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SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR URBAN AND REGIONAL STUDIES & HUBERT H. HUMPHREY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
Over the years, we at the Special Program for Urban and Regional Studies (SPURS) have traveled, conceptually as well as programmatically, 180 degrees in our thinking about “leadership” what is it, how it affects organizational performance, and, most importantly, how can it be cultivated in a one-year program of midcareer professionals such as the SPURS/Humphrey Program.

When SPURS started in 1967, there was very little concern that the Fellows needed leadership training. Reflecting the rebellious flavor of the times, SPURS was created to provide complete flexibility to the Fellows to spend the year exploring whatever interested them. The program was totally unstructured—intentionally—to provide ample time for the Fellows to choose from a host of activities on the MIT campus. No one monitored how each Fellow was utilizing the year. The only “requirement” was a weekly luncheon meeting at which Fellows shared reflections of all kinds—on the Vietnam War, civil rights, the women’s movement, environmentalism, and so on. Leadership was not a strong concern then; in fact, leaders were portrayed as representing and defending the status quo, which needed to be changed. In the late 1960s, the mid-career SPURS Fellows bore witness to the social turmoil of the era and likely returned home with an enlightened view of the democratic character of American society, which was expressed with such vibrancy on university campuses across the United States.

The purpose, structure, and content of SPURS had evolved significantly by 1978, when we joined the Hubert Humphrey Program. Needless to say, times had changed: the global economy had faced a major shock from the rapid rise in the price of oil in 1970; both inflation and unemployment were rising to the consternation of economists (who invented the term “stagflation” to describe the anomaly); and politically, many developing countries had turned from democratic rule to authoritarian or theocratic regimes. In other words, economically as well as politically, there was deep disillusionment with conventional modes of thinking about development; it was clear that the simple democratic exercise of raising awareness through protests, street marches, and social criticism of the kind that characterized the ’60s was not enough to address the economic/political crisis of the late 1970s. In SPURS likewise, there was a growing awareness that our former model of international educational exchange focusing on individual reflection would not produce the kind of expertise needed to address the world’s mounting challenges.

All such sentiments and more were incorporated when SPURS joined the Hubert Humphrey Program in 1978. The new SPURS/Humphrey Program was more structured and centered on three principle activities: academic courses, professional affiliations, and community service. The Humphrey seminar was added at this time, and the topics covered reflect how priorities changed over the years—from development planning challenges to global interdependencies to cultural conflict. Each year, we experimented with different conceptual approaches and explored a range of issues, including leadership—but the subject only rarely received the kind of attention it deserves.

Since then, there have been other global developments that have encouraged SPURS/Humphrey to reflect on our approach. The publication of the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future (also known as the Brundtland Report) in 1987, for example, called for a new model of leadership to address global environmental concerns. According to the report, environmental problems could not be addressed by single nation states alone; the global nature of the problem required a joint effort by all countries, rich and poor, to
agree on and implement a set of policies to protect the environment. This effort would require a very different and unconventional leadership, not bounded by the interests of specific territorial entities. The debt crisis in the 1980s also called for leaders who understood the interdependencies of the global economy. To be sure, there were many arguments regarding who was to be blamed for what; but gradually it became clear that the world needed a new type of leader—the kind good at negotiating and jointly crafting public policies that could address globally intertwined problems.

Despite the increasing interconnectedness of global challenges and our refocusing of the SPURS/Humphrey Program toward academic and professional learning, for some time leadership remained tangential to our focus, which centered on the technical skills our Fellows could develop in their specific areas of interest, including planning, policy, environmental change, and economic development. There were at least three reasons why leadership training never received our central attention until recently. First, for a while, there was no consensus about the normative goals of development; with such undefined objectives, it was obviously difficult to identify the leadership qualities necessary to achieve them. Second, increasing awareness of racial and gender inequalities raised serious questions about conventional leadership styles, suggesting that a cooperative approach might be better than the traditional top-down model. While we know now that collaboration is central to good leadership, there were many years when it seemed that they were mutually exclusive in practice. Finally, there was a sense that we had entered a new period of uncertainty as well as humility—we neither understood the precise nature of problems nor were we confident of how best to address them. Ultimately, we found we had more questions about appropriate leadership qualities than definitive answers.

This spring, we launched the Abdulaziz A. Alkhedheiri Leadership Fund with the SPURS/Humphrey Leadership Development and Inclusion Seminar. Designed to facilitate a process of reflection on leadership through critical discussion, the seminar is organized as a spring series of workshops that follows a sequential logic in moving from the theoretical to the practical. Through this seminar, we have been exploring fundamental questions about leadership in order to encourage our Fellows to reflect on and reframe their approaches to the planning and development challenges that brought them to MIT. The seminar has explored such foundational questions as:

- Where do good ideas come from? How can leaders be poised to welcome and recognize these ideas as they emerge?
- How are ideas mobilized? One school of thought is that effective change follows a model of “continuity but better”—which is to say that innovative ideas are most likely to be adopted when they are presented as not being radically different. What kind of leadership is needed to produce a culture of innovation that understands and respects organizational and cultural norms while
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moving communities toward experimentation? When should leadership be disruptive?

• How do effective leaders deal with opposition? How can they build alliances and connect ideas to broader goals and principles? How much of leadership is a matter of sheer persistence by advocates for change?

• Finally, how do effective leaders implement good ideas? At the end of the day, putting ideas into practice in an effective and sustainable way requires a different set of skills from those needed to build support for the idea. How do effective leaders amass resources for new ideas in a context in which many implementing bodies are short-staffed and underfunded? Does creativity in implementation require repurposing existing resources? How can leaders monitor and evaluate the progress of new ideas and retain the flexibility to adapt as circumstances change?

The seminar has brought several exciting visiting speakers to SPURS/Humphrey, including Harvard Kennedy School Professor of Public Policy Matt Andrews; Boston University Professor of International Relations and Earth and Environment Adil Najam; MIT Professor of Political Economy and Community Development J. Phillip Thompson; MIT Ford Professor of Urban and Environmental Planning and founder of the Consensus Building Institute Lawrence Susskind; and MIT Community Innovators Lab Director Dayna Cunningham. The seminar will culminate in a final event in May, where Fellows will present to the DUSP community the plans they have formulated for putting their lessons into action when they return home.

The Fellows also continue to be involved in the MIT-Roxbury Community College (RCC) Partnership, which provides a unique perspective through cross-cultural learning and collaboration. As Nene Igietseme and Amy Curran describe later in the newsletter, the MIT SPURS/Humphrey community has been deeply involved this year with RCC, and the experience is helping everyone involved to learn more about what good leadership may require in a multicultural world. Before our Fellows had fully settled into the rhythm of life at MIT and in Cambridge, the MIT-RCC Partnership offered them the opportunity to present their work in their home countries to a new community in Boston, one with overlapping but also distinctly different concerns related to city living. This collaboration has given our Fellows the distance necessary to be objective about their work at home. Likewise, RCC students have been inspired and helped by SPURS/Humphrey Fellows to act on problems they see in the wider Boston community.

In many ways—both within SPURS/Humphrey and in the broader Boston community—we are experimenting with what leadership means for international development. We have learned that effective leadership takes thoughtfulness and reflection on the part of the individual, collaboration and deliberation within and between communities, and action—even amid uncertainty and change.

We look forward to this continuing process of experimentation and discovery, and we’ll let you know how it goes.

**SPURS PROGRAM EXPANDS COLLABORATION**

Argentina’s former Chief of the Cabinet of the Ministers Office Juan Manuel Abal Medina signed a 5-year agreement with SPURS Director Bish Sanyal to provide two scholarships each year under the BEC.AR Program for a year of study in SPURS starting 2014–2015.
American Planning

The American Planning Seminar is an important part of the SPURS/Humphrey Program in the fall term. After getting settled and deciding on their classes, Fellows launch into professional affiliations, working with agencies and firms for six weeks or more to get the feel of American practice and meet peer professionals. Most of the Fellows lack a familiarity with the institutional structure and customary linkages of U.S. problem solving as well as some of the “personality” of professional interaction. The seminar addresses this with a series of talks by American professionals, who usually speak in pairs about their work and responsibilities.

So far this year, we have been fortunate to have discussions with Mitchell Silver, former president of the American Planning Association; Noah Maslan, a Massachusetts housing development specialist; and David Luberoff, director of the Rappaport Institute for Greater Boston. These sessions have produced very vigorous interchanges.

Professor John Mullin from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst also participated in a series of four lectures on American planning history and current structure. Professor Mullin has had a long career as a planning instructor and as a consultant on a wide span of urban issues, especially in Massachusetts. The Fellows were enthusiastic about his lectures.

The American Planning Seminar continues to highlight important institutional differences for the Fellows between their countries and the United States. For example, many countries of the developing world lack strength in intermediate governmental levels, whereas the United States has a robust state system of governance. States handle or influence many of the development functions in the United States, making this structure among the most important to study in addressing many of the Fellows’ interests in a U.S. context. Many foreigners also find the insistence in American planning on informal, widespread agreement to projects and policy unusual. Through this seminar—especially with Professor Mullin’s involvement this year—we have given the Fellows ways to explore and explain the peculiarities of America’s planning culture.

International Development

The SPURS spring semester launched in February with two seminars led by Professor Bish Sanyal on issues in international development. Serving as a thoughtful introduction to the subsequent Leadership Seminar, these seminars began a critical conversation on the goals and practices of international development by questioning the historical progression of conventional wisdom in the field and encouraging the Fellows to creatively envision new approaches. The first seminar—“Older Sensibilities: Newer Sensibilities”—started with deep questions about changing intellectual thought on international development over the last few decades. This led to a lively discussion about globalization, modernity, and planning in the 21st century. The second seminar—“Housing for the Poor: What Works? What Does Not?”—extended the conversation from the DUSP 2013 Fall Seminar series, “Successful Struggles: Planning for Resilient Urban Housing.” Discussing the pros and cons of different housing policy approaches, Professor Sanyal asked the Fellows: “If you were the Minister of Housing in your country, what would be your approach to housing the poor?” Fellows then discussed the development of housing policies in their countries and what different models they could imagine.

Professor John Mullin with Fellows.
The Leadership Development and Inclusion Seminar is a new component of the SPURS/Humphrey Program this spring term. Designed to develop leadership knowledge and practical skills, the seminar is intended to support the Fellows in implementing their individual programs once they return to their countries. Throughout their time at MIT, the Fellows will have had various opportunities to engage with substantive experts in their areas of work, as well as to share and reflect on their personal experiences, which benefits both the Fellows and the MIT community. In this process, Fellows often identify issues or projects that they would like to explore upon their return home. Developing their capacities to lead processes of innovation and organizational change—especially in moments of crisis or uncertainty—thus becomes critical to the Fellows’ ability to put their ideas into action after they leave the SPURS/Humphrey Program.

The new seminar combines a set of theoretical and practical elements to build Fellows’ understanding of the challenges surrounding leadership while also offering opportunities to test new approaches and tools that support equity and inclusion. The seminar involves a series of workshops, held throughout the spring semester, and culminates in a final presentation by the Fellows.

By participating in the SPURS/Humphrey leadership development program, the Fellows will gain “better understanding of the role and potential of leadership in their practice; better understanding of leadership as a vehicle for equity and inclusion; practices to see current situations from a systems perspective; practices to support reflection in action; practices to enhance collaboration and co-creation; and tools to initiate and sustain processes of personal and organizational innovation and change.”

The semester’s activities were designed and facilitated in collaboration with the MIT Community Innovators Lab (CoLab), a center for planning and development in DUSP. CoLab supports the use of knowledge from excluded communities to deepen civic engagement, improve community practice, inform policy, mobilize community assets, and generate shared wealth. Using leadership networks to connect community leaders with academic expertise and enthusiastic student engagement, CoLab helps leaders develop effective responses to structural inequality, sharpen their constituents’ participation, and make planning and development processes more responsive.

The seminars are facilitated by Instructors CoLab: Dayna Cunningham, CoLab Executive Director; Alyssa Bryson, Program Director, Puerto Rico/Caribbean Development Initiative; SPURS: Bish Sanyal, SPURS Director; Ofer Lerner and Abby Spinak, SPURS Associates.
SPURS/Humphrey Fellows enhanced their study of American Planning through a series of Professional Visits to municipal, regional, and national agencies as well as guided tours and discussions with community organizations/activists about influential civic actions and important public spaces. Professional Visits included weekly events in the Boston Area plus an exciting three-day visit in November to New York City. Through these visits, Fellows learned about planning and development in the United States from the federal to the local level.

Visits in Boston included:
**Massachusetts State House**
Fellows learned about the importance of the state in American politics and how policy is made at the state level.

**Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA)**
Fellows explored how planning is conducted in Boston and discussed the differences between planning in the U.S. and abroad.

**Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)**
Fellows learned about the responsibilities, budget, and development goals for one of the country’s most comprehensive transportation agencies.

**Volpe National Transportation Systems Center**
Fellows were introduced to national level transportation concerns and Homeland Security issues.

**Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC)**
MAPC is a voluntary organization of municipalities in the Greater Boston area. Fellows explored the need for regional analysis techniques and cooperation between municipalities.

**Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI)**
DSNI manages a community land trust and community development initiatives. Fellows were introduced to various aspects of community organizing in the U.S., leading to discussions about the power of community and the idea of organizing.

Visits in New York City included:
**NYC Economic Development Corporation (EDC)**
Fellows learned about the relationship between political administrations and development priorities in the city.

**NYC Department of City Planning (DCP)**
Fellows learned about managing the NYC waterfront, especially regarding climate change mitigation and extreme weather events, and the connection of the city’s neighborhoods and suburbs through the waterfront.

**Franklin D. Roosevelt Four Freedoms Park**
Multimedia artist and activist Yazmany Arboleda gave a detailed tour of the architectural history and design of the park and encouraged Fellows to reflect on the message of freedom inscribed within the park’s main architectural structure.

**Museum of Reclaimed Urban Spaces**
Fellows explored the history of urban homesteading and the continued role of interstitial spaces in the heart of the city.

**The High Line** is a municipal park built on an abandoned elevated train line through the national Rails to Trails program. Exploring the park’s celebrated design encouraged the Fellows to reflect on urban nature and the changing shape of neighborhoods.

**Project for Public Spaces**
A presentation on PPS projects around the world, from NYC to Nairobi, prompted discussion about creative and effective public spaces.

**Occupy Wall Street: Zuccotti Park; Occupy Sandy: Battery Park**
Guided by Occupy Activist and MCP student Leo Goldberg, Fellows visited Zuccotti Park, the site of Occupy Wall Street, as well as the post-Hurricane Sandy reconstruction of Battery Park, where Fellows learned about the mobilization of Occupy activists during the hurricane.
Since 2010, the SPURS/Humphrey Program at DUSP has engaged in a partnership with Roxbury Community College (RCC), an institution that primarily serves low-income students from the Boston area. The vision, goals, and rhetoric of the collaboration initially baffled me as a student. The recurring theme seemed to be “global-local linkages,” but what does that mean, exactly? Why is it important for SPURS/Humphrey Fellows to get to know students from Boston? How does society benefit when students from Boston hear about the challenges faced by planners, economists, and organizers in developing countries? What is the connection between local development in an American city and development abroad?

RCC student Joseph Chevalier put it best: “We [SPURS Fellows and RCC students] are all the same—we have the same struggles, the same oppressions, so why not try to come together and find out the solutions?” The countries that the Fellows tend to come from have economic systems that originate in imperialism and colonialism. People in such places are still struggling to recover from their difficult histories while contending with resource struggles, deeply embedded traditions, and global capital flows. Similarly, RCC students typically come from communities that have been institutionally disenfranchised and disinvested in while also suffering from the impacts of globalization—even though the larger U.S. society is often seen as the standard for development and economic activity.

The histories of imperialism, colonization, and slavery, and the realities of capitalism and neoliberalism, have given rise to deep parallels between the lives and struggles of poor people in the United States—mostly people of color—and people in developing countries. Concerns about gentrification and displacement, privatization of human needs, climate change, environmental justice, and resource distribution are present in the contexts and lives of both RCC students and the Fellows, which makes conversation and collaboration not only enriching but imperative.

For the past two years, SPURS/Humphrey Fellows have been invited to give lectures in two RCC classes—Urban Economics, taught by Professor Nasreen Latif, and Political Science, taught by Professor Randall Foote, with a focus on international relations. In these classes, SPURS/Humphrey Fellows speak on topics within their areas of expertise—from energy and sustainable development to corruption and civil society. The discussions that emerge are valuable to both sides. Most of the 2013–2014 Fellows have said they are eager to see the program expanded to include small group discussions, social events, one-on-one mentorship, and collaborative research opportunities. Fellows recognize the value in the connection—both as an opportunity to provide support to others and as a chance to gain new and valuable perspective for themselves.

RCC students, realizing the investment being made in them through the collaboration, begin to see themselves in a new light—as leaders of social change and development efforts in their city. As Florise Luc, an RCC student who participated in the MIT Student Research Program, and Amy Curan, one of Professor Foote’s students, both emphasize, this collaboration enables students to realize that it is possible for them to effect change. They learn from role models who have
met with similar challenges—the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows—and through research opportunities, internships, and discussions get the support they need to find their own paths forward.

What is so compelling about underresourced students from Boston connecting with mid-career professionals from developing countries? The answer is rooted in the need for intentional leadership and effective strategies for community development. Chevalier offered the term “holistic leaders” to describe people who have experienced the challenges of underdevelopment and also have the skills and tools needed to spur development in their communities. These holistic leaders can diagnose and synthesize solutions for difficult problems better than academics (who mainly study and show empathy for these struggles) and better than policy wonks (who mainly analyze and discuss these issues) because they are at the forefront of the struggle and are fighting for themselves, their families, and their own communities.

Speaking with Professors Foote, Latif, and RCC Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Jose Alicea, I have gathered that the goal of the partnership from the perspective of RCC’s administration is to increase the number of planners in the city who are from Boston by creating a pathway from RCC to MIT’s Master in City Planning Program. The program is already inspiring RCC students to conduct studies of planning and policy in Boston. Curan, a former homeless mother, for example, wants to focus on parent education in the homeless population in Boston, and Luc is excited about delving into youth and community organizing. These goals in community development have been nurtured within the context of the SPURS/RCC collaboration.

So, what is the RCC/SPURS collaboration really about? It is a matter of holistic leadership. The SPURS/Humphrey Program recognizes that as we work with holistic leaders internationally, we can also develop young leaders from Boston’s marginalized communities. This investment can catalyze the changes we want to see both locally and globally.

**Excerpts from RCC Impressions and Reflections**

*by Amy Curan, RCC student*

My journey after high school was a stormy one. Following a loss that left me reeling, I found myself on a path of self-destruction. Having been stripped of everything, including my self-esteem, I ended up broken and homeless. On the rebound from this experience, I became dedicated to helping others who may have battled similar prejudice and social injustice, which plagued my life at that time. My openness in sharing this aspect of my life stems from the appreciation I feel for being included and welcome in such an amazing collaboration. I feel extremely grateful for the ingenuity of the dedicated staff involved and their realization of the importance of shared knowledge and understanding between RCC and MIT students.

On the first day of class this fall, Professor Foote explained that we would have the opportunity to listen to “Fellows” from MIT who were in the States, dedicated to improving their respective countries. Students from all over the world came to give presentations to our class. We were able to learn about Kenya, Angola, El Salvador, Argentina, Pakistan, Turkey, Bahrain, Korea, and China. What I learned from the collaboration with these students will stick with me forever. I was especially drawn to a student from Angola who spoke about the devastating corruption in her country leading to unbearable poverty and injustice. Her plan to help the people in her country was inspirational. I met with this student the following week at MIT, and I decided to do my research paper on her country. Her encouragement was comforting; however, after the meeting, I realized that she was more interested in talking about my life than she was of her own. Surprisingly, we had much in common. I began to realize how important these relationships with the “Fellows” could be.

Being invited to MIT for a dinner to discuss and celebrate the collaboration between the two schools was an honor. The campus was unreal to me. A sense of innovation seemed to permeate around me, and I kept looking around for one of those flying bubble cars from *The Jetsons*. It was intimidating at first to be walking around such a renowned institution. When we actually got to listen to some presentations from some of these amazing students, it was obvious from their creations and ideas to change the world that these students were brilliant. What stuck out to me most, however, was their integrity and willingness to let us into their worlds.
How Will China Move?
Mobility Management for China’s Urban Billion

by Jinhua Zhao, Edward H. and Joyce Linde Assistant Professor, Department of Urban Studies and Planning

China urbanized 350 million people in the last three decades and is poised to do it again in the next 30 years; the ensuing urban sprawl and intensification of urban activities have led to ballooning mobility demands. At the same time, rising income and falling automobile prices have released a wave of mass motorization. China surpassed the United States as the largest automobile market in 2009–2010, and in that year alone Beijing added 1 million vehicles.

Imagine driving in a city where the average speed is lower than that of a jogger or being left behind on the subway platform after four trains have pulled away. Imagine having to register your car by entering a lottery with a 1 percent chance of success or by bidding at a price over $10,000. Imagine being warned to avoid any outdoor activities or having to wear a mask because of the smog. Millions of people in China are confronted with these scenarios every day.

China’s current level of motorization has already resulted in severe traffic congestion and hazardous air pollution. Yet the country’s per capita auto ownership (approximately 80 cars per 1,000 people) is only 10 percent of the U.S. figure. The situation will get worse before getting better: China is projected to put another 80 million cars on the road by 2020. Given its high population density, China physically cannot support its mobility needs by following a path of automobile dependence. Recognizing that transportation serves as the enabler of people’s economic and recreational needs and the glue of the social fabric, it thus becomes imperative to find an efficient, sustainable, and equitable way to meet and shape this enormous urban mobility demand.

The consequences of the astronomical growth of private car usage are felt nationwide in China. But as Chinese cities differ, so do their transportation programs and policies. The nationwide increase conceals crucial policy differences between cities that influence effectiveness, revenue, efficiency, equity, and public acceptance. How do these programs and policies perform? Does the focus remain on infrastructure or is it shifting toward service or institution? Are current efforts sufficient to guide China’s mobility system into a sustainable future? How acceptable are various policies to the public? How do cities compare and can they learn from each other?

For example, while Shanghai and Beijing each had approximately 2 million motor vehicles in 2004, by 2010 Beijing had 4.8 million versus Shanghai’s 3.1 million. By 2011, 38 percent of Beijing households were vehicle owners in contrast to 18 percent in Shanghai. What accounts for this difference? Two decades ago, Shanghai opted for a monthly license auction to control vehicle ownership, while Beijing had few controls over usage or ownership until the run-up to the 2008 Olympics. When Beijing began controlling auto ownership in 2012, it chose to allocate the monthly quota through a lottery. While such a method is equally effective in controlling the number of licenses as Shanghai’s auction, it raises no revenue. Shanghai’s auction policy, with a bid price currently over CNY 90,000 (resulting in affordability and equity concerns), has raised CNY 6.7 billion in 2012, more than Shanghai’s government subsidy to its public transit system, one of the biggest in the world. While Beijing’s policy is
superficially fairer—every person with local residency (hukou) has an equal chance—in practice it has significant drawbacks. Entry is detached from travel need, which distorts resource allocation. The gray market price for licenses has reportedly reached CNY 100,000. Two equity issues arise: all of the vehicle licenses issued prior to 2012 are effectively grandfathered in, and there are significant barriers for non-resident migrants to obtain licenses. Nevertheless, the survey I conducted with my research team found 83 percent of Beijing residents prefer lottery to auction. Even 52 percent of Shanghai residents indicate that they would prefer Beijing’s system. In July 2012, Guangzhou adopted a policy of controlling vehicle ownership, allocating 60 percent of the quota via lottery and 40 percent via auction. To what extent this hybrid brings advantages of both models remains to be seen. The emerging policy diversity is made possible both by the urgency of the problem and an evident willingness to experiment.

The shift toward more sustainable mobility is important, but the timing is also critical. Mass vehicle ownership is still nascent in many Chinese cities, so transit projects are competing head-to-head with auto-oriented road construction, and a mostly green travel tradition is being threatened by the car-dependent lifestyle. A strategic effort now may tip the balance in the future.

My research team at MIT and I are working on four closely coupled research programs to understand and manage the mobility challenges for Chinese urban dwellers, forecast to reach 1 billion by 2040.

State of China’s Urban Mobility
This first program, China Urban Mobility Assessment and Ranking (CUMAR), aims to systematically measure and analyze the state of urban transportation in China. The program has three parts: 1) the rigorous multidimensional evaluation and ranking framework; 2) the crowd-sourced and public-engaged data collection method; and 3) the large-scale implementation in Chinese cities.

The framework integrates objective dimensions (e.g., system efficiency, financial sustainability, and environmental externalities) and subjective dimensions by the end-users (e.g., public perceptions of accessibility, affordability, and quality of service).

CUMAR will publish an annual white paper series titled State of China’s Urban Mobility. The paper will be released publicly and disseminated to transportation professionals and policymakers through collaborating organizations and, most importantly, to the public through media partners. This document will not only fill the current void for comprehensive thinking on urban mobility and transportation systems in China, but in a country where rankings generate high public attention and political salience, we envision it having a tangible influence on transportation policymaking, channeling funding and effort into areas perceived as most significant to public well-being.

We partner with media outlets (online, offline, or crowd-sourced, i.e., Sohu, Sina, Baidu, WeChat, and Weibo) to engage the public to collect data on people’s subjective evaluation of China’s urban transportation systems. The team at MIT will also collaborate with key agencies in China and their local partners, e.g., Ministry of Transport (MOT), the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), and the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development (MOHURD), to develop an assessment methodology and implement the large-scale data collection.

From Infrastructure to Service
The word “transportation” has almost been synonymous with infrastructure in China’s past decades of rapid development. We are endeavoring to help shift the attention from infrastructure toward service and institutions.

We are preparing for an initiative called China’s Mobility Project, Policy and Program Monitoring (PPPM). Projects, policies, and programs are the specific actions that transform the state of China’s urban mobility. The service enhancement and institutional building processes will be tracked by PPPM along with traditional infrastructure projects. The PPPM will examine the trend and the degree of China’s shift from transportation infrastructure to transportation service and advocate customer-oriented mobility service delivery as the fundamental purpose of transportation development.

We are developing two end products based on the PPPM data and analysis: an annual publication, PPPM Report: China’s Transition from Infrastructure to Service, and an interactive portal that will collect and update information continuously on specific transport projects and programs.
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This monitoring program will capture the longitudinal trend of urban mobility projects on the ground, examine the real processes that are changing the face of China’s transportation, and identify the temporal and regional pattern shifts in terms of the mixture between infrastructure, service, and institution. We will work with our collaborating agencies in China to integrate our analysis in their project ratification and selection process.

Preference Shaping: Nudging Active Travel

Until the 1990s, most Chinese walked, cycled, and took buses. But this tradition is being dramatically challenged by rapid motorization. For example, the bicycle mode share in Beijing dropped from 63 percent in 1986 to 39 percent in 2000 and to 16 percent in 2010. Among many factors contributing to this decline is a change in people’s preference. Echoing Margaret Thatcher’s quote—“A man who, beyond the age of 26, finds himself on a bus can count himself a failure”—in 1980s London is the infamous statement “I would rather cry in a BMW than smile on your bike” in 2010s China. There is a real danger in China that bicycling and public transit will become perceived and associated with being poor. In fact, if every Chinese person comes to regard having a car as part of his/her successful life, there is no technology yet available to satisfy such a desire.

We will be piloting a Preference Shaping: Nudging Active Travel program in multiple Chinese cities. We aim to bring the latest innovations in behavioral economics, social psychology, and neuro-marketing as well as green technology to the urban mobility management system in China. In our partnering cities, we will design and conduct behavioral experiments using innovative, preference-shaping programs to encourage more sustainable modes of travel that can be respected and pursued by people before the car dominates the society.

The goal of the pilot is to improve our understanding of the behavioral mechanism of mobility, evaluate the realistic impact of nudging, and fine-tune the execution of the behavioral change program based on feedback and challenges from the implementation in real-world settings. If proven effective, both the behavioral concepts and practical strategies will be further improved, shared, and scaled in other cities. The behavioral nudging program should add to China’s existing mobility management portfolio, inspiring new ideas for shaping mobility preferences and behaviors.

Transportation Knowledge Exchange Platform

Chinese cities have conducted fascinating and diverse experiments in response to their local mobility problems. But the lack of an effective platform has much hindered the exchange and learning among cities in terms of transportation policies, programs, technologies, and data. We plan to initiate an MIT Transportation Knowledge Exchange Platform (TKEP) to facilitate the exchange of data, technology, and program ideas; codify best practices as well as lessons learned; and disseminate and amplify best transportation knowledge throughout cities in China and other rapidly urbanizing countries.

The TKEP will convene transportation decision-makers nationally (China’s NDRC, MOT, MOHURD) and locally (approximately 50 Chinese cities) and host reflective dialogues on MIT’s campus annually. In addition to facilitating the exchange of ideas, the platform serves four purposes: 1) to formally release the State of China’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROGRAMS</th>
<th>DELIVERABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CUMAR How is China’s mobility system performing?</td>
<td>China Urban Mobility Assessment &amp; Ranking</td>
<td>Whitepaper: State of China’s Urban Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PPPM Where is it heading? Can we guide it?</td>
<td>China’s Mobility Project, Policy and Program Monitoring</td>
<td>Annual PPPM Report: Transition from Infrastructure to Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NAT Can we shape sustainable travel behavior?</td>
<td>Preference Shaping: Nudging Active Travel</td>
<td>Design &amp; implement experiments in pilot cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TKEP Can cities learn from each other?</td>
<td>MIT Transportation Knowledge Exchange Platform</td>
<td>Annual Transportation Dialogues; Open-Access Data Portal, Technology Portal, and Policy Portals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Mobility white papers and assemble feedback; 2) to enable transportation scholars at MIT and practitioners from China to collectively and critically review results from China’s Mobility Project, Policy and Program Monitoring (PPPM) initiative; 3) to initiate an open-access Data, Technology, and Policy Portal; and 4) to develop capacity-building and leadership development training programs for Chinese transportation professionals and officials.

**Transportation Innovation and Impact Chain**

Both China’s public and its government are treating urban mobility issues with great urgency as the window to effectively influence transportation outcomes is closing fast. It is prohibitively expensive, if not impossible, for cities to reverse congestion and environmental impacts once they are on the trajectory of mass automobile ownership with the corresponding car-dependent built forms.

Table 1 illustrates the relationships between the four research programs. Collectively they aim to establish the transportation innovation and impact chain by improving all five stages of the process, as illustrated in Figure 1. Given the fast-evolving nature of China’s transportation condition and policymaking, my team at MIT and I are focusing on these immediate actions with the hope of tipping the balance toward a sustainable mobility paradigm in the long run.

---

**NIMFA DE LEON FELLOWSHIP FUND**

The Nimfa de Leon Fellowship Fund was established in 2013 to acknowledge Nimfa de Leon’s invaluable contributions to the SPURS program over the past 29 years. The Nimfa de Leon Fellowship will be awarded to one outstanding member of the DUSP community each year who shows exceptional commitment to supporting the academic and professional development of the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows.

Please consider supporting generously to the Nimfa de Leon Fellowship Fund. You can send your donation through the following:

- **Mail a check** (payable to DUSP/Nimfa de Leon Fellowship Fund) to: 77 Mass Ave., Bldg. 9-435, Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
- **Online at** https://giving.mit.edu/ways/
  - **Fund Name:** Nimfa de Leon Fellowship Fund; **Number:** 33856830
This fall, the MIT SPURS/Humphrey Program has taken the Fellows up and down the East Coast. We launched the year with a “Duck Tour” on the Charles River and a guided walk on the Boston Freedom Trail led by Roxbury Community College Political Science Professor Randall Foote. This outing featured long discussions about Boston’s important contributions to American democracy. Later in the term, we drove through New Hampshire’s White Mountain National Forest and stopped at the Mount Washington Hotel, which hosted the historic Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. Russian Fellow Elena Korotkova insisted that we sign our own SPURS/Humphrey 2013 Accord, and a serious discussion of economics ensued over hot chocolate and sundaes. In November, we spent a weekend in New York City, visiting the New York City Planning Office, the New York City Economic Development Corporation, the Project for Public Spaces, and many different neighborhoods and iconic landmarks.

The Fellows have also participated in American cultural traditions, both regional and national. At the September retreat in Bryant Pond, Maine, after many Fellows visited a New England town fair in Bethel (complete with scarecrow and chowder competitions), the SPURS/Humphrey family came together for a traditional lobster dinner, marking the first time some of the Fellows had eaten lobster or even seen one in person! (Bhutanese Fellow Latha Chhetri later described the experience: “Eeks! No, no, no . . . this creepy, crawly, and ORANGE creature will not find a place on my plate! I would have thought better if I knew ‘delicacy’ had a different meaning in America!”) We also celebrated Thanksgiving together with a turkey-and-stuffing dinner and a long discussion about regional cuisines and family traditions. Finally, we came together at the end of the semester for a holiday party at the home of SPURS/Humphrey Director Bish Sanyal and his wife, Diane, to sing winter carols, discuss the commonality of festivals of lights across many religions, and celebrate a successful semester.

The Fellows have also had the chance to experience American-style education with a focus on reflective practice and personal discovery. This year, we asked the Fellows to complete a more comprehensive program plan and have been requiring them to submit regular updates, thus encouraging them to orchestrate their year at MIT actively and to seek out professional and leadership training as well as recreational activities. Our Fellows have attended conferences in Turkey, Columbia, Peru, and the United States, and they have participated in community activities ranging from soccer leagues to ballroom dancing competitions to creative writing groups to political rallies. A highlight of the Maine retreat was an interactive urban diorama workshop led by James Rojas, MIT alumnus and co-chair of the Latino Urban Forum in Los Angeles. The Fellows created images of their own cities out of found objects and then connected them together, working to create innovative solutions to urban problems. The capstone of the American Planning Seminar was an essay assignment in which the Fellows were asked to compare planning customs in their countries with those in the United States; Fellows wrote on a range of issues from government corruption to spatial urbanization patterns, covering specific topics from public housing to urban design education.

“It has been an intense and thrilling year of intercultural exchange and learning, and we still have a full schedule of events planned for the culmination of the Leadership Seminar, our year-end retreat, and graduation.”
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