

PUCM Objective 4 Tertiary Newsletter

Issue 2:
10 January 2005



CONTENTS

For New Readers:

About the PUCM Objective 4 **Tertiary Newsletter**

Who is a Corresponding Member?

Why do we have a PRWG?

Activity Report:

Course Ideas from 6 December 2004 PRWG Meeting

Work in Progress:

FOR NEW READERS

ABOUT THE PUCM OBJECTIVE 4 TERTIARY NEWSLETTER

PUCM (Planning Under Co-operative Mandates) is a research programme funded by FRST. It is based in the International Global Change Institute (IGCI), University of Waikato. The four objectives of PUCM focus on:

1. planning under the Resource Management Act (RMA) (led by Jan Crawford);
2. planning under the Local Government Act (LGA) (led by Ali Memon);
3. Māori interests (led by Richard Jefferies); and
4. a Practice Development Programme aimed at providing end-users with concepts, methods, tools and related research findings (led by Tom Fookes).

This **Newsletter** is in support of Objective 4 – the Practice Development Programme.

The aim of this **Newsletter** is to maintain contact between the Objective 4 *Tertiary Corresponding Members* (TCM) and the PUCM Team. It is an occasional publication, as and when there is something to pass on. One of the regular items will be a report from the *Tertiary Peer Review Working Group* (PRWG, a sub-group of TCM), which is in direct contact through workshops with the PUCM Team.

WHO IS A CORRESPONDING MEMBER?

Tertiary Corresponding Members (TCM) formed as a group through responses to the initial enquiry about people's interest in PUCM Objective 4 (Practice Development Programme) and with respect to tertiary institutions. The plan was to maintain an email dialogue between staff in the ongoing PUCM Research Programme and tertiary

institutions. An aim was to consider prospects for incorporating PUCM's methods and findings, including lessons about the RMA and LGA, into tertiary courses.

The initial letter was sent to appropriate faculties and departments in all New Zealand Universities and Unitec. Further approaches are being made with the mailing of this **Newsletter** to enable people who may have missed out earlier to consider joining the *TCM*. Within the *TCM* group is another group who have indicated an interest in more "hands-on" involvement through the *Tertiary Peer Review Working Group* (PRWG). Additional members for this group are also welcome.

WHY DO WE HAVE A PRWG?

There are two reasons why we wish to have a Tertiary peer review component to the PUCM research programme (Objective 4). First, to enable scrutiny by others in the tertiary education field of:

- (a) our thinking about concepts and methods, and content for capability-building to better respond to governance and planning under the RMA and LGA; and
- (b) the results of our work.

The valuable feedback from such scrutiny will ensure our work has added credibility and acceptability by end-users.

The second reason is to establish an effective line of communication with tertiary teaching colleagues who may usefully include concepts, methods, and results from the PUCM research programme in their own courses, and/or pass this on to others for their application. This is taking the notion of "technology transfer" a step further than before, when the act of publishing results and presenting at conferences was intended to disseminate the knowledge from research. Now we can see the benefits from talking to educators about suitable teaching outlines and materials, so that they feel more inclined to introduce new content in their courses, and/or pass this onto others for their application.

ACTIVITY REPORT: Course Ideas from 6 December 2004 PRWG Meeting

Three examples of course plans and materials were presented at the inaugural meeting of the Peer Review Working Group. They were developed from the 1st and 2nd Phases of PUCM (1995-98 and 1999-02), and the current Objective 1 in Phase 3 (2003-09). They were presented by Dr Tom Fookes (The University of Auckland) and Jan Crawford (Planning Consultants Ltd, Auckland). Summaries follow:

COURSE PLAN 1. A GUIDE TO PLAN-MAKING IN NEW ZEALAND: THE NEXT GENERATION – PUCM GUIDELINE #1

The Guideline (which is already published) is laid out in a form which suggests a sequence of teaching units on the theme “Plan-Making”. This means it is possible to select from the list of topics or work systematically through, depending on the context for the teaching. The topics are:

- Planning mandates;
- Quality of Planning under the RMA;
- Plan Quality – Ingredients of a Good Plan;
- Plan Quality Performance;
- Barriers to Better Performance;
- The ‘Art’ of Plan-Making; and
- Organisational Strategies for Plan-Making.

In addition there are supporting resources:

- Institutional references with Internet address;
- References – as cited in the Guide.

Supporting Reading

In addition to the references cited there is a supporting text book: Ericksen, N.J., Berke, P.R., Crawford, J.L. and Dixon, J.E., 2003, *Planning for Sustainability: New Zealand under the RMA*, Hamilton: IGCI, University of Waikato (Price: \$39.95) [Also published as an International Edition by Ashgate (UK).] Part 1 covers Planning Mandates and Making Plans.

An order form for the book can be accessed at www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm/Linked%20documents/BookFlyer.pdf

Approach to the Course

It has already been suggested that one could select from the topics covered in the Guideline. Students could also deepen their understanding by reading the relevant sections of Part 1 in Ericksen, Berke, Crawford and Dixon, 2003. The Guideline includes a summary panel on each page which presents key ideas and findings from the research. For example, for “Planning Mandates” on page 1 the two styles of Planning Mandate are identified, with definitions of key terms used:

- Coercive
- Co-operative
- Capability
- Commitment
- Capacity.

Page 2 continues with an explanation that the Resource Management Act 1991 is a co-operative mandate and explains why. It also identifies the key agency (Ministry for the Environment) responsible for effective implementation of the Act, and spells out what this responsibility should include for plan-making. It also presents the PUCM research conclusion that “Government failed to adequately fund MfE to do its job.” This summary style continues through the Guideline, providing a useful structure for any teaching although, obviously, it is only one of several possible ways to cover the content of the Guideline.

It is important to point out at this juncture that teachers should be prepared to place alongside this resource relevant material that would enable the students to develop a critique of the PUCM work. In this sense PUCM is being used as a case study, and therefore provides a good basis for students to appraise its approach and findings as part of their learning. Material which follows this approach is being prepared for the Planning 210 and Planning 200 courses at Auckland in 2005.

Guide #1 is available at \$10 per copy from IGCI, University of Waikato, email pucm@waikato.ac.nz, ph 07 858 5638

A summary is online at www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm/Linked%20documents/Guide1Overview.pdf

COURSE PLAN 2. PLAN EVALUATION: INTERNAL CONSISTENCY – A TEACHING RESOURCE

The title of this teaching unit has been taken from a PUCM workbook: Backhurst, M., Crawford, J. and Ericksen, N.J., et al, 2003, *Plan Evaluation: Internal Consistency – A Teaching Resource*, Hamilton: IGCI, University of Waikato (Version 1, October).

It is explained in the Introduction that “This package has been developed to implement a practice development programme...to ensure best methods and practices are available for planning and governance” (p.2). The objectives for this course are to achieve:

- an understanding of the overall goals of the PUCM research project (1995-2003);
- an understanding of Phase 1 of PUCM, its aims, methods and results;

- the state of district plans and regional policy statements produced under the Resource Management Act, and reasons for this;
- the importance of policy analysis to planning, specifically the usefulness of measuring plan quality to actors in the plan making process;
- tools to objectively measure plan quality; and
- application of PUCM evaluation criteria by participants to a range of district plans.

Course Structure

The course is divided into three sessions:

1. Overview of PUCM Phase 1 (50 mins.) [Lecture];
2. Plan evaluation exercise – worked example (50 mins.) [Interactive workshop];
3. Plan evaluation exercise – class exercise (1 hr 50 mins.) [Interactive workshop].

Each session has its own set of objectives.

Teaching Resources

Included in the workbook is a list of Recommended Reading (p.3).

COURSE PLAN 3.

PLAN EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING

This is an example where lecturing, fieldwork, and Studio (practical) activities can be integrated with an ongoing research project.

This teaching unit is directed at the topic *Plan Effectiveness Monitoring* by way of their participation in the PUCM 3 research project, Objective 1 (Environmental Outcomes from District Plans). Replication of this course elsewhere is not expected to have the added benefit of involving the students in an ongoing piece of research as we have been able to do at Auckland this year. It does, however, provide the basis whereby a modified version could be developed. The opportunity to continue Jan Crawford's involvement in the 2005 Studio 2 at Auckland's Planning Department may mean that this variant of the 2004 course could be developed. By the 2nd semester 2005 it may be possible for Jan Crawford to bring her Objective 1 findings on environmental outcomes from plans (as they are at that stage) into the Studio.

The supporting material for this curriculum example is the ANZAPS paper prepared for the Perth 2004 meeting of the Australian and New

Zealand Association of Planning Schools: Fookes, T.W. and Crawford, J., 2004, *A Planning Studio Assessing Plan Effectiveness: A Trial at the University of Auckland Planning Department*.

Course Objectives

The formal objectives for the Studio 2 course have been:

- to learn about the RMA framework for plan effectiveness monitoring;
- to learn about the international, national and regional policy framework within which sustainability is monitored, and hence within which district plan monitoring occurs;
- to become familiar with a specific plan, especially the Anticipated Environmental Results (AERs) and monitoring provisions;
- to learn about the state of practice with respect to the monitoring of plan AERs in districts and regions; and
- to assist the PUCM 3 research project, especially Objectives 1 and 4 (see p.1 of Newsletter).

Course Focus or Emphasis

The broad range of issues covered in any one district plan has required the PUCM project to narrow down the issues to three:

- Urban amenity (including a case on heritage management);
- Māori interests;
- Stormwater effects.

These three issues underpin the continuing work in PUCM Phase 3, and provide the focus for its Objective 1.

Research Questions

Because the Studio activities were linked to the PUCM 3 Objective 1 research, the Studio Brief included two research questions. This is an example of the way the course was able to include instruction on research methods, as an additional benefit. The research questions were:

1. Have the AERs for urban amenity, Māori issues (Papakura only) and effects of stormwater on water quality and quantity been achieved?
2. If not (or if Q.1 can't be answered for any reason), what has been the change in the State of the Environment with respect to these topics since the district plan was made operative (or publicly notified)?

WORK IN PROGRESS

The PUCM Phase 1 and 2 reports drew conclusions about Capability Building, including the fact that this required attention to capacity and commitment by local bodies. The research for PUCM 3 Objective 4 (Practice Development Programme) will benefit from further enquiries into the scope of the terms 'capability', 'capacity' and 'commitment'. The enquiry will take the focus beyond the scope of PUCM 1 and 2, asking how the terminology is being interpreted and applied across a wide range of disciplines, and what this may mean for PUCM 3. Currently, short reports as part of a "Research Memorandum Series" are being worked on. The first of these reports is expected to be released in late February-early March on the PUCM website under "work in progress".

For more information about PUCM Objective 4, contact Objective leader:

Dr Tom Fookes
Department of Planning
University of Auckland
ph. 09 373 7599 ext. 85730
email: t.fookes@auckland.ac.nz

NEXT ISSUE

There is enough material to hand to produce a March 2005 issue. This will include:

- For New Readers
- Work in Progress: A review of Capability Building literature.

Where can I find more on PUCM?

www.waikato.ac.nz/pucm