

USP 541 Public Participation, Diversity, Professional Ethics

Winter 2006

Tuesdays, 12:00 – 2:40 p.m.

URBN 270

Dr. Connie Ozawa
URB 370R, x5-5126
E-mail: ozawac@pdx.edu

The professional planner acts within a particular (though varying) institutional context. 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.

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: Emergin Participatory Planning Processes*. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999).

Additional Resources

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

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 12 noon on the date specified, unless otherwise noted.) Rewrites are allowed and due one week after papers are returned.

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

1. Memo – Due January 17, 2006

A group of angry citizens has complained to the mayor that the city planners are

railroading the future of their neighborhood. They believe that the technical analyses are biased and that a handful of people are making all the major decisions. The Planning Director has asked each staff planner, including you, to write a brief memo describing what you believe is the ethical responsibility of the planner in the context of public decision-making. How do you in your practice handle your personal values, especially if and when they conflict with others, such as business groups, residents, or white supremacists? (Two pages max., 10 points)

2. Memo – Unrepresented Interest Group - Due February 7, 2006.

Identify one group who was not directly represented in your plan. Make a case for why they should have been included and how their inclusion could be facilitated. (Two pages max, 15 points.)

3. Plan Reflections on Ethics – Due February 21, 2006.

This memo is a group assignment. Write a *letter* to the AICP ethics board from the perspective of a concerned professional that either defends or raises questions about the ethics of a decision in the plan itself or in its development. By what principles could the plan be ethically supported and by what principles could questions arise? Clearly explain what the dilemma is, and why you believe the decision made was or was not appropriate. (Five pages max., 20 points)

4. Planners and Negotiations – Due February 28, 2006.

Identify a conflict or an opportunity for negotiations encountered by the planner(s) who prepared the plan you are studying. Placing yourself in the planning process immediately prior to the conflict or potential conflict, write a memo to the Planning Director explaining how and why a negotiation might be effectively conducted. (Three pages max., 20 points)

5. Memo - Plan Reflections to Ethically Improve Public Participation – Due March 14, 2006.

This is a group assignment. Write a memo to the Planning Director identifying a major shortcoming of the public participation process utilized during the planning process. Explain how this shortcoming may be overcome. Provide illustrative examples from the readings, as appropriate. (Five pages, 20 points)

6. In-Class Participation – 10 points

7. Group Presentation – 5 points

Ph.D. Students

1. Two-page (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 17, 2006.
2. Draft outline of USP 541 paper due. February 21, 2006.
 3. In-class presentation.
 4. Final paper due March 14, 2006.

CLASS SCHEDULE

January 10 Introductions and Course Overview

Reading: None

January 17 Public Involvement in Planning

Readings

Louis Albrechts, The Planning Community Reflects on Enhancing Public Involvement. Views from Academics and Reflective Practitioners. *Planning Theory and Practice*. Vol. 3, No 3, 331-347, 2002.

E. R. Alexander, "The Planner-Prince: Interdependence, Rationalities and Post-Communicative Practice" *Planning Theory and Practice*. Vol. 2, No 3, 331-347, 2001.

Ann Fadiman, *When the Spirit Catches You*, pp. 3-118.

January 24 Planning with Diversity

Readings

Ann Fadiman, *When the Spirit Catches You*, pp. 154-288.

Sandercock, Leonie, (2000) "When Strangers Become Neighbours: Managing Cities of Difference," *Planning Theory & Practice*; Vol. 1 Issue 1, p 13-30.

January 31 Ethical Issues in Land Use Planning

Readings

Beatley, pp. 33-152.

February 7 Ethical Issues (cont.)

Readings:

Beatley, pp. 155-274.

February 14 Professional Ethics

Readings

Forester, pp. 1-58.

Web – AICP Code of Ethics

February 21 Public Participation: Narratives and Negotiation

Readings

Forester, pp. 59-153.

Paul Selman, (2001) "Social Capital, Sustainability and Environmental Planning."
Planning Theory and Practice, Vol. 2, No. 1, 13-30,.

February 28 Collaborative Planning and Consensus Building

Readings

Forester, pp. 155-249.

Judith Innes, (1996). "Planning through Consensus Building: A New View of the
Comprehensive Planning Ideal," *Journal of the American Planning Association*,
Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 460-472.

Van Driesche, Jason, Lane, Marcus, (2002) "Conservation through Conversation:
Collaborative Planning for Reuse of a Former Military Property in Sauk County,
Wisconsin, USA," *Planning Theory and Practice*, Vol. 3 Issue 2, p133-153,.

March 7 Group Presentations.

March 14 Group presentations. *Group memo due at start of class.*

Finals week: *Special meeting dates and times: Monday, March 20: 10:15-12:05.*