Curriculum Proposal Cover Sheet - University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Contact Person(s) Calvin O. Masilela	Email Address cmasilel@iup.edu
Proposing Department/Unit Geography and Regional Planning	Phone 7-2250

Check all appropriate lines and complete all information. Use a separate cover sheet for each course proposal and/or program proposal.

1. Course Proposals (check all that apply)

[✓] New Course   [ ] Course Prefix Change   [ ] Course Deletion

[ ] Course Revision   [ ] Course Number and/or Title Change   [ ] Catalog Description Change

Current course prefix, number and full title: RGPL/GEOG 462/GEOG 562 Land Use Policy

Proposed course prefix, number and full title, if changing: RGPL/GEOG 462/GEOG 562 Planning Policy, Implementation, and Administration

2. Liberal Studies Course Designations, as appropriate

This course is also proposed as a Liberal Studies Course (please mark the appropriate categories below)

[ ] Learning Skills   [ ] Knowledge Area   [ ] Global and Multicultural Awareness   [ ] Writing Across the Curriculum (W Course)

[ ] Liberal Studies Elective (please mark the designation(s) that applies – must meet at least one)

[ ] Global Citizenship   [ ] Information Literacy   [ ] Oral Communication

[ ] Quantitative Reasoning   [ ] Scientific Literacy   [ ] Technological Literacy

3. Other Designations, as appropriate

[ ] Honors College Course   [ ] Other: (e.g. Women's Studies, Pan African)

4. Program Proposals

[ ] Catalog Description Change   [ ] Program Revision   [ ] Program Title Change   [ ] New Track

[ ] New Degree Program   [ ] New Minor Program   [ ] Liberal Studies Requirement Changes   [ ] Other

Current program name:_____

Proposed program name, if changing:_____

5. Approvals	Signature	Date
Department Curriculum Committee Chair(s)	*[signature]*	11/20/13
Department Chairperson(s)	*[signature]*	11/20/13
College Curriculum Committee Chair	*[signature]*	2/17/14
College Dean	*[signature]*	2/28/14
Director of Liberal Studies (as needed)		
Director of Honors College (as needed)		
Provost (as needed)		
Additional signature (with title) as appropriate		
UWUCC Co-Chairs	*Gail S Sechrist*	2/21/14

RGPL/GEOG 462/GEOG 562 Planning Policy, Implementation, and Administration
Syllabus of Record
11/17/2013

I. Catalog Description

RGPL 462 Planning Policy, Implementation, and Administration
Prerequisite: RGPL 458

3 class hours
0 lab hours
3 credits
(3c-0l-3cr)

Focuses on the planning and implementation of policies to manage the location, timing, type, and intensity of land development. Explores the multi-step process from community plan to project completion. Exposes students to the public environment in which community plans are developed and implemented and walks them through the real world problems of identifying projects, building agency and interagency consensus, finding funding, putting together a project plan, project management, personnel and budget to project completion. (Also offered as GEOG 462; may not be taken for duplicate credit.)

GEOG 462/562 Planning Policy, Implementation, and Administration
Undergraduate Prerequisite: RGPL 350
Graduate Prerequisite: GEOG 558

3 class hours
0 lab hours
3 credits
(3c-0l-3cr)

Focuses on the planning and implementation of policies to manage the location, timing, type, and intensity of land development. Explores the multi-step process from community plan to project completion. Exposes students to the public environment in which community plans are developed and implemented and walks them through the real world problems of identifying projects, building agency and interagency consensus, finding funding, putting together a project plan, project management, personnel and budget to project completion. (Also offered as RGPL 462; may not be taken for duplicate credit.)

II. Course Outcomes:

Students will be able to:
1. Combine knowledge, skills and values in each of three major areas of plan making: framing problems, composing alternatives and devising implementation strategy.
2. Identify major funding sources and the components of a successful grant proposal.
3. Describe the process and key elements of project management.
4. Demonstrate understanding of the constitutional authority and limitations of plans and various plan implementation tools.
5. Demonstrate understanding of the role of plan implementation in the decision making process and its relationship to comprehensive planning.
6. Analyze the purposes, means, methods and tools of land use planning which seek to manage the rate, location and character of development.
7. Analyze the interagency nature of plan implementation.

Additional Graduate Outcomes
1.	Evaluate alternative plan implementation tools including zoning and subdivision regulations, for example form based codes
2.	Evaluate alternative tools for financing as well as controlling and shaping development growth, for example tax increment financing
3.	Evaluate alternative tools for preserving land and natural resources as part of the development process, for example conservation-based planning

III. Course Outline

Introduction (1:15 hours)
	Orientation and discussion of course objectives and assignments

Policy Identification and Project Selection (13 hours)
	Technical Approach: Problem Analysis
	Identifying the Stakeholders
	Intergovernmental Relationships and Conflicts
	Negotiation and Consensus Building
	Conflicts, Contradictions, and Tradeoffs

Project Management (11:30 hours)
	Project Planning Elements
	Project Communications: Memos, Deadlines, Meetings, Chain of Command
	Project Scheduling Techniques: PERT, Gantt, CPM, Word
	Teams, Leadership, Motivation, Task Management

Mid-Term:
	Project Plan Assignment and Presentation (1:15 hours)

Implementation (15 hours)
	Problem Statement, Objectives, and Methods
	Identifying Funding Sources
	Public-Private Partnerships
	Funding Proposals
	Institutional Capabilities and Past Performance
	Project Management: Personnel and Project Work Plan
	Program Indicators and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
	Budget

Final Exam:
	Project Funding Assignment and Presentation (2 hours)

IV. Evaluation Methods

1. The final grade will be determined by (undergraduate):

Policy Analysis Paper Assignment	50 points
Project Plan Assignment	50 points
Grant Application assignment	50 points
Class Participation	<u>30 points</u>
	180 points

2. The final grade will be determined by (Graduate):

Policy Analysis Paper Assignment	50 points
Project Plan Assignment	50 points
Grant Application assignment	50 points
Policy Analysis Research Paper	50 points
Class Participation	<u>30 points</u>
	230 points

V. Grading Scale
1. A: 90% or above B: 80-89% C: 70-79% D: 60-69% F: less than 60% (undergraduate)
2. A: 90% or above B: 80-89% C: 70-79% F: less than 69% (graduate)

VI. Attendance Policy

The individual faculty member will develop their own policy in compliance with the university attendance policy as outlined in the Undergraduate Catalog.

VII. Required textbooks, supplemental books and readings

Anderson Larz T. 1995. <u>Guidelines for Preparing Urban Plans</u>. APA Planners Press.

Lewis, James P. 2010. <u>Project Planning, Scheduling, and Control</u>. McGraw Hill.

Tedesco, Mike. 2010. <u>City Boy: Urban Planning, Municipal Politics, and Guerrilla Warfare</u>

VIII. Special resource requirements

There are no special resource requirements expected of the students who enroll in this course.

IX. Bibliography

Anderson Larz T. 1995. <u>Guidelines for Preparing Urban Plans</u>. APA Planners Press.

4

Benjamin L. Crosby. 1996. Policy Implementation: The Organizational Challenge. World Development, 24: 1403-1415.

Bowen, G. A. 2005. Local-level stakeholder collaboration: A substantive theory of community-driven development. Community Development: Journal of the Community Development Society, 36(2), 73-88.

Christensen, Karen Stromme. 1999. Cities and Complexity: Making Intergovernmental Decisions. Sage.

DeGrove, John M. 2005. Planning Policy and Politics: Smart Growth and the States. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Derick W. Brinkerhoff. 1996. Coordination Issues in Policy Implementation Networks: An Illustration from Madagascar's Environmental Action Plan. World Development, 24, pp. 1497-1510.

Elmore, Richard F. 1982. Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions. In Walter Williams et al., eds., Studying Implementation: Methodological and Administrative Issues ,Chatham House.

Gerckens, Laurence C. 2003. Ten Failures That Shaped The Twentieth Century American City. Planning Commissioners Journal., Vol. 38, pp. 3– 9.

Jacobs, Alan B. 1968: Getting Going, Staffing Up, Responding to Issues" In Introduction to Planning History in the United State. In D. A. Krueckeberg (Center for Urban and Policy Research, 1983), pp. 235-258.

Kerwin, Cornelius. 1994. Rulemaking Congressional Quarterly Press.

Krumholz, Norman. 1982. A Retrospective View of Equity Planning in Cleveland 1969-1979, Journal of the America Planning Association, pp. 163-174.

Laurian. L., Crawford. J., Day. M., Kouwenhoven. P., Mason. G., Ericksen. N. and Beattie. L 2010. Evaluating the Outcomes of Plans: Theory, Practice, and Methodology." Environment & Planning B: Planning and Design 37 (4) 740-757.

Laurian, L., M. Day., Berke. P., Ericksen. N., Backhurst. M., Crawford. J. and Dixon. J. 2004. "What Drives Plan Implementation? Plans, Planning Agencies and Developers". Journal of Environmental Planning and Management 47(4): 555-577.

Lawrence Susskind, Sarah McKiernan, and Jennifer Thomas-Larmer (eds.). 1999. Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement. Sage Publications.

Layzer, Judith A. 2008. Natural Experiments : Ecosystem-Based Management and the Environment. American and Comparative Environmental Policy. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lewis, James P. 2012. Project Planning, Scheduling, and Control , McGraw Hill.

Lipsky, Michael. 1980. Street-Level Bureaucracy, Russell Sage Foundation.

June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds. 1997. Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows, Sage Publications.

Margerum, Richard D. 2011. Beyond Consensus: Improving Collaborative Planning and Management. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Mazmanian, Daniel A., and Paul A. Sabatier. 1989. Implementation and Public Policy. University Press of America.

Morgan. D.R. and Robert E. England. 1996. Managing Urban America, Chatham, NJ, Chatham Press.

Morris, Marya. 1994. "The Economic Impact of Local Comprehensive Plans", Public Investment, December.

Newell, C. and Ammons, D. 2006. The Effective Local Government Manager, ICMA.

O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr., and Robert S. Montjoy. 1984. "Interorganizational Policy Implementation: A Theoretical Perspective" Public Administration Review, (November/December): 491-503.

Stone, Deborah A. 1989. Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 104, No. 2 (pp. 281-301).

Susskind, Lawrence, and Jeffrey L. Cruikshank. 2006. Breaking Robert's Rules: The New Way to Run Your Meeting, Build Consensus, and Get Results. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Susan Waldner. 2004. "Planning to Perform: Evaluation models for City Planners," Berkeley Planning Journal. 17(204), 1-28.

Tedesco, Mike. 2010. City Boy: Urban Planning, Municipal Politics, and Guerrilla Warfare, Sunstone Press.

Yanow, Dvora. 1993. "The Communication of Policy Meanings: Implementation as Interpretation and Text" Policy Sciences (26), 41-61.

Course Analysis Questionnaire

Section A: Details of the Course

A1   How does this course fit into the programs of the department? For what students is the course designed? (majors, students in other majors, liberal studies). Explain why this content cannot be incorporated into an existing course.

This course is meant to remedy a shortcoming in our planning curriculum identified by the Planning Accreditation Board. Although some parts of this proposal are covered in other courses, the shortfall in common topics was so great we felt a full course was necessary.
(see below for PAB comments). The course will replace RGPL/GEOG 464/GEOG 564 Land Use Policy.

A2   Does this course require changes in the content of existing courses or requirements for a program? If catalog descriptions of other courses or department programs must be changed as a result of the adoption of this course, please submit as separate proposals all other changes in courses and/or program requirements.

Yes. It changes program requirements. A program proposal will follow shortly.

A3   Has this course ever been offered at IUP on a trial basis (e.g. as a special topic) If so, explain the details of the offering (semester/year and number of students).

This course will be replacing RGPL/GEOG 464/564 Land Use Policy, so some content in the proposed course has been offered previously. RGPL/GEOG 464/564 was offered once per year for many years, with an enrollment of 20-25 students.

A4   Is this course to be a dual-level course? If so, please note that the graduate approval occurs after the undergraduate.

Yes.

A5   If this course may be taken for variable credit, what criteria will be used to relate the credits to the learning experience of each student? Who will make this determination and by what procedures?

No.

A6   Do other higher education institutions currently offer this course? If so, please list examples (institution, course title).

Cornell
CRP (City and Regional Planning) 3010 Theory and Practice of Public Organizations and Leaders

Portland State
USP (Urban Studies and Planning) 563 Policy Implementation

7

University of Oregon
PPPM (Planning, Public Policy and Management) 407 Project Management
PPPM 448 Collaborative Planning and Management

University of Buffalo
PD (Department of Urban Planning) 404 Introduction to Urban Management

A7 Is the content, or are the skills, of the proposed course recommended or required by a
professional society, accrediting authority, law or other external agency? If so, please
provide documentation.

The Regional Planning bachelor's degree program was accredited in April 2012 by
the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB). The Board granted the program a five-year
initial accreditation, effective January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2016. Among
the three deficiencies cited in our program, only one had to do with curriculum. In
the January 3, 2012 Site Visit Report of the PAB the following related curricular
areas were seen as only "partially met." See long extract under "Section D:
Miscellaneous."

Section B: Interdisciplinary Implications

B1 Will this course be taught by instructors from more than one department? If so,
explain the teaching plan, its rationale, and how the team will adhere to the syllabus
of record.

No.

B2 What is the relationship between the content of this course and the content of courses
offered by other departments? Summarize your discussions (with other departments)
concerning the proposed changes and indicate how any conflicts have been resolved.
Please attach relevant memoranda from these departments that clarify their attitudes
toward the proposed change(s).

None.

B3 Will this course be cross-listed with other departments? If so, please summarize the
department representatives' discussions concerning the course and indicate how
consistency will be maintained across departments.

No.

Section C: Implementation

C1 Are faculty resources adequate? If you are not requesting or have not been authorized
to hire additional faculty, demonstrate how this course will fit into the schedule(s) of
current faculty. What will be taught less frequently or in fewer sections to make this

possible? Please specify how preparation and equated workload will be assigned for this course.

Faculty resources are adequate. Faculty members are presently teaching the course (RGPL/GEOG 464/GEOG 564) that the proposed is meant to replace. RGPL/GEOG 462/GEOG 562 will be substituted in the course teaching schedule/rotation of current faculty.

C2   What other resources will be needed to teach this course and how adequate are the current resources? If not adequate, what plans exist for achieving adequacy? Reply in terms of the following:

*Space
*Equipment
*Laboratory Supplies and other Consumable Goods
*Library Materials
*Travel Funds

None.

C3   Are any of the resources for this course funded by a grant? If so, what provisions have been made to continue support for this course once the grant has expired? (Attach letters of support from Dean, Provost, etc.)

No.

C4   How frequently do you expect this course to be offered? Is this course particularly designed for or restricted to certain seasonal semesters?

Depending on demand, we plan to offer the course during the Fall semester.

C5   How many sections of this course do you anticipate offering in any single semester?

One.

C6   How many students do you plan to accommodate in a section of this course? What is the justification for this planned number of students?

The course will enroll between 20-25 students. As an upper-level major core course that requires significant class discussion and writing, it is important that the class environment allows this pedagogy.

C7   Does any professional society recommend enrollment limits or parameters for a course of this nature? If they do, please quote from the appropriate documents.

No.

C8   If this course is a distance education course, see the Implementation of Distance Education Agreement and the Undergraduate Distance Education Review Form in Appendix D and respond to the questions listed.

Section D: Miscellaneous

The Regional Planning bachelor's degree program was accredited in April 2012 by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB). Among the three deficiencies cited in our program, only one had to do with curriculum. The January 3, 2012, PAB Site Visit Report: Part III. C 2 Criteria and Guidelines notes:

4. Curriculum
4.2.2(f) Adoption, Administration and Implementation of Plans

This criterion is judged "partially met" because there is no clear indication that the content of this requirement is covered in the current course structure or in student work, although there does appear to be "vicarious or anecdotal" evidence of discussions generally about this topic as well as the imminent development of a political science/public administration degree devoted to a range of topics including this specific content.

4.2.3(e) Collaboration, Mediation, Interpretation and Negotiation

This criterion is judged "partially met" because there is no clear indication that the content of this requirement (in the subsection "planning skills") is covered in the current course structure or in student work, although there does appear to be "vicarious or anecdotal" evidence of discussions generally about this topic.

4.2.3(h) Techniques for the Adoption and Implementation of Plans

This criterion is judged "partially met" because there is no clear indication that the content of this requirement (in the subsection "planning skills") is covered in the current course structure or in student work, although there does appear to be "vicarious or anecdotal" evidence of discussions generally about this topic as well as the imminent development of a political science/public administration degree devoted to a range of topics including this specific content. "

The proposed course addresses these deficiencies.