

Open Access Journal

# Educating Planners as Social Entrepreneurs: The Potential of Community-based Professional Training

Shelly Hefetz

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Israel  
Corresponding author: shelly.hefetz@gmail.com

Rachel Kallus

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Israel

This article reports on the findings of a study that examined and evaluated the applicability and feasibility of community-based knowledge (CBK) in planning education in Israel. Based on research findings, the paper explores different approaches and attitudes to CBK in planning, as well as ways to implement community-based pedagogy (CBP) in professional training. The connection between planning knowledge and pedagogy is explored in order to understand the role of academia in professional training and its potential in establishing a toolbox for current planners. We discuss these challenges, and present a framework for implementing the skills required for educating planners as social entrepreneurs.

**Keywords:** community-based knowledge; planning education; community-based professional training; university-community partnership.

Copyright: author(s). Protected under CC BY-NC 4.0. ISSN: 2468-0648.

**Please cite as:** Hefetz, S., Kallus, R. (2018). Educating Planners as Social Entrepreneurs: The Potential of Community-based Professional Training. *plaN**ext** – next generation planning*. 7: 27-40. DOI: [10.24306/plnxt/47](https://doi.org/10.24306/plnxt/47).

## Open Access Journal

### Introduction

The use of the terms "social entrepreneurship" and "social innovation" has gained popularity in research and practice in planning (Bartlett, 2005; Drewe et al., 2008; McFarlane, 2012; Van Dyck, 2011). "Social entrepreneurs" are often defined as individuals, or groups of individuals, who "look for the most effective methods" (Dees, 1998, p. 1) to create social change in, with, and for their communities, while promoting their own respective social agendas and values (Alvord et al., 2003). This article questions the knowledge and professional skills required by urban planners to approach social challenges not just *for* but mainly *with* communities. These questions focus on planning education and how it could be used to impart knowledge and skills that allow planners to work effectively *with* designated populations and not merely *for* them. Following other researchers dealing with planning education, (Alexander, 2005; Edwards & Bates, 2011; Friedmann, 1996; Frank, 2006; Poxon, 2001; Saghir & Sands, 2015), our goal is to examine current developments in planning theory related to community-based knowledge, how it is included in the planning curriculum and how it is aligned with appropriate pedagogy. We focus on the implementation of community-based knowledge in Israeli planning education, considering this academic setting and its specific context.

As a result of the dramatic changes in the planning discourse worldwide during the twentieth century, research has reconsidered planners' profiles, to assess the skills and knowledge required by professionals and how they obtain them during their academic training (Alexander, 2005; Edwards & Bates, 2011; Friedmann, 1996). The transition from modernist perceptions of planning brought with it an emphasis on relevant knowledge outside the profession, as well as outside academia and planning departments; most notably from communities and individuals with no academic or professional qualifications in planning (Rydin, 2007). Consequently, the concept of local knowledge was introduced, its relevance to planning illuminated, and its inclusion in planning education considered (Angotti et al., 2011; Bose et al., 2014; Fenster, 2009; Kotval, 2003; Tal et al., 2015; Winkler, 2013).

The credibility and legitimacy of local knowledge in research and teaching, as well as in policy and decision-making has been controversial and thus widely debated (Corburn, 2007; Fenster & Yacobi, 2005; Innes & Booher, 2010; Moore, 2010). Many planners experienced what Taylor & de Loë (2012) defined as "epistemological anxiety" i.e. a reluctance to use local knowledge (Innes & Booher, 2010). A similar anxiety was found among academics (Moore, 2010) and obviously among public officials (Taylor & de Loë, 2012).

In order to better understand the professional potential of local knowledge, we rely on Reed's interpretation of local knowledge and its use (Reed, 2008). Reed suggests that when engaging with communities during planning, not only do these communities offer their expert local knowledge, but the process also involves various players who, together with experts and policymakers, share information and participate in joint learning. In line with this notion, in this article we refer to community-based knowledge (CBK) as an outcome of an engagement process combining three types of knowledge: local, professional, and scientific.

The inclusion of CBK in the planning process is related to the planner's profile and issues such as status, public standing, and role in decision-making (Alexander, 2005; Innes, 1997). The making of the professional is conducted under academic responsibility, with a direct bearing on professional conduct and the profession at large (Angotti, et al., 2011; Reardon & Forester, 2016). It is thus worthwhile to examine and evaluate the applicability and feasibility of community-based *knowledge* in planning education, as well as the means with which it is imparted via community-based pedagogy (CBP).

This article reports on the findings of a study focused on Israeli planning education. It opens

## Open Access Journal

with a short review of community-based knowledge (CBK) and community-based pedagogy (CBP) in planning education, followed by a focus on our study of planning curricula in four planning programs in Israel. A comprehensive analysis of syllabi has identified three main pedagogical themes that pointed out fundamental differences among courses. These themes draw attention to the impact of agendas and related teaching methods of each course, and thus, the connection between *knowledge* and *pedagogy*. It allowed us to examine different planning approaches and attitudes to CBK and to consider ways to implement CBP in the educational process. Finally, we discuss the challenges of our findings and consider a framework for implementing the skills required for educating planners as social entrepreneurs.

### **Community-Based Knowledge and Pedagogy in planning education**

#### *Community-based knowledge in planning theory and practice*

Planning history demonstrates continuous debates on the relevant knowledge required by professionals, and the optimal manner in which to integrate this knowledge in planning education (Brooks, 2002). Since the late 1960s, planning scope has been broadened and relevant knowledge identified in different sources. Analysis of the data has rejected "one single truth" and looked for different methodologies to uncover a diverse range of knowledge (Fenster, 2009; Oranje, 2002). This diversity of knowledge has been contended and achieved in many ways, depending on time and location (Fischer, 2000). It is quite clear nowadays that knowledge is not solely dependent on the expert, or embedded in scientific research, but that it is also available from other sources, including local communities and lay people, but its mining is largely influenced by power relations and the political position of different interested parties (Flyvberg, 2003).

Shifts in the perception of planning knowledge have affected procedural approaches and paved the way for shared and participatory processes in which residents are involved in planning and decision-making (Corburn, 2003). Berman (2017) suggests to divide the concept of "public participation" into two different practices: (1) "unilateral participation" and (2) "radical-collaborative participation." This division relates to the players leading the process, the means of action, and the products. As suggested by Berman, the "unilateral participation" approach is top-down, usually statutory and based on one-sided procedures. Conversely, the "radical-collaborative participation" approach is bottom-up, used by non-governmental institutions, and encourages residents to initiate and motivate the participation processes. On the spectrum between these two approaches, Berman suggests two others: "improved unilateral" that perfects the "unilateral" approach, and "network participation," which utilizes more collaborative methods. Berman's distinction is directly tied to developments in the past two decades, during which planning discourse and practice started to take radical steps toward including the public in planning processes, often outside official domain.

Non-official planning (Yacobi, 2007) and the spontaneous attempts by individuals or groups to manage their lives (Law-Yone, 2007) have emphasized planning approaches derived from daily routines (Jarvis et al., 2001) and the potential of self-organization (Alfasi & Portugali, 2009). The realization of local challenges (Marcuse, 2009) along a need to address underserved and marginalized parts of society (McFarlane, 2012; De Souza, 2006) surfaced a neo-pragmatic planning approach (Forester, 2013). Unlike official top-down planning, current urban dynamics and conflicts enable communities to take hold of their future. Social-activists and NGOs play an important role in promoting alternatives to institutional planning, challenging the traditional role of planners, and encouraging planners to become social-entrepreneurs (Dekel *et al.*, 2016).

## Open Access Journal

The discussion of planners' profiles (Dalton, 2001; Forester *et al.*, 2001; Steele, 2009) realizes the importance of knowledge, including what is acquired during professional education and training (Frank, 2006; Stiftel, 2009). A large amount of research has been devoted to academic programs and the way they shape professional approach (Edwards & Bates, 2011; Friedmann, 1996; Frank, 2006), including the discrepancies between what has been learned in professional training and current theory and practice (Alexander, 2005; Edwards & Bates, 2011). The complexity of the field is often associated with three factors: the diversity of professional localities (Sanyal, 1990; Watson & Odendaal, 2012); the organizational characteristics of planning departments (Ashley & Vos, 2015; Stiftel, 2009); and the way the academic community perceives the profession and vice versa, including relevant knowledge and training needed to make an apt professional (Chettiparamb, 2006; Edwards & Bates, 2011; Kotval, 2003).

There is no conclusive answer regarding the skills and knowledge planners must acquire during their training, nor established appropriate teaching methods to train a planner. Research shows the need to assimilate in professional training social substance along with suitable tools, such as communication, mediation, negotiation, ethics, and criticism (Alexander, 2005; Dalton, 2001; Harwood & Zapata, 2014; Kotval, 2003; Nagy & Edelman, 2014; Ozawa & Seltzer, 1999; Saghir & Sands, 2015); yet, planning departments struggle to integrate these knowledge and skills in planning curricula (Stiftel, 2009).

### *Community-based pedagogy in professional training*

In the mid-20th century, John Dewey called upon the American academy to advance toward progressive teaching methods, encouraging students to gain experience by confronting real-life situations (Moore, 2010). Community-based pedagogy is a similarly progressive teaching approach that promotes experiential and applied learning (Zlotkowski & Duffy, 2010; Johnson, 2017). It reiterates academia's commitment to social justice and human rights and its traditional role as a promoter of democratic values and civic engagement (Soria & Mitchell, 2016). In the United States this pedagogical approach manifested mainly in service-learning (Butin, 2010), but largely it promotes social empowerment through the connection between academic training and the goals of a particular community (Hardin *et al.*, 2006).

Dallimore *et al.* (2010) identify three major components of community-based courses, community engagement, learning-by-doing, and guided reflection. Roakes and Norris-Tirrell (2000) develop a four-part framework for including service learning courses in planning education. Their framework includes an emphasis on the different *ways of understanding*; the value of *human experience as a source of learning*; the requirement for *reflective thinking* to transform experience into learning; and an ethical foundation that stresses *citizenship* of the community, the profession, and the public at large.

Wight *et al.* (2016) note that community-based courses offer reflective learning, which allows students to recognize the complexity of professional practice both in and out of the classroom. This reflexivity is not neutral, but rather immersed in political and social encounters. Research conducted into reflective and ideological learning emphasizes the importance of experiential teaching methods (Farnsworth, 2010). Shriberg (2002) and Cortese (2003) suggest to combine theoretical knowledge with experiential knowledge in the curriculum, in order to include actual social involvement, outside the classroom and on the ground. Similarly, Lucas (1980) claims that the foundation of reflective learning is composed of learning about the field, as well as learning from, with and for the field.

Research pointed to the connection between community-based pedagogy and qualitative research methods (Eizenberg & Shilon, 2016), although, according to Johnson (2017),

## Open Access Journal

community-based approach can benefit also from quantitative research. Surveys and demographic data analysis may assist in understanding existing conditions and could provide background information for qualitative research. In this way, community-based courses expose students to different types of material and to diverse tools with which to digest this material, all of which reveal the complexity of the social phenomena of planning and the existence of multiple truths.

Community-based pedagogy often requires community-university collaboration, although it depends on the types of partnership and partners (Dallimore *et al.*, 2010; Reardon, 2006). Research conducted by Meron (2012) in urban planning and design departments in the United States found that the way the department works with communities depends on the type of partnership selected by the university. These partnerships include, for example, the development of unique degrees and programs that involve community-based pedagogy, establishing internal and external research institutes involving communities, or developing community-engaged courses that are embedded in professional training programs. Based on a study conducted by Schramm & Nye during the 1990s, Reardon classified three types of community-university partnerships in professional education (Reardon, 2006, pp. 96-97): (1) *Paternalistic Theory-Testing Partnerships*, which uses the community as a laboratory to verify its theory; (2) *Professional Expertise Partnerships*, in which the university controls the process, but the community is still partially involved; and (3) *Empowerment Capacity-Building Partnerships*, which empowers the community as a full participant in the process. The partnership type affects the knowledge, skills, and values acquired by students during their professional training.

### Community-Based Knowledge in planning curricula in Israel

#### *Planning education in Israel*

Planning education programs in Israel are offered as a master's degree (MCP). Students enrolled in the programs come from backgrounds in design, social sciences, or humanities. Working as a planner in Israel does not require a license or official accreditation, therefore, academia holds the mandate on the curriculum. However, professional education is not neutral to external influences and diversions. Academic institutions and the higher education system are funded and regulated by the government through the Council of Higher Education. In fact, in many cases academia works hand in hand with different political groups and professional organizations. Although writers have noticed how planning can be used by the government to influence its society and to control its territories (Yacobi 2009, Yiftachel 1998), the question regarding the political impact on planning education in Israel has yet to be studied and was not looked at in our research.

Planning education was first established in Israel in the 1970s and the curriculum was first based on leading planning programs in the United States. The local context was integrated into the curriculum through the inclusion of practice-based experience, most of which is founded on British-Mandat planning by-laws and land regulations integrated in planning rules established by the state. The first urban and regional planning program was established at the Technion. But in the last decade, with the profession gaining popularity, three more programs have been recognized by the Israeli Planning Association as official training programs, and more schools have become interested in opening such programs.

The study of urban planning education in Israel examined in-depth four programs based in four public universities: The Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Tel Aviv University, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. The study included



## Open Access Journal

interviews with 12 key figures in these programs and analysis of the curriculum offered during the 2015-2016 academic year, including 4 catalogs and 207 syllabi.<sup>1</sup> After analyzing the core curricula, syllabi found to have relation to CBK ideas were examined in depth, although it is obvious that these syllabi hold only partial information about courses' content and methods (Klosterman, 2011). A keyword search led to a detailed examination of the 91 syllabi found to be related to CBK. For each syllabus, five main characteristics were examined: hierarchy in the program; relation to core subjects; pedagogical approach; knowledge and skills; and operational models. In a final iteration, 60 courses were identified and analyzed in depth.

**Table 1.** *Community-Based Knowledge and Pedagogical Approach.*

Pedagogy	Type	Definition
<i>Traditional</i>	<i>Community-Based Theory</i>	Theoretical knowledge from several disciplines (e.g. sociology, anthropology) concerned with community-based aspects
	<i>Community-Oriented Theory</i>	Theoretical knowledge and case studies related to specific communities
	<i>Tools and Methods</i>	Professional and technical tools used for planning with communities
<i>Experiential</i>	<i>About the Community</i>	Main Objective: to experiment with relevant tools. Pedagogy: aspects of public participation and community engagement are taught in a traditional way, using literature, precedents, case studies and guest lectures.
	<i>Community-Oriented</i>	Main objective: to train students how to gather local knowledge and implement this database in planning. Methods include interviews and surveys, involving only few interactions between the students and the community. Course outcome is produced by the students, without the involvement of the community.
	<i>Community-engaged</i>	Main objective: to train students how to plan with communities. Students learn <i>about</i> the community, <i>with</i> the community, and <i>from</i> the community. Local knowledge leads the learning of planning process. The products of the course are not predetermined but depend on shared process with the community.

### *CBK in traditional-theoretic courses*

The syllabi analysis shows that the four studied planning education programs tend to consider residents involvement in planning. They focus on the normative aspect of community-based knowledge, which tries to answer the "what" and "why" more than the "how." Findings show that most of the CBK related courses are theoretical and are being taught using traditional methods. It is possible to distinguish three types of theoretical community-based courses:

1. Community-Based Theory: courses that focus on the theoretical aspects of CBK from several disciplines (e.g. sociology, anthropology).
2. Community-Oriented Theory: courses that focus on a particular community using philosophical and theoretical points of view to case studies related to this community.

<sup>1</sup> In a few cases when syllabi were not available these courses were not examined (17/223).

## Open Access Journal

3. Theoretical tools and Methods: courses that focus on general tools and methods useful while working with communities.

As presented in Table 1, some of these community-based courses deal with critical approach to public participation, the challenges of multi-cultural planning, and social, ethnic or religious characteristics of the community. Teaching methods in these courses is mainly theoretical, with no significant hands-on involvement in the field or engagement with an actual community.

### *CBK in experiential courses*

Of the 60 courses analyzed in-depth, only 23% were found to be using experiential teaching methods. The analysis shows two primary findings. The first is that what is considered 'social planning' is not necessarily community-based. The difference between the methods used in the courses became evident upon reviewing their academic contents. It comes up also in the interviews with informants. As a senior faculty member in one of the departments said:

In social research, you are the expert wearing a white robe and writing about the community [...] community-based research is a whole different approach, in which you create partnerships with a group of people, working with them form the research goals all the way to the research methodology. It's an action-based research, in which every move potentially signifies a change.

The second finding shows that experiential courses do not necessarily include community-based content or the use of local knowledge. Three types of experiential courses were identified: (1) "about the community," (2) "community-oriented" and (3) "community-engaged."

1. "*About the Community*" are experiential courses focusing mainly on theoretical comprehension of local knowledge and participation. They stress the importance of CBK in planning, but do not offer any actual experience on the ground. The main teaching methodology is through reading, guest presentations, and analysis of case studies. There is no interaction with a real community and no practice-oriented approach to CBK to make this knowledge relevant to the planning process.

2. "*Community-Oriented*" are, for the most part, courses that focus on a particular site as a case study. Their main objective is to train students to gather local data as a foundation for planning, and to learn how to implement this data in the planning process. The methods used in community-oriented courses are mainly interviews and surveys, often based on a one-time interaction with a local population. The analysis of the material gathered is detached from the community, so it is not actually part of a shred planning process. One of the informants, an instructor of few planning studios in the past, criticized this approach:

Many planners think that since they studied planning, they know better than the residents. Even those who do recognize the need to assimilate social, environmental, and cultural knowledge, think they have all the tools and know-how needed to plan. As part of our training we learn from the residents about their neighborhood, and from that conclude how to plan for the 'other; the poor, the immigrant, the weak. But in fact that is not how it works. You took a course about it, that's important, but it is also important to realize that every community contains a different knowledge.

## Open Access Journal

3. "*Community Engaged*" are courses that introduce students to a site with a particular community for a whole semester. They use the community to teach students about urban and planning matters with two main objectives. The first objective is pedagogical - to train students in three areas: how to perform planning with the community; how to gather, use and assimilate local knowledge in planning; and how to co-create with the community, and possibly with other relevant actors (e.g. the public or third-party representatives). The second objective is social responsibility toward community needs.

In community engaged studios or workshops, students exercise professional practice with the community. Local knowledge leads the learning in a shared process. Course outcome is not predetermined, but depends on the encounter with the community. One of the informants explained that the learning process in a community-engaged course is not based on traditional education, but on co-learning in action:

This is not a 'top down' educational process, but a way of bringing up issues and ideas that demand deliberation. Knowledge comes from dealing with concrete needs, which entails the creation of theory out of practice.

The methods used in community-engaged courses are on-site tours, storytelling, and mutual meetings, either onsite, on campus, or in other places in the city, in which residents interact with students and participate in different stages of the planning process.

Research findings differentiate between three types of CBK and pedagogical approaches in courses that commonly fall under the title 'social planning': (1) objectives, (2) tools, and (3) products. The objectives are set by the instructor and the tools used, as well as the products, represent the instructor's agenda in integrating CBK into planning, either as a background database, as a methodology, or in the action taken. This agenda is related to the instructor's professional approach, as one of our informants, a senior faculty member in one of the departments examined, explains:

There are a lot of methodology courses in our program, in which students experience all kinds of approaches of field work with communities. Each professor takes it to a different level of interaction with the community. Some believe that working with the community forms a better agenda, and some, such as me, believe that interaction with communities is just the beginning of the process.

These different approaches toward the place of local knowledge in professional practice affect the curriculum of each department. But rather than becoming an explicit departmental agenda, they are often related to faculty members and to their personal and professional agendas.

### **Discussion and Implications for Community-Based training**

Our article follows other researchers who question ways of integrating into planning education up-to-date knowledge, aligned with current tendencies in planning theory and practice. We examined the implementation of CBK in four academic planning programs in Israel, and were especially interested in the challenges of CBK and its pedagogical aspects.

Our findings show that planning education programs in Israel focus more on the normative aspect of CBK (its positive or negative impact) than on its empirical aspects. The courses examined stress the "why" (why CBK in planning) and the "what" (what is CBK) and not on



## Open Access Journal

the "how" (how to include CBK in planning). Consequently, students are presented mainly with theoretical knowledge about the role of the community in planning, but they lack actual tools and methods with which to work with communities. This finding supports a survey of community-engaged academic courses in architecture and urban planning at the Technion (Kallus, 2019). Students' reflections on these courses report an increased social awareness, but inability to integrate their awareness into a comprehensive professional approach. Alongside the recognition of the potentials of community-engagement in professional practice, students expressed a need for a more concrete toolbox, which most of these courses were unable to provide.

Although in our study we did not look at the students' learning process, the three main categories of CBK implementation in professional education we used emphasize social awareness. They show that against courses that teach "about the community", in which the community is used as a laboratory (Reardon, 2006), "community-engaged" courses promote more radical "bottom up" shared learning, for the benefit of communities and NGOs (Berman, 2017). Local knowledge is usually absent from "about the community" type courses, mainly due to their focus on theoretical aspects. Even "community-oriented" type courses correspond to the "unilateral approach" of public participation, as a "top-down" process, based on a single-side procedure and with the "more sharing" approaches, such as Berman's "improved unilateral" and "network participation" methods (2015). But, as opposed to "about the community" type courses, in "community-oriented" and "community engaged" type courses, students have an opportunity to experience the field and practice analytical tools. However, when local knowledge is used only to legitimize planning, or as yet another source of knowledge gathered in the early stages of the planning process, it maintains the planner as the sole source of knowledge, thus the only one capable of leading the planning. The differences between "community-oriented" and "community engaged" courses are based on the way the former uses local knowledge as a source of information, while the latter focuses on how to establish a shared process.

While examining experiential teaching of courses attempted to impart CBK, and the means used to introduce this knowledge, the difference between local knowledge and CBK becomes clear. Local knowledge is a dynamic force in a collaborative process, whether in the educational arena or in "reality." Other researchers noted that the transition from static to dynamic engagement may lead to the empowerment of the community participating (Fenster & Eizenberg, 2016). It could further establish trust between the community and professionals, consequently improving the final product and leading to more effective planning process (Fenster & Eizenberg, 2016; Owens, 2000; Reed, 2008).

A social position distinguishes between training of "technical" professional and professional more attentive to social and ethical values. The curriculum of the various theoretical courses (e.g. planning theories) and practical-experiential courses (e.g. studios) implement normative knowledge. The assimilation of values and ethics in reflective education emphasizes the potential of experiential learning on, in, and with the community (Shriberg, 2002; Cortese, 2003, Lucas, 1980; Farnsworth, 2010). This is hardly available in "about the community" type courses, where there is no interaction with local populations. In community-oriented courses, there is usually one session of interaction with the community and in "community-engaged" courses, there is a prolonged interaction. Therefore, within the experiential courses there may be variations in the ability to assimilate transformative learning, ethical discussions, and the value of social involvement and leadership. However, building the planner's profile through academic training is greatly affected by the academic institution, the department, and the faculty. At the end, how the courses are actually taught, and not only how they are designed beforehand and presented in the syllabi, is probably more important for students' learning.

## Open Access Journal

This aspect of the actual learning requires a further study.

### *Operative steps for integrating community-based knowledge in training programs*

Diverse teaching methods are found to be essential in order to apply community-based content in planning training programs. In order to educate planners to work effectively with communities, experiential teaching, such as in the studio, should be combined with applicable theory and practice. Our findings suggest a way for planning departments to examine CBK courses in their curriculum in accordance with the different typologies identified in this research ("about the community", "community-oriented", and "community engaged"). It could assist the department in determining which planning tools it wishes to provide for its students and how to better integrate CBK into planning education.

Our findings further suggest that methodological tools be included in the training program, for:

1. Knowledge gathering: off-site demographic statistics and other relevant databases, and on-site, using in-depth interviews and participatory observations. An important question should regard the focuses of the documentation: the process itself, the site, or both?
2. Knowledge creation and formulation: with or without the community? Through one-time interaction or an ongoing process?
3. Products and knowledge transfer: by the teacher, or based on a shared process with the community: What is the purpose of the products? Are they solely for pedagogic purposes? Can they serve the community?

Finally, transitioning to a more enhanced adoption of planning *with* and not only *for* the community depends on a profound change at the heart of professional training and revision of teaching methods. Effective pedagogy will integrate CBK into the core of the curriculum and make it define future professionals who will lead the professional world. This is not a simple mission and requires a significant organization towards a more advanced perception of planning education. However, if we want to educate planners as social entrepreneurs, we must provide them with community-based knowledge and skills.

## References

- Alexander, E.R. (2005). What do planners need to know? Identifying needed competencies, methods and skills, *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 22(2): 91–106. Retrieved from <http://lockescience.com/>.
- Alfasi, N. & Portugali, Y. (2009). *New structure for the planning system in Israel: Proposition* [Hebrew]. Nevo, Israel: The S. Daniel Abraham Center for International and Regional Studies, Tel-Aviv University. Retrieved (1/3/2017) from <http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/abraham/publications/city.pdf>
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, D. & Letts, C. W. (2003). *Social entrepreneurship. Leadership that facilitates societal transformation—an exploratory study*. Working Papers, Centre for Public Leadership. Retrieved (1/3/2017) from: [https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/55803/CPL\\_WP\\_03\\_5\\_AlvordBrownLetts.pdf?sequence=1](https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/55803/CPL_WP_03_5_AlvordBrownLetts.pdf?sequence=1)
- Angotti, T., Doble, C. S. & Horrigan, P. (eds.) (2011). *Service-learning in design and planning: Educating at the boundaries*. New York: New Village Press.
- Ashley, A. J. & Vos, J. (2015). The department as a third sector planner: Implementing Civic Capacity through the Planning Core Curriculum. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35(4): 501-514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X15591281>.
- Bartlett, L. (2005). Smart City: social entrepreneurship and community engagement in a rural regional city. In: Proceedings of the international conference on engaging

## Open Access Journal

- communities, Brisbane, Australia. Aug 14–17
- Berman, T. (2017) *Public participation as a tool for integrating local knowledge into spatial planning: planning, participation, and knowledge*. New York: Springer
- Bose, M., Horrigan, P., Doble, C., & Shipp, S. C. (Eds.). (2014). *Community Matters: Service-learning in Engaged Design and Planning*. London: Routledge.
- Brooks, M.P. (2002). *Planning theory for practitioners*. Chicago, IL: Planners Press, American Planning Association
- Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service Learning in Theory and Practice: The Future of Community Engagement in Higher Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chettiparamb, A. (2006). Bottom-Up Planning and the Future of Planning Education in India. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26(2): 185-194.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X06289239>
- Corburn, J. (2007). Community Knowledge in Environmental Health Science: Co-Producing Policy Expertise. *Environmental Science & Policy* 10(2): 150-161.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2006.09.004>
- Corburn, J. (2003). Bringing local knowledge into environmental decision making: Improving Urban Planning for Communities at Risk. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22(4): 420-433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X03022004008>
- Cortese, A. D. (2003). The Critical Role of Higher Education in Creating a Sustainable Future. *Planning for Higher Education* 31(3): 15-22. Retrieved (1/3/2017) from: <https://www.scup.org/learning-resources/planning-for-higher-education-journal/>
- Dallimore, E., Rochefort, D. A. & Simonelli, K. (2010). Community-based learning and research. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (124): 15-22.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.416>.
- Dalton, L.C. (2001). Weaving the fabric of planning as education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20(4): 423-36.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X0102000404>.
- Dees, J. G., (1998). *The meaning of 'Social Entrepreneurship.'* October 31. Comments and suggestions contributed from the Social Entrepreneurship Funders Working Group. Retrieved from <https://entrepreneurship.duke.edu/news-item/the-meaning-of-social-entrepreneurship/>
- De Souza, M. L. (2006). Social movements as 'critical urban planning' agents. *City*, 10(3): 327-342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810600982347>
- Dekel, T., Kallus, R. & Bird-David, N. (2016). Dynamic and Flexibility in a planning NGO, *Planning Journal of the Israel Association of Planners* 13, 25-47 [Hebrew].
- Drewe, P., Klein, J. L. & Hulsbergen, E. (eds.). (2008). *The Challenge of Social Innovation in Urban Revitalization*. Amsterdam: Techne press.
- Edwards, M. M. & Bates, L. K. (2011). Planning's core curriculum: Knowledge, practice, and implementation. *Journal of planning Education and Research* 31(2): 172-183.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X11398043>
- Eizenberg, E. & Shilon, M. (2016). Pedagogy for the new planner: Refining the qualitative toolbox. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 43(6): 1118-1135.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265813515604477>
- Farnsworth, V. (2010). Conceptualizing Identity, Learning and Social Justice in Community-Based Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26(7): 1481-1489.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.006>
- Fenster, T., & Eizenberg, E. (2016). Planning with communities in regeneration projects: toward a gendered civic capacity. *Gender, Place & Culture* 23(9): 1254-1269.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2015.1136818>
- Fenster, T. (2009). Cognitive temporal mapping: The three steps method in urban planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 10(4): 479-498.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350903417266>

## Open Access Journal

- Fenster, T., & Yacobi, H. (2005). Whose city is it? On urban planning and local knowledge in globalizing Tel Aviv-Jaffa. *Planning Theory & Practice* 6(2): 191-211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350500137051>
- Fischer, F. (2000). *Citizens, experts, and the environment: The politics of local knowledge*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Flyvberg B. (2003). Rationality and Power. Reading in Planning Theory. Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell. pp 318-329
- Forester, J., Fischler, R. & Shmueli, D. (2001) *Israeli Planners and Designers: Profiles of Community Builders*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Forester, J. (2013). On the theory and practice of critical pragmatism: Deliberative practice and creative negotiations. *Planning theory* 12(1): 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095212448750>
- Frank, A. I. (2006). Three decades of thought on planning education. *Journal of Planning Literature* 21(1): 15-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412206288904>
- Friedmann, J. (1996). The core curriculum in planning revisited. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15(2), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X9601500202>
- Hardin, M. C., Eribes, R. A. & Poster, C. (eds.) (2006). *From the Studio to the Streets: Service Learning in Planning and Architecture*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing
- Innes, J. E. & Booher, D. E. (2010). *Planning with complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. London: Routledge.
- Innes, J. (1997). The planner's century. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 16(3): 227-28. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/home/jpe>
- Jarvis, H., Pratt, A.C., Cheng-Chong Wu, P. (2001). *The Secret Life of Cities: Social reproduction of everyday life*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, L. R. (2017). *Community-Based Qualitative Research: Approaches for Education and the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Kallus, R., (2019). Campus-community Partnership in Professional Education: Architecture and planning students reflect on community-engaged courses. *Understanding Campus-Community Partnerships in Conflict Zones: Engaging Students for Transformative Change*. Dalya Yafa Markovich, Daphna Golan and Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian (eds.). London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 57-78
- Klosterman, R. E. (2011). Planning theory education: A thirty-year review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31(3): 319-331. DOI: 10.1177/0739456X11413601
- Kotval, Z. (2003). Teaching experiential learning in the urban planning curriculum. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 27(3): 297-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309826032000145061>
- Law-Yone, H. (2007). Another planning theory? Rewriting the meta-narrative. *Planning Theory*, 6(3): 315-326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095207082038>
- Lucas, A. M. (1980). The role of science education in education for the environment. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 12(2): 33-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.1981.10801898>
- Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City* 13 (2-3): 185-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810902982177>
- McFarlane, C. (2012). The entrepreneurial slum: Civil society, mobility and the co-production of urban development. *Urban Studies* 49(13): 2795-2816. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012452460>
- Meron, G. (2012) *Community engaged design education*. Final report - The Fellowship for Social and Institutional Change at Cornell University, supported by The Public Service Center and Engaged Learning + Research.
- Moore, D. T. (2010). Forms and issues in experiential learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (124), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.415>



## Open Access Journal

- Nagy, B. & Edelman, D. J. (2014). Transformational Leadership in Planning Curricula. *Current Urban Studies* 2(03), 198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/cus.2014.23020>
- Oranje, M. (2002). Planning and the postmodern turn. *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory*, Allmendinger, P. & Twdwer, J.M (eds.), London: Routledge, pp. 172-186.
- Owens, S. (2000). 'Engaging the public': information and deliberation in environmental policy. *Environment and planning A* 32(7): 1141-1148. DOI:10.1068/a3330
- Ozawa, C. P. & Seltzer, E. P. (1999). Taking our bearings: Mapping a relationship among planning practice, theory, and education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18(3): 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X9901800307>
- Poxon, J. (2001). Shaping the planning profession of the future: the role of planning education. *Environment and Planning B* 28(4): 563-580. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b2735>
- Reardon, K. M. (2006). Promoting reciprocity within community/university development partnerships: Lessons from the field. *Planning, Practice & Research* 21(1): 95-107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697450600901566>
- Reardon, K. & Forester, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Rebuilding Community after Katerina: transformative education in the New Orleans planning initiative*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Reed, M. S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: a literature review. *Biological Conservation* 141(10): 2417-2431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.014>
- Roakes, S. L. & Norris-Tirrell, D. (2000). Community service learning in planning education: a framework for course development. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 20(1): 100-110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073945600128992636>
- Rydin Y. (2007), Re-examining the role of knowledge within planning theory, *Planning Theory*, 6(4): 52-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095207075161>
- Saghir, C. & Sands, G. (2015). What Do City Planners Need to Know? When Do They Need to Know It? *International Journal of Social Science Studies* 3(2): 21-29. doi:10.11114/ijsss.v3 i 2 652
- Sanyal, B. (ed.). (1990). *Breaking the boundaries: A one-world approach to planning education*. New York: Springer.
- Shriberg, M. (2002). Institutional assessment tools for sustainability in higher education: strengths, weaknesses, and implications for practice and theory. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 3(3): 254-270. Retrieved from <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/journal/ijsh>
- Soria, K. M. & Mitchell, T. D. (eds.) (2016). *Civic Engagement and Community Service at Research Universities: Engaging Undergraduates for Social Justice, Social Change and Responsible Citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Steele, W. (2009). Australian urban planners: hybrid roles and professional dilemmas? *Urban Policy and Research* 27(2): 189-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08111140902908873>
- Stiftel, B. (2009). Planning the paths of planning schools. *Australian planner*, 46(1): 38-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07293682.2009.9995289>
- Tal, R. B., Fenster, T. & Kulka, T. (2015). Academy-Community Partnerships: Challenges and Changes in Israeli Urban Regeneration Projects. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 19(3): 63-87. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1077476>
- Taylor, B. & de Loë, R. C. (2012). Conceptualizations of local knowledge in collaborative environmental governance. *Geoforum* 43(6): 1207-1217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.03.007>
- Van Dyck, B. (2011). Social entrepreneurship in urban planning and development in



## Open Access Journal

- Montreal, *Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning: Cities, Policies, and Politics*. Tسان-  
Kok, Tuna, Baeten, Guy (eds.) New York: Springer. pp. 117-132.
- Watson, V. & Odendaal, N. (2012). Changing Planning Education in Africa: The Role of the  
Association of African Planning Schools. *Journal of Planning Education and  
Research* 33(1): 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X12452308>
- Wight, I., Kellett, J. & Pieters, J. (2016). Practice ~ reflection ~ learning: work experience in  
planner education. *Planning Practice & Research* 31(5): 500-512.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2016.1222109>
- Winkler, T. (2013). At the Coalface Community–University Engagements and Planning  
Education. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 33(2): 215-227.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X12474312>
- Yacobi, H. (2007). The NGOization of Space: Dilemmas of Social Change, Planning Policy,  
and the Israeli Public Sphere. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25  
(4): 745-758. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d459t>
- Yacobi, H. (2009). *The Jewish-Arab City: Spatio-politics in a mixed community*. London:  
Routledge.
- Yiftachel O. (1998). Planning and Social Control: Exploring the Dark Side. *Journal of  
Planning Literature* 12(4): 395-406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088541229801200401>
- Zlotkowski, E. & Duffy, D. (2010). Two decades of community-based learning. *New  
Directions for Teaching and Learning* (123): 33-43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.407>