

CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

CP6xxx: Citizen Participation and Community Engagement

Citizen Participation is a vital and powerful part of most planning processes, providing important data and values used in the design of plans and projects, and preparing the way for successful plan adoption and plan implementation. Yet participation is also a source of tension for planners since it is an interpersonal and political process that can be unpredictable and even uncontrollable. This course seeks to build understanding about why planners undertake participation, how it can be best framed for success, and how best to carry it out. A catalog of participatory tools will be developed, social psychological principles for group process will be reviewed, and examples of the various participatory tools/methods in planning practice will be examined. Recent innovations in participation and consensus building will be explored.

Methods examined will include: input methods, such as public hearings, public meetings, nominal group technique, survey research, delphi processes, visioning processes, and e-government tools; output methods, such as newsletters, stakeholder outreach, and cable TV; and interactive methods, such as advisory committees, planning cells, neighborhood planning, negotiated rulemaking, charette, and joint fact finding. Relationships of these tools to current ideas about social capital, civic engagement and adaptive governance will be explored.

Pre-requisites: Graduate standing at Georgia Institute of Technology or permission of instructor.

Course objectives: At the end of the course, students will be able to:

- articulate the key reasons why planners seek to involve citizens in planning processes, as well as the key impediments that stand in the way of successful participation;
- identify appropriate stakeholder groups and individuals for involvement in given planning processes;
- design processes for effective involvement of citizens and affected interests in planning programs;
- prepare and execute successful participatory activities, including appropriate use of a wide variety of methods and group process tools;
- work with technical planning personnel to ensure appropriate use of participatory input in designs and plans; and
- provide feedback to citizens, corporate leaders and elected officials on the impact of participation on planning outcomes.

Texts: We have three textbooks, available from the Georgia Tech bookstore on Spring Street, and the Engineer's Bookstore on Marietta Street (or from various online vendors):

Xavier de Souza Briggs. *Democracy as Problem Solving: Civic Capacity in Communities Across the Globe*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-262-542485-8.

Elaine Cogan. *Successful Public Meetings: A Practical Guide*. Chicago, APA Planners Press, 2000. ISBN: 1-884829-38-4.

James L. Creighton. *The Public Participation Handbook: Making Better Decisions Through Citizen Involvement*. San Francisco: Jossey -Bass, 2005. ISBN: 0-7879-7307-6.

Additional materials will be made available through the course folder on the CoA server or on our T-Square site. Consult the reading lists or the instructor, if unsure.

Outline:

- I. Introduction
- II. Participatory Concepts and Roles
- III. Participatory Planning Methods
- IV. Practice Contexts
- V. Case Studies

Procedures: Classes will combine lectures, discussions, exercises, field work, and student presentations. Informed participation in discussions is essential, so your first responsibility is to do required reading and other homework on time. Field work may take place at times that do not correspond to the assigned class period. In such cases every effort will be made to accommodate other obligations you may have.

Written assignments should be prepared according to a standard social science format. Those not familiar with the conventions of social science writing should obtain and use any of the style manuals designed to present these (e.g. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* 5th ed. Washington DC: 2001). Effective communication is the primary goal, but clarity as to originality of ideas is vital. Ideas stimulated by others should be cited appropriately as, of course, should be quotes and facts taken from other sources. Timely submission of written assignments is important; late submissions will be penalized. In general, unless instructed otherwise, I believe it is useful to imagine that you are writing for a general national professional urban planning audience. This requires that you not assume the reader will be familiar with the context, laws, and institutions of the plans or programs you are writing about, but it does suggest that you can use the language of planning theory and methods efficiently without the need to explain fundamental concepts which are widely understood by the educated professional community.

Assignments:

1. **Attend and participate** in class discussions. Participation in discussion is not evaluated on opinions expressed, but rather on effective contribution to the class' understanding of issues. In order to participate effectively you will need to read assigned materials prior to class. You are expected to regularly review the course website. (Attendance/Participation = 15% of course grade)
2. **Description and evaluation of a participatory event** held in the community (such as a public hearing, workshop, advisory committee meeting, etc.) in terms of its procedures, requirements, applicability and cost effectiveness. (20% of course grade).
3. **Leadership of a class exercise or class presentation.** Each of us will take responsibility to lead the class in an exercise (such as nominal group technique) or present an area of literature prior to class discussion. Dates will vary. (15% of course grade).
4. **Design of a participatory program** integrated with substantive planning process (such as a transportation plan or neighborhood plan). (20% of course grade).
5. **Case study of citizen participation effort OR involvement in and evaluation of an actual participatory planning process** in a neighborhood, local jurisdiction, region, government program or grass-roots effort. Report due in oral form, with final written version submitted (oral=10%; final=20%).

Grading Practices: Assignments are graded in the usual A, B...F system. In general, I endeavor to follow these grading standards:

"A" : exemplifies excellence: including clear reasoning, sound methods, forceful exposition, and stimulating ideas in comparison with others at the same stage of career. Independent and creative thinking utilizing a thorough understanding of course concepts is evidenced. Language usage, calculation, attribution, and formatting are essentially free of error.

"B" : allowing for growth in performance between now and graduation, the work would be considered satisfactory professional planning work given the time and resources allocated to it. Assertions are correct; arguments are persuasive. Mastery of course concepts is evidenced. Errors in language usage, attribution, calculation and/or formatting are minimal.

"C" : even allowing for growth in performance between now and graduation, the work would be considered less than satisfactory in a professional planning environment. There may be errors in fact or in understanding of course concepts. Arguments may not be convincing; there may be multiple errors in language usage, grammar, attribution, calculation and/or formatting.

"D" : the work does not meet expectations for graduate students. The core prompts in the assignment may not be followed; arguments may be hard to understand or may ignore key lessons understood broadly in our profession and/or developed in the course; language usage, attribution, calculation and/or formatting may have serious flaws or widespread errors.

"F" : the work does not address the assignment, fails to meet ordinary expectations for English-language exposition, or appears to have been completed in a manner violating the Institute Honor Code

Any assignment received electronically by 11:55pm on the announced due date will be considered on time. Please take precautions to make multiple copies of files related to your coursework; I have sympathy for problems related to computer malfunctions or lost materials, but can offer no grading concessions. Submissions after 11:55pm on the due date are downgraded 1/4 letter grade; submissions more than one week late are downgraded a full letter grade. Submissions received after the graded assignment has been returned to the class will receive the grade of F.

Those with *bona fide* illness or serious family problems should make this known and seek suitable arrangements at the earliest possible date. Such personal crises are the only acceptable justifications for the Incomplete grade.

Communicating with the instructor Office hours and contact information provided here.

Please use the course T-Square site to submit assignments: we will discuss how to do this in class. Do not send assignments by e-mail or fax. Name your files with identifiers that are unique (eg StakeholderAnalysis.Jones.8Feb08.rtf), combine all graphics, spreadsheets and text into one file, and submit in a standard software format (.wpd; .doc; .pdf or .rtf). Certain course materials are available from the course folder on the CoA server or on the course T-Square site. I will endeavor to provide all important course documents and information through these two online locations.

Academic Honor Code and Student Code of Conduct. The Georgia Tech Academic Honor Code (<http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/rules/18b.php>) and Student Code of Conduct (<http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/rules/19b.php>) outline the Institute's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading these two documents fully and for living up to them. Among the Codes' provisions are expectations about unauthorized access, unauthorized collaboration, plagiarism, false claims of performance, grade alteration, falsification, forgery and distortion. You should be absolutely clear in indicating when you have used ideas or words that are not your own. You are permitted to discuss the written assignments in this course with your fellow classmates, but, except for group assignments, you should not collaborate on your submissions. If you are unclear about the boundaries, ask the instructor or assume that the joint action in question is not allowed.

Students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should provide documentation to the Access Disabled Assistance Program for Tech Students (<http://www.adapts.gatech.edu/>) and bring an ADAPTS accommodation letter to the instructor indicating the nature of accommodations required. This should be done within the first week of class or as soon as possible after a new disability condition arises. All effort will be made to provide reasonable accommodation.

CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

CP6xxx: Citizen Participation and Community Engagement

Course Schedule

I. Introduction

Week 1 Decide, Announce, Defend and other Myths of Citizen Participation

II. Participatory Concepts and Roles

Week 2 Participatory Involvement for Better Decisions, Implementability, and Social Development

Week 3 Empowerment, Deliberative Planning and Civic Engagement

Week 4 Collective Action Theory; Input, Output and Exchange

III. Participatory Planning Methods

Week 5 Group Process Fundamentals

Week 6 Nominal Group Technique
Event Report due

Week 7 Stakeholder Identification

Week 8 Public Meetings

Week 9 Charrettes

Week 10 Advisory Committees
NO CLASS (Spring Break)

Week 11 Survey and Online Tools
Program Design due

IV. Practice Contexts

Week 12 Neighborhood Planning

Week 13 Adaptive Governance

V. Case Studies

Week 14 Student Project Presentations I

Week 15 Student Project Presentations II

Finals Week Final Case Project due.

CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

CP6xxx: Citizen Participation and Community Engagement

Readings

Participatory Involvement for Better Decisions, Implementability and Social Development

1. X. de S. Briggs. *Democracy as Problem Solving: Civic Capacity in Communities Across the Globe*. MIT Press, 2008. Pp. 5-45.
2. J. Creighton. *The Public Participation Handbook*. Jossey-Bass, 2005. Pp. 7-25.
3. Nancy Roberts. "Public participation in an age of direct citizen participation." *American Review of Public Administration*. 34 (4, 2004): 315-353.

Empowerment, Deliberative Planning and Civic Engagement

1. D. Godschalk and W.E. Mills. "A collaborative approach to planning through urban activities." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 32(1966):86-95.
2. Allan David Heskin. "Crisis and response: an historical perspective on advocacy planning." *JAPA* 46(1980):50-63.
3. Briggs. *Democracy as Problem Solving*. Pp. 47-120.

Collective Action Theory: Input, Output and Exchange

1. J. Creighton. *The Public Participation Handbook*. Pp. 229-42.
2. Stiftel B, 1990, "Balance of representation in water planning: an assessment of experience from North Carolina" *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 17(1) 105 – 120.
3. X. de S. Briggs. *Democracy as Problem Solving*. Pp. 123-42; 221-230.
4. Vinit Mukhija. "Collective action and property rights: a planner's critical look at the dogma of private property." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 29(2005):972-983.

Group Process Fundamentals

1. J. Creighton. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook*. Pp. 139-179.

Nominal Group Technique

1. AL Delbecq, AH Van de Ven and DH Gustafson. 1975 *Group Techniques for Program Planning*. Scott, Foresman and Co.

Stakeholder Identification

1. J. Creighton. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook*. Pp. 27-84.

Public Meetings

1. J. Creighton. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook*. Pp. 85-138.
2. E. Cogan. 2000. *Successful Public Meetings: A Practical Guide*. APA Planners Book Service. Pp. 1-130.

Charrettes

1. B. Lennertz and A Lutzenhiser. *The Charrette Handbook*. National Charrette Institute: 2006.

Advisory Committees

1. J. Creighton. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook*. Pp. 183-9; 229-36.
2. X. de S. Briggs. *Democracy as Problem Solving*. Pp.143-84.
3. AL Delbecq, AH Van de Ven and DH Gustafson. 1975 *Group Techniques for Program Planning*. Chapter 4: The Delphi Technique. Pp. 83-107.

Survey and Online Tools

1. G. Lindsey. 1994. Planning and contingent valuation: some observations from a survey of homeowners and environmentalists. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 14(1).
2. J. W. Stanley and C Weare. 2004. The effects of internet use on political participation: evidence from an agency online discussion forum. *Administration and Society* 36(5):503-527.
<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=724134371&Fmt=6&clientId=30287&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Neighborhood Planning

1. C. Silver. "Neighborhood planning in historical perspective." *Journal of the American Planning Assn.* 51(2, 1985):161-74.
2. Study Circles Resource Center. *Building Strong Neighborhoods*. Pomfret, CT. n.d.

Adaptive Governance

1. J. Scholz and B. Stiftel. *Adaptive Governance and Water Conflict: New Institutions for Collaborative Planning*. RFF Press, 2005.