Spring 2016

REGIONPL 891: Seminar in Advanced Planning Theory

One Day and Time/Week TBD (Proposed either Monday or Wednesday evening 4-6:30pm)

Mark Hamin PhD  
mhamin@larp.umass.edu  
Room 108 Hills North  
413-545-6608  
Office Hours: MW 10-11am, TTh 11am-noon  
(or by appointment)

Learning Objectives

The primary goal of this class is to assure that doctoral planning students and advanced Master’s students (and potentially interested others) have a general, substantive command of the spectrum of past and present perspectives regarding planning theory. The course has been organized so that students will read highly influential original texts, as well as more current related/critical planning literature, i.e., primary as well as secondary sources. Central learning objectives are:

- Familiarity with the core (as well as emerging) arguments in planning theory, their origins and contexts, their relation to wider social/political/economic/environmental/etc. theories
- Capability to compare and contrast these different modes of thought, and to explain and assess critically how they have influenced planning theory and practice to the present
- Increased capacity to specifically, coherently articulate your own theoretical perspective and to substantively, constructively critique those of others (scholars as well as peers)
- Assistance in preparations for the doctoral comprehensive examination in planning theory and history. Note that the readings and writings considered here will not constitute your full preparation, but they (along with RP 651 readings) should give you an excellent start.
- Engage with students from other academic backgrounds and theoretical orientations for the purpose of broadening one’s perspective on the values and uses of planning theory.

Required readings

The main text for the course is Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein, Readings in Planning Theory 3rd edition. In addition, there will also be a variety of supplementary readings available through the Du Bois Library’s electronic reserves or from the instructor. Students who have not had much experience with social theory may wish to supplement their course readings with Michael Brook’s Planning Theory for Practitioners, but this is not a required part of the course, and would only be an option in addition to, not replacement for, the other readings of the class. Many of the seminar reading will be emergent, as determined by the respective backgrounds, interests, and anticipated research needs of you and your peers.
Class organization

This is a seminar tailored to advanced PhD/Master’s students with an interest in planning theory. Students have significant responsibility for participation and presentation in the course. For most class sessions, the first hour or more will involve student- or instructor-led discussion of readings, followed by a brief break. The instructor will then provide a summary and discussion of major points of the readings and the student responses in terms of their respective ‘fit’ into the sequence of the course and of the PhD program.

Grading/Assignments

1. Class participation (40%): This is a seminar where the expectations for each student’s full engagement in the class will be quite high. You must come to each class meeting having read and reflected on assigned readings, as demonstrated by weekly ‘Reading Reflections’ papers (please see below). You will also be responsible to lead discussion for at least one weekly meeting. Specific expectations are as follows:
   a. “Readings Reflections’ for each meeting: this is a 3-5 page paper which identifies key thematic contributions from each of the readings for that class, connects them together and/or connects them to other readings in the course and/or other works of planning/social theory with which you may be familiar. Occasionally your weekly reflection may invoke a personal planning experience to illustrate the (ir)relevance/ (in)appropriateness or other aspects of the readings, but your empirical description of the case study should complement rather than supersede the theoretical focus of the paper. Please circulate your reflection to all students and instructors at least 24 hours before class.
   b. Class leadership requirements (one time):
      i. advance preparation of readings;
      ii. selection and distribution of at least one ‘update’ article that clearly builds on one of the foundational readings for the day, to demonstrate how the original article/theory is influencing current theory or practice (this article should be as recent as possible and from a major planning journal such as JPL, JPER, JAPA, Planning Theory, etc.);
      iii. develop a plan for the class session, including key discussion questions and/or exercises for the session; and
      iv. provide the instructors and fellow students with a verbal summary of the major themes and issues regarding the readings at the start of class.

2. Field paper (30%): This paper asks you to begin to review the body of planning theory literature that will be most important for your dissertation focus. Note that this will not be the substantive field, unless you are doing a theory dissertation. Instead, it should identify a body of planning theory that will form a conceptual/interpretive paradigm within which your dissertation research will operate. You should try to discuss this focus area with your prospective committee chair and actual/potential members prior to beginning work on this paper. In this paper, you will identify foundational arguments/precepts for this theoretical
approach, relate it to the longer-term, wider-scope context of planning theory, and explore the structure of the arguments across the various scholars in that area. Please review one or two articles in the *Journal of Planning Literature* as guides to these expectations. The hope is that the paper that you produce will potentially be of sufficient quality for you to eventually aim at submitting it to *JPL* for review and potential publication.

a. You must prepare one copy of this for the instructor, and one copy must go to your prospective committee chair (or another RP member if the instructor is your chair).

b. All field papers should include reflection on the proper role for planners within the planning process, connected either to the various approaches you examine or to the interpretive paradigm you select and develop.

3. First Draft, Reading List for Comprehensive Exam in Planning History and Theory (30%): This is an annotated bibliography that will include the literature cited in your field paper, but will also include other readings from this course, from Planning History and Theory, and from other related works that you may not yet have read for the but anticipate will be important. Much of this list may be generated by ‘following the footnotes’ or citations for articles in your field paper. This list should demonstrate your familiarity with the breadth of planning theory, both historical and current, and should also demonstrate some depth in the area of planning theory that is most relevant to your anticipated dissertation. Please submit one copy of this for your instructor, and one copy for your prospective/intended history and theory examiner or committee chair.

*Note:* Given the importance of each of these criteria for evaluating students’ work, anyone who needs to miss a class meeting, turn in an assignment after deadline, or request other arrangements must address such matters with the instructor as far in advance as possible. Only urgent reasons or unusual circumstances will receive consideration in such cases. Please familiarize yourself, if you have not already, with university policies regarding plagiarism, disability, health issues, etc. [http://www.umass.edu/dean_students/codeofconduct](http://www.umass.edu/dean_students/codeofconduct)

The University of Massachusetts is committed to providing equal educational opportunity for all students. If you have a documented physical, psychological, or other learning disability on file with UMass Disability Services [http://www.umass.edu/disability/index.html](http://www.umass.edu/disability/index.html), you may be eligible for reasonable accommodations to help you succeed better in this course. If you have a documented disability that requires an accommodation, please notify me at the start of the semester so that we may make appropriate arrangements.

It is expected that all students will abide by the Student Honor Code and the Academic Honesty Policy, available at the Academic Honesty Office (Ombud’s Office) or found online at [http://www.umass.edu/ombuds/honesty.php/](http://www.umass.edu/ombuds/honesty.php/) Potential sanctions for acts of dishonesty range from receiving a course grade of F, probation or suspension for a period of time, or dismissal. Students have the right of appeal through the academic honesty board.

We are all responsible for maintaining an environment that is conducive to learning and discussion. In order to assure that we all have the opportunity to gain from our time in class,
please review and respect these standards for creating a reciprocally responsible learning environment.

- The instructor and students will recognize and respect each other.
- Respect may include appropriate humor, enjoyment, or other indications of a comfortable and pleasant classroom community.
- We will be on time for class: no late arrivals and no packing up early.
- We will avoid disruptions during class such as loud noises, private conversations, reading newspapers, speaking on cell phones or texting, using a laptop for something other than current classroom work, and obvious sleeping, however peacefully.
- We will avoid negative language that is considered racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. or in other ways may exclude or disturb members of our campus and classroom community.

Attendance is not mandatory, but is factored into the participation grade. The instructor reserves the right to give an incomplete or F for any student with over four unexcused absences, and will make exceptions only for medical and family emergencies or other pre-approved reasons. The letter grade equivalents to the numerical scores are:

- > 94 = A; 90-94 = A-; 87-90 = B+; 83-87 = B; 80-83 = B-; 77-80 = C+; 73-77 = C;
- 70-73 = C-; 63-70 = D; <63 = F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topical/Thematic Focus and Readings</th>
<th>Session Leader(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Introductions and review of syllabus. Course collaboration  
|      | • Campbell and Fainstein, Introduction in C&F |                   |
| 2    | Universal ↔ Situated Knowledge? Paradoxes of Theory?  
|      | • Fishman in C&F  
|      | • Friedmann in C&F  
|      | • Jane Jacobs in C&F  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 3    | What Spatial Scale/Temporal Range? ‘Rational’ Planning?  
|      | • Lindblom in C&F  
|      | • Heather Campbell and Marshall in C&F  
|      | • Scott in C&F  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 4    | Planning of, by, for whom? Planners’ Roles/Responsibilities  
|      | • Forester, “Planning in the Face of Power” TBA  
|      | • Forester in C&F  
|      | • Healey in C&F  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 5    | Justice: From each according to…?/to each according to…?  
|      | • Rorty, Richard. TBA  
|      | • Rawls, John. “Justice as Fairness” TBA  
|      | • Fainstein in C&F  
|      | • Davidoff in C&F  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 6    | Managing the System? (Post)Capitalism and its Discontents  
|      | • Love in C&F  
|      | • Foglesong in C&F  
|      | • Harvey, David. TBA  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 7    | Spring Break at UMass: no seminar meeting |                   |
| 8    | Field paper drafts due to group the week before class; discussion of papers in class |                   |
| 9    | Communicative/Collaborative Planning? Consensus Models  
|      | • Section IV in C&F  
|      | • Innes, Judith. “Planning Thru Consensus Bldg” TBA  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 10   | What Difference does Difference Make? Gender, Race, etc.  
|      | • Section V of C&F  
|      | • Update article? |                   |
| 11   | 4Es: Connecting Planning and Theory through Sustainability  
|      | • Campbell in in C&F  
|      | • Evans in C&F  
|      | • Low and Gleeson, TBA  
|      | • Our Common Future (Brundtland Comm.), UN 1987  
<p>|      | • Update article? |                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>The West vs. the Rest? Globalization and Internationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section VII in C&amp;F (except Evans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bish Sanyal. 2002. “Globalization, ethical compromise and planning theory.” TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update article?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>5Ws: Why planning theory? Which planning theory? When, Where, Whom, etc.? Implications for Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AICP Code in C&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fischler in C&amp;F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kohn in C&amp;F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 14   | Final draft field paper and first draft H&T reading list due  |