

# PLAN 704: Theory of Planning I

Spring 2021

Class Room: <https://go.unc.edu/plan704-sp21>

Instructor: Nikhil Kaza

Office: <https://unc.zoom.us/j/8985414713>

Office Hours: <https://nikhilkaza.youcanbook.me/>

Email: [nkaza@unc.edu](mailto:nkaza@unc.edu)

Time: 11:15 AM - 12:30 PM

TA: Sophie Kelmenson

<https://unc.zoom.us/j/8985414713>

<https://sophiekelmenson.youcanbook.me/>

[soph@live.unc.edu](mailto:soph@live.unc.edu)

---

## Course Description & Objectives

Planning is usually conflated with collective action, collective choice, communication, centralisation and coordination. It is also common to conflate planning theory with urban theory. In this course, we explore how these concepts inform planning. However, they are neither necessary for plans, nor the issues they raise are ameliorated by planning. The point of the course is to provide concepts and reasonings that will help you make sense of planning practice. We will explore various normative as well as positive theories of plans, institutions, ethics and governance at sufficient depth to provide grounds for understanding the nature and dilemmas of urban planning.

To sum up, the question we will attempt to answer in this course is, “What are good plans, planning practices and planners?” “What is a good place and a good society?” is left for other courses.

## Prerequisites & Preparation

There are no prerequisites for this class. However, this class will quickly cover ground and use concepts that you may not be familiar with. It is your responsibility to seek out additional background material to keep up. You will read many classic readings from various fields as well as some case studies in planning. Thus, you may encounter novelties in both style and substance. Most of the readings have generated a lengthy trail of secondary literature. Use the resources on the World Wide Web as well as the library for secondary literature. It is your responsibility to seek clarifications for unfamiliar concepts and ideas.

## Course Policies

The following set of course policies is not meant as an exhaustive list. If in doubt, ask for permission and clarification.

## Student Responsibilities

This is a graduate class and, therefore, I won't belabour the proper in-class and out-of-class etiquette and academic integrity. You are expected to be aware of these issues. If in doubt, please refer to university policies and ask for permission, rather than forgiveness.

This course forces students to think through various arguments, question, affirm or change deeply held beliefs and ideas. Such thinking requires discipline as well as openness to critiques and challenges. This class is set up so that you will learn much more from your peers than from lectures. Therefore, vigorous participation is not only encouraged, but also required. Initiative and creativity in articulating the main points are especially prized. You should bring in materials, concepts and cases from your professional experience and other classes.

I use slides sparingly, so please be prepared to take notes.

## Grading

I will follow Specification Grading for this course. The grading is based on the following requirements.

- Class participation (weekly writeup and in-class participation)
- Discussion Lead/Presentation.
- Pop Quizzes
- Assignments

All of the above is graded on a Satisfactory (S)/Unsatisfactory(U) scale. Satisfactory grade is equivalent to a B+ letter grade. The focus of these assignments is on learning outcomes such as mastery of the material, engaging your peers and making innovative connections in the material.

The following table sets out the *minimum number* of Satisfactory grades that needs to be achieved in all of the different assessment types to get a corresponding grade in different scales (graduate H/P/L, undergraduate A/B/C/D/F).

Assessment Type/Grade	L/C	P/B	H/A
Weekly participation	7	9	11
Pop Quizzes	4	5	6
Assignments	3	4	4
Discussion Lead/Presentation	OR	AND	AND

Failure to meet the minimum requirements in any of the categories will result in a lower grade, e.g. failure to meet all of the minimum requirements for L grade will result in a failing grade. Reach out to me in a timely fashion for remedial action, if you are struggling in the course.

## Weekly Reading Response

A short response (2-3 paragraphs) to the week's reading material is required and is due by 9 AM on Mondays. It is to be posted in the discussion forum for the corresponding week. This response is about making a compelling argument about what is important in the readings, what is engaging, what you disagree with and how to connect it with other topics discussed in the course and or in other courses. The point of these responses is to engage with your peers asynchronously and help the instructors and discussion leads to tailor the lectures and discussions.

## Pop Quizzes & Attendance

Students are responsible for keeping up with the material this course covers. On random days, there will be a pop quiz in the class. You need to be present in class to take the quiz (i.e. no make

up quizzes). You will receive Satisfactory grade, if you submit the quiz. These pop quizzes are not graded for points, but will be used to clarify material and discuss ideas.

### Discussion Leads

A randomly chosen group of students will lead the discussion section for each module. The discussion leads are expected to come prepared to discuss the main points of the modules readings, supplement them with particular case studies and activities in which rest of the students can participate. Skills for leading the discussion are similar to skills you will need to manage a meeting, frame the agenda, solicit and encourage participation and persuasively present different but illuminating view points. The discussions are evaluated as part of the in-class participation. Discussion leads will be posted on the wiki, once the roster stabilises. I strongly urge the leads to meet with me and/or the teaching assistant, to get some guidance and clarification on the real and hypothetical cases that might be used in the discussion.

### Assignments

Four major assignments are part of the course. *The point of the assignments is to demonstrate your mastery of the material discussed in the class and proper application of the concepts.* You are welcome to disagree with the authors and/or extend their arguments but you should engage with the course material.

Two assignments are individual submissions and two are group submissions. You are welcome to pick your team members for the group (no more than 3 members per group), however, the teams are different for assignments.

At appropriate times, you will have to claim your topic for each assignment on Sakai's Wiki. The Wiki will function as a signup sheet. Occasional overlap of topics among the students is permitted, but I would prefer to keep them unique. Please figure out how to edit the Wiki.

Final papers for the assignments are submitted via Sakai using the Assignment tool (not on the Wiki).

All assignment submissions are argumentative essays. "[The argumentative essay](#) is a genre of writing that requires the student to investigate a topic; collect, generate, and evaluate evidence; and establish a position on the topic in a concise manner. ... Regardless of the amount or type of research involved, argumentative essays must establish a clear thesis and follow sound reasoning"

Writing well is a necessary skill to develop. Your papers will be graded, not merely on their substantive merits, but also on style. You should take advantage of the excellent resources at [UNC writing center](#). Please refer to the grading rubric handout as a guide.

All verbatim text and illustrations from other sources appearing in the assignments and weekly analyses are to be properly cited and documented. All help from websites, individuals, and other materials should be properly acknowledged. There is no penalty for collaborative endeavours; however, severe penalties are imposed for non-attribution.

All citations should follow the guidelines set forth by the *Chicago Manual of Style*. A quick and ready guide is available at [this page](#). Use the *author-date* format of the Chicago style. The [course library webpage](#) has information on citation formats. You will be penalized for not following these formatting instructions.

Page limits mentioned in the assignments are guides, and are not binding.

Double spacing is an anachronism. Presumably, you have moved on from the fixed font era of typewriters.

### **Assigned Readings**

The following textbook is required for this class:

- Hopkins, L. D. (2001). *Urban Development: The Logic of Making Plans*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

henceforth, LDH

The textbook should be available at the Student Stores and is on reserve at the Undergraduate library. The library should also have access to the online version of the book. Other readings are posted on Sakai as links.

### **E-mail & Calendar**

Sakai messaging system is the preferred way to communicate with me. If you insist on sending messages using your email client, please use “PLAN 704” in the subject line, so that it is not trapped by the aggressive spam filtering, I implement. I will do the same, in my emails to you.

The class has a group [email list](#). Please be considerate to your colleagues.

The [course calendar](#) should list the most up to date information about topics, guest lectures, field trips, due date etc. Please pay attention to it and subscribe in your calendaring software. The schedule described in this document is very tentative.

You can set up an appointment on [my calendar](#).

### **Course Corrections**

Because of the unusual nature of the delivery and the content of the class, we may need to change direction at various points in the semester, based on student learning outcomes. This may include changes in course policies, pace of the material, depth of coverage, deadlines etc. I strongly recommend that you engage with me when course corrections are needed or desired. I reserve the right to change the material as and when I see fit. As such, Sakai Lessons and Calendar will be updated, rather than this document.

## Schedule (Tentative)

---

### Preliminaries & Background

**Jan 20 (Wed): Introduction** This class will be used to introduce the syllabus and set the stage and expectations.

- Friedmann, J. (2008). "The Uses of Planning Theory: A Bibliographic Essay". En. In: Journal of Planning Education and Research 28.2, pp. 247–257. DOI: 10.1177/0739456X08325220.

#### *Module 1: Histories of Planning*

Where do we situate planning? Is it city reform? Is it social reform? Is it governance reform?

### Jan 25 (Mon): Planning Eras

- Smith, M. E. (2007). "Form and Meaning in the Earliest Cities: A New Approach to Ancient Urban Planning". In: Journal of Planning History 6.1, pp. 3–47.
- Peterson, J. A. (1979). "The Impact of Sanitary Reform upon American Urban Planning, 1840 - 1890". In: Journal of Social History 13.1, pp. 83–103. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3786777>.
- Wilson, W. (1997). "Moles and Skylarks". In: Introduction to Planning History in the United States. Ed. by D. A. Krueckeberg. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, pp. 88–121.

### Jan 27 (Wed): Contested Histories of Planning

- Sies, M. C. and C. Silver (1996). Planning the Twentieth-Century American City. En. JHU Press.
- Shibata, K. (2008). The Origins of Japanese Planning Culture: Building a Nation-State, 1868-1945. En. Monograph London, UK. URL: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/geographyAndEnvironment/> (visited on Jan. 19, 2021).
- Sandercock, L., ed. (1998). Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History. First. Berkeley: University of California Press.

### Feb 1 (Mon): Watershed Moments in Planning (Short presentations by students)

---

### Justifying Planning

#### *Module 2: Plans, Planning & Planners: Why? What? Whither?*

Is planning a rational activity undertaken by organisations? Many do not think so, as rationality has fallen out of favour. In this module, we will examine whether or not there could be such a thing as irrational/non-rational planning. We will also examine, what kinds of entities engage in planning.

**Feb 3 (Wed): Should We Plan?**

- LDH (Chapter 1)
- Brooks, M. (2002). *Planning Theory for Practitioners*. 1st edition. Routledge.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). "The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning." In: *Harvard Business Review* 72.1, pp. 107–114. URL: <https://hbr.org/1994/01/the-fall-and-rise-of-strategic-planning>.
- Watson, V. (2009). "Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues". In: *Urban Studies* 46.11, pp. 2259–2275. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43198476>.

**Feb 8 (Mon): Comprehensive Rational Planning Model**

- Rittel, H. and M. Webber (1973). "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning". In: *Policy sciences* 4.2, pp. 155–169.
- Goetz, A. R. and J. S. Szyliowicz (1997). "Revisiting Transportation Planning and Decision Making Theory: The Case of Denver International Airport". In: *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 31.4, pp. 263–280. DOI: DOI: 10.1016/S0965-8564(96)00033-X.
- Hammond, J. S., R. L. Keeney, and H. Raiffa (1999). *Smart Choices: A Practical Guide to Making Better Decisions*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

**Feb 10 (Wed): Student Led Discussion***Module 3: Intentions, Plans & Actions*

We will dissect the notions of rationality and how they inform our understanding of motivations of different organisations to act and plan. I will argue for planning as a method of thinking before acting. As such plans are made by various entities including private groups, to convince larger public. It is in this cacophony of intersecting plans and intentions and goals, that we must individually act.

**Feb 17 (Wed), Feb 22 (Mon): Organisational Decision Making I & II**

- LDH (Chapter 2, 4 & 7)
- March, J. G. (1997). "Understanding How Decisions Happen in Organizations". In: *Organizational Decision Making*. Ed. by Z. Shapira. Cambridge University Press, pp. 9–32.
- Pralle, S. B. (2006). "Timing and Sequence in Agenda-Setting and Policy Change: A Comparative Study of Lawn Care Pesticide Politics in Canada and the US". In: *Journal of European Public Policy* 13.7, pp. 987–1005. DOI: 10.1080/13501760600923904.
- Allison, G. T. and P. Zelikow (1999). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Longman.
- McCartney, R. and P. Duggan (2016). "Metro Sank into Crisis despite Decades of Warnings". In: *Washington Post*. URL: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/metro-sank-into-crisis-despite-decades-of-warnings/2016/04/24/1c4db91c-0736-11e6-a12f-ea5aed7958dc\\_story.h](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/metro-sank-into-crisis-despite-decades-of-warnings/2016/04/24/1c4db91c-0736-11e6-a12f-ea5aed7958dc_story.h) (visited on Jan. 07, 2017).

- Friend, J. and A. Hickling (2005). *Planning under Pressure: The Strategic Choice Approach*. Third. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Etzioni, A. (1967). "Mixed-Scanning: A "Third" Approach to Decision-Making". In: *Public Administration Review* 27.5, pp. 385–392. DOI: 10.2307/973394.

*Feb 24 (Wed): Student Led Discussion*

---

*Module 4 : What Kinds of Plans are Worth Making? When? What is a Good Plan?*

"Plans are worthless, but planning is everything" - Anonymous quoted by Presidents Eisenhower & Nixon.

We want plans to be designs. Once plans are made, all that is left to do is to follow them to the hilt and implement them. These ideas form the core of angst about the efficacy of planning. In this module, I present an alternative view of plans and how they should be thought of, and why some vague plans that do not necessarily point to specific actions may indeed be useful.

### **Mar 1 (Mon): Making Plans**

- LDH (Chapter 3 & 5)
- Schwarting, W., J. Alonso-Mora, and D. Rus (2018). "Planning and Decision-Making for Autonomous Vehicles". In: *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems* 1.1, pp. 187–210. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-control-060117-105157.

### **Mar 3 (Wed): Implementing Plans**

- Winter, S. C. (2011). "Implementation". In: *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc., pp. 1158–1170. DOI: 10.4135/9781412994163.
- Kaza, N. (2019). "Vain Foresight: Against the Idea of Implementation in Planning". In: *Planning Theory* 18.4, pp. 410–428. DOI: 10.1177/1473095218815201.
- Mastop, H. and A. Faludi (1997). "Evaluation of Strategic Plans: The Performance Principle". In: *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 24, pp. 815–832.

### **Mar 8 (Mon): Using Plans**

- LDH (Chapter 9 & 10)
- Ryan, B. D. (2006). "Incomplete and Incremental Plan Implementation in Downtown Providence, Rhode Island, 1960-2000". In: *Journal of Planning History* 5.1, pp. 35–64. DOI: 10.1177/1538513205284619.
- Schon, D. A. (1984). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think In Action*. First. Basic Books.

### **Mar 10 (Wed): Student Led Discussion**

---

## What is Worth Planning For?

### *Module 5: Untangling Planning, Regulation and Police Power*

Central to many arguments about justification for planning, are that markets fail either because of externalities or because they cannot provide common goods and planning is meant to remedy them. I will dissect these notions and show that fallacy of conflating government with planning. I will also argue that planning is not limited to governments; firms, individuals and voluntary groups plan within markets and without. For markets to function, a well-defined, and an evolving system of property rights need to be established. I will argue for a social construction of bundles of rights that account for changing circumstances. Construction of *de facto* and *de jure* rights are contingent on transaction costs, peoples and historical practises and are backed by the police power of the state through regulations. Planning sometimes provide justifications for these regulations, but is neither sufficient nor necessary for them. Furthermore, planning is rarely exclusively about regulatory action.

### **Mar 15 (Mon): Planning & Markets: A False Dichotomy**

- Alexander, E. R. (2001). "Why Planning vs. Markets Is an Oxymoron: Asking the Right Question". In: *Planning and Markets* 4.1, pp. 1–8.
- Bowles, S. (1991). "What Market Can - And Cannot - Do". In: *Challenge* 34.4, p. 11. URL: [www.jstor.org/stable/40721264](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40721264) (visited on Jan. 02, 2020).

### **Mar 17 (Wed): Rights and Regulation**

- LDH (Chapter 6)
- Bancroft, A. (2000). " 'No Interest in Land': Legal and Spatial Enclosure of Gypsy-Travellers in Britain." In: *Space & Polity* 4.1.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Yale Agrarian Studies/Yale ISPS. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

### **Mar 22 (Mon): Power & Police**

- Abdelfateh, R. (2021). *American Police : Throughline* : NPR. En. URL: <https://www.npr.org/transcripts/86> (visited on Jan. 20, 2021).
- Sherman, S. A. (2020). "From Revanchism to Inclusion: Institutional Forms of Planning and Police in Hyde Park, Chicago". En. In: *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 40.2, pp. 139–150. DOI: 10.1177/0739456X19877683.
- Crofts, P., P. Hubbard, and J. Prior (2013). "Policing, Planning and Sex: Governing Bodies, Spatially". En. In: *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 46.1, pp. 51–69. DOI: 10.1177/0004865812469974.
- Gunderson, A. (2020). "The Illegitimate Tent: Private Use of Public Space at a San Francisco Restaurant". In: *Food and Foodways* 28.4, pp. 321–331. DOI: 10.1080/07409710.2020.1826714.

### **Mar 24 (Wed): Student Led Discussion**



*Module 6 : Managing the Commons*

Hardin's classic article on how common pool resources (CPR) are degraded when no well-defined system of property rights exists. However, as Ostrom forcefully argues private property rights are only one type of institutional response to CPRs and there could be many others. These rights are also negotiated over time and are in constant flux, contrary to popular perception. We will examine how planning might or might not be useful, necessary and sufficient to care for these CPRs.

**Mar 29 (Mon): Common Pool Resources & Institutional Responses**

- Brinkley, C. (2020). "Hardin's Imagined Tragedy Is Pig Shit: A Call for Planning to Recenter the Commons". En. In: *Planning Theory* 19.1, pp. 127–144. DOI: 10.1177/1473095218820460.
- Heller, M. A. (1998). "The Tragedy of the Anticommons: Property in the Transition from Marx to Markets". In: *Harvard Law Review* 111.3, pp. 621–688. DOI: 10.2307/1342203.
- Ostrom, E. (2010). "Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems". In: *American Economic Review* 100.3, pp. 641–672.

**Apr 7 (Wed): Groups, Identity & Commons**

- Sherif, M. (1956). "Experiments in Group Conflict". In: *Scientific American* 195.5, pp. 54–59. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24941808> (visited on Jan. 20, 2021).
- Lau, J. D. and I. R. Scales (2016). "Identity, Subjectivity and Natural Resource Use: How Ethnicity, Gender and Class Intersect to Influence Mangrove Oyster Harvesting in The Gambia". En. In: *Geoforum* 69, pp. 136–146. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.01.002.
- Fominaya, C. F. (2010). "Collective Identity in Social Movements: Central Concepts and Debates". En. In: *Sociology Compass* 4.6, pp. 393–404. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00287.x.

**Apr 12 (Mon): Student Led Discussion***Module 7 : Collectives and Commons*

Collective action and collective choice are central to 'public' planning in large societies. Collective action is the action that needs to be taken as a group, about goals agreed upon by a group. Collective choice are mechanisms through which groups decide. These two are rather distinct from, though related to, one another and planning. I will discuss these notions in detail and argue about when and why wide participation in planning process, makes sense and when it does not. I will also discuss the nature of collectives and their roles in managing the commons.

**Apr 14 (Wed): Physical & Digital Spaces, Citizenship & Access**

- Jackson, S. J. and B. Foucault Welles (2015). "Hijacking #MNYNYPD: Social Media Dissent and Networked Counterpublics". In: *Journal of Communication* 65.6, pp. 932–952. DOI: 10.1111/jcom.12185.
- Kitchin, R., P. Cardullo, and F. C. Di (2019). "Citizenship, Justice, and the Right to the Smart City". In: *The Right to the Smart City*. Ed. by P. Cardullo, C. Di Felicianantonio and R. Kitchin. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 1–24. DOI: 10.1108/978-1-78769-139-120191001.

- Salganik, M. J. and K. E. C. Levy (2015). “Wiki Surveys: Open and Quantifiable Social Data Collection”. En. In: PLOS ONE 10.5, p. e0123483. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0123483.
- Schweitzer, L. A. and N. Afzalan (2017). “09 F9 11 02 9D 74 E3 5B D8 41 56 C5 63 56 88 C0: Four Reasons Why AICP Needs an Open Data Ethic”. In: Journal of the American Planning Association 83.2, pp. 161–167. DOI: 10.1080/01944363.2017.1290495.

### **Apr 19 (Mon): Logic of Collective Action & Collective Choice**

- LDH (Chapter 8)
- Beard, V. A. (2003). “Learning Radical Planning: The Power of Collective Action”. In: Planning Theory 2.1, pp. 13–35. DOI: 10.1177/1473095203002001004.
- Kaza, N. and L. D. Hopkins (2009). “In What Circumstances Should Plans Be Public?” In: Journal of Planning Education and Research 28, pp. 491–502.
- Rydin, Y. and M. Pennington (2000). “Public Participation and Local Environmental Planning: The Collective Action Problem and the Potential of Social Capital”. In: Local Environment 5.2, pp. 153–169. DOI: 10.1080/13549830050009328.

*Apr 21 (Wed): Student Led Discussion*

---

### **Process vs. Outcomes**

*Module 8: Who to Plan with? Who to Plan for?*

Planning from above, in the name of public interest has fallen out of favour and planning from below to discover collective will has been gaining momentum. In this module we dissect these different modes of planning and examine the justice claims and precedence of procedure over substance. We will also deal with the notions of solidarity, conflict, subversion and their proper place in planning practise.

### **Apr 26 (Mon): Substantive vs. Procedural Justice**

- Farrelly, C. (2003). Introduction to Contemporary Political Theory. 1 edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fainstein, S. S. (2011). The Just City. 1 edition. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Innes, J. E. (1996). “Planning through Consensus Building: A New View of the Comprehensive Planning Ideal”. In: Journal of the American Planning Association 62.4, pp. 460–472. URL: [http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/150499\\_901436927\\_787364861.pdf](http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/150499_901436927_787364861.pdf).
- Hoch, C. (1984). “Doing Good and Being Right The Pragmatic Connection in Planning Theory”. In: Journal of the American Planning Association 50.3, pp. 335–345. DOI: 10.1080/01944368408976600.

### **Apr 28 (Wed): Race, Class & Gender**

- Duneier, M. (2017). Ghetto: The Invention of a Place, the History of an Idea. Illustrated edition. New York, N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Ritzdorf, M. (2000). “Sex, Lies, and Urban Life: How Municipal Planning Marginalizes African American Women and Their Families”. In: *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries, and Visions of Urban Life*, pp. 169–81.
- Goh, K. (2018). “Safe Cities and Queer Spaces: The Urban Politics of Radical LGBT Activism”. In: *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108.2, pp. 463–477. DOI: 10.1080/24694452.2017.1392286.

**May 3 (Mon): Dissent, Agonism & Subversion**

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). “A New Ladder of Citizen Participation”. In: *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35.4, pp. 221–228.
- YOUNG, I. M. (2001). “Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy”. En. In: *Political Theory* 29.5, pp. 670–690. DOI: 10.1177/0090591701029005004.
- Pløger, J. (2004). “Strife: Urban Planning and Agonism”. En. In: *Planning Theory* 3.1, pp. 71–92. DOI: 10.1177/1473095204042318.
- Association, A. P. (2016). AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. URL: <https://www.planning.org/> (visited on Jan. 20, 2021).

**May 5 (Wed): Student Led Discussion & Wrapup**

---