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### Introduction

The second biannual Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS) Conference on Revitalising Planning Education in Africa will take place in Dar es Salaam from 5 to 8 October 2010. The conference aims to stimulate debate and obtain consensus over the future role, structure and direction of the association, as well as to produce a curriculum framework for the development of postgraduate planning courses in Africa.

This paper provides the necessary background to the history of planning education and recent innovations in the field of curricular development. It also proposes a framework for curricular development in Africa, based on a review of international literature and the outcomes of the previous AAPS Conference, held in 2008.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 presents a broad historical overview of the development of planning educational programmes internationally, and culminates in a working typology of planning educational models. Section 2 briefly discusses this typology with respect to planning education in Africa, and argues that educational models originating in the United States and Europe have inculcated the African experience. Section 3 provides a series of brief introductions to relevant debates within planning literature, with respect to curricular development. Section 4 discusses contemporary trends and cases of curricular reform. Section 5 concludes by proposing a curriculum framework for postgraduate African planning education.

### 1. Why are planning curricula different?

This section constructs a narrative of the evolution of mainstream planning educational approaches internationally, culminating in a typology of these approaches. By doing so, we do not suggest that this typology describes actual modes of planning education that exist discretely, as though particular schools exemplify ‘one or the other’ approach. In reality, most schools have been influenced by a range of philosophical and pedagogical approaches. However, it is useful to present a typology for the purposes of distinguishing broad international trends in planning educational philosophy, substantive content and pedagogical approaches. This typology is then used to explain how different educational approaches have been introduced to and translated into the African educational context.

Formal planning education has its origin in the initial planning courses offered in the United States and Great Britain in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Pioneering programmes, such as that devised by the University of Liverpool (Department of Civic Design) in 1910, offered planning-specific courses as part of architectural programmes that emphasised the teaching of spatial and physical design techniques. Batey (1985) notes that early British planning courses were ‘post-professional’ in orientation, ‘primarily intended for qualified architects, engineers and surveyors who wanted to acquire a second professional qualification’ (1985:407). The first *postgraduate* planning programmes were devised by American Universities, such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in the 1930s. These generally employed practicing planners as lecturers, and continued in the vein of practical design-oriented professionalism:

‘The curriculum involved lectures on principles, techniques, and special topics but emphasized the studio. Indeed, this approach followed the design tradition in education and simulated the apprenticeship approach that predated formal education in the field. However, it differed in that students were assigned hypothetical design problems rather than working on a professional project of their teacher’s. Alonso characterizes this pedagogy as a form of professional socialization rather than instruction (1986:61)… Thus the pedagogy for the comprehensive civic design tradition was defined by the design tradition originating in landscape architecture programs where most early courses and degrees were offered’ (Dalton, 2001:425).

As in the United States, early planning educational programmes in Britain were oriented towards the training of able professional technicians:

‘[British] Education was essentially professional in orientation and there was little motivation or aspiration for any intellectual aggrandizement in academic terms. Planning was conceived of as a technical skill-based activity, akin to architecture or civil engineering. To say that practice and education were in harmony is perhaps too strong but both were close in spirit and had common goals’ (Batty, 1984, cited in Rodriguez-Bachiller, 1988:39).

Such approaches to planning education remain influential globally, and have been characterised as the **‘design-oriented physical planning approach’** (Frank, 2006) or, in the terminology of Rodriguez-Bachiller (1988), the **‘traditional-technical model’**.

The formulation of subsequent planning educational approaches occurred as a result of the ‘differentiation’ of aspects of the design-oriented physical planning approach. This happened in three ways, following Rodriguez-Bachiller (1988:205). Firstly, physical planning split into different component disciplines, usually architecture, urban design, and planning. As a result, planning became ‘more concentrated on socio-economic aspects’. Secondly, planning education differentiated into undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Thirdly, educational objectives differentiated according to the general desire to produce ‘theoreticians’ or practitioners.

In the United States during the early to mid-twentieth century, these differentiations led to the development of a distinctive postgraduate educational model, which became internationally influential in the post-Second World War period (termed the **‘knowledge-based social science approach’** by Frank, 2006). Early US planning education had its roots in the civic design tradition, as in Britain, but by the late 1940s planning theory had become heavily influenced by the social science disciplines of economics, and later sociology and politics (Rodriguez-Bachiller, 1988). The influence of these subjects fostered a knowledge-producing concern for the (newly) discrete academic field of planning (a concern driven by the field’s need to affirm its position within academia), particularly through quantitative analysis of city regions and the production of mathematical models to explain urban and regional development patterns.

Several key changes to the definition of ‘what is planning’ are evident in the development of the American postgraduate model. One was the general shift from ‘intuitive’ to ‘rational planning’. Planning ‘skills’ became increasingly equated with quantitative data analysis and strategic decision-making techniques, rather than creative technical design ability. A second key change was the shift in emphasis from ‘plans and plan-making’ to the analysis and creation of policies. Indeed, the influence of administrative science led to an ‘emphasis on planning as a general tool for policy analysis’ and in particular the social, economic and political ramifications of public policies (Healey, 1999). Thirdly, planning undertook a shift in its scalar interest, becoming more concerned with regional dynamics in consonance with the development of regional science. The concept of region was initially employed by geographers but by the mid-twentieth century came to influence economists such as Walter Isard. Regional science was based on the understanding that urban areas function economically within their wider rural regions, which themselves exist within ‘systems of regions’. Typically, Isard and Reiner (1962) advocated the ‘mathematically rigorous’ development of models describing the spatial-economic dynamics of urban and regional development, as a means of providing guidance for ‘rational or judicious public decision-making and activity’, as well as a basis for ‘goal-oriented and planned activities susceptible to evaluation’.

The structure of planning education programmes in the USA changed significantly in conjunction with the ‘social science turn’. Dalton recognizes that, ‘social science research and rational decision making assumed the center of the planning education fabric with the establishment of the Chicago School in 1947’ (2001:424). The period 1947 to 1975 saw a rapid increase in the establishment of postgraduate planning programmes in the USA. A number of universities established postgraduate planning programmes that were administered outside of architectural departments, and which accepted students from a wide variety of undergraduate disciplines (i.e. not narrowly from the architecture, landscape architecture and engineering disciplines). These largely followed the curricular recommendations of Harvey Perloff (1957, 1958), who maintained that planners should be trained as generalists, but with a specialty, ‘based on a curriculum with a common core and advanced work in specialized areas’ (Dalton, 2001:426). Perloff’s vision for curriculum structure has been referred to as the ‘cafeteria system’.

‘A core program should center about the basic principles and methods of planning… [The student] should learn to use the basic methods by employing them in a problem-solving content. It is the thinking through and working through that is at the heart of the learning process… The core should enable him [sic] to come to understand various kinds of interrelationships – among problems, subject matter, specialists’ (Perloff, 1957, cited in Batey, 1985:414-415).

Curricular reform was accompanied by major changes in pedagogical approach: ‘during this period, not only did educators in many programs express disdain for design, but also interest in practice became peripheral and the studio vestigial’ (*ibid.*). Instead scholarship was emphasized, and numerous Ph.D. programmes in planning were created. After 1975 however, enrollments steadily decreased for US planning programmes, leading both educators and practitioners to question this model. However, ‘the influence of the social science research approach to planning education continues to this day, particularly through specializations, research centers, and Ph.D. programs’ (Dalton, 2001:424). It is also evident in the continued use of quantitative methods for planning, whether it is the construction of mathematical models or computer-aided analysis such as GIS.

A third general model of planning education, the **‘comprehensive integrated model’** (Rodriguex-Bachiller, 1988), has its origins in mid-twentieth century Britain, where post-war planning educational reforms were driven by the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947. This legislation sought to aid post-war reconstruction via the establishment of new local government planning departments, each tasked with preparing land-use development plans as well as conducting development controls. The resulting demand for planners led the British government to undertake a review of the planning education system, which until that point was oriented towards providing post-professional qualifications to architects, engineers and surveyors. The resulting Schuster Report (1950) recommended the formulation of two-year postgraduate planning programmes designed to promote inter-disciplinary and inter-professional links by attracting graduates from a range of first degree subjects (Batey, 1985). The Report regarded the postgraduate planning degree as a ‘vocational course providing training for a professional career’ in physical, land-use planning practice (1985:409). Planners were expected to be able to produce ‘consistent’ land use and development policies, to translate these policies into ‘a practical, economic and aesthetically pleasing’ plan, and to organise the means for realising the planned mode of development.

Following the publication of the Schuster Report, planning programmes such as that of the University of Liverpool devised master’s degrees to incorporate subjects relating to land economics, economic geography, social science and statistics (Batey, 1985). However, practical work continued to ‘play an equal, if not more important part in the course’ (1985:410). The number of two-year master’s planning programmes in Britain increased rapidly in the 1960s, and peaked in the 1970s. In the late 1970s however, the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) education policy underwent extensive review, and eventually adopted a core curriculum approach – similar to that pioneered by the University of Chicago in the late 1940s and early 1950s (Batey, 1985). The curriculum adopted by the RTPI in 1980 attempted to define a compulsory core, whilst allowing individual planning schools a degree of freedom to develop concentrated courses around this core.

Batey, writing in 1985, suggested that British postgraduate planning education exemplified significant variation between schools (Batey, 1985). One factor of variation was the ‘relative weight given to planning as a technical or professional skill rather than as an administrative function within local or central government’ (1985:416). Some schools emphasised ‘the development of skills traditionally associated with physical planning, to methods of plan-making and to the preparations of designs for various types of land development’. Those with a social science orientation were ‘more concerned with analysing planning policy and establishing its social, political and economic implications, and with the administrative and legal procedures necessary for the implementation of policy by government’ (1985:416). Another variable was ‘the degree to which the course adopts a scholarly or professional stance’. Despite these differences, the comprehensive integrated models may be characterised as a generalist approach focusing on methodology, physical planning and administration. According to Rodriguez-Bachiller, ‘what characterises this approach most of all is the fact that it uses a single model of education to deal with different orientations (it is at the same time skill-oriented, policy-oriented, and academic-oriented), different scales (local and strategic-regional), and different approaches (generalism, specialism)’ (1988:207).

The final educational model comprising this typology is less distinctive as an educational approach, in comparison to the three previous examples. Frank terms this the **‘radical critique and advocacy’ approach**, which became influential in American and European schools during and following the 1960s. Dalton recognises that this approach developed as social equity and reform were popularised as educational agendas in the 1960s: ‘Emerging as an important theme concurrently with social critique, this strand represents a postmodern influence on planning education, including support for greater diversity and multiculturalism among students and faculty and in the curriculum and profession’. Conventional (i.e. social science or design-oriented) modes of planning practice and education were subjected to a series of critiques in the post-1960 period. Sandercock writes,

‘The first real challenge to traditional planning education came from the direction of Marxist political economy in the 1970s, and resulted in the formation of ‘breakaway’ programmes in ‘urban studies’ which developed critical analyses of the role of planning in capitalist societies and which were skeptical of the possibility of planners contributing to a transformative politics. The “skills” which these programmes offered and emphasized were skills in critical thinking and critical theory. In tandem… came the dismantling by feminists of the supposed gender-neutrality of planning theory and practice and, more recently, similar arguments by people of colour about the history of race- and ethnicity-based forms of discrimination embedded in traditional planning practice’ (1999:535).

Such critical attention led planning practitioners and educators to question the appropriateness of Western educational models to practice in the developing world. Some institutions devised specific programmes to train planners aiming to work within developing contexts (the ‘dualism’ approach to planning education – see Section 3.1). Another important corollary was the increasing criticism of social science-based pedagogical approaches. Many educators began to argue for ‘a learning approach to practice’, and over the next twenty years ‘studies of practice emerged as an important theme in planning research and education. Planning schools began to experiment with experiential and problem-based learning approaches. Furthermore, the studio reemerged as a collaborative problem-solving workshop, often with a real community as its client’ (Dalton, 2001:427).

The following table presents a summary of the four educational models discussed above, compared according to their general curricular structure, educational objectives and pedagogical approach:

Table 1.1: Characteristics of Planning Education Models (Twentieth Century Europe and North America).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Design-oriented physical planning approach** (Frank, 2006)  **Traditional-technical model** (Rodriguez-Bachiller, 1988) | **Knowledge-based social science model** (Frank, 2006)  **Academic postgraduate model** (Rodriguez-Bachiller, 1988) | **Comprehensive integrated model** (Rodriguez-Bachiller, 1988) | **Radical critique and advocacy approach** (Frank, 2006) |
| **Origination** | Britain, USA (early twentieth century) | USA (mid-twentieth century) | Britain (post-1950) | USA, Britain, Europe (post-1960s) |
| **General course length and structure** | >3 years undergraduate | 2 years postgraduate | 3 years undergraduate; 1 year postgraduate (3+1) | - |
| **Educational philosophy/objectives** | * Practical training * Planning ‘as an aspect of technology or design’ * ‘oriented towards a “liberal” professional practice in a market dominated by physical planning’ * Emphasis on design skills | * + - * Planning as a distinct discipline (separate courses for architecture, urban design)       * Social science-based (mainly economics, sociology and politics).       * Rational planning model       * Training of planners as ‘thinkers’ and theoreticians       * Planners as generalists with a specialism       * Produce planners to ‘serve a diverse market of strategic decision-making’ | * + - * Social science-based, but mainly practical       * Produce planners to serve a ‘highly professionalized and specific market of local government planning’ | * + - * Planning as a knowledge domain is in constant flux       * Critique of Western epistemology and the predominance of rational-utilitarian planning skills       * Planning as an exercise in ethical judgement |
| **Approach to curriculum development** |  | * + - * Revolves around a central ‘core’,       * ‘Cafeteria’ system – wide range of choices in terms of specialisation | * + - * Revolves around a ‘core’ usually ‘imposed by the professional organisation’       * Core consists of three areas: methodology, physical environment and administrative context       * Generalist approach to core development       * Less specialisation than US approach       * No differentiation between ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ training | * + - * Greater choice of subjects within planning programmes (i.e. weakened ‘core’)       * Greater integration of planning, environmental and design programmes |
| **Pedagogical approach** | * Studio and project work * Akin to conducting professional apprenticeship, but with hypothetical design problems | * + - * Relatively little project work       * Emphasis on individual study (i.e. less contact with teacher) | * + - * Heavy emphasis on project work | * + - * Emphasis on experiential learning       * The studio as a collaborative problem-solving exercise |

*Source: Rodriguez-Bachiller (1988), Dalton (2001) and Frank (2006).*

### 2. Translation in Africa

The history of planning education in African is firmly ensconced in the traditions and models of Europe (especially Britain) and the United States. Most planning curricula were originally formulated during the colonial era, or were devised post-independence to mirror colonial-type master planning systems. These were largely based on the British system of town and country planning education, and as such physical planning and technical design concerns have historically dominated higher education on the continent. However, there are significant differences between countries. In some cases, schools have received post-independence assistance from Western schools or development organisations, which has resulted in significant curricular and pedagogical reform. In others, particular national political and developmental initiatives have affected the intentions and direction of planning policy, with obvious effects for planning education.

Current planning educational programmes in Africa broadly fall within three categories, which were developed using information sourced from the AAPS’s member database, and by perusing the websites of individual planning schools (where available). These are as follows:

* Programmes with a strong technical design/physical planning focus (i.e. planning allied with architecture or engineering) mainly offered at an undergraduate level.
* Programmes originally created with a design/physical planning focus, but with relatively recent shifts towards policy/management/administration curricular content at the postgraduate level.
* Programmes exemplifying a strong geographical/regional/environmental science approach, predominantly at the postgraduate level.

AAPS member schools based in **Ethiopia** and **Sudan** generally fall within the first category. The Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU), for example, offers an undergraduate degree in urban planning (based on the French multidisciplinary tradition) within the Institute of Urban Development Studies. This department is the descendent of the *Ecole superieure d'amenagement et d'urbanisme* (Urban Planning College), which was established in the 1960s through a bilateral agreement between French and Ethiopian governments. The intention was to ‘train higher technicians serving Ethiopian cities’. In subsequent years, the college became known for its ‘unique multi-disciplined training in architecture, planning and civil engineering’.[[1]](#footnote-1) The ECSC programme emphasises the teaching of both quantitative and qualitative skills – students study a range of social science and humanities subjects, but ‘there is an emphasis on integrating these skills in particular design and research projects, just as in the operational world’.[[2]](#footnote-2) Approximately ten years ago, the ECSU introduced a separate master’s degree in urban management in collaboration with Erasmus University and the Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies (both located in the Netherlands). In the case of Sudanese planning schools, Omdurman Islamic University offers an undergraduate degree in planning within the Department of Architecture and Planning. Since 1979, the University of Khartoum has offered a M.Sc. in Physical Planning, within the Department of Physical Planning and Urban Design (Faculty of Architecture). Presently the university is preparing to introduce separate master’s degrees in urban design and urban management.

Examples of programmes falling within the second category are those of Tanzania and Ghana. In the case of **Tanzania**, the Ardhi Institute formulated a three-year Town Planning programme in 1972, in conjunction with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Drawing heavily on the British model of town planning education, ‘the original course curriculum was based on a conception of planning as design and land-use arrangements’ (Diaw *et al.*, 2002:346). Increasing government interest in rural development during the 1970s and 1980s (*Ujamaa*) led to a shift from Town Planning towards Urban and Rural Planning. In 2002 the department was renamed Urban and Regional Planning ‘apparently to widen the rural component and encompass the regional aspects of planning’.[[3]](#footnote-3) Historically, skills in producing plans were emphasised – a focus enhanced by the influence of architect planners from Europe (Poland, Sweden and Denmark) who became involved in teaching at Ardhi in the 1970s, through the UNDP. From 1978 the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) took over responsibility for training Tanzanian planners. Most teachers were Danish architects who had received urban planning training according to their particular educational system. They ‘had a remarkable impact on the design-focused nature of planning education in Tanzania and project-oriented or context-based teaching’ (2002:346).

From the mid-1970s the Ardhi planning curriculum content has shifted to accommodate changes to local contexts and planning approaches, whilst maintaining the ‘design- and context-based plan production focus’. Currently the institution (now Ardhi University) offers a Postgraduate Diploma and M.Sc. in Urban Planning and Management (the latter lasting 18 months), as well as a M.Sc. in Urban and Regional Development Planning and Management (in association with Dortmund University – lasting two years). The Tanzanian Institute of Rural Development Planning (IRDP) also reflects recent trends towards the offering of development planning and management programmes at postgraduate level. The IRDP has devised a one-year Postgraduate Diploma in Regional Planning, which is ‘designed to equip multidisciplinary functional officers and managers with advanced knowledge and skills in the supervisory, coordination, formulation, preparation and implementation of development plans which addresses local and national needs and priorities’.

**Ghanaian** planning education was also devised with a physical design focus in the British mould. As with the Tanzanian example, since the 1980s the influence of international development agencies has shifted the educational approach towards policy and management concerns. From the initial establishment of the School of Architecture, Planning and Building at the then Kumasi College, the focus of the curriculum was on physical planning. The link with the British educational and professional system was evident in the requirement that students gain professional qualification from the Town Planning Institute of Great Britain. With the foundation of an Institute for Community Planning in 1961, spatial planning training was emphasised, leading to the creation of a M.Sc. in Regional Development Planning. In the early 1980s the postgraduate planning programme was suspended, but was resurrected in 1985 when an international postgraduate programme in Regional Development Planning and Management was established in association with the Dortmund University. In 1996, a second postgraduate programme in Development Policy and Planning was established in coordination with Erasmus University (Netherlands). Both programmes represent a shift away from the initial physical design emphasis in planning education. The German and Dutch influence has resulted in a greater concern with management, administration, policy development/analysis, as well as the fostering of ‘multi-disciplinary and integrated planning skills’ (2002:345).

The third and most populated category of planning education (programmes exemplifying a strong geographical/regional/environmental science approach) is evident in the cases of Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda (an atypical undergraduate model[[4]](#footnote-4)), Uganda and South Africa. In **Kenya**, Kenyatta University has offered a degree in Environmental Planning and Management since 1991 (within the Faculty of Environmental Studies). The programme broadly aims to produce planners and managers with skills necessary to work within government, international development agencies and non-governmental organisations, and entails a studio approach to teaching. Maseno University offers the Master of Project Planning and Management degree within the School of Environment and Earth Science. Alternatively, the University of Nairobi offers a M.A. in Planning (through the School of the Built Environment), which entails an urban and regional planning focus. The programme runs over two years, with the fourth semester involving an equally weighted ‘regional planning studio’ and research project. Smaller-scale rural and urban planning studios are compulsory in the first year of study.

**Nigerian** planning schools generally offer master’s programmes in urban and regional planning, with a strong influence from environmental science and design disciplines. At risk of over-generalisation, technical institutions such as the Federal, Enugu State and Ladoke Akintola universities of technology offer two-year M.Tech. degrees in urban and regional planning within departments of environmental science or design. Similar institutional arrangements are evident at Obafemi Awolowo University, where the Department of Urban and Regional Planning falls within the Faculty of Environmental Design and Management. A more academic or research orientation is apparent with the University of Ibadan, where the Department of Urban and Regional Planning falls within the Faculty of the Social Sciences (previously the department was operated as a centre within the Department of Geography). The University of Nigeria, Enugu operates the Department of Urban and Regional Planning within the Faculty of Environmental Studies. The University of Strathclyde (Glasgow) assisted the early stages of this department’s development (founded in 1982). The Master of Urban and Regional Planning degree was established in 1993.

In **Uganda**, Makerere University offers planning courses within two separate departments. The Faculty of Technology runs the Master of Physical Planning degree within the Department of Architecture. Alternatively, a two-year M.A. Land Use and Regional Development Planning is available within the Faculty of Arts. Recently this department has introduced a postgraduate diploma in integrated rural planning.

In **South Africa** the first postgraduate planning programme was established in 1946 at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Staff and consultants who had been trained in the United Kingdom assisted in the creation of these initial programmes, and as such they bore a strong resemblance to the British physical planning and design approach (Diaw *et al.*, 2002). During the *Apartheid* era top-down, control-oriented and comprehensive planning approaches tied into the governmental aim of racial segregation, and some schools aimed to train planners equipped for this task. Afrikaans-medium schools had a particular emphasis on traditional physical planning with the objective of satisfying the bureaucratic needs of the time (Todes and Harrison, 2004). However, other schools were highly critical of this mode and objective of planning education. From late 1970s several English-medium schools embraced a ‘human-centred approach’, including the notion of planning as a ‘developmental activity’ (Todes and Harrison, 2004:197). This agenda was promoted as the ‘progressive planning movement’ took hold in the 1980s and early 1990s. In this era many universities redeveloped their educational emphasis around elements of the American model of knowledge-based social science planning education. Universities of Technology have largely continued with an emphasis on practical workplace experience and technical design expertise.

South African planning schools have responded differently to post-apartheid political changes – some remain in the traditional physical planning approach, others have propounded a greater developmental emphasis. Generally speaking, educational courses have been created to deal with new policy-based agendas such as integrated development planning, plan implementation, urban and environmental management, impact assessment, and participation (Diaw *et al.*, 2002). The majority of master’s programmes are structured for two years of full-time study.

From this discussion, several key issues and trends are identifiable within African planning education:

* There is significant variation in approaches to planning education in Africa. However, nearly all planning curricula were formulated during the colonial era, or were devised post-independence to mirror colonial-type master planning systems. Most were based on the British system of town and country planning education, and as such physical planning and design concerns have historically dominated higher educational curricula.
* In recent decades there has been a general shift from technical and design-oriented curricula towards approaches that involve an expanded definition of planning (to include, for example, economic development, environmental planning, as well as participatory and collaborative ideas) (UN-Habitat, 2009).
* Many programmes originally oriented towards the localised physical planning approach have been restructured to reflect a greater interest in planning at the regional scale, or have been complemented with other degree programmes in urban management, regional planning and/or development planning (policy and administration).
* Educational programmes incorporating elements of postmodern/radical critique or advocacy are not as influential in Africa as elsewhere. The majority of programmes still appear to regard planning skills as being rational competencies in technical design or social scientific analysis (as far as one can tell from degree titles and departmental affiliation). The case is slightly different in South Africa: some planning schools adopted a critical advocacy approach during the apartheid era (Todes and Harrison, 2004). In addition, most South African curricula have undertaken significant ‘progressive’ reforms following the end of apartheid.

### 3. Key international debates in planning curricula

As noted in section 1, the positivist-rational model of planning education and practice has been subjected to numerous critiques since the 1960s, but with increasing frequency and urgency since the mid-1980s. In part, these critiques have been driven the realisation that globalising political and socio-economic systems (signified by the ‘information society’ and the ‘knowledge economy’) have had major implications for contemporary modes of development and planning practice internationally. Clearly, development does not unfold in bounded geographical containers, sequestered from outside influences, and neither is it wholly malleable in the hand of local, regional or national policy instruments (including planning). Urbanisation and development are dynamic, influenced by multi-scalar forces, and planning is as much a socio-political process as it is an exercise in rational decision-making or technical design. Planning education has been forced to respond to these realities, and this response is manifest in various debates surrounding curricular structure, objectives, expected skills or competencies, as well as pedagogical approaches. This section provides a brief introduction to some of the main lines of thought in these areas, with a view to informing the proposed draft curriculum framework for planning education in Africa, presented section 5.

### 3.1 Globalization: universalism vs. dualism

Contemporary changes in economic organization and modus, associated with the rapid advancement of information and communication technologies and the rise of the ‘network society’ (Castells, 1996), have led planning educators to question the skills expected of graduates. Pezzoli and Howe (2001) report on a survey they conducted of planning syllabi in the United States. Their findings are diverse, but indicate that numerous American schools have devised planning courses to either specifically or partially deal with issues of globalization (defined as cross-cutting transnational dynamics and interconnections). Such schools recognise the increasing importance of knowledge of economics, economic development and the development process for planning practitioners. The authors write,

‘Given the dawn of the so-called information age, the planning profession is likely to take on renewed importance. It is a profession well positioned to harness the power of informational technology for enabling cross-sectoral and multidisciplinary collaboration. Today’s complicated issues of development span the scales from micro, to meso, to macro. The ability to plan proactively and effectively is increasingly dependent on the ability to manage data collection, integration, and presentation’ (Pezzoli and Howe, 2001:374).

IT-based skills are therefore increasingly valued amongst planners, particularly as means of promoting collaboration amongst a wide variety of development-related actors. Generally, however, knowledge of global processes, of how events in any one locality are increasingly affected by those of far-removed topographical locations, is vital for practitioners in all contexts.

A wider debate surrounding the relationship between planning education and globalisation involves the ceaseless comparison of the merits of ‘universalist’ and ‘dualist’ approaches to education. The debate has origins in the early 1960s, when planners first argued the merits of devising different curricula for those practising in developed and developing contexts respectively (Burayidi, 1993):

‘The dualistic perspective argues that there are significant differences in value systems, stages of development, and socioeconomic priorities between rich and poor countries, and, consequently, planning education should reflect those differences’ (van Horen *et al.*, 2004:255).

Others emphasised the similarities between developed and developing contexts and hence recommended a universal (singular) planning curriculum:

‘In the 1950s, proponents of the early version of this approach (many of whom, at the time, subscribed to modernization theories of development) argued that such an approach to planning was a means of changing value systems in developing countries, thus setting them on the path to economic growth’ (van Horen *et al.*, 2004:255).

Post-1980s the universalist approach gained some favour, as planners recognised the increasing interdependence of nations under conditions of globalisation, as well as the increasing need for ‘cross-cultural cooperation’, and to close global skill and knowledge deficits (Burayidi, 1993). Proponents argued that a one-world or ‘globalist’ approach would ensure interaction between planners from developed/developing contexts and hence ‘mutual learning’. The one-world approach would serve as the basis for establishing common global planning ethics, objectives and ideologies.

Criticisms of the universalist approach have arisen from the realisation that there are specific ‘role requirements’ of planners in developing countries that a unitary education framework is incapable of fulfilling. Burayidi argues that developing world planners should have ‘a special role as mobilizer, coordinator, opinion shaper, innovator and educator’ (1993:228). They should recognise and explicate the value systems that frame their decisions whilst playing a ‘less technical role than that of their counterparts in developed countries’ (*ibid.*). To create such professionals, he argues for greater distinction between generic planning education and training in specific planning skills. The former emphasises the procedural aspects of decision-making and implementation, as well as ‘skills of problem formulation and solution that may be transferred from field to field’ (Teitz, 1984, cited in Burayidi, 1993:227). The latter is substantive, place-specific and concerned with the ‘spatial organisation, functional efficiency, and social well-being’ of communities (*ibid.*). Burayidi (1993:229) sees hope in ‘universalism at the level of generic planning education and dualism at the level of substantive planning education’:

‘The issue, then, is not one of universalism or dualism, it is one of designing flexible planning curricula that can have both a universal appeal and yet provide for the special needs of different third world regions’ (*ibid.*).

In a slightly different vein from conventional universalist and dualist debates, Peel and Frank (2008) have discussed the implications of a general process of ‘internationalisation’ for the design and delivery of planning curricula. As a starting point, the authors distinguish between internationalisation and globalisation, understood as ‘a structuring force that globalises processes, such as the means of production and service delivery, in a way that is relatively insensitive to national boundaries’ (2008:93). Internationalisation, on the other hand, describes a wide range of processes affecting higher planning education, including the adjustment of teaching methods to accommodate increasing numbers of foreign students, as well as the ‘reworking module content to include more international perspectives) as a response to (economic) globalisation’ (2008:98). Internationalisation is thus understood as an institutional response to the ‘flows and currents of globalisation’. Historically, planning educators have carried out such responses differently, ‘as their particular contexts and individual institutional missions encourage or dictate’ (2008:91). Various responses have included:

* the inclusion of international topics in educational curricula;
* the use of international fieldwork to support student learning;
* attempts to recruit international students for research and teaching purposes;
* the franchising of degrees on a global basis; and
* the development of increasingly international faculties (2008:103).

Ultimately, Peel and Frank regard the internationalisation of planning curricula as an eminently important yet under-explored educational agenda. Their primary point is that the dynamics of this process ‘will not be experienced evenly’ and therefore there is a pressing need for ‘greater dialogue around these issues’ (2008:120). They do not venture to suggest how curricular internationalisation should be performed, or whether it should be actively encouraged in the first place. In a response to these authors, Watson (2008) has drawn upon insights from the African educational context to argue that contemporary debates on internationalisation fail to recognise ‘the inevitable embedding of power in the production of knowledge’. Here a Northern bias in knowledge production and distribution is actively ‘reinforced by the structure of the publishing economy’. She writes,

‘Goals for an international planning education that aim to meet the “needs of an international student body”, provide “equality of opportunity” through academics cast as “intercultural learners”, with curricula that reflect “fair play” and “universal suffrage”, are noble ones, but ignore, or mask, the workings of power and Northern dominance in this field’ (Watson, 2008:119).

So, given the dominance of ‘Northern’ theoretical bases globally, institutions seeking to internationalise their educational curricula will inevitably adopt a particular and largely Northern-oriented perspective. The complexities of urbanisation in the Global South, which necessitate that planners operate in contexts of widespread informality, for example, will probably continue to be under-recognised by internationalised planning curricula. For Watson, it is imperative that the issue of how to train planners to deal with informality, crime, violence, health crisis and major poverty should be a focus of debates about internationalisation and planning education. Nevertheless, such debates are likely to become an increasing source of interest for planning educators in Africa, as nations and institutions seek to deal with trends towards increasing international and intercontinental social mobility, and as they seek to continue the strong tradition of Afro-European split-site degree programmes (discussed in Section 2).

* Processes of political, social and economic globalisation have major implications for planning practice.
* The question of how to respond to these processes have been centred on debates about the merits of ‘universalist’ or ‘dualist’ curricular approaches (the latter distinguishing between education for developed and developing countries).
* Burayidi (1993) argues that universalist and dualist debates are misleading; the objective should be to design ‘flexible planning curricula that can have both a universal appeal and yet provide for the special needs of different third world regions’.
* Watson (2008) argues that debates about internationalisation of planning curricula neglect the realities of power relations in the global knowledge-economy, and argues that such debates typically neglect the issue of educating planners to deal with widespread informality, poverty and ‘conflicting rationalities’.

### 3.2 Key planning competencies and core curricula

Section 1 recognised that planning institutions in the (American) knowledge-based social science mould have historically attempted to devise ‘core curricula’ to promote the development of certain ‘generic’ skills – including rational, systematic thinking, statistical analysis and problem solving – all firmly embedded within positivist and rationalist scientific discourse. Perloff’s position that planners should be ‘generalists with a specialty’ also entailed the provision of specialised courses around the core curriculum, which were designed to foster sector- or discipline-specific skills. Modernist assumptions about the nature of ‘general’ and ‘specific’ skills have suffered critique however, notably from Marxist, feminist and postmodern lines of thought, thereby driving a fundamental reassessment of the desired relationship between curricular structure and planning skills (Sandercock, 1999).

Since the 1980s a particularly influential body of planning theory, known as ‘communicative planning theory’, has encouraged the acceptance that planning is not merely an exercise in rational analysis and decision-making based on quantitative theoretical models. Rather, it is often a ‘stubbornly social and political’ activity, involving conflicts, negotiations, stalemates and consensus between a wide variety of actors, distributed across the public and private divides at all scales of governance (Ozawa and Seltzer, 1999). The fulcrum of communicative planning theory is the Habermasian notion of ‘communicative rationality’, the idea that a shared, reasoned understanding of truth may be reached by communication between actors in an ‘ideal speech situation’. Within this paradigm, the primary activity of planners is ‘interaction (with stakeholders or interest groups), communicating ideas, forming arguments, debating differences in understandings, and finally reaching consensus on a course of action replace detached, expert-driven plan-making’ (Watson, 2002:29). As such, skills in communication, mediation and conflict resolution are paramount to practitioners, and hence capacity-building in these areas should be central to planning curricula. ‘In this model, the planner is not an analyst working behind closed doors to eventually produce the most rational recommendation but an active and intentional participant in a process of public discourse and social change’ (Ozawa and Seltzer, 1999:259).

The implications for curricular development are various. In this definition, planning is an activity that straddles traditional disciplinary boundaries – making ‘the delineation of a core curriculum increasingly difficult’ (*ibid.*). Friedmann’s (1996) discussion of the role of core curricula in planning education begins with a critique of Perloff’s ‘generalist with a specialty’ model. Above all, he notes the inadequacy of this approach given contemporary social, economic and epistemological trends. The solution for some is to define the domain of planning as a ‘set of socio-spatial processes which are subject to continuous change’ (Sandercock, 1999:535), together with a ‘palette of methods, and a structure for deploying both in the form of a curriculum’ (Ozawa and Seltzer, 1999:259). Sandercock insists that planning choose its self-definition, or the ‘specificity of its domain’, in a robust manner that would avoid the problem of being ‘declared redundant every decade’.

For pragmatists such as Charles Hoch and John Forester, curricula should primarily respond to ‘what planners do’. Ozawa and Seltzer’s (1999) survey of planners in Oregon (US) and Ontario (Canada) revealed that the most highly sought-after attributes of were those relating to communication, including ‘working well as a member of team’, ‘working with the general public’, as well as ‘understanding the needs of the public or client’ (1999:262).

‘Other highly sought skills included the ability to complete tasks in time and within budget, being a “self-starter”, knowing how to read and interpret a zoning code, an understanding of the planning process and the roles played by planners and others, the ability to think and respond on their feet, and an ability to see multiple perspectives and synthesize them into a single product’ (*ibid.*).

Writing and critical thinking were ranked above traditional quantitative skills and knowledge of microeconomic theory and GIS. The authors conclude that ‘communicative aspects of planning, of plans, and of the actions of planners need to be clearly evident as a frame and context for the construction of core curricula in this region’ (1999:264). However, Alexander (2001) has critiqued Ozawa and Seltzer’s conclusions by pointing out that a different theoretical approach to the same findings (he categorises skills and competencies according to the Aristotelian tradition of theoria, techne and phronesis) does not necessarily raise any support for ‘communicative discourse’ to constitute the ‘frame and context’ of curricular development. ‘If anything,’ Alexander writes, ‘their study shows the diverse nature and relatively equal status of various modes of practice in professional planning. Rather than supporting any particular planning paradigm, these findings tend to suggest a more contingent approach for planning theory’ (2001:379-380).

Generally speaking, educational approaches based on communicative planning theory are not without criticism. Authors such as Bent Flyvbjerg (2004) argue that whilst planners are often required to act as mediators, and communication skills are clearly valuable in many professional circumstances, communicative theories generally underplay the effects of power on planning processes. Other authors have argued that conflict rather than consensus is the norm in planning and that occasions of agreement are the exception (e.g. Hillier, 2003; Watson, 2006). Therefore, planners are not necessarily best served by a theoretical disposition that privileges consensus over ‘agonism’ (Hillier, 2003).

Sandercock (1999) in particular has criticised the traditional core curriculum approach in planning education. She sees four interrelated dilemmas of a curriculum driven by the need to produce competent rational professionals:

* The reduction of knowledge to a set of measurable skills;
* ‘The ossifying of programmes around a “core” whose main purpose is indoctrination into the professional culture of state planning’ – associated with the perpetuation of the ‘outdated modernist paradigm’;
* The neglect of questions of ‘meaning’ and ‘value’ as a result of ‘an over-reliance on positivist social science’;
* The ‘tendency to draw tight boundaries around professional identity’, thus preventing ‘a truly interdisciplinary understanding and practice from emerging’.

Sandercock believes curricula should be created to reflect planning as an ethical inquiry, and to promote the convergence of environmental, design and planning programmes, in order to encourage a more ‘integrated’ perception and conception of urban processes and problems. Curricular development should also review the established model of the ‘modernist planner’ operating with a ‘toolkit of technical problem-solving skills’ – the a-political and value-neutral professional. Instead, planners should have ‘multiple literacies’ – ‘the capability to link different forms of formalized cultural knowledge (from economic analysis to film and poetry) to local, experiential knowledge and practical sense’ (Healey, 1999:546). Debates over methods, skills or competencies should be redefined as matters of how to ensure that ‘key literacies’ are invoked in students. These literacies are encompassed by the acronym TAMED – technical, analytical, multi- or cross-cultural, ecological, and design.

Recent trends in the Planning Institute of Australia’s educational policy reflect Sandercock’s demands closely (Budge, 2009). In 2004 the PIA commissioned the ‘National Inquiry into Planning Education and Employment’, centred on the question, ‘what skills do planners need?’ The resulting document recognised the increasing importance of new skill areas including urban design and social, environmental, economic and transport planning. In addition, it highlighted various generic skills such as negotiation, facilitation, project management, consultation, teamwork and complex analysis. Subsequently the PIA released ‘Foundations for the Future – The Planning Education Discussion Paper’ (2008), which ‘describes and discusses the ‘creative tension’ between the expectations of industry, the community and the academy; and the reality of higher education rationalisation, competition and resources’ (Budge, 2009:7). The report concludes that,

‘Planning education in Australia should deliver planning curricula that are conscious of international directions in planning knowledge, skills and modes of learning while reflecting Australian circumstances. It should contribute to the development of generic competencies from written and oral communication skills to critical thinking and analysis, adaptability, and sensitivity to different social and cultural contexts.’

Andreas Faludi’s work on European spatial planning practices (signified by the term ‘new regionalism’) also has implications for planning education, particularly in terms of the need to foster spatial planning skills on a transnational scale:

‘Basically, the trend, certainly in Europe, is towards more fluid arrangements, towards multilevel governance, and towards a form of spatial planning beyond territoriality. Rather than the control of a specific and closely guarded territory, spatial planning may become the engineering of connectivity on various scales and in often overlapping manner. The future of planning, and of planning education, will become no simpler for that, but then, nobody promised that things will become easier!’ (Faludi, 2009:10).

‘Planning and planning education have also strengths to bring to bear to the handling of the management of the emergent, more fluid arrangements beyond nation-state territoriality. They are spatial analysis and imagination, pointing out where connections can and must be made, connections that often crisscross administrative borders, just as we in Europe where most national territories are small crisscross borders. We are already living in a world vastly different from a world consisting of sets of nested, mutually exclusive containers in which conventional planning is caught. It's time for planning and planning education to catch up with this reality and to adapt our tools and approaches. However, I am convinced that this can be done by building on the existing model of planning education with a strong core, including planning theory, and with specializations’ (Faludi, 2009:10).

In conclusion, planning theory has undergone a shift in thinking away from understanding ‘planning skills’ primarily in terms of rational, technical skills conferred by a core curriculum ‘whose main purpose is indoctrination into the professional culture of state planning, and which perpetuates the outdated modernist paradigm’ (Sandercock, 1999:535). However, this has not led to total disregard for the core curricular approach. Faludi, above, is a strong advocate for the approach and the Australian PIA also saw a greater role for planning curricula to develop generic competencies ranging from ‘written and oral communication skills to critical thinking and analysis, adaptability, and sensitivity to different social and cultural contexts’. Sandercock does not necessarily oppose the creation of central curricular elements, she merely wants this to happen in a far more dynamic manner (continuously changing to suit prevailing real-world conditions), with greater respect to alternative knowledge systems and different modes of experiencing planning activities and training. The point is that the core curriculum should aim to develop a wide range of competencies or ‘literacies’ that are not necessarily reducible to ‘sets of measurable skills’, but which include the capacity for critical thought and conceptual reflexivity alongside traditional design and analytical capabilities. Sandercock uses the acronym TAMED (technical, analytical, multi- or cross-cultural, ecological, and design) to encapsulate the array of literacies that should directly inform curricular development and teaching methodology within planning education.

### 3.3 Pedagogical approaches

The intellectual trends described in the previous section have also triggered a major reassessment of the goals and practices of planning pedagogy (i.e. the principles and methods of instruction), with obvious knock-on effects for curricular development. Much of recent thinking is encapsulated by van Horen *et al.* (2004):

‘…the multidisciplinary and applied nature of planning, which emphasizes the links between theory, policy, and practice, implies an approach of multimethod teaching going beyond traditional classroom “chalk-and-talk” sessions’ (p. 259).

‘…courses increasingly involve community outreach programs, as well as professional development programs for practicing planners – all grounded in practice. The implication here is that teaching should be underpinned by creative methods such as problem-based learning, case studies, simulations, group work, compulsory internships, and fieldwork, in contrast to the more traditional lecture-based transfer of information to students’ (p. 260).

One of the most prominent trends in planning pedagogy is the shift from front-end unidirectional teaching towards interactive, practical educational experiences that seek to foster ‘experiential learning’ (Ozawa and Seltzer, 1999). Planning educators began to recommend the adoption of such pedagogical approaches in the late 1980s (e.g. Tyson and Low, 1987). Kotval (2003) has emphasised the underlying benefits of learning from real-life experiences/fieldwork:

* First-hand practice-based experiences provide students with a deeper, empirical understanding of planning issues. They also provide opportunities for discussion, interaction and reflection – thereby assisting in the creation of ‘reflexive practitioners’.
* An emphasis on group work advances peer learning and principles of collaborative learning – it also gives learners a more personal and challenging educational experience.
* Experiential learning courses foster the development of ‘transferable skills’, which are deployable ‘with little or no adaptation in a wide variety of social settings’. These include ‘the art of communicating (both verbal and written) presenting material, time management, independent learning, problem solving, effectively working with others and self-motivation’ (Kotval, 2003:298).

Pedagogical models based on experiential learning appear in many forms. One example is the ‘problem-based learning’ (PBL) approach, which is generally based upon situated and engaged project work (see Section 4.3 for an example of curricular development based on the PBL pedagogical approach):

‘PBL is an instructional strategy intended to engage students in authentic, real-world tasks in order to enhance learning. Students are given open-ended problems with more than one approach or answer, intended to simulate professional situations. Learning is student-centered and include the teacher in the role of facilitator and coach’ (Andreassen and Flyvbjerg, 2003:20).

In this approach, the **problem** (including its identification and description) is the ‘point of departure’ for student work. The **project** is an attempt to ‘find a solution or answer to that problem’. Andreassen and Flyvbjerg find numerous advantages to be associated with the PBL approach, not only in terms of fostering individual problem solving capacities, but also developing highly marketable and effective skills amongst planning graduates:

‘Apart from the academic benefits of stimulating curiosity and independent learning, PBL has been found to encourage the development of skills that are in high demand among modern employers: Co-operating and negotiating skills, practice in problem and project management, problem solving, mutual learning, social skills and in-depth experience with oral, written and multimedia presentations’ (2003:20).

The case teaching methodology is one approach that has been successfully used to promote critical, experiential learning amongst graduates in the business, legal, medicinal and other disciplines. The case method generally requires learners to define a problem, analysing it in depth before formulating their own solutions. The Harvard Business School Method is one influential approach. Its characteristics include being a resource intensive approach, meaning that teachers must research cases, write them up and prepare class materials before the teaching session. It therefore requires having extensive access to relevant case data. The case is presented as ‘open-ended’ so that students prepare by discussing solutions and outcomes within learning groups. In the classroom, the lecturer fulfils a role as a facilitator, by encouraging interactive discussion and by calling upon students to provide solutions.

The point about lecturers acting as facilitators indicates two fundamental objectives of the Harvard Method. The first concerns changing the teacher-student relationship from the master-servant relationship of traditional lecturing (which may be fine when the transfer of knowledge is the primary objective) towards the teacher-student ‘partnership’ approach of ‘discussion teaching’. ‘In discussion teaching, partnership – a collegial sharing of power, accountability, and tasks – supplants hierarchy and asymmetry in the teacher-student relationship’ (Barnes *et al*., 1994:24). Secondly, the teacher must facilitate the development of ‘learning communities’ by ensuring that discussion contexts promote mutual respect and an ‘operational contract’ for student-teacher interaction.

Whilst the Harvard Method is recognised globally as being an effective teaching approach, the fact remains that it depends upon simulation – the classroom situation is used to simulate real business cases. This lack of contact with the real world limits its learning potential, especially for disciplines, such as planning, which are concerned with the analysis and production of the physical built environment. Nevertheless, the basic rationale of the method – of using a single empirical referent to illustrate a range of problem-solving dilemmas and skills – remains a pre-eminent approach to producing critical thinking and intuitive problem solvers in a multitude of demanding professions.

### 4. International innovations in curricular development

The previous section described some of the major academic debates with respect to curricular objectives, structure, content and pedagogical approach. The purpose of this section is to discuss several recent cases of curricular reform, which have reflected these debates to varying degrees, in order to illustrate the contemporary context for the development of an African postgraduate planning educational framework. The cases assembled here vary from regional standardisation initiatives (such as the European Union’s ‘Bologna Process’) to national and individual institutional reforms. Although an effort was made to discuss an internationally representative sample of cases, it must be noted that, generally speaking, few cases of curricular reform have been documented and published.

### 4.1 European Union: the Bologna Process

In 1999 education ministers from various European nations signed the Bologna Declaration to govern European higher education by, amongst other means, standardising a two-cycle degree structure (i.e. education according to undergraduate and postgraduate levels). The agreement also created an ‘equivalence matrix’ for higher educational programmes across Europe, to facilitate credit transfer and accumulation between institutions and nations. The formulation of the ‘Bologna Process’ was driven by certain principles relating to the need to encourage ‘lifelong learning’, ‘student-centred learning’, ‘employability’, as well as international ‘openness’ and ‘mobility’. Ultimately, the Process sought to promote the creation of a European Higher Educational and Research Area, ‘in which students can choose from a wide and transparent range of high quality courses and benefit from smooth recognition procedures’.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The Bologna Model does not stipulate how two-cycle degree programmes should be structured. In fact, a survey of the progress of the Bologna Process within European planning schools, conducted by AESOP in 2006, noted a ‘significant variation’ in the composition of two-cycle models (Davoudi and Ellis, 2006). A majority of schools employed a 3+2 model (i.e. three years of undergraduate study, followed by a two-year master’s degree), whilst other preferred 4+2 (Czech Republic, Serbia and Turkey) or 3+1 (UK and Netherlands) options. The survey revealed that the Bologna Process has resulted in various changes to planning education in Europe. In Italy the process has encouraged ‘a marked development of the professional and educational profile of planning’ as an independent discipline. Several schools have undertaken curricular revision in terms of not only ‘what is being taught’, but also ‘how it is being delivered’. One trend has been towards the delivery of master’s programmes in English to facilitate the teaching of a ‘more international curriculum’ and to attract foreign students. Several schools have also undertaken modularisation and ‘semesterisation’ of their programmes to ensure Bologna compliance (Davoudi and Ellis, 2006:15).

Although more of an approach to standardisation and equivalence than to programme structuring, the Bologna Model is likely to become a benchmark for assessing planning curricula internationally. For example, the Indian Institute for Human Settlements has indicated the Bologna compliance of their proposed curriculum for the Master of Urban Practice.

### 4.2 United Kingdom: RTPI restructuring

In the United Kingdom, the Royal Town Planning Institute undertook a process to review their educational policy, which resulted in the production of the RTPI Education Commission Report (RTPI, 2003). This report maintained the need for the RTPI to focus on spatial planning as the underlying discipline to inform planning education. The essential idea of spatial planning was described as ‘critical thinking about space and place as the basis for action or intervention’. Two points underpinned the RTPI’s overall view of the planning profession:

* Planning is not ‘a purely or primarily governmental activity whose legitimacy depends on statute or regulation’.
* A set of ‘rich’ and ‘complex’ processes that calls ‘for a cadre of people with expertise - i.e. knowledge, skills and competence - to facilitate it’.

The RTPI report also locates its discussion and recommendations within major changes in society and the nature of the planning profession in the UK (changes which are common internationally). It recognises that ‘although planning is or should be more important to the state as the spatial linkage between social, economic and environmental objectives, at the same time the old paradigm of planners as technocratic ‘state bureaucrats’ held in check or challenged by smaller number of equally qualified private sector technocrats is obviously obsolete. Whereas the Schuster report [of 1950] saw planning as solely a public sector activity, we need to recognise it as shared between the state, private enterprise and civil society.’ In addition, the professional practice of spatial planning has undergone changes involving:

* ‘A continuous expansion of the constituent fields of planning’ such that it involves a highly diverse assortment of practices including regeneration, community planning, transport planning, urban design, strategic planning, environmental planning, and so on.
* A reduction of the relative influence of local government planning departments, alongside a growing influence of the private sector.
* ‘An increasing emphasis on cross-disciplinary or multi-disciplinary work in both public and private sectors’. Emerging ‘community planning’ practices, for example, involve ‘a less formal and more participatory approach to planning’.

The report recommended the reformulation of postgraduate planning education as follows:

‘Postgraduate level planning education should be based on the same principle as that for undergraduate, with the equivalent of a one year (i.e. twelve-month f.t.e.) post-graduate master’s level qualification, which should include a significant element of project or thesis work to fulfil the requirement for a specialism’.

The RTPI further recommended a ‘partnership approach’ to overcome the skills and capacity inequalities existing between schools.

‘RTPI should support regional and/or national partnerships between providers to promote planning education. Our underlying rationale is the economy of scale that would be achieved by pooling resources (particularly among small providers)… A further development of partnership among planning schools might involve the joint development and delivery of courses. Joint delivery could operate locally, nationally or internationally, helping to attract students, support research and teaching specialisms, and overcome the disadvantages of limited size and capacity’.

### 4.3 Master’s curriculum at Pristina University, Kosovo

In 2003 the University of Pristina (Kosovo), in association with consultants from UN-HABITAT, produced a draft proposal for a curriculum to form the basis of a new master’s programme in Urban Planning and Management (Andreassen and Flyvbjerg, 2003). The two-year programme was organised in accordance with the Bologna Charter (see section 4.1), and was to be offered by the Department of Architecture, within the Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture.

The production of the draft curriculum was undertaken in the context of a general shortage of trained planners in Kosovo. Most active planners in that country were trained as architects, with few having studied planning as part of their higher education. Another contextual factor was the general shift (in Europe) towards the need for planners with multidisciplinary knowledge and skills:

‘In the future, Kosovar planners will undoubtedly be recruited from a wider spectrum of disciplines than architecture, as is the case in the rest of Europe, and the individual planner will be trained in a broader manner. Interdisciplinarity and teamwork are key to planning. The proposed master's programme at Pristina University in urban planning and management reflects this by incorporating a larger element of interdisciplinarity than was previously the case, and by allowing for further development of this element as experience is gained and new teachers employed’ (2003:17).

The curriculum had the objective of developing skills in a wide variety of areas, ranging from communication, negotiation and mediation to ICT, entrepreneurship, critical analysis and creative problem solving. Courses were structured according to four semesters, involving a progression from a concern with the local scale to the regional scale:

1. Local Planning (neighbourhood scale)
2. Urban Development Planning (town)
3. Regional Spatial Planning (e.g. national parks, cross-border areas or an area combining two or more municipalities)
4. Master’s Thesis/Dissertation

For each semester, the emphasis is on ‘problem-based learning’ (PBL) through intensive project work. The PBL approach was considered ‘particularly relevant as a pedagogical model for training in urban planning and management’ and other forms of professional education, due to its ‘emphasis on professional skills’. According to the Pristina curriculum, students would work in ‘project groups’, with an assigned supervisor, and would be required to produce a project report at the end of each semester, to form the basis of an oral examination (general courses and assignments are graded independently). Here a major emphasis is on innovative engagement with real-life problems and stakeholder interests:

‘Student groups doing project work are encouraged to seek out multiple sources of information and inspiration. Proposed solutions typically address problems experienced by actual stakeholders, whom students attempt to engage in both problem identification, problem solving and feedback’ (Andreassen and Flyvbjerg, 2003).

Furthermore, each semester of project work involves the teaching of project-related courses and workshops, as well as general courses to promote breadth of knowledge (these ‘cover subjects that students must master no matter which problem and project they have decided to work with’). Assessment of project work is carried out in a ‘performance-based manner’, and draws upon stakeholder feedback as a means of simulating the ‘real-life situation of professionals’. The overall programme structure is represented by Table 4.1 following (please note, ECTS stands for European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Systems, which is the credit system devised as part of the Bologna Process):

Table 4.1: Curriculum Structure for Planning Master’s Course at Pristina University, Kosovo.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MASTER’S PROGRAMME IN URBAN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
|
| **Admission requirement**: Bachelor’s degree in relevant field, with a grade-point average above 8.5 or 1 year of relevant practice. | | | | |
| **Semester** | **Theme** | **Activities** | **Credits** | **Description** |
| I | Local planning | Project, 18 ECTS  Project courses, 5 ECTS  General courses, 5 ECTS  Free study, 2 ECTS | 30 | Focused planning and development of a neighbourhood with typical needs of upgrading of spatial as well as infrastructure plans. |
| II | Urban development planning | Project, 18 ECTS  Project courses, 5 ECTS  General courses, 5 ECTS  Free study, 2 ECTS | 30 | Comprehensive urban development planning at the level of a whole town, with particular focus on the issue of sustainability. |
| III | Regional spatial planning | Project, 18 ECTS  Project courses, 5 ECTS  General courses, 5 ECTS  Free study, 2 ECTS | 30 | Regional spatial planning with a focus on regional development, including environmental and land-use issues. |
| IV | Thesis | Work on master’s thesis, 30 ECTS | 30 | Research, synthesis and presentation of thesis. |
| **Title:** Master of Urban Planning and Management | | | | |

*Source: Andreassen and Flyvbjerg (2003)*

### 4.4 Sri Lanka

Van Horen *et al*. (2004) undertook ‘an international review of planning curricula’ and found ‘a widespread consensus with respect to key competencies required of planners’. This understanding formed the basis for the formulation of new urban and regional planning teaching programmes at three Sri Lankan universities, in collaboration with the School of Community and Regional Planning at the University of British Columbia, Canada. The process of curriculum development took place within the ‘broad framework’ of the one-world, ‘universalist’ or ‘globalist’ approach to planning education. The ultimate aim was to ‘achieve a balance between learning from trends and innovations in planning education in other countries while also moving a step ahead and putting in place programs that are locally relevant and that draw from the considerable indigenous knowledge in the country’ (van Horen *et al.*, 2004:256).

The authors locate the case of curricular reform within the context for planning in Sri Lanka:

* Globalization and fragmentation: ‘centralised political controls’; fragmentation of government structures at the urban level – loss of control over infrastructure development. Increasing rates of ‘informalization’, especially in housing. Also socio-economic fragmentation – understood as ‘increasing inequality and poverty’
* Policy changes – decentralization, building local government capacity; ‘increased role for civil society in local governance’; market-led growth, privatization as part of a process of economic liberalization.
* Shifting planning approaches from colonial-type rigid, statutory ‘master’ plans towards ‘performance-based planning’. ‘This is where planning is determined by performance or outputs required, rather than following a prescribed statutory pattern. These plans are necessarily more indicative and flexible and are thus able to accommodate change and fluidity. Often, these are underpinned by participatory processes’ (van Horen *et al.*, 2004:257).

The framework underpinning the curriculum development process was based on three categories of key planning competencies: analytical, technical and socio-political. It was noted that each ‘complements and builds on the others’, as such their boundaries ‘are often blurred and overlapping, requiring competence in all three areas’ (2004:259).

* *Analytical*: structuring and solving problems, as well as ‘the ability to develop new and innovative frameworks for judgment when dealing with “ill-structured and ill-behaved problems”. The ability to understand how economic, social, political, and institutional forces collectively shape modes of urban and regional development, as well as ‘how knowledge about this can be translated into action to achieve planning goals’ (2004:259).
* *Technical*: encompasses a wide range of skills including the areas of statistics, economics, demographics, GIS and other computer-based support systems, report writing, legislative knowledge, ecological analysis, project management etc.
* *Socio-political*: stems from the need to accommodate diversity and heterogeneity, without privileging the interests of a particular agent/group. The types of skills and competencies here include a sound understanding of institutional relationships, citizen participation, conflict resolution, communication, negotiation, and mediation.



*Source: van Horen et al. (2004:260)*

The process was carried with a strong emphasis on promoting ‘local relevance’ within the respective programmes. The ‘local’ or ‘generic’ emphasis varied according to the types of competencies required by the learner, in the manner indicated below:



*Source: van Horen et al. (2004:262)*

Obstacles to promoting such ‘local relevance’ included the general lack of a ‘Sri Lankan body of planning theory’. Ultimately however, the implicit Sri Lankan focus on devising planning education to meet local needs led to the ‘formulation of a planning curriculum that is highly local although embedded in a globalist framework’ (2004:263). The localised, contextualist approach to education was also reflected in the pedagogical approach informing the curricula:

‘…it was recognized, in principle, that the traditional classroom-based approach is limited, is out of date, and needs to be complemented, and in many cases replaced, by more innovative learning methods. Broad agreement was reached that such innovative methods as problem based learning, case studies, group projects, and internships are more effective in preparing planning students for real-world planning practice. Aside from the commonsense logic of placing real-world problems at center stage in the learning process, theoretical rigor is provided by the paradigm of communicative action and interactive practice. This theoretical framework provides a bridge between theory and practice insofar as practice is argued to be the starting point in developing meaningful policy and theory (Innes 1995; Healey 1996). Along these lines, and to ensure the relevance of planning curricula, an emphasis was placed on grounding new planning courses in lessons learned from local- or community-level project experience’ (2004:262).

### 4.5 The Indian Institute of Human Settlements

The Indian Institute of Human Settlements (IIHS) is a newly established National Innovation University, designed to focus on the challenges and opportunities of India’s urbanisation. ‘A central challenge to the IIHS mission is creating a dynamic, interdisciplinary, South Asia-centric and globally relevant curriculum that spans the… disciplines and practice areas that define urban transformation’. The IIHS has therefore undertaken a thorough curriculum development process (spanning from 2009 to 2011) to provide the substantive content for a two-year master’s course in urban practice. The scale of the IIHS’s challenge is to create ‘not just a new university but a new profession and kind of practitioner based on a set of capacities, sensibilities and perspectives that bridge the contemporary divide between theory and praxis, and also the multiple divides between the disciplines and professions that are necessary for urban transformation’ (IIHS, 2010:20).

IIHS curriculum Version 3.5 (produced April 2010) structures the Master of Urban Practice according to three overlapping elements: **Core**, **Commons** and **Concentration**.

Table 4.2: Summary of IIHS Master’s Programme in Urban Practice, 2010.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curriculum Component | Basic Description | Philosophy/Objectives | Subject Areas |
| **Core** | Series of course modules (could be field trips, workshops, studios, guest lectures etc.) spread across two years | Integrated, holistic learner development – developing ‘lifelong learners’  Enabling the agency of learners  Situatedness in Indian realities  Sensibilities and skills required for practice |  |
| **Commons** | Shared curriculum undertaken by all master’s students in their first year. Includes a year-long practical project (practicum) | Promotion of interdisciplinarity  Provide foundational knowledge extending across disciplinary divides | * Contemporary India * Settlements and environment * Economics, finance, management and quantitative methods * Commons practica |
| **Concentrations** |  | Granting learners in-depth exposure to a particular knowledge domain or practice area | * Policy and governance * Economic development * Urban management * Human development * Infrastructure * Planning * Disaster risk reduction * Design * Land and housing * Environment and climate change * Entrepreneurship |

*Source: IIHS (2010)*

One of the ‘layers’ of the ‘Commons’ is a practicum: a year-long practical assignment (studio) that integrates the teaching of theory with practical field training:

‘The year-long Commons Practica is set in a single site where learners are based for the whole year. The site is imagined to the scale of a large neighbourhood or even perhaps a ward – for example Malleswaram in Bangalore, or the Old City of Shahjahanabad in Delhi. The scale must be appropriate to be able to sustain multiple layers of investigation and [to] allow multiple small groups of learners to study various parts of it.’

The overall approach is therefore to use a single empirical case to teach a wide variety of subjects and skills. Each subject area will approach the case in a different manner. Students will spend two hours in lectures and six hours carrying out studio/site activity per week. The teaching component of the practicum will cover the following areas:

* qualitative methods
* primary and secondary data collection
* mapping based on different types of primary and secondary data
* systems identification, analysis and mapping
* policy evaluation, critique and analysis.

The practicum course culminates in a six week-long analytical project, whereby small groups of learners ‘use their immersion in the site, their data and their systems analysis to take on a particular place, site, theme or issue and then propose solutions. These can take on multiple forms and [can be] design, planning, project or policy-based. It is hoped that this project will [not only] be a space of synthesis but also one where learners can develop their proposative capacity in real-world situations’.

### 4.6 Summary

Several trends are evident from the discussion of these recent cases of curricular development:

* In Europe planning education has undergone significant restructuring in order to promote the standardisation and transferability of planning knowledge within the EU. Programmes are increasingly offered in English and have consciously sought to promote the ‘internationalisation’ of their curricula.
* Postgraduate planning programmes are usually structured over two years (full-time study) although in the United Kingdom planning master’s degrees are offered over one year.
* In all cases, there has been a deliberate trend to balance the teaching of global concerns and processes with the analysis of local contexts.
* All cases reflect a shift in the types of skills and competencies expected of professional planners: curricula have sought to promote planners with communicative, technological, critical analytical and problem-solving efficacy. This shift is associated with the general view that planning is a complex set of (often highly contested) processes and practices involving a wide variety of both public and private actors. Courses such as that of the IIHS have sought to develop ‘self-reflexive’ and highly interdisciplinary ‘urban practitioners’ capable of negotiating local political interests.
* Whilst not always stated explicitly the cases show strong elements of ‘problem-based learning’ and ‘experiential’ pedagogical approaches, where students engage with real-world planning problems through intensive project work or internships.
* In the case of Pristina University (Kosovo), project work was structured around three consecutive semesters, involving a progression of spatial scales (from local to regional). With the IIHS ‘commons practicum’, a single project site is analysed from a variety of subject-specific perspectives as a means of integrating the teaching of theory with practical field training.

### 5. Towards a draft curriculum framework

This section asks the question as to what would be an appropriate (post-graduate) planning curriculum in Africa given, for example, the establishment of a new planning School or a decision by an existing planning School to undertake a major curriculum revision. Clearly the draft proposed here will have to be broad, given the great diversity of conditions and planning systems across Sub-Saharan Africa.

The curriculum framework presented below was developed in accordance with the particular institutional position and perspective of the Association of African Planning Schools. Several points about the Association’s position on planning education in Africa are worth mentioning. Firstly, curricular development should move beyond debates centred on globalist/universalist or dualist approaches, to seek an appropriate balance between local priorities and a global perspective. Knowledge of the global ‘space of flows’ is vital to the planner, inasmuch as such knowledge can help to explain how global processes translate with local contextual realities to produce concrete developmental outcomes. Debates about the ‘internationalisation’ of planning education and the merits of ‘one-world’ curricular development are heavily rooted in the experiences and perspectives of Northern contexts. It is worth re-quoting Watson,

‘Goals for an international planning education that aim to meet the “needs of an international student body”, provide “equality of opportunity” through academics cast as “intercultural learners”, with curricula that reflect “fair play” and “universal suffrage”, are noble ones, but ignore, or mask, the workings of power and Northern dominance in this field’ (2008:119).

Curricular development should therefore avoid Northern-oriented paradigms to engage, in a highly pragmatic and contextualised manner, with the real conditions and demands of African developmental processes.

Secondly, African planners require a range of skills, competencies or ‘literacies’ to be able to effectively respond to contemporary urbanisation and regional development challenges. Many authors have argued that planning education needs to move beyond a narrow conception of planning skills as a sequestered set of physical design or rational-analytical capabilities. Sandercock (1999) uses the acronym TAMED (technical, analytical, multi- or cross-cultural, ecological, and design) to encapsulate the much wider array of literacies that should directly inform curricular development and teaching methodology within planning education. The challenge for planning educators is to develop curricula that adequately promote learning in particular ‘generic’ and ‘specific’ skill areas. Generic skills, required by planners in all contexts, include procedural aspects of decision-making, implementation, communication, as well as ‘skills of problem formulation and solution’. Specific skills relate to particular sectoral disciplines and the demands of local contexts, and are concerned with the ‘spatial organisation, functional efficiency, and social well-being’ of communities (Burayidi, 1993:227). We therefore posit that core curricula, designed to ensure the development of certain generic and transferable skills, have a role to play in planning education. However, curricula should be devised with sufficient flexibility to allow for concentrations and specialisations around the central core.

Thirdly, postgraduate planning education should be based on a pedagogy that emphasises intensive, integrated theoretical and practical training via practice-based projects that necessitate student engagement with real-world planning problems, and the formulation of innovative and creative responses. This requires a shift from lecture-type, unidirectional instruction towards practice-based and ‘discussion teaching’ approaches that promote ‘experiential’ and ‘problem-based learning’ using case studies.

Finally, the substantive emphasis of planning curricula in Africa should be placed on spatial methods and techniques, as opposed to policy analysis and development (in the American educational vein). Historically, African planning education has exemplified such an emphasis, largely due to the influence of European physical planning and design traditions in many former colonies. The spatial planning orientation therefore makes sense from the point of view of ensuring a degree of historical and institutional continuity. Furthermore, the Association has the position that cities grow and change spatially; spatial trends and dynamics remain the dominant phenomena of urbanism. An effective response to the challenges of twenty-first century urbanisation depends on the actions of professionals capable of ‘reading’ and manipulating urban spaces to the greater pubic benefit. Policy analysis and implementation are important drivers of this response, and by no means should skills in such areas be neglected by planning education, but we maintain that spatial planning remains the fundamental activity of the discipline we call ‘planning’.

**5.1 Key Informants**

What are the key real-world issues and trends that direct curricular development?

* Processes of social, political and economic globalisation, associated with information technological advancement, increasing trans-national mobility and migration, the dominance of the global ‘knowledge economy’, and the emergence of the African ‘information’ or ‘network society’.
* High rates of urbanization in Africa, and the likelihood that the rate will increase in the future.
* Widespread prevalence and growth of peri-urban settlements and informality in work and housing.
* Increasingly high rates of poverty and unemployment.
* All the impacts associated with global climate changes, including the concentration of environmental risks on poor residents of coastal areas.
* Decreasing food security in Africa and elsewhere in the Global South.
* The fact that the development and use of urban land is increasingly directed by private market and developer interests, leading to a general marginalisation of the interests of the poor.
* The existence of diverse and conflicting interests in urban land development and change, and the need for mediation.
* The persistence of outdated planning legislation and practices in many African countries.
* The need to promote regional (i.e. trans-national) collaboration in development and environmental management interventions.

### 5.2 Educational Objectives

The objectives of master’s programmes in planning are to:

* equip qualifiers with values, knowledge and skills to enable them to engage in continued personal intellectual growth, gainful economic activity and rewarding contributions to society;
* produce professionals and researchers who are able to exercise leadership in dealing creatively with the developmental and environmental challenges associated with human settlements;
* produce innovative thinkers and practitioners in the discipline of city and regional planning;
* develop relational thinking and an integrative consciousness which is both critical and deeply connective;
* promote knowledge of sustainability and the wisdom of socio-ecological systems to inspire students to transform themselves and the world.

**5.3 Values, Knowledge and Skills**

The planning graduate should be able to identify, assess, formulate and solve complex spatial planning problems integrally and relationally, working from first principles based on humanist and environment-centred **values**. The graduate should strive to promote planning as a set of democratic and collaborative activities that is sensitive to social and biological diversity, and which serves to empower the marginalised in society.

**Knowledge** is socially contingent, therefore education programmes must equip graduates with the capacity to reflect on the specific social circumstances that produce their ways of ‘knowing and valuing’. They should also be able to recognise and negotiate with the many other ways of doing the same, which are ‘typically manifest’ in real-world planning situations (Healey, 1999:546).

The planning graduate should be able to:

* identify core issues relating to urban and regional development in complex contexts through theoretical and precedent-derived insights;
* devise appropriate methods to tackle complex planning tasks, integrate information from a wide variety of disciplines and direct the energies and activity of multi-disciplinary teams;
* formulate spatial frameworks and site layouts which integrate spatial, environmental, social, economic, cultural and institutional considerations at a variety of scales;
* integrate critical consideration of sustainability issues and the interconnected nature of natural and social systems into planning exercises, using a variety of tools and methods to assess sustainability;
* draft consistent and relevant policy in arenas relating to urban and regional planning and development;
* design implementational strategies for complex land development projects;
* communicate ideas and strategies verbally, in textual and graphical form, to a range of possible audiences;
* interact effectively with other professionals and officials, politicians, business interests and communities; and
* engage effectively in the measuring and monitoring of environmental impacts.

The planning graduate should have soundly based and appropriately developed **skills** in the following arenas:

* critical thinking and problem ‘framing’;
* creative problem-solving;
* the formulation of method;
* spatial planning and design;
* research design and information management;
* map reading and interpretation;
* data analysis, including the application of GIS;
* graphical representation;
* academic and professional report writing;
* oral communication to large and small audiences;
* entrepreneurship;
* negotiation and mediation; and
* interaction with various stakeholders in planning processes.

**5.4 Curriculum Structure**

Two alternative curriculum frameworks are proposed below. Each is structured over a two-year period, for full-time study. Although certain UK planning schools have increasingly favoured the creation of one-year master’s programmes, there is a strong case for keeping a second year of postgraduate education. A second year allows more time for learners to develop their theoretical and practical interests, competencies and values, as well as for the incorporation of practical work experiences into the curriculum (through summer internships, placements or extensive practice-based projects). It also allows time for extensive research work and the production of a thesis or dissertation.

The proposed frameworks seek to promote the integration of theoretical and practical training via parallel practice and theory-based streams. These streams run through the first three semesters. The rationale is to allow learners to move fluidly between theory and practice as a means of enhancing their capacity to reflect upon and modify existing preconceptions and techniques.

Curriculum Option 1 (page 29) is structured around three practical projects, all based on real-world planning problems, and each spanning a single semester. The first project entails the analysis and planning of a local area (e.g. a particular neighbourhood) with a focus on detailed planning and design. The second involves a scalar shift towards the town or city-scale, and focuses on issues of urban sustainability. The third is based on analysis and planning at a regional scale. The basic rationale of this structure is to permit a logical progression from local to regional planning concerns, thereby allowing students time to develop their theoretical perspectives and skills as their project work becomes more complex. The programme culminates in the production of a thesis/dissertation (semester four).

Option 2 (page 30) is designed to allow more freedom to incorporate elements of specialised planning education (environmental, transportation and rural planning, etc.) into the curriculum. The first year of study involves an extensive practical project based on a single area (e.g. an entire town or city) that can be viewed from different scalar and thematic perspectives as the academic year progresses. In the third semester (i.e. first semester of year two), the student undertakes more specialised theoretical training and project work, according to the intended area of concentration. Again, semester four entails the production of a thesis/dissertation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OPTION 1: Postgraduate Programme in Urban and Regional Planning | | | |
| YEAR 1 | **Practice** | Project (local scale) | Project (urban scale) |
| **Theory** | Content suited for analysis and planning of a local area (e.g. neighbourhood) and production of local spatial/infrastructure plans. Key thematic areas include:  - Planning history and theory/practice  - Informality  - Planning and land law  - Introduction to urban design  - GIS, CAD | Content suited for town or city-scale analysis and planning. Key thematic areas include:  - Environment, cities, climate change and sustainability  - Governance and institutions  - Heritage and conservation  - Space economies  - Urban infrastructure |
| Planning techniques and methods  Research methods | |
| YEAR 2 | **Practice** | Project (regional scale) | Thesis / dissertation |
| **Theory** | Content suited for analysis and planning of a delimited geographical region. Includes various forms of regional theory (e.g. economic geography, tourism, transport, agriculture) and further IT-based training. |
| Planning techniques and methods  Research methods |
|  | | SEMESTER 1 | SEMESTER 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SKILLS/OUTCOMES | | |
| Plan/map reading and interpretation  Design and detailed planning  Writing  IT skills | Contextual engagement  Value definition  Understanding power  Collaborative problem solving | Problem definition and solving  Strategic decision making  Creative problem solving  Critical thinking |
| Regional analysis  Strategic planning  Research design  IT-assisted analysis and modelling | Professional ethics and practice  Negotiation, mediation, advocacy |
| **Technical** | **Values** | **Analytical/Interventive** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OPTION 2: Postgraduate Programme in Planning (with specialisation) | | | |
| YEAR 1 | **Practice** | Year-long practical project  Local City scale | |
| **Theory** | Content suited for analysis and planning of areas from local to regional scales. Key thematic areas:  - Planning history and theory/practice  - Informality  - Planning and land law  - Introduction to urban design  - GIS, CAD  - Environment, cities, climate change and sustainability  - Governance and institutions  - Heritage and conservation  - Space economies  - Urban infrastructure | |
| Planning techniques and methods  Research methods | |
| YEAR 2 | **Practice** | Project (specialised) | Thesis / dissertation |
| **Theory** | Content suited for specialisation according to sector discipline:  - Regional  - Rural  - Housing and informal settlements  - Environmental planning  - Transportation planning  - Advanced urban design |
| Planning techniques and methods  Research methods |
|  | | SEMESTER 1 | SEMESTER 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SKILLS/OUTCOMES | | |
| Plan/map reading and interpretation  Design and detailed planning  Writing  IT skills | Contextual engagement  Value definition  Understanding power  Collaborative problem solving | Problem definition and solving  Strategic decision making  Creative problem solving  Critical thinking |
| Research Design  IT assisted analysis and modelling  Specialist expertise in chosen area | Professional ethics and practice  Negotiation, mediation, advocacy |
| **Technical** | **Values** | **Analytical/Interventive** |
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