



American Planning Association
Georgia Chapter

Making Great Communities Happen

Welcome to

AICP EXAM REVIEW

February 12, 2011
Georgia Tech Student Center

AICP Exam Review

Topics Covered Today -

Faculty

- **Public Participation / Social Justice**
Stiftel, Ph.D., FAICP
- **Ethics and Professional Conduct**
City of Duluth
- **Spatial Areas of Practice**
Jacobs

Bruce

Glenn Coyne, AICP -

Gary Cornell, FAICP -



American Planning Association
Georgia Chapter

Making Great Communities Happen

Ethics, Public Participation and Social Equity (in 30 minutes)

AICP EXAM REVIEW

February 20, 2009
Georgia Tech Student Center

Section A contains a statement of *aspirational principles* that constitute the ideals to which we are committed. We shall strive to act in accordance with our stated principles. However, an allegation that we failed to achieve our aspirational principles cannot be the subject of a misconduct charge or be a cause for disciplinary action.

Section B contains *rules of conduct* to which we are held accountable. If we violate any of these rules, we can be the object of a charge of misconduct and shall have the responsibility of responding to and cooperating with the investigation and enforcement procedures. If we are found to be blameworthy by the AICP Ethics Committee, we shall be subject to the imposition of sanctions that may include loss of our certification.

- Deontological Ethics
 - Concerned with the rightness of an act itself.
 - Moral rights and duties (e.g. Ten Commandments)
 - Kant's principle of humanity (treat humanity never as a means but always as an end)
 - Tend to the procedural (being fair, telling the truth, avoiding conflict of interest, not stealing, no plagiarism, equal opportunity)
- Consequentialist Ethics (Teleological Ethics)
 - Concerned with the goodness of the consequences of action.
 - e.g.. utilitarianism ("greatest good to the greatest number"; balance of pleasure over pain)
 - Often involve the Public Interest (economic efficiency, environmental protection, collective goods provision, public welfare, equity, redistribution).

Aspiration Principles I: the Public

- Conscious of rights of others
- Concern for long-range consequences
- Attend to interrelatedness of decisions
- Timely, adequate, clear, accurate info
- Give people meaningful opportunity
- Seek social justice
- Promote excellence of design; preserve natural and built environment
- Deal fairly with participants

Aspirational Principles II: Clients and Employers

- Independent professional judgment
- Accept decisions of clients/employers
 - Except if illegal or inconsistent with public interest
- Avoid conflict of interest

Aspirational Principles III: Profession and Colleagues

- Protect integrity of profession
- Educate public about planning
- Fairly comment on other professionals' work
- Share results of experience and research
- Not accept customary approaches without establishing appropriateness
- Contribute to prof development of others
- Increase opportunity of underrepresented
- Enhance our education
- Critically analyze ethical issues in practice
- Contribute to voluntary prof activities

Rules I

- Provide adequate, timely, clear, accurate info
- Not accept illegal or unethical work
- Don't advocate against a prior position of one's own (except under conditions)
- Moonlight only with disclosure and permission
- No corruption (except in public interest and with public knowledge)
- Keep confidential info confidential (except..)
- No ex parte communication, if illegal
- No sunshine violations, if illegal

Rules II

- Don't misrepresent credentials
- Don't imply improper influence
- Work only within competence; don't promise unachievable time or results
- Don't plagiarize
- Don't push others to over-reach from data
- Disclose client's interests
- Don't discriminate illegally
- Be honest and forthcoming with Ethics Committee



Key Tensions

- Client loyalty v. public interest
 - Research design
 - Information availability
 - Objectives prioritization
 - Development v. environment/equity
- Personal advantage v. client interests
 - Replication of work
 - Changed recommendations

Two Views of Why Planners Do Citizen Participation

- Legitimacy
 - Improve representativeness of democracy
 - Enhance social development of the polity
 - Foster civic engagement
 - Boost faith in government
- Efficiency
 - Make better government decisions
 - Get programs adopted
 - Get programs implemented



Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
 - Decide, Announce, Defend
 - Participation as PR
 - Isolate Participation from Technical Work
 - The Public Hearing
- Advocacy
- Empowerment
- Collaboration

Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
- Advocacy
 - Planner represents special interests
 - Argues in "coin of public interest"
 - Conflicted and unstable roles
 - Wide evolution/effect
- Empowerment
- Collaboration



Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
- Advocacy
- Empowerment
 - Build planning skills in the community
 - "Teach to fish"
- Collaboration




Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
- Advocacy
- Empowerment
- Collaboration
 - Stakeholder identification
 - Planner as mediator
 - Win Win



Participatory Innovations

- Plan for Participation
- Tie participatory design to actual decisions
- Distinguish Input, Output and Exchange methods of participation
- Use methods that fit the task
- Negotiated rulemaking
- Joint fact finding
- Mediated participation
- Use information technology



Use Methods that Fit the Task

- Input, Output and Exchange
- A “Cafeteria” of public participation techniques:
 - NGT
 - Delphi
 - Samoan circle
 - Charrette
 - Visioning
 - Idea marketplace
 -
- Ideas from social psychology, organizational development, decision theory



Ethics, Public participation and Social equity

QUESTIONS?