URBS369 Global Cities. The Port of Piraeus
Fall 2021

Dr. Evgenia Tousi, Architect-Urban and Regional Planner NTUA

Class Times: Monday, 11.00-14:00
Office Hours Available: Monday 10:00-11:00

Course Description
In the world of global economy, the sense of place has changed dramatically over the past decades. The traditional forms of inter-state cooperation have given their position to new types of development where new technologies facilitate cross-border collaborations. Apart from the old centers of global economy, strategic territories are emerging within cities that are not considered to be global. The Municipality of Piraeus in Greece is a typical example due to the recent opening-up of the Greek economy to foreign firms. On account of this, it is a suitable case study for analyzing the new types of spatial units that play a key role on urban planning. Given the fact that Greece is a member state of the European Union, students are going to envision the greater impact that these procedures may have. With the help of international literature students are going to work on the crucial urban issues emphasizing on the area of Piraeus. In addition, they are going to discover what lies beneath a territory of strategic interest through field work. The problems they are about to handle are associated with the abandoned brownfield sites, the derelict public housing reserve and the intense socio-spatial inequalities. The aim of the course is to help students elaborate critical thinking on spatial planning issues and area-based policies, recommending innovative tools for strategic urban planning in the era of globalization.

Course Approach
Students are going to work as interdisciplinary groups in pairs of 2, 3 or 4. The course involves literature review as well as empirical research. To investigate all the above-mentioned issues, we are going to study not only the international literature and the state-of-the-art, but also selected articles focusing on the Greek case study. Apart from reading, students are about to make independent observations during field trips and keep a field work diary. They are going to present their findings and write papers focusing on the three main issues of the course: global cities- territories of strategic interest, social housing and brownfield remediation practices. To be more specific, this course involves the following activities:

Reading: We will read a wide variety of texts relevant to urban and regional planning. Students are going to study selected pieces of international literature on the following issues:

- global cities and strategic territories,
- theories and practices on social housing policy
- Brownfield rehabilitation,
- the impact of flagship projects
- methods of participatory planning and bottom-up practices
- texts associated with the Greek case study, the area of Piraeus

Analyzing and interpreting: The course includes analysis and interpretation of texts and experience.

Working and thinking with others: Students are about to work not only as individuals but also in groups. Since the course has an interdisciplinary character, the final project is based on team work, where everyone’s contribution is equal and important.

Writing: This course involves a significant amount of writing, since it includes three written assignments described below and a field work diary.

Presentations: Each written assignment is accompanied by a 10-15’ presentation so as to open the dialog on the crucial issues of the course. Students should also present their fieldwork notes during the midterms
and their final project, the A0 poster.

**Learning Objectives**
By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- define the variety of forces that shape the built environment
- explain the transnational interrelations, beyond spatial borders and limitations
- recognize the specificities of time and place in relation to urban planning procedures
- identify and interpret the layered or multifaceted sense of place (with the help of international and Greek case studies)
- outline the environmental, social, economic and cultural factors that contribute to spatial justice or injustice
- experiment with the ways that urban and regional planning can manage change in complex environments
- deal with multiple scales of planning, making use of planning as an active practice with the help of participatory design
- prioritize a variety of urban issues in terms of collective memory
- construct critical thinking on spatial issues

**Course Requirements**
- Mid-term and Final exams
- Participation
- Critical reading of selected academic journals and monographs
- Three written assignments of 1500 words each, excluding bibliography
- 10' minutes oral presentation of each assignment
- Field work diary
- Final project: the whole class is going to work as an interdisciplinary team and create a A0 poster
- Presentation of the poster

**Estimate course workload by using the estimator:** 5.75 out of class hrs/wk

**Class Field Work and CYA Field Study**
Field work is a necessary tool for making direct observations during the course. As mentioned before, the course combines literature review and empirical research. Class field work comprise visits in selected enclaves in the wider area of Piraeus. CYA Study is not a part of course’s field work. However, CYA field study offers a general perspective on the evolution of the Greek State from ancient times to nowadays. These pieces of information are valuable knowledge so as to understand the variety of forces that shaped the build environment in Greece.

**Class Field Work**
Students are going to attend five field trips, visiting the wider area of Piraeus; the Port, the historic center, a gentrified area around the port, some post-refugee urban settlements, a brownfield zone along the coastal area of Drapetsona and Perama, the coastal zone along Pasalimani and one significant flagship project.

- **Mon Oct 4** - 1st Field trip: Visit to the central area of Piraeus and the Port.
- **Mon Oct 11** - 2nd Field trip: The neighborhood of Germanika as described in Renee Hischon’s work and the wider area of the historic centre of Nikea, the post-refugee area of Korydallos and Palia Kokkinia
- **Mon Nov 8** - 3rd field trip: Visit to the Brownfield area of Drapetsona and Perama Industrial zone
- **Mon Nov 15** - 4th field trip: Visit to the Stavros Niarchos Cultural Center and the neighboring refugee enclave
Evaluation and Grading
Your grade for this course will be based on the following distribution:

**Evaluation Criteria - Course Assignments**
Your grade for this course will be based on the following distribution:

1st assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)- due date 27/9
2nd assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)- due date 25/10
3rd assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)-due date 29/11
Midterm presentation: 10 %- scheduled on Monday the 18th of October
Final project: 15 %
Final exam: 30 %
Participation and field work: 15 %

Grades are intended to give you a sense of the quality of a particular piece of work: roughly speaking, a B means that you have done a good job with the writing, the ideas, and the organization of the work; a C conveys that the work lacks some important qualities and has some problems, while an A means that the work is exemplary in some key ways: the writing is particularly clear, the ideas thoroughly treated, the organization of the presentation well considered and effective.

Class Participation: This course requires not only attendance but also participation during the lessons and field trips. Moreover, the participation during in class writing and analysis is vitally important to your success in this course.

Papers
The course includes three written assignments associated with the crucial issues discussed during the lessons and the onsite visits. These issues are: global cities’ development, social housing and brownfield regeneration. Students are going to understand the international literature by analyzing case studies from the USA or other countries, focusing on the good practices implemented. Students will be asked to find similarities and differences between the chosen examples from the USA and the Greek case study. The knowledge gained from these assignments is going to become a useful tool for the strategic planning in the area of Piraeus, required for the final project.

To receive credit for an assignment, you must turn it in at the beginning of class on the due date. No late assignments will be accepted.

Assignment 1: Global Cities’ Development, due date 27/9/2021

**Description**
Students should choose a global city and describe the crucial issues related to the city’s development. Papers should be 1500 number of words, excluding bibliography. Students are allowed and encouraged to work in groups. Each group of students should also prepare a 10’ minute presentation in PowerPoint.

- Criteria 1: the paper and the PowerPoint presentation should have a central point, a statement about the development of the selected city
- Criteria 2: the paper and the PowerPoint presentation should comment on the positive and negative aspects of globalization as found in the city of study
- Criteria 3: use of literature and quality of writing are also very important
Assignment 2: Social Housing, due date 25/10/2021

Description
Students are going to choose an example of public housing from the USA and write about it, mentioning the effect that it has on the socio-spatial physiognomy of the city. Furthermore, they should make a comparison between the chosen example and the Greek case study. Students should state and support a thesis in an essay of 1000-1500 words, excluding bibliography and also prepare a PowerPoint presentation. Students are encouraged to work in groups.

• Criteria 1: the paper and the PowerPoint should be well-documented, using literature and other material (photos, maps etc.)
• Criteria 2: The comparison between the example from the USA and Greece should be accurate and to the point.
• Criteria 3: the quality of writing is very important

Assignment 3: Brownfield Remediation, due date 29/11/2021

Description
Students should choose a case of brownfield regeneration, mentioning the good practices implemented. The essay should be 1000-1500 words, excluding bibliography. Students have to prepare a PowerPoint presentation as well. Students are encouraged to work in groups.

• Criteria 1: the paper and the PowerPoint should be well-documented, using literature and other material (photos, maps etc.)
• Criteria 2: The comparison between the example from the USA and Greece should be accurate and to the point.
• Criteria 3: the quality of writing is very important

CYA Regulations and Accommodations

Attendance Policy
CYA regards attendance in class and on-site (in Athens or during field study trips) as essential. Absences are recorded and have consequences. Illness or other such compelling reasons which result in absences should be reported immediately to the Student Affairs Office.

Academic Accommodations

Policy on Original Work
Unless otherwise specified, all submitted work must be your own original work. Any ideas taken from the work of others must be clearly identified as quotations, paraphrases, summaries, figures etc., and accurate internal citations and/or captions (for visuals) as well as an accompanying bibliography must be provided (Check the Student Handbook, pg. 7).

Use of Laptops
In-class or onsite use of laptops and other devices is permitted if this facilitates course-related activities such as note-taking, looking up references, etc. Laptop or other device privileges will be suspended if devices are not used for class-related work.
## Class Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Day</th>
<th>Day/Date/Place (if applicable)</th>
<th>Topic / Readings / Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1         | Mon Sep 6                     | **Global cities, introducing the concept (1st part of the lesson (11:00-12:30)**  
*Description*  
The first lesson is introductory to the concept of global city, focusing on the work of Saskia Sassen. The lecture includes a short description of the global cities index, referring to the international tendencies on the field. Moreover, the lecture analyses the effects of industrialization, de-industrialization and the role of new technologies.  
**2nd part of the lesson (12:30-14:00)**- Transnational interrelations- Readings on Saskia Sassen  
*Description*  
This part of the lesson focuses on the transnational interrelations and the areas of strategic interest within the cities around the world. Specificities of time and place are evaluated in the context of globalization.  
*Required reading*  
*Optional Reading*  
*Discussion on the 1st Assignment: Paper and PowerPoint Presentation due on 27/9-Teamwork*  
The first assignment includes a paper on one of the core issues linked to the course. The assignment requires teamwork (2 or 3 students). Students should choose a global city and describe the crucial issues related to the city’s development. Papers should be 1000 number of words, excluding the bibliography. Each group should also prepare a 10 minute presentation in PowerPoint. The assignment is due on Monday 1/3. |
| 2         | Mon Sep 13                    | **Global Cities of the world- London and New York (11:00-12:30)**  
*Description*  
The role of the traditional global centers as New York and London. Their socio-spatial physiognomy and their influence on other regional centers.  
**12:30-14:00- 2nd part of the lesson- Asian Global Cities**  
This part of the lesson focuses on the case of the Asian global cities, referring not only to the traditional global centers but also to the emerging economies. Patterns of development, strengths and weaknesses are described. Examples and suitable case studies are illustrated so as to present the crucial issues associated with the socio-spatial transformations in those areas.  
*Required reading*  
Optional Reading

- Harvey D. (2013) *Rebel Cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*, Verso, p.3-27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Mon Sep 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>The case of Piraeus Port in Greece (11:00-12:30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Description</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flagship projects, transnational collaborations, economic crisis, social cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The case of Piraeus, the central port of Greece. The variety of forces that shape the built environment during the era of globalization. The situation in Piraeus Port and its periphery. The first part of the lesson emphasizes on the central area of Piraeus and its socio-spatial attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Peripheral Municipalities-The Greater Piraeus Region-The Asia Minor Refugee Demographic Flow and its impact on urban development (12.30-14.00)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Description</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Asia Minor Refugee Inflow was a milestone for the Greek history of the 20th century. More than 1,500,000 refugees found shelter in Greek urban and rural areas, 48% of whom was located in the urban agglomeration of Athens-Piraeus. This part of the lesson aims at providing all the necessary pieces of information so as to offer a well-rounded perspective on the type of urban expansion met in Piraeus during the early 20th century and its impact on contemporary urban narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Required reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Mon Sep 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the 1st assignment (11:00-12:30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Description</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 1st part of the lesson is dedicated to student's work. Each study group is going to present the final outcome of the research so as to open up dialogue on issues related to globalization and its effect on city images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12:30-14.00- The issue of Social Housing, The International Experience and the case of Greece (area of focus- Piraeus)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description

Presentation of the variety of policies applied in the field, analyzing the example of the United States of America and the European Union. The issue of neighborhood effects is going to be discussed as well as the connection between social housing and social exclusion.

**Discussion on the 2nd assignment:** Students are going to choose an example of public housing and write about it, mentioning the effect that it has on the micro-scale of city. Students should write an essay of 1000-1500 words, excluding bibliography and also prepare a powerpoint presentation. Students are encouraged to work in groups.

**Required Reading**


**Optional Reading**


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mon Oct 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1st class visit: Central area of Piraeus, Port, gentrified areas and flagship projects (11.00-14.00)**

**Description**

The class visit includes the central area of Piraeus, the ancient gate to the city, a gentrified area around the Port full of neoclassical buildings, Piraeus Tower (the only high-rise structure of the area- an architectural landmark), the recent flagship project in Saint Nicolas passengers' station (a new 5-star hotel), the ancient harbor of Zea and the gentrified area of Pasalimani. During this class visit, students will have the chance to understand the contradictory images of the city of Piraeus that forms its contemporary physiognomy with elements of different eras. The class visit includes field work (site analysis).

**Required Reading**


**Optional reading**

2nd class visit: Refugee Social Housing Complexes an ex-refugee area
The Area of Nikea, Korydallos and Palia Kokkinia

Description
Students are going to visit the post-refugee enclaves of Nikea, Korydallos and Palia Kokkinia, located in Greater Piraeus Region. The class visit includes field work (site analysis). These areas face today numerous challenges, hosting vulnerable households of economic immigrants and elderly people. Students are going to familiarize with spatial expressions of social exclusion as linked to the decaying old refugee housing complexes.

Required Reading


Optional Reading

Midterm Evaluation – related to fieldwork, combined with a brief literature review

Brownfield management and Flagship Projects. Bottom up and top-down practices.

1st part of the lesson: Flagship projects and brownfield management

Description
Much has been written about “Bilbao effect” and the transformation of the socio-spatial identity of a city. The predominance of “starchitects” so as to re-brand an urban area is a well-known phenomenon throughout the world. The construction of flagship projects is being used as a mechanism of attracting investors and visitors. This is rather common in countries that base their economy on tourism. New geographies and tendencies in the field of tourism dictate alterations in urban policies. Globalization procedures form new patterns of urban evolution expressing new priorities and choices.

From this point of view, this lesson explores the social side effects of flagship projects, looking in depth the case of Bilbao. It also includes information about brownfield sites in the UK and in the USA.

Required reading
Ponzini, D. (2010). Bilbao effects and narrative defects, Cahiers de recherche du Pro-


Optional Reading

2nd part of the lesson: Presentation of the 2nd assignment

Discussion on the 3rd assignment: Students should choose a case of brownfield regeneration, mentioning the good practices implemented. The essay should be 1500 words, excluding the bibliography. Each study group is going to present a PowerPoint of about 10’ minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Mon Nov 1</th>
<th>Brownfield Management in Europe and the case of Greece, applied policies and Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>The lesson describes the variety of policies met in Europe as far as brownfield management is concerned in the light of globalization. The lesson concludes to the case of Piraeus providing students with original cartographic material related to brownfield management and flagship projects along the Athenian Riviera.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required Reading


Optional Reading
10 Mon Nov 8

3rd class visit: Brownfield area of Drapetsona and the industrial zone of Perama

Description

The aim of this lesson is to understand the linkages between the refugee housing rehabilitation and the industrial development in the area of Piraeus. The urban refugee settlements had been constructed near industrial units where the majority of the refugee population used to work. De-industrialization procedures affected the socio-spatial physiognomy of those areas in various ways. On the one hand we have the brownfield issue and on the other the international collaborations as in the case of the Chinese Corporation named Cosco. Students are going to visit the main industrial zone of Perama and a large brownfield area in Drapetsona.

Required reading


11 Mon Nov 15

4th Class Visit: Stavros Niarchos Cultural Center and the neighboring refugee enclave

Description

The lesson is about the role of urban planning and its impact on the socio-spatial physiognomy of the city, taking into account contemporary policies on brownfield redevelopment. A Greek case study is analyzed. This case study, named Kallithea, is located at the coastal forefront of Attica, that is part of the Athenian Riviera. The aim of this lesson is to designate issues associated with severe gentrification procedures commenting on the applied urban policies.

Required reading


12 Mon Nov 29

Presentation of the 3rd assignment and discussion on the final project-Poster

Description

The lesson focuses on the required academic skills for a well-designed and documented poster.

Required reading

Preparation of the final Project- SWOT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION ON PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

Description

SWOT ANALYSIS- A Useful tool in urban planning. The case of Piraeus. Students are going to look in depth the strengths and weaknesses of Piraeus in the era of Globalization, taking into account all the previously discussed issues.

Required reading


N.B.: The course schedule, in terms of subjects and readings, may be subject to change to benefit student learning and to keep up to date with current research.
Course Readings: Full Bibliography


Harvey D. (2013) Rebel Cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution, Verso


Related sites
http://www.epa.gov/brownfields


http://canadianbrownfieldsnetwork.ca/

http://www.saskiasassen.com/

https://understandingsociety.blogspot.com/2012/12/neighborhood-effects.html

https://www.advancedurbanmarginality.com/loiumlc-wacquant.html

https://carnegieeurope.eu/2016/04/20/strategic-interests-of-european-union-pub-63448

www.housingeurope.eu/page-91/the-observatory
Rubrics:

1st assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
2nd assignment: 10%
3rd assignment: 10%
Midterm presentation: 10%
Final project: 15%
Final exam: 30%
Participation (5% in classroom and
Field trips, 5%
Activities on Moodle, 5%
Moodle’s Forums: 15%

TOTAL: 100%

The instructor will convert the final grade to a letter grade according to the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>80-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (failing grade)</td>
<td>0-59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also – and + grades according to the Faculty Handbook.

For example, if a student has earned 70% for the 1st assignment, 75% for the 2nd, 80% for the 3rd, 90% for the Midterm presentation, 85% for the final project, 90% for the final exam and 70% for participation and the fieldwork diary, then his/her total grade is equal to:

\[
\frac{(70\times10) + (75\times10) + (80\times10) + (90\times10) + (85\times15) + (90\times30) + (70\times15)}{700+750+800+900+1275+2700+1050} = \frac{8175}{100} = 81.75\%.
\]

So the student’s final grade is **81.75%**, which is equal to the letter **B-**, according to the Faculty Handbook. The criteria for evaluation of each activity in the course are described in the rubrics printed below.
## Evaluation criteria for the three assignments: Papers (6%+6%+6%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central point</th>
<th>90-100 % A</th>
<th>80-89% B</th>
<th>70-79 % C</th>
<th>60-69 % D</th>
<th>0-59% F (failing grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displays clear, well-developed central point</td>
<td>Displays adequately-developed central point</td>
<td>Displays central point, although not clearly developed.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays adequately-developed central point.</td>
<td>Displays central point, although not clearly developed.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays central point.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical thinking skills**

- Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas throughout, leading to an overall sense that the piece could withstand critical analysis by experts in the discipline.
- Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas throughout.
- Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas in most parts of the assignment.
- Includes little analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.
- Includes no analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.

**Quality of writing**

- Excellent: Ideas are interesting and important. Organization of ideas is logical and effective. Word choice is specific and memorable. Sentence
- Very Good: Most of the ideas are interesting and important. The organization of ideas is sufficiently logical and in
- Good: There are some interesting and important ideas but their organization is not very consistent. The word choice is not very
- Marginal: Only a few interesting ideas but their organization lacks consistency. The word choice is vague in most of the text.
- Unsatisfactory: There are no interesting ideas. The essay lacks consistency. There are no correct or communicative conventions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of literature</th>
<th>More than five articles are referenced</th>
<th>Five to four articles are referenced</th>
<th>Four to three articles are referenced</th>
<th>Three to two articles are referenced</th>
<th>Only one or two sources/mostly websites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Evaluation criteria for the Oral Presentation of each of the three assignments, 4%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>90-100 % A</th>
<th>80-89% B</th>
<th>70-79 % C</th>
<th>60-69 % D</th>
<th>0-59% F (failing grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central point</strong></td>
<td>Central point is uniquely displayed and developed through the oral presentation.</td>
<td>Displays clear, well-developed central point</td>
<td>Displays adequately-developed central point</td>
<td>Displays central point, although not clearly developed.</td>
<td>Assignment lacks a central point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas, throughout, leading to an overall sense that the piece could withstand critical analysis by experts in the discipline.</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas in most parts of the assignment.</td>
<td>Includes little analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.</td>
<td>Includes no analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of delivery/use of terminology/use of visual aids</td>
<td>Excellent/correct use of terminology/ Use only of relevant graphical elements Use of the slides to complement speaking, rather than duplicate it. Make the audience eager to read the paper. The presentation is clearly and enthusiastically delivered.</td>
<td>Very Good: Most of the terms used are correct. The student has only a few unnecessary visual elements and the slides mostly complement speaking. There are some repetitions but the final product is consistent.</td>
<td>Good: The presentation includes some terms based on the literature on the field. The presentation has some unnecessary visual graphics and the sequence of the slides is in some cases not consistent. The slides in some cases duplicate speaking.</td>
<td>Marginal: There is an effort to capture the main gist of the topic and make references to the main literature on the field. However, the presentation is not well organized, has many unnecessary elements and lacks consistency.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory There is no use of terminology and the visual aids used lack the main gist. Inconsistent slides show. Irrelevant visual graphics. Vague meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria for fieldwork and in classroom</td>
<td>Participation 5% of the final grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field trips attended</strong></td>
<td>90-100 % A</td>
<td>80-89% B</td>
<td>70-79 % C</td>
<td>60-69 % D</td>
<td>0-59% F (failing grade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Insightful description of the contemporary situation in the field /Recognition of the crucial issues** | All of them (seven) | From 6 to 5 | From 5 to 4 | From 4 to 3 | Only 1 or 2 |

| **Evaluation and prioritization of the problems encountered in the urban areas visited** | The student has a well-rounded understanding of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city | The student has understood the majority of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city | The student has understood some of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city | The student has understood only a few of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city | The student has not understood the crucial issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The presenter speaks clear with enthusiasm.</th>
<th>rather than complement it. The presenter does not speak very clear.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The pre-senter than complement it. The pre-senter does not speak very clear.
### Evaluation criteria for the Midterm Presentation, 10% of the final grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>90-100 %</th>
<th>80-89%</th>
<th>70-79 %</th>
<th>60-69 %</th>
<th>0-59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central point</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F (failing grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central point is uniquely displayed and developed through the oral presentation.</td>
<td>Displays a clear, well-developed central point</td>
<td>Displays an adequately-developed central point.</td>
<td>Displays a central point, although not clearly developed.</td>
<td>Presentation lacks a central point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of notes</strong></td>
<td>Very accurate notes that lead to an interesting presentation</td>
<td>Accurate notes that detail most of the crucial issues encountered in the field</td>
<td>The notes are not well organized. Only a few of the crucial issues are addressed during the presentation</td>
<td>Vague notes with no significant contribution</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory; lack of understanding about how to keep field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photos /other illustrative material (sketches etc)</strong></td>
<td>Plenty</td>
<td>Adequate amount</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of delivery/use of terminology/use of visual aids</td>
<td>Excellent/correct use of terminology/Use only of relevant graphical elements. Use of the slides to complement speaking, rather than duplicate it. The presentation is clearly and enthusiastically delivered.</td>
<td>Very Good: Most of the terms used are correct. The student has only a few unnecessary visual elements and the slides mostly complement speaking. There are some repetitions but the final product is consistent. The presenter speaks clear with enthusiasm.</td>
<td>Good: The presentation includes some terms based on literature on the field. The presentation has some unnecessary visual graphics and the sequence of the slides is in some cases not consistent. The slides in some cases duplicate speaking rather than complement it. The presenter does not speak very clear.</td>
<td>Marginal: There is an effort to capture the main gist of the topic and make references to the main literature on the field. However, the presentation is not well organized, has many unnecessary elements and lacks consistency.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory: There is no use of terminology and the visual aids used lack the main gist. Inconsistent slides show. Irrelevant visual graphics. Vague meanings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria for the Final Project (Poster), 15% of the final grade</th>
<th>90-100 %</th>
<th>80-89%</th>
<th>70-79 %</th>
<th>60-69 %</th>
<th>0-59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis,</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis,</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis,</td>
<td>Includes little analysis,</td>
<td>Includes no analysis, synthesis, interpretation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas throughout, leading to an overall sense that the piece could withstand critical analysis by experts in the discipline.</td>
<td>interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas throughout.</td>
<td>interpretation and/or other critical manipulation of ideas in most parts of the assignment.</td>
<td>synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.</td>
<td>and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team spirit as evaluated by the instructor</strong></td>
<td>High level: the student takes into consideration the instructor’s directions and the opinions expressed by his/her classmates</td>
<td>Very good level: the role of the student in the team is helpful in most cases</td>
<td>Good level: the student seems willing to cooperate but lacks communicative skills</td>
<td>Opinionated student/difficult to work with</td>
<td>Unwilling to cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative ideas</strong></td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td>A few</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of literature</td>
<td>High level of understanding and incorporation of the international literature on the issues discussed</td>
<td>Very good level of understanding and incorporation of the international literature on the issues discussed</td>
<td>Adequate level of understanding and incorporation of the international literature on the issues discussed</td>
<td>Low level of understanding and incorporation of the international literature on the issues discussed</td>
<td>No understanding of the major issues related to the themes discussed during the lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team spirit as evaluated by the peers</td>
<td>High: peers consider him/her to be a valuable partner</td>
<td>Very good: most peers think that they have worked well with him/her, sharing ideas and discussing the crucial issues</td>
<td>Good: despite disagreements, peers consider his/her contribution important</td>
<td>Opinionated student/difficult to work with</td>
<td>Unwilling to cooperate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Evaluation criteria for the Final Exam, 30% of the final grade |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 90-100%                          | 80-89%                          | 70-79%                          | 60-69%                          | 0-59% F (failing grade) |
| Critical thinking skills | Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas throughout, leading to an overall sense that the piece could withstand critical | Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas throughout. | Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation and/or other critical manipulation of ideas in most parts of the assignment. | Includes little analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas. | Includes no analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas. |
| | | | | | |
| Quality of writing | Excellent: Ideas are interesting and important. Organization of ideas is logical and effective. Word Choice is specific and memorable. Sentence fluency that is smooth and expressive. Conventions correct and communicative. | Very Good: Most of the ideas are interesting and important. The organization of ideas is sufficiently logical and in most of the cases effective. The word choice is sufficiently specific and memorable. The sentence fluency is sufficiently smooth and expressive and most of the conventions correct and communicative. | Good: There are some interesting and important ideas but their organization is not very consistent. The word choice is not very specific and memorable and the sentence fluency is not very smooth. There are some correct and communicative conventions. | Marginal: Only a few interesting ideas but their organization lacks consistency. The word choice is vague in most of the text. The sentence fluency is not smooth. Just a few correct and communicative conventions. | Unsatisfactory: There are no interesting ideas. The essay lacks consistency. There are no correct or communicative conventions. |
| Experience gained through the activities during the course | The student seems competent in making recommendations on a variety of urban planning issues | The student is able to propose some insightful planning strategies | The student is able to propose a few insightful planning strategies | The student has gained some experience but is not able to express them and propose planning strategies | The student is not able to propose insightful planning strategies |
| Understanding and study of literature | High level: The student has studied hard. He/she has understood the connection between literature and the issues met in field. The use of literature is supporting the fieldwork findings in an insightful and successful way. | Very good level: The student has sufficiently studied and makes use of appropriate literature. They recognize in general the connection between literature and fieldwork findings. However, some crucial issues are not presented in a successful way that reveals high quality of literature understanding. | Good level: The student has studied enough so as to make use of appropriate literature while describing the situation met in field. An overall review of his/her work reveals some weaknesses owed to a large extent to not having understood the literature used during the lessons. | Average level: The student seems to have at least cross-read the suggested literature but is not able to make the appropriate connections with the situation met in field. | Not having studied enough, no use of appropriate literature. |