

PLAN 890
PLAN AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: FALL 2015

Time: Monday 3:35-6:35

Room: Philips 220

Instructor: Danielle Spurlock
Contact: dspurloc@live.unc.edu

Office Hours: M&W 11:00-1:00 or by appointment
New East 318

Course Description

Almost every planning intervention involves public action and process. By definition, we plan to anticipate, influence, or manage future outcomes. Yet, the effectiveness of planning interventions is influenced by actions of regional and national governments, private businesses, bureaucracies, stakeholder groups and a range of “publics”. Planners must understand how process matters in determining the success of their interventions. This course covers the theory and techniques of plan and policy adoption and implementation while examining the processes and institutions involved in urban planning and design decision-making.

It is a hands-on, skill-building course focused on the development of professional skills including project management, grant-writing, and meeting organization and facilitation. In addition to completing readings selected to build theoretical knowledge, students will engage in 1) lectures from practitioners, 2) regular in-class writing assignments to improve the quality and speed of their professional writing, 3) role playing exercises to expand their facilitation and mediation skills, and 4) semester long projects aimed at develop their critical analysis of real-world implementation cases and the acquisition of crucial management skills.

Course Goals

As an engaged participant in this course, by the end of the semester, you will be able to:

- Identify the governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and institutions that influence the implementation process
- Articulate your management style, your professional strengths and weaknesses, and your understanding of ethical planning practices
- Write clear professional documents in limited time periods
- Describe and apply key facilitation and mediation skills necessary to increase the likelihood of plan and policy implementation
- Critically analyze real-world plan implementation cases and suggest improvements to the planning process within their unique context

Course Readings

Readings for this course are listed under “Resources” on SAKAI. Reserve readings are available on my shelf in the Chapin Reading Room. One book is not electronically available, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. This book is readily available through on-line booksellers.

Course Format

This course will meet for one session per week. Class sessions will be a mixture of lectures with extensive class discussion, oral presentations by students, guest speakers, and in-class activities. It is expected that students will come to each class prepared to participate actively in discussions. In order to participate actively, students should be able to summarize the major arguments of the readings and provide a critical analysis and evaluation of key arguments and concepts.

The course is divided into three modules: Institutions, Stakeholders, and Engagement; Process and Outcomes; and Challenges and Opportunities. The first module covers the role that government agencies, private residents, the media, and non-profits play in achieving certain outcomes. It provides the necessary background to understand issues of process and implementation. The second module covers implementation issues in additional detail, including who implements plans, how do they do it, and why this influences planning outcomes. The third module emphasizes other forces (e.g., local budgets and conflict) that shape planning outcomes and the unique barriers and opportunities these forces present.

Course Requirements

You will be evaluated on four main components of the course. Each component is intended to parallel the main ways in which you will be evaluated should you choose to be a planner (or, pursue most any other profession). The evaluation components include: 1) showing up for work prepared and working well with your peers; 2) completing small projects with quick turnaround times; 3) managing larger projects over a longer time period; and 4) demonstrating your understanding of the core aspects of your field.

Requirements by % of Course Grade

- 1) Participation: 10%
- 2) In-class Assignments: 15%
- 3) Engagement Plan 10%
- 4) Data Visualization project: 25%
- 5) Grant Proposal Project: 20%
- 6) Implementation Case Study: 20%

Late Assignments

I expect all assignments to be handed in on time. If for some reason you cannot make a deadline, let me know ahead of time (not the night before an assignment is due) so we can try to work something out. Late assignments will be penalized one full grade (e.g., H to a P) for each day the assignment is late.

Communication

The best way to reach me is by email or during my office hours. If my office hours do not fit your schedule, you can also make an appointment using <https://dsprlck.youcanbook.me/>.

- All emails should include PLAN 890 in the subject line. I will make every effort to respond to your emails on the same day I receive them unless I receive them after 7:00 pm. Please do not wait until the last minute to contact me about assignments, especially if you are having problems.

- Please contact me as soon as possible should a medical or family emergency arise or a religious holiday (the only acceptable reasons for missing class) so that I can work with you to make accommodations.

Honor Code

UNC HONOR CODE
 “It shall be the responsibility of every student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to obey and to support the enforcement of the honor code, which prohibits lying, cheating, or stealing when these actions involve academic processes or University, student or academic personnel acting in an official capacity.”

The University Honor Code is in effect, and all assignments must be completed through your individual effort unless otherwise instructed. In order to uphold the Honor Code in your written assignments, you must properly cite all data, ideas, and information that are not your own. Please visit the UNC Writing Center website for information about citations and how to avoid plagiarizing: <http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/plagiarism.html>.

Each assignment should include the following Honor Pledge:
 “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.”

Semester at a Glance

8/24	Sess. 1	Course Overview & Assessment
PART I: INSTITUTIONS, STAKEHOLDERS, AND ENGAGEMENT		
8/31	Sess. 2	What is Implementation?
9/7		<i>Labor Day- No Classes</i>
9/14	Sess. 3	Institutions
9/21	Sess. 4	Public and Private Stakeholders
9/28	Sess. 5	Designing Engagement
10/5	Sess. 6	Politics, Policy Interpretation, and Discretion
PART II: PROCESS AND OUTCOMES		
10/12	Sess. 7	Comprehensive Planning Process & Professional Ethics
10/19	Sess.8	Development Management Ordinances
10/26	Sess. 9	Development Applications
11/2	Sess. 10	Site Plans
Part III: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES		
11/9	Sess.11	Development Finance
11/16	Sess. 12	Monitoring and Enforcement
11/23	Sess. 13	Conflict Resolution
11/30	Sess. 14	Final Presentations

Part I. Institutions, Stakeholders, and Engagement

Session 1: Course Overview and Assessment

Aug. 24

The Writing Center, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2012). Business Letters. Retrieved from <http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/business-letters/>.

University Career Services, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2015). Cover Letters. Retrieved from <http://careers.unc.edu/handouts>.

Tableau. (2015). Introduction to Tableau video. Retrieved from <http://www.tableau.com/learn/tutorials/on-demand/introduction-tableau>.

Session 2: What is Implementation?

Aug. 31

Matland, R. E. (1995). Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 5(2, April), 145–174.

Elmore, R. (1980). Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions. *Political Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 601–616.

Laurian, L., Day, M., Backhurst, M., Berke, P., Ericksen, N., Crawford, J., Dixon, J., and Chapman, S. (2004). What drives plan implementation? Plans, planning agencies and developers. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47(4), 555–577.

Robert, H. M., Robert, S. C., Evans, W. J., & Honemann, D. H. (2011). *Robert's rules of order newly revised*. Fourth Ed. Retrieved from <http://www.rulesonline.com/index.html>. (SKIM)

Slaughter, Jim, Ragsdale, Gaut, and Ericson, Jon L.. Notes and Comments on Robert's Rules (4th Edition). Carbondale, IL, USA: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 10 August 2015.

Doyle, M., & Straus, D. (1982). Chapter 7: How to be a Good Recorder. In *How to Make Meetings Work: The New Interaction Method*. Jove Books.

Session 3: Institutions

Sept. 14

Thomas, J. V. (2006). Dividing Lines and Bottom Lines: The Forces Shaping Local Development Patterns. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 25(3), 275–293.

Peters, B. G. (2014). Implementation structures as institutions. *Public Policy and Administration*, 29(2), 131–144.

Hedge, D. (1989). The Intergovernmental Milieu and Street-Level Implementation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 70(2), 285–299.

May, P. J., & Jochim, A. E. (2013). Policy regime perspectives: Policies, politics, and governing. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 426–452.

Kaner, S. (2011). Chapter 11: *Designing Realistic Agendas*. In *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making*. John Wiley & Sons.

Clark, T. A. (2002). Chapter 3: Initiating. *Project Management for Planners: A Practical Guide*. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Assignment #1: Data Visualization Posted

Session 4: Public and Private Stakeholders

Sept. 21

Arnstein, S. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224.

Burby, R. J. (2003). Making plans that Matter: Citizen involvement and government action. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(June 2013), 33–49.

Day, D. (1997). Citizen Participation in the Planning Process: An Essentially Contested Concept? *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), 421–434.

Hanna, K. S. (2000). The Paradox of Participation and the Hidden Role of Information. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 66(4), 398–410.

Tauxe, C. S. (1995). Marginalizing Public Participation in Local Planning: An Ethnographic Account. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61(4), 471–481.

Clark, T. A. (2002). Chapter 4: Planning. *Project Management for Planners: A Practical Guide*. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Assignment #2: Engagement Plan Posted

Assignment #3: Implementation Case Study Posted

Session 5: Designing Engagement

Sept. 28

Goldstein, H. (1984). Planning as Argumentation. *Environment and Planning B*, 11, 297–312.

Glass, J. (1979). Citizen Participation in Planning: The Relationship between Objectives and Techniques. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45(2), 180–189.

Innes, J. (1996). Planning through consensus building: A new vision of the comprehensive planning ideal. *Journal of American Planning Association*, 62(4), 125–137.

Laurian, L., & Shaw, M. M. (2008). Evaluation of Public Participation: The Practices of Certified Planners. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 28(3), 293–309.

Clark, T. A. (2002). Chapter 5: Executing. *Project Management for Planners: A Practical Guide*. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Session 6: Politics, Policy Interpretation, and Discretion

Oct. 5

Gilg, a. W., & Kelly, M. P. (1997). The delivery of planning policy in Great Britain: Explaining the implementation gap. New evidence from a case study in rural England. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 15(1), 19–36.

Prottas, J. M. (1978). The Power of the Street-Level Bureaucrat in Public Service Bureaucracies. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 13(3), 285–312.

Fineman, S. (1998). Street-level Bureaucrats and the Social Construction of Environmental Control. *Organization Studies*, 19(6), 953–974.

Hill, H. C. (2003). Understanding Implementation: Street-Level Bureaucrats' Resources for Reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research*, 13(3), 265–282.

Tang, B.-S., Choy, L., & Wat, J. (2000). Certainty and Discretion in Planning Control: A Case Study of Office Development in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, 37(13), 2465–2483.

Clark, T. A. (2002). Chapter 6: Controlling. *Project Management for Planners: A Practical Guide* . Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Part II: Process and Outcomes

Session 7: Comprehensive Planning Process and Professional Ethics

Oct. 12

Talen, E. (1996). Do Plans Get Implemented? A Review of Evaluation in Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 10(3), 248–259.

Talen, E. (1996). After the Plans: Methods to Evaluate the Implementation Success of Plans. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 16, 79–91.

Brody, S., & Highfield, W. (2005). Does Planning Work? Testing the Implementation of Local Environmental Planning in Florida. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71(2), 159–175.

Berke, P., Backhurst, M., Day, M., Ericksen, N., Laurian, L., Crawford, J., & Dixon, J. (2006). What Makes Plan Implementation Successful? An Evaluation of Local Plans and Implementation Practices in New Zealand. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 33, 581–600.

Neuman, M. (1998). Does Planning Need the Plan? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64(2), 208–220.

American Institute of Certified Planners. (2005). AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. Retrieved from <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm> December 29, 2013.

American Planning Association. (1992). Ethical Principles in Planning. Retrieved from <http://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicalprinciples.htm> December 29, 2013.

Clark, T. A. (2002). Chapter 7: Closing. *Project Management for Planners: A Practical Guide*. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

Assignment #2: Engagement Plan Due

Assignment #4: Grant Proposal Review Posted

Session 8: Development Management Ordinances **Oct. 19**

Fischler, R. (2000). Linking Planning Theory and History: The Case of Development Control. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 19(3), 233–241.

Booth, P. (1995). Zoning or Discretionary Action: Certainty and Responsiveness in Implementing Planning Policy. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(2), 103–112.

McPherson, E. G. (2001). Sacramento's parking lot shading ordinance: Environmental and economic costs of compliance. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 57(2), 105–123.

Lindsey, G., & Schoedel, C. (1997). Anticipatory Analysis in Environmental Planning: Managing Argument in Wellhead Protection. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 16(4), 243–256.

Selection of development management ordinances

Session 9: Development Applications **Oct. 26**

Godschalk, D. R., & Malizia, E. E. (2013). Chapters 1-4. *Sustainable development projects: Integrating Design, Development, and Regulation*. Chicago: American Planning Association, Planners Press.

Brotherton, I. (1992). On the Quantity and Quality of Permit Applications. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 19, 465–478.

Doublet, J. a., & Bond, A. J. (2005). Development control and the natural environment—the Maltese connection. *European Planning Studies*, 13(3), 407–433.

Wood, R. (2000). Using appeal data to characterise local planning authorities. *The Town Planning Review*, 71(1), 97–107.

Selection of approved development applications

Session 10: Site Plans **Nov. 2**

LaGro, J. A. (2001). Chapters 3-8. *Site Analysis: Linking Program and Concept in Land Planning and Design* (p. 227). John Wiley & Sons. Available electronically from UNC Libraries at <http://search.lib.unc.edu/search?R=UNCb8102000>.

Part III: Challenges and Opportunities

Session 11: Development Finance

Nov. 9

Lemmon, Wayne. (2013). Pro-Forma 101, Parts 1-5. Planners Web: News and Information for Citizen Planners. Retrieved from <http://plannersweb.com/2013/12/>.

Godschalk, D. R., & Malizia, E. E. (2013). Chapters 5-8. *Sustainable development projects: Integrating Design, Development, and Regulation*. Chicago: American Planning Association, Planners Press.

Session 12: Monitoring and Evaluation

Nov. 16

May, P. (1992). Policy Learning and Failure. *Journal of Public Policy*, 12(4), 331–354.

Seasons, M. (2003). Monitoring and Evaluation in Municipal Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(4), 430–440.

Mueller, G. P., & Hersperger, A. M. (2014). Implementing comprehensive plans: indicators for a task-sheet based performance evaluation process. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, (November), 1–26.

Laurian, L., Crawford, J., Day, M., Kouwenhoven, P., Mason, G., Ericksen, N., & Beattie, L. (2010). Evaluating the outcomes of plans: Theory, practice, and methodology. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 37(4), 740–757.

Assignment #4: Grant Proposal Review Due

Session 13: Conflict Resolution

Nov. 23

Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Penguin Publishing Group. *Read Chapters 1- 5, pp. 1-94. Skim the Rest.*

Glozman, E., Barak-Corren, N., & Yaniv, I. (2014). False Negotiations: The Art and Science of Not Reaching an Agreement. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59(4), 671–697.

Confidential instructions for role-playing

Session 14: Final Presentations

Nov. 30

Assignment #1: Data Visualization Due

Assignment #3: Implementation Case Study Due
