



UP 614: Collaborative Planning

Fall 2016

Course Staff and Schedule

Instructor: Prof. Robert Goodspeed
Email: rgoodspe@umich.edu
Office: 2223C Art & Architecture Building
Tel.: (734) 615-7254
Office Hours: T&Th 2:40 – 4 PM (Sign up via Canvas link)

Class Schedule: T&Th, 1-2:30 PM, 2210 Art & Architecture Building

Course Overview

This course provides students the opportunity to learn skills and techniques of collaborative planning, the practice of engaging diverse people and groups to resolve disputes and come to agreement. Topics covered will include interest-based negotiation, stakeholder analysis, facilitation, mediation, the consensus building approach to multi-party negotiation, and the design of urban planning processes. Special attention will be paid to race, gender, and cultural diversity, as well as the role of power and expert knowledge in the planning process. Students will explore these topics through in-class exercises and simulations, case analysis, readings, and discussion.

Learning Goal and Objectives

The course goal is to foster the development of reflective practitioners who are knowledgeable of existing collaborative planning methods and are attuned to the importance of context and interpersonal dynamics in professional practice. At the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Summarize the theory and methods of interest-based negotiation and the consensus building approach;
- Demonstrate intrapersonal skills required for collaborative planning developed through in-class exercises and written reflection assignments;
- Constructively evaluate and contribute to the design of a collaborative planning process;
- Analyze the role of race, gender, culture and expertise in collaborative planning, and propose actions that improve the inclusiveness of planning practices.

Materials

Textbooks

Available for purchase at the North Campus Bookstore or online.

- Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton. 2011. *Getting To Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 3rd ed. New York: Penguin Books. ISBN: 978-0143118756
- Susskind, Lawrence, and Jeffrey L. Cruikshank. 2006. *Breaking Robert's Rules: The*

New Way To Run Your Meeting, Build Consensus, And Get Results. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 978-0195308365

Readings

All course readings not from the textbooks will be posted to the course Canvas website. The materials listed under “Additional Readings” are not mandatory, but are suggested for students interested in exploring the topics more deeply, PhD students, or those who are facilitating the discussion that week.

Professional Guides

There is a substantial “grey literature” on many of the topics discussed in the course, including professional reports, guidebooks, tools, and other resources. Some of these are listed below as additional readings. If you are aware of materials such as these, I will gladly share them with the class. The course website includes copies of the following reports, which complement the assigned readings and may be useful for your case study reports:

- Michigan Association of Planning. 2014. *Community Engagement Workbook*.
- Rivers, Gloria and Myra Lee. 2013. *Equitable Detroit Coalition Toolkit: A Process Guide for Community Advisory Group Organizing*.
- Toor, Pardeep, Jason Cox, and Mark Wyckoff. 2014. *A Guidebook to Community Engagement: Involving Urban and Low-Income Populations in an Environmental Planning Process*. Michigan State University Planning & Zoning Center and the Flint River Watershed Coalition.
- Wilcox, David. 1994. *The Guide to Effective Participation*. Brighton [UK]: Delta Press.

Books Available Through UM Library

- Archer, David and Alex Cameron. 2009. *Collaborative Leadership How To Succeed In An Interconnected World*. Oxford, U.K. ; Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann. [Management/organization focus]*
- Chrislip, David D., and John Parr. 2002. *The Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook A Guide For Citizens And Civic Leaders*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Holman, Peggy, Tom Devane and Steven Cady. *The Change Handbook: The Definitive Resource on Today's Best Methods for Engaging Whole Systems*, 2nd Edition. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Sanoff, Henry. 2000. *Community Participation Methods in Design And Planning*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons. [methods compendium]
- Wates, Nick. 2000. *The Community Planning Handbook: How People Can Shape Their Cities, Towns And Villages In Any Part Of The World*. London: Earthscan. [methods compendium]

Website

This course will utilize the Canvas learning management system, and the course website is available through the CTools Gateway, or at this URL:

<https://umich.instructure.com/courses/89313>

Grading and Assignments

Self-Assessment (5%) – Students will complete a short self-assessment assignment, due **Sept. 14, at 12:00 noon**.

Attendance (10%) – Class attendance is required. Students may be able to receive credit for classes missed due to unavoidable personal or family emergencies or religious observance by following the following procedure: 1) notify the instructor at least a week before, or as early as possible, 2) identify an article or report related to the topic of the missed class session and, 3) after confirming the article or report with the instructor, prepare a 500-word reaction paper synthesizing its contents and relationship to the class content. The paper is due within three weeks of the missed session.

Class Discussion Facilitation (10%) – Students will select a week as individuals or as a group of two to lead the class discussion of the topic. Students should post to the class forum by **noon on Monday** the week of the discussion 1) a working definition or brief summary of the topic to be discussed; 2) a set of questions that will be used to organize the discussion about the readings and the topic in general. Students may choose to provide additional examples, readings, activities or other materials, however these should be introduced during the class period. Students are encouraged to review the “Additional Resources” provided for each week, as well as discuss their plans with the instructor during office hours the week previous. The following materials, posted on Canvas, may be useful as students develop ideas for how to facilitate the discussion:

- Frederick, Peter. “The Dreaded Discussion: Ten Ways to Start”
- Cashin, William E. “Answering and Asking Questions.” 1995. Idea Paper No. 30, Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development.
- Kachorek, Lauren V. “Using Discussion Questions Effectively.” 2009. University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.

Planning Process Profile (10%) – Students will complete a short analysis of a planning process. Additional guidance and suggested processes will be provided separately. Assignment will be due **Nov. 4**.

Journal (25%) – Students keep a journal throughout the semester, submitting it in weekly installments in Canvas forum. The journal is a place to reflect on class readings and discussion, and serves to begin a dialog continued in class. Each journal must contain a substantive reference to all of the class readings assigned that week. Students should submit journal entries of 400 words or longer for 10 of the 12 sessions with reading assignments. **Journals are due by 12 noon on Mondays.**

Case Study Presentation (10%) and Report (30% - 10% for each part) – Students will work in groups to complete a case study of a public sector dispute or planning process. The case study is divided into three parts, and further instructions will be provided in a separate assignment. **Part I is due Sept. 28, Part II is due Oct. 19, Part III is due Dec. 7.**

Policies

The Urban and Regional Planning Program is part of the Rackham Graduate School. Policies that apply to students in this course may include the Rackham Academic and Professional Integrity Policy, Taubman College Academic Policies, and other University policies.

Academic Integrity

The Taubman College Policy on Plagiarism reads in part:

“Plagiarism is knowingly presenting another person’s ideas, findings, images or written work as one’s own by copying or reproducing without acknowledgement of the source. It is intellectual theft that violates basic academic standards. In order to uphold an equal

evaluation for all work submitted, cases of plagiarism will be reviewed by the individual faculty member and/or the Program Chair. Punitive measures will range from failure of an assignment to expulsion from the University."

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

It is Taubman College policy to "meet the educational needs of all persons, including those with physical or perceptual limitations, who are interested in the study of architecture, urban planning and/or urban design." If you think you need an accommodation for a disability, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of this course, the assignments, the in-class activities, and the way the course is usually taught may be modified to facilitate your participation and progress. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, we can work with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) office to help us determine appropriate academic accommodations. SSD (734-763-3000; <http://ssd.umich.edu>) typically recommends accommodations through a Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. Any information you provide is private and confidential and will be treated as such.

Grading

The following scale will be used for grading in this course.

Grade	Minimum %
A+	100
A	95
A-	90
B+	87
B	83
B-	80
C+	77
C	73
C-	70
D+	67
D	63
D-	60
E	50
F	40

Course Outline

Module	Topics	Exercises	Assignments <i>In addition to journals</i>
1. Introduction and Theoretical Foundations (3 weeks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic Theory • Skills of Collaborative Planning • Collaborative Planning Theory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductory Exercises • Appleton v. Baker 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Assessment (9/14)
2. Negotiation Theory, Methods & Roles (7 weeks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiation • Intersectionality and Gender • Mediation • Multiparty Negotiation/Consensus Building • Stakeholder Analysis • Facilitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiated Development in Redstone • Chestnut Drive/Bunyon • Flooding II • Westville 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study Part I (9/28) • Case Study Part II (10/19) • Process Profile (11/4)
3. Implementing Collaborative Planning (4 weeks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing Processes & Community Benefits Agreements • Race, Ethnicity & Power • Expertise and Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guest Speakers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study Part III (12/7) • Case Presentation I

Schedule**Module 1 – Introduction and Theoretical Foundations****Week 1. Introduction**

Tues., Sept. 6: Introduction and Overview, Short Exercises “Negotiated Eggs” and “Lost at Sea”

Thurs., Sept. 8: Film Viewing and Discussion

- Assigned: Thomas-Kilmann Instrument & Self-Assessment
- Episode from “Corporate/Community Dialog: An Introduction” film series by the Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative at Harvard Kennedy School/Professor John Ruggie. Available online at <http://vimeo.com/43661831>

Week 2. Democratic Theory

Tues., Sept. 13: Democratic Theory

1. Dryzek, John S. 2000. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press. Introduction, “The Deliberative Turn in Democratic Theory,” Chapter 1, “Liberal Democracy and the Critical Alternative,” and (recommended but not required) Chapter 6, “Green Democracy.”
2. Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. “A Ladder of Citizen Participation.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35 (4):216-224.

3. Fung, A. 2006. "Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance." *Public Administration Review* 66 (1):66-75.
4. Maier, Karel. 2001. "Citizen Participation in Planning: Climbing a Ladder?" *European Planning Studies* 9 (6):707-719.

Wed., Sept. 14th: Self-Assessment Due by Noon

Thurs., Sept. 15: Skills of Collaborative Planning

1. Umemoto, Karen. 2001. "Walking in Another's Shoes: Epistemological Challenges in Participatory Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21 (1):17-31.
2. Stone, Douglas, Bruce Patton, and Sheila Heen. 1999. *Difficult Conversations*. New York: Penguin. Chapter 5, "Have Your Feelings (Or They Will Have You)" and Chapter 9, "Learning: Listen from the Inside Out."
3. Sandercock, Leonie. 2000. "When Strangers Become Neighbors: Managing Cities of Difference." *Planning Theory & Practice* 1 (1):13-30.

Week 3. Collaborative Planning Theory

Tues., Sept. 20: Introduction to Collaborative Planning Theory

1. Innes, Judith E. 1996. "Planning Through Consensus Building - A New View of the Comprehensive Planning Ideal." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62 (4):460-472.
2. Forester, John. 1982. "Planning in the Face of Power." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48 (1):67-80.
3. Healey, Patsy. 1996. "Consensus-Building Across Difficult Divisions: New Approaches to Collaborative Strategy Making." *Planning Practice & Research* 11 (2):207-216.
4. Booher, David and Judith Innes. 2002. "Network Power in Collaborative Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21:221.

Additional Readings:

- Mattila, Hanna. 2002. "Aesthetic justice and urban planning: Who ought to have the right to design cities?" *GeoJournal* 58 (2):131-138. (Recommended for PPD students)
- Tewdwr-Jones, M., and P. Allmendinger. 1998. "Deconstructing Communicative Rationality: A Critique of Habermasian Collaborative Planning." *Environment and Planning A* 30:1975-1990.
- Key Books in Collaborative Planning Theory
 - Healey, Patsy. 1997. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
 - Innes, Judith E., and David E. Booher. 2010. *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. London and New York: Routledge.
 - Margerum, Richard D. 2011. *Beyond consensus*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
 - Sager, Tore. 1994. *Communicative Planning Theory*. Brookfield, Vt.: Avebury.
 - Sager, Tore. 2013. *Reviving Critical Planning Theory: Dealing With Pressure, Neo-Liberalism, And Responsibility In Communicative Planning*. New York: Routledge.

Thurs., Sept. 22: Exercise – "Appleton v. Baker"

Module 2 – Negotiation Theory, Methods & Roles

Week 4. Negotiation

Tues., Sept. 27: Discussion

1. *Getting to Yes*, all chapters, including “Ten Questions”

Wed., Sept. 28: Case Study – Part 1 Due at 12 Noon

Thurs., Sept. 29: Exercise - “Negotiated Development in Redstone”

Week 5. Collaboration and Inclusion I: Intersectionality and Gender

Tues., Oct. 4: Gender and Racial Identity

1. Hankivsky, Olena, and Renee Cormier. 2011. "Intersectionality and Public Policy: Some Lessons from Existing Models." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (1):217-229. doi: 10.1177/1065912910376385.
2. Babcock, Linda, and Sara Laschever. 2003. *Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Chapter 8, “The Female Advantage.”
3. Kolb, Deborah and Gloria G. Coolidge. 1988. "Her Place at the Table: A Consideration of Gender Issues in Negotiation." Harvard Law School Program on Negotiation Working Paper Series, 88(5).
4. Droste, C. and R. Chestnutt, eds. 2011. *Berlin Handbook: Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Development*. Berlin: Kulturbuch-Verlag GmbH. (read section 3, “Gender-Oriented Planning Processes,” skim remainder).

Suggested Readings:

- Manuel, Tiffany. 2006. "Envisioning the Possibilities for a Good Life: Exploring the Public Policy Implications of Intersectionality Theory." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 28 (3-4):173-203.
- Harrison, Jack, Jaime Grant, and Jody L Herman. 2012. "A gender not listed here: Genderqueers, gender rebels, and otherwise in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey." *LGBTQ Public Policy Journal at the Harvard Kennedy School* 2 (1).
- Anonymous. 1980. “No Academic Matter: Unconscious Discrimination in Environmental Design Education.” In *New Space for Women*, edited by Gerda R. Wekerle, Rebecca Peterson, and David Morley, 235-253. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1995. “Difference as a Resource for Democratic Communication.” In *Deliberative Democracy*, edited by James Bohman and William Rehg, 383-406. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- There is a substantial literature in the areas of how to promote equality among groups defined by gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or other characteristics through public policy and urban planning. A few key citations include:
 - Moser, Caroline O.N. 1993. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice & Training*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 5, “Towards gender planning: A New planning tradition and planning methodology,”
 - Frisch, Michael. 2002. "Planning as a Heterosexual Project." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21 (3):254-266.

- Hayden, Dolores. 1980. "What would a non-sexist city be like? Speculations on housing, urban design, and human work." *Signs*: 170-187.
- Crane, Randall. 2007. "Is there a quiet revolution in women's travel? Revisiting the gender gap in commuting." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 73 (3):298-316.
- Tacoli, C. and D. Satterwaite. April 2013. Gender and Urban Change Theme Issue, *Environment and Urbanization*. <http://eau.sagepub.com/content/25/1.toc>

Thurs., Oct. 6: Collaborative Problem Solving Workshop

Week 6. Mediation

Tues., Oct. 11: Mediation

1. Susskind, Lawrence, and Connie Ozawa. 1984. "Mediated Negotiation in the Public Sector: The Planner as Mediator." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 4 (1): 5-15.
2. Jacobs, Scott, and Mark Aakhus. 2002. "What mediators do with words: Implementing three models of rational discussion in dispute mediation." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 20 (2):177-203.
3. Forester, John. 2006. Making participation work when interests conflict - Moving from facilitating dialogue and moderating debate to mediating negotiations. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72 (4):447-456.

Additional Readings

- Forester, John. 1987. Planning in the face of conflict: Negotiation and mediation strategies in local land use regulation. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 53 (3):303-314.

Thurs., Oct. 13: Exercise – “Westville”

Week 7. Fall Break Week

Tues., Oct. 18: No Class – Fall Break

Wed., Oct. 19: Case Study – Part 2 due at 12 noon

Thurs., Oct 20: Case Study Discussion: “Brazil - The Point of New Return: informal Settlement Upgrading”

Week 8. Multiparty Negotiation/Consensus Building

Tues., Oct. 25: Multiparty Negotiation

1. *Breaking Robert's Rules*, all chapters.
2. Susskind, L. and J. Thomas-Larmer. “Conducting a Conflict Assessment.” In *The Consensus Building Handbook*, edited by L. Susskind, S. McKernan and J. Thomas-Larmer, 99-135, Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1999.

Additional Readings

- Weir, M., J. Rongerude, and C.K. Ansell. 2009. "Collaboration is not enough." *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (4):455.
- Ehrmann, J. and B. Stinson . “Joint Fact-Finding and the Use of Technical Experts.” In

The Consensus Building Handbook, edited by L. Susskind, S. McKernan and J. Thomas-Larmer, 375-400, Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1999.

Thurs., Oct. 27: Exercise – “Chestnut Avenue / Bunyon Brothers”

Week 9. Stakeholder Analysis

Tues., Nov. 1: Stakeholder Theory and Analysis

1. Reed, Mark S., Anil Graves, Norman Dandy, Helena Posthumus, Klaus Hubacek, Joe Morris, Christina Prell, Claire H. Quinn, and Lindsay C. Stringer. 2009. "Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management." *Journal of Environmental Management* 90 (5):1933-1949.
2. Monnikhof, René A. H., and Jurian Edelenbos. 2001. "Into the fog? Stakeholder input in participatory impact assessment." *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 19:29-39.
3. Prell, Christina, Klaus Hubacek, and Mark Reed. 2009. "Stakeholder Analysis and Social Network Analysis in Natural Resource Management." *Society & Natural Resources* 22 (6):501-518.

Additional Resources:

- Bryson, John M., Gary L. Cunningham, and Karen J. Lokkesmoe. 2002. "What to Do When Stakeholders Matter: The Case of Problem Formulation for the African American Men Project of Hennepin County, Minnesota." *Public Administration Review* 62 (5):568-584.
- Olander, Stefan, and Anne Landin. 2005. "Evaluation of stakeholder influence in the implementation of construction projects." *International Journal of Project Management* 23 (4):321-328.
- Reed, M. S. 2008. "Stakeholder participation for environmental management : A literature review." *Biological Conservation* 141(10), 2417–2431.
- Edelenbos, J. and E. Klijn. 2005. "Managing Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making: A Comparative Analysis of Six Interactive Processes in the Netherlands." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(3), 417–446.

Thurs., Nov. 3: No Class (Group Work)

Fri., Nov. 4: *Process Profile Due at 12 noon*

Week 10. Facilitation

Tues., Nov. 8: Facilitation

- *Assigned: Flooding Exercise Preparation*
1. Schwarz, R. M. 2002. *The Skilled Facilitator: Practical Wisdom for Developing Effective Groups*. 2nd Ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Chapters 1, 6, 8 and 16.

Additional Reading:

- Doyle, Michael, and David Straus. 1993. *How to Make Meetings Work! The New Interaction Method*. New York: Berkley Books.
- Kaner, Sam, and Lenny Lind. 2007. *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons/Jossey-Bass.

Thurs., Nov. 10: Exercise – “Flooding: Helping Cities Adjust to Climate Change Risks (II)”

Module 3 – Implementing Collaborative Planning

Week 11. Designing Collaboration and Community Benefits Agreements

Tues., Nov. 15: Designing the Planning Process and Community Benefits Agreements

1. Creighton, James L. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Chapter 3, “Decision Analysis,” and Chapter 4, “Process Planning.”
2. Faga, Barbara. 2006. *Designing Public Consensus*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley. Chapters 1, 3 and 7.
3. Carp, Jana. 2004. “Wit, Style, and Substance: How Planners Shape Public Participation.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23 (3):242-254.
4. Baxamusa, Murtaza H. 2008. “Empowering Communities through Deliberation the Model of Community Benefits Agreements.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 27 (3):261-276.
5. The U.S. Legal Context of Collaborative Planning (handout), see also “Making Public Participation Legal” report on Canvas.

Additional Resources:

- Glass, J. J. 1979. “Citizen Participation in Planning – Relationship Between Objectives and Techniques.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45 (2):180-189.
- Sarkissian, W., Hurford, D., & Wenman, C. 2010. *Creative Community Planning: Transformative Engagement Methods for Working at the Edge*. Washington, DC: Earthscan.
- Straus, David A. “Designing a Consensus Building Process Using a Graphic Roadmap.” In *The Consensus Building Handbook*, edited by L. Susskind, S. McKernan and J. Thomas-Larmer, 137-167, Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1999.
- Burby, Raymond J. 2003. “Making Plans That Matter: Citizen Involvement and Government Action.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69 (1):33-49.
- Day, JC, Thomas I Gunton, and Peter W Williams. 2003. “Evaluating collaborative planning: the British Columbia experience.” *Environments* 31 (3):1.

Thurs., Nov. 17: CBA Speaker

1. *Readings will be announced*

Week 12. Collaboration and Inclusion II: Race, Ethnicity, and Power

Tues., Nov. 22: Inclusion II

1. de Souza Briggs, Xavier. 1998. “Doing Democracy Up-Close: Culture, Power, and Communication in Community Building.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18 (1):1-13.
2. McCullum, C., D. Pelletier, D. Barr, J. Wilkins, and J.P. Habicht. 2004. “Mechanisms of Power Within A Community-Based Food Security Planning Process.” *Health Education & Behavior* 31 (2):206-222.
3. Bollens, Scott A. 2002. “Urban Planning and Intergroup Conflict: Confronting a Fractured Public Interest.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 68:22-42.

Additional Resources:

- Ameyaw, S. "Appreciative Planning: An Approach to Planning with Diverse Ethnic and Cultural Groups." In *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society* edited by M. Burayidi, 101-114. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.

Thurs., Nov. 24: No Class (Thanksgiving)

Week 13. Expertise and Technology

Tues., Nov. 29: Expertise and Technology

1. Corburn, Jason. 2003. "Bringing Local Knowledge into Environmental Decision Making: Improving Urban Planning for Communities at Risk." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22 (4):420-433.
2. Kartez, Jack D., and Molly P. Casto. 2008. "Information Into Action: Biodiversity Data Outreach and Municipal Land Conservation." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 74 (4):467 - 480.
3. Rydin, Yvonne. 2007. "Re-examining the role of knowledge within planning theory." *Planning theory* 6 (1):52-68.
4. Goodspeed, R. 2016. "Digital knowledge technologies in planning practice: from black boxes to media for collaborative inquiry." *Journal of Planning Theory & Practice*. In press.

Additional Reading:

- Andrews, Clinton J. 2002. *Humble Analysis: The Practice of Joint Fact-Finding*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Fischer, Frank. 2000. *Citizens, experts, and the Environment: The politics of local knowledge*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Gudmundsson, Henrik. 2011. "Analyzing Models as a Knowledge Technology in Transport Planning." *Transport Reviews* 31 (2):145-159.
- Tironi, Manuel. 2013. "Modes of Technification: Expertise, Urban Controversies and the Radicalness of Radical Planning." *Planning Theory* 14 (1):70-89.
- Wassen, M. J., H. Runhaar, A. Barendregt, and T. Okruszko. 2011. "Evaluating the Role of Participation in Modeling Studies for Environmental Planning." *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 38 (2):338-358.
- Zellner, Moira L., Leilah B. Lyons, Charles J. Hoch, Jennifer Weizeorick, Carl Kunda, and Daniel C. Milz. 2012. "Modeling, Learning, and Planning Together: An Application of Participatory Agent-based Modeling to Environmental Planning." *URISA Journal* 24 (1):77-92.

Thurs., Dec. 1: "Entering, Engaging, and Exiting Community," Ginsberg Center Workshop

Week 14. Course Wrap-Up and Case Presentations

Tues., Dec. 6: Collaborative Planning in the 21st Century

1. Beauregard, Robert A. 2001. "The Multiplicities of Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20 (4):437-439.
2. Evans-Cowley, Jennifer, and Justin Hollander. 2010. "The New Generation of Public Participation: Internet-based Participation Tools." *Planning Practice and Research* 25 (3):397-408.

3. Cravens, Amanda E. 2015. "Negotiation and Decision Making with Collaborative Software: How MarineMap 'Changed the Game' in California's Marine Life Protected Act Initiative." *Environmental Management* 57: 474-497.

Additional Reading:

- Brabham, Daren C. 2009. "Crowdsourcing the Public Participation Process for Planning Projects." *Planning Theory* 8 (3):242-262.
- Kelly, M., S. Ferranto, S. Lei, K. Ueda, and L. Huntsinger. 2012. "Expanding the Table: The Web as a Tool for Participatory Adaptive Management in California Forests." *Journal of environmental management* 109:1-11.
- Stern, E., O. Gudes, and T. Svoray. 2009. "Web-based and traditional public participation in comprehensive planning: a comparative study." *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 36 (6):1067-1085.

Wed., Dec. 7: Case Study – Part 3 due at 12 noon

Thurs., Dec. 8: Case Presentations

Week 15

Mon., Dec. 13: Case Presentations

3 School/Comprehensive Educational Plan (S/CEP) Development Timeline Actions Timeframe The S/CEP planning cycle launches with the Spring 2016 Comprehensive April 16, 2016 Educational Planning Conference. Schools access their S/CEPs in the iplan Portal. April 18, 2016 Schools develop their S/CEPs using iplan and align with their proposed schoolbased April 18-June 30, 2016 budgets.Â Set Up and User Guide Version 3.2.2 Updox, LLC support@updox.com 614-547-9635 Table of Contents Creating and Managing Internal Updox Users 3 How to Send and Receive Faxes 4 How to Import Files into. Collaborative Planning allows planners to limit the sharing by setting up security rules. The following formula depicts the calculation that ASCP uses to calculate safety stock level: For time bucket n.Â You can provide your suppliers with view-only access to the Oracle Advanced Supply Chain Planning Planner Workbench through Oracle Collaborative Planning.