

Instructor: Mattijs Van Maasakkers
Office Hours: Wednesday 4-5pm; and by appointment
Office: 233 Knowlton Hall
Email: vanmaasakkers.1@osu.edu

TA: Cody Price
By appointment only
468 Knowlton Hall
price.644@osu.edu

Planning *For* and *With* People

(CRPLAN 3300)

Spring 2015

Wednesday and Friday, 12:45-2:05pm, Location: Bolz Hall 412

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Planning involves making decisions, often about deeply controversial issues. Sometimes it seems like planners are moving from conflict to conflict, one day determining where a new affordable housing development should be located and the next day how vacant land can be better managed for the city. Many of these decisions have important and long-lasting impacts on many people. Elected officials, civil servants and professional experts have long played an important role in how these decisions are made, but advocacy organizations, civil society groups and individual activists have become increasingly effective at influencing decision-making in the public sphere. This means that the role of planners is often to determine how diverse groups of people can effectively make decisions about the places and spaces they seek to improve? This course teaches students how to design and implement participatory planning processes in a democratic context. To do so, this course consists of four parts: 1. Theories of Participation, 2. Stakeholder Assessment, 3. People, Processes and Tools, 4. Improving Participation: Skills & Evaluation. The local project will be an opportunity for students to research and design a participation process for a planning project in Columbus. Since this project will involve direct engagement with community members and other stakeholders some flexibility will be required.

Learning Objectives: -Upon finishing the course, students will be able to:

- Present, prepare and implement an effective participatory decision-making strategy
- Recognize and classify the theoretical assumption underpinning different participatory decision-making techniques and processes
- Evaluate participatory decision-making to assess its strengths and weaknesses

DISABILITY STATEMENT: All students with disabilities who need accommodation should see Dr. Mattijs van Maasakkers privately to make arrangements. Please contact the Office for Disability Services at 614-292-3307 in room 150 Pomerene Hall to coordinate reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities.

COURSE OVERVIEW

DATE	TOPIC	FOCUS
Jan. 14	<i>Course Overview</i>	Introduction
16	<i>Project Description – Elan Daniel, Urban Nature</i>	
21	<i>Representative, Deliberative and Direct Democracy</i>	
23	<i>Justice, Rights and Regulations</i>	Theories of Participation
28	<i>Communicative Rationality and Local Knowledge</i>	
30	<i>Overview(s) of Processes and Tools</i>	
Feb. 4	<i>Deciding on Participation: Stakeholder Assessment</i>	
6	<i>Working Session on Stakeholder Analysis</i>	Stakeholder Assessment
11	<i>Representation and Recruitment</i>	
13	<i>Working Session on Representation and Outreach</i>	
18	<i>Learning from Stakeholders</i>	
20	<i>Working Session on Stakeholder Interviews</i>	
25	Midterm	Exam
27	<i>Introduction to Development Team and Site Visit</i>	People, Processes and Tools
March 4	<i>Process Design – Connecting Stakeholders and Tools</i>	
6	<i>1. Exploration: World Café</i>	
11	<i>2. Consultation: Charettes</i>	
13	<i>3. Advisory Processes: Citizen Advisory Boards</i>	
18&20	Spring Break	
25	<i>4. Decision-making: Mediated Negotiations</i>	
27	<i>5. Implementation: Collaborative Planning</i>	
April 1	<i>Negotiation: Sally Soprano</i>	Improving Participation: Skills & Evaluation
3	<i>Coalition Building: Three-party Coalition</i>	
8	<i>Facilitation: Siting an Asphalt Plant in Madrona</i>	
10	<i>Reflection in/on Practice</i>	
15	<i>Evaluation of Meetings, Events and Sessions</i>	
17	<i>Learning from Participatory Decision-making</i>	Final Presentations
22	<i>Groups present assessment and process proposals</i>	
24	Final Presentations Project Report Due at 6pm on April 28	

GRADING: There are 100 points possible in the class. Grading is assessed based on the following maximum points allocation:

- Midterm: 20 points
- Team Intermediate Deliverables: 30 points (Up to 5 points each for 1-3 and 5, up to 10 for the presentation)
- Peer Evaluation: 5 points
- Attendance and Participation: 5 points
- Reflection Memos: 10 points (minimum of 2, up to 5 points per memo)
- Team Stakeholder Assessment and Process Recommendation: 30 points (maximum of 10 for the in-class presentations, and up to 20 for the written report)

COURSE READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS

All readings are either available through Carmen or on reserve in the Knowlton library. The following books are recommended for purchase. When deciding whether or not to purchase these, keep in mind that older editions of these texts can be used. Second-hand copies are easily and cheaply found online.

- Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Uni. Press, 1996.
- Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Penguin, 2011.
- Susskind, Lawrence and Patrick Field. *Dealing with an Angry Public: The Mutual Gains Approach to Resolving Disputes*. New York: Free Press, 1996.

The students are required to attend all class-sessions; complete the required readings listed below and be prepared to discuss them in class. In addition, every student is required to produce three individually written assignments (two reflection memos and the peer review), and produce the required deliverables related to the team projects. The written assignments should be double-spaced, 12 point font. The due dates are noted on the syllabus. Unless otherwise noted, written assignments are due at the beginning of class and one point will be deducted for each day a paper is late. Papers more than a week late will not be accepted. Students will be graded on both intellectual content and clarity of writing.

MUD CARDS: At the end of lectures, 3x5 cards will be handed out to all students in the class, so they can write down what the “muddiest” part of that day’s class was. This can be a conceptual problem, a practical issue, or a request for additional readings on a particular topic or conflict. After each class, these cards will be collected. If there are questions that can be answered briefly in writing, I will do so via the class website. Alternatively, or if a large part of the class brings up a very similar question, I will devote some time in the next session to the question. These “Mud Cards” can be filled out anonymously, and do not count towards a grade. If nothing is unclear, a student does not have to fill out a mud card.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT: Submitting plagiarized work to meet academic requirements including the representation of another’s works or ideas as one’s own; the unacknowledged work for work use and/or paraphrasing of another person’s work; and/or the inappropriate unacknowledged use of another person’s ideas; and/or the falsification, fabrication, or dishonesty in reporting research results shall be grounds for charges of academic misconduct.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT: Any forms of sexual harassment or intimidation will not be tolerated. The University’s Code of Student Conduct and Sexual Harassment Policy are available online (<http://studentconduct.osu.edu/page.asp?id=35>) Sexual harassment includes inappropriate behavior among two or more students; between students and faculty; and among faculty. The actions can take place in physical, verbal, or written forms. When a complaint is received, the situation will be investigated by the academic department, possibly by the police, even if the harassment was done anonymously or possibly as a jest.

I. INTRODUCTION

Wednesday, Jan. 14: Course Overview

Friday, Jan. 16: Project Description – Guest Lecture by Elan Daniel, Urban Nature
Tierney, John. “Remaking Columbus’s Most Downtrodden Neighborhood.” *The Atlantic*, October 1, 2014. <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/10/remaking-columbuss-most-downtrodden-neighborhood/380860/>

Whiston Spirn, Anne. “Restoring Mill Creek: Landscape Literacy, Environmental Justice and City Planning and Design.” *Landscape Research* 30, no. 3 (July 1, 2005): 395–413.

II. THEORIES OF PARTICIPATION

Wednesday, Jan. 21: Representative, Deliberative and Direct Democracy

Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996. Chapter 1 (p. 11-27), Chapter 5 p. 125-157) and Chapter 9 (p. 231-253)

Friday, Jan. 23: Justice, Rights and Regulations

Arnstein, Sherry R. “A Ladder of Citizen Participation.” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35, no. 4 (1969): 216–24.

National Research Council. *Public Participation in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making*. Thomas Dietz and Paul C. Stern. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2008. Chapter 2: The Promises and Perils of Participation p. 33-74.

Wednesday, Jan. 28: Communicative Rationality and Local Knowledge

Wynne, Brian. “Sheepfarming After Chernobyl: A Case Study in Communicating Scientific Information.” *Environment* 31, no. 2 (March 1989): 10–15 and 33-40.

Healey, Patsy. “Planning through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory.” *The Town Planning Review* 63, no. 2 (April 1, 1992): 143–62.

Friday, Jan. 30: Overview of Processes and Tools

Fung, Archon. “Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance.” *Public Administration Review* 66 (2006): 66–75.

International Association for Public Participation, *Spectrum of Public Participation*, 2014. www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/Foundations_Course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum.pdf

National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, *Engagement Streams Framework*, 2013. Available at: http://www.ncdd.org/files/NCDD2010_Engagement_Streams.pdf

Orenstein, S., Moore, L. and Sherry, S. *Spectrum of Processes for Collaboration and Consensus-building in Public Decisions*. 2008 Available at: <http://ncdd.org/rc/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/spectrum2008-CollabConsensusInPubDecisions.pdf>

II. STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT

Wednesday, Feb. 4: Deciding on Participation: Stakeholder Assessment

Reed, Mark S., Anil Graves, Norman Dandy, Helena Posthumus, Klaus Hubacek, Joe Morris, Christina Prell, Claire H. Quinn, and Lindsay C. Stringer. "Who's in and Why? A Typology of Stakeholder Analysis Methods for Natural Resource Management." *Journal of Environmental Management* 90, no. 5 (April 2009): 1933–49.

Susskind, Lawrence and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer. *The Consensus Building Handbook : A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1999. Chapter 2: Conducting a Conflict Assessment p. 99-136

Friday, Feb. 6: Working Session on Stakeholder Analysis

Deliverable 1: Stakeholder Diagram

The diagram is due at the end of class on Feb. 6 in digital copy in the dropbox on Carmen. To work on this deliverable, make sure one of the team-members brings a laptop to class.

Wednesday, Feb. 11: Representation and Recruitment

Forester, J. *Planning in the Face of Conflict: The Surprising Possibilities of Facilitative Leadership*, 2013. Chapter 5: Creativity in the Face of Urban Design p. 81-104

Baum, Howell S. "Community Organizations Recruiting Community Participation: Predicaments in Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18, no. 3 (March 1, 1999): 187–99.

Friday, Feb. 13: Working Session on Representation and Outreach

Deliverable 2: Stakeholder Contact List

The contact list will include specific information on individuals and organizations, and will most likely include the result of online searching. Bring a laptop to class.

Wednesday, Feb. 18: Learning from Stakeholders

Weiss, Robert Stuart. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York; Toronto; New York: Free Press, 1994.

Chapter 3: Preparation for Interviewing and Chapter 4: Interviewing. P. 39-120.

Laws, David, and John Forester. "Learning in Practice: Public Policy Mediation." *Critical Policy Studies* 1, no. 4 (2007): 342–70.

Friday, Feb. 20: Working Session on Stakeholder Interviews

Deliverable 3: Stakeholder Interview Protocol

Wednesday, Feb. 25: MIDTERM

All materials and lectures covered until now are examined. The midterm will be held in class, and the use of outside materials is not permitted.

III. PEOPLE, PROCESSES AND TOOLS

Deliverable 4: Presentation on Participation Process

Teams will be assigned a process type and associated time/date. Presentations should outline the basic elements, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of their process/tool in general. In addition, each presentation should also describe the opportunities and threats associated with its potential implementation in Franklinton.

Friday, Feb. 27: Introduction to Development Team and Site Visit

Attendance is mandatory

Deliverable 5: Collage of at least five unique (meaning taken by students in this class) pictures of the site and its surroundings

All students will visit the development site in Franklinton at the center of our participatory process design project and meet with the development team.

Recommended Reading (specifically the sections on “The Bottoms, Columbus, in Chapters 4,5&6): Moga, Steven Thomas. “Bottoms, Hollows, and Flats : Making and Remaking the Lower Section of the American City.” Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010. Available at: <http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/62137>

Wednesday, March 4: Process Design – Connecting Stakeholders and Tools

Forester, John. *Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. Chapter 1: Beyond Promises: Making Public Participation and Democratic Deliberation Work and Chapter 2: Cultivating Surprise and the Art of the Possible: The Drama of Mediating Differences. p. 19-56

Friday, March 6: Exploration: World Café

Percy-Smith, Barry. “From Consultation to Social Learning in Community Participation with Young People.” *Children, Youth and Environments* 16, no. 2 (January 1, 2006): 153–79.

The website of the World Café Community Foundation: <http://www.theworldcafe.com> contains helpful information on the preparation and execution of this type of meeting. Focus especially on design-principles and methods sections.

Wednesday, March 11: Consultation: Charettes

Lennertz, Bill, Aarin Lutzinher, and Tamara Failor. “An Introduction to Charettes.” *Planning Commissioners Journal*, Summer 2008. Available at: http://www.charretteinstitute.org/resources/files/charrettes_pcj_article.pdf

Department for Planning and Infrastructure. “Enquiry-by-Design Workshops: A Preparation Manual” Available at: http://www.planning.wa.gov.au/dop_pub_pdf/EBDprep_manual.pdf

Friday, March 13: Advisory Processes: Citizen Advisory Boards

Laurian, Lucie. "Deliberative Planning through Citizen Advisory Boards: Five Case Studies from Military and Civilian Environmental Cleanups." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26, no. 4 (June 1, 2007).

Municipal Research and Services Center, "Local Governmental Citizen Advisory Boards: Examples, options, and model practices for the effective and efficient use of advisory boards by local governments." Report Nr. 63, August 2008, Seattle, WA. Available at: <http://www.mrsc.org/publications/lgcab08.pdf>

March 18 & 20: SPRING BREAK

Wednesday, March 25: Decision-Making: Mediated Negotiations

Rothman, Jay. "Identity and Conflict: Collaboratively Addressing Policy-Community Conflict in Cincinnati, Ohio." *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution* 22 (2007 2006): 105–32.

Clines, Francis X. "A City Tries to Turn Candor Into Consensus." *The New York Times*, September 9, 2001, Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/09/us/a-city-tries-to-turn-candor-into-consensus.html>

Friday, March 27: Implement: Collaborative Planning

Bonnell, Joseph E., and Tomas M. Koontz. "Stumbling Forward: The Organizational Challenges of Building and Sustaining Collaborative Watershed Management." *Society & Natural Resources* 20, no. 2 (February 1, 2007): 153–67.

ULI – the Urban Land Institute *Involving the Community in Neighborhood Planning*. ULI Community Catalyst Report 1. Washington, D.C.: ULI - the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

IV. IMPROVING PARTICIPATION: SKILLS & EVALUATION

Wednesday, April 1: Negotiation

Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Penguin, 2011. Part I: The Problem and Part II. The Method p. 3-100

Friday, April 3: Coalition Building

Fisher, et al., Part III: Yes, but...and Part IV: In Conclusion p. 101-154

Wednesday, April 8: Facilitation

Susskind, Lawrence and Patrick Field. *Dealing with an Angry Public: The Mutual Gains Approach to Resolving Disputes*. New York: Free Press, 1996. Chapter 1: Introduction, Chapter 2: Why Is the Public Angry? & Chapter 3: The Mutual Gains Approach p. 1-59 Skim: Chapter 7: The Media p. 198-221 & Chapter 8: Principled Leadership, p. 222-238

Friday, April 10: Reflection in/on Practice

Schön, Donald A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books, 1983. Chapter 7: Town Planning: Limits to Reflection-in-Action p. 204-235.

Wednesday, April 15: Evaluation of Meetings, Events and Sessions

Rowe, Gene, and Lynn J. Frewer. "Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation." *Science, Technology & Human Values* 25, no. 1 (January 1, 2000): 3–29.

Halvorsen, K E. "Assessing Public Participation Techniques for Comfort, Convenience, Satisfaction, and Deliberation." *Environmental Management* 28, no. 2 (August 2001): 179–86.

Friday, April 17: Learning from Participatory Decision-making

Chess, Caron, and Kristen Purcell. "Public Participation and the Environment: Do We Know What Works?" *Environmental Science & Technology* 33, no. 16 (August 1, 1999): 2685–92.

Innes, Judith E., and David E. Booher. "Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65, no. 4 (December 31, 1999): 412–23.

VI. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

Wednesday, April 22: Presentations

Friday, April 25: Final Presentations

Written reports and peer evaluations are due (via Carmen) on April 28, at 6pm.