et al., “Evaluating the outcomes of plans: theory, practice, and methodology.” E&P B: P&D, 37, 2010. 740-757; William Baer, “General Plan Evaluation Criteria: An Approach to Making Better Plans,” JAPA, 63, 3, 1997, pp. 329-344; Bent Flyvbjerg, “Rationality and Power,” in Campbell/Fainstein; John Forester, “Planning in the Face of Power,” in Stein. In addition, the paper should also include an annotated bibliography of articles from scholarly and practice journals that were used to produce Memo #3. The paper should incorporate ideas and arguments from those journal articles and class readings into the critique. Finally, the paper should also include an appendix in which a brief history of the organization that produced the plan is given. The significance of the plan for the organization that produced it should be addressed.

IV. History Exam. This will be a take home exam due in class on 11/8. A set of historically significant ideas, events, relationships and projects will be handed out in class on 10/25. You will need to discuss five of them. There is a 1500-word total limit for all responses. The total number of words should be written on the exam.

Grading:
- Memos: 45%
- History Exam: 30%
- Critique: 15%
- Presentation: 10%

PhD Students
- We will meet to discuss required course and individual projects.

An asterisk (*) indicates a required reading.

Journal acronyms:
- E&P B: P&D: Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design
  - JAIP: Journal of the American Institute of Planners (the earlier name of JAPA)
- JAPA: Journal of the American Planning Association
- JPER: Journal of Planning Education and Research
- JPH: Journal of Planning History
- JUH: Journal of Urban History
- PP: Planning Perspectives
- PP&R: Planning Practice and Research
- PT: Planning Theory
- PT&P: Planning Theory and Practice
- UAQ: Urban Affairs Quarterly
- UAR: Urban Affairs Review