

PPD 616: Participatory Methods in Planning and Policy
School of Policy, Planning, and Development
University of Southern California
Zoom
4 Units

Instructor: Katherine Aguilar Perez
Phone: (310) 578-2856/ (626) 253-1890 cell
Email: katherine.perez@arup.com
Office Hours: By appointment

Course Description

This course discusses techniques and tools for involving members of the public in urban planning and policy making processes. The course is intended in particular to serve the MPL concentrations in social and community planning, sustainable land use planning, and economic development, and the MPP specializations in social and urban policy and community economic development.

Since the 1960s the legal requirements for public access and consultation in decision making are now universal, and we are observing continuing experimentation and innovation around citizen engagement. In this course, we will examine how to link the purposes of public participation to the designs and techniques used for citizen engagement.

The course will review the theoretical and methodological participation, address the practical strategies required to design a meaningful participation program, and consider several participatory applications, from small group exercises such as charettes and focus groups, structured involvement of panels in policy analysis and budgeting, and the much larger-scale types of participatory exercises.

Technology and the introduction of internet –designed community engagement tools have proliferated in recent years as we enter a new era of civic participation. Social media platforms have redefined the term ‘engagement’ and it is now a requirement to have internet based tools included in the suite of participatory tools. We will explore how those new devices have changed the planning and decision making environment.

The course requires application of readings to cases, analytic writing, and class debate. Students will be required to attend a ‘public outreach’ event or planning commission meeting and report on their experience. Students will apply the techniques and frameworks learned in class in working together to design a participatory program for an issue and mock client of their choosing.

Learning objectives

This course will help the student develop the following:

- **Context for participation.** Understand the conceptual context for public engagement, and be able to establish clear goals for a participation forum and consider the political and organizational context within which it occurs.
- **Model approaches to participation.** Understand the different models available for participatory planning and policy, and the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches as applied to particular settings.
- **Design skills.** Be able to find the appropriate “fit” between goals and design of a participatory initiative. Understand the preconditions and standards for effective participation within different planning or policy contexts.
- **Cultural sensitivity.** Understand the cultural issues that arise with respect to participation within a diverse society, and develop skills for interacting with culturally diverse populations.
- **Facilitation, analysis, and follow-through.** Develop skills required to facilitate a participatory initiative, to analyze findings, and to follow through in feedback and implementation of outcomes.

Textbooks and Materials

Required Textbooks

Nabatchi, Tina., & Leighninger, Matt. (2015). *Public participation for 21st century democracy*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass. [This book is available online via the USC Library system.](#)

James Creighton, *The public participation handbook: Making better decisions through citizen involvement*. John Wiley and Sons, 2005.

Condon, Patrick. (2007). *Design Charrettes for Sustainable Communities*, Island Press.

Required Reading that will be provided by Instructor:

- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224.

- Leyden et al. (2017). Public and stakeholder engagement and the built environment: A review. *Current Environmental Health Report* (4), 267–277.
- Gustafson & Hertting. (2016). Understanding participatory governance: An analysis of participants' motives for participation. *American Review of Public Administration* 47(5), 538-549.
- Margerum, Richard D. (2002) "Collaborative Planning: Building Consensus and Building a Distinct Model for Practice," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21(3), 237-253.
- Gustafson & Hertting. (2016). Understanding participatory governance: An analysis of participants' motives for participation. *American Review of Public Administration* 47(5), 538-549.
- Selin et al. (2016). Experiments in engagement: Designing public engagement with science and technology for capacity building. *Public Understanding of Science* 26(6), 634-639.
- Juliet Musso, Christopher Weare, Nail Oztas, and Bill Loges, "Neighborhood Governance Reform and Networks of Community Power in Los Angeles," *American Review of Public Administration*, 36,1. March 2006.
- The Neighborhood Council System: Past, Present, & Future, Neighborhood Council Review Commission, City of Los Angeles, Final Report, Sept 25, 2007
- Christopher Hoene, C. Kingsley, et. al., National League of Cities with The Knight Foundation, "Bright Spots in Community Engagement," April 2013
- [PodCast](#): Neighborhood Councils and Activism with Jamie Tijerina (March 23, 2018) 37 min
- Robin Gregory; Ralph L. Keeney, Creating Policy Alternatives Using Stakeholder Values *Management Science*, Vol. 40, No. 8. (Aug., 1994), pp. 1035-1048.
- Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). "Stakeholder Analysis: A review." *Health Policy and Planning*, 15(3), 239-246.
- Ramirez, Ricardo, "Chapter 5: Stakeholder Analysis and Conflict Management," *Cultivating Peace: Conflict & Collaboration in Natural Resource* (1999), p101
- Webler, T., Tuler, S., & Krueger, R. (2001). *What is a good public participation process? Five perspectives from the public. Environmental Management* 27(3), 435-450.
- Glenorchy City Council. (2017). *Community Engagement Procedure. Community Planning and Inclusion Department.*
- Leighninger, M. (2018). *Infogagement. Citizenship and democracy in the age of connection.* Washington, DC: Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (PACE).
- Baker et al. (2005). Critical factors for enhancing municipal public hearings. *Public Administration Review* 65(4):490-499.
- Robin Gregory; Ralph L. Keeney, Creating Policy Alternatives Using Stakeholder Values *Management Science*, Vol. 40, No. 8. (Aug., 1994), pp. 1035-1048.
- Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). "Stakeholder Analysis: A review." *Health Policy and Planning*, 15(3), 239-246.
- Ramirez, Ricardo, "Chapter 5: Stakeholder Analysis and Conflict Management," *Cultivating Peace: Conflict & Collaboration in Natural Resource* (1999), p101
- Poplin, A. (2012). Playful public participation in urban planning: A case study for online serious games. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 36, 195-206.
- Seltzer, E. and Mahmoudi, D. (2013). Citizen participation, open innovation, and crowdsourcing: Challenges and opportunities for planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 28(1), 3-18.

- Medima, W. et al. (2016). Exploring the potential impact of serious games on social learning and stakeholder collaborations for transboundary watershed management of the St. Lawrence River Basin. *Water* 8, 175.
- Davies, S. R. (2012). Citizen engagement and urban change: Three case studies of material deliberation. *Cities* 29(6), 351-357.
- U.S. Department of Transportation. (2016). *Supporting performance-based planning and programming through scenario planning*. Washington DC: Office of Planning, Environment, & Realty.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2010). *Social science tools for coastal programs: Introduction to planning and facilitating effective meetings*. Charleston, SC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office for Coastal Management.
- Croft, S. and Beresford, P. (1996). 'The politics of participation'. In Taylor, D. (ed.) *Critical Social Policy: A Reader*. London: Sage.
- Coleman, Stephen and John Gøtze "Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation," 2014
- Quick, K.S. and Feldman, M.S. (2011). Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31(3), 272-290.
- Cursue, P.L. and Schruijer, S. (2017). Stakeholder diversity and the comprehensiveness of sustainability decisions: the role of collaboration and conflict. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 28, 114-120.
- Race and Social Justice Initiative. (2012). *Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement Guide*. Seattle, WA: Seattle Office for Civil Rights
- Benham, C. F., & Hussey, K. E. (2018). Mainstreaming deliberative principles in environmental impact assessment: Current practice and future prospects in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Environmental Science and Policy* 89, 176-183.
- Street, J. et al. (2014). The use of citizens' juries in health policy decision-making: A systematic review. *Social Science and Medicine* 109, 1-9.
- Judith E. Innes and David E. Booher, "Collaborative policymaking: governance through dialogue," *Collaborative Policymaking*.
- ["10 Lessons In More Engaging Citizen Engagement," Planetizen, 2014](#)
- Goodspeed, R. (2017). *An evaluation framework for the use of scenarios in urban planning*. Lincoln Institute of Land Planning.
- Reed, M. S. et al. (2018). A common standard for the evaluation of public engagement with research. *Research for All* 2(1), 143–162.
- McEvoy ,S. et al. (2018). Planning support tools and their effects in participatory urban adaptation workshops. *Journal of Environmental Management* 207, 319-333.
- Suskind, L. & Thomas-Larmer, J. (1999). *The consensus building handbook: Conducting a conflict assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Course Requirements

1. *Preparation and class discussion.* The course requires extensive reading. Students must attend class regularly, prepare adequately, and participate constructively in class discussion.
2. *Case memo #1 – Current public engagement issue.* Students will provide a memo that outlines the issue in question, the response from the community and local electeds, and predicatable response.
3. *Case analysis #2– Neighborhood Councils in LA.* Students will complete one short memoranda in which they attend and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a NC Board meeting.
4. *Stakeholder Analysis #3 –* Students will evaluate a project area using a statistical evaluation of the demographics, language, assets and preferred outreach approach.
4. *Case analysis #4 – Comparison of Community Workshops.* Students will attend two different types of community workshops and compare them for effectiveness and lack of effectiveness of the public meetings. The memo should integrate readings on participation with field observations and interviews with participants and/or designers of the participatory initiative.
4. *Public Participation workshop design.* Working in groups of up to three students will design a participatory initiative in a workshop format (meaning that they will develop a “mock” client who is associated with an actual planning or policy making entity with an actual issue at hand. They will present their findings through (1) a 15 minute class mock workshop with collateral and materials ; and (2) a group staff report that identifies the problem to be addressed, the goals and purposes of public engagement, the design of the the participatory initiative, resource requirements, and planned outcomes.

Requirements and Grading:

| Assignment | Length | Grade % |
|---|--------------|---------|
| <i>Discussion forum/live session participation</i> | | 20 |
| <i>Case memo #1</i> | Min 2 pages | 5 |
| <i>Case analysis memo #2 – Neighborhood Council</i> | Min 5 pages | 10 |
| <i>Stakeholder Analysis #3</i> | Min 6 pages | 10 |
| <i>Case analysis memo #4 – Community Workshops</i> | Min 6 pages | 15 |
| <i>Group participation design</i> | | |
| Group Presentation | 15 min | 20 |
| Staff report | 15 pp. sngl. | 20 |

Form and style: All assignments are single-spaced, double sided, and length excludes figures and charts. They must be written in plain, concise prose, as described in Strunk and White's Elements of Style.

Policy on late and missing assignments: I will grade late assignments down 25 percent for each day late. Please inform me in advance if you must miss a deadline. I will not give a passing grade unless all assignments are completed.

Syllabus revision. I will regularly assess progress and elicit student feedback regarding the course. If necessary I will revise the syllabus to make it more suitable.

Academic integrity: Students should maintain strict adherence to standards of academic integrity, as described in SCampus (<http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/>). In particular, the University recommends strict sanctions for plagiarism, defined below:

11.11 Plagiarism

- A. The submission of material authored by another person but represented as the student's own work, whether that material is paraphrased or copied in verbatim or near-verbatim form.
- B. The submission of material subjected to editorial revision by another person that results in substantive changes in content or major alteration of writing style.
- C. Improper acknowledgment of sources in essays or papers.

Note: Culpability is not diminished when plagiarism occurs in drafts which are not the final version. Also, if any material is prepared or submitted by another person on the student's behalf, the student is expected to proofread the results and is responsible for all particulars of the final draft.

Source: SCampus University Governance; <http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/governance/gov05.html>

The recommended sanctions for academic integrity violations are attached to this syllabus, as is the "Guide to Avoiding Plagiarism," from USC's Expository Writing Program. *All reference to the work of others must be properly cited using APA citation standards. This includes work made public on the WWW.* If you have any questions about academic integrity or citation standards, please ask in advance.

Academic accommodations. Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open early 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-0776.

COURSE SCHEDULE

PART I: CONTEXT

January 19, 2021

Session 1 Introduction and course overview

Required reading:

- Creighton, Part I: Overview of Public Participation, Ch. 1 “Defining What Public Participation Is (and Is Not)” and Ch. 2 “The Rationale for Public Participation.”
- Nabatchi and Leighninger, Chapter 1 “Citizenship, Outside the Public Square” and Chapter 2 “Good or Bad? Charming or Tedious? Understanding Public Participation”
- Leyden et al. (2017). Public and stakeholder engagement and the built environment: A review. *Current Environmental Health Report* (4), 267–277.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez

Handouts:

- **Course syllabus**
 - **Review of Requirements for Case Memo #1**
 - **HANDOUT: Instructions for Case Analysis #2 - Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles**
-

January 26, 2021

Session 2 History of Participatory Engagement

Required reading and review:

- Nabatchi and Leighninger, Chapter 3
- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," *JAIP*, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224.
- [Video](#): Description of Arnstein’s Ladder

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez

Assignment Due

- **Assignment #1 DUE – Case Memo**
-

February 2, 2021

Session 3 Toward collaborative planning

Required reading:

- Nabatchi and Leighninger, Chapter 6
- Margerum, Richard D. (2002) “Collaborative Planning: Building Consensus and Building a Distinct Model for Practice,” *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21(3), 237-253.
- Gustafson & Hertting. (2016). Understanding participatory governance: An analysis of participants’ motives for participation. *American Review of Public Administration* 47(5), 538-549.

- Selin et al. (2016). Experiments in engagement: Designing public engagement with science and technology for capacity building. *Public Understanding of Science* 26(6), 634-639.
- [Video](#): Mayor Eric Garcetti (November 19, 2020) 2 min
- Discussion in class re: Neighborhood Councils

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

February 9, 2021

Session 4 Down to the neighborhoods

Required Reading:

- Juliet Musso, Christopher Weare, Nail Oztas, and Bill Loges, "Neighborhood Governance Reform and Networks of Community Power in Los Angeles," *American Review of Public Administration*, 36,1. March 2006.
- The Neighborhood Council System: Past, Present, & Future, Neighborhood Council Review Commission, City of Los Angeles, Final Report, Sept 25, 2007
- Christopher Hoene, C. Kingsley, et. al., National League of Cities with The Knight Foundation, "Bright Spots in Community Engagement," April 2013
- [PodCast](#): Neighborhood Councils and Activism with Jamie Tijerina (March 23, 2018) 37 min
- The Neighborhood Participation Project, "The Meaning of Success: Evaluating Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils", October 16, 2002. (Optional)
- Juliet Musso, C. Weare, et. Al, "Toward Community Engagement In City Governance: Evaluating Neighborhood Council Reform in Los Angeles," USC Urban Policy Brief, 2007 (Optional)

Guest Speaker:

Thomas Soong , Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, City of Los Angeles

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

PART II: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

February 16, 2021

Session 5 Public participation strategies in the Social Media Era?

- Creighton, *The public participation handbook*, Part II, "Designing a Public Participation Program," pp. 27-84.
- Nabatchi & Leighninger, *Part 3 (pages 239-286)*
- Webler, T., Tuler, S., & Krueger, R. (2001). *What is a good public participation process? Five perspectives from the public. Environmental Management* 27(3), 435-450.
- Glenorchy City Council. (2017). *Community Engagement Procedure. Community Planning and Inclusion Department.*

- Leighninger, M. (2018). *Infogagement. Citizenship and democracy in the age of connection*. Washington, DC: Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (PACE).
- Baker et al. (2005). Critical factors for enhancing municipal public hearings. *Public Administration Review* 65(4):490-499.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez

Assignment Due:

- **DUE: Assignment #2 Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles**
 - **HANDOUT: Requirements for Assignment #3 Statistical Analysis**
-

February 23, 2021

Session 6 Stakeholder analysis

Required reading:

- Robin Gregory; Ralph L. Keeney, Creating Policy Alternatives Using Stakeholder Values *Management Science*, Vol. 40, No. 8. (Aug., 1994), pp. 1035-1048.
- Varvarovszky, Z. and Brugha, R. (2000). "Stakeholder Analysis: A review." *Health Policy and Planning*, 15(3), 239-246.
- Ramirez, Ricardo, "Chapter 5: Stakeholder Analysis and Conflict Management," *Cultivating Peace: Conflict & Collaboration in Natural Resource* (1999), p101

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

March 2, 2021

Session 7 "Guerilla" Outreach Tactics

Required reading:

- Creighton, *The Public Participation Handbook*, Part Three: "Public Participation Toolkit," pp. 85-138.
- Poplin, A. (2012). Playful public participation in urban planning: A case study for online serious games. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 36, 195-206.
- Seltzer, E. and Mahmoudi, D. (2013). Citizen participation, open innovation, and crowdsourcing: Challenges and opportunities for planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 28(1), 3-18.
- Medima, W. et al. (2016). Exploring the potential impact of serious games on social learning and stakeholder collaborations for transboundary watershed management of the St. Lawrence River Basin. *Water* 8, 175.
- Davies, S. R. (2012). Citizen engagement and urban change: Three case studies of material deliberation. *Cities* 29(6), 351-357.
- U.S. Department of Transportation. (2016). *Supporting performance-based planning and programming through scenario planning*. Washington DC: Office of Planning, Environment, & Realty.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez

Assignment Due:

- **DUE: Assignment #3 Statistical Analysis**
-

March 9, 2021

Session 8 Implementation and Facilitation II

Required Reading

- Criegton, James, *The Public Participation Handbook*, Part Four: Public Meeting Tools,” pp. 139-180.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2010). *Social science tools for coastal programs: Introduction to planning and facilitating effective meetings*. Charleston, SC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office for Coastal Management.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

March 16, 2021

Session 9 Resource, cultural, political challenges

Required reading:

- Croft, S. and Beresford, P. (1996). 'The politics of participation'. In Taylor, D. (ed.) *Critical Social Policy: A Reader*. London: Sage.
- Coleman, Stephen and John Gøtze “Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation,” 2014
- Quick, K.S. and Feldman, M.S. (2011). Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31(3), 272-290.
- Cursue, P.L. and Schruijer, S. (2017). Stakeholder diversity and the comprehensiveness of sustainability decisions: the role of collaboration and conflict. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 28, 114-120.
- Race and Social Justice Initiative. (2012). *Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement Guide*. Seattle, WA: Seattle Office for Civil Rights

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez

Handout:

- **HANDOUT: Instructions for Updated Case Analysis #4**
-

March 23, 2021: NO CLASS – WELLNESS DAY

PART III: APPLICATIONS

March 30, 2021

Session 10 Participatory policy analysis and resource allocation

Examination of the Envision Utah process and discussion about it's use of values based stakeholder analysis.

Required Reading:

- Benham, C. F., & Hussey, K. E. (2018). Mainstreaming deliberative principles in environmental impact assessment: Current practice and future prospects in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Environmental Science and Policy* 89, 176-183.
- Street, J. et al. (2014). The use of citizens' juries in health policy decision-making: A systematic review. *Social Science and Medicine* 109, 1-9.
- Crieghton, Part IV: General Purpose Tools, pp. 181-242.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

April 6, 2021

Session 11

Small group methods; charettes and focus groups

Required reading:

- Patrick Condon, *Design Charrettes for Sustainable Communities*, Island Press, 2008, Chpts 1-4.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

April 13, 2021

Session 12 Large-scale deliberation and conflict management

Required reading:

- Patrick Condon, *Design Charrettes for Sustainable Communities*, Island Press, 2008, Chpts 5-7.
- Suskind, L. & Thomas-Larmer, J. (1999). *The consensus building handbook: Conducting a conflict assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

April 20, 2021

Session 13 *The Challenges of Public Participation and Evaluation*

Required reading:

- Judith E. Innes and David E. Booher, “Collaborative policymaking: governance through dialogue,” *Collaborative Policymaking*.
- [“10 Lessons In More Engaging Citizen Engagement,” Planetizen, 2014](#)
- Goodspeed, R. (2017). *An evaluation framework for the use of scenarios in urban planning*. Lincoln Institute of Land Planning.
- Reed, M. S. et al. (2018). A common standard for the evaluation of public engagement with research. *Research for All* 2(1), 143–162.
- McEvoy ,S. et al. (2018). Planning support tools and their effects in participatory urban adaptation workshops. *Journal of Environmental Management* 207, 319-333.

Discussion Forum:

- Respond to exchange and questions posed by Professor Perez
-

April 27, 2021

**Session 14 *Group project finals*
Final Exam**