Fall 2013
CIRP 5303 Planning Theory and History
Dr. Enid Arvidson
Tuesday, 7:00-9:50 p.m.
University Hall room 2
University of Texas, Arlington

Phone: (817) 272-3349
Fax: (817) 272-5008
email: enid@uta.edu
Office Location: University Hall 503
Office Hours: Wednesday afternoon 2-4 p.m. by appointment

☙ Course Description

This course introduces students to various ways of understanding what planners do when they "do" planning. The course surveys a variety of different theories, or "paradigms," used by planners in carrying out and explaining their practice, including rational comprehensive planning, communicative action, advocacy planning, and radical planning. In explaining the content of each approach, the course also considers the historical, social, intellectual contexts in which these approaches arose and which condition their existence. In the process of studying the various planning approaches, we also evaluate the different approaches for their underlying values and social consequences. Insodoing, students are encouraged to become aware of their own values and to reflect on the ethical, social, political consequences of the various different ways of practicing planning.

☙ Student Learning Outcomes

By the end of the semester, each student will:

- Explain the diverse approaches, or "paradigms," used by planners when they do planning
- Describe the historical and social contexts in which these diverse approaches arose
- Compare in detail the differences and similarities between two specific approaches
- Apply their knowledge of planning approaches to analyze two specific planning case studies
- Recognize ethics and consequences associated with different planning approaches

☙ Required Textbooks and Other Course Materials

Required texts for this class, available at the UTA Bookstore, are:

N. Taylor. 1998. *Urban Planning Theory since 1945*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, ISBN: 978-0761960935.

S. Fainstein and S. Campbell, eds. 2012. *Readings in Planning Theory, 3rd ed*. Cambridge: Blackwell, ISBN: 978-1444330809.

Required additional readings:

In addition to the two texts, a number of xeroxed journal articles and book chapters from various sources are required. These items are available for free download through the instructor's MavSpace (link is provided in Blackboard).

Recommended texts for this class that complements the assigned material for class (not pre-ordered at UTA Bookstore), are:

M. Brooks. 2002. *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. Chicago: APA Planners Press, ISBN: 978-1884829598

D. Krueckeberg, ed. 1983. *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers. ISBN: 978-0882850832

☙ Course Requirements and Descriptions of Major Assignments and Exams with Due Dates

Grades are based on the following three requirements (see the **Grading Policy** section of this syllabus for how course grade is calculated):

1) Participate in class discussion. In addition to participating in the weekly in-class discussion of the material, this participation involves two additional things for master's students and three additional things for doctoral students:

a) Weekly Written Interpretation of Readings and Multiple Choice Question on the Week's Material (master's and doctoral): write a weekly one-page, double-spaced *interpretation* (not summary) of the week's readings. It is suggested that you use your weekly interpretation as a guide for your in-class contributions. The weekly interpretation should not be a summary of the readings but instead should synthesize and reflect on the readings, linking the weekly readings to one another and to the week's topic. Interpretations and multiple choice question should be emailed to the instructor by no later than noon of the day on which they are to be discussed. They can be emailed as a Word.doc, pdf file, or pasted into the body of the email. **The subject line must include the words "planning theory interpretation."** Please also bring a copy of your interpretation to class to use as basis for your in-class contributions. **Due: weekly**.

Notes: To write an *interpretation* rather than summary, you may find the technique of Free Writing useful (please see the **Free Writing** section of this syllabus). To write a good multiple choice question, please see the **Tips for Writing Good Multiple Choice Questions** section of this syllabus.

b) In-class Research Presentation on one of the following (sign-up sheets are circulated the first day of class) (master's and doctoral). Due: see sign up sheet for your due date

i) Organization Presentation: research and prepare a 1-page summary handout (bring enough copies for the instructor and all students) and make a maximum 10-minute in-class presentation on a professional organization in which planners traditionally have been active. In your presentation, you should use the classroom web access to visit the organization's website, and provide details about such things as (but not limited to): mission and purpose; history; board membership; publications including content and types of issues covered; meetings and conferences; dues and membership; chapters or divisions; services to planners or the profession; special services for students; awards, scholarships, funding; relevance to planners; etc. Some of this information may not be available on the organization's website, so don't wait until the last minute to prepare your presentation; do allow yourself time to contact the organization, or visit the library, to obtain additional information or materials. **You must rehearse your presentation ahead of time (do not waste class time by navigating the website for the first or second time during your presentation).**

OR

ii) Course Content Presentation: Lead the weekly discussion. This means making a case for, and thoughtful interpretation of, the readings based on how they relate to that week's topic and the overall narrative about planning that is being built in the course. Be prepared also to suggest some provocative questions about the readings that can be discussed in class.

OR

iii) Case Study Presentation: Research and prepare a 1-page summary handout (bring enough copies for the instructor and all students) and make a maximum 10-minute in-class presentation on a case study of one of the planning theories discussed in class (a case study is an actual plan that is an example or illustration). In your presentation, be sure to link your case study with the week's readings. In particular, provide details about the *process* (rather than the substance) that was followed in the case study (that is, focus on the "who" and the "how," rather than the "what"). To focus on the *process*, you need to look behind-the-scenes of the plan. Some plans have a section describing the process that was followed in developing the plan. Some do not. Whether they do or not, you will need to dig deeper than what the plan says about itself to find details of the process that was followed, how the process unfolded, the role of citizens, the role of the planner, how decisions were made, the "politics" involved in the process, inclusion (or exclusion) of "stakeholders," planning outcomes, and values embedded in each approach. If two theories and case studies are discussed in one week, the students signed up for that week should coordinate ahead of time, and compare and contrast the two case studies as part of their presentation.

c) Review Essay and Panel Presentation (doctoral only): Purchase and read **either** P. Hall's *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century* (2001, Blackwell Publishers, ISBN 978-0631232520), **or** J. Friedmann's *Insurgencies: Essays in Planning Theory* (2011,

Routledge, ISBN 978-0415781527). Then write a short (±5 pages, double-spaced) book review essay — *not* a summary but rather a review essay (see the *New York Times* Book Review section for examples of how to write an interesting review essay).

A **panel discussion** about the books is also required, basing your comments on your review essay. A panel discussion is a structured conversation among panelists (in this case, the Ph.D. students) in front of an audience (in this case, the rest of the class). One Ph.D. student will serve as moderator (choose amongst yourselves who will serve as moderator). Duties of the moderator are: i) open and close the discussion, ii) structure the discussion and keep it on track, iii) encourage interaction among panelists (for example, by pointing out differences or similarities in viewpoints), iv) highlight, summarize, and synthesize points made by panelists, v) lead Q&A from the audience. Because the discussion is structured, it must be planned and rehearsed ahead of time by all members of the panel. **Book reviews are due and panel discussion is held November 26.**

2) Satisfactorily pass the midterm exam testing your knowledge of the material covered up to that point in the course. The exam is administered on Blackboard. The link will be available for a 5-day period beginning 6:00 a.m. on October 18 and ending 10:00 p.m. on October 22. You must take the midterm exam during this time. **Midterm exam is due any time after October 18 and no later than October 22 at 10 p.m.**

3) Complete a term research paper. This paper involves two things:

a) Write a one-page proposal memo for the term research paper. In the memo, you must identify the following: i) your topic, ii) your two selected planning approaches from among those discussed in class, iii) your two selected case studies on the same topic but from each of the two selected planning approaches, and iv) an initial bibliography that is properly formatted. This memo serves as the proposal for your term research paper. There are many online resources describing how to write a memo, if you need assistance with memo writing. **Proposal memos are due in class on October 1.**

b) Complete a term research paper on a planning topic of your choice in which you compare and contrast two different planning approaches to your topic and present two different case studies as examples that illustrate the different planning approaches to your topic (a case study is an actual plan that is an example or illustration). The point of the paper is to allow you to explore in detail two of the approaches, or paradigms, discussed during the semester, to see how these theories have been practiced by planners. The paper should be roughly 20 double-spaced pages with 1 inch margins on all sides in 10 or 12 point font, and must include a properly-formatted bibliography. Suggested outline for term papers is as follows.

i) Introduction: state the topic and the two paradigms, and give a brief overview of the paper. Note: do not use this section to describe your topic in detail. The topic can't be described independently of the way it is defined within each of the paradigms; instead, use section (iii) to show the different ways of understanding your topic via each paradigm (half a page to one full page)

ii) Discussion of the two paradigms: discuss each paradigm in general terms. That is, discuss your paradigms in terms of the assigned readings rather than specifically as they relate to your topic and case studies (this latter is done in section (iii)). In your discussion, be sure to include the historical and social contexts in which the paradigms arose, as well as the underlying values of each paradigm. Base your discussion on the assigned readings and in-class discussion, as well as additional relevant references (roughly 6-7 pages)

iii) Presentation of your topic and case studies: describe your topic, and distinguish how it is understood within each paradigm. Then summarize your two case studies *as examples of* the two paradigms discussed in section (ii). Don't discuss your topic and case studies independently of the two paradigms; instead, use the case studies as examples through which to illustrate the paradigms discussed in section (ii). In particular, you should provide details about the *process* (rather than the substance) that was followed in the case studies (that is, focus on the "who" and the "how" rather than the "what"). To focus on the *process*, you need to look behind-the-scenes of the plan. Some plans have a section stating the process that was followed in developing the plan. Some do not.

Whether they do or not, you will need to dig deeper than what the plan says about itself to find details about what process was followed, how the process unfolded, the role of citizens, the role of the planner, how decisions were made, the "politics" involved, inclusion (or exclusion) of "stakeholders," intended and unintended outcomes, and implicit or explicit values embedded in each approach (roughly 6-7 pages)

iv) Compare and contrast: compare and contrast your two case studies. In this section, you should focus on how the two case studies, as examples of the two approaches, are different (or similar) in their process, roles of citizens and planners and "stakeholders," decision-making, planning outcomes, and values embedded in each approach. Do not give your opinion about which paradigm is "better" or more effective; instead, simply comment on the differences (and similarities) between the two approaches (roughly 4-6 pages)

v) Conclusion: summarize what you said in your paper (1-2 pages)

You are also expected to give a short (no more than 7 minutes) in-class presentation to share with the class your findings. Before submitting your term research paper, you must run it through the SafeAssign feature of Blackboard for plagiarism detection, and generate a clean report (see the **Academic Integrity** section of this syllabus for more information). **In-class presentations are November 26 through December 3, and Term Research Papers are due in class on December 3.**

NOTES:

a) All written assignments and presentations for this class must be of professional quality. This means carefully editing and proof-reading your written work for typing, stylistic, spelling, and grammatical errors, and for clarity of thought. These things will affect your grade. If you have questions about style, consult *The Chicago Manual of Style* or Strunk & White's *The Elements of Style*. All stylistic and formatting aspects of your paper, including your bibliography, must conform to the format listed in *The Chicago Manual of Style* or be consistent with some other recognized style. If you would like help with a paper draft, any UTA student can use the UTA Writing Center which can be reached at http://www.uta.edu/owl/Graduate%20Workshops.html or 272-2601. Students can also use the Paper's Due Drop Inn, http://www.uta.edu/library/help/pddi.php.

b) Be sure to keep copies of your written work that is submitted.

☙ Grading Policy

In-class participation per the two components (three for doctoral students) (due various)	15%
In-class midterm exam (due October 22)	40%
Term research paper memo (due October 1) *and* Term research paper including oral presentation (due November 26 and December 3)	45%

Weekly interpretations are not graded nor returned with comments; rather, credit is given for each weekly interpretation that is Satisfactory, based on the rubric described in the **Weekly Interpretation Evaluation Rubric** section of this syllabus. If your interpretation is not Satisfactory, the instructor will contact you with pointers and feedback to give you a chance to Revise and Resubmit it. If your revised interpretation is Satisfactory, then credit is given; if you choose not to revise and resubmit your interpretation, or if the revised interpretation is Unsatisfactory, then no credit is given for that interpretation.

Letter grades on the review essay and term research paper are based on the rubric described in the **Paper Grading Rubric** section of this syllabus. An "A" paper is one that is suitable for submission to a student-run peer-reviewed journal (such as UCLA's student-run journal, *Critical Planning* — more info, see: http://gsa.asucla.ucla.edu/services/publications/critical-planning) and/or for a nationally-competitive award for Best Student Paper (such as ACSP's Edward McClure Award — more info, see: http://www.acsp.org/awards/edward-mcclure-award).

Attendance Policy

- Regular class attendance is expected of all students (of course, real life is tolerated; if you must miss a class due, please let the instructor know ahead of time)
- Students are responsible for all course information, content, and assignments that may be missed due to absence

Academic Integrity

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating on a test or other coursework, plagiarism (offering the work of another as one's own), and unauthorized collaboration or file sharing with another person. Detailed descriptions of cheating, plagiarism, and collusion are found on the Office of Student Conduct website, http://www.uta.edu/studentaffairs/conduct/saiconstitutes.html. Academic dishonesty is prohibited by UTA (see http://grad.pci.uta.edu/about/catalog/current/general/regulations/#dishonesty).

All students are expected to pursue their academic careers with academic honesty and integrity. Students in this course who choose to engage in academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary sanctions, including the possibility of failure in the course and dismissal from the University. Since dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced.

Students sometimes plagiarize because they do not know how and when it is appropriate to cite the work of others. The most common examples of plagiarism include:

- word for word copying of sentences or paragraphs without quotation marks and clear citation of the source
- closely paraphrasing sentences or paragraphs without clear citation of the source (rewrite ideas in your own words and also then cite the source)
- drawing upon or using another person's ideas, work, data, or research without clear citation of the source

"It wasn't intentional" is NOT an excuse.

UTA offers a tutorial on plagiarism and it is strongly advised that all SUPA students take this tutorial (http://library.uta.edu/plagiarism/index.html). In addition, there are many useful websites and books that provide more information about plagiarism (see, for example, http://www.rbs2.com/plag.htm, or http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml).

Before submitting your term research paper for this course, you must run it through the SafeAssign feature of Blackboard for plagiarism detection. Please review your Originality Score and Report. You are looking for an Originality Score of 15% or less. Even if your score is less than 15% AND ESPECIALLY IF IT IS NOT, please review the matches one by one to be sure: i) all your sources are properly cited, ii) paraphrasing is completely in your own words, and iii) all verbatim quotations are set off by quotation marks. You should make revisions and run your paper through as many times as necessary to generate a clean Originality Report ("clean" = 15% or less and all matches taken care of).

Calendar

August 27: **Introductions**

September 3: **What Is Theory? Theoretical Diversity and Theoretical Choice**

Readings: T. S. Kuhn. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Selections from "A Role for History," "The Route to Normal Science," "The Nature and Necessity of Scientific Revolutions," "Revolution as Changes of World View," and "The Invisibility of Revolutions," pp. 1-13; 92-98; 111-113; 136-138. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

S. Resnick and R. Wolff. 1987. *Economics: Marxian versus Neoclassical*. Selections from "Two Different Theories," and "The Importance of Theoretical Differences," pp. 1-7; 10-14; 256-268. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. *[note: in making sense of this reading, do not focus on the specifics of economics and instead focus on the general issue of theoretical differences.]*

D. Schön. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, ch. 1, "The Crisis of Confidence in Professional Knowledge," pp. 3-20. New York: Basic Books.

September 10: What Is Planning? An Historical Answer: what were the historical contexts and conditions that gave rise to planning?

Readings: Taylor, chs. 1 & 2, "Town Planning as Physical Planning and Design," and "The Values of Post-War Planning Theory," pp. 3-37.

R. Fishman. "Urban Utopias: Ebenezer Howard and Le Corbusier," ch. 1 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 27-53.

E. Relph. 1987. *The Modern Urban Landscape*, chs. 4 & 6 "The Invention of Modern Town Planning," and "Modernism and Internationalism in Architecture: 1900-40," pp. 49-75 and 98-118. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

C. Boyer. 1990. *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning*, chs. 3 & 4, "In Search of a Spatial Order," and "The Rise of the Planning Mentality," pp. 33-82. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

A. Erickson. 2012. "A Brief History of the Birth of Urban Planning." *The Atlantic Cities*. August 24.

September 17: What Is Planning (cont)? A Theoretical Answer: how do planners explain and justify planning?

Readings: Taylor, "Introduction," pp. v-viii.

S. Fainstein and S. Campbell. "Introduction: Structure and Debates of Planning Theory," in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 1-20.

T. D. Galloway and R. G. Mahayni. 1977. "Planning Theory in Retrospect: The Process of Paradigm Change." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, January, pp. 62-71.

J. Friedmann. 1996. "Two Centuries of Planning Theory: An Overview," ch. 1 in S. Mandelbaum, L. Mazza, and R. Burchell, eds. *Explorations in Planning Theory*, pp. 10-29. New Brunswick, NJ: CUPR/Rutgers University Press.

P. Healey. "Traditions of Planning Thought," ch. 12 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 214-233.

S. Fainstein. "Planning Theory and the City," ch. 8 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 159-175.

September 24: Criticisms of Early Modern Physical Planning and the Rise of the Rational-Comprehensive Approach

Readings: Taylor, chs. 3 & 4, "Early Criticisms of Post-War Planning Theory," and "The Systems and Rational Process Views of Planning," pp. 38-74.

J. Jacobs. "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," ch. 3 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 72-86.

A. Faludi. 1973. "Towards Comprehensive Planning? Introduction," in A. Faludi, ed. *A Reader in Planning Theory*, pp. 113-126. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

E. C. Banfield. 1959. "Ends and Means in Planning," in A. Faludi, ed. *A Reader in Planning Theory*, pp. 139-149. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

C. Lindblom. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'," ch. 9 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 176-190.

A. Etzioni. 1967. "Mixed Scanning: A 'Third' Approach to Decision-making," in A. Faludi, ed. *A Reader in Planning Theory*, pp. 217-229. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

H. Hightower. 1969. "Planning Theory in Contemporary Professional Education." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, September: 326-329.

October 1: Criticisms of the Rational-Comprehensive Approach

Memo outlining term research paper is due

Readings: Taylor, chs. 6 (pp. 95-101 only) & 7 (pp. 111-top of 122 only), "Theory about the Effects of Planning," and "Rational Planning and Implementation"

J. Friedmann. 1971. "The Future of Comprehensive Planning: A Critique." *Public Administration Review*, May/June, pp. 315-326.

R. Goodman. 1985. "The Scientific Method: Salvation from Politics, " ch. 6 in *After the Planners*, pp. 143-170. New York: Simon and Schuster.

L. Dalton. 1986. "Why the Rational Paradigm Persists — The Resistance of Professional Education and Practice to Alternative Forms of Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Spring, 5(3): 147-153.

H. Baum. 1996. "Why the Rational Paradigm Persists: Tales from the Field." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Winter, 15(2): 127-135.

October 8: Advocacy and Equity Planning: Alternative Paradigms or Accommodation of the Rational-Comprehensive Approach?

1st and 2nd Case Study Presentations

Readings: Taylor, ch. 5, "Planning as a Political Process," pp. 75-91.

P. Davidoff. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," ch. 10 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 191-205.

S. Arnstein. 1969. "Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4): 216-224.

B. Checkoway. 1994. "Paul Davidoff and Advocacy Planning in Retrospect." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Spring, 60(2): 139-143.

T. Angotti. 2007. "Advocacy and Community Planning: Past, Present and Future." *Progressive Planning Magazine*, Spring, No. 171: 21-24.

L. R. Peattie. 1968. "Reflections on Advocacy Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, March, pp. 80-88.

N. Krumholz. 1982. "A Retrospective View of Equity Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Spring, 48(2): 163-174.

N. Krumholz. 1994. "Advocacy Planning: Can It Move the Center?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Spring, 60(2): 150-51.

October 15: **Criticisms of Advocacy Planning and the Rise of Radical Planning: The Influence of Marxism**

3rd Case Study Presentation

Readings: Taylor, ch. 6, "Theory about the Effects of Planning," pp. 101-110 only; ch. 8, "Planning Theory After the New Right," pp. 139-145 only.

F. F. Piven. 1970. "Whom Does the Advocate Planner Serve?" *Social Policy*, May/June: 32-35.

D. Mazziotti. 1982. "The Underlying Assumptions of Advocacy Planning: Pluralism and Reform," in C. Paris, ed. *Critical Readings in Planning Theory*, pp. 207-225 (read especially pp. 207-209 and 219-223). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

R. Foglesong. "Planning the Capitalist City," ch. 6 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 132-138.

D. Harvey. 1984. "On Planning the Ideology of Planning." In R. Burchell and G. Sternlieb, eds. *Planning Theory in the 1980s: A Search for Future Directions*, pp. 213–34. New Brunswick, NJ: Centre for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

R. Kraushaar. 1988. "Outside the Whale: Progressive Planning and the Dilemmas of Radical Reform." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Winter, pp. 91-100.

S. Fainstein. 2000. "New Directions in Planning Theory." *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(4): 451-478.

S. Grabow and A. Heskin. 1973. "Foundations for a Radical Concept of Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 39: 106-114.

October 22: **No in-class meeting — midterm exam due no later than 10 p.m. on October 22**

October 29: **Transactive Planning (The Contributions of John Friedmann) and Communicative Planning**

4th and 5th Case Study Presentations

Readings: Taylor, ch. 7 (pp. 122-129 only), "Rational Planning and Implementation."

J. Forester. 1980. "Critical Theory and Planning Practice." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, July, pp. 275-286.

M. Stephens. 1994. "The Theologian of Talk: An Interview with Habermas." *Los Angeles Times Magazine*, October 23.

J. Forester. "Challenges of Deliberation and Participation," ch. 11 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 206-213.

Judith Innes. 1995. "Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14(3):183-9.

J. Friedmann. 1973. *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning*, Preface and ch. 7, "The Transactive Style of Planning," pp. xiii-xx and 171-193. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

J. Friedmann. 1993. "Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59(4): 482-85.

November 5: **Postmodern Planning, or Planning in the Postmodern Era: Multicultural, Corporatist/Free-Market, And Narrative Trends In Planning**

6th and 7th Case Study Presentations

Readings:

General overview of topic:

Taylor, ch. 8, "Planning Theory After the New Right," pp. 130-154; ch. 9, "Paradigm Shifts, Modernism and Postmodernism," pp. 162-167 only.

B. Goodchild. 1990. "Planning and the Modern/Postmodern Debate." *Town Planning Review*, pp. 119-137.

M. Dear. 1986. "Postmodernism and Planning." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 4: 367-384.

Postmodern Planning as Corporatist/ Free-Market:

S. Staley and L. Scarlett. 1998. "Market-Oriented Planning: Principles and Tools for the 21st Century," *Planning and Markets*, 1(1).

J. Kaufman and H. Jacobs. 1987. "A Public Planning Perspective on Strategic Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 53(1): 23-33.

K. Goonewardena. 2007. "Planning and Neoliberalism: The Challenge for Radical Planners." *Planners Network Magazine*, Summer.

Postmodern Planning as Multicultural Diversity:

K. Umemoto. 2001. "Walking in Another's Shoes: Epistemological Challenges in Participatory Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21: 17-31.

F. Fischer. "Public Policy as Discursive Construct: Social Meaning and Multiple Realities," ch. 22 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 445-462.

I. Young, "Inclusion and Democracy," ch. 16 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 321-337.

S. Watson and K. Gibson. 1995. "Postmodern Politics and Planning," in K. Gibson and S. Watson, eds. *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, pp. 254-264. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Postmodern Planning as Narrative Trends:

J. Throgmorton. 1996. *Planning As Persuasive Storytelling: The Rhetorical Construction Of Chicago's Electrical Future*, ch. 2, "The Argumentative or Rhetorical Turn in Planning," pp. 36-54. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

November 12: **The Second Coming of Physical Planning: Place-making, New Urbanism, Neotraditionalism**

8th Case Study Presentation

Readings: A. Duany and E. Plater-Zyberk. 1992. "The Second Coming of the American Small Town." *Wilson Quaterly*, Winter: 19-48.

B. Lennertz. 2003. "The Charrette as an Agent for Change," in R. Steuteville and P. Langdon, eds. *New Urbanism: Comprehensive Report & Best Practices Guide, 3rd ed*. Ithaca: New Urban Publications.

S. Bond and M. Thompson-Fawcett. 2007. "Public Participation and New Urbanism: A Conflicting Agenda?" *Planning Theory & Practice*, 8(4): 449-472.

D. Harvey. 1997. "The New Urbanism and the Communitarian Trap." *Harvard Design Magazine*, Winter/Spring, No. 1.

Review (especially discussion on new urbanism): S. Fainstein. 2000. "New Directions in Planning Theory." *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(4): 451-478.

F. Roble. 1999. "Who Benefits From Smart Growth?" *Planners Network Magazine*, November/December.

M. Pyatok. 2002. "The Narrow Base of the New Urbanists." *Planners Network Magazine*, Spring.

November 19: **Planning Ethics, Values, and the Past and Future of Planning**

Guest Speaker

Readings: Taylor, ch. 9, "Paradigm Shifts, Modernism and Postmodernism," pp. 157-169.

American Institute of Certified Planners. "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct," ch. 21 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 439-444 (look for places where the various paradigms we have discussed have influenced ethical standards).

American Planning Association. 1992. "Ethical Principles in Planning." http://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicalprinciples.htm (please download and read; look for places where the various paradigms we have discussed have influenced ethical standards)

J. Friedmann, "The Good City: In Defense of Utopian Thinking," ch. 4 in Fainstein and Campbell, pp. 87-104.

J. Innes and D. Booher. 2004. "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century." *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(4): 419-436.

R. Beauregard. 2001. "The Multiplicities of Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20: 437-439.

November 26: **Panel Discussion of P. Hall's *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century* and J. Friedmann's *Insurgencies: Essays in Planning Theory*, led by doctoral students**

Term research paper presentations begin

Book Reviews due in class

December 3: **Term research paper presentations conclude**

Term research papers due in class

☙ Free Writing

Free Writing is a technique developed by Peter Elbow (1973), and enhanced by other writers, where a person writes continuously for a set period of time without regard to spelling, grammar or continuity of thought. It produces immediate, often unusable, material, but allows a writer to overcome writer's block, and allows them to start putting their ideas down in writing.

To write your weekly interpretation, as well as your research term paper (or any other paper or report for another class or for work) the following process may be useful: read carefully and take notes on the readings. Reread your notes to be sure they make sense and to get the ideas into your head. Then, to start writing, put your notes and readings aside and use the technique of Free Writing to write about impressions and reactions. Be sure to polish up, edit, and proofread your Free Writing before turning in your work. Do not turn in unedited writing! Also, do not include your opinions in work (everyone has an opinion; the challenge is to have an informed, educated opinion).

Free Writing follows these steps:

- Write down your topic (whatever topic you are choosing for this Free Writing session) at the top of an empty page.
- Give yourself a time limit — for example, 5, 10, 15, or 20 minutes — and set the timer for this amount of time.
- Start the timer and write nonstop for the set period of time.
- Write whatever comes to mind about the topic.
- If you get off topic or run out of ideas, keep writing anyway. Do not stop writing while the timer is going.
- Keep writing until the time is up. Do not pause to think, or to stare into space, or to read what you've written. Keep your hand moving, even if you have to write something like, "I don't know what to write" over and over again.
- If you feel bored or self-conscious as you're Free Writing, start writing about being bored or self-conscious, something like, "I feel really stupid doing this. This is really dumb."
- Do not make corrections as you write.
- Do not pay attention to grammar, spelling, punctuation, neatness, or style. Nobody else will read what you produce in your Free Writing.
- Do not judge or censor what you are writing.
- When the timer stops, stop writing.

****

- Take a break, then come back to what you have written and read it over. You might find it beneficial to read it out loud.
- At this stage, spend time going through your Free Writing, and look for themes or patterns related to the topic.
- Get out another empty page. Transfer and rewrite some of the good stuff from the Free Writing. Omit the divergences, the nonsense, and the "I can't think of anything to say" lines.
- If some of the material is still unusable, undeveloped, or you don't have enough material for your essay, repeat the above steps, narrowing down your topic, to get additional ideas down on paper.

****

- Once you have produced enough material from your Free Writing to transfer to an essay, be sure to carefully edit your essay before sharing it with others. This means carefully editing and proof-reading your essay for typing, stylistic, spelling, and grammatical errors, and for clarity of thought. If you have questions about style, consult *The Chicago Manual of Style* or Strunk & White's *The Elements of Style*. All stylistic and formatting aspects of your paper, including your bibliography if you have one, must conform to the format listed in *The Chicago Manual of Style* or be consistent with some other recognized style.

This information about Free Writing is compiled for use in CIRP 5303 Planning History and Theory, University of Texas at Arlington, from the following sources:

http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/GRAMMAR/composition/brainstorm_freewrite.htm
http://web.mst.edu/~gdoty//classes/concepts-practices/free-writing.html
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free_writing
Elbow, Peter. 1973. *Writing without Teachers.* Oxford: OUP.

☙ Tips for Writing Good Multiple Choice Questions

Definitions:

Item = the entire multiple choice question
Stem = the first, sentence-like portion of the multiple choice question
Alternates or options = all of the possible multiple-choice responses
Keyed response = correct answer
Distractor or foil = the wrong answers. They are called distracters or foils because they should be written to closely resemble the keyed response, therefore distracting or foiling students who are good as guessing.

1. Writing the Stem:

a. Use a question format — Write the stem as a complete sentence

Multiple-choice questions should be questions (rather than incomplete statements)

Incomplete Statement: The capital of California is in _____

Direct Question: In which of the following cities is the capital of California?

b. Make sure the grammar and syntax in the stem and options are correct and are consistent

i) use simple, precise and unambiguous wording
ii) use vocabulary that is consistent with in-class discussions and students' level of understanding
iii) avoid textbook, verbatim phrasing when developing stems

c. Avoid overly specific knowledge when developing questions

i) base each item on broader or important topics, themes, or issues in the course, not on trivial information or factual detail
ii) focus on a single problem or issue or idea for each item
iii) items should be based on course materials, not on information outside the course
iv) avoid questions based on opinions

d. Avoid "negative" stems, or using negative words such as "except" or "not." — if you can't avoid a negative, then capitalize the negative word (e.g., Which of the following is NOT the capital of California?)

e. Engage different levels of knowledge in different questions

Factual knowledge: Write the fact as a statement and then transform the statement into a question that serves as the stem.
Conceptual knowledge: Write a stem from this template: Which of the following is an example of _____?
Procedural knowledge: Write a stem that asks the student to demonstrate the use of the procedural knowledge or solve a problem.
Applied knowledge: Write a stem that requires the student first to recall the facts and then apply or transfer the application of those facts into a situation.

2. Writing the Options and Distractors:

a. Use Plausible Distractors — the best distracters help diagnose where each student went wrong in his or her thinking. Identify each mental task that students need to do to answer a question correctly, and create a distracter that students would arrive at if they completed a step incorrectly

b. Write the options so they are homogeneous in length, grammar and syntax (avoid making your correct answer the long or short answer)

i) include from three to five options for each question — more than five options does not help discriminate performance. Also, it is difficult to write more than five good options.
ii) avoid repeating words between the stem and the correct response. Test-wise students will pick up this clue.

c. Avoid using "None of the above" or "All of the above" — a student may correctly recognize wrong answers without knowing the right answer, and these options may penalize those in a timed tests who know the material but are slow readers.

Paper Grading Rubric

	The A Paper	The B Paper	The C Paper	The D Paper	The F Paper
Ideas	Excels in responding to assignment. Interesting, demonstrates sophistication of thought. Central idea/thesis is clearly communicated, worth developing; limited enough to be manageable. Paper recognizes some complexity of its thesis: may acknowledge its contradictions, qualifications, or limits and follow out their logical implications. Understands and critically evaluates its sources, appropriately	A solid paper, responding appropriately to assignment. Clearly states a thesis/central idea, but may have minor lapses in development. Begins to acknowledge the complexity of central idea and the possibility of other points of view. Shows careful reading of sources, but may not evaluate them critically. Attempts to define terms, not always successfully.	Adequate but weaker and less effective, possibly responding less well to assignment. Presents central idea in general terms, often depending on platitudes or clichés. Usually does not acknowledge other views. Shows basic comprehension of sources, perhaps with lapses in understanding. If it defines terms, often depends on dictionary definitions.	Does not have a clear central idea or does not respond appropriately to the assignment. Thesis may be too vague or obvious to be developed effectively. Paper may misunderstand sources.	Does not respond to the assignment, lacks a thesis or central idea, and may neglect to use sources where necessary.
Organization & coherence	Uses a logical structure appropriate to paper's subject, purpose, audience, thesis, and disciplinary field. Sophisticated transitional sentences often develop one idea from the previous one or identify their logical relations. It guides the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.	Shows a logical progression of ideas and uses fairly sophisticated transitional devices; e.g., may move from least to more important idea. Some logical links may be faulty, but each paragraph clearly relates to paper's central idea.	May list ideas or arrange them randomly rather than using any evident logical structure. May use transitions, but they are likely to be sequential (first, second, third) rather than logic-based. While each paragraph may relate to central idea, logic is not always clear. Paragraphs have topic sentences but may be overly general, and arrangement of sentences within paragraphs may lack coherence.	May have random organization, lacking internal paragraph coherence and using few or inappropriate transitions. Paragraphs may lack topic sentences or main ideas, or may be too general or too specific to be effective. Paragraphs may not all relate to paper's thesis.	No appreciable organization; lacks transitions and coherence
Support	Uses evidence appropriately and effectively, providing sufficient evidence and explanation to convince.	Begins to offer reasons to support its points, perhaps using varied kinds of evidence. Begins to interpret the evidence and explain connections between evidence and main ideas. Its examples bear some relevance.	Often uses generalizations to support its points. May use examples, but they may be obvious or not relevant. Often depends on unsupported opinion or personal experience, or assumes that evidence speaks for itself and needs no application to the point being discussed. Often has lapses in logic.	Depends on clichés or overgeneralizations for support, or offers little evidence of any kind. May be personal narrative rather than essay, or summary rather than analysis.	Uses irrelevant details or lacks supporting evidence entirely. May be unduly brief.

(continued)	The A Paper	The B Paper	The C Paper	The D Paper	The F Paper
Style	Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses an appropriate level of specificity. Sentence style fits paper's audience and purpose. Sentences are varied, yet clearly structured and carefully focused, not long and rambling.	Generally uses words accurately and effectively, but may sometimes be too general. Sentences generally clear, well structured, and focused, though some may be awkward or ineffective.	Uses relatively vague and general words, may use some inappropriate language. Sentence structure generally correct, but sentences may be wordy, unfocused, repetitive, or confusing.	May be too vague and abstract, or very personal and specific. Usually contains several awkward or ungrammatical sentences; sentence structure is simple or monotonous.	Usually contains many awkward sentences, misuses words, employs inappropriate language.
Mechanics	Almost entirely free of spelling punctuation, and grammatical errors.	May contain a few errors, which may annoy the reader but not impede understanding.	Usually contains several mechanical errors, which may temporarily confuse the reader but not impede the overall understanding.	Usually contains either many mechanical errors or a few important errors that block the reader's understanding and ability to see connections between thoughts.	Usually contains so many mechanical errors that it is impossible for the reader to follow the thinking from sentence to sentence.
Citation & bibliographic practices	Consistent, appropriate use of quotations and paraphrasing, with no hint of plagiarism. Uniform and appropriate handling of in-text citations (or footnotes). Well-organized reference list or bibliography with appropriate, consistent style.	Occasional, minor lapses in use of quotations and paraphrasing, with no hint of plagiarism. Minor inconsistency or inappropriate handling of citations. Reference list or bibliography has minor problems with organization or style.	More frequent minor lapses in use of quotations and paraphrasing, with no hint of plagiarism. Some minor inconsistency or mishandling of citations. Reference list or bibliography has more serious organizational or style problems.	Crude use of quotations or paraphrasing, perhaps with serious inconsistency or mishandling of citations. Plagiarism (including unintentional plagiarism) may be strongly suspected. Reference list or bibliography may have serious problems in organization or style.	Grievously defective use of quotations or paraphrasing or serious mishandling of citations. Plagiarism (even if unintentional) can be demonstrated. Reference list or bibliography deeply defective in organization or style.

Original rubric provided by UTA's Office of Instructional Assessment (12-2010) Modeled after UC Davis English Department Composition Program rubric

ଓ Weekly Interpretation Evaluation Rubric

Weekly Interpretation Evaluation Rubric	Satisfactory (receives full credit)	Revise and Resubmit (receives full credit if revisions are Satisfactory; receives no credit if revisions are Unsatisfactory)	Unsatisfactory (receives no credit)
Ideas and Support	Responds to the assignment. Shows careful reading of the material, and main ideas are clearly communicated. Points are supported by relevant evidence and/or examples from the material, and connections between evidence and main ideas are provided.	Does not respond appropriately to the assignment. Shows hasty or sloppy reading of the material, and/or main ideas are unclearly communicated. Points are unsupported, or depend on clichés, opinion, personal experience, or overgeneralizations, rather than the material, for support; provides sparse connections between evidence and main ideas.	No paper is submitted, or response shows hasty or sloppy reading of the material and lacks coherence. Points are unsupported, or depend on clichés, opinion, personal experience, or overgeneralizations, rather than the material, for support; provides insufficient connections between evidence and main ideas.
Organization, Style, and Mechanics	Sentences generally have clear syntax, and are grammatically correct and focused; words are used accurately and effectively. Shows logical progression of thought. May contain a few errors which may annoy the reader but not impede the reader's understanding. No hint of plagiarism.	Sentences have awkward syntax, and/or are grammatically incorrect; logical progression is not always clear. Contains many mechanical errors, or a few substantive errors, that block the reader's understanding. Plagiarism (including unintentional plagiarism) may be suspected.	No paper is submitted, or sentences have awkward syntax, and grammar and words are misused. Contains so many stylistic, organizational, and/or mechanical problems that it is impossible for the reader to follow the points sentence to sentence. Plagiarism (even if unintentional) can be demonstrated.

☙ The Stuff at the End of the Syllabus

Drop Policy: Students may drop or swap (adding and dropping a class concurrently) classes through self-service in MyMav from the beginning of the registration period through the late registration period. After the late registration period, students must see their academic advisor to drop a class or withdraw. Undeclared students must see an advisor in the University Advising Center. Drops can continue through a point two-thirds of the way through the term or session. It is the student's responsibility to officially withdraw if they do not plan to attend after registering. Students will not be automatically dropped for non-attendance. Repayment of certain types of financial aid administered through the University may be required as the result of dropping classes or withdrawing. For more information, contact the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships (http://wweb.uta.edu/aao/fao/).

Americans with Disabilities Act: The University of Texas at Arlington is on record as being committed to both the spirit and letter of all federal equal opportunity legislation, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). All instructors at UT Arlington are required by law to provide "reasonable accommodations" to students with disabilities, so as not to discriminate on the basis of that disability. Any student requiring an accommodation for this course must provide the instructor with official documentation in the form of a letter certified by the staff in the Office for Students with Disabilities, University Hall 102. Only those students who have officially documented a need for an accommodation will have their request honored. Information regarding diagnostic criteria and policies for obtaining disability-based academic accommodations can be found at http://www.uta.edu/disability or by calling the Office for Students with Disabilities at (817) 272-3364.

Academic Integrity: Students enrolled in this course are expected to adhere to the UT Arlington Honor Code:

> *I pledge, on my honor, to uphold UT Arlington's tradition of academic integrity, a tradition that values hard work and honest effort in the pursuit of academic excellence.*
>
> *I promise that I will submit only work that I personally create or contribute to group collaborations, and I will appropriately reference any work from other sources. I will follow the highest standards of integrity and uphold the spirit of the Honor Code.*

UT Arlington faculty members may employ the Honor Code as they see fit in their courses, including (but not limited to) having students acknowledge the honor code as part of an examination or requiring students to incorporate the honor code into any work submitted. Per UT System Regents' Rule 50101, §2.2, suspected violations of university's standards for academic integrity (including the Honor Code) will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. Violators will be disciplined in accordance with University policy, which may result in the student's suspension or expulsion from the University.

Student Support Services: UT Arlington provides a variety of resources and programs designed to help students develop academic skills, deal with personal situations, and better understand concepts and information related to their courses. Resources include tutoring, major-based learning centers, developmental education, advising and mentoring, personal counseling, and federally funded programs. For individualized referrals, students may visit the reception desk at University College (Ransom Hall), call the Maverick Resource Hotline at 817-272-6107, send a message to resources@uta.edu, or view the information at http://www.uta.edu/resources.

Electronic Communication: UT Arlington has adopted MavMail as its official means to communicate with students about important deadlines and events, as well as to transact university-related business regarding financial aid, tuition, grades, graduation, etc. All students are assigned a MavMail account and are responsible for checking the inbox regularly. There is no additional charge to students for using this account, which remains active even after graduation. Information about activating and using MavMail is available at http://www.uta.edu/oit/cs/email/mavmail.php.

Student Feedback Survey: At the end of each term, students enrolled in classes categorized as "lecture," "seminar," or "laboratory" shall be directed to complete an online Student Feedback Survey (SFS). Instructions on how to access the SFS for this course will be sent directly to each student through MavMail approximately 10 days

before the end of the term. Each student's feedback enters the SFS database anonymously and is aggregated with that of other students enrolled in the course. UT Arlington's effort to solicit, gather, tabulate, and publish student feedback is required by state law; students are strongly urged to participate. For more information, visit http://www.uta.edu/sfs.

Final Review Week: A period of five class days prior to the first day of final examinations in the long sessions shall be designated as Final Review Week. The purpose of this week is to allow students sufficient time to prepare for final examinations. During this week, there shall be no scheduled activities such as required field trips or performances; and no instructor shall assign any themes, research problems or exercises of similar scope that have a completion date during or following this week unless specified in the class syllabus. During Final Review Week, an instructor shall not give any examinations constituting 10% or more of the final grade, except makeup tests and laboratory examinations. In addition, no instructor shall give any portion of the final examination during Final Review Week. During this week, classes are held as scheduled. In addition, instructors are not required to limit content to topics that have been previously covered; they may introduce new concepts as appropriate.

Emergency Exit Procedures: Should we experience an emergency event that requires us to vacate the building, students should exit the room and move toward the nearest exit, which is located up the stairs. When exiting the building during an emergency, one should never take an elevator but should use the stairwells. Faculty members and instructional staff will assist students in selecting the safest route for evacuation and will make arrangements to assist handicapped individuals.