



**Women in Informal Employment
Globalizing and Organizing**

WIEGO Working Paper (Urban Policies) N° 21

April 2011

Inclusive Urban Planning for the Working Poor: Planning Education Trends and Potential Shifts

Vanessa Watson



WIEGO Working Papers*

The global research-policy-action network Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO) Working Papers feature research that makes either an empirical or theoretical contribution to existing knowledge about the informal economy especially the working poor, their living and work environments and/or their organizations. Particular attention is paid to policy-relevant research including research that examines policy paradigms and practice. This series includes statistical profiles of informal employment and critical analysis of data collection and classification methods. Methodological issues and innovations, as well as suggestions for future research, are considered. All WIEGO Working Papers are peer reviewed by the WIEGO Research Team and/or external experts. The WIEGO Publication Series is coordinated by the WIEGO Research Team. This report was commissioned under the Inclusive Cities Project by WIEGO's Urban Policies Programme Director Caroline Skinner, who is based at the African Centre for Cities at the University of Cape Town.

About the Author:

Vanessa Watson is a Professor in the City and Regional Planning Programme, School of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics, University of Cape Town, South Africa. She is affiliated to the African Centre for Cities, also at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. She chairs the steering committee of the Association of African Planning Schools, which has a long-term project aimed at changing planning education in Africa, and is co-chair of the Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN).

Publication date: April 2011

ISBN number: ISBN 978-92-95095-12-0

Published by Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO)
A Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee – Company No. 6273538, Registered Charity
No. 1143510

WIEGO Secretariat

Harvard Kennedy School,
79 John F. Kennedy Street
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
www.wiego.org

WIEGO Limited

521 Royal Exchange
Manchester, M2 7EN,
United Kingdom

Copyright © WIEGO.

This report can be replicated for educational and organizing purposes as long as the source is acknowledged.

Cover photograph by: Dennis Gilbert who was commissioned for the book “Working in Warwick: Including Street Traders in Urban Plans”.

* This paper was first published in the WIEGO Urban Policies Research Report Series. In May 2012 WIEGO launched this Working Paper Series incorporating all the Urban Policies Research Reports.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1. Introduction and Purpose of the Report.....	2
2. Planning Education in the Global South.....	3
2.1 Changing Influences on Planning Education.....	3
2.1.1 Formative Ideas which Shaped Planning and Planning Education	3
2.1.2 Post 1940s Shifts in Planning Education.....	5
2.1.3 Planning Education in Latin America, Asia and Africa	7
2.1.4 Importance of the 2009 UN Habitat Global Report on Human Settlements.....	8
2.2 Numbers and Distribution of Planning Schools Worldwide	9
3. Planning School Organizations and Networks	12
3.1 Planning School Associations.....	12
3.2 The Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN).....	13
3.3 Organizations of Professional Planners	14
4. Case: Association of African Planning Schools	16
5. Conclusion and Recommendations	18
5.1 Incorporating an Understanding of Informal Work into Planning Curricula.....	19
5.2 Research Gaps	20
Appendix A: Website Addresses and Contact People of Planning School Associations	21
Appendix B: Memorandum of Understanding Between Slum Dwellers International and the African Associations of Planning Schools	23
References	26

Executive Summary

The report outlines and critically assesses trends in urban planning education across the globe, specifically in countries of the global South, and the extent to which curricula address issues of inclusivity and planning for the working poor. The laws, regulations and professional practices linked to the discipline of “urban planning” have a significant effect on the ability of the poor to survive in towns and cities. Planning regulations are frequently so onerous that the poor are obliged to step outside the requirements of the law, living and working in ways that are categorized as “informal” and are, therefore, open to state-initiated censure and often repressive intervention. At the same time, planning has a potentially positive role to play in rapidly urbanizing cities, facilitating processes of land delivery and service improvement, and making sure that populations are protected from environmental disasters. All too often, however, planners are educated and encouraged (by prevailing legislation) to play a function in cities that is predominantly about control; this negatively impacts on the livelihoods and shelter options of the urban poor and serves formal economic (and elite) interests, resulting in socially and spatially exclusive urban environments.

This report outlines and critically assesses trends in planning education across the globe, specifically in countries of the global South, and the extent to which curricula address issues of inclusivity and planning for the working poor. The report also sets out the current organizational structure of planning education, and how regional associations relate to a global network of planning schools. With reference to WIEGO's ongoing urban policy, research and dissemination work, the report concludes with a set of recommendations as to how WIEGO and its affiliates should engage at an international, regional and local level with planners and planning curricula. The conclusion also identifies a set of research gaps relating to the impact of planning on informal work.

The report proposes that WIEGO interact with the global planning education network and the relevant planning school associations to explore the possibility of a collaborative working arrangement between WIEGO affiliates and individual planning schools, following the example of one of the planning school associations which has entered into such a relationship with Slum Dwellers International. This can promote experiential learning for students who can engage in projects in collaboration MBOs. Case studies of successful projects involving inclusive planning and informality need to be written up and published to be used as a teaching resource. New teaching modules can be developed which show how both formal and informal economic actors drive change in cities and how the contribution of informal actors can be incorporated. Some significant research gaps are: the impact of planning law on informal actors; the phenomenon of working from home and how this can be facilitated in planning approaches; and guidelines for planning for markets in ways which include the smallest as well as larger informal traders.

1. Introduction and Purpose of the Report

The laws, regulations and professional practices linked to the discipline of “urban planning” have a significant effect on the ability of the poor to survive in towns and cities. Planning regulations are frequently so onerous that the poor are obliged to step outside the requirements of the law, living and working in ways that are categorized as “informal” and are, therefore, open to state-initiated censure and often repressive intervention. At the same time, the regulations and practices associated with urban planning have a potentially positive role to play in rapidly urbanizing cities, facilitating processes of land delivery and service improvement, and making sure that populations are protected from environmental disasters. All too often, however, planners are educated and encouraged (by prevailing legislation) to play a function in cities that is predominantly about control; this negatively impacts on the livelihoods and shelter options of the urban poor and serves formal economic (and elite) interests, resulting in socially and spatially exclusive urban environments. An important step towards achieving more inclusive and pro-poor cities is to address the nature of planning education, and the value systems and “mind-sets” graduating planning students carry into their professional life.

Many different definitions have been used to describe informal work and informal settlements. In the planning field, recent work on informality defines it as “... a mode of production of space defined by the territorial logic of deregulation” (Roy 2009: 8). “Informal spaces” are produced as states of exception, where “the ownership, use, and purpose of land cannot be fixed and mapped according to any prescribed set of regulations or the law” (Ibid.). Some definitions focus specifically on the housing aspects of informality, describing these as areas that have been developed largely through community or individual effort and outside of formal institutional processes and regulations; aspects of the settlement (infrastructure, services, shelters, tenure) may not conform to formal legal requirements and may be deficient in ways detrimental to health and well-being (Watson 2010). Since the 2002 Resolution on the informal economy, the International Labour Organization has been advocating for a definition of informal economy which includes both enterprise and employment relations (without secure contracts, worker benefits or social protection) both inside and outside informal enterprises (ILO 2002).

The scale and rate of growth of informality in cities of the global South requires urban planners and managers to respond to this issue with some urgency. In some developing countries “slum” dwellers constitute the majority of the urban population, and this proportion reaches 62 per cent of urban populations in Sub-Saharan Africa (UN-Habitat 2008: xiii). Informal employment comprises one-half to three-quarters of non agricultural employment in developing countries: specifically, 48 per cent of non-agricultural employment in North Africa; 51 per cent in Latin America; 65 per cent in Asia; and 72 per cent in sub-Saharan Africa. If South Africa is excluded, the share of informal employment in non-agricultural employment rises to 78 per cent in sub-Saharan Africa (ILO 2002: 7). With continued rapid urban growth in the global South, and particularly in Africa and Asia (United Nations 2008) the numbers of those living in cities and relying on both informal work and shelter will continue to rise.

The global research-policy-action network Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO) sees planning as a key profession that shapes the work environment of the informally employed. As a core component of WIEGO’s work within the Inclusive Cities project, the network is committed to providing information about planning education, curricula and planning institutional networks. This is with a view to assisting WIEGO members (especially international and regional networks of membership-based organizations – MBOs – of the working poor and the MBOs themselves), but also those generally concerned with exclusionary practices in cities of the global South, to engage with these issues and networks. This report is the first step in this process.

In response to this agenda, this report outlines and critically assesses trends in planning education across the globe, specifically in countries of the global South, and the extent to which curricula address issues of inclusivity and planning for the working poor. It draws on secondary data collected in the process of preparing the 2009 UN Habitat Global Report on Human Settlements: Planning Sustainable Cities; and

on information collected from visits to members of the Association of African Planning Schools during 2009/2010.¹ The report will also set out the current organizational structure of planning education, and how regional associations relate to a global network of planning schools (GPEAN).²

With reference to WIEGO's ongoing urban policy, research and dissemination work, the report will conclude with a set of recommendations as to how WIEGO and its affiliates should engage at an international, regional and local level with planners and planning curricula. The conclusion will also identify a set of research gaps relating to the impact of planning on informal work.

2. Planning Education in the Global South

This section of the report will review the development of, and influences on, planning education in the global South, indicating the extent to which these have been influenced by global North approaches which have paid little attention to the issue of urban informality. It will also draw on available information to show if and how the issue of informality (particularly informal work) is addressed in planning curricula (with a focus on African planning schools).

2.1 Changing Influences on Planning Education³

2.1.1 Formative Ideas which Shaped Planning and Planning Education

Planning education at the university level did not begin until the early twentieth century, with the earliest programmes to be found in the UK, Europe and the USA (Batey 1985). These early curricula were strongly physical and design focused (see Table 1), reflecting planning's close ties to the architecture profession. In this period both architecture and planning were reacting primarily to what was termed as the "horror" of the Industrial Revolution (as it impacted on cities) and the rapid urbanization that accompanied this (Hall 1988; Taylor 1998).

Across Europe, the UK and the USA, rapidly growing industrial cities had developed "slum" conditions and environmental degradation at a scale and intensity not previously experienced in these parts of the world. A central reason, at this time, for the emergence of "modern" planning and the organized planning profession was to address these ills of industrial cities (Hall 1988). The widely shared vision of how this should be done is crystallized in the term "urban modernization": slums should be torn down and replaced with urban environments that create plentiful green open space (bringing nature and health back into cities), generous movement channels for the newly emerging motor car, low density and green suburban developments or (according to famous and highly influential architect Le Corbusier) high-rise apartment blocks surrounded by open space, and the separation of urban land uses into residential, industrial, commercial and public facility zones. In all these visions of the ideal modern city, nuclear families are supported by one member travelling to an industrial or commercial area of the city each day to work. Public spaces (usually grand and monumental) allow for recreation and visual amenity. People do not work at

¹ The Association was the beneficiary of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation 2008-2010 to take forward the project Revitalising Planning Education in Africa. The project convenor personally visited 19 of the Association members (membership has subsequently risen to 42) to collect information on curricula.

² Note: it is common to refer to planning departments within universities as "schools" – indicating the professional orientation of this discipline.

³ The section below is drawn from chapter 10 of UN Habitat (2009). The chapter was compiled by Professor Bruce Stiftel, who enlisted each of the nine planning school associations which are members of GPEAN (the Global Planning Education Association Network) to distribute a questionnaire to their member schools. UN Habitat also commissioned case studies of planning education in Ghana and Poland. Reports on planning in different regions of the world were also commissioned, and these authors were asked to include a section on planning education. The website at <http://www.unhabitat.org/content.asp?typeid=19&catid=555&cid=5608> contains the background reports for the UN Habitat 2009 Report on Sustainable Urban Planning. The section on Regional and Thematic Studies is the source for information on planning education in specific regions of the world.

home (this was considered a relic of the pre-industrial era) and they certainly do not sell or make goods in public spaces. The ideal modern city has no sign of informality either for living or working (Watson 2009).

The importance of these early modernist and architecturally inspired visions of ideal post-industrial cities cannot be emphasized strongly enough. They inspired central planning traditions (the City Beautiful Movement; Garden Cities) in the global North for much of the twentieth century (Hall 1988) and importantly for this report, were imported into colonized parts of the world, where they shaped planning regulations, planning practices and planning curricula through the twentieth century and into the present (Ward 2002; Nasr and Volait 2003; Njoh, 2003; Healey and Upton 2010). The ideas were spread in a number of different ways.

Ward (2010) offers a typology of the transfer of planning ideas, along dimensions of authoritarianism, contestation, and consensus (in short: imposition); and synthesis, selection, and uncritical reception (borrowing). He argues that the nature of the power relationship between exporting and importing country is a major determining factor, with colonialism and conquest giving rise to imposition of foreign planning systems, while a more equal relationship between countries sees planning ideas transported through other means: travelling planning consultants, politicians or other influential people, or scholarly articles and books. This process of diffusion was never smooth or simple: the ideas themselves were often varied and contested, and they were articulated in different ways that were shaped by the contexts to which they were imported.

Colonialism was a very direct vehicle for diffusing planning systems, particularly in those parts of the world under colonial rule when planning was ascendant. In these contexts planning of urban settlements was frequently bound up with the “modernizing and civilizing” mission of colonial authorities, but also with the control of urbanization processes and of the urbanizing population. On the African continent, for example, this diffusion occurred mainly through British, German, French and Portuguese influence, using their home-grown instruments of master planning, zoning, building regulations and the urban models of the time – garden cities, neighbourhood units⁴ and Radburn layouts,⁵ and later urban modernism. Most colonial and later post-colonial governments also initiated a process of the commodification of land within the liberal tradition of private property rights, with the state maintaining control over the full exercise of these rights, including aspects falling under planning and zoning ordinances. Many African countries still have planning legislation based on British or European planning laws from the 1930s or 1940s, which has been revised only marginally. Post-colonial governments tended to reinforce and entrench colonial spatial plans and land management tools, sometimes in even more rigid form than colonial governments (Njoh 2003).

Currently, national politicians in most post-colonial countries aspire to modernist city forms and *Le Corbusierian* urban visions, particularly in main and capital cities (Brasilia, Abudja, Lillongwe, Chandigarh, etc.), often because such cities represent a form of status and “catching up with the West.” In currently rapidly urbanizing and developing parts of the world (China, parts of Asia and the Middle East) ideas about planning and urban form are direct imports from post-war US and Europe: highly controlling, top down “master planning”; segregation of urban functions; car domination; grand open spaces; and *Le Corbusierian* high-rise “towers in parks of green.”

In all these visions, informal settlements and economic activities are an anathema and an indication of backwardness and lack of development, even as in reality they dominate the urban scene. The term “illegality” is used more frequently than “informality” to describe these activities, and African politicians often refer to the “insanity” of urban informal activities. It is not surprising therefore, that planning academics and planning curricula continue to promote the urban modernist ideal, supported by early twentieth century master plans, rigid land use control, and onerous building regulations, all produced through technocratic and non-participatory approaches.

⁴ Introduced in the 1920s in the USA, this approach held that cities should be broken down into smaller areas that have the “feel” of a village. They hold around 5,000 people and contain most of the functions necessary for daily life – shops, schools, clinics, etc. Major traffic routes should go around these units and only local traffic and pedestrians should enter the units.

⁵ Also introduced in the 1920s in the USA, this was an approach to planning suburbs that separated vehicular traffic away from pedestrian movement and confined the former to specialized movement channels (highways and freeways). Pedestrian routes were to meander through large green spaces which also contained residential blocks and community facilities.

2.1.2 Post 1940s Shifts in Planning Education

Table 1: Characteristics of Planning Education Models (Twentieth Century Europe and North America)

	Design-oriented physical planning approach (Frank 2006) Traditional-technical model (Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988)	Knowledge-based social science model (Frank 2006) Academic postgraduate model (Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988)	Comprehensive integrated model (Rodriguez-Bachiller 1988)	Radical critique and advocacy approach (Frank 2006)
Origin	Britain, USA (early twentieth century)	USA (mid-twentieth century)	Britain (post-1950)	USA, Britain, Europe (post-1960s)
General course length and structure	>3 years undergraduate	2 years postgraduate	3 years undergraduate; 1 year postgraduate (3+1)	-
Educational philosophy/objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical training • Planning “as an aspect of technology or design” • “oriented towards a ‘liberal’ professional practice in a market dominated by physical planning” • Emphasis on design skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning as a distinct discipline (separate courses for architecture, urban design) • Social science-based (mainly economics, sociology and politics) • Rational planning model • Training of planners as “thinkers” and theoreticians • Planners as generalists with a specialism • Produce planners to “serve a diverse market of strategic decision-making” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social science-based, but mainly practical • Produce planners to serve a “highly professionalized and specific market of local government planning” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning as a knowledge domain is in constant flux • Critique of Western epistemology and the predominance of rational-utitarian planning skills • Planning as an exercise in ethical judgement
Approach to curriculum development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revolves around a central “core,” • “Cafeteria” system – wide range of choices in terms of specialization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revolves around a “core” usually “imposed by the professional organisation” • Core consists of three areas: methodology, physical environment and administrative context • Generalist approach to core development • Less specialization than US approach • No differentiation between “theoretical” and “practical” training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater choice of subjects within planning programmes (i.e. weakened “core”) • Greater integration of planning, environmental and design programmes
Pedagogical approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studio and project work • Akin to conducting professional apprenticeship, but with hypothetical design problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively little project work • Emphasis on individual study (i.e. less contact with teacher) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy emphasis on project work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on experiential learning • The studio as a collaborative problem-solving exercise

Source: J. Duminy (unpublished background report for the Association of African Planning Schools: <http://www.africanplanningschools.org.za>), drawn from: Rodriguez-Bachiller (1988), Dalton (2001) and Frank (2006).

From the late 1940s onwards, new shifts emerged in planning education, particularly in the USA. This has been termed the “knowledge-based social science approach” by Frank (2006), with planning education heavily influenced by the social science disciplines of economics, and later sociology and politics (Table 1). The influence of these subjects fostered a knowledge-producing concern for the (newly) discrete academic field of planning, particularly through quantitative analysis of city regions and the production of mathematical models to explain urban and regional development patterns. This approach to planning education has perhaps been less influential in the global South and post-colonial countries, although planning education in Brazil tends to take a wider and interdisciplinary form, where it is often taught as part of architecture, geography or economics programmes.

From the 1960s the number of planning schools and students skyrocketed in the USA, UK and Europe, as the requirement for producing and administering land use plans became a common function of local government, and as the economic boom of the 1960s propelled urban renewal schemes and freeway construction in many urban centres. At about the same time, planning schools in the global South multiplied as well. At many of these universities resources were scarce, and planning programmes often relied on Northern universities for planning staff, examiners, texts and ideas. Many of these global South programmes only offered undergraduate programmes, or a masters degree at best, and it was standard practice for students to complete their post-graduate education and PhDs in planning in universities of the global North (Diaw et al. 2002). This helped to reinforce the Northern dominance of planning ideas and approaches in Southern planning education.

As Northern planning departments found themselves enrolling growing numbers of students from the global South, some of them initiated specialized courses oriented towards conditions in these parts of the world (Frank 2006). These new courses often faced the problem of how to teach planning ideas based on the assumption of a liberal democratic context, to students who often came from countries where democracy and a market-based economy were less likely to exist. There were also few planning ideas that addressed the issues of cities of the global South: informal settlement, rapid growth, poverty and weak government. As a result, the “one world” approach to teaching planning emerged in many Northern universities (Burayidi 1993). This tends to be universalist in orientation and tries to develop planning theory and method that could be applicable in any part of the world; however, but the approach has been criticized as failing to respond to the specificities of diverse contexts.

In recent years, planning schools in the global North have undergone significant shifts in terms of what is covered in the curriculum. While different regions have different areas of emphasis, many schools now teach that urban plans should be flexible and strategic rather than top down and over-determining of land use patterns, and major concerns are with environment and climate change, the economy and “real estate,” transport infrastructure and conservation. Students are now taught that planning is a participatory process and that planners should engage “the public” as far as possible. Some schools teach “community planning” which usually refers to poorer areas of a city, and how to economically and socially uplift them and integrate them more closely into areas with jobs and social facilities. Very little of this has had a bearing on urban informality in cities of the global North where, historically, it has been less in evidence. In cities of the global South, bottom-up and participatory planning processes have been taken seriously by governments and planners in some regions (such as Brazil) where an *in situ* approach to informal settlement upgrade is increasingly seen as acceptable. *In situ* upgrade is less likely to destroy home-based businesses and informal street-trading areas. In many parts of the global South, however, these new planning approaches still find themselves in competition with a modernist vision of the city. Informal settlement upgrade and street trading may be tolerated in less visible and marginal parts of cities, but rarely in the more central urban locations.

2.1.3 Planning Education in Latin America, Asia and Africa

This section reviews in more detail the nature of planning education in those parts of the world where informality is often the dominant economic activity and mode of accessing shelter and services.⁶

East and South East Asia and the Pacific

In East Asia, most urban planning schools have some association with either architecture or geography, as well as public administration, environment, community planning and engineering. Many planning schools offer a basic technical education, the core of which is the control of urban land use. In China planning schools mostly had their origin in departments of architecture (Leaf and Hou 2006). As such, there is strong continuity with curricula inherited from planning schools in the West and from the Soviet Union during periods of colonial influence. Contact with the Soviet Union in the 1950s ushered in a period of “industrial master planning” for cities as well as the Soviet model for planned housing estates. Authors (such as Mendis 2007) make the point that planning education is not static and the philosophy of planning education is shifting, in keeping with a newer focus of planning on “place” at the level of neighborhood, village, town, region or even the state. However it appears that this concern with place has less to do with conservation and heritage, and more to do with “place marketing” and “city branding” as part of a new urban entrepreneurialism prevalent in China today (Leaf and Hou 2006).

Mahadevia (2009) describes how planning education in India has followed the neo-liberal trend in urban development, with new courses labelled as urban/infrastructure planning and management and focused on real estate, property finance and project management. Planning legislation and education in India has had a strong British colonial influence and, as elsewhere in the region, the curricula are heavily loaded with architecture and civic design oriented subjects. Indian planning schools produce only some 300 graduates a year, which means that in practice, planning work is often carried out by other professions (Mahadevia 2009).

A significant recent development in India is the establishment of the IIHS – the Indian Institute for Human Settlements⁷ – which is a new university dedicated to filling the gap left by the lack of planners and inappropriate planning skills. The IIHS aims to produce, in large numbers, a new form of professional – termed the “urban practitioner” – which combines the skills of planners, architects, engineers, economists, environmentalists, etc., “...committed to the creation and management of equitable, efficient, economic and sustainable urban settlements, regions and villages.” This curriculum will engage directly with the issue of informal settlement and work from a supportive and inclusive position. While the curriculum is still evolving, it appears likely that a course on economics will distinguish between the formal and the informal economy and the implications of each for planning.

Africa

In Africa the influence of colonial and global North countries on planning education has been very strong, with some diversity as a result of differing colonial influences in the past. In South Africa and other ex-British colonies there are combinations of a land-use control approach and an architectural/design approach, and in ex-European colonies the French and Portuguese design approach to planning is still influential. This usually expresses itself in the teaching of planning as top-down, control-oriented master planning to produce modernist urban environments in the *Le Corbusierian* tradition. Informality is unacceptable in these urban visions. In African countries, as in other parts of the global South, planning is frequently governed by rigid and outdated national planning legislation aimed at the control of land uses, and planning schools often feel compelled to produce students who simply know how to operate the legislation and little more.

In Francophone Africa there has been an unusual degree of country co-operation on the training of planners. On the recommendations of a UNESCO study, OCAM (The Common African and Mauritian Organization) created the *Ecole Africaine et Mauricienne d'Architecture et d'Urbanisme* (EAMAU) in Lomé. When OCAM dissolved in 1981, 14 countries agreed to support the school. The school's mission is three-fold: teaching, research and

⁶ This information is drawn from the regional reports commissioned for the UN Habitat 2009 Global Report – see footnote 3.

⁷ <https://sites.google.com/a/iihs.co.in/iihs/>

evaluation. It has a vast network of over 400 graduates working in Sub-Saharan Francophone Africa in various areas of professional practice (public, private, liberal, international, NGOs). After some 20 years of existence and following the emergence of new urban planning and management practices, the school embarked on its first reform in 1994. The name of the school has now been changed to *Ecole Africaine des Métiers de l'Architecture et de l'Urbanisme* (African School of Architecture and Urban Planning Practices). While initially architecture and planning followed a common curriculum, a more recent (2008) reform aimed to separate the two disciplines. The proposed new curriculum appears to respond to the issues of African cities, and includes strategic planning, poverty reduction and urban insecurity, and implementing the Millennium Development Goals.

In Sub-Saharan Africa some schools have shifted to an environmental science approach, some to a developmental and managerial approach and others have continued with a technical and physical approach. There are some exceptions, such as the Ardhi University in Dar es Salaam, where many years of assistance from the Department of Human Settlements in Copenhagen, as well as the *Technische Universität Dortmund*⁸ (which initiated the SPRING programme), shifted the curriculum towards bottom up, participatory planning and informal settlement upgrade. Planning for informal markets and informal service provision is often covered in studios and dissertations.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Planning education is traditionally linked to architecture schools and planners usually have an architectural background. Much planning in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) has been done and continues to be done by architects without formal training as planners or urban designers. However, many architectural programs include courses on planning and urban design. This linkage to architecture is gradually changing, as planning becomes more recognized as an interdisciplinary field with connections to economics, political science, engineering, law, and geography. Planning education trains professionals in certain skills, such as econometric modeling, transportation modeling, urban design, statistical analysis, etc., but is usually weak in training in community planning, participation, negotiation, mediation, etc.

Short-term online programs and certificates in planning topics, such as citizen participation, are increasingly making the field accessible to diverse actors from civil society who could then be enabled to engage in more democratic planning processes. A noteworthy example of this approach is FLACSO—the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences.

2.1.4 Importance of the 2009 UN Habitat Global Report on Human Settlements

The 2009 UN Habitat Global Report: *Planning Sustainable Cities*, is a landmark document which is attempting to change approaches to urban planning (and planning education) worldwide. Inspiration for the report came from the 2006 World Urban Forum where the then Executive Director of UN Habitat argued that “the planned city sweeps the poor away (Tibaijuka 2006).” Tibaijuka pointed to the “urbanization of poverty” as the most important urban issue of the future, as well as the need to address this as part of an environmental sustainability agenda. But she also pointed to planning as factor which often tends to increase social exclusion in cities through anti-poor measures. She called on planning practitioners to develop a different approach to planning that is pro-poor and inclusive, and that places the creation of livelihoods at the center of planning efforts (Watson 2009).

The report devotes an entire Chapter (7) to urban informality and planning, including how planners should work with informal economic actors to manage public space and provide services. It argues that the rights of entrepreneurs to operate in the city should be recognized (Ibid.: 147), harassment and eviction should be avoided and property (and space) rights should be improved and respected. Urban planners play an important role in providing for markets, trading spaces and services, promoting mixed-use zoning to allow for home-based workers, and encouraging a participatory and collaborative approach to policy formulation and day-to-day management. The publication of this authoritative and widely circulated report encourages a shift in mind-set for both planning professionals and educators, and provides an important reference point for those urging reform in this direction.

⁸ <http://www.raumplanung.uni-dortmund.de/rel/typo3/index.php?id=39>

2.2 Numbers and Distribution of Planning Schools Worldwide

A survey undertaken for the production of the UN Habitat (2009) Global Report on Human Settlements (see footnote 2 for details of this survey) estimated that there are approximately 553 universities in the world that offer a form of planning education, but this figure may be higher as not all belong to a GPEAN-member association; as well, some parts of the world (the Middle East) are not organized into an association. This survey was the first global count of planning schools ever undertaken. The research showed that over half of these schools (320) are located in just 10 countries; the remaining 223 are spread across 72 different countries. This means that half of the countries in the world have no planning schools at all.

Half of all schools are in developed countries and half in “developing” (global South) parts of the world, leading to a major regional imbalance of planning schools to population, as over 80% of the world’s population is in the global South.⁹

While Latin America and the Caribbean appear to have a particularly low number of schools (27) given the population, planning is more likely to be taught as part of programmes in other disciplines (architecture, economics, geography) rather than in programmes labelled “planning.” Also, there has been rapid growth in short-term online and certificate programmes in specialized planning topics. India also has few schools (15) relative to population (1.15 billion), particularly compared to China, which has some 97 schools and a similar population (1.3 billion). It appears that there is somewhat of a crisis in planning education in India, which has a massive shortage of planners to address burgeoning urban issues in this part of the world (UN Habitat 2009).

Table 2: Urban Planning Schools Inventory (University Level), by Country (2009)

Region/Country	No. of schools
Developing countries	260
Africa	69
Algeria	1
Botswana	1
Egypt	3
Ghana	1
Kenya	3
Lesotho	1
Morocco	1
Mozambique	1
Nigeria	39
Rwanda	1
South Africa	11
Tanzania	1
Togo	1
Tunisia	1
Uganda	1
Zambia	1
Zimbabwe	1

⁹ In 2003, 82 per cent of the world’s population lived in the global South (National Research Council, 2003).

Region/Country	No. of schools
Asia and the Pacific	164
Bangladesh	1
China	97
China, Hong Kong	1
China, Taiwan	3
India	15
Indonesia	16
Iran	1
Israel	1
Lebanon	1
Malaysia	4
Pakistan	1
Philippines	1
Republic of Korea	7
Saudi Arabia	1
Sri Lanka	1
Thailand	6
Turkey	5
United Arab Emirates	1
Viet Nam	1
Latin America and the Caribbean	27
Argentina	3
Brazil	6
Chile	2
Colombia	2
Guatemala	1
Jamaica	1
Mexico	9
Peru	1
Venezuela	2

Source: UN Habitat (2009) Table 10.2

2.3 Informality in Planning Curricula – The Case of Sub-Saharan Africa

The survey of all planning schools carried out for the UN Habitat 2009 Global Report asked schools to comment if they had a focus on Sustainable Development; Social Equity; Participatory Planning; and Climate Change. The category of social equity may have covered a concern with informal work, but this was not specified. Only half of the schools surveyed reported a concern with social equity issues at all in their curriculum. This section of the report, therefore, draws on the more detailed study of members of the Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS), all located in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In 2010 the AAPS co-ordinator visited 19 of the member schools (total membership 41) to promote AAPS projects and to document current curricula. Thirteen schools reported that they covered informality in their curricula as follows: in South Africa (Free State University, North West University, Pretoria University, Wits University); in Kenya (Kenya University, Nairobi University, Maseno University); in Tanzania (Ardhi University); in Nigeria (Ibadan; University Lagos University, Nigeria University); in Ghana (KNUST University); in Uganda (Makerere University); and in Rwanda (Rwanda University). Three of these schools (Ibadan, Makerere and Rwanda) specified that the focus within this was on housing.

South Africa's 11 planning schools have formulated their own curricula and approaches to planning education over time, and there is a high degree of diversity. While none of the programmes have courses labelled "informality," many deal with issues of informal settlement and the economy as part of planning projects or theory courses. For example, the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) in Cape Town, South Africa, has been developing a new honours degree curriculum that contains "...two semester-long modules that deal with community engagement, dynamics and understanding livelihoods and networks on the one hand; and the nature of urban land markets, and the efficacy of the institutions and management frameworks that interface the formal-informal manifestations of urban life" (Tapela 2010).

Ardhi University¹⁰ in Dar es Salaam has for some time conducted studios on informal settlement upgrading, and students have undertaken dissertations on a facilitative approach to informal service providers. The University of Nairobi planning school has a partnership arrangement with Slum Dwellers International in Nairobi, which means that planning students undertake internships in informal settlements and studios are offered on the topic of upgrading informal settlements.

In Nigeria the statutory professional accrediting body (TOPREC) approves a minimum planning curriculum and then conducts accreditation visits and sets professional examinations for graduated students, based on what is in the approved curriculum. This statutory body therefore seems to have a high degree of control over what is taught in planning programmes. Agbola and Wahab (2010: 14) assert the following: "A look at the curricula in use in planning schools in Nigeria reveals a gross under-representation of the issue of informality and illegality in settlement development. Not only is there no specific course or subject devoted to it, they are not found as statements in the course contents." They note that in the new additions for the 2009 TOPREC's Syllabus for Professional Programmes of Urban and Regional Planning – URP 906 Contemporary Issues in Planning and URP 907 Electives – there is no mention of informality.

These authors also suggest they themselves do not see informality as a positive phenomenon: "There is unsightliness and disorderliness in the appearance of areas with illegal development. People (especially pedestrians) are in constant struggle with vehicles, hawkers, street traders, informal business operators for available spaces that have become so limited. Infrastructural facilities and environmental services (especially waste collection) are difficult to provide in such areas" (Agbola and Wahab 2010).

In sum, there is significant variation across Sub-Saharan Africa regarding the ways in which informality is incorporated into curricula. Some curricula pay little attention to informality and it is likely that where informality does feature it is regarded in a negative light. Terms such as "disorder" and "insanity" are likely to be used to describe urban areas where informality is present, with a particular emphasis on the appearance which informality gives to cities. The belief that informality prevents African cities from meeting the Western modernist ideal seems to be a particular worry for both academics and professional planners and regulators. In other parts of the continent, curricula have engaged with informality and students are trained to plan in a facilitative and supportive way. However, it appears the focus in many planning programmes is on informal settlement, and much less so on informal work.

¹⁰ For this and other AAPS curricula, see <http://www.africanplanningschools.org.za/> under Downloads.

3. Planning School Organizations and Networks

Strategies to influence planning curricula, so that they take more account of how informal work can be supported in urban plans, will need to engage with the organizations to which planning schools belong. This section covers the nature and objectives of these organizations.

3.1 Planning School Associations

Since the 1950s planning schools have begun to organize themselves into associations, usually on the basis of geographical area or language. The table below lists the association title, when it was founded, size and the basis of its representation.

Table 3: Planning school associations which are members of GPEAN

Association name	When founded	Region/s represented*	Number of member schools (2010)	Organization form
Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS)	2001	Sub-Saharan (Anglophone) Africa	42	Headed by elected steering committee
Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP)	1974	Canada (English-speaking)	+/- 24	Elected office holders
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (USA) (ACSP)	1958	USA	+/- 99	Elected office holders, membership fees
Association for the Development of Planning Education and Research (APERAU)	1984	French-speaking – France, Canada & North Africa	+/- 23	Elected office holders
Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP)	1987	Europe	+/- 141	Elected office holders, membership fees
American Association of Schools of Urbanism and Planning (ALEUP)	1999	Spanish-speaking Latin America	+/- 18	Elected office holders, membership fees
Asian Planning Schools Association (APSA)	1993	Asia	+/- 19	Elected office holders, membership fees
Australian and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools (ANZAPS)	1995	Australia and New Zealand	+/- 12	Network, no membership fees
National Association of Urban and Regional Post-graduate and Research Programs (Brazil) (ANPUR)	1983	Portuguese-speaking Latin America	+/- 53	Elected office holders, membership fees

* There is no planning school association in the Middle East.

These associations vary greatly in terms of their activities. Most organize a conference for their members every year or two. The two largest associations (ACSP and AESOP) undertake a range of other activities:

newsletters, publications, PhD workshops, issue-based meetings, etc. The following section gives more detail on those Associations representing planning schools in regions of the global South.

APSA (Asian Planning Schools Association): Their website lists 18 members in 2003, which suggests there may be schools not yet part of this association (particularly in China). The Association has a website and its main activity is the biennial congress.

AAPS (Association of African Planning Schools): This association secured a Rockefeller grant in 2008 which allowed it to launch a project entitled “Revitalising Planning Education in Africa.” A full-time coordinator was employed, the website developed, membership expanded, and two meetings of all members were held, one each in 2008 and 2010. A further Rockefeller grant in 2009, for the promotion of case study research and teaching in planning schools, allowed AAPS to hold three case research workshops, develop guidelines for case research, and fund some case research in various parts of the continent. The African Centre for Cities¹¹ at the University of Cape Town has provided a conduit for funding and logistical support.

ANPUR (National Association of Urban and Regional Post-graduate and Research Programs, Brazil): This association includes planning schools as well as programmes in Brazil offering urban studies, and is thus wider and more interdisciplinary than the other associations. It holds large and well-attended conferences and papers are published in an association journal. Given the progressive nature of planning and urban-related legislation in Brazil, as well as a national commitment to the right to the city, planning and planning education here is probably more likely than elsewhere to be willing and able to take an inclusive stance on informal work and settlement.

ALEUP (American Association of Schools of Urbanism and Planning): This association represents schools from five Spanish-speaking South American countries, with six of the member schools in Mexico. Unfortunately there is very little further information on the website.

The Association of Indonesian Planning Schools (ASPI) is currently considering joining GPEAN.

3.2 The Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN)¹²

In 2001 the planning school associations came together for the first time for a joint World Planning Schools Congress. This was hosted by Tongji University in Shanghai. At this conference, a decision was made to form an organization that could coordinate the work of the nine planning school associations and organize future world congresses – thus the Global Planning Education Network (GPEAN) was formed. It consists of two committees: the Steering Committee (with a representative from each association) plans world planning school conferences every five years. The 2006 event took place in Mexico and the 2011 event will happen in Perth. The second committee is the Co-ordinating Committee (again with a representative from each association), which is responsible for other GPEAN projects: a book publication every two years of best published papers from each association; the website; and linkages with other organizations. This committee of GPEAN was given responsibility for the chapter on world planning education in the UN Habitat 2009 Global Report, and took responsibility for the first ever survey of planning education across the globe.

The GPEAN Charter, signed in 2003, set out the following objectives for GPEAN:

The purposes of GPEAN are to facilitate international communication on equal terms amongst the university planning communities in order to improve the quality and visibility of planning pedagogy, research and practice, and to promote ethical, sustainable, multi-cultural, gender-sensitive, participatory planning.

¹¹ <http://africancentreforcities.net/>

¹² <http://www.GPEAN.org>

Both GPEAN committees meet once a year, and elect chairs and co-chairs for the Co-ordinating Committee, and conference chairs every five years for the Steering Committee. Involvement of the nine associations in GPEAN has been uneven over the last ten years. Representatives of associations which do not have a funding source have found it difficult to get to annual meetings, and it appears there has been less participation from associations operating in regions where the language is other than English. GPEAN itself does not have funding and is reliant on members to fund themselves. It has not always been easy to persuade all associations that global co-ordination is worth the time and effort, particularly when some associations themselves are not strong.

GPEAN accepts in principle that it can link with other global organizations in pursuit of its own objectives, but has never formalized a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or other formal agreement. An informal agreement is in place to coordinate with GPEIG (Global Planning Educators Interest Group¹³), a US-based network under the umbrella of the US planning school association ACSP, but no concrete action has been taken on this. GPEIG's mission statement is:

...to enable planning educators and students to collaboratively: (1) share global perspectives in planning education and research, (2) foster an understanding of the global perspectives in planning education and research, (3) foster an understanding of the global context of local and regional issues; and (4) engender an appreciation of and respect for cultural, economic, and political dimensions of planning; and the recognition of the rich array of planning processes that can be fully appreciated only by learning about what is being done in other countries.

Source: http://www.gpeig.org/index.php/about_gpeig/mission_history/

GPEIG is specifically interested in encouraging the linking of planning networks with other global networks, and has proposed a roundtable at the Perth World Planning Schools Congress to discuss this issue.

GPEAN is also recognized by UN Habitat, which invites the organization to the annual Habitat Professionals' Forum, and in 2011 to the new UN Habitat University Partners initiative.

In sum, the regional and global organization of planning education has come a long way in the last 50 years but many aspects of it remain fragile and dependent on a few enthusiastic individuals. Nonetheless, planning educators have achieved a higher level of networking and organization than the planning profession, which is briefly covered in the next section.

3.3 Organizations of Professional Planners

Professional planning organizations potentially have an impact on planning education as they can influence directly or indirectly the professional accreditation processes which most planning schools are required to undertake. In some countries the planning profession is not organized at all and there is no professional accreditation, but in others the profession is highly organized and can play a determining role, often through statutory bodies which are legally required to approve planning curricula. Nigeria is a case where the profession is organized and where the statutory body (TOPREC – see above) appears to prescribe the planning curriculum. Indian planning schools also interact with a very influential accrediting body.

There is no comprehensive database on national accreditation systems, hence this section reviews some of the main supra-national organizations of professional planners. These bodies can potentially influence planning schools to change curricula to incorporate some of the key twenty-first century urban issues (such

¹³ <http://www.gpeig.org/>

as incorporating informality); alternatively they could present an obstacle to prevent planning schools from doing this if they disapproved of such a move.

The website of the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP)¹⁴ states that it is concerned with the planning and management of settlements and regions across the Commonwealth. Professional organizations of urban and regional planners across the Commonwealth are members. CAP is a forum for creative ideas and practical action to make healthy, attractive and competitive towns, cities and regions. CAP does not accredit planning schools, but does consider planning education as part of its area of concern.

The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)¹⁵ is a UK-based (non-statutory) professional organization and accrediting body, but also accredits some planning schools outside of the UK.¹⁶ Its website states that its work involves promoting good planning; developing and shaping policy affecting the built environment; consistently raising the standards of the planning profession; supporting members through continued professional development; and education and training for future planners. Its vision for planning includes promoting inclusive planning processes and places, which could be interpreted as encouraging the acknowledgement of informality in cities.

The African Planning Association (APA)¹⁷ is a fledgling organization being supported by CAP and the South African Planning Institute. At the 2010 Planning Africa conference in Durban, South Africa, a further commitment was made to growing this organization.

The Global Planners' Network¹⁸ (GPN) was formed after the 2006 World Urban Forum in Vancouver. The mission of the GPN, as stated on their website, is "...Through a collaboration of the international planning profession, [to] contribute to the creation and maintenance of inclusive, safe, healthy and sustainable human settlements." Current membership is the American Planning Association, the Canadian Institute of Planners, the Commonwealth Association of Planners, the Planning Institute of Australia and the Royal Town Planning Institute. While the membership is largely based in the global North, these organizations have committed themselves to "tackling the challenges of rapid urbanization, the urbanization of poverty and hazards posed by climate change and natural disasters." The website has a "planning and research registry" section where it is possible to post links to other related organizations and networks.

The most useful starting point for those interested in interactions with the planning education sector is likely to be GPEAN as the overarching body which links all the planning school associations. This is a useful conduit, in turn, to the individual associations that each have their own priorities and communications systems. Depending on the nature of interaction, associations may simply pass on issues to individual planning schools.

¹⁴ <http://www.commonwealth-planners.org/>

¹⁵ <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/>

¹⁶ For example the planning schools at Botswana University and the University of Cape Town are engaged in an accreditation process.

¹⁷ <http://www.durban.gov.za/durban/discover/history/communities/cbos/apa/aplan>

¹⁸ <http://www.globalplannersnetwork.org/>

4. Case: Association of African Planning Schools

This case looks at how the AAPS is raising awareness of informality in planning curricula, teaching and research, and in supporting legislative change. The Rockefeller Foundation funded project – Revitalising Planning Education in Africa – was formally initiated in 2008 by AAPS.

Map 1: Distribution of Association of African Planning Schools members



At the first all-school meeting of AAPS in 2008, it was agreed that the five key issues for urban planning in Africa are: actor collaboration, climate change, spatial planning and infrastructure, informality and access to land. It was also agreed that these issues are insufficiently dealt with in many current planning curricula, and yet they represent some of the most important issues planners in Africa will have to deal with over the next decades.

Between 2008 and 2010, the AAPS project team has undertaken the following actions in order to promote the incorporation of these issues into planning curricula, guided by the goal of equitable, inclusive and sustainable cities:

- The development of course modules on the key issues (including on informal work), which will be put on the AAPS website.
- Structuring the 2010 AAPS conference around the key issues, and requiring participants to write conference papers about how they incorporate these issues into curricula. Several participants wrote on informality, interpreted as informal settlement (housing and services) but none specifically on informal work.
- Developing a model Masters planning curriculum for discussion at the AAPS 2010 workshop, showing how informality can be included.
- With a second grant from Rockefeller, initiating a process of encouraging case study research, teaching and publication by planning academics. The reason for this was to encourage an understanding of the actual nature of, and issues in, African cities, to which planners need to respond, rather than simply adopting inappropriate models and ideas from the global North. This project involved the holding of three four-day workshops on the case research method, conducted in Southern, Eastern and West Africa. Funds have also been granted to planning academics to undertake case research related to one of the key planning issues. This research will be compiled into a book.
- AAPS has recognized that there is reluctance to change planning curricula while national planning legislation remains unchanged, as teachers feel that students should be trained to operate and conform to existing legislation. As pointed out above, this legislation is very often outdated and strongly influenced by previous colonial relations; it is very unlikely to address the key planning issues of twenty-first century cities, including informality. For this reason, part of the AAPS project has been to lobby for revised planning legislation across the continent (where this has not already occurred). A land lawyer (Mr Stephen Berrisford) with expertise in planning law in African countries was commissioned to produce a series of working papers on the problems of planning law in Africa.¹⁹ These have been presented at key policy-shaping forums. The next step will be to convene a meeting of like-minded individuals to consider how to up-scale the lobbying initiative.
- The initiative with the greatest potential has been the signing of an MoU between Slum Dwellers International²⁰ and AAPS (October 2010). This was motivated by an understanding that teaching students about informal settlements and their needs in the classroom will have some, but limited, effect. The principle of “experiential learning” is that students learn far more, through deeper learning processes, from direct experience of situations and problems.

A number of SDI representatives were invited to attend the four-day AAPS conference in Dar es Salaam in October 2010. They spent the time in discussions with planning school representatives on how to change planning curricula. The convenor of SDI Kenya gave a keynote address on how the issue of informal upgrade was being addressed in Nairobi, and how the University of Nairobi planning school was collaborating with SDI to secure student internships and run planning projects in the informal settlements. A graduate of the Nairobi planning school told how this experience during his planning course had persuaded him to work for SDI as a professional planner. By the end of the workshop, SDI representatives reported that they had changed their view of planners, and found

¹⁹ Special issue of Urban Forum (2011 forthcoming).

²⁰ <http://www.sdinet.org/>

them far more open to change and collaboration than they previously believed. Likewise planning academics reported that they saw great potential in the kind of collaborative arrangements the Nairobi school adopted. The meeting led to unanimous agreement to sign an MoU between SDI and AAPS that would encourage this kind of co-operation with local affiliates of SDI across the continent (see Appendix B for the MoU).

This MoU is seen as an umbrella agreement that can pave the way for country-based planning schools to sign MoUs with local, country-based affiliates of SDI. In South Africa there are four planning schools that have expressed interest in engaging with Community Organization Resource Centre (CORC),²¹ the local affiliate of SDI. The University of Cape Town planning school has agreed to mainstream SDI work into its curriculum for 2011. This will involve planning studios based on informal settlements in Cape Town and assistance with community-based enumeration and mapping processes. Two students have been working as interns during the 2010/2011 vacation, in the CORC offices and in Zambia.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This report has documented the nature of planning education across the globe and the kinds of issues and problems it faces. It has shown that planning education is regionally uneven in terms of production capacity and highly diverse in terms of approach. However, there is a general tendency for planning schools in the global South to adopt and promote ideas and approaches from the global North, often because planning legislation in global South countries has been shaped by global North ideas.

Overall there is very little indication that the issue of informal work is an important part of planning curricula, and in many parts of the global South it is likely that planning students are being taught that the urban informal economy is a negative feature of cities and that their planning skills should be used to remove and repress it. The overriding vision of what constitutes an “ideal city,” and is thus promoted by politicians, planning professionals and academics in many parts of both the global North and South, does not contain informality at all. The UN Habitat 2009 Global Report on Human Settlements argues strongly that urban informality will not disappear under present economic conditions, and that planners need to shift their approaches to acknowledge, facilitate and include informal work and settlement in city plans.

This report has summarized the current organizations and networks of planning education across the globe, as these might provide useful channels through which NGOs such as WIEGO and their affiliated global and regional networks of membership-based organizations (MBOs) of the working poor, and the MBOs themselves can engage with planning education. The report has documented a case study of one planning school association that has made efforts to persuade planning schools to incorporate informality (and other pressing urban issues) into their curricula. The proposal here is that WIEGO interact firstly with GPEAN and then the relevant planning school associations to explore the possibility of a collaborative working arrangement between WIEGO affiliates and individual planning schools, following the SDI-AAPS example.

The recommendations below deal firstly with aspects of planning curricula which could shift in order to leave students more prepared to plan in a context of informality; and secondly with research gaps where a better understanding is needed between planning and informal work.

²¹ <http://www.sasdialliance.org.za/corc/>

5.1 Incorporating an Understanding of Informal Work into Planning Curricula

There are three ways in which informal work can be better covered in planning curricula:

Experiential learning through “live” studios involving informal workers and related MBOs – There is no doubt that direct, first-hand experience of a situation imparts a far deeper grasp of a situation than many hours of a text book or classroom lectures could. This form of learning is particularly important when it is needed to form the basis for future judgement of some kind (Christensen et al. 1991), for example, planning decisions need to be made about problems and opportunities, and a way forward. The “studio” culture of learning (familiar to architects but widely used by planners as well) is by definition a problem-based learning approach where students are given an issue or an area to explore and are asked to come up with a “solution,” or perhaps a range of possible “solutions.” The most effective studios are therefore those that allow direct engagement of students with the human and material subjects that will inform their conclusions. Of course, such studios must be very carefully planned and managed: they require complete commitment and support from a mediating body such as an NGO or MBO leadership, permission from the “community” (street traders, waste-pickers, shack-dwellers, etc.) to undertake this work, thorough feedback throughout the process that also allows community members to comment on and criticize the studio findings, and joint ownership over the products of the studio (maps, survey data, models, etc.). In essence, the community takes on the role of the planners’ client, and is due as much respect from the students as would be demanded by a private developer or the state.

In the case of the AAPS-SDI collaboration, these learning engagements have also been seen as producing valuable outcomes for the SDI affiliated communities. Students produce useful information, maps and documentation which the community can make use of, students can work out costings of alternative forms of upgrade and infrastructure, as well as finding policies and plans which relate to city development proposals. Academic staff can bring higher levels of professional expertise to bear on upgrade issues. If the MBO offers internship possibilities for planning students, then these students can provide a source of expertise and new ideas. Once they graduate they become professionals who are sensitized to informal issues in cities and are far likely to work to promote inclusive cities than would other professionals.

Learning through case studies – Next to a live studio, learning through case studies allows a simulation of a live situation. A well-written case study allows students deep insight into the problems and dilemmas of a situation, and can either show how and why a particular approach was or was not successful, or the case can be written in a way that allows students to debate what their own resolution to a situation would be. Case studies and student dialogue around outcomes is becoming an increasingly popular mode of teaching in problem-based disciplines (see the Harvard Business School, for example, which relies almost entirely on the case method of teaching). However, what is needed are the documented cases to provide the basis for this form of learning, and these are not readily available. The book *Working in Warwick: Including Street Traders in Urban Plans* (Dobson and Skinner 2009) about the Warwick Triangle Market in Durban, South Africa is a good example of a documented case which can be used for teaching.

Lecture-based theory courses that deal with informal work – Ideally such a course would deal with how both formal and informal actors shape the production of urban space, bringing the two into juxtaposition with each other. The purpose of this would be to show that while the economic drivers of street traders and shopping mall developers (for example) may appear different on the surface, they are in fact responding to similar logics of demand and supply, and profit making. What differentiates them may ultimately be scale or their ability or willingness to respond to regulatory requirements.

5.2 Research Gaps

The impact that planning and planned urban environments have on informal work is only partly understood, and much more research is needed in these areas. Some aspects are context specific and require investigation on a country-by-country basis. Key research gaps are as follows:

Research on planning law – Given the strong influence on planning curricula of existing planning legislation (at country and city level), and the position taken by many schools that they need to train planners to operate existing planning laws, it is suggested here that some research be carried out into how planning law impacts on informal employment. Some of these laws may be national in scope, but there are also likely to be a plethora of by-laws in urban areas which constrain the activities of informal workers. As these laws are often country-specific, a strategic approach may be to take a sample country from the East, from Africa and from Latin America, and test out the impact of this legislation.

Working from home – While there has been a great deal of attention focused on street traders or others in the public realm, many working poor operate from their home, either making goods to sell or selling directly from their home-base. Their ability to do this can be affected by housing policy (form of tenure, services, forms of unit, etc.) where frequently there is little consideration given to how the home functions as an economic unit as well. Working from home can also be affected by a range of planning and by-laws: areas zoned as residential areas; laws restricting front-extensions of a house to form a shop; noise restrictions, etc. The spatial layout of an area also increases or decreases possibilities to work and sell from home. The North American neighbourhood unit and Radburn layouts (see footnotes 4 and 5), for example, aim to dilute the movement of people through an area rather than concentrating them on particular routes where informal sellers can take advantage of combined purchasing power.

The planning of markets and street markets to optimize opportunities for a wide range of informal sellers (from larger to the smallest) – Where these markets are located, their size, shape, organization and management can make a fundamental difference to the ability of traders to operate successfully in them.

Appendix A: Website Addresses and Contact People of Planning School Associations

AAPS (African Planning Schools Association)

<http://www.africanplanningschools.org.za/>

Contact person:

Vanessa Watson

School of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics / African Centre for Cities

University of Cape Town, South Africa

Email: Vanessa.Watson@uct.ac.za

APSA (Asian Planning Schools Association)

<http://www.apsaweb.org/>

President:

Professor Utpal Sharma

Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology (CEPT) (University)

Ahmedabad

India

Tel: (+91-79) 2630-2470, 2630-2740

Fax: (+91-79) 2630-2075

Email: utpal.sharma@spcept.org

Homepage: www.spcept.org

ACUPP (Association of Canadian University Planning Programmes)

<http://acupp-apucu.mcgill.ca/>

President:

David Amborski

Ryerson University, Toronto

Email: amborski@ryerson.ca

ANPUR (National Association of Urban and Regional Post-graduate and Research Programs, Brazil)

<http://www.anpur.org.br/home.htm>

President:

Leila Christina Dias

Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas – CFH

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Campus Universitario, Trindade

CEP 88-040-900

Florianopolis, Santa Caterina, Brasil

Fax: +55 (48) 37219983

Email: leiladias@hotmail.com

ALEUP (American Association of Schools of Urbanism and Planning)

<http://www.uaemex.mx/pwww/Aleup/Integrantes.html>

President:

Dr. Roberto Rodríguez G.

Universidad Simón Bolívar, Venezuela

Email: robroguez@gmail.com

ACSP (Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, USA)

<http://www.acsp.org/>

President:

Cheryl Contant

University of Minnesota Morris

USA

Email: contant@morris.umn.edu

ANZAPS (Australian and New Zealand Association of Planning Schools)

<http://www.perio.org.au/events.php?mid=5>

Contact person:

Ali Memon, Ssecretary

Professor, Environmental Management Group

Environment, Society and Design Division

Lincoln University

Canterbury

New Zealand

Tel: 64 3 325 3868

Email: memona@lincoln.ac.nz

APERAU (Association for the Development of Planning Education and Research)

<http://www.aperau.org/>

President:

Didier Paris (President of APERAU Internationale)

Professor, Institut d'Aménagement et d'urbanisme

UFR de Géographie, Université Lille 1

59655 Villeneuve d'Asq Cedex

France

Tel: 06 81 66 90 07

Email: didier.paris@univ-lille1.fr

AESOP (Association of European Schools of Planning)

<http://www.aesop-planning.com/>

President:

Kristina Nilsson

Lulea University of Technology,

Department of Architecture and Infrastructure

Sweden

Email: kristina.l.nilsson@ltu.se

IPSA (Indonesian Planning Schools Association)

President:

Haryo Winarso PhD

Assc. Professor

School of Architecture PLanning and Policy Development

Institut Teknologi Bandung

Email: haryowinarso@yahoo.com

Appendix B: Memorandum of Understanding Between Slum Dwellers International and the African Associations of Planning Schools

1. Purpose of the Collaboration

To promote the collaboration of SDI and SDI country-based affiliates with members of the AAPS in order to promote initiatives, plans and policies which encourage pro-poor and inclusive cities and towns in Africa. The Partnership recognizes that planners play an important role in either facilitating or hindering the inclusion and improvement of informal settlements and slums, and that the education of planners has a fundamental impact on both their values and understanding, responses and practices, in relation to urban informality. The Partnership recognizes that one of the most effective ways to change the mind-sets of student planners is to offer them direct experiential exposure to, and interaction with, the conditions and residents of informal settlements and slums.

2. Nature of the Collaboration

The parties are entering into this MoU on the basis that they are equal partners who bring different and yet complementary strengths to the tasks of:

- creating “pro-poor” cities that integrate rather than marginalize the interests of slum dwellers and countering the dominant urban development approaches which so often exclude them;
- collaborating (in the cities and towns of Africa where AAPS member schools have a presence) to expose students of city/town/regional planning to the issues and needs of those living and working in informal settlements, so that as professionals they will work directly or indirectly to promote inclusive and pro-poor urban settlements;
- exchanging ideas on the development of curricula in planning and the built environment;
- joint research and collaboration on the documentation and dissemination of successful cases of pro-poor intervention, both for use in teaching and to influence policy-makers.

The two organisations commit themselves to the common goal of jointly delivering to the highest level of quality. Their relationship in taking forward this goal will be underpinned by principles of transparency and trust.

All research and publication collaborations will adhere to the principles of ethical research, the right to privacy and informed consent. This includes sensitivity to cultural diversity, confidentiality and anonymity. It is acknowledged that both institutions have different agendas and processes, but are partnering towards a common goal. In the spirit of the collaboration, each entity will respect the autonomy, experience and timelines of the other.

It is intended that the collaboration is undertaken with the Partners equally sharing risks and benefits associated with the objectives of the collaboration.

The use of the term “Partner” in this agreement is not intended in a way that implies the creation of a legal partnership, joint venture or any other kind of legal entity between (AAPS) and (SDI) in order to implement the collaboration. It is rather used to express a collaboration in which both members have equal status.

3. Responsibilities of Both Partners

Within this collaborative agreement, both partners will work within the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) established to promote the joint aims of the partnership.

The AAPS Steering Committee (and/or its delegated representatives) and Co-ordinators of SDI will hold joint meetings at mutually agreeable times (but at least once per annum) to review progress with the achievement of the aims of the MoU and assess further ways in which the common goals can be implemented.

Working within the broader MoU, the Parties will assume specific responsibilities:

The AAPS Steering Committee undertakes to:

- Encourage member schools to establish a relationship with SDI country-based affiliates, within their country of operation;
- Encourage country-based collaborations between planning schools and SDI affiliates to develop their own more specific MoU, operating under the umbrella agreement provided by this MoU;
- Encourage member schools to consider possibilities of student internships with SDI affiliates; and conduct educational projects for their students in partnership with SDI affiliates within informal settlements;
- Encourage member schools to invite SDI affiliate staff to give inputs and lectures to students;
- Encourage member schools to consult SDI affiliate staff to give feedback on planning curricula and comment on the extent to which these curricula impart pro-poor values and strategies to student planners;
- Encourage member schools to discuss the possibility of their staff and students undertaking research on successful pro-poor initiatives, in collaboration or with the agreement of SDI affiliates, for use as teaching case studies and for publication.

SDI undertakes to:

- Notify its country-based affiliates (in countries and cities where there is an AAPS membership) of this MoU;
- Encourage its country-based affiliates to co-operate with AAPS member schools in order to: host student interns; facilitate educational projects in informal settlements; consider invitations to lecture or address planning students and staff; consider invitations to give feedback on planning curricula; consider and encourage opportunities for staff and student research on informal settlement interventions and projects, for use in teaching case studies and publication;
- Meet with AAPS when necessary to discuss further strategies to encourage pro-poor and inclusive urban policies and practices amongst planning academics and professionals.

4. General

The Parties shall be entitled to use the name and/or either Party's logo for purposes of the Project, and on the websites of the respective organizations, with the written consent of that Party. During the course of the Project, Parties shall use appropriate citations as mutually agreed upon.

Material produced from collaborative projects, i.e. plans, models, photos, written material will belong to both parties who will acknowledge each other's contribution.

SDI and AAPS will consider joint documentation of this collaboration to disseminate projects and processes to further expand access to others for academic or practical application.

What follows are recommendations for examples of the kinds of “field of work” this collaboration will encompass. The parties generally agree on broad areas of collaboration on projects, including but not limited to:

- Community-led mapping and enumeration. This could include GIS database and analysis.
- Planning and engineering solutions in consultation with communities
- Planning and engineering of greenfield sites
- Advocacy with cities, municipalities and national government on policy issues, implementation etc.
- Material and shelter innovations
- Other emerging interests

5. Dispute Resolution/Arbitration

Disputes arising at country level: Any dispute, arising from, or in connection with this agreement at country or city level shall first be resolved by the parties through the process of negotiation or mediation. If the dispute cannot be resolved, then the dispute can be mediated by a joint committee of SDI and AAPS identified at the time of this MoU.

Disputes between SDI and AAPS shall be referred to the Arbitration Foundation of South Africa to be resolved in accordance with the UNCITRAL Rules in South Africa in English.

6. Financial Obligations of the Parties

The two parties shall share any financial obligations associated with the implementation of the activities herein stated after consultations and discussions for mutual benefit.

7. Time Frame/Duration of the MoU

This MoU is valid for a period of two years from the day of signing after which it shall be renewed subject to the terms and conditions to be agreed upon by the Parties. Country-level MoUs may set their own timeframes.

References

- Agbola, T. and B. Wahab. 2010. Informality, Illegality and Actor Collaboration: A Curriculum and Planning Practice Review of Topical Issues in Nigeria. *Workshop of the Association of African Planning Schools*, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- Duminy, James. 2010. Conference Background Paper for Conference 2010: Revitalising Planning Education in Africa. Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Found online at http://www.africanplanningschools.org.za/images/stories/aaps/AAPS2010_backgroundpaper1.pdf (retrieved 1 March 2011).
- Batey, W. J. 1985. "Postgraduate Planning Education in Britain: Its Purpose, Content and Organisation." *Town Planning Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4, 407-420.
- Burayidi, M. A. 1993. Dualism and Universalism: Competing Paradigms in Planning Education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 12, 223-229.
- Christensen, C., D. Garvin, A. Sweet, Eds. 1992. *Education for Judgement*. The artistry of discussion leadership. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Dalton, L. C. 2001. "Weaving the Fabric of Planning as Education." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 20, 423-436.
- Dewar, D. and V. Watson. 1990. *Urban Markets: Developing Informal Retailing*. Routledge: London.
- Diaw, K., T. Nnkyia and V. Watson. 2002. "Planning Education in Africa: Responding to the Demands of a Changing Context." *Planning Practice and Research*, Vol. 17, No. 3, 337-48.
- Dobson, R. and C. Skinner with J. Nicholson. 2009. *Working in Warwick, Including Street Traders in Urban Plans*. Durban: School of Development Studies, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.
- Frank, A. 2006. Three Decades of Thought on Planning Education. *Journal of Planning Literature*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 15-67.
- Hall, P. 1988. *Cities of Tomorrow*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Healey, P. and R. Upton, Eds. 2010. *Crossing Borders: International Exchange and Planning Practices*. London and New York: Routledge.
- International Labour Organization (ILO). 2002. *Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture*. Geneva: ILO.
- Leaf, M. and L. Hou. 2006. The "Third Spring" of Urban Planning in China. China Information, Found online at <http://cin.sagepub.com/content/20/3/553> (retrieved 1 March 2011).
- Mahadevia, D. 2009. Subversive Urban Development in India: Implications on Planning Education. Asian Planning Schools Association Congress, Ahmedabad.
- Mendis, W. 2007. Trends and Challenges for Planning Education at Asia Towards Achieving Millennium Development. Congress of Asian Planning Schools Association, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

- Nasr, J. and M. Volait, Eds. 2003. *Urbanism: Imported or Exported? Native Aspirations and Foreign Plans*. Chichester: Wiley-Academy.
- National Research Council. 2003. *Cities Transformed: Demographic Change and Its Implications in the Developing World*. Washington: The National Academies Press.
- Njoh, A. 2003 *Planning in Contemporary Africa: the State, Town Planning and Society in Cameroon*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Rodriguez-Bachiller, A. 1988. *Town Planning Education*. Gower: Aldershot.
- Roy, A. 2009. "Strangely Familiar: Planning and the Worlds of Insurgence and Informality." *Planning Theory*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 7-11.
- Tapela, N. 2010. Responding to Informality and Increased Access to Land Through Actor Collaboration in Design and Implementing a Responsive Planning Education Curriculum at CPUT. Workshop of the Association of African Planning Schools, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- Taylor, N. 1998. *Urban Planning Theory Since 1945*. London: Sage.
- Tibajuka, A. (2006) The importance of urban planning in urban poverty reduction and sustainable development, *World Planners Congress*, Vancouver.
- UN-Habitat. 2008. *The State of the World's Cities 2008/9*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat. 2009. *Planning Sustainable Cities. Global Report on Human Settlements*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- United Nations. 2008. *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2007 Revision*. New York: United Nations.
- Ward, S. 2002. *Planning the Twentieth-Century City: The Advanced Capitalist World*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Ward, S. 2010. 'Transnational planners in a postcolonial world', in P. Healey and R. Upton (eds.) *Crossing Borders. International exchange and planning practices*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Watson, V. 2009. 'The planned city sweeps the poor away...' Urban planning and 21st century urbanization, *Progress in Planning*, 72(3), 153-193.
- Watson, V. 2010. 'Informal settlements: in search of a home in the city ', in D. Vlahov, J. Boufford, C. Pearson and L. Norris (eds.) *Urban Health: Global Perspectives*, Jossey-Bass and John Wiley & Sons: 305-316.

About Inclusive Cities: The Inclusive Cities project aims to strengthen membership-based organizations (MBOs) of the working poor in the areas of organizing, policy analysis and advocacy, in order to ensure that urban informal workers have the tools necessary to make themselves heard within urban planning processes. Inclusive Cities is a collaboration between MBOs of the working poor, international alliances of MBOs and those supporting the work of MBOs. For more information visit: www.inclusivecities.org.

About WIEGO: Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing is a global research-policy-action network that seeks to improve the status of the working poor, especially women, in the informal economy. WIEGO builds alliances with, and draws its membership from, three constituencies: membership-based organizations of informal workers, researchers and statisticians working on the informal economy, and professionals from development agencies interested in the informal economy. WIEGO pursues its objectives by helping to build and strengthen networks of informal worker organizations; undertaking policy analysis, statistical research and data analysis on the informal economy; providing policy advice and convening policy dialogues on the informal economy; and documenting and disseminating good practice in support of the informal workforce. For more information visit: www.wiego.org.



Women in Informal Employment
Globalizing and Organizing