Global Course: Spatial Planning and Institutional Design

Edition 2019-2020

ASSIGNMENT TEMPLATE AND INSTRUCTIONS

Title [fill in the title of the assignment]

Assignment Global Course on Institutional Design for Spatial Planning

Group Description
Student_1 name, Newcastle University
Student_2 name, Newcastle University
Student_3 name, Renmin University
Student_4 name, Renmin University
Student_5 name, University of Washington
Student_6 name, University of Washington
Student_7 name, University of Groningen
Student_8 name, University of Groningen
Student_9 name, University of Tokyo
Student_10 name, University of Tokyo
Student_11 name, Damascus University
Student_12 name, Damascus University

Abstract (*max. 200 words*)

The abstract is a **collective effort**. Summarize the assignment structure, topic under study and key findings from the specific country chapters and international comparison of the Institutional Design.

1. Introduction (*max. 700 words*)

The introductory chapter is a **collective effort** done **after the peer-review process**. Please describe the topic/planning issue under analysis ('what' is it, 'why' did you choose this planning issue, and 'when' is it encountered in practice by a planner). Develop a sound problem definition that expresses the relevance of analysing a specific spatial planning problem. You are encouraged to think of the scalar level, history, underlying power balance of institutions and their outcomes regarding the chosen topic. The introduction should provide a comprehensive understanding of the planning problem selected.

2. Country Chapters (*max. 1500 words per country description*)

This chapter constitutes the 'country chapters' elaborated by **each local group**, i.e. you will work together with colleague(s) from your University.

This is the first stage of your Assignment – where you should start working on. The **deadline** for submitting the country chapter to your lecturers and colleagues is the **May 18, 23:59 (GMT).**

The Country Chapter is the starting point for the international comparison you will do in the following chapter. Here you will analyse, explain and discuss the impact of the local Institutional Design in your home country on the chosen planning topic. Position the Institutional framework you are studying using the different perspectives presented in the lectures.

Global Course: Spatial Planning and Institutional Design

Each local group should use the **following structure as a guideline for their country chapter**:

1*. How have past decisions impacted the current situation?*
   a) *Present the historical, cultural and political contexts that shape the planning system/problem.*

2*. How have institutions influenced the situation in recent years?*
   a) *Map the stakeholders involved - who is responsible for what and to what extent?*
   b) *Analyse the relationships - the established power struggles, collaboration and/or cooperation structures between stakeholders.*
   c) *Discuss the outcomes of decision-making in the shape of the city*

3*. What can be expected with regard to future implications and recommendations?*
   a) *Relate to recent or forthcoming policies or initiatives.*

Recommendation: *Use the different perspectives discussed in the lectures in your analysis: Path Dependency, Institutional Economics, Political Economy, Informal Intuitions.*

2.1 Description of country Institutional Framework – United Kingdom
To be written by the students from Newcastle University. Apply the above suggested structure.

2.2 Description of country Institutional Framework – China
To be written by the students from Renmin University. Apply the above suggested structure.

2.3 Description of country Institutional Framework – USA
To be written by the students from the University of Washington. Apply the above suggested structure.

2.4 Description of country Institutional Framework – Netherlands
To be written by the students from the University of Groningen. Apply the above suggested structure.

2.5 Description of country Institutional Framework – Japan
To be written by the students from the University of Tokyo. Apply the above suggested structure.

2.6 Description of country Institutional Framework – Syria
To be written by the students from Damascus University. Apply the above suggested structure.

3. Peer-review process (*max. 500 words per peer review*)

The **local groups** peer-review a 'country chapter' written by the other local groups. For example, students from the University of Groningen will reflect on the work done by students from the University of Washington and so on. The desired length of the review report is **500 words** (fill in peer-review rubrics in Appendix). The review helps the students to extract relevant variables on the basis of which the institutional systems can be compared, and forms the basis for the international comparison (see part 4).

This is the second stage of your assignment. The **deadline** for submitting the peer-review to your lecturers and colleagues is the **May 25, 23:59 (GMT).**

4. Institutional Design International Comparative Analysis (*max. 2000 words*)

The Comparative Analysis chapter is a **collective effort** done <u>**after the peer-review process**</u>.

Together you will work with your colleagues from all the other partnering Universities (make use of online social media platforms) on a comprehensive chapter positioning the Institutional Design of the UK, China, USA, the Netherlands, Japan and Syria.

- Based on the peer-reviewing process, assess to what extent a comparison of a planning system, policies and practices between the countries is feasible and reliable.
- Then, you should verify and summarize the major differences and similarities identified. It is mandatory to highlight how and why the Institutional Design differs between the countries. What are the relevant outcomes that can be compared with other countries? Y
- Provide a clear and comprehensive comparative analysis among the comparable characteristics of the countries under analysis.

  ou are encouraged to use the so-called 'nine cells model' to reflect on the nature of international differences and their underlying causes. As a suggestion, you can classify and group Institutional frameworks that share similarities into typologies.

5. Discussion and Conclusion (*max. 500 words*)

This section results from a **collective effort** from all the authors of the assignment.

This is the **last stage** of the Assignment. The **deadline** for submitting the final version to your lecturers is **June 10, 23:59 (GMT).**

You should explore the significance of the results of the work, not repeat them. You should reflect on the comparative analysis produced by your peers on their completeness, accuracy and relevance, while critically reflecting on your own research process and outcomes. Thus, a combined Discussion and Conclusion section is appropriate. Avoid extensive citations and discussion of published literature.

6. References

Use APA (American Psychological Association) reference style.

7. Appendix – Scoring Rubric Peer-review *(max. 500 words)*

Use the following scoring rubric to peer-review your colleagues' work.

Part 1 – Academic style and argumentation.

Asses the academic style of writing, referencing and argumentation skills from:

7 – Very Good	The document can be easily followed. A combination of the following are apparent in the document: - Effective transitions are used throughout, - A professional format is used, - The graphics are descriptive and clearly support the document's purpose. The document is clear and concise and appropriate grammar is used throughout.
5 - Good	The document can be easily followed. A combination of the following are apparent in the document: - Basic transitions are used, - A structured format is used, - Some supporting graphics are provided, but are not clearly explained. The document contains minimal distractions that appear in a combination of the following forms: - Flow in thought - Graphical presentations - Grammar/mechanics
3 - Sufficient	Organization of document is difficult to follow due to a combination of following: - Inadequate transitions - Rambling format - Insufficient or irrelevant information - Ambiguous graphics The document contains numerous distractions that appear in a combination of the following forms: - Flow in thought - Graphical presentations
1 - Insufficient	Lack of organization of the document's contents. Sentences are difficult to understand.
Comments for improving Academic Style (maximum 100 words):	

Part 2 – Content

Asses the analysis of the country planning system, policies and practices.

Elements	Grade from 1 (insufficient) – 7 (very good)
Is the Institutional Design framework clearly described?	1 (insufficient) – 7 (very good)
Is the planning issue clearly characterized?	1 (insufficient) – 7 (very good)
Are the stakeholders identified and their roles in the planning issue discussed?	1 (insufficient) – 7 (very good)
Are examples provided to illustrate the Institutional Design of the planning issue?	1 (insufficient) – 7 (very good)
Comments for improving the content (max. 300 words):	

Part 3 – Final score

Your final verdict of the country chapter:

7 – Very good	The content is clear, well-structured and organized. It is easy to understand the writer's argumentation and examples are given to illustrate them. Several references are provided to support discussion.
5 – Good	The content is clear, easy to understand and organized. It is easy to understand the writer's argumentation and some examples are given to illustrate them. References are provided to support discussion.
3 – Sufficient	The content is difficult to understand. Writer's arguments are fuzzy and few examples are given to illustrate them. Few references are provided to support discussion.
1 – Insufficient	The content is hard to understand. Writer's present little to no arguments. The content is only descriptive and no critical reflection is made. Few/no examples are given to illustrate them. No references are provided to support discussion.
Comments for overall improvement (max. 100 words)	