

URSP 804
Advanced Planning Theory

Thursdays, 3:30pm - 6:00pm

Online

Professor Casey Dawkins

dawkins1@umd.edu

Course Description

Planning has been described as an activity that is concerned with the translation of knowledge into organized action. Planning is often equated with coordination, intentionality, rationality, and spatiality. Planners generate new knowledge, facilitate the realization of collective shared understandings, and apply received knowledge to solve social problems and guide social change. Planning theory, as a distinct scholarly enterprise, provides an account of this activity, drawing upon literature from epistemology, moral and political philosophy, and the social sciences.

This course provides an overview of contemporary planning theory and its historical roots. The course is designed to provide PhD students with a base of theoretical knowledge to guide research and practice. The course also provides the primary source material for the planning theory portion of the comprehensive exam. The readings have been chosen to engage with the following questions:

- What is planning, and what distinguishes planned action from unplanned action?
- What is the relationship between planning, knowledge, and rationality?
- How do (should) values inform planning practice?
- Who plans, and what are the differences between individual planning and collective planning?
- What is the normative justification for planning?
- What is the relationship between planning, markets, communities, and the state?
- How do (should) planners reconcile conflicting values?
- What is the “public interest,” and how do (should) planners advance the public interest?
- What are the major intellectual traditions that define the scope of planning theory, and how have these traditions evolved over time?

Course Objectives

The reading, contemplation, and discussion of key concepts and debates in planning theory are intended to:

1. Expand students’ capacities to critically examine planning practice;
2. Equip students to make scholarly contributions to the planning theory literature;
3. Provide a meta-theoretical framework for students’ planning research; and
4. Provide students with the knowledge and skills to teach planning theory at the graduate level

Grading

Each student's grade in the course will be determined by performance on the following assignments:

- (15%) Essay 1: Rationality and planning (details provided in a separate handout)
- (15%) Essay 2: Values and planning (details provided in a separate handout)
- (30%) In-class participation. Each week students are required to actively participate in class discussions. To prepare for the class discussions, students are required to read the assigned readings and prepare written responses to discussion questions and other assignments. Periodically, students will also be asked to lead discussions of assigned readings.
- (40%) Final paper
 - All students will prepare a paper suitable for submission to a peer-reviewed planning journal. Students should be prepared to submit and discuss their papers on the final day of class. A one-page outline of the proposed paper is due in class on September 28. Possible topics for the final paper include:
 - A literature review of recent developments within a planning theory tradition discussed in class (incorporating but also going beyond the readings discussed in class)
 - A discussion of a contemporary debate in planning theory
 - An application of a planning theory discussed in class to a case study
 - A discussion of how different theorists approach a central question within planning theory
 - Exploration of a theoretical concept and its application within the planning theory literature

The grading scale will be based on a plus / minus system with each assignment receiving a grade between 1 and 100 that is weighted as above. Final letter grades will be based on the following scale:

97 – 100:	A+
94 – 96.9:	A
90 – 93.9:	A –
87 – 89.9:	B+
84 – 86.9:	B
80 – 83.9:	B –
77 – 79.9:	C+
74 – 76.9:	C
70 – 73.9:	C –
67 – 69.9:	D+
64 – 66.9:	D
60 – 63.9:	D –
< 60:	F

Course Policies

Policy on Late or Missed Assignments

All work must be submitted by the due date. It is extremely important that you stay current in this course. Once you fall behind, it is difficult to get caught up, due to the pace of the course and the cumulative nature of the material.

Attendance Policy

I realize that extenuating circumstances often preclude students from attending every class. If you are absent from class, you are still responsible for ensuring that all assignments are completed by the due date.

Special Needs of Students

If you need course adaptations or accommodations due to a disability, please consult Disability Support Services in 0126 Shoemaker Hall to make necessary arrangements. The rules for eligibility and the types of accommodations a student may request can be reviewed on the DSS web site at http://www.counseling.umd.edu/DSS/receiving_serv.html.

Religious Observances

The University System of Maryland policy provides that students should not be penalized because of observances of their religious beliefs. Students shall be given an opportunity, whenever feasible, to make up within a reasonable time any academic assignment that is missed due to individual participation in religious observances. It is the responsibility of the student to inform the instructor of any intended absences for religious observances in advance. Notice should be provided as soon as possible but no later than the end of the schedule adjustment period. Prior notification is especially important in connection with final exams, since failure to reschedule a final exam before the conclusion of the final examination period may result in loss of credits during the semester. The problem is especially likely to arise when final exams are scheduled on Saturdays.

Academic Integrity

The University of Maryland has a nationally-recognized Code of Academic Integrity. This Code sets standards for academic integrity at Maryland for all undergraduate and graduate students. As a student you are responsible for upholding these standards in this course. It is very important for you to be aware of the consequences of cheating, fabrication, facilitation, and plagiarism. For more information on the Code of Academic Integrity, please visit <https://policies.umd.edu/policy/d3c4519f-99f1-42e9-a224-300e746a7a13/>.

Course Evaluations

Your participation in the evaluation of courses through CourseEvalUM is a responsibility you hold as a student member of our academic community. Your feedback is confidential and important to the improvement of teaching and learning at the University as well as to the tenure and promotion process. You will be informed when CourseEvalUM will be open for you to complete your evaluations. You can go directly to the website (www.courseevalum.umd.edu) to complete your evaluations. By completing all of your evaluations each semester, you will have the privilege of accessing the summary reports for thousands of courses online at Testudo.

- Wildavsky (1973)

Week 3: Sept. 14

Conceptions of rationality

- Reade, Eric. 1985. An Analysis of the Use of the Concept of Rationality in the Literature of Planning. In *Rationality and Planning: Critical Essays on the Role of Rationality in Urban & Regional Planning* (Michael Breheny & Alan Hooper, Eds). Pion, Ltd: London (Ch. 6).
- Alexander (2000)
- Mannheim, Karl. 1954. *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction: Studies in Modern Social Structure*. Harcourt, Brace & Co: New York (pp. 51-60).
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1981. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Beacon Press: Boston (Ch. 1).
- Sen (2008)
- Forester (1984)
- Bratman (1983)

Week 4: Sept. 21

Planning and the modernist tradition

- FD, Ch. 1,3,4
- JF, Ch. 3
- Legates, Richard T. and Frederic Stout. 1998. Modernism and Early Urban Planning. In *The City Reader, 2nd Ed.* Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout, Ed). Routledge: London (pp. 299-313).
- Harvey, David. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Blackwell: Cambridge, MA (Ch. 2).

Week 5: Sept. 28

Comprehensive-rational planning: critique

- F (Banfield), pp. 139-149
- F (Davidoff and Reiner), pp. 11-39
- F (Altshuler), pp. 193-209
- F (Friedmann), pp. 211-215
- F (Lindblom), pp. 151-169
- Rittel and Webber (1973)
- Hayek (1945), pp. 39-70
- Hirschman (1967)
- Faludi (1996)
- JF, Ch. 4

One page outline of final paper due

Week 6: Oct. 5

Beyond the comprehensive-rational planning paradigm

- F (Meyerson), pp. 127-138

- F (Robinson), pp. 174-191
- F (Etzioni), pp. 217-229
- Galloway and Mahayni (1977)
- Alexander (1984)
- Alexander (1996)

Discussion of Essay 1

Week 7: Oct. 12

Planning, the public interest, and the question of values

- FD, Ch. 19, 20, 21
- Dworkin (2011, Ch. 18)
- Campbell and Marshall (2002)
- Maskin and Sen (2014)
- Klosterman (1983)
- Moroni (2004)
- Spicer (2001)
- Wall (2012), accessible from: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perfectionism-moral/>

Week 8: Oct. 19

Planning and markets (efficiency)

- FD, Ch. 5, 9
- Moore (1978)
- Munzer (1990), Ch. 8
- Banerjee (1993)
- Richardson and Gordon (1993)

Week 9: Oct. 26

Planning and distributive justice (liberty and equality)

- Gaus (2014), accessible from: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism/>
- Rawls (excerpt in Cohen and Fermon [1996]), pp. 669-697
- Nozick (excerpt in Cohen and Fermon [1996]), pp. 698-708
- Mills (2008)
- Stein and Harper (2005)
- Krumholz (1982)
- FD, Ch. 13
- Basta (2015)
- Steil (2018)

Week 10: Nov. 2

Planning, sustainability, and environmental justice

- FD, Ch. 11, 12
- Wheeler (1998)
- Sen (2013)
- Schlosberg (2013)

- Dawkins (2017)

Week 11: Nov. 9

Planning as social learning (pragmatism)

- JF, Ch. 5
- Healey (2009)

Discussion of Essay 2

Week 12: Nov. 16

Planning as social mobilization (Marxism and critical theory)

- JF, Ch. 6
- FD, Ch. 5
- Harvey (1996)
- Bernstein (1976), Part IV
- Williams (2020)

Week 13: Nov. 23

NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING BREAK

Week 14: Nov. 30

Communicative / collaborative planning

- Forester (1980)
- Huxley and Yiftachel (2000)
- Hoch (2007)
- Fischler (2000)
- Huxley (2000)
- Healey (1999)
- Sager (2006)
- Purcell (2009)
- Innes and Booher (2015)
- Healey (2003)
- Kaza (2013)

Week 15: Dec. 7

Presentation and discussion of student-chosen readings

Week 16: Dec. 14

Final presentations