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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 Resources and Activities
To investigate these 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 the 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. Moreover, they are going to work as a team so as to recommend urban planning strategies for the area of Piraeus. 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.

**Field trips**
Students are going to attend seven field trips in the wider area of Piraeus, visiting the Port, the historic center, a gentrified area around the port, some post-refugee urban settlements, a brownfield zone along Pireos avenue, the coastal zone along Pasalimani and one significant flagship project. Field trips also include a visit to the historical archive of the Municipality of Piraeus, where students will have the opportunity to study archival material as old maps, pictures, master plans and drawings. In addition, students will have a discussion with citizens and people working in the industrial area of Piraeus. Furthermore, a meeting with the members of the Association of Greek Architects and the scientific committee of the workshop “Paths of Architecture form modernism until today in Attica” will be arranged.

**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)
- discover through field work the socio-spatial inequalities that lead to social exclusion
- dissect the causes of the above mentioned inequalities
- 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
- Make 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
- recommend innovative tools for area-based policies

**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

Assignments
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.

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. The students are going to understand the international literature by analyzing case studies from the USA, focusing on the good practices implemented. The 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.

Due Dates:

- **Monday the 10th of February:** The 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 the bibliography. Each student should also prepare a 10’ minute presentation in PowerPoint.

- **Monday the 16th of March:** 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 1500 words, excluding bibliography. They should also prepare a 15’ minutes presentation in PowerPoint with the main topics for discussion so as to be presented in class on the 21st of March.

- **Wednesday the 8th of April:** Students should choose a case of brownfield regeneration, mentioning the good practices implemented. The essay should be 1500 words, excluding the bibliography. The students should prepare a 15’ minutes presentation in PowerPoint working in groups finding similarities and differences between the chosen case studies form the USA. The aim of the presentation is to open the discussion on the policies applied in the field, discovering methodological tools that are able to help the brownfield rehabilitation in Greece.

Special Projects

- **Field work diary:** each student should keep a record of the data collected from the field, meaning systematic notes describing field work situations. The students are free to make independent observations and develop their own ideas about the areas visited. After each field trip the diary should be updated. Students are going to take into consideration their notes so as to succeed in midterms and fulfill the final project. The students are going to attend a workshop on field notes during the Orientation Week. They are allowed to use either a notebook or a suitable mobile phone application.

- **Final project-team work:** The whole class is going to work as an interdisciplinary team so as to create a poster of A0 size, analyzing the Greek case study. The students are asked to clearly comment on the crucial issues affecting the area of Piraeus, as they have understood them during the whole semester. They are going to present through S.W.O.T. analysis the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, recommending directions for an innovative area –based policy that could be implemented in the area of Piraeus.

Exams

**Midterm evaluation: Monday the 9th of March:** Presentation of the data collected from the field. Students have to prepare a 15’ minutes presentation including the main findings from the field taking into consideration their notes, photos etc. They are going to present their view on the following topics:

- The condition of the social housing reserve in the wider area of the urban agglomeration of Piraeus
The contribution of social housing in the contemporary physiognomy of the city
The differences between the central area of Piraeus and the Peripheral municipalities
Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of those areas

Final: Wednesday the 13th of May: The essay questions selected for the final exam will provide students with an opportunity to explain their understanding and demonstrate creativity on urban planning issues. The number of words for each answer will not exceed 500 words. The written examination is divided into two parts. The first 60’ minutes students are going to answer three questions associated with the literature used during the lessons. The next 90’ minutes students are free to use their field notes, books, journals etc. so as to answer three questions associated with the case study, meaning the wider area of the urban agglomeration of Piraeus.

The questions of both parts will be related to the following topics:
- Global cities and territories of strategic interest
- Public housing policies
- Brownfield remediation
- Flagship projects
- Bottom-up practices in urban planning

Grading and Evaluation
Your grade for this course will be based on the following distribution:

1st assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
2nd assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
3rd assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
Midterm presentation: 10 %
Final project: 15 %
Final exam: 30 %
Participation and field work diary: 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.

Use of Laptops: In-class or on-site use of laptops and other devices is permitted if that facilitates course-related activities such as note-taking, looking up references, etc. Laptop or other devise privileges will be suspended if there are not used for class-related work.

Attendance: Students are expected to report for classes promptly. CYA regards attendance in class and on-site as essential. Absences are recorded and have consequences. Illness or other such compelling reasons which result in absences should be reported immediately in the Student Affairs Office.

Policy on Original Work: Unless otherwise specified, all submitted work must be your own, original work. Any excerpts from the work of others must be clearly identified as a quotation, and a proper citation provided. (Check Student handbook, pg. 9)

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: If you are a registered (with your home institution) student with a disability and you are entitled to learning accommodation, please inform the Director of Academic Affairs and make sure that your school forwards the necessary documentation.

Books, Course Materials, Moodle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Day</th>
<th>Day/Date</th>
<th>Topic / Readings / Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | Mon Jan 27 | **Global cities, introducing the concept**  
**Description**  
This 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.  

**Required reading**  

**Optional bibliography**  
| 2        | Wed Jan 29 | **Transnational interrelations- Readings on Saskia Sassen**  
**Description**  
This 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**  
Harvey D. (2013) *Rebel Cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*, p. 155-164  

**Discussion on the 1st Assignment: Paper and PowerPoint Presentation due on 10/2**  
The first assignment includes a paper on one of the core issues linked to the course. The 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 the bibliography. Each student should also prepare a 10’ minute presentation in PowerPoint. The assignment is due on Thursday the 14th of February. |
### 3 Mon Feb 3

**U.S.A. - European Union, Analyzing the example of New York and London**

**Description**
The role of the traditional global centers as New York and London. Their socio-spatial physiognomy and their influence on other regional centers.

**Required reading**

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

### 4 Wed Feb 5

**Asian Global Cities**

**Description**
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**

### 6 Mon Feb 10

**First half of the lesson: Presentation of students’ 1st assignment**

**Discussion on the 2nd assignment: Paper and PowerPoint Presentation due on 16/3**

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. Students should state their opinion writing an essay of 1500 words, excluding the bibliography. They should also prepare a 15’ minutes presentation in PowerPoint with the main topics for discussion so as to be presented in class on the 16th of March. Students should make a comparison between the Greek case study and the example from the USA.

**Second half of the lesson: The case of Greece: Areas of strategic interest**

**Description**
Flagship projects, transnational collaborations, economic crisis, social cohesion. 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.

**Required reading**

7 Wed Feb 12  The physiognomy of Piraeus – The role of the Port-field work

Description

1st Field Trip: Visit to the naval museum of Piraeus.

Required Reading


Optional Reading

The rest of the above mentioned booklet.

---

8 Mon Feb 17  Areas of strategic interest: The case of Piraeus

The physiognomy of Piraeus

Description

Students are going to discover what lies beneath an area of strategic interest, meaning the problems which should be taken into consideration while planning an area based policy. Socio-spatial inequalities owed to a large extent to the lack of efficient urban planning are going to be studied together with the influence of historic events that determined the development of the municipality of Piraeus. Students are going to keep a record from the data collected from the field. These notes are going to be a necessary tool for the fulfillment of the research and the final proposal for the area of Piraeus. The field work diary is a practice borrowed from the science of ethnography which is useful for interpreting the socio-spatial physiognomy of the area studied.

2nd Field Trip: Visit to the central area of Piraeus and the Port.

The students begin making field notes.

Required Reading


Useful website with instructions for keeping a field work diary:

https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/fieldnotes
9 Mon Feb 24  The refugee inflow after the Asia Minor Catastrophe, The issue of housing rehabilitation in the regional administrative area of Piraeus.

Description

The Asia Minor catastrophe was a milestone for the Greek history of the 20th century, due to the fact that it was associated with a vast demographic flow of more than 1,500,000 refugees. These people settled permanently in Greece mostly in the urban complex of Athens-Piraeus. The policies that followed the refugee rehabilitation have a great impact on the contemporary physiognomy of the city. The aim of the lesson is to present the basic knowledge needed to comprehend the problems that Piraeus faces today, one of which the old public housing reserve.

Required Reading


10 Wed 26 Feb  Social Housing during the ‘30s: The area of Nikea in the administrative regional area of Piraeus

Description

The municipality of Nikea - Ag.Ioannis Rentis hosts a significant number of social housing blocks. The area includes various neighborhoods with different socio-spatial identity. Moreover, numerous public policies have been implemented form the refugee rehabilitation to the post war housing policies, influencing the contemporary image of the city in general.

3rd Field trip: The neighborhood of Germanika as described in Renee Hisrchon’s work and the wider area of the historic centre of Nikea. The students will keep a record of the data collected from the field. They are going to visit different types of social housing, take photos, draw sketches and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in such areas.

Required Reading


11 Wed 4 Mar  Post War Social Housing: the cases of Ag. Ioannis Rentis and Ag. Anargyroi

Description

4th Field Trip: Students are going to visit the unique example of a social housing complex designed after the Austrian prototypes derived from Vienna’s Karl-Marx Hof. Moreover, they are going to visit a Worker’s Housing Organization enclave with typical forms of social housing.

During the mid ‘50s, the Workers’ Housing Organization was founded. The Organization had been active in the field of public housing until 2012. The closure of this organization is owed to the lack of funds during the contemporary economic crisis. The buildings that the students are going to visit are typical examples of the post war housing policy. Students are going to experience the contemporary condition, characterized mostly by socio-spatial discrepancies and inequalities.

Update the diary of the research.
Required Reading


Optional Reading


Mid Term: Presentation of the data collected from the field. Students have to prepare a 15’ minutes presentation including the main findings from the field taking into consideration their notes, photos etc. They are going to present their view on the following topics:
- The condition of the social housing reserve
- The contribution of social housing in the contemporary physiognomy of the city
- The differences between the central area of Piraeus and the Peripheral municipalities
- Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of those areas

The International literature on Social Housing. The issue of neighborhood effects. USA and European Union

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.

Required reading


Social Housing and Social Exclusion

Description

Presentation of students’ work. Discussion on the connection between social housing and social exclusion.

Discussion on the 3rd Assignment: Work as individuals and in groups. Paper and PowerPoint Presentation.

Students should choose a case of brownfield regeneration, mentioning the good practices implemented. The essay should be 1500 words, excluding the bibliography. The students should prepare a 15’ minutes presentation in PowerPoint working in groups finding similarities and differences between the chosen case studies form the US. The aim of the presentation is to open the discussion on the policies applied in the field, discovering methodological tools that are able to help the brownfield rehabilitation in Greece. The assignment is due on Tuesday the 8th of April.

Suggested reading
Brownfields

The International literature on the issue: USA, Canada, UK

**Description**

After the ‘90s, the issue of brownfields started to attract not only the attention of the scientific community but also the interest of politicians and public policy makers. The lesson focuses on the various policies applied in the USA, Canada and U.K., giving emphasis on the effects of de-industrialization.

**Required reading**


Brownfields, the International experience: European Countries and the case of China

**Description**

The aim of this lesson is the presentation of the variety of policies applied around the world on the brownfield rehabilitation issue. Students are about to familiarize with the strengths and weaknesses of those policies, constructing critical thought on the matter of urban regeneration.

**Required reading**


[https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8NZ8FTR](https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8NZ8FTR)


**Optional Reading**

Brownfields: The case of Greece: The industrial area of Drapetsona.

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.

5th Field trip: Visit the industrial area of Drapetsona.

Required Reading


Optional Reading

18 Mon 6 Apr Brownfields: The case of Greece. The issue of flagship projects in the wider area of Piraeus.

Description

Much has been written about “Billbao 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 a Greek case study. This case study, named Kallithea, is located at the coastal forefront of Attica, near Pireos avenue. Pireos avenue is full of brownfield sites. The aim of this lesson is to designate issues associated with severe gentrification procedures commenting on the applied urban policies.

6th Field trip: Pireos Avenue and the Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Center.

Required reading


19 Wed 8 Apr Discussion on brownfield regeneration practices. The international experience and the Greek example.

Presentation of students work and discussion.

Discussion on the final project: team work due on 13/5

All the students attending the course should work as one team so as to recommend innovative planning strategies for the area of Piraeus, taking into consideration issues as: social housing, brownfield regeneration, impact of flagship projects and the principles of participatory design. They have to incorporate the knowledge gained through the three assignments, field work and the readings on international literature. The instructor of the course is going to allocate duties during this lesson and inform the students for each participant’s evaluation. The students should work as an interdisciplinary team and conclude to two or three scenarios for further development of the area of Piraeus. They should clearly state their priorities and propose a timeline. The final project is due on Thursday the 9th of May.

Suggested Reading

20  Wed 22 Apr  Introduction to participatory city planning. International practices and the Greek example.

Description

The aim of this lesson is to introduce the practice of participatory city planning and present the variety of bottom-up practices according to literature. Typical examples and innovative ideas are going to be discussed, focusing on the case of Piraeus.

Required Reading


21  Mon 27 Apr  The other side of Piraeus. The area of Pasalimani and the small harbor of Zea.

Description

7th field trip: Apart from the degraded urban neighborhoods, Piraeus has a coastal zone full of nightlife and leisure time activities. Students are going to visit this zone so as to construct a well-rounded opinion of Piraeus and the Peripheral Municipalities.

Update the fieldwork diary.

Required reading


22  Wed 29 Apr  SWOT ANALYSIS- A Useful tool in urban planning. The case of Piraeus.

Description

All the students are going to work as one team during this lesson with the guidance of the instructor in order to complete a SWOT analysis for the wider area of Piraeus. This is going to be used in the final project as a result of the research done during the whole semester.

Required Reading


23  Mon 4 May  Preparation of the final Project – workshop on poster presentation

24  Wed 6 May  Preparation of the poster - the final project.
Round-table discussion on the crucial issues affecting the physiognomy of Piraeus and the peripheral Municipalities.

25 Wed 13 May    **Final Exam**

*Assignments must be submitted at the beginning of class on due date, unless noted otherwise on syllabus*

Course schedule, in terms of subjects and readings, may be subject to change to benefit student learning and in keeping 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
ANNEX I-II

Rubrics:

1st assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
2nd assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
3rd assignment: 10% (paper 6% and presentation 4%)
Midterm presentation: 10%
Final project: 15%
Final exam: 30%
Participation and field work diary: 15%

TOTAL: 100%

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

90-100 A
80-89 B
70-79 C
60-69 D
0-59 F (failing grade)

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:

\[
\frac{(70 \times 10) + (75 \times 10) + (80 \times 10) + (90 \times 10) + (85 \times 15) + (90 \times 30) + (70 \times 15)}{700 + 750 + 800 + 900 + 1275 + 2700 + 1050} = \frac{8175}{100} = 81.75 \%
\]

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.
<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 paper</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><strong>Critical thinking skills</strong></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 throughout.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of writing</strong></td>
<td>Excellent: Ideas are interesting and important. Organization of ideas is logical and effective. Word Choice is specific and memorable. Sentence fluency that is smooth</td>
<td>Very Good: Most of the ideas are interesting and important. The organization of ideas is sufficiently logical and in most of the cases effective.</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory: There are no interesting ideas. The essay lacks consistency. There are no correct or communicative conventions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and expressive. Conventions correct and communicative.

<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 three assignments: Oral Presentations**

<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></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 throughout.</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. The presenter</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 rather</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria for fieldwork diary and participation</td>
<td></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>Field trips attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-59% F (failing grade)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of them (seven)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 6 to 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 5 to 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 4 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has a well-rounded understanding of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has understood the majority of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has understood some of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has understood only a few of the issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has not understood the crucial issues affecting the contemporary physiognomy of the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insightful description of the contemporary situation in the field /Recognition of the crucial issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and prioritization of the problems encountered in the urban areas visited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is competent in prioritizing the problems of the area in an insightful and successful way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is able to prioritize most of the problems encountered in the area in an insightful way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is able to prioritize only a few of the problems encountered in the area in an insightful way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has understood the importance of some issues but is not able to build suitable criteria for prioritization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is not able to build a hierarchy of the problems encountered in field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria for the Midterm Presentation</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>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central point</strong></td>
<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>
</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>

**Evaluation criteria for the Final Project (Poster)**

<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>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or</td>
<td>Includes analysis, synthesis, interpretation and/or</td>
<td>Includes little analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or</td>
<td>Includes no analysis, synthesis, interpretation, and/or other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syllabus</strong></td>
<td></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>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>other critical manipulation of ideas throughout.</td>
<td>other critical manipulation of ideas in most parts of the assignment.</td>
<td>pretest, and/or other critical manipulation of ideas.</td>
<td>critical manipulation of ideas.</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><strong>Implementation of literature</strong></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>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>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation criteria for the Final Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent: Ideas are interesting and important. Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Very Good: Most of the ideas are interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good: There are some interesting and important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Marginal: Only a few interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-59</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory: There</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
- Very Good: Most of the ideas are interesting
- Good: There are some interesting and important
- Marginal: Only a few interesting
- Unsatisfactory: There
of ideas is logical and effective. Word Choice is specific and memorable. Sentence fluency that is smooth and expressive. Conventions correct and communicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience gained through the activities during the course</th>
<th>The student seems competent in making recommendations on a variety of urban planning issues</th>
<th>The student is able to propose some insightful planning strategies</th>
<th>The student is able to propose a few insightful planning strategies</th>
<th>The student has gained some experience but is not able to express them and propose planning strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and study of literature</td>
<td>High level: The student has studied hard. He/she has understood the connection between literature and the</td>
<td>Very good level: The student has sufficiently studied and makes use of appropriate literature. The</td>
<td>Good level The student has studied enough so as to make use of appropriate literature</td>
<td>Average level: The student seems to have at least cross-read the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not having studied enough, no use of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
issues met in field. The use of literature is supporting the fieldwork findings in an insightful and successful way.

student recognizes 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.

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.

suggested literature but is not able to make the appropriate connections with the situation met in field.

appropriate literature.