
Syllabus for the Fall 2017
Tuesdays (4:00 - 6:00 PM) - Room 9-217

Lead instructor:
Bish Sanyal – Office Hours: by appointment - Email: sanyal@mit.edu

Co-instructor:
Cauam Ferreira Cardoso – Office Hours: by appointment - Email: cauam@mit.edu

1. Course Description:

This is an advanced seminar that will analyze the effectiveness of development and planning theories from the perspective of practitioners who implement projects and policies based on such theories. The course will be organized around twelve implementation puzzles, which should be considered for re-theorizing both developmental and planning processes. The course will begin with a review of conventional theories of Development, Planning, and Implementation to set the stage for critical reviews of how such theories actually unfolded in practice. Then, drawing on the implementation experiences of projects and policies, the conventional theories will be revised particularly to fit organizational constraints which influence implementation outcomes. The ultimate goal is to create new planning sensibilities, which theorize from practice, not the other way around. Students will be required to focus on any one of the implementation puzzles discussed in the class and write a paper on the multiple facets of any such puzzle. This kind of an understanding can lead to re-conceptualization of the developmental process, as nations develop, cities grow, and planning is practiced by professionals who do not conceptualize the process as either "top-down" or "bottom-up", but seek an understanding of the connection between the two
levels. Since the central purpose of the course is to cultivate a conversation between theory and practice, this class will be open to both graduate students and SPURS-Humphrey Fellows.

2. Learning Objectives:

The choice of a dialectic approach to study the relationship between development, planning, and implementation is intended to foster critical thinking. Specifically, we expect students attending 11.S940 to develop two critical skills, which are the ability to understand conventional development and planning theories, then question the conventional understanding by looking at actual outcomes, and finally revise theory building in a way that is useful for practitioners. Even if this process sounds very clear-cut, the process is likely to be dialogic, and will rely on students reflecting on their own professional experience.

The main goal is not to replace conventional theories with non-conventional ones, but identify under what conditions any set of theoretical propositions hold. Hence, identifying conditions which determine development and planning outcomes is crucial.

One assumption that underlies this pedagogical approach is that it encourages unconventional thinking, and reflection in action – and not planning prescriptions based on pre-conceived ideas.

3. Course Format & Structure

The classes will start with lecture on each of the debates, followed by a seminar style discussion, in which students are expected to participate actively. The students will need to read the assigned material in advance as a way to prepare for an extensive in-class discussion. The weekly meetings will be organized around the implementation-related debates, with the co-instructors taking the lead.

Students will be required to attend three panel discussions at DUSP on issues of implementation by leading scholars in the field. These panels are scheduled for dates and times yet to be determined.

We will also use online resources for information sharing, and to promote discussions on the challenges of implementation development policies and projects. These include the usual Stellar website and group emails.
4. Calendar Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Registration day – No Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction – The rationale for the course: why is it important to understand the difference between conventional theories and actual outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overview of conventional theories of development, planning, and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One Modernity or Multiple Modernities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assessment of development and planning efforts: what has worked and what has not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Columbus Day – No Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bottom-up versus Top-down development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Comprehensive versus incremental planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Under what conditions do public sector institutions perform well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is politics a hindrance to, or essential for planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>How do development professionals define what is ethical practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rigidity versus flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Modes of evaluation: what is useful knowledge for practitioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Social construction of learning institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Surety of purpose or humility of not knowing the answer?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Assignments:

- **Analysis of an “Implementation Surprise”:** Two-page paper sharing a surprising outcome of an effort to implement either a development project or policy that the student is personally familiar with. At this stage, students will be asked to identify one or more of the proposed
implementation puzzles that come closer to their experience, and will be asked to make a short presentation (10 minutes) sharing the puzzle with their classmates.

• **Mid-term**: Students will complete an extended outline (5-pages), drawing on the implementation surprise selected in the first class. This outline will expand the description of the surprise and should include three plausible alternative explanations on why this might have happened. This assignment should be an intermediary step towards the formulating a full-fledged paper by the end of the semester.

  o **Final Paper**: Individual 15-20-pages paper due at the last week of the semester. The paper should be built on the mid-term paper, and focus on one of the three potential explanations given earlier. In writing their final paper, students will be expected to draw from the required and some of the optional readings; or even better introduce new readings that could make the class better in the future.

6. Grading Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Percentage of the Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Puzzle</td>
<td>09/20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>10/18</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper</td>
<td>12/06</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grade</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Grades Levels:

A=93-100%; A- = 90-92%; B+ = 87-89%; B = 83-86%; B- = 80-82%; C+ = 77-79%; C = 73-76%; C- = 70-72%; D+ = 67-69%; D = 63-66%; D- = 60-62%; F = <60
8. Additional Requirements:

**Attendance:** Attendance is required. More than two unexcused absences will result in a full letter grade reduction. Three “late” will result in one absence.

**Statement on Class Conduct:** I expect students to behave respectfully in class, which includes politeness towards the classmates and the instructor (e.g. giving others the chance to speak), as well as full engagement with the classroom activities (no browsing on the internet and social media allowed during class).

*Plagiarism will not be tolerated! Please consult Institute guidelines:*

[http://humanistic.mit.edu/wcc/avoidingplagiarism](http://humanistic.mit.edu/wcc/avoidingplagiarism)

9. Writing Support

The WCC at MIT (Writing and Communication Center) offers *free* one-on-one professional advice from communication experts. The WCC is staffed completely by MIT lecturers. All have advanced degrees. All are experienced college classroom teachers of communication. All are all are published scholars and writers. Not counting the WCC’s director’s years (he started the WCC in 1982), the WCC lecturers have a combined 133 years’ worth of teaching here at MIT (ranging from 4 to 24 years).

The WCC works with undergraduate, graduate students, post-docs, faculty, staff, alums, and spouses. The WCC helps you strategize about all types of academic and professional writing as well as about all aspects of oral presentations (including practicing classroom presentations & conference talks as well as designing slides). No matter what department or discipline you are in, the WCC helps you think your way more deeply into your topic, helps you see new implications in your data, research, and ideas.

The WCC also helps with all English as Second Language issues, from writing and grammar to pronunciation and conversation practice. The WCC is located in E18-233, 50 Ames Street). To guarantee yourself a time, make an appointment. To register with our online scheduler and to make appointments, go to [https://mit.mywconline.com/](https://mit.mywconline.com/).

To access the WCC’s many pages of advice about writing and oral presentations, go to [http://cmsw.mit.edu/writing-and-communication-center/](http://cmsw.mit.edu/writing-and-communication-center/). Check the online scheduler for up-to-date hours and available appointments.
10. Classes and Reading Assignments*, **, ***:

*Some of the reading assignments may change in the course of the semester to incorporate student feedback.

** Students must complete these readings prior coming to class.

*** A list of Optional Readings is provided for each class. These readings are not required. Students may access these resources for further study, according to their own time availability and interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 5</th>
<th>Registration Day – No Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep 12</th>
<th>Introduction – The rationale for the course: why is it important to understand the difference between conventional theories and actual outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Overview of conventional theories of development, planning, and implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• Rosenstein-Rodan, P. N. (1943). Problems of industrialisation of eastern and south-eastern Europe. The economic journal, 202-211.  
### Sep 26  
**One Modernity or Multiple Modernities?**

**Required Readings**

**Optional Readings**

### Oct 3  
**Assessment of development and planning efforts: what has worked and what has not?**

**Required Readings**

**Optional Readings**

### Oct 10  
**Columbus Day – No Classes**

### Oct 17  
**Bottom-up versus Top-down development?**

**Required Readings**
- Evans, P. B., Rueschemeyer, D., & Skocpol, T. (1985). Bringing the state back in. Cambridge University Press. – Ch 2
### Oct 24  Comprehensive versus incremental planning

**Required Readings**

**Optional Readings**

### Oct 31  Under what conditions do public sector institutions perform well?

**Required Readings**

**Optional Readings**

### Nov 7  Is politics a hindrance to, or essential for planning?

**Required**
### Readings

### Optional Readings

### Nov 14  *How do development professionals define what is ethical practice?*

#### Required Readings

#### Optional Readings
- **Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K.** (2010). Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing. Penguin. – Ch. 3

### Nov 21  *Rigidity versus flexibility*

#### Required Readings

#### Optional Readings
and Development, 9(5), 487-503


**Nov 28  \textit{Modes of evaluation: what is useful knowledge for practitioners?}**

**Required Readings**


**Optional Readings**

- Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. (2010). Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing. Penguin. – Ch. 6


**Dec 5 \textit{The Social construction of learning institutions.}**

**Required Readings**


- Argyris, C. (2004). Reasons and Rationalizations: The Limits to Organizational Knowledge: The Limits to Organizational Knowledge. OUP Oxford. – Ch. 7

**Optional Readings**

- Healey, P. (1997). Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies. UBC Press. – Ch. 9

Dec 12  *Surety of purpose or humility of not knowing the answer?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lear, J. (1998). <em>Open minded: Working out the logic of the soul</em>. Harvard University Press. – Ch 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>