

**URPL 5000 PLANNING HISTORY AND THEORY (3 CREDITS)
FALL 2016**

Section 001 (Nemeth) meets: Tuesdays, 9:30 – 12:15 p.m.
Section 002 (McAndrews) meets: Wednesdays, 2:00 - 4:45 p.m.
CU Building Room 3301

Instructors:

Assistant Professor Carolyn McAndrews
CU Building 320BB
Phone: 303.315.1000
carolyn.mcandrews@ucdenver.edu

Office hours:
Tuesdays 12:15 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.
Or e-mail to schedule an appointment

Associate Professor Jeremy Nemeth
CU Building 504
Phone: 303.315.1000
jeremy.nemeth@ucdenver.edu

Office hours:
Tuesdays 1:00 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.
Or e-mail to schedule an appointment

Course Abstract

This course introduces students to city and regional planning ideas and practices and how they have both shaped and responded to urban development over the past two hundred years. Through writing, discussion, lectures, in-class exercises, and readings, the course calls attention to complex, real-world opportunities in planning, as well as its dilemmas. We will discuss the power and limits of planning, planning as a tool for problem solving, planning and social change, ideas about the city and who cities are for, the multiple roles in which planners find themselves, and the relationship between planning and built and natural environments. We focus on planning in the US, and place American planning practice in a global context. This is a core course in the MURP curriculum. There are no prerequisites.

Course Schedule

Week	Date	Topics	Learning
1	Aug 23/24	Introduction to planning history and theory	Introduction to the course
Module 1: Modern Planning Problems, Ideas, and Techniques			
2	Aug 30/31	Industrialization and social change	Emerging techniques of planning
3	Sep 6/7	Human and community development	Influence of Progressivism in planning
4	Sep 13/14	Building utopias	Garden cities
5	Sep 20/21	Rationalization of infrastructure and development	Zoning, City Beautiful
6	Sep 27/28	Planning ethics, the public interest, and the profession of planning	Planning becomes official, systematic, and optimized Who are planners planning for?
Module 2: Transitions			
7	Oct 4/5	Housing, the state, and social welfare debates	Federal role in urban policy vis-à-vis housing
8	Oct 11/12	Urban renewal and planning politics	Politics of development and displacement
9	Oct 18/19	Environmentalism and sustainability planning	Environmentalist thought and practice in planning
10	Oct 26	Sprawl debates, smart growth, and equity	Smart growth debates and outcomes
11	Nov 1	Sprawl debates, smart growth, and equity	Smart growth debates and outcomes
Module 3: Problems of Contemporary and Future Planning			
12	Nov 8/9	Social and environmental justice	Social and political inclusion, equality, and equity
13	Nov 15/16	Power, science, local knowledge	The production and use of science in a political context
14	Nov 22/23	NO CLASS, FALL BREAK	
15	Nov 29/30	Communicative and collaborative planning	Designing planning processes
16	Dec 6/7	Global geography of planning	Where do planning ideas come from?

Course Format

The course has two sections, each meeting one day per week, and the course content is the same for each section. The course content finds a balance between both the practical and intellectual foundations of planning.

The course format combines self-directed learning with classroom activities and discussions that call upon social learning. Self-directed learning means doing readings and writing assignments independently and exploring topics following your own path. Social learning means understanding what you are learning in relation to what other people seem to be learning. Because students in the course are adult learners with various learning styles and with varied academic and professional backgrounds, we use different types of in-class exercises to maximize access to course content and learning. Engaging fully with the self-directed and social learning elements of the course is necessary for achieving the course's learning objectives.

In addition, this core course delivers training in writing. As such, assignments and classroom activities focus on developing writing skills at all levels.

Communication

Unless otherwise noted, we will use Canvas for all official course communication and it is the responsibility of each student to use Canvas settings that enable reliable communication. For example, this may mean selecting a personal e-mail address as the default in Canvas. We may use Canvas for course announcements, changes to the schedule, returning graded assignments, personal communication, or other course-related business. All assignments, unless otherwise noted, must be submitted on Canvas. Each student should be familiar with Canvas's assignment submission procedures.

Learning Objectives

This course has six official learning outcomes per the Planning Accreditation Board guidelines. After completing this course, students will have essential knowledge about the following:

1. Purpose and meaning of planning: appreciation of why planning is undertaken by communities, cities, regions and nations, and the impact planning is expected to have.
2. Planning theory: appreciation of the behaviors and structures available to bring about sound planning outcomes.
3. Human settlements and history of planning: understanding the growth and development of places over time and across space.
4. The future: understanding of the relationships between past, present, and future in planning domains, as well as the potential for methods of design, analysis, and intervention to influence the future.

5. Social justice: appreciation of equity concerns in planning.
6. Planning process methods: tools for stakeholder involvement, community engagement, and working with diverse communities.

Grading Policy

Grading of assignments will be based primarily on the quality and depth of the work presented, but organization, composition, and presentation (editing, spell checking) will also be taken into account. Students are expected to turn in all assignments on time using Canvas (see schedule). Late assignments will not be accepted.

Final grades will be based on the total number of points earned on the following assignments:

Weekly assignments and responsibilities		
Attendance	75 points (5x15 weeks)	Each week
Classroom participation and engagement	150 points (10x15 weeks)	Each week
Weekly reading commentaries	60 points (5x12 weeks)	12 of 14 weeks
Assignments with sporadic deadlines		
Paragon Learning Style Inventory assessment	0 points	August 28
Syllabus question	5 points	August 28
Names quiz	10 points	August 30/31
Planning book essay (writing center consultation required)	100 points	October 4/5
Plan analysis	100 points	November 8/9
Cumulative essay	100 points	December 6/7
TOTAL	600 points	

Grading in this course follows university and departmental guidelines set forth in the MURP handbook. Total points translate to the following final grades:

- 540-600 points = A/A-
- 480-539 points = B+/B/B-
- 420-479 points = C+/C/C-
- 0-419 points = D or below

Academic Honesty

Education at the University of Colorado Denver and in the College of Architecture and Planning (CAP) depends on honesty and integrity, as well as appropriate conduct. CAP students are required to follow the Student Code of Conduct, Honor Code and all other college and university policies. Please refer to

<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/ArchitecturePlanning/StudentResources/Pages/PoliciesForms.aspx> for details.

All University and College policy, as well as common sense, regarding academic honesty applies in this course. Plagiarism and cheating are not tolerated and will be handled through the University's official process. When working in a group, it is the responsibility of everyone in the group to maintain the norms of academic integrity.

Students may do joint work with other courses only with the permission of all instructors and when the work is suitable for the topic and the course.

Accommodations

Any student who needs, or who may need, accommodations due to a disability should speak with the instructors as soon as possible, and should contact the Disability Resources and Services Office on campus to arrange accommodations. See <http://www.ucdenver.edu/student-services/resources/disability-resources-services/accommodations/Pages/accommodations.aspx> for more details.

Assignments

1. Attendance

Due: At each class session

Total points: 75

Attendance is taken at each class using the Roll Call function in Canvas. All students must arrive on time to class to avoid disrupting other students' attention and learning. Arriving up to 10 minutes late to class reduces attendance points for the class session by 50%. Students who arrive later than 10 minutes to class do not receive attendance credit for the class session.

This policy applies to all absences.

2. Participation

Due: At each class session

Total points: 150

Class participation traditionally means demonstrating one's knowledge verbally and hiding any evidence of gaps in knowledge, doubts, and questions. These traditional expectations of class participation do not support learning in the classroom. They are particularly difficult for students who are less verbal. Norms of participation in this course include the following aspects of engagement (adapted from: Lathrop A. 2006. Teaching How to Question: Participation Rubrics. The Teaching Professor, 20(2): 4-5):

- **Preparation:** Demonstrate being prepared for class by arriving on time, taking notes, bringing notes and copies of the readings to class, researching unfamiliar or interesting topics found in the readings, and setting an intention for the class meeting.
- **Engagement:** Actively engage with other members of the class in respectful and inclusive discussion and active listening. It is usually more important to listen than to talk. It's also important to engage with people who you perceive as different from you. This means being curious about and open to what other people think and experience.
- **Initiative within a group:** Ask questions during discussion that focus, clarify, and summarize what the group is talking about. Help others express themselves when they have trouble communicating. Create space for shy people. Don't monopolize conversation. In general, try to have a positive effect on other people.
- **Discussion:** Discussion is about increasing collective understanding, not only individual understanding. Successful class discussion requires having compassionate and respectful relationships with peers, and these relationships reflect higher order intellectual and emotional skills (analysis, synthesis, compassion, etc.). In contrast to the traditional classroom, discussion in this class is not about showing other people how much you know.

Each week, students may earn up to 10 points for participation. These points will be added to the assignment in Canvas each week until they total 150 at the end of the semester.

To provide additional information about participation, and to increase communication about how the course is going, we will use a "quick feedback" anonymous survey at the end of class to collect information about participation and the group dynamic.

Grading Rubric: Participation			
	Excellent	Good	Poor
Demonstrating engagement during class sessions, 15 total, 3 points each	Reliably has positive externalities for classroom learning	Is present during class, doesn't actively disrupt other people, not clear what contributions are being made, if any	Participation regularly disrupts and disturbs others' learning
Total	135-150 points	105-134 points	≤ 104 points

3. Reading commentaries

Due: Each Sunday or Monday by 11:59 p.m.

Total points: 60 (5 points for each commentary, must do commentaries for 12 of 14 weeks)

Readings are a primary method of learning in this course. Each week, approximately three required readings present information, themes, and arguments that we will discuss in class. The syllabus includes optional readings for anyone who desires more information. Often, these optional readings are relatively theoretical or they offer an interesting case or perspective. The syllabus also offers questions to focus your reading, but feel free to read in whatever way works best for you. Materials posted on Canvas offer information about strengthening your reading skills – these are essentially guides to “reading in graduate school.”

Students will prepare a total of 12 weekly commentaries related to the readings. The first commentary is due in the second week of class, and the final commentary is due during the week of December 1st. There are 13 unique reading-weeks in this period, and students must complete commentaries for 12 of these 13 weeks. One can choose to complete all 13 commentaries and receive an extra five points toward his or her final grade for each additional commentary completed.

The commentaries should be no more than 250 words in length, and they should be posted to the discussion board in Canvas. One’s own commentary must be posted before one can read those of other students.

These commentaries are an exercise in reflection. They are an opportunity for students to share opinions, thoughts, and doubts about the readings. The best commentaries demonstrate that the student has gained a new insight into planning. The commentaries should not be a summary of the readings. A possible prompt is: “What is the main thing that you take away from this set of readings?”

The commentaries are due no later than 11:59 pm on Sunday (for Tuesday’s class) or 11:59 pm on Monday (for Wednesday’s class) to allow everyone one day to read them before class, and even comment on another student’s commentary. Instructors will select a few commentaries as prompts for reading/discussion exercises. Also, students may be randomly called upon to share their observations and questions.

There is no rubric for this assignment. Commentaries that are submitted on time receive full credit. No credit is given for only a summary of the readings.

4. Paragon Learning Style Inventory (PLSI) assessment

Due: August 28, 11:59 p.m.

Total points: 0

Each student should complete the Paragon Learning Style Inventory (PLSI) assessment before the second week of class and post his or her “type” in the discussion posted to Canvas. This assessment, which is similar to the Meyers Briggs assessment, gives insight into how individuals

participate in groups, including how we participate in class. We will use these indicators to guide the formation of work groups in class.

The PLSI assessment (including instructions, etc.) is located here:

<http://web.calstatela.edu/faculty/jshindl/plsi/>

5. Syllabus question

Due: August 28, 11:59 p.m.

Total points: 5

Each student is required to ask one clarifying question about the content of the course syllabus. The questions should be posted to a discussion board on Canvas before 11:59 pm on Sunday, August 28 to allow everyone time to read them before class. One's own question must be posted before one can read those of other students.

We will review and respond to these questions, and will likely make changes to the syllabus based on them. Please check Canvas for updated versions of the syllabus throughout the semester, and make a habit of asking clarifying questions about the course.

There is no rubric for this assignment. Syllabus questions that are submitted on time receive full credit.

6. Names quiz

Due: August 25/26

Total points: 10

It is a norm in our classroom to know and use one another's names. During the first week of class, we will do a speed networking exercise to break the ice and get to know one another. In the second week we will have a names quiz.

7. Planning book essay

Appointment made with writing center by: September 4

Writing center meeting by: September 30

Final due: October 4/5

Total points: 100

In professional practice, the time available to seek out and process information to guide planning decisions is scarce. Research shows that planners often rely on peer networks and other cities' experiences to make decisions, and that they do not have time to search for additional information or to verify that what works in other places will be appropriate locally. Therefore, it is a luxury in planning practice to turn to scholarly research papers, grey literature, and

government reports for information, let alone a scholarly, literary, or popular book, to learn about new ideas to guide practice.

In resistance to the pressures of expediency, the objective of this assignment is to take the opportunity to read a good book about planning, to enjoy the book, and to take time to reflect on the author's argument.

To provide structure to your reading, and to maximize its relevance to this course, follow the series of steps outlined below to complete the assignment.

Step 1: Select a book that is of interest to you from the list of books provided on Canvas.

Step 2: Read and (hopefully) enjoy the book. As you read, think about how to respond to the following prompts, paying attention to the importance of historical context:

1. Identify and discuss the author's argument. (September 6/7)

Example: The author argues that communities with fewer personal resources are more likely to rely on social networks for support, and this is why community-based networks are critical for making policy change in communities that have historically been marginalized.

2. Identify the specific conditions that need to be true, or the assumptions that need to be made such that the author's argument is valid. For example, the author may make an argument about a specific city, time period, demographic group, or set of laws and institutions—would the argument make sense in other contexts? (September 13/14)

Example: When planners built highways in the U.S. in the beginning and middle of the 20th century the argument for highways made sense given a specific set of conditions: highways were a tremendous improvement over existing roads.

3. Generalize the argument of this book to today's context or to our local setting. Specifically, analyze which aspects of the argument you think are valid in today's context/local setting, and what would need to change in order for the argument generalize outside of its original context. (September 13/14)

Example: But today's conditions are different. Though we still want safe and smooth roads, we have other social problems that need to be addressed through road infrastructure, such as air quality, water quality, climate change, and livability.

4. Argue for the importance of this book for planning. (September 20/21)

Example: In fact, we may need to undo some of the design decisions that were made many decades ago because today's problems are different from yesterday's problems. Thus, yesterday's reasons to build and expand highways might not make sense today—they may not generalize to today's context. This argument against highways has helped remove them from dense urban areas where they have been out of context.

5. Reflect deeply on your author's arguments, or the experiences of a protagonist in the story, considering how your new knowledge might guide your professional practice. Specifically, what values does this writing conjure for you? (September 27/28)

Step 3: Respond to the prompts above in a concise essay (no more than 2,500 words in length, double-spaced) with a beginning, middle, and end, with any references properly cited using any style you wish (but be consistent).

Step 4. Work with the writing center to improve the draft of your paper (see deadlines above). Revise the paper per your meeting with the writing center, and turn in your final essay along with a "blue sheet" from the writing center as evidence of your meeting with them. Papers submitted without consultation with the writing center do not receive credit.

Grading Rubric: Planning Book Essay			
	Excellent	Good	Poor
Identifies and discusses an argument about planning and argues for its importance. Prompts 1 and 4. (35 points)	The argument of the book is clearly stated and the essay explicitly relates the argument of the book to planning, cities, and regions (32-35 points)	The argument of the book is not perfectly clear, but the reader can understand the main points and the essay attempts to relate the argument of the book to planning, cities, and regions (24-31 points)	The argument of the book is not clearly or logically presented, and it is difficult to make the connection between the book and planning, cities, and regions (≤ 23 points)
Works with the concept of generalization as it relates to planning, cities, and regions. Prompts 2 and 3. (35 points)	The essay identifies the conditions that need to be true for the author's argument to be valid and uses this information in a new situation from the one in which it was originally applied (32-35 points)	The essay relates the argument to other places or situations, but is not specific about what needs to be true in order for the author's argument to be valid (24-31 points)	The essay presents evidence supporting the author's argument, but does not identify the conditions needed for the argument to be valid. These are distinct types of analysis. Or, the essay does not answer the question. (≤ 23 points)
Quality of composition (30 points)	Author writes with the reader's needs in mind, no copy editing needed, successful communication of the main ideas/argument (27-30 points)	The author does not truly believe anyone will read the essay. The main ideas are in the text, but it needed another revision to make the points clear	Does not qualify as professional writing (≤ 20 points)

		to the reader, and it could use additional copy editing (21-26 points)	
Total	90-100 points	70-89 points	≤ 69 points

8. Plan analysis

Plan selected and requested from library: September 6

Draft response to question 2 due: October 11/12

Final due: November 8/9

Total points: 100

Select an entire plan from any moment in history before 1990. The plan may be of any type (e.g., comprehensive plan, area plan, economic development plan), created by any type of organization. The plan may be from the U.S. or from another region. Write an essay that presents an analysis of the plan, responding to the prompts listed below with evidence from the plan. Use the prompts as subheadings in the essay (they can be paraphrased). The response should be no more than 3,000 words in length and it should liberally reference ideas, readings, discussions, and debates that we have discussed in class.

1. Read: Ryan, Brent D. "Reading through a Plan." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 77(4):309-327.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2011.616995>

2. Identify the explicitly stated purposes of the plan you selected (the "factual meaning") and the "good planning outcome" (i.e., its normative framework, the "contextual meaning") the plan is expected to have. The normative framework encompasses the plan's implied purposes, which are usually not stated explicitly. (October 11/12)

3. Identify the processes, institutions, and incentives included in the plan that are supposed to bring about this good planning outcome in the future (i.e., institutions of plan implementation, not the planning process that created the plan). Explain how these processes, institutions, and incentives relate to theories/models of planning. (October 18/19)

4. Scrutinize how issues of social justice and equity are incorporated into the plan. This may include planning process. Account for how the authors of the plan might define social justice. (October 26/November 1)

5. Scrutinize how the plan treats historical growth and development of the place (e.g., the city, region, neighborhood). Summarize how it draws on the past to develop a trajectory for the future. (October 26/November 1)

6. Evaluate whether the plan influenced future outcomes, paying attention to the aspects of the plan that may have limited its potential to guide decision making and future development.

This assignment does not require a consultation with the Writing Center, though this is always a good option.

Grading Rubric: Plan Assessment			
	Excellent	Good	Poor
Understanding of planning frameworks and planning processes and institutions (30 points)	Grasps the meaning of planning frameworks, processes, and institutions, and provides evidence of this understanding by referencing specific information in the plan (27-30 points)	Uneven grasp of the meaning of planning frameworks, processes, and institutions. Insufficient evidence presented, or not clearly presented (21-26 points)	Incorrect understanding of planning frameworks, processes, and institutions. No evidence to support correct understanding (≤ 20 points)
Critical thinking about social justice, the role of place, and the potential of plans to influence future outcomes (40 points)	Expresses reflection, critique, and assessment of how planning concepts (abstract) manifest in a plan (applied) (36-40 points)	Identifies these topics in the plan, but does not sufficiently reflect on, critique, or assess how they are applied through a real plan (28-35 points)	Incorrect understanding of these topics. No evidence to support correct understanding. (≤ 27 points)
Quality of composition (30 points)	Author writes with the reader's needs in mind, no copy editing needed, successful communication of the main ideas/argument (27-30 points)	The author does not truly believe anyone will read the essay. The main ideas are in the text, but it needed another revision to make the points clear to the reader, and it could use additional copy editing (21-26 points)	Does not qualify as professional writing (≤ 20 points)
Total	90-100 points	70-89 points	≤ 69 points

9. Cumulative essay

Due: December 6/7 at 11:59 pm

Total points: 100

Rely on our required/suggested readings, class discussions, student presentations, popular articles, readings completed outside of class, personal experiences, and any other relevant sources to reflect on major issues that we have begun to discuss this semester.

Write two essays.

First, what have you learned in this class that you will take with you into your (professional) career? Respond to this larger question, also answering the following questions in an essay of no more than 2,000 words.

1. Why is it important to learn planning theory?
2. What values will you take away with you from the course readings and discussion we have had?
3. What values do you value (ha!) in other planners who you have read about?
4. Of all the characters you've encountered in readings this semester, with whom do you most identify with and why?

Second, in an essay of no more than 2,000 words, including appropriate citations, address *one and only one* of the following sets of questions:

- a. The concept of the “public interest” has shifted remarkably over the past half-century in particular. Explain how the concept of the public interest relates to the ethics of planning and identify what strategies planners can use to define and address the public interest. Evaluate how this concept has changed in recent years. Evaluate whether this concept still relevant for the 21st century planner. Argue whether there a singular public interest for and with whom planners should plan. (Thanks to Jill Grant at Dalhousie University for this line of questioning.)
- b. We know of the many physical legacies of the Urban Renewal era of city planning, but perhaps just as importantly for all of us, the role of the planner has changed significantly as an indirect and direct result of this period. For example, planners were always seen as form-givers (i.e., designers) albeit on a larger scale than architects and landscape architects, but the profession is viewed much more as a regulatory function of the state. Explain what happened. Explain how the theory and practice of planning has changed since the 1960. Differentiate among some of the main mechanisms that influenced these profound changes to the profession.
- c. Daniel Burnham’s work can be summarized by his famous “Make no small plans” quotation, which seems to celebrate the notion of the heroic, visionary planner acting on behalf of (or in spite of) a compliant and passive community. Planning has clearly moved on from this “visionary” role, and planners are now required and compelled to work with communities, with one ultimate goal of rising to a higher rung on Arnstein’s ladder of

citizen participation. Nonetheless, if the planner does her job and helps communities achieve complete “citizen control” of the planning process, then planners become unnecessary. Make an argument about this potential paradox: if we want communities to plan for themselves, then why does our profession even exist? Defend your position about role of the profession if community self-sufficiency is our ultimate goal.

d. Planners and policy makers often claim that growth without regulation will inevitably result in less-than-preferable development outcomes. Libertarians and others claim that, for example, Smart Growth regulation limits personal choice and liberty and that if they want to pay to live in suburbs and exurbs, they should have the right to do so. Take a side in this debate (make an argument, make a claim) drawing on both concrete examples and higher order constructs such as justice, equity, and choice, to elaborate upon and provide evidence for your position.

e. Assess one or two current political, economic, cultural, or societal shifts that will most profoundly affect the practice of planning, i.e., shake its very foundations, in your lifetime?

Grading Rubric: Cumulative Essay			
	Excellent	Good	Poor
Mastery of planning ideas (understanding) (40 points)	Shows an understanding of the larger discourse of planning ideas (36-40 points)	Discusses planning ideas successfully, but is less successful presenting them in the larger discourse of planning ideas (28-35 points)	The discussion of planning ideas does not meet standards of professionalism (≤ 27 points)
Quality of argument and/or critical thinking (30 points)	Shows reasoning, makes explicit claims, and provides convincing evidence, more analytical than descriptive (27-30 points)	The argument is based on reasoning and evidence, but claims not always clear to the reader, and the essay is more descriptive than analytical (21-26 points)	The argument lacks reasoning, does not make any claims, does not provide evidence, and is not convincing (≤ 20 points)
Quality of composition (30 points)	Author writes with the reader’s needs in mind, no copy editing needed, successful communication of the main ideas/argument (27-30 points)	The author does not truly believe anyone will read the essay. The main ideas are in the text, but it needed another revision to make the points clear to the reader, and it could use additional copy editing (21-26 points)	Does not qualify as professional writing (≤ 20 points)
Total	90-100 points	70-89 points	≤ 69 points

Readings

WEEK 1. AUGUST 23/24: Introduction to planning history and theory: Readings that foreshadow the course

Prompt to focus reading: Describe the main themes from these readings. Identify the “planning” actions and actors in the readings. Based on these readings, what issues are central to planning and who would be involved in these issues?

NB: These prompts are optional. They do not need to form the basis of one’s reading or of one’s reading commentaries.

Required, but not for the first week of class (read at least two of these over the next two weeks):

1. Davis, Mike. 2006. “The Urban Climacteric,” from *Planet of Slums*. New York: Verso, pp. 1-19.
2. Thompson Fullilove, Mindy. 2005. “Imagining Neon,” “Urban Renewal…” and “...Means Negro Removal,” from *Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do About It.* New York: Ballantine Books, pp. 21-107.
3. Gibbons, Boyd. 1977. *Wye Island*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, Chapters 1-2.

Module One: Modern Planning Problems, Ideas, and Techniques

WEEK 2. AUGUST 30/31: Industrialization, social change, and cities

Prompts to focus reading: Larger changes in social, economic, and political life in Europe created a setting in which the “industrial city” emerged with its specific combination of environmental and social problems. Describe how people responded to these changes. Identify the formal and informal techniques and methods people developed to deal with urbanization.

Required:

1. Engels, Friedrich. 1845. “The Great Towns,” in Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout, eds. 1996. *The City Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp. 46-55.
2. Hall, Peter. 2002. “The City of Dreadful Night,” in *Cities of Tomorrow*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 13-47.
3. Johnson, Steven. 2006. “The Night-Soil Men,” in *The Ghost Map: The Story of London’s Most Terrifying Epidemic and How it Changed Science, Cities and the Modern World*. New York: Riverhead Books, pp. 1-22.

Optional:

4. Mumford, Lewis. 1961. “The Structure of Baroque Power,” in *The City in History*. San Diego: Harcourt, Inc, pp. 344-374.

5. Gerckens, Laurence. 1979. "Historical development of American city planning," in Frank S. So et al., eds. *The Practice of Local Government Planning*. Washington, DC: International City Management Association, pp. 21-31.
6. Levy, John. 1988. "The History of Planning: Part I," in *Contemporary Urban Planning*, 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., pp. 27-34.

WEEK 3. SEPTEMBER 6/7: Human and community development

Prompts to focus reading: This week's readings focus on how society addresses poverty in a variety of ways, including housing, hospitals, charity, and regulation. Explain where poverty sits within the story that planning tells about its history. Identify principles of Progressivism, especially as you imagine they inform contemporary planning thought and debates.

Required:

1. Hofstadter, Richard. 1963. "The Meaning of the Progressive Movement," in *The Progressive Movement: 1900 to 1915*. New York: Simon & Schuster, pp. 1-15.
2. Wirka, Susan Marie. 1996. "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning," in *Planning the Twentieth-century American City*, Mary Corbin Sies and Christopher Silver, eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
3. Peterson, Jon. 2009. "The Birth of Organized City Planning in the United States, 1909-1910," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, pp. 123-33.

Optional:

4. Vale, Lawrence J. 2000. "Coping with the Poor: Techniques and Institutions," in *From the Puritans to the Projects: Public Housing and Public Neighbors*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 51-91.
5. Addams, Jane. 1899. "A Function of the Social Settlement." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 13: 33-55.

WEEK 4. SEPTEMBER 13/14: Building utopias

Prompts to focus reading: These readings present ideas about "how to live." Differentiate between ideas that are derived from ideals and those that are based in reality. Question how planning makes implicit claims about ideals and how it uses these ideals. These are some of the normative foundations of planning.

Required:

1. Fishman, Robert. 1982. "Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Le Corbusier," in Susan S. Fainstein and Scott Campbell, eds., *Readings in Planning Theory*, 3rd ed., 2012. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 46-53.
2. Howard, Ebenezer. 1965. *Selections from Garden Cities of To-Morrow*. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd.

3. Hall, Peter. 2002. "The City in the Garden," in *Cities of Tomorrow*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 13-47.
4. Hall, Peter. 2002. "The City in the Region," in *Cities of Tomorrow*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 143-187.

Optional:

5. Le Corbusier. [date]. "The Working Day," in *The City of To-morrow and Its Planning*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

WEEK 5. SEPTEMBER 20/21: Rationalization of infrastructure and development

Prompts to focus reading: This week, we will visit Denver's Civic Center, which is exemplar of the City Beautiful movement's planning and design mission: to realize the connections between civic life, civic places, and civic architecture to improve social and economic health and wellbeing in cities. Today, groups organizing to restore and revitalize Civic Center must reconcile this mission and design with contemporary issues. Explain how the ideals and assumptions of the City Beautiful Movement could be in conflict with contemporary goals for public spaces. Do background research as needed to prepare for our field trip.

Required:

1. Neuman, Michael and Sheri Smith. 2010. "City Planning and Infrastructure: Once and Future Partners." *Journal of Planning History*, 9(1):21-42.
2. Ben-Joseph, Eran. 2005. "Neighborhoods Developed Scientifically" and "Sanitized Cities," in *The Code of the City: Standards and the Hidden Language of Place Making*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 47-99.
3. Willis, Carol. 1993. "A 3D CBD: How the 1916 Zoning Law Shaped Manhattan's Central Business Districts," in *Planning and Zoning New York City: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, Todd W. Bressi, ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, pp. 3-26.

Optional:

4. Boyer, M. Christine. 1983. "In Search of a Spatial Order" and "The Rise of a Planning Mentality," in *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 33-82.
5. Olmsted, Frederick Law. 2000 (1870). "Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns," in Roth, ed. *America Builds: Source Documents in American Architecture and Planning*. New York: Harper and Row, pp. 182-191.
6. Talen, Emily. 2009. "Design by the Rules: The Historical Underpinnings of Form-Based Codes." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 75(2):144-160.
7. Burgess, Patricia. 1994. "Of Swimming Pools and 'Slums': Zoning and Residential Development in Post-World War II Columbus, Ohio," in *Planning the Twentieth-Century*

American City, Mary Corbin Sies and Christopher Silver, eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

WEEK 6. SEPTEMBER 27/28: Planning ethics, the public interest, and the professionalization of planning

Prompts to focus reading: Planning aims to take action today in order to improve the future in ways that benefit the public good. Summarize why this is a key issue in planning, the reasons why the definition of the public interest is often problematic, and thoughts about how planners should observe and understand the public interest.

Required:

1. Marcuse, Peter. 1976. "Professional Ethics and Beyond: Values in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 42(3): 264-274.
2. Peiser, Richard. 1990. "Who Plans America? Planners or Developers?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 56(4): 496-503.
3. Stone, Deborah. 2002. "Chapter 2: Equity," in *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Optional:

4. Sandercock, Leonie. 1998. "A Chronicle of Modernist Planning," in *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 22-29.
5. Peattie, Lisa. 1987. "Representation," in *Planning: Rethinking Ciudad Guyana*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 111-152.
6. Zinn, Howard. 1999. "Afterword," in *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper Collins, pp. 683-688.
7. Peterson, Paul. 1981. "The Interests of the Limited City," in Paul Kantor and Dennis Judd, eds., *American Urban Politics in a Global Age*, 2009, Pearson, pp. 9-18.

Module 2: Transitions

WEEK 7. OCTOBER 4/5: Housing and federal urban policy

Prompts to focus reading: The first movement in this module about transitions in planning thought focuses on the role of federal policy in shaping urban places. Housing is central to understanding the institutional, economic, and political dynamics of planning and urban development. Moreover, the story of housing goes hand in hand with the development of the welfare state and national policies that influence urban development. Contrast specific ways in which the central institutions in these readings are distinct from those we discussed in the previous module. Identify any similar themes.

Required:

1. Jackson, Kenneth. 1985. "Federal Subsidy and the Suburban Dream: How Washington Changed the American Housing Market," in *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 190-230.
2. Quigley, John M, Michael A. Stegman, and William C. Wheaton. 2000. "A Decent Home: Housing Policy in Perspective [with comments]." *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, 53-59.
3. Weiss, Marc. 1989. "The Rise of the Community Builders: The American Real Estate Industry and Urban Land Planning," in *Suburbia Re-Examined*, Barbara M. Kelly, ed. New York: Greenwood Press.

Optional:

4. Whittemore, Andrew. 2013. "How the Federal Government Zoned America: The Federal Housing Administration and Zoning." *Journal of Urban History*, 29(4): 620-642.
5. Friedrichs, Chad, Jaime Friedrichs, Paul Fehler, Brian Woodman, Benjamin Balcom. 2011. *The Pruitt-Igoe Myth*. Columbia, Mo: Unicorn Stencil LLC; First Run Features. [DVD at Auraria Library: HD7304.S2.P78 2011]

WEEK 8. OCTOBER 11/12: Urban renewal and planning politics

Prompts to focus reading: A second transition in planning was the recognition that planning techniques are equally, if not more, political and technical. Development coalitions, activists, and a host of interests work politically – and sometimes plan – to achieve development goals. However, there are also questions of economic disparities and development that still need to be answered in order to understand how to plan and develop policy. List the political attitudes (loosely defined) that you encounter in the readings and summarize how they are a departure (or not) from prior modes of planning.

Required:

1. Davidoff, Paul. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31(4): 331-338.
2. Page, Brian and Eric Ross. 2015. "Envisioning the urban past: GIS reconstruction of a lost Denver District." *Frontiers in Digital Humanities*, 2: Article 3.
3. Page, Brian and Eric Ross. 2016. "Legacies of a Contested Campus: Urban Renewal, Community Resilience and the Origins of Gentrification in Denver." *Urban Geography*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1228420>
4. Thompson Fullilove, Mindy. 2005. "Imagining Neon," "Urban Renewal..." and "...Means Negro Removal," from *Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do About It.* New York: Ballantine Books, pp. 21-107.

Optional:

5. Mollenkopf, John H. 1983. "Chapter 4: Forging Progrowth Coalitions in Urban Politics: Boston and San Francisco," in *The Contested City*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
6. Teitz, Michael B. and Karen Chapple. 1998. "The Causes of Inner-City Poverty: Eight Hypotheses in Search of Reality." *Cityscape*, 3(3):33-70.
7. Gans, Herbert J. 1982 [1962]. "Chapter 13: Redevelopment of the West End," in *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York: The Free Press.

WEEK 9. OCTOBER 18/19: Environmentalism and sustainability planning

Required:

1. Leopold, Aldo. 1948. "A Land Ethic," in *Sand County Almanac*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 217-241.
2. McHarg, Ian. 2002 [1967]. "Sea and Survival," in *Design with Nature*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp. 6-17.
3. O'Rourke, Dara. 2002. "Chapter 4: Community-Driven Regulation: Towards and Improved Model of Environmental Regulation in Vietnam," in Peter Evans, ed. 2002, *Livable Cities: The Politics of Urban Livelihood and Sustainability*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 95-131.

Optional:

4. Campbell, Scott. 1996. "Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities?: Urban Planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62(3): 296-312.

WEEKS 10-11. OCTOBER 26 / NOVEMBER 1: Sprawl debates, smart growth, and equity

Prompts to focus reading: With respect to urban form, contemporary regional planning has developed smart growth strategies to tackle the problems of sprawl, but not everyone sees sprawl as a problem, per se. Summarize the purpose, meaning, and conflicts within smart growth approaches to planning.

Required:

1. Frumkin, Howard, Lawrence Frank, and Richard J. Jackson. 2004. "From Urban Sprawl to Health for All," in *Urban Sprawl and Public Health: Designing, Planning, and Building for Healthy Communities*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
2. Godschalk, David R. 2004. "Land Use Planning Challenges: Coping with Conflicts in Visions of Sustainable Development and Livable Communities." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(1): 5-13.
3. Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson. 1997. "Are Compact Cities a Desirable Planning Goal?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(1):95-106.

Optional:

4. Raphael, Steven and Michael A. Stoll. 2010. "Job Sprawl and the Suburbanization of Poverty." Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
5. Kotkin, Joel. 2010. "Urban Legends: Why Suburbs, Not Cities, are the Answer." *Foreign Policy*.
6. Glover Blackwell, Angela and Radhika K. Fox. "Regional Equity and Smart Growth: Opportunities for Advancing Social and Economic Justice in America." Funders Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities.

Module 3: Problems of Contemporary and Future Planning

WEEK 12. NOVEMBER 8/9: Social and environmental justice

Prompts to focus reading: Based on your understanding of planning processes, identify concrete ways in which planners (broadly defined) can advance social and environmental justice through their work (broadly defined).

Required:

1. Fainstein, Susan S. 2010. "Introduction: Toward an Urban Theory of Justice" and "Justice and Urban Transformation: Planning in Context," in *The Just City*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 1-21, 57-86.
2. Collin, Robert W., Timothy Beatley, and William Harris. 1995. "Environmental Racism: A Challenge to Community Development." *Journal of Black Studies*, 25(3): 354-376.
3. Umemoto, Karen. 2001. "Walking in Another's Shoes: Epistemological Challenges in Participatory Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21:17-31.

Optional:

4. Harvey, David. 1992. "Social Justice, Postmodernism and the City," in Richard LeGates and Frederick Stout, eds. *The City Reader*, 2nd ed., London: Routledge, pp. 199-207.
5. Faber, Daniel and Deborah McCarthy. 2001. "The Evolving Structure of the Environmental Justice Movement in the United States: New Models for Democratic Decision-Making." *Social Justice Research*, 14(4): 405-421.

WEEK 13. NOVEMBER 15/16: Power, science, and knowledge

Prompts to focus reading: Planners will often discuss how planning is political. Above and beyond political savvy, planners need to understand power to be effective. Imagine that you are a community organizer trying to work with a local planning department to influence the content of a neighborhood plan in your community. Propose a strategy for achieving your goals based on ideas about power in this week's readings.

Required:

1. Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2002. "Bringing Power to Planning Research: One Researcher's Praxis Story." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21(4): 353-366.
2. Forester, John. 1982. "Planning in the Face of Power." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 48(1): 67-80.
3. Sandercock, Leonie. 1998. "Exploring Planning's Knowledges" and "The Difference that Theory Makes," in *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 57-104.

Optional:

4. Sadan, Elisheva. 1997. "Theories of Power," in *Empowerment and Community Planning: Theory and Practice of People-Focused Social Solutions*," Richard Flantz, trans. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishers.

WEEK 14. NOVEMBER 22/23: Fall break, no class

WEEK 15. NOVEMBER 29/30: Communicative planning and collaboration

Prompts to focus reading: In the MURP planning program, we talk about "getting out of the classroom" to experience planning. However, I propose that the classroom is an important professional setting in its own right; it is a professional setting in which colleagues practice the communication skills needed to be effective planners. Translate this week's readings into a proposal for how planning students could practice the skills of communicative planning in the classroom.

Required:

1. Fung, Archon. 2006. "Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance." *Public Administration Review*, 66:66-75.
2. Booher, David E and Judith E. Innes. 2002. "Network Power in Collaborative Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21: 221-236.
3. Isaacs, William. 1999. "Chapter 1: A Conversation with a Center, Not Sides," in *Dialogue: The Art of Thinking Together*. New York: Random House.

Optional:

4. Healey, Patsy. 2006. "Chapter 1: Traditions of Planning Thought," in *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, 2nd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 7-30.

WEEK 16. DECEMBER 6/7: Global geography of planning

Prompts to focus reading: Identify what you consider the most important distinction between planning ideas developed in the US/European context and those developed in other places.

Required:

1. Robinson, Jennifer. 2002. "Global and World Cities: A View from Off the Map." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3): 531-554.
2. Roy, Ananya. 2005. "Urban Informality: Toward an Epistemology of Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71(2): 147-158.
3. Yiftachel, Oren. 2006. "Re-engaging Planning Theory? Towards 'South-Eastern' Perspectives." *Planning Theory*, 5(3): 211-222.