

USP 541 Public Participation, Diversity, and Professional Ethics
Winter 2008
Tuesdays, 1:00 – 3:40 p.m.
ED 408

Dr. Connie Ozawa
URB 370R, x5-5126
Office Hours: Wednesdays, 1:00-3:00 or by appointment
E-mail: ozawac@pdx.edu

This course examines 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 specifically at conceptualizations of the planning process and the planner's role in helping to structure it, differing notions of how to bring the public into planning discussions, and how issues of diversity are, or are not, addressed. The course investigates instances of planner's work to understand in practical terms the practical dilemmas that arise. The objective of the course is to increase the awareness of the ethical consequences of planner's actions, 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 Press, 1994).

Ann Fadiman, *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down*, (New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997).

John Forester, *The Deliberative Practitioner: Emerging Participatory Planning Processes*. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999).

Additional Resources

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/pw/p_memo.html

Journal articles obtainable through PSU Millar Library's electronic journals.

Written Assignments

Unless otherwise indicated, all written submissions should be typed in **12-point font** and double-spaced. 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.

Plagiarism is not tolerated. All excerpted material, including graphics, should be attributed properly 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.

1. Memo to Planning Directory – Due January 15, 2008

A group of angry citizens has complained to the media, the mayor and the city council, that the city's planners are railroading the future of their neighborhood. The Planning Director has asked each of her staff planners to write a two-page memo recommending how the Planning Department should respond. (Two pages **max.**, 10 points)

2. Memo to Planning Director – Unrepresented Stakeholder Group - Due February 5, 2008.

Identify a stakeholder group who was/was not well represented in your plan. This group may be an ethnic or cultural group, or a non-English-speaking immigrant group. Explain in what ways this group was/was not adequately represented. If this group was not adequately included, make a case (plausible, backed up with data, if available) for why they should have been. This is an individual assignment. (Two pages max, 15 points.)

3. Plan Reflections on Ethics – Due February 19, 2008.

This memo is a group assignment. Identify a specific goal and implementation strategy (a technical fix and a policy instrument) in your plan. If no implementation strategy was included, propose one. Then, provide an analysis of who gains what and who loses what from two alternative policy instruments applied to the technical fix chosen. Explain why this occurred. That is, what are the underlying theory of planning and the ethical considerations of the planners involved? (Five pages max., 20 points)

4. Planners and Negotiations – Due March 4, 2008.

Describe one mechanism for public participation that was incorporated into the planning making process of the plan you are studying. Write a memo to the Planning Director explaining how this public participation event might be analyzed and/or improved using a negotiation frame. This is an individual assignment. (Three pages max., 20 points)

5. Memo – Plan Critique: The Role of the Planner(s) – Due March 11/18, 2007.

This is a group assignment. Referencing various conceptions discussed in class and in the readings, what role(s) did the planner(s) in your plan assume? How did they deal with ethical choices? Even if no explicit dilemmas are evident, explain the ethical stance s/he/they assumed in the making of their work. In what ways did this promote the interests of the public? (Five pages, 20 points)

In-Class Activities

1. Attendance and Participation

We will establish “*groundrules*” for participation in this class. Attendance counts: The class meets 12 times; each session is worth 1 point. (10 + 2 bonus point)

2. Group Presentation

The presentation or activity should engage the class, substantively inform us about your plan, and draw out issues concerning public participation, diversity and/or ethics. (5 points)

Ph.D. Students

In addition to absorbing the course 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 15, 2008.
2. Draft outline of USP 541 paper due. January 29, 2008
3. In-class presentation on March 4. 2008.

CLASS SCHEDULE

	Readings
January 8 Introductions and Course Overview	None.
January 15 Planner's Ethics Guest Lecturer: Arnold Cogan, FAICP, Planner-in-Residence; Principal of Cogan, Owens, Cogan and Associates	Excerpts from Huw Thomas and Patsy Healey, <i>Dilemmas of Planning Practice: Ethics, Legitimacy and the Validation of Knowledge</i> , Brookfield USA: Avebury Technical, 1991. AICP Code of Ethics < http://www.planning.org/ethics/conduct.html > Gunder, Michael and Jean Hillier. "Conforming to the Expectation of the Profession: A Lacanian Perspective on Planning Practice, Values and Ethics." <i>Planning Theory and Practice</i> . 5(2): 217-235, 2004. Hendler, Sue. "Toward a Feminist Code of Planning Ethics." <i>Planning Theory and Practice</i> , 6(1):53-69, 2005.
January 22 Ethical Issues in Land Use Planning Planning with Diversity	Beatley, pp. 33-152.
January 29	Beatley, pp. 155-274. Heather Campbell (2006) "Just Planning: The Art of Situated Judgment," <i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i> , 26(1): 92-106.
February 5 Ethical Issues (cont.)	Ann Fadiman, <i>The Spirit Catches You</i> , pp. 1-118 Sandercock, Leonie , (2000) "When Strangers Become Neighbours: Managing Cities of Difference," <i>Planning Theory & Practice</i> ; Vol. 1 Issue 1, p 13-30.
February 12 Professional Ethics	Fadiman, 140-288.
February 19 Public Participation and Narratives	Forester, pp. 1-111. Archon Fung, "Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance," <i>Public Administration Review</i> , December 2006, Special Issue.
February 26 Negotiation and Deliberative Practice	Forester, pp. 115-197.
March 4	Doctoral student presentations.
March 11 Collaborative Planning and Consensus Building	Forester, pp. 201-249. Judith Innes, (1996). "Planning through Consensus Building: A New View of the Comprehensive Planning Ideal," <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> , Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 460-472.
March 17 10:15-12:05, Group Presentations	
March 20 , Final Class 10:15-12:05, Group Presentations	