

Diversity and North American Planning Curricula: The Need for Reform

Siddhartha Sen
Graduate Program in City and Regional Planning
Morgan State University

Résumé

Depuis quelques années, le domaine d'aménagement Nord-américain (professionnel et académique) a reconnu le besoin d'incorporer et d'intégrer les questions de diversité multiculturelle au sein des programmes et curriculum d'aménagement. L'une des tâches les plus importantes que confrontent les enseignants Nord-américain, est de développer un environnement d'études qui rencontre les défis d'une société multiculturelle. Bien qu'une réforme complète de l'enseignement de l'aménagement urbain exige le recrutement actif et la préservation d'un corps enseignant et étudiant multiculturel, cela exige également la réforme de programmes d'études. À plus forte raison qu'il n'y a aucune garantie qu'un corps enseignant et étudiant multiculturel promouvra la diversité culturelle au sein de l'enseignement de l'aménagement urbain. Ainsi, il importe d'analyser les différentes approches visant à incorporer la diversité multiculturelle dans la planification de programmes d'études. Cet article est une enquête de recherches exploratoire basée sur l'analyse de la littérature actuelle sur la diversité multiculturelle au sein de l'enseignement de l'aménagement urbain. L'analyse présente plusieurs catégories d'approches et thèmes qui incorporent la diversité multiculturelle aux États-Unis. L'article se termine avec quelques réflexions sur l'intégration de la diversité multiculturelle.

Mots clés: Diversité multiculturelle, Différence, Programme d'aménagement, Alternative pédagogique

Canadian Journal of Urban Research, Volume 14, Issue 1, Supplement pages 121-144.
Copyright © 2005 by the Institute of Urban Studies
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.
ISSN: 1188-3774

Abstract

In recent times, leading North American planning educators as well as practitioners have recognized the need to incorporate and integrate issues of diversity into planning curricula. One of the biggest tasks facing North American planning educators is to develop learning environments that meet the challenges of a diverse and just society. Although a total reform of planning education warrants active recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and student body, and a supportive academic environment to nurture them, it also includes curriculum reform because there is no guarantee that a non-white or female faculty and student body will promote diversity in planning education. Thus, it is useful to explore approaches to incorporate diversity in planning curricula. This article is an exploratory inquiry that seeks to do so by analyzing the existing literature on diversity in planning education and presenting 'categories of approaches' and 'themes' to incorporating diversity in the US. It concludes with some reflections on integrating diversity that arise from the study.

Key words: Diversity, Difference, Planning Education, Redistributive Justice, Alternative Planning Pedagogy

Introduction

In recent times, leading North American¹ planning educators as well as practitioners (Rodriguez 1992; Friedmann and Kuester 1994; Thomas 1996; Burayidi 2000; Wolfe 2003; Sandercock 2003; Goonewardena et al. 2004; Milroy 2004; Rahder and Milgrom 2004) have recognized the need to incorporate issues of diversity into planning curricula. They believe that such change is necessary in order to transform planning education to suit the diverse society of the twenty-first century.

Defining diversity is difficult and complex. Diversity encompasses multiple dimensions including identities that arise due to differences of race, gender, class, ethnicity, culture, nationality, region, family background, education, sexual preferences, physical disability, cognitive style, worldviews, religion, and age. The definition of diversity should not be limited to the simple acknowledgement of the existence of diverse groups, but must rigorously explore the relationship between diversity and issues of socio-economic and cultural justice (Goonewardena et al. 2004; Rahder and Milgrom 2004).

A brief clarification of some frequently employed terms may usefully preface the discussion. The terms sex and gender refer to classification of persons into male or female. Following feminist scholars (Roy 2001), they also refer to socially constructed differences between men and women. Feminist refers to the social movement that advocates for women the same rights granted to men in political, economic, cultural, spatial, and public spheres of life and recognition of identity and difference that gender brings. A feminist perspective on planning issues would consist of critiques of planning that emphasize the difference that gender makes and strive for recognition and redistribute justice (Roy 2001; Goonewardena et al. 2004), while a gender-informed perspective would build awareness of these differences. The word ‘incorporation’ implies inclusion of diversity topics into course and curricular content, while ‘integration’ refers to making such topics an integral part of curriculum and course content. Diversity topics can be awareness generating and informative (e.g. gender informed planning) or critical (e.g. feminist critiques of planning).

In order to understand why North American planning education should be concerned with diversity, we need to understand why planning practice must embrace difference. First, as Canadian cities, suburbs, and exurbs become more socially and culturally diverse due to immigration, aging, physical ability, sexual preferences, class differences and other factors, planners must develop critical analytical skills to understand, empathize, and work with diverse communities (Goonewardena et al. 2004; Rahder and Milgrom 2004). Furthermore, given the multicultural policies adopted by the Canadian government since the early 1970s, and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988, planners need to recognize that accommodating difference is national policy. This is especially important because the Canadian Government’s multicultural programs have fallen short of the promises and mandates of the 1988 Act, which goes beyond the narrow definition of cultural diversity (Goonewardena et al. 2004). Primarily framed in ethno-cultural terms, the Act also mandates equality in economic, social, and political arenas of Canadian society for individuals of all origins and seeks their full participation in Canadian society. Although cities in the United States (US) are as diverse as Canadian ones, US discourses on diversity are somewhat one-dimensional and still rooted in slavery, civil rights, affirmative action, and turbulent racial relations between African Americans and Whites (Thomas and Ritzdorf 1997). Hence, Americans need to develop more multidimensional discourses on diversity, akin to

the Canadian ones (Goonewardena et al. 2004; Milroy 2004; Rahder and Milgrom 2004).

Second, if planning is to maintain its cherished tradition of equality and equity and the need to shape the public interest, it must abandon its modernist and liberal view and recognize difference. Substantive equality needs to be achieved where differences such as culture, gender, physical ability, and sexual orientation are in play (Milroy 2004). As Milroy reminds us, resource distribution is just one dimension of justice. The other is recognition. Recognition involves not only ethno-cultural difference, but differences that arise from multiple dimensions of diversity. Public interest must also be redefined to understand that 'multiple publics' or a 'heterogeneous public' now reflects our cities' diversity (Sandercock 1995, 1998).

Given this situation, one of the biggest tasks facing North American planning educators is to develop learning environments that meet the challenges of a diverse and just society. Planning educators need to bring fuller treatment of and sensitivity to issues of race, gender, class, ethnicity, culture, nationality, region, family background, education, sexual preferences, physical disability, cognitive style, worldviews, religion, and age and articulate them to redistribute social justice in educating planners (Thomas 1996; Thomas and Ritzdorf 1997; Burayidi 2000; Goonewardena et al. 2004; Milroy 2004; Rahder and Milgrom 2004). Although a total reform of planning education warrants active recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and student body, and a supportive academic environment to nurture them, it also includes curriculum changes (Forsyth 1995; Thomas 1996; Goonewardena et al. 2004). While demographic diversity is important, there is no guarantee that a non-White or female faculty and student body will promote diversity in planning education. We need a systemic curricular reform to bring diversity to the forefront. Such curriculum reform no longer deals with diversity by adding diversity issues in our courses or reciting mantras about the importance of diversity. Instead, it integrates diversity into the curriculum and understands the variations in teaching styles that diversity brings (Ritzdorf 1993; Friedmann and Kuester 1994; Forsyth 1995; Thomas 1996).

Thus, it is useful to explore approaches to incorporating diversity in the planning curriculum. This article analyzes literature on diversity in planning education, engaging the discussion that took place recently in this journal, and presents 'categories of approaches' and 'themes' to incorporating diversity in American planning schools. It concludes with some reflections on integrating diversity that arise from the study.

Methodology

The study is exploratory in nature and attempts to present categories of approaches and themes used among planning schools. I employed multiple methods for the research. These included literature review; collection, content analysis, and critical assessment of course outlines; open-ended interviews with department chairs and planning educators who have taught such courses; electronic mail correspondence with department chairs and educators² and my experience of teaching at a Historically Black institution (HBCU).³

The course outlines were collected over a period of 10 years to develop a sense of history behind the development of the curriculum. The process was started in the Spring of 1995 by requesting department chairs of accredited graduate planning programs in the US to send me outlines of courses that included a “diversity” element.⁴ Due to the poor response, I again requested the chairs of those programs that did not respond to send me these outlines in the Fall of 1995. I re-requested the course outlines from non-respondents in the Fall of 1997 and the Fall of 1998. Finally, my request to planning educators and chairs in Fall of 2004 and Spring of 2005 yielded positive results. I also examined course outlines available at program websites on the Internet during the Summer of 2001, Fall of 2004, and Spring of 2005. The web pages with complete course outlines not only helped me to examine new courses, but also provided updated versions of several syllabi. As I was seeking to get a sense of history, I analyzed courses from only those programs for which I had course outlines from the mid-1990s. A cursory glance at web sites of planning programs that are not included here indicates that diversity courses taught in these programs are similar to those included for analysis. In doing a convenience sampling I attempted to include various types of planning programs in terms of size, age, and geographic dispersion (see Appendix A).

That a large number of the diversity courses are taught by international faculty, women, and minorities with a research interest in diversity issues increases the significance of undertaking such an analysis. Many White faculty members who teach the courses have a research interest in race and gender issues or have been champions for promoting these issues in their schools. Appendix A lists the courses, the faculty that taught them, and the latest academic year for which I had the course outlines. Courses examined were taught at accredited planning programs in the US from the early-1990s to 2005.

The analytical inspiration for the critical assessment and content analysis of the courses draws on Pezzoli and Howe's (2001) analysis of courses on globalization and Klosterman's (1981, 1992) examination of planning theory courses. The analysis attempted to look at functional specializations where diversity is incorporated; whether diversity topics were given a 'primary' or 'partial' emphasis; changes in course requirements, contents, and readings over ten years; topics covered; whether topics were informative or critical; and the course formats and requirements.

The analytical framework for the interviews was drawn from critical ethnography (Van Maanen 1988; Forester 1993; Weiss 1995; Schensul et al. 1999). Interviews were conducted between the Fall of 2003 and the Summer of 2004 with 14 chairs and educators. Although interviewing chairs presented some limitations, many of the chairs were international migrants, people of color, or scholars with an interest in diversity. The interviews were conducted to shed light on how diversity is incorporated at US schools and how curricula are generated and changed. The questions also addressed institutional and external factors that led to integration and incorporation of diversity in the curriculum. Convenience sampling was employed for the interviews. I made an attempt to include various types of planning programs in terms of size, age, and geographic dispersion (see Appendix B). Such a methodological approach relies on qualitative interpretative inquiry and seeks to understand the unique and contextual: it does not permit generalized propositions. I did find certain salient distinct categories of approaches or themes as discussed below.

Review of the Literature on Diversity in Planning Education

Canadian debates on diversity in planning education provide a useful comparison with US discourses on the topic. The unique contribution of Goonewardena et al. (2004) lies in reviewing the relevancy of critical feminist theories of difference to understand diversity and relating them to planning pedagogy and practice. They situate their analysis in the context of multicultural policies adopted by the Canadian government since the 1970s and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988. They argue that planning programs have an obligation to address diversity for two reasons. First, based on recruitment and admission practices, planning schools determine

whether graduates who are future practicing planners represent the diversity of cities where they will practice. Demographic diversification of planning programs not only ensures that faculty and students reflect the urban region but also creates an intellectual environment that embraces diversity of opinions on the nature and role of planning. Second, universities train and educate planners who will practice in diverse cities. Whether graduates can address the situation in a way that challenges social-economic and cultural forms of injustice depend on how well planning curricula provide them with analytical capabilities to grasp urban issues in relation to multiple dimensions of diversity.

The analysis by Goonewardena et al. (2004) also provides a framework for self-reflective institutional reform. Ensuring the representation of urban populations in planning programs involves understanding the nature of diversity of the region and the city where programs are located. It also includes a critical awareness of the relationship between the socio-economic and cultural forms of injustice associated with regional forms of difference. A second order of self-reflection would require an examination of existing recruitment, admissions and retention practices in order to understand who gains admission and succeeds in planning programs and who gets excluded. A faculty recruitment strategy requires not only the demographic diversity of the candidates, but their capacity and willingness to address diversity issues substantively in teaching, curriculum development, community service, and research. Curriculum development and consideration of a planning program's relationship with the wider community are integral to diversification of programs. Students need to be provided with a solid grounding in various approaches to understanding and analyzing diversity.

The critique by Goonewardena et al. (2004) of the advocacy and equity tradition of planning is also informative. Concerns with race, social justice, advocacy, and equality entered the planning profession in the 1960s, with volumes written on progressive planning practice and theory (Davidoff 1965; Davidoff et al. 1970; Friedmann 1973). However, Goonewardena et al. (2004) point out that advocacy and equity planners viewed justice in socio-economic terms and carved an expert role for planners in implementing redistributive solutions to urban as well as social problems. By retaining faith in the planner's expertise, advocacy and equity planners committed the cultural injustice of non-recognition: they failed to involve marginal groups directly in planning processes.

Rahder & Milgrom (2004) argue that planners need to move beyond managing diversity as an interpretation of Canada's multicultural policies and instead to respond to the needs of diverse cities. They argue that planners should see social, cultural, and ethnic differences from the perspective of various communities involved and develop skills for learning and working with communities to achieve diverse human possibilities and make space for difference. They critically examine how modernist planning has tended to homogenize urban space and silence many users. They criticize communicative planning theory (despite its contribution of opening the issue of voice) because of its failure to address intercultural relations. They argue for redistributive justice that would require planning to address the diversity of needs expressed by different communities and to close the growing gap between opulence and poverty. So far as planning education is concerned, they believe new knowledge and skills will emerge from praxis and recommend adding popular education to the planning curriculum for facilitating social change. Such an education would urge planning educators and students to resist the logic of market relations and to avoid the role of expert. Planning educators should train students with critical skills to deal within the uncertainty of the ever-changing city, promote redistributive justice, and instill an openness to discovering the path by walking with others.

Milroy's (2004) comments are also useful in understanding the Canadian contribution to the literature on diversity, as distribution and recognition are tightly interwoven in spatial context in today's diverse cities. Other Canadian educators agree. For example Wolfe (2003) urged educators to inculcate an environmental ethic that includes social sustainability and the eradication of poverty. Thus, the notion of justice has shifted from a liberal one to one that recognizes multiple dimensions of diversity. The recognition of this shift, the critical analysis of the relationship between diversity and socio-economic and cultural justice, and the pleas to promote redistribute justice constitute a unique contribution of the Canadian literature.

Among US scholars, Thomas (1996) and Forsyth's (1995) work are most critical. Thomas calls for a unified diversity to avoid the disjointed pluralism of race, ethnicity, gender, nationality, and the lack of clarity about how to handle it all. Her work is of special importance because it provides concrete thoughts on curriculum areas where one could introduce diversity issues. These include courses on urban society, planning history and theory, ethics, law/land use/zoning, quantitative

methods, planning analysis, field studies, community service-oriented courses and guided internships. Specialty areas such as housing, land use, economic development, urban design, environmental planning, and transportation could also incorporate diversity issues.

Thomas' notion of using community service courses or service learning to incorporate diversity by exposing students to low-income and racially diverse communities has been reiterated by several planning educators in the US (Forsyth et al. 1999a, 1999b, 2000; Dewar and Isaac 1998; Reardon 1998). Service learning involves practical work with communities primarily in a setting outside the university: applied to low-income and diverse communities, it contributes to teaching diversity (Forsyth et al. 2000). By conducting studios in diverse communities, planning educators can increase awareness of White or middle-class students of cultures other than their own. Canadian scholars have also reinforced this notion. For, example Goonewardena et al.'s (2004) reference to the planning program's relationship to the wider community and Rahder & Milgrom's (2004) suggestion to add popular education can certainly be operationalized into service learning.

Forsyth (1995) warns that diversity can no longer be recited as a 'mantra.' "Saying class-race-and-gender (all in one breath) avoids the difficult problem of analyzing when, how, and if each one is important, and how they interact"(Forsyth 1995, 60). Like Canadian scholars, Forsyth recognizes the multiple dimensions of diversity and urges curricular reform. Despite her critique of the 'add and stir' approach, she acknowledges its place as a beginning in teaching. As she correctly points out, adding a reading or using different variable in a database or varying assignment topics brings another set of voices into the conversation, raises another set of questions, and exposes some gaps.

The US literature includes individual accounts of approaches to incorporating diversity (Ritzdorf 1993; Washington and Strong 1997; Forsyth et al. 1999a, 1999b). These articles may be useful to academics grappling with the issue of incorporating diversity in courses. Ritzdorf (1993) for example, provides a useful account of a class, 'Women in Planning and Public Policy,' in which she and her students employed non-traditional methods to study planning and public policy issues of significance to their lives as women. Each week the class discussed a different problem for women from planning and the public policy arena. Ritzdorf derives three pedagogical lessons that are transferable to other situations. First, faculty must learn to listen to the students. Second, students benefit from creative writing assignments. In a gender-wise

and ethnically diverse classroom, planning educators need to develop and use methods, which are not just technical and task-oriented. All students can benefit from assignments that allow them to interpret their own life experiences within a larger social or political context and relate them to the task at hand. Third, faculty should nurture differences in the classroom. In her case, she tried to create an atmosphere of trust where students of different backgrounds and opinions felt comfortable discussing controversial issues and choices.

Looye & Sesay (1998) provide a useful strategy for incorporating new materials dealing with diversity issues into existing courses at the University of Cincinnati's School of Planning. The essence of the strategy was to work with faculty members to analyze current syllabi for diversity content, and use library resources to identify sources that covered the same content while addressing issues of diversity. The search strategy for diversity material provided by Looye and Sesay in the appendix of the article is useful and easily adaptable to any modern library electronic database.

Categories of Approaches and Themes of Incorporating Diversity in Planning Curriculum

This section presents underlying categories and themes behind the incorporation of diversity in the planning curriculum. These emerged from content analysis and a critical assessment of 78 courses, and analysis of the interviews. The major categories and themes that emerged are: approaches and strategies adopted to incorporate diversity; factors behind the incorporation of diversity; and impediments to incorporation of diversity.

Approaches and Strategies Adopted to Incorporate Diversity

Three distinct approaches to incorporating diversity in planning curricula have been adopted by US planning schools. The first is to have a specialized course on diversity. Some schools have taken advantage of specialized courses that exist in related programs by cross-listing them or making them available to their students. A minor variation to this approach is to have specialization areas such as 'international planning' and/or 'housing and community development' that focus on diversity. The second way is to have one or more specialized courses on diversity while also integrating these issues throughout the curriculum.

The third way is to not to have any specialized courses, but integrate diversity throughout the curriculum.

Specialized courses on diversity existed in many schools since the mid-1990s and even date back to the late-1970s in some schools. The practice of having one specialized course or a specialized area is becoming rare. Most schools address these issues to some extent somewhere in the core curriculum. Specialized courses in diversity are not desirable since they would attract only students who are interested in the issues. However, as pointed out by one chair, offering a special course can bring attention to diversity issues and give such concerns a boost in a department. He continued that such a course is initially helpful, but later on these issues should be integrated into the curriculum (especially the core curriculum). The syllabi that incorporate diversity can be classified into the following functional categories: specialized courses on diversity; international planning /comparative planning; housing, community development and neighbourhood planning; planning theory and history; urban and regional theory/regional planning; public policy; environmental planning, land use, and growth management; urban design and physical planning; economic development; ethics; and computer applications. Besides specialized diversity courses, international planning/comparative planning, housing /community development / neighbourhood planning, and planning history and theory courses were the predominant vehicles for introducing diversity in the early- to mid-1990s and they still fulfill this role. However, by the early 2000s, the number of courses, as well as the functional specializations that incorporated diversity, had increased significantly.

There are two distinct ways in diversity is being incorporated in planning courses in the US. First, in some courses diversity topics had a 'primary' or 'partial' emphasis. The emphasis on diversity topics was classified as primary if diversity was indeed the focus of the course and all topics dealt with it throughout the semester/quarter. The emphasis was classified as partial if the course devoted a few weeks to diversity topics. For example, the planning history and theory courses were classified as courses with a partial emphasis on diversity if some attention was given to issues of: women's participation in urban reform at the turn of the century; equity, advocacy and participatory planning; feminist ethics and ethics related to race; critical and post-modern theories of planning as it relates to race and justice in cities; feminist planning theory; existence of multiple voices in planning theory and practice; and the need for pluralist planning for today's multicultural cities. In contrast, planning history and theory courses that completely focused

on the above topics were classified as courses with a primary emphasis on alternative topics.

On another level courses may be classified as those that introduce diversity from a critical analytical perspective and those that are awareness generating and informative. For example a course that incorporates women's housing and transportation issues and safety concerns is gender informed, whereas a course that introduces feminist perspective on planning is critical analytical. Although the first approach is desirable to equip students with the analytical tools that Goonewardena et al. (2004) and Rahder & Milgrom (2004) are suggesting, the second at least eradicates the diversity-blind nature of most planning courses.

A wide array of critical as well as informative diversity topics was covered in these courses. These included racial and ethnic relations in the cities and the planning profession; globalization and its impact on race, gender, urban form, and poverty in cities; racial and gender discrimination and inequity in transportation planning; poverty and informality; feminist planning theory; existence of multiple voices in planning theory and practice; the need for pluralist planning for today's multicultural cities; gender issues in international development; planning ethics in national and international contexts; equity and advocacy planning; homelessness, residential segregation, and housing discrimination; radical, ethnic, and feminist perspectives on housing and community development; and other critical/post-modern theories of race and justice in cities.

In order to incorporate diversity in the curriculum, one must understand the variation in teaching styles that diversity brings (Ritzdorf 1993; Friedmann and Kuester 1994; Forsyth 1995; Thomas 1996). The analysis revealed that some course requirements were attentive to alternative pedagogy. These included requiring the students to write papers which delineated in a fairly specific way personal environmental ethics or philosophy; to visit a community to determine community needs through discussions with neighbourhood leaders; to participate in tours led by community leaders; to work with a neighbourhood association to develop a statement of priorities for the neighbourhood; to conduct interviews; and to employ ethnographic methods. Since the mid-1990s, significant changes in course requirements, contents, and readings were incorporated in many courses. Later versions of most courses introduced newer readings on the topic or newer methods of instruction such as videos and films, and use of fieldwork. Some educators were also attentive to different learning styles that diversity brings, while many

courses drew attention to divergent ways in which people may participate in planning.

Factors Behind the Incorporation of Diversity

The development of specialized courses on diversity as well as integration of diversity in the curriculum are attributable to faculty interest and demographic composition, departmental philosophy and history, demand for such courses, departmental leadership, location of the school and external factors. A nexus of diverse faculty who are interested in diversity issues can lead to the development of specialized courses as well as integration of diversity issues in the planning curriculum. However, it is not the case that only women and faculty of color are instrumental in the development of such courses. White, male faculty members have also been champions of diversity issues in many US planning schools.

A diverse student population can lead to the development of courses that consider diversity. A diverse class creates pressure on the instructor to discuss issues of diversity. Faculty interest and demographic composition determine the dimensions in which diversity is introduced. For example, my own experience at an HBCU indicates that our approach to diversity is focused on race (especially African Americans), given faculty interest and composition. Departmental philosophy and history play an important role in incorporating diversity. For example, our program has a philosophy and history of serving the underprivileged (mainly African-American) community in Baltimore because of its location, urban mission, and heritage as a HBCU. Naturally, we integrate race in our entire curriculum and meet the university's urban mission thorough classroom projects. HBCUs do an excellent job in integrating diversity as it relates to race because of their history and mandate. In this context, institutional priorities provide a rationale for diversifying planning curricula. Schools with an urban mission could take the advantage of the mission to diversify curricula as was done at HBCUs. The same is true for land grant institutions that have had a long history of extension work: service learning can effectively integrate diversity issues and approaches.

A demand from the student body for courses that embrace diversity has led to their development in schools with a less diverse, but informed student body. The leadership also plays a significant role in shaping the dimensions in which diversity is incorporated. The school's location often

has a strong influence on incorporation of diversity in the curriculum. If the school were located in a diverse city, it would make no sense to only use planning examples from White-American society. In cases where schools are located in campus towns, faculty and student interest and demand for these courses have played a significant role behind their development. External factors, such as the changing nature of race relations in US cities, also led to the development of such courses. Finally, many undergraduate diversity courses may have been developed to meet the changing nature of the general education requirements at the undergraduate level in the US.

Impediments to Incorporation of Diversity

Shortage of faculty is a major deterrent to teaching specialized courses on diversity. Faculty has to first cover the core curriculum before teaching specialty courses. As a result specialized courses have not been offered at some schools for some time. Similarly, faculty turnover has resulted in some courses being not offered. Furthermore, some universities have a will to teach specialized courses on diversity, while others keep courses in their records but never teach them. Faculty members may not be interested in teaching the courses. Faculty at prestigious and bigger schools may believe that they do not need to teach diversity: their arrogance arises from the notion that their students are bright enough to be able to sort out prejudices that they encounter and be sensitive to diversity issues on the job. Such faculty may argue that the curriculum should focus on teaching methods and theories of planning.

Concluding Remarks

Several approaches to incorporating diversity emerged from the study. US discourses on diversity are historically rooted in slavery, civil rights, affirmative action, and turbulent racial relations between African-Americans and Whites, although newer discourses are emerging that are attentive to many dimensions of diversity. US planning schools can learn from the Canadian emphasis on multiple dimensions of diversity. In fact, the absence of courses that deal with abilism and sexual identity validates the suggestion that broader approaches are required.

It is clear that a total reform of a planning education warrants active recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and student body, and a supportive academic environment to nurture them, but it also

warrants curriculum changes. Demographic diversity is important in those teaching and studying planning, but there is no guarantee that a non-White or female faculty and student body will promote diversity in planning education. We need a systemic curricular reform that integrates diversity into the core planning curriculum. Our approach should not be limited to simply acknowledging the existence of diverse groups, but must rigorously explore the relationship between diversity and socio-economic and cultural justice. We must also change our pedagogical philosophy and understand the variation in teaching styles that diversity brings. Faculty must nurture differences in the classroom and acknowledge the perceptions of students on diversity, rather than imposing views.

Many faculty members have developed useful pedagogical tools to teach about diversity. Some require students to write papers to delineate their own ethics. Others advocate active engagement with racially and ethnically diverse communities in studio or service learning courses. We should avoid the pitfalls of some schools' experience and not relegate diversity courses to marginal status. We need to overcome the arrogance that may detract from integrating diversity.

Curriculum reform is one of our most difficult tasks, given faculty resistance to incorporating new course material. Furthermore many planning educators and administrators are not theoretically and politically on board with the proponents of diversity. The study suggests that one way to overcome this resistance is to offer a special course on diversity that can bring attention to these issues within a department. Chairs can also manage creative ways to harness resources to teaching specialized diversity courses or cross list courses with other departments. Beginning the discussion with specialized courses is initially helpful, but greater impact will result from integrating diversity issues into the core curriculum. Even the adding and stirring approach, may be desirable in the beginning because adding a reading or varying assignment topics brings another set of voices into the conversation, raises another set of questions and exposes gaps in the discourse about diversity. Another strategy is to work with the faculty members to analyze their current syllabi for diversity content, and use library resources to identify sources that covered the same content of the course while addressing the issues of diversity. Ad hoc strategies should not be the ultimate goal. Ultimately, the goal is to make diversity a mainstream issue in planning education. Hopefully, the incremental strategies discussed above will set the momentum in achieving this ultimate goal.

The study also suggests that is essential to build a nexus of faculty who have the interest, capacity, and willingness to address diversity issues substantively in teaching, curriculum development, and community service. Similarly, we must ensure through our recruitment and admission practices that future practicing planners represent the diversity of cities where they will practice. Such strategies for demographic diversification will not only ensure that our schools reflect the urban region, but also create an intellectual environment that embraces diversity of opinions on the nature and role of planning. Ultimately institutional factors such as departmental leadership that encourages, fosters and nurtures diversity, and a departmental philosophy that is self-reflective and critical, will led to further enhancement of diversity in planning the curriculum in both countries. Whether that happens is a matter of conjecture, but planning educators can no longer ignore differences in today's multicultural cities.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the editor, Ian Skelton and the anonymous referees for their constructive criticism; Bishwapriya Sanyal and Linda C. Dalton for the encouragement and inspiration for this article; the late Gill-Chin Lim for enabling me to gain a better insight on North American planning education; all the program chairs and educators who responded to my request for courses and participated in the interviews; the PAB for its initial support; and Carla Bauer, Ashutosh S. Belgi, Clarence Chavis, Elisabeth L. Hyleck, Olumese Iyomon, Christain Pulley, Brett Ripkin, Amitabh A. Sule, and Neelapala V. Suresh for their invaluable research assistance.

Notes

¹ Although, the term North America includes other countries, here it is employed to refer to Canada and the United States.

² Electronic mail correspondence was carried out to seek clarifications on categories of approaches and themes of incorporating diversity and obtain updated course syllabi. In particular, correspondence with Enid Arvidson, Edith Barrett and James V. Cornehl of the University of Texas at Arlington; Faranak Miraftab of the UIUC; Minu Tiwari and Emil Malizia of UNC-Chapel Hill; Lourdes Beneria of Cornell University; Lawrence Vale of MIT; and Jonathan C. Levine of University of Michigan were very useful.

³Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) are generally defined as Black institutions of higher learning in the US, established prior to 1964 with the primary goal of educating African Americans. HBCUs must be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or must be making an effort to get accreditation. However, certain institutions that were established after 1964 are still designated as HBCUs by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO). See Roebuck Murty (1993) for a detailed discussion on HBCUs.

⁴ Programs that became accredited and those that lost accreditation after the mid-1990s were not included in the solicitation for syllabi.

References

- Burayidi, M. A. 2000. Tracking the planning profession: from monoistic planning to holistic planning for a multicultural society. In *Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society*, ed. M. A. Burayidi. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Davidoff, P. 1965. Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31(4): 331-338.
- Davidoff, P., L. Davidoff, and N. N. Gold. 1970. Suburban action: advocate planning for an open society. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 36 (1): 12-21.
- Dewar, M. E., and C.B. Isaac. 1998. Learning from difference: the potentially transforming experience of community-university collaboration. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (4): 334-347.
- Forester, J. 1993. On Critical Ethnography: Fieldwork in a Habermasian Way. In *Critical Management Studies*, eds. M. Alvesson and H. Wilmott. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Forsyth, A. 1995. Diversity issues in a professional curriculum: four stories and suggestions for a change. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15 (1): 58-63.
- Forsyth, A., Wu, H., and P. McGirr. 1999a. College students and youth collaboration in design: research on the design studio. *Landscape Review* 5 (2): 26-42.
- Forsyth, A., H. Wu, and P. McGirr. 1999b. Inside service learning studio in urban design. *Landscape Journal* 18 (2): 166-178.
- Forsyth, A., H. Wu, and P. McGirr. 2000. Service learning in an urban context: implications for planning and design education. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 17 (3): 236-259.

- Friedmann, J. 1973. *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.
- Friedmann, J., and C. Kuester. 1994. Planning education for the late twentieth century: an initial enquiry. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14 (1): 55–64.
- Goonewardena, K., K.N. Rankin, and S. Weinstock. 2004. Diversity and planning education: a Canadian Perspective. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 13 (1) Supplement: 1-21.
- Klosterman, R. E. 1981. Contemporary planning theory education: results of a course survey. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 1 (1): 1-11.
- Klosterman R E. 1992. Planning theory education in the 1980s: results of a second course survey. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 11(2): 130-140.
- Looye, J. W., and A. Sesay. 1998. Introducing diversity into planning curriculum: A method for department-wide implementation. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18 (2): 161-170.
- Milroy, B. M. 2004. Diversity and difference: a comment. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 13 (1) Supplement: 47-49.
- Pezzoli, K., and D. Howe. 2001. Planning pedagogy and globalization: a content analysis of Syllabi. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20 (2): 365-375.
- Rahder, B., and R. Milgrom. 2004. The uncertain city: making space(s) for difference. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 13 (1) Supplement: 27-45.
- Reardon, K. M. 1998. Enhancing the capacity of community based organizations in East St. Louis. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (4): 323-333.
- Ritzdorf, M. 1993. The fairy's tale: teaching planning and public policy in a different voice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12 (2): 99-106.
- Rodriguez, S. 1992. Schools for today, graduates for tomorrow. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 59 (2): 152–155.
- Roebuck, J. B., and K. S. Murty. 1993. *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Their Place in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Roy, A. 2001. A “public” muse: on planning convictions and feminist contentions. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21 (2): 109-126.

- Sandercock, L. 1995. Voices from the borderlands: mediation on a metaphor. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14 (2): 77-88.
- Sandercock, L. 1998. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. London, Wiley.
- Sandercock, L. 2003. Planning in the ethno-culturally diverse city: a comment. *Planning Theory and Practice* 4(3): 319-323.
- Schensul, S. L., J. J. Schensul, and M. D. Lecompte. 1999. *Essential Ethnographic Methods: Observations, Interviews, and Questionnaires* (Ethnographer's Toolkit, Vol 2). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Thomas, J. M. 1996. Educating planners: unified diversity for social action. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15 (3): 171-182.
- Thomas, J.M., and M. Ritzdorf. eds. 1997. *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Maanen, J. 1988 *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Washington, R.O., and D. Strong, 1997. A model for teaching environmental justice in a planning curriculum. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 16 (4): 280-290.
- Weiss, R. S. 1995. *Learning From Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Wolfe, J.M. 2003. Politics and Planning Schools. *Plan Canada* 43(3): 15-17.

APPENDIX A

List of courses by functional specializations and categorizations

	Institution	Type of Coverage
Specialized Courses on Diversity (N=25)		
Courses, Instructors, Academic Years		
The Political Economy of Gender and Work* (Benéria, L)(1994-1995)	Cornell	Primary/Critical
Women and the City (Blumenberg, E.) (1999-2000)	UCLA	Primary/Critical
Collaborative Problem Solving in Diverse Communities(de Soza Briggs, X) (2004-2005)	MIT	Primary/Critical
Environmental Justice (Carmin, J.A) (2004-2005)	MIT	Primary/Critical
Civil Rights and Urban Minorities (Cornelis, J) (2004-2005)**	U-Texas, Arlington	Primary/Informative
Gender and Race, Work, and Public Policy (Fried, M. & McDowell, C.) (2003-2004)	MIT	Primary/Critical
Race and Class in Urban Planning and Policy (Gills, D.) (2002-2003)	U-Illinois, Chicago	Primary/Critical
Social Inequality and Planning(Harwood, S) (2004-2005)	U-Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Primary/Critical
Race and Ethnicity in the Urban Planning Process (Heumann, L.F) (1997-1998)*	U-Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Primary/Critical
Planning for Multiple Publics (Grigsby, E. J.) (2001-2002)	UCLA	Primary/Critical
Urban Policy Impacts on Inner City Residents (Hollis, R. L.) (1998-1999)***	San Jose State	Primary/Informative
Diversity and the City (Howland, M.) (2003-2004)	U-Maryland, College Park	Primary/Informative
Asian American Communities: Race, Gender, and Planning (Hune, S.) (2000-2001)	UCLA	Primary/Critical
Race, Gender, Culture and Cities (Hune, S.) (2001-2002)	UCLA	Primary/Critical
Women and Economic Development (Isaac, C.) (2003-2004)	U-New Mexico, Albuquerque	Primary/Critical
Forces Shaping Metropolitan Environment (Jeske, K.Q) (2004-2005)	Iowa State	Primary/Informative
Race, Immigration and Planning (Jones, A) (2004-2005)	MIT	Primary/Critical
Organizing for Participation and Planning (Leavitt, J.) (2000-2001)	UCLA	Primary/Critical
The Multicultural City (Ritzdorf, M.)(1992-1993)	VPI	Primary/Critical
The Political Economy of Poverty and Inequality (Tewari, M) (2003-2004)	Chapel Hill	Primary/Informative
The Politics and Culture of Disability in the Urban Environment (Toy, A.) (2000-2001)	UCLA	Primary/Critical
Urban Diversity (Vázquez, T.) (2000-2001)*	U-Texas, Arlington	Primary/Critical
Women and Environments* I (Wasserman, J.) (1994-1995)	Arizona State	Primary/Critical
Developing a Bridge Between Cultural and Racial Differences (Williams, C.G) (1995-1996)	MIT	Primary/Informative
Diversity Issues in Planning and Design (Whitaker, A. M.) (2003-2004)	Cal Poly, Pomona	Primary/Informative

Diversity and North American Planning Curricula: The Need for Reform

International Planning (N=14)			
Gender and International Development (Beneria, L.) (2003-2004)	Cornell		Primary/Critical
Planning for Jobs, Housing and Community Services in Third World Cities (Bromley, R.) (2003-2004)	SUNY, Albany		Primary/Critical
Gender and Development (Dandekar, H.C.) (2001-2002)	U-Michigan, Ann Arbor		Primary/Critical
Infrastructure and Housing in Developing Countries (Doan, P.) (2000-2001)	Florida State		Primary/Informative
Rural Development Issues: The Peasant Economy – Old Debates, New Theory, Different World (Hect, S.) (2000-01)	UCLA		Primary/Critical
Development Theory and Developing Countries: A History of Ideas (Hect, S.) (2000-2001)	UCLA		Partial/Critical
Third World Urbanization (Kohl, B.) (2000-2001)	Cornell		Partial/Informative
International Dimensions of Environmental Planning: Ideology, Politics and Policy (Lynch, B.) (2004-2005)	Cornell		Primary/Critical
Gender and Development (Miles, R.) (2004-2005)	Florida State		Primary/Critical
Poverty and Informality in Developing (Noponen, H.) (1993-1994)	U-North Carolina, Chapel Hill		Primary/Informative
Gender and Development: Implications for Planning (Noponen, H.) (1998-1999)	U-North Carolina, Chapel Hill		Primary/Critical
Planning in Developing Countries (Owusu.F) (2002-2003)	Iowa State		Partial/Informative
World Cities and Globalization Owusu.F) (2004-2005)	Iowa State		Partial/Informative
The Political Economy of Development Projects: Developing Targeting the Poor (Tendler, J.) (1994-1995)	MIT		Primary/Informative
Housing and Community Development and Neighborhood Planning (N=12)			
Urban Neighborhood Community Development (Bromley, R.) (2003-2004)	SUNY, Albany		Primary/Critical
Urban Problems: Affordable Housing in Urban Areas (Barrett, E) (2002-2003)****	U-Texas, Arlington		Primary/Informative
Housing and the Elderly* (Browning, G. B.) (1994-1995)	Texas A&M		Primary/Informative
Special Topics in Housing and Community Development (Connerly, C.) (2000-2001)	Florida State		Primary/Critical
Problems and Issues in Housing and Community Development (Connerly, C.) (2000-2001)	Florida State		Primary/Critical
Housing Systems (Dielman, F) (2002-2003)	U-Michigan,		Primary/Critical
Neighborhood Planning Seminar (Harwood, S.) (2004-2005)	U-Illinois, Urbana-Champaign		Primary/Informative
Affordable Housing Policies and Programs (Pendall, R) (2004-2005)	Cornell		Primary/Informative
Housing and Public Policy (Quercia, R.G.) (2003-2004)	U-North Carolina, Chapel Hill		Partial/Informative
Introduction to Housing Policy (McClure, K.) (2004-2005)	U-Kansas		Partial/Informative
Community and Neighborhood Revitalization (McClure, K.) (2002-2003)	U-Kansas		Partial/Informative
Housing (Yen-Penubarti, M) (1999-2000)	Iowa State		Primary/Critical

Planning Theory and History (N=8)			
Introduction to Histories and Theories of Urban Planning (Blumenburg, E.) (2000-2001)	UCLA		Partial/Informative
Planning History and Philosophy (Bromley, R.) (2004-2005)	SUNY, Albany		Partial/Informative
Introduction to Planning Practice and History (Forester, J.) (2004-2005)	Cornell		Primary/Critical
Planning History and Theory (Cohen, J.) (2004-2005)	U-Maryland, College Park		Partial/Informative
Development of American Planning Thought (Hopkins, L.) (2000-2001)	U-Illinois, Urbana-Champaign		Partial/Informative
Introduction to the History of the Built Environment in the US (Loukaitou-Sideris, A.) (2003-2004)	UCLA		Primary/Informative
Advanced Planning Theory (Takahashi, L.) (2004-2005)	UCLA		Partial/Informative
Planning Theory Colloquium (Soja, E. W.) (2000-2001)	UCLA		Primary/Critical
Urban and Regional Theory/Regional Planning (N=5)			
Urban Spatial Theory (Goldsmith, W.) (2000-2001)	Cornell		Partial /Critical
Looking at L.A. (Leavitt, J.) (1999-2000)	UCLA		Primary/Critical
Urban Spatial Structures (Noponen, H.) (1991-1992)***	U-North Carolina, Chapel Hill		Partial/Informative
Introduction to Regional Planning: The Evolution of Regional Planning Doctrines (Soja, E. W.) (2000-2001)	UCLA		Primary/Critical
The Political Economy of Urbanization (Soja, E. W.) (2003-2004)	UCLA		Primary/Critical
Public Policy (N=4)			
Introduction to Community and Environmental Dispute Resolution (Forester, J.) (2004-2001)	Cornell		<i>Type of Coverage</i> Partial/Informative
Poverty, Public Policy and Controversy (Rein, M.) (2004-2005)	MIT		Primary/Critical
Devolution and Privatization: Challenges for Urban Public Management (Warner, M.) (2000-2001)	Cornell		Partial/Informative
Urban and Regional Economic Development Applications (Wolff, G.) (1999-2000)	UCLA		Partial/Informative
Environmental Planning, Land Use, and Growth Management (N=3)			
Introduction to Environmental Planning (Esnard, A-M.) (2000-2001)	Cornell		Partial/Informative
Environmentalism, Past, Present, and Future? (Hect, S.) (2000-2001)	UCLA		Primary/Critical
Social Analysis of Land Use Planning (Ritzdorf, M.) (1994-1995)	VPI		Primary/Critical
Urban Design and Physical Planning (N=3)			
Socio-Cultural Issues in Architecture and Planning (Baker, M.) (2002-2003)	U-Michigan, Ann Arbor		Primary/Critical
Urban Design and Planning Methods: Planning for Diversity* (Mirafitab, F.) (2000-2001)	U-Illinois, Urbana-Champaign		Primary/Critical
Urban Design Politics (Vale, L.) (1994-1995)	MIT		Partial/Informative

Diversity and North American Planning Curricula: The Need for Reform

<p>Economic Development (N=2) For Richer or for the Poorer? <i>Understanding How Globalization Impacts Local Economies</i> (Tewari, M) (2003-04) Urban and Regional Economic Development Applications (Wolff, G) (1999-2000)</p>	<p>U-North Carolina, Chapel Hill UCLA</p>	<p>Partial/Informative Partial/Informative</p>
<p>Ethics (N=1) Ethics and Professional Practice (Wasserman, J.) (1994-1995)</p>	<p>Arizona State</p>	<p>Primary/Critical</p>
<p>Computer Applications (N=1) Web-GIS and Environmental Justice (Esnard, A-M.) (28)</p>	<p>Cornell</p>	<p>Primary/Critical</p>

Notes:

- *The course has not been offered lately.
- ** This is a public policy course available for planning students.
- *** The newer version of the course has less of diversity content or does not have any diversity content.
- **** The topics for the course vary with each course offering. The course is cross-listed with public policy.

APPENDIX B
List of chairs and educators interviewed

<i>Chairs and Academics</i>	<i>Current Institutional Affiliation</i>
John Betancur	Urban Planning and Policy Program, University of Illinois at Chicago
Ray Bromley	Masters of Urban and Regional Planning Program, State University of New York at Albany
Charles E. Connerly	Department of Urban and Regional, Planning, Florida State University
Hemalata C. Dandekar	School of Planning and Landscape Architecture and Planning, Arizona State University
John Forester	Department of Regional Planning, Cornell University
Leonard F. Heumann	Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Lewis D. Hopkins	Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Marie Howland	Urban Studies and Planning Program, University of Maryland at College Park
Claudia Isaac	Masters Program in Community and Regional Planning, University of New Mexico
Riad G. Mahayani	Department of Community and Regional Planning, Iowa State University
Bishwapriya Sanyal	Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris	Department of Urban Planning, University Of California, Los Angeles
Teresa Vázquez	Sociology and Chicano Studies, Pitzer College
Richard W. Willson	Department of Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona