PROPOSED SYLLABUS OUTLINE: ACTOR COLLABORATION MODULE

MODULE OVERVIEW

This module on Actor Collaboration has been prepared as part of 'Revising Planning Education' project undertaken by the Association of African Planning Schools.

The module examines how changing approaches to planning are matched by a shift in the ways in which planners engage with people. It locates planning within the complex realities of the African city and the challenge of informality. The module provides a background on key planning debates and the relationships between state and non state actors which characterise different planning approaches. It introduces collaborative frameworks, tools and techniques which planners can draw on to hear different voices and better understand the contested realities which they must navigate as part of their work. Finally the module stimulates discussion and debate about the values, attitudes, knowledge and skills required by the new African Planning Professional.

The module consists of four learning units each consisting of xx learning hours:

- Unit 1: Comparative approaches to planning and actor collaboration
- Unit 2: The collaborative challenge of informality
- Unit 3: An introduction to collaborative frameworks, tools and techniques
- Unit 4: The profile of the new African Planning Professional

MODULE OUTCOMES

By the time participants have completed this module they should have an understanding of:

- the range of approaches to actor collaboration embedded within different planning paradigms;
- the challenges of effective actor collaboration within the context of informal settlement upgrading;
- the range of collaborative tools and methods which planners can draw on for participatory or agonistic planning;
- the values, attitudes, knowledge and skills required by the African planner in the 21st century.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The syllabus below is premised on an interactive teaching and learning process which combines group activities for shared analysis and co-construction with prepared inputs and structured discussions on key content areas. The session plans for each module provide suggestions on how the content might be approached together with indicative learning activities. An initial set of case studies has been prepared which provide the foundation for analysis in certain of the units. These case studies should be seen as a starting point for the development of a much larger case repertoire of learning materials. Each unit has a list of recommended readings and links to other web based materials.

Overall the approach sets out to promote new ways of learning and the development of a community of practice which will allow academics and practitioners to share knowledge resources developed in different settings. As people adapt and develop additional materials for the teaching of this and other modules so these resources will be uploaded to website for exchange and common use.

UNIT ONE: COMPARATIVE APPROACHES TO PLANNING AND ACTOR COLLABORATION

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- To critically examine how African planners relate to people and to identify the current principles and approaches which frame their engagement.
- To review and outline the key features of four broad approaches to planning:
  - Rational comprehensive planning;
  - Collaborative action planning;
  - Agonistic planning premised on conflicting rationalities;
  - Insurgent planning from below.
- To examine the mode of actor engagement associated within each approach.

SESSION OVERVIEW

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources, links and references
Actor Collaboration module introduction	- To introduce the participants - To review the objectives, structure and content of the module as a whole - To clarify key learning outcomes	Who's who? Activity Course overview presentation setting out structure of module and clarifying assessment requirements Discussion and questions of clarity	A1: Who's who? – Introductory activity to profile the skills, experience and expectations of the course participants P1: Actor collaboration module overview
Getting started	- To profile the current values, attitudes, knowledge and skills (VAKS) of the African planner - To discuss the key features of the institutional environment in which planners work	Tape several flip charts together the height of a person and lay them on the floor Get a volunteer to lie on the floor and trace the outline of his her body with a marker pen Break participants into three small groups Distribute cards in three colours (red for values and attitudes, blue for knowledge and green for skills) assigning each group a different colour Give the group ten minutes to identify characteristics of the African planner according to the colour they have been allocated Annotate the heart with red cards (values and attitudes), the head with blue cards (knowledge) the hands with green cards (skills) Discuss the picture that emerges, add and subtract cards by agreement Beneath the feet of the model add additional cards (yellow) which characterise key features of the	A2: Profiling the African planner (1)

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources, links and references
		institutional environment in which planners currently work Discuss the picture that emerges. Close by telling the participants that this image will be revisited at the end of the course to identify the VAKS needed by the new generation African planner.	
Unit 1: Comparative approaches to planning and actor collaboration			
What do we mean by an 'actor'	• To distinguish between state and non state development actors and relations between them • To develop a typology of development actors	Ask participants what they understand by a development actor. Brainstorm examples of development actors who play a role in urban development. Ask the participants to organise the development actors they have identified into a typology (state/ non state) and to elaborate on the subsets in these two basic categories (international agencies, national, provincial and local government, councillors, ward committees, traditional authorities etc, NGOs, CSOs faith-based organizations , financial institutions, professional associations, property owners/rate payers shack/ slumdwellers etc) Encourage them to break broad categories down into subsets.	A3: What do we mean by a development actor?
Reviewing a worked example of an actor map/stakeholder analysis	• To provide a prepared example of an actor map associated with a particular case history	A short presentation which highlights how different sets of actors have been identified and illustrate their relationships to one another	P2 Prepared actor map/Venn diagram (ICRA n.d)
Identifying different planning approaches and their mode of actor engagement (1)	• To develop a matrix of different planning approaches, identify their key characteristics and mode of actor engagement based on participant knowledge	Provide participants with a three column matrix as below | Planning approach	Characteristics	Mode of actor engagement
---	---	---
Rational comprehensive		
Collaborative		
Agonistic		
Insurgent				A4: Comparative planning approaches and modes of actor engagement

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources, links and references
		Ask participants to draw on their knowledge of planning theory to identify the key characteristics of each and the associated mode of actor engagement. This can be done in groups or as a facilitated discussion with the group as a whole. Discuss the outcomes.	
Identifying different planning approaches and their mode of actor engagement (1)	• To share the planning typology and associated modes of actor collaboration developed in the toolkit	Develop a presentation which contains the completed matrix in the toolkit and which summarises the key features of each approach Review the participant's matrix and discuss key differences with what was presented. Add useful and insightful points to the completed matrix from that developed by the participants as appropriate.	P3: Comparative planning approaches and modes of actor engagement (Atkinson 1992; Holston 1998; Watson 2002; Hillier 2003; Watson 2003; Goldman, Feldman et al. 2004; Fosse 2005; Hague, Wakely et al. 2005; Sanyal 2005; Harrison 2006; Moulaert and Cabaret 2006; Bond and Thompson-Fawcett 2007; Brand and Gaffikin 2007; Chettiparamb 2007; Costa and Costa 2007; Rydin 2007; Miraftab 2009; Watson 2009; Healey and Upton 2010; Ward 2010)
Which approach is most suited to planning in the African city?	• To assess the pros and cons of each planning approach and debate which is the most suited for the planning context of the African city people work within	Add an additional component to the matrix to capture participant perspectives on the pros and cons of each planning approach and its appropriateness for the African city	A5: Debating appropriate approaches to planning in the African city
Unit summary	• To review the content of the module highlighting key learnings	Present a brief summary of what was covered in the unit and the key learnings which emerged from each session	P4: Unit 1 Summary and key learnings

UNIT TWO: THE COLLABORATIVE CHALLENGE OF INFORMALITY

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- To review place of informality in the African City
- To identify lessons from different approaches and responses to informality based on the analysis of selected cases
- To examine the potentials and the challenges to be anticipated in the development of collaborative approaches to informal settlement upgrading

SESSION OVERVIEW

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources
Unit 2: The collaborative challenge of informality			
Introducing Unit 2	• To provide a brief overview of Unit 2	A short presentation introducing the objectives and content of Unit 2	P1: Introducing Unit 2
Change and the city	• To select two or three African cities which are well known to the participants and identify key factors driving change in the colonial and post colonial periods • To identify the place and extent of informality within the city	Participants select cities for a rapid analysis of key factors driving change. Participants work to prepare a timeline and sketchmaps which show how the city has grown or changed over time. They identify and discuss the place and extent of informality and how it has influenced the growth of the city	A1: Change and the City

Responses to informality. Comparative case study review	• To examine how state and non state actors have responded to informality in three different settings
	  ○ Joe Slovo
	  ○ Harare
	  ○ Nairobi
	• To plot the different responses on a continuum
	• To identify starting points
		Participants review the three case studies and map the perspectives and approaches of State development actors to informality.
		These reviews can be sequentially case by case or in parallel where three separate groups each are assigned one case which they report on depending on time availability
		For each case participants plot the responses of State development actors in the various cases on a continuum and locate them within the planning typology developed in Unit 1.
		For each case participants plot the responses of non state development actors and highlight their relationship with the State actors. Participants distinguish between radical and survivalist insurgent planning.
			A2: Case analysis
			Joe Slovo – Cape Town, South Africa
			Murambatsvina/Garikai – Harare, Zimbabwe
			Huruma – Nairobi, Kenya
			Related readings: See tool kit references with a focus on (Mutillah 2003; UN-Habitat 2003; Alam, Baliga et al. 2005; Tibaijuka 2005; Potts 2006; Potts 2008; Pieterse 2009)

The collaborative challenge of	• To examine the potentials and the	Ask participants to develop an approach as to how a	A3: Comparative planning approaches and

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources
informality	challenges to be anticipated in the development of collaborative approaches to informal settlement upgrading	collaborative process could be designed for engaging with informality at city and settlement scales which identifies actors and their prospective roles and relationships. Once they have mapped out an approach ask them to identify the key challenges which they anticipate in trying to make their proposed approaches work in practice Once groups have completed the discussion ask them them to present their assessments Facilitate a discussion based on the group work. Explore assumptions made by the groups about who drives the process at different scales. Is it a top down, bottom up or a more horizontal process which people have envisaged? Examine the challenges and how they have been framed. What are the rationalities which underpin these framings? Are they techno-legal challenges anticipated by planners? Are they socio-economic challenges anticipated by the poor? How can conflicting rationalities best be accommodated? To what extent do the challenges engage with broader sustainability concerns? What is the interface between sustainability discourse and the complex realities of the African city?	modes of actor engagement
Unit summary	• To summarise the lessons from the three cases • To review the concept of conflicting rationalities • To highlight key features of participatory upgrading strategies developed in different contexts	Present a summary of the approaches taken in the three cities and which unpacks the roles of state and non state actors Highlight the continuum which ranges from continuing hostility and crackdowns on informality, and different attempts to accommodate informality as a result of contestation and action below Explore the concept of conflicting rationalities which shape the agenda of the different actors Highlight key features of participatory informal settlement upgrading approaches	P2: Unit 1 Summary and key learnings

UNIT THREE: COLLABORATIVE TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

SESSION OVERVIEW

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources
Unit 3: Collaborative tools and techniques			
Introducing Unit 3	• To provide a brief overview of Unit 3	A short presentation introducing the objectives and content of Unit 3	P1: Introducing Unit 3
From participation to actor collaboration	• To review changing thinking about participation in development planning	Presentation and discussion highlighting emergence of the concept of participation in development planning and its different pathways north and south. Different rationales for participation. Deliberative democracy. Key critiques of participation and the danger of homogenising concepts of "the state" and "the community". The emergence of approaches to actor collaboration premised on the recognition of relations of power, conflict and differentiation. Development of an African centred theory and practice.	P2: From participation to actor collaboration (Cooke and Kathari 2001; Mansuri and Rao 2004; Rao and Walton 2004; Chambers 2007; Creasy, Gavelin et al. 2008; Justino 2010)
Participatory research and planning	• To provide an introduction to the wide range of tools and techniques in use	Presentation and discussion of a range participatory planning tools developed in different settings Discussion explores relevance and appropriateness of different approaches and tools – PRA, Participatory urban appraisal, PGIS, Participatory upgrading of informal areas. Recognition of different 'knowers' and 'knowledges'. Weighting relative knowledge claims.	P3. An introduction to collaborative approaches tools and techniques (Pretty, Guijt et al. 1995; de Satgé, Holloway et al. 2002)
Perspectives on conflict	• To introduce different perspectives on conflict • To provide a conflict centred approach to development and planning	Presentation to highlight circuits of power and knowledge– relationship, data, interest, structural and value based definitions of conflict and methods of mapping stakeholder interests. The challenge of deep difference. Factors which aggravate and moderate conflict and approaches to handling conflict	P4: Perspectives on conflict (Ramirez 1999; DFID 2002; Mac Ginty and Andrew 2009; Justino 2010)
Conflict assessment as a foundation for the emergence of actor collaboration in the African city	• To identify starting points for actor collaboration for locality based planning	Discussion on the practicality of conflict assessment and actor analysis as a starting point of planning Perspectives from above and below Minimum conditions for effective actor collaboration	A1: Conflict assessment and actor analysis as the foundation for actor collaboration
Unit summary	• To summarise and highlight key learnings from Unit 3	Present a summary of the changing thinking about participation in development and the limitations of	P5: Unit 3 Summary

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources
		participatory planning paradigms in the contested landscapes of the African city. Reexamine the appropriateness of conflict and actors assessment as a starting point of point of planning Highlight that there is a wide variety of participatory planning and research tools appropriate for locality based planning processes. However their usefulness depends on the nature of social relations on the ground and the state of relations between state and non state actors	

CASES

WEBLINKS

- Appreciative enquiry www.iisd.org/ai/ IISD site on planning approaches which build on strengths
- Civic Practices Network www.cpn.org/index.html A collaborative and nonpartisan project in America dedicated to bringing practical tools for public problem solving into community and institutional settings
- Integrated approaches for participatory development www.iapad.org/links_participation.htm Links to sites specialising in Participatory Rural Appraisal and Participatory GIS approaches and tools
- People and participation www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/Involve/Home British website providing case studies, resources and advice on participatory planning
- Wageningen portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme/?Participation Participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation portal
- World Bank Social Development Group go.worldbank.org/FMRAMWVYV0 Participation and civic engagement resources

UNIT FOUR: THE PROFILE OF THE NEW AFRICAN PLANNING professional

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- To examine the increasingly transdisciplinary nature of planning in the context of the African city
- To identify the VAKS set required by the new African planning professionals
- To examine the institutional changes required to facilitate the emergence of new African planning professionals and an African centred planning theory and practice

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources
Unit 4: The profile of the new African Planning professional			
Introducing Unit 4	• To provide a brief overview of Unit 4	A short presentation introducing the objectives and content of Unit 4	P1: Introducing Unit 4
The different knowledge domains which intersect with the discipline of planning	• To identify the different knowledge domains which intersect with the discipline of planning	An introductory activity where course participants construct a conceptual framework illustrating the intersection of different knowledge domains of planning Provide participants with a foundational statement which describes what city and regional planners currently do which includes: • demographic analysis; • spatial development frameworks to guide economic development and land use management; • urban design; • development of public transportation systems; • public housing and informal settlement upgrading; • location of public facilities and infrastructure; • development and enforcement of zoning and building codes; • land use planning; • disaster risk management • approval of development applications; • development control; • environmental management and regulation. Ask participants to prepare a conceptual framework which identifies how other key knowledge domains intersect with the 'core business' of the African planner. Discuss how these knowledge domains currently intersect and how they affect or are ignored by planners.	A1: Constructing a conceptual framework
Key principles and debates about transdisciplinarity	• To introduce the concept of transdisciplinarity • To examine its relevance to the African planner	Presentation which introduces essential concepts relating to transdisciplinarity Discussion of its relevance to African planners	P2. Principles and debates about transdisciplinarity (Krimsky 2000; Max-Neef 2005; Apgar, Argumedo et al. 2009)

Element	Objectives	Method	Resources
Modeling the New African Planning professional	• To revisit introductory course activity and identify the values, attitudes, knowledge and skills (VAKS) of the new African planner • To identify key changes in the institutional environment in which planners work which will enable	Display the values, attitudes, knowledge and skills (VAKS) of the African planner which were identified by participants at the beginning of the course Redo the activity drawing on the course content and discussions to identify the values, attitudes, knowledge and skills (VAKS) required by the new African planner given the challenges facing the African city. Identify key changes in the institutional environment in which planners work which could enable the emergence of the new African planner and the development of an African centred theory and practice	A2: Modelling the New African professional
Unit and course summary	• To briefly summarise the key learnings emerging from the unit and actor collaboration module as a whole		P3: Unit 4 and Module summary

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Term	Definition
Foundational questions	These are essential questions that clarify our core understanding of an issue, concept, or principle. They provide a platform for further enquiry and investigation.
Actor collaboration	The process of negotiating strategy and development priorities between diverse sets of state and non state actors with conflicting perspectives and needs
Agonist	One that is engaged in a struggle[1]
Agonistic	Contested, argumentative
Communicative action theory	The process of democratic deliberation between conflicting social interests as part of the process of creating common visions for the future of a particular geographical area
Deliberative democracy	A process of reasoned reflection based on a willingness to understand the values, perspectives, and interests of others and find mutually acceptable solutions
Epistemology	The theory of knowledge and the grounds for its validity
Gini coefficient	A way of measuring income inequality. A zero coefficient implies that all households in a country have exactly the same amount of

---

[1] Marriam Webster online dictionary

	wealth, while a coefficient of 1.0 means a single household has all the country's income.[2]
Insurgent planning	A survivalist planning from below driven by local conditions and rationalities
Modernist planning	Modernist planning was premised on the expert development of master plans detailing the city layout from its built form to its ideal end-state. In Africa modernist planning ideas spread through colonial administrations together with carbon copies of planning and zoning laws and regulations[3]
Normative	Conforming to assumed norms and standards
Positivist	An approach to knowledge which is defined solely by empirical and scientifically observable facts

REFERENCES

Alam, A., N. Baliga, et al. (2005). Enabling a community led process: Pamoja Trust's approach to slum upgrading in Nairobi, Kenya, School of International and Public Affairs: Colombia University.

Apgar, J. M., A. Argumedo, et al. (2009). "Building Transdisciplinarity for Managing Complexity: Lessons from Indigenous Practice." International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences. **4**(5): 255-270.

Atkinson, D. (1992). Let the people decide? : public participation in urban planning. Johannesburg, Centre for Policy Studies.

Bond, S. and M. Thompson-Fawcett (2007). "Public participation and New Urbanism: A Conflicting Agenda." Planning Theory and Practice **8**(4): 449-472.

Brand, R. and F. Gaffikin (2007). "Collaborative planning in an uncollaborative world." Planning Theory **6**(3): 283-313.

Chambers, R. (2007). From PRA to PLA and Pluralism: Practice and theory. Working paper 286. Sussex, Institute of Development Studies.

Chettiparamb, A. (2007). "Reconceptualising public participation in planning: A view through autopoiesis." Planning Theory **6**(3): 263-281.

Cooke, B. and U. Kathari, Eds. (2001). Participation: The new tyranny?, Zed Books.

Costa, H. and G. Costa (2007). "Between Planning Practice and the Academic World: Some Comments from a Brazilian Experience." Planning Theory and Practice **8**(3): 387-395.

Creasy, S., K. Gavelin, et al. (2008). Everybody needs good neighbours? A study of the link between public participation and community cohesion. London, Involve.

de Satgé, R., A. Holloway, et al. (2002). Learning about livelihoods: Insights from southern Africa. Cape Town, Periperi Publications and Oxfam Publishing.

DFID. (2002). "Conducting conflict assessments." DFID Development Issues Retrieved 30 November, 2010, from www.dfid.gov.uk/documents/publications/conflictassessmentguidance.pdf.

Fosse, J. (2005). "The potential of dialogue in a municipal development project: Action research and planning practice." Artificial Intelligence and Society **19**: 464-484.

Goldman, I., M. Feldman, et al. (2004). Urban-rural change in South Africa – lessons for planning and local economic development, Khanya.

Hague, C., P. Wakely, et al. (2005). Making planning work: A guide to approaches and skills, Practical Action Publishing.

Harrison, P. (2006). "On the Edge of Reason: Planning and Urban Futures in Africa." Urban Studies **43**(2): 319-335.

Healey, P. and R. Upton, Eds. (2010). Crossing borders: International exchange and planning practices. The NTPI library series. London, Routlege.

Hillier, J. (2003). "'Agon'izing over consensus: Why Habermasian ideas cannot be 'real'." Planning Theory **2**(1): 35-79.

---

[2] http://lexicon.ft.com/term.asp?t=Gini-coefficient
[3] (UN-Habitat 2009)

Holston, J. (1998). Spaces of insurgent citizenship. Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history. L. Sandercock. Los Angeles, University of California Press.

ICRA. (n.d). "ICRA Learning resources: Systems diagram guidelines."   Retrieved 30 November, 2010, from http://www.icra-edu.org/objects/anglolearn/Systems_Diagrams-Guidelines1.pdf.

Justino, P. (2010). War and poverty. Households in Conflict Network Working Paper 81. Sussex, Institute for Development Studies.

Krimsky, S. (2000). Prespectives from Social Scientists and Humanists: Transdisciplinarity for Problems at the Interstices of Disciplines. Transdisciplinarity: recreating integrated knowledge. M. Somerville and D. Rapport. Oxford, EOLSS Publishers.

Mac Ginty, R. and W. Andrew (2009). Conflict and Development. Oxford, Routledge.

Mansuri, G. and V. Rao (2004). "Community based and driven development: A critical review." World Bank Research Observer 19(1).

Max-Neef, M., A (2005). "Foundations of transdisciplinarity." Ecological economics 53: 5 - 16.

Miraftab, F. (2009). "Insurgent planning: Situating radical planning in the global south." Planning Theory 8(32).

Moulaert, F. and K. Cabaret (2006). "Planning, networks and power relations: Is democratic planning under capitalism possible?" Planning Theory 5(1): 51-70.

Mutillah, W. (2003). Urban slums report: The case of Nairobi, Kenya, UN-Habitat.

Pieterse, E. (2009). African Cities: Grasping the unknowable. Inaugural Lecture delivered at the University of Cape Town

Potts, D. (2006). "Restoring order: Operation Murambatsvina and the Urban Crisis in Zimbabwe." Journal of Southern African Studies 32(2).

Potts, D. (2008). Displacement and livelihoods: the longer term impacts of Operation Murambatsvina. Zimbabwe: The Hidden Dimensions of Operation Murambatsvina. M. Vambe. Harare, Pretoria, Weaver Press, Africa Institute of South Africa.

Pretty, J., I. Guijt, et al. (1995). Participatory learning and action - A trainer's guide. London, Sustainable Agriculture Programme. International Institute for Environment and Development.

Ramirez, R. (1999). Stakeholder Analysis and Conflict Management. Cultivating Peace: Conflict and collaboration in natural resource management. D. Buckles. Ottowa, Washington, IDRC/World Bank.

Rao, V. and M. Walton (2004). Conclusion: Implications of a Cultural Lens for Public Policy and Development Thought. Culture and Public Action. V. Rao and M. Walton, Stanford University Press.

Rydin, Y. (2007). "Re-examining the role of knowledge within planning theory." Planning theory 6(1): 52 - 68.

Sanyal, B. (2005). "Planning as anticipation of resistance." Planning Theory 4(3): 225-245.

Tibaijuka, A. (2005). Report of the Fact-Finding Mission to Zimbabwe to assess the Scope and Impact of Operation Murambatsvina by the UN Special Envoy on Human Settlements Issues in Zimbabwe. New York, United Nations.

UN-Habitat (2003). The challenge of slums. Global report on human settlements. Nairobi.

UN-Habitat. (2009). "Backgrounder: Emergnce and spread of modern planning." Global Report on Human Settlements Retrieved 30 November, 2010, from www.unhabitat.org/documents/GRHS09/bg2.pdf.

Ward, S. (2010). Transnational planners in a post colonial world. Crossing borders: International experiences and planning practices. P. Healey and R. Upton. London, Routledge.

Watson, V. (2002). "The usefulness of normative planning theories in the context of sub-Saharan Africa." Planning Theory 1(1): 25-72.

Watson, V. (2003). "Conflicting Rationalities: Implications for Planning Theory and Ethics." Planning Theory and Practice 4(4): 395-407.

Watson, V. (2009). "Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues." Urban Studies 44(11): 2259-2275.