# Report of the Curriculum Committee of the Globally Planning Task Force

## Draft January 1, 2003

I. Rationale and purpose of ACSP President Wim Wievel's charges to the Planning Globally Task Force, Feb. 2002:

"Planners in the U.S. need to have a broad understanding of planning issues, policies and programs outside of the U.S. and how global issues affect planning inside the U.S. This is important for many reasons:

- To increase the arsenal of tools planners can bring to bear on U.S. planning issues;
- Because planning students are increasingly likely at some point to have to deal with planning issues abroad;
- Because as educated citizens and professionals it is important to be aware of the field and profession outside of one's own country;
- Because global issues, immigration, and international cultural issues have an impact on U.S. communities and the planning activities in them; and
- To more effectively build theories and methods that truly reflect planning behaviors and the full range of planning contexts.

The charge to the Planning Globally Taskforce is to prepare specific recommendations and plans for discussion, adoption, and implementation in the following areas:

1) Curricular changes ACSP member schools might consider and implement.
2) Development of opportunities for research and study abroad and interaction with non-U.S. Scholars.
3) Strengthening planning education and the field of planning abroad. "

The specific charges to the Curriculum Committee are as follows:

"The task of the committee would be to review planning curricula in regard to how well they address the issue raised in 'Rationale and purpose,' to develop recommendations for improvement, and to recommend ways that curriculum improvements might be developed, with a particular interest in joint and collaborative activities."

## II. Members of the Curriculum Sub-Committee

**Bish Sanyal,** Chair
Dept of Urban Studies and Planning
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
Voice: 1-167-253-3270
Fax: 1-617-253-2654
Email: Sanyal@mit.edu

**John Browder**
Urban Affairs and Planning
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
201 Architecture Annex (0113)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Voice: 1-540-231-6217
Fax: 1-540-231-3367
Email: browder@vt.edu

**Hemalata Dandekar**
School of Planning & Landscape Arch.
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-2005
Voice: 1-480-965-8676
Fax: 1-480-965-9656
Email: hema@asu.edu

**Michael Hibbard**
Dept of Planning, Public Policy & Mgmt
1119 Hendricks Hall
1209 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
Voice: 1-541-346-3897
Fax: 1-541-346-2040
Email: mhibbard
@oregon.uoregon.edu

**Edward Jepson**
Dept of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Tennessee-Knoxville
Suite 108 Hoskins Library
Knoxville, TN 37996
Voice: 1-865-974-4630
Fax: 1-865-534-1691
Email: ejepson@utk.edu

**Keith Pezzoli**
Dept of Urban Studies & Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0517
Voice: 1-858-534-3691
Fax: 1-858-534-1691
Email: kpezzoli@uscd.edu

**Siddhartha Sen**
Inst. of Architecture and Planning
Morgan State University
2201 Argonne Drive, Montebello B107
Baltimore, MD 21251
Voice: 1-443-885-1864
Fax: 1-410-319-3786
Email: ssen@morgan.edu

**Martim Smolka**
Voice: 1-800-526-3873

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
113 Brattle Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Fax: 1-800-526-3944
Email:msmolka@lincolninst.edu

**Betsy Sweet**
Instituto del Progreso Latino
2570 South Blue Island
Chicago, IL 60608
Voice: 1-773-890-5500
Fax: 1-773-890-1537
Email:sweal@idpl.org

**Teresa Vazquez**
City and Regional Planning Program
University of Texas – Arlington
UTA Box 19588
Arlington, TX 76019-0588
Voice: 1-817-272-3314
Fax: 1-817-272-5008
Email:tere@uta.edu

**Niraj Verma**
School of Policy, Planning
and Development
University of Southern California
Lewis Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0626
Voice: 1-213-740-3958
Fax: 1-213-740-5379
Email: nverma@usc.edu

## Sub-Committee Activities

The Sub-Committee participated in a two-day workshop at MIT on April 25 to 27, 2002. Nine members attended this workshop, which was designed to generate a set of key issues for the Sub-Committee to deliberate over the next six months. The Sub-Committee members met again in Baltimore in November 2002 during the ACSP conference and provided brief notes on issues of particular interest to each member.

Based on these meetings and the issue-based notes, the Chair of the Sub-Committee, Bish Sanyal, prepared the following draft, which is divided into three sub-sections. The first section provides an overview of the currently offered curriculum related to international planning issues, describes the intellectual rationale underlying the structuring of existing courses., and, also, identifies major gaps in the existing curriculum. The second section lays out the reasons for rethinking the purpose of the curriculum in light of the shocking events of September 11, 2001, which signifies a major shift in the way we perceive globalization's impact on U.S. planning practices. And, finally, in section three, we lay out a set of recommendations for three specific actors – namely, ACSP, GPEIG (Global Planning Educators Interest Group) and individual planning schools.

## Section I: The State of Current Curriculum

In writing this section, we have drawn on the following references:

i) Globalizing North American Planning Education: Final Report, ACSP Commission on Global Approaches to Planning Education, Chair, Ibrahim Jammal, April, 1994.

ii) Pezzoli, K & Howe, D. "Planning Pedagogy & Globalization: A Content Analysis of Syllabi", JPER 20 (2) pp 365-375.

iii) JPER, Special issue on Integrating Globalization and Planning, Guest Editors: Farokh Afshar and Keith Pezzoli, 2001.

iv) Sen, S. "Some Thoughts on a Global Approach to Teaching Diversity", 2002. Draft Paper.

v) Klosterman, R.E., "Planning Theory education in the 1980s: Results of a Second Course Survey", JPER 11(2) pp130-140.

vi) Friedmann, J. & Carol Kuester, 1996, "Planning education for the Late Twentieth Century: An Initial Inquiry", JPER 14(1) pp 55-64.

vii) Lim, Gill-Chin, 1993, "Reforming Planning Education Towards the Global Country", Environmental Planning: Planning and Design, 20,pp. 567-576.

viii) Sanyal, B. (Ed.) 1990 Breaking Boundaries: One World Approach to Planning Education, New York: Plenum Press.

### Main Observations

We start with the assumption that all knowledge production is historically, socially, and politically located.

1. There is a long history of intellectual interest in international issues in American academia that demonstrates how such interests changed with key historical events:

   1910 – The first Journal of Race Development which argued that "the U S has as fundamental an interest in races of a less developed civilization as have the powers of Europe." This issue linked to the topic of race relations within the U.S. (with regard to African Americans) to that of "less developed civilizations" abroad. (Reference: Items, Social Science Research Council, Vol 3, No 3-4, Fall 2002, p. 12)

   1911-1944 – American academia acknowledged European intellectual superiority and European influence globally through colonization. (Reference: Noam Chomsky "Two Roles of American University," Chomsky on Democracy and Education, ed by C.P. Otero, 2003, RoutledgeFalmer.)

Post World War II: The beginning of new U.S. interest in International Studies.

- Truman's inaugural address "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial program available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. The old imperialism – exploitation for foreign profit – has no place in our plans. What we envision is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealings." (Reference: Truman, H.S., "Inaugural Address, January 20, 1949" in Documents on American Foreign Relations, Princeton University Press)
- The Marshall Plan and rebuilding of Europe. (Reference: A. Hirschman, "The Rise & Fall of Development Economics," A Bias for Hope, 1985, Westview Press.)
- American support for United Nations declaration of human rights (Eleanor Roosevelt)
- Development Theory (Rastow, Hirschman, etc.) on how to develop the capitalist model (economically) and the democratic model (politically). Reaction to the cold war.

The main theme: We are all the same, and we will all go through the same stages of development to reach mass consumption societies.

1970's: Rise of Alternative theories of development and, domestically, the rise of multiculturalism (shift from America as a melting pot to that of a salad bowl (Nathan Glazer)) Emphasis on: Difference. Different trajectories of Development (Friedmann, Schumacher & others). Special program for Planning in Developing Countries (MIT/Harvard). Domestically: The crisis of Democracy (Haberman); Democracies Discontent (Sandall). Lack of communication among different groups. No collective "public interest."

1980: U.S. facing business competition from Japan and the need for "international" knowledge to better compete globally ( The New Rationale). The introduction of international business practices in business schools. Some business schools begin to require new language skills at the doctoral level.

1980's (late): Collapse of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. The end of cold war and the celebration of capitalism (The "End of History" argument). This, coupled with the "Washington consensus" on development theory revives the "we are the same" argument (Example: Every country has to have Western style capitalism and democracy to flourish). America is leading the way (the winner in the cold war) and American experts are much sought after for advising internationally. The need for "international competence" to perform the advisory roles abroad. Another related goal: to reduce the shock experienced by U.S. graduates when working or traveling abroad.

The central theme: The expansion of U.S. global influence; hegemonic ideas of growth and development; the goal of international studies is to look at the world through the lens of North America.

2. Particular intellectual trajectories of Planning.

    - Post WWII emphasis on Rational Planning; and the emphasis on how developing countries should follow the U.S. model. (Rodwin, Abrahams).

    - Collapse of the hegemony of the rational model in 1960's; emergence of th multiple approaches, multi-culturalism (emerging from gains of the civil rights movement).

    - 1970's: Emergence of a new literature on "Deindustrialization" of the U.S. and global restructuring of capitalism (plants closedowns, decline of industrial cities, etc.). (Bluestone and Harrison's seminal work).

    - Emerging literature on Environmental Sustainability first within the U.S. then demonstrating the global connection of environmental issues (Brandt Commission, Susskind & others).

    - Emergence of special programs in Planning in Developing Countries (MIT/Harvard/Berkeley) (Assumption: "their" problems are different).

    - Emergence of literature on "Global Cities (Friedman, Castells, Porter, Sunkie) showing the interconnection of the global economy and its expression in particular cities (much literature on the informal economy, etc. in both U.S. cities and abroad).

    - Emergence of courses on Globalization, etc., starting in the mid 1980's.

3. There are many courses (at least 70, according to Pezzoli & Howe) on globalization: much literature, but no consistency of purpose of such courses other. Other findings of the survey:

    - Global concerns, linkages, etc. are not central or included as core courses. They are specialized courses much like the way most schools dealt with diversity issues by having special courses on gender, race, sexual orientation without including such concerns in the teaching of all courses or, at least, the core courses.
    - Planning theory focused on U.S. planning experiences although the intellectual strands are borrowed from Europe (Manheim for Friedman; Habermas for Forrester; Foucault & so on). Although Friedmann had incorporated international issues in writing Retracking America, planning theory as a field remains focused on U.S. planning experience. Bent Flyvbjerg's recent book on Denmark (Flyvbjerg, Bent (1997) *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press) is an exception. And Patsy Healey's book on communicative planning (Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning*. London: Macmillan) rejects the dominance of U.S. planning academia globally.

- Generic courses on "Planning in Developing Countries." These are over-view courses with some literature on slums, informal economy, and so on. The purpose is to show how different the problems and institutions are in developing countries.

- Specialized courses (sectoral, i.e. transportation, housing, service delivery, social policies, etc.) in the U.S. have internally no reference to either Europe or other countries of the world, although many such countries have better public policies related to such issues as public transportation, public housing, environmental legislation, social policies (unemployment benefits, child care policies and so on).

- Most courses offered are at the Masters level; virtually no specialized course for doctoral students interested in global planning. There are a few courses at the undergraduate level on cities around the world, which also emphasize the differences of between such cites and U.S. cities. It's a view of the world from the U.S. which assumes that the U.S. case is normal while others are "deviant" cases.

- Language requirement for advanced degrees – particularly at the doctoral level – has been steadily eroded One can receive a PhD with only knowledge of English. This was very different between the two wars – WWI and WWII – when the U.S. suffered intellectual inferiority vis-à-vis Europe, and many universities required the knowledge of either German or French, in addition to English, for a PhD (e.g. Harvard).

- Himi's report describes many efforts, including course offerings, special programs, special Centers for International Studies, studios and study abroad, and so on. But, the intellectual purpose of such efforts is not to encourage global understanding but the exportation of the American hegemonic view of the world and the use of the corporate model of franchising big name universities abroad to generate revenue. (See special issue of SSRC newsletter, 2002, on International Studies).

- Meanwhile, the growth and spread of information and communication technology (ICT) has created an enormous reservoir of information, data, and reports on international issues (Ex: the World Bank's portal on international issues). There is no shortage of information. The problem is the opposite: Too much information which must be navigated through.

- As a result of PAB requirements for courses on diversity (gender, race, etc.) most planning schools now offer at least one such course. But these courses are considered "specialized courses" and do not influence the core curriculum. Some of the courses on globalization are being used to meet PAB criteria on diversity. (Sen's article).

## Section II: Challenges to Planning Education Posed by 9/11

- It is a dangerous illusion to assume that the logic of globalization needs to bring the people of all countries together. Many recent events, including 9/11, suggest that the opposite may be happening (Tony Judt, "America's Restive Partners" NY Times, April 28, 2002).

- The argument that is separating the people and countries apart is the argument of "we are different."
  Examples: • "Clash of Civilizations" (Samuel Huntington).
    - Reaction against immigrants in Europe and elsewhere (Tony Judt).
    - Orientalism/Occidentalism stereotypes (Edward Said, Power, Politics & Culture, p.239).

The emphasis on "difference" which was encouraged during the 1970's onward under the banner of "post-modernism" and "multi-culturalism" did not develop from bad intentions, nevertheless, it discouraged the intellectual project of searching for "similarities" among different groups of people, both within the U.S. and between the U.S. and other countries.

- 9/11 also demonstrated the reaction to the global reach of the U.S. and how others view the U.S. It showed that the perspectives of others on America are as crucial as U.S. perspectives on others, as the United States' global engagements dramatically expand.
    - "Which word but 'empire' adequately describes the awesome thing that America is becoming?" (Michael Ignatieff, "The Burden," The NY Times Magazine, January 5, 2003, pp.22-37).
    - Results of PEW survey on how others view the U.S. (Source: "America Admired, Yet Its New Vulnerability Seen As Good Thing Say Opinion Leaders" PEW Research Center for the People & the Press, December 19, 2001).
        - Majority of the people outside the U.S. are very impressed by America's technological progress;
        - They also mention the democratic tradition of the U.S.;
        - But, they deeply resent the military power of the U.S. and its unfairness in dealing with the situations in Vietnam, Latin America (Chile, Argentina, Cuba) etc.

• Within the U.S., 9/11 poses both challenges and opportunities for Planners.

Challenges:

- Focus on "Homeland security" at a time of declining economy will divert government spending from traditional planning concerns.
- Loss (overlooking) of civil rights, racial profiling of Arab-Americans, etc.

- Withholding of visas for international students (35% of planning doctoral students are international students); and an increasing percentage of graduate students are international. Their contributions are poorly understood by policy-makers in D.C. and even by some U.S. academic administrators.
- There is an urge to follow unilateral action to protect U.S. safety concerns.

Opportunities:

- 38 billion dollars will be spent on "Homeland Security." This creates an opportunity for planners to define security in a way that brings people together, not set them further apart.
- New emphasis on international studies, with special focus on area studies (i.e. the Middle East), engineering (for reconstruction of war damaged countries such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and so on).
- New focus on issues of inequality within and among nations, and the relationship between inequality and insecurity. This allows planners to expand the notion of security from homeland to global security. Also, stress the way security is related to better knowledge of each other (Vartan Gregorian, President, Carnegie Corporation, Report of the President, Annual Report, 2001 "Islam: A Mosaic, Not a Monolith," pp.1-66).

## Objectives of Planning Education

The aim of contemporary planning education should be to reap the benefits of globalization by cultivating a new mindset which will appreciate the rights as well as the responsibilities of citizenship at multiple levels, from the local to the global. (Reference: Sen, A.. "How to Judge Globalization," The American Prospect, January 1, 2002, pp. 2-6; P. Singer, One World: The Ethics of Globalization, Yale University Press, 2002).

This will require: (a) better understanding of interlinkages and interdependencies among countries transcending the traditional "us" versus "them" approach in conceptualizing problems; (b) better judgments of problems and trends supporting some universal norms (such as Human Rights, Global Environmental Standards and so on) while opposing others (i.e. cultural homogenization); and, (c) better action strategies which will rely on collective problem solving, in contrast to unilateralist and self-serving actions which emerge from the "us versus them" approach to problem formulation.

The cultivation of such a mindset would require: (a) a more egalitarian knowledge production system about the world and the United State's particular role in it relying on co-production; (b) more deliberations regarding "rights and responsibilities" of multiple citizenship, and (c) convincing the larger public and key decision makers about the benefit of such an educational approach.

## III. Recommendations

The internationalization of planning education is not a new issue for the ACSP. ACSP had acknowledged the need as far back as the early 1980's (Presidential Speech by Don Krueckeberg at ACSP). Since that speech, most ACSP presidents have acknowledged this need repeatedly (See speech by Bruce Stiftel).

In 1993, ACSP created the National Commission on Global Planning Education and out of this effort emerged the Global Planning Education Interest Group (GPEIG).

More recently, the world congress held in Shanghai in 2001 added a new momentum and the creation and expansion of GPEAN (Global Planning Education Association Network) offers a unique opportunity for ACSP to play a leadership role in influencing the quality and output of the global knowledge production system.

### (a) Specific Recommendations for ACSP

(i) ACSP should propose to other member organizations of GPEAN to join in the co-production of a global study on The State of the World's Cities and City Planning. This will expand GPEAN's current activities and will require a more intensive intellectual engagement and mutual learning among the member institutions. Each national institution, including ACSP, should propose a team of planning academics (some senior, but also some junior faculty) who should collectively frame such a study, seek funding from national governments, donor agencies and foundations (such as MacArthur, Carnegie, and others), and publicize the results in a high profile report to draw national and international attention. One major goal of such a study should be to expand our understanding of global linkages, compare the norms of service delivery in different cities, and identify a set of problems which require collective problem solving. In other words, this study should lay out a research agenda for a series of other studies to be conducted collectively by planning academics around the world.

(ii) Work closely with PAB to develop a new criterion for accreditation which will require that the core curriculum cultivates a global mindset of the kind necessary for operating in an interdependent world. This criterion cannot be met, however, by providing one, token, specialized course in Globalization or International Planning. Neither can this need be addressed by adding a few new reading materials to any existing course on racial or gender equality. In other words, to meet this new criterion, planning schools will need to rethink the core curriculum which introduce the students to the field of city and regional planning, provide over-views of procedural planning theories, and teach methodological skills for problem analysis. The revised courses should incorporate new reading materials and require new course assignments which will help cultivate an understanding of global interlinkage, familiarize the students with both universal norms and local preferences for assessing social trends, and encourage collective problem solving.

(iii) As individual planning schools and national organizations of planning schools from abroad seek ACSP's support in various forms, including accreditation for their programs, ACSP should request such schools and organizations to offer a course on U.S. cities and city planning which would counter stereotypes of the U.S. abroad. The purpose of such a course should not be public relations of the kind currently encouraged by the U.S. State Department: such a course should be historically based, drawing on some of the key aspects of city building in the U.S., and thereby refine the views of planners abroad regarding the role of technological change, social change (such as the Civil Rights Movement) and the Women's Movement), international immigration, and local level democracy in shaping cities and city planning in the U.S. Such a course, if well structured, can play a very important role in facilitating a better understanding of the U.S.

To develop such a course about the U.S., and its many linkages to the world, ACSP should organize a national competition and give an award for the best course which should also be posted, with lectures as well as reading materials, on ACSP's website. Many foundations or government agencies (including USAID) will be eager to fund such an effort. ACSP may allocate a special session at the annual ACSP conference for the top three finalists to present their courses to the jury and to a large audience. Since the reading materials for such a course have to be updated frequently, ACSP can hold this competition every two to three years, and provide the material to planning schools abroad for a small fee. ACSP may require planning schools abroad seeking accreditation that such a course must be included in their curriculum.

**(b) Recommendations for GPEIG (Global Planning Educators Interest Group)**

(i) GPEIG should launch an initiative, with financial support from ACSP, to prepare a short report (a brochure?) which will document the benefits of: (a) enrollment of international students in the U.S. planning schools; (b) international exposure of domestic faculty; and, (c) cooperation with planning schools abroad (in the form of joint studies and such other efforts) in altering the view of the U.S. from abroad.

This report should go beyond the traditional documentation of financial benefits to U.S. planning schools as a result of international students' enrollment and document their intellectual impact, particularly at the doctoral level where nearly 30% of enrolled students are international.
The main purpose of this report will be to solicit the support of national and state level policy-makers and university administrators for the internationalization of planning programs. The report can draw inspiration from APA's International Division's recently published report (2nd edition) on International Careers for American Planners, and, in fact, draw on interviews with some of the influential practicing planners.

(ii) GPEIG should work closely with ACSP in adding a new section on Global Planning in the guide for Graduate Schools of Planning. The purpose of such a section will be two-fold. First, it should provide a concise over-view of the different types and levels of efforts by planning schools regarding internationalization of planning curriculum. This will be helpful for not only prospective students but also for administrators (Deans and Department Heads) who may want to orient their programs toward specific target groups of students. In other words, GPEIG should collect and synthesize information on the internationalization activities and efforts of all planning schools so that individual schools may use such information to strategize what particular role may best fit their faculty capabilities and interests.

(iii) GPEIG should be encouraged to organize a one-day workshop, perhaps a day prior to or after the annual ACSP conference, on the theme of global planning. Modeled after the popular Fannie Mae workshop, or the workshop organized by the Computer Resource Group, such an effort every year should draw on the faculty from small, medium, and large planning schools for the following purposes: First, to formulate a strategy whereby acute resource inequalities among ACSP member schools, with regard to international planning expertise, can be equalized somewhat, either through faculty exchange programs or other ways which would offer the opportunity to both the students and faculty in small and medium sized programs to tap the resources of the bigger programs. One possible strategy may be to create a consortium of schools, probably on a regional basis, which may offer annual workshops or collectively organize studios abroad. Such collective efforts may be more efficient than each individual school organizing their own studios abroad.

A second objective of such regional workshops should be to generate innovative course material on international issues which could be incorporated in the teaching of core courses. This is necessary if the core curriculum has to be modified to incorporate an international outlook. To achieve this objective, GPEIG should invite to the workshop not only faculty whose research and teaching interests are focused on international issues, but also those faculty who are more familiar with U.S. domestic issues but would like to expand their intellectual outlook. GPEIG may want to give an annual award for the most creative effort to expand a U.S. domestically oriented course to incorporate international issues on a comparative basis.

**(c) Recommendation for Individual Planning Programs**

(i) In re-designing the core curriculum to respond to the intellectual needs of our times, planning schools should appreciate the different intellectual needs at the undergraduate, Masters, and doctoral levels.

At the undergraduate level, the emphasis should be on the cultivation of a global mindset which will appreciate the need for multiple citizenships at multiple levels,

ranging from the local to the global. Relying on examples of cities and regions, both in the U.S. and elsewhere in the world, such courses should be taught by the departments' best teachers who are capable of engaging undergraduate students through multi-media presentations. The broad objective of such courses should be to cultivate an awareness of global interdependencies and to generate an appreciation of similarities among peoples of the world despite the apparent differences in income, physical appearance, and so on. Since there is no proven method of developing such a course, there will have to be some experimentation which should be encouraged by Department Heads. In the long run, a well-developed course of this kind will help recruit undergraduate students to Masters level programs in city and regional planning.

At the Masters level, all core courses should begin to incorporate new reading material with examples from other countries. In re-designing such courses, planning schools should take advantage of the resources available for "Homeland Security" (38 billion dollars, nationally) and propose to co-teach courses with faculty from natural sciences and Engineering. Why should planning faculty seek cooperation with faculty from Science and Engineering and not social sciences or humanities, one may ask? The answer is that natural sciences and engineering studies are based on universal approaches to knowledge building which is the appropriate mode for our task at hand. In designing such courses, planning schools should focus on particular problems facing their own regions – i.e. water scarcity in the U.S. Southwest, problems of mountain erosion in the Northwest, and so on. Joining hands with natural scientists and engineers, planning faculty and students should search for solutions to such specific problems drawing from experience around the world. This will create intellectual differentiation among the planning schools, and will advance our understanding of global issues beyond the kind of general approach which marks many of the existing courses on International Planning.

A second approach at the Masters level should be to rethink the purpose and structure of international courses and studios offered by U.S. planning schools abroad. Such courses and studios offer the opportunity to engage in collective problem-solving of the kind necessary to inculcate the spirit of global citizenship. Fortunately, the availability of new information/communication technologies has made it easier for U.S. students and faculty to communicate regularly with students and faculty from around the world. If properly used, such technologies can now demonstrate well spatial as well as other connections among different countries. An example of such effective use of information/communication technology is the Regional Workbench Consortium (RWBC), a global network of university and community-based partners dedicated to improving the quality and visibility of planning and planning education. The RWBC is developing new tools for information integration and sharing at regional and global scales--including GIS, scientific visualization, multimedia narratives, collaborative groupware, and quality of life indicators. The primary geographic focus (taking into account the dynamic interplay of local-global forces), is the U.S.-Mexico border region with a

special emphasis on equity and sustainability in the San Diego-Tijuana city-region. (For more details, see http://www.regionalworkbench.org/html/mission.html.)

Yet another way planning schools can cultivate a global mindset is by building on and further strengthening those existing courses, which evoke issues of global interconnections and their differential impact on localities around the world. As we mentioned earlier, there are some existing courses on global economic restructuring and regional development, environmental sustainability, and World cities to introduce students to the issue of global interconnection. These courses can be built upon to cultivate a new sensibility of multiple citizenships, which will help the students to better understand their rights as well as responsibilities as citizens at various levels, ranging from the local to the global.

At the Doctoral level, there is a need for advanced research methodology courses which would prepare well the doctoral students to conduct rigorous comparative research. It seems that, even though the focus of doctoral research has changed significantly over the last thirty years with increasing numbers of students studying the emergence and consequences of an increasingly interconnected world, the methods of their research inquiries, both quantitative and qualitative, have not evolved much from the earlier modes. There is very little experimentation with new research methodologies for comparisons, and most academic journals do not encourage unorthodox research methodologies which do not fit traditional styles of scholarship. Since doctoral education is intended to produce future researchers and scholars in the field, it is important to deliberate what kind of research methodologies are appropriate to demonstrate the similarities as well as differences among peoples of the world. One way some scholars of social sciences have addressed this need is to educate doctoral students in historical analysis of the kind which demonstrates multiple connections, including financial, cultural, demographic, technological, and so on, among places which may now appear to be totally different in all aspects (See research by Charles Tilly, Theda Skocpol). Such historical analysis cannot be learned without formal training. In fact, to master such sophisticated methodologies one needs to spend more time and effort than what is necessary for learning traditional research techniques.

(ii) Planning programs have to provide incentives to faculty to revamp old curricula and develop new courses. In this regard, there is much to learn from previous experiences during the 1960's when Centers for International Studies were established in some of the leading private as well as public universities. The Ford Foundation had played a key role in providing resources to encourage U.S. faculty to travel abroad, conduct fieldwork-based research, support doctoral students and develop new courses. Similar levels of support will be necessary now if planning schools are to encourage their current faculty to make significant changes in the curriculum. Since the new approach we are advocating is yet to take a particular form, it will require much experimentation. Planning schools will have to

encourage such experimentation by allocating resources, both financial and administrative, and by acknowledging the demands of time and effort such changes are likely to require from faculty members. These factors should be considered explicitly during deliberations of faculty promotion cases; and traditional criterion for promotions (such as refereed publications), have to be refined somewhat to take into account the extra time that will be needed for conducting the new type of research and teaching.

Incidentally, we are not the first group to recommend this approach. The National Commission on Global Approaches to Planning Education had proposed this policy as far back as 1994. It will be important to understand the institutional reasons why such changes have not been made in most planning schools, particularly in the large schools with clear emphasis on international planning issues. Appropriate responses to such institutional barriers have to be formulated.

(iii) We want to conclude this report by reemphasizing two issues mentioned briefly earlier:
First, our proposal to internationalize planning curriculum should not be implemented by shifting and lowering the level of support for current courses on domestic diversity issues, particularly with regards to race and gender. As we mentioned earlier, some planning schools include international planning concerns under the umbrella of their domestic diversity oriented courses. Although there is much to be learned from the struggle for racial and gender equality within the U.S., in cultivating a new global mindset, all such issues cannot be addressed in any one course. In such a situation, there is a danger that limited institutional resources may get redirected from domestic diversity courses to global planning issues. If this were to happen, it would be a major mistake which will eventually hurt both concerns. Because, to enhance global understanding, one needs to first understand the reasons for social differentiations within ones own immediate territory. Without that understanding of domestic differentiation and its adverse impact on social harmony, it is unlikely that we will be able to cultivate an appreciation for diversity at the global level. That means planning schools have to allocate new resources for internationalization of planning curriculum without taking away resources from traditional diversity oriented courses. Similarly, the PAB, in reviewing the curriculum of planning programs, should be aware of this possible adverse trend and not be complacent with one token course on diversity which addresses a range of issues from domestic race relations to global views of the U.S.

(iv) It is obvious that planning programs will need new and additional resources to transform current curriculum to meet the new challenges of our times. The question is: who will provide such resources? If planning departments request such resources from university administrations, how likely are they to receive additional funds for new course development? At a time when most state budgets are being reduced, and private universities are experiencing a sharp decline in

return on their endowment investments, what will it take for planning departments to generate the necessary resources?

We propose that planning departments have to form alliances with other academic departments to jointly put forward intellectually inspiring proposals to the administration. In most universities with international studies programs, such activities are increasingly being centralized under a center or equivalent administrative unit, which is usually managed by either the School of Humanities or Social Sciences. However, social sciences have not been particularly effective in internationalizing their curriculum. In fact, the ideological debates raging within the social sciences and, to some extent, even within the humanities, have made it very difficult to internationalize the curriculum in the way it is necessary to address collective problems. Meanwhile, engineering and natural sciences have moved forward in their traditional universal way without taking any overtly ideological stance on the issue of globalization. It's our recommendation that planning departments should form alliances with natural sciences and engineering departments in looking for solutions to problems particular to their regions. Analysis of such problems will provide the window of intellectual opportunity to probe larger issues of global interconnectedness. It will also facilitate the creation of specialized knowledge of specific problems, may that be water shortages, soil erosion, or such other "natural problems." It's by addressing specific problems that planning academics and students will eventually be able to understand the complex relationship between local problems and global solutions.