Department of Geography

GEOG 351 2018-S2
Rethinking Development

Outline

This course explores the ways in which people across the globe are building community economies based on ethical concerns for more sustainable and equitable futures. It will provide students with a theoretical basis for rethinking economies and some practical skills in organising for community-based development interventions.

Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to:

1. Appreciate the diversity of economic practices that are found in in different parts of the world and in different communities around us.
2. Compare the different theoretical approaches used to frame these diverse economic practices.
3. Understand the ethical concerns that underpin many of these diverse economic practices.
4. Analyse the contribution of these diverse economic practices to more sustainable and equitable forms of development
5. Plan and critically evaluate a community development case study project based on fostering economic diversity.

Teaching staff

Course Convenor
Dr Kelly Dombroski, GEOG room 404, (4th floor of the Geography Building)
Phone 03 3694101.
Email: kelly.dombroski@canterbury.ac.nz

1

Timetable and Workload

There are two one-hour 'lecture' sessions most weeks and one one-hour tutorial most weeks. The schedule is provided later in this handout.

The course is worth 15 points, being one eighth of a full time study load of 120 points for the year. This equates to about 10 hours of weekly study throughout the semester. On average, workshops and tutorials account for up to 3 hours of this weekly allocation: the remaining 7 hours are for completing the online mini-lectures, readings and assessment items. Readings MUST be completed prior to coming to workshops, as the workshops involve discussion and activities that presume prior knowledge. The weeks where there are no face to face activities, you are expected to put in the full 10 hours to your assessments.

Contact Time

Contact Type	Day	Time
Lecture A	Monday	11am
Lecture B	Friday	1pm
Tutorial (Stream 1)	Wednesday	12pm
Tutorial (Stream 2)	Tuesday	2pm

Lecture A is an interactive workshop time, and you will need to have watched the video mini-lecture beforehand (available via echo360). It is helpful if you have begun doing the reading too. Lecture B is a kai-and-korero style seminar, where we will eat some light lunch and discuss ideas emerging from the readings. It is helpful if you bring copies of the readings (which you need to have read) and/or your journal to this session to enable focused and intelligent reflection. You will then attend one of the two tutorials, and work on practical skills related to assessments, or your assessments themselves in groups. I recommend you and your group make a regular time on tutorial days to work on your project proposal.

Course Materials

Course handouts, some readings, and lecture materials will be available on the GEOG351 LEARN page. Electronic links to the essential readings will also be posted on the GEOG351 LEARN site.

Compulsory Course Text: Gibson-Graham, JK, J Cameron and S Healy (2013) *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming our Communities.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Available from UBS $26.99. We will be reading the entire book.

Recommended Text: Williams, Glynn, Paula Meth, and Katie Willis. 2014. *Geographies of Developing Areas: The Global South in a Changing World*. Abingdon: Routledge. This is available as an ebook from the library as well as from UBS.

2

Course Expectations: Class Preparation Essential

Classes, tutorials and the assessment tasks are closely aligned (i.e. they are interdependent and it is not possible to complete the course without engaging with each of them). The 'lectures' operate via flipped classroom, and as such are workshop activities and in depth discussions and explanations of the readings, which will not make sense unless you have done your readings and watched the lectures. Your reflective journals will also be assessed based on your **weekly** reflections on readings and class materials. The tutorials are practical exercises taking you through the steps of designing a community project proposal. You will not be able to complete the project proposal satisfactorily without attending tutorials. It is therefore expected that you attend weekly classes and weekly tutorials. We have a roster for bringing kai, and I invite you to participate in this community building element of our course.

Course Requirements	Time Expected
'Lecture' attendance	20 hours
Tutorial attendance	10 hours
Readings & class prep including short videos	36-48 hours
Reflective journal (not including reading here, just writing them)	8 hours
Community Project Proposal	21 hours
Project Peer assessment	1-2 hours
Final Essay	9-15 hours
Total	**106 - 115 hours**

Enquiries and Course Concerns

If you have any questions or concerns about the course, please feel free to approach me as course coordinator in the first instance. I am more than happy to discuss your needs and experiences of the course. I prefer face to face or phone communication to email. You can also report your concerns to the Class Representative, who can raise the issue with the course staff on your behalf. If you would like to be class representative, please approach me in the first week.

Printable Course Plan

Week	Mini-Lecture & Readings (Online & textbook)	Classroom sessions	Tutorials	Assessment Item
1	Introduction: Key ideas: communities, economies, development	Introductory lecture Kai & Korero : What is community? What is economy? What is development?	No tutorials. Drop-ins welcome during tutorial time. Kelly's office.	
2	Development as International Practice	NZ's international development history Kai & Korero: Development as industry	NZAID's partnerships programme	
3	Development as Discourse	The economy as iceberg activity Kai & Korero: Development as discourse	Project Proposal Template and Planning	
4	New Theoretical Approaches to economies and development	The diverse economy activity Kai & Korero: Rethinking economy	Navigating the Project Planning Cycle	Reflective Journal hand in #1
5	Community Economies: Surviving Well	Surviving Well Tools Kai & Korero: Labour	Partnerships in International Development Funding	
6	Community Economies: Distributing Surplus	Distributing Surplus Tools Kai & Korero: Enterprise	Designing an activity results framework	
STUDY BREAK				
7	Project Week	No lectures	Creating your project proposal Appendices	Project Proposal Due
8	Community Economies: Commoning	Commoning Tools Kai & Korero : property	Peer Assessment Tutorial **Compulsory!**	Project Proposal Peer Assessment
9	Community Economies: Investing in Futures	Investing in Futures Tools Kai & Korero : finance	Christchurch Field Trip	
10	Community Economies: Encountering Others	Encountering Others Tools Kai & Korero : Markets	Essay expectations & choosing your topic	
11	Essay Week	Fieldwork for essay/No lectures	Writing awesome intros	
12	Rethinking Community Development: where to next?	Invited guests for discussion Farewell potluck meal	Drop in time – Kelly's office	
Study Week Classes Finished				Case Study Essay Reflective Journal Hand In #2

5

GEOG351 Assessment Information

Assessment Summary

GEOG351 uses research-based internal assessment techniques to help you focus your learning and to help us assess your achievements. Assessments closely match learning outcomes, and require *both* holistic understanding *and* more detailed knowledge. Your learning for GEOG351 will be assessed as follows:

Item	Completed by	Due Date	Worth	Learning Outcome
Reflective Journal	Each individual student, before, in or after class workshops	August 1st *in tutorial or online* **and** October 24th *Geography office or online 5pm*	30%	1,3
Community Project Proposal	Groups	September 12th 5pm *online*	30%	3,4,5
Project Peer Assessment	Groups in Tutorial/Tutorial	**In tutorials,** week 8.	10%	5
Final Essay	Each individual student	October 24th *5pm online*	30%	1,2,4

Deadlines, Extensions, Special Considerations

Extensions may be granted in extenuating circumstances (illness, accident, bereavement), but must be requested **in advance**. When requesting an extension, you **must send me what you have done so far**, as evidence you have begun the assignment. In the absence of extenuating circumstances or evidence of beginning, extensions will not be granted. Please note it is university policy that work (study or paid work) related reasons are not extenuating circumstances.

If your performance in the Community Project Proposal or the Final Essay is affected by extenuating circumstances beyond your control, you may apply for special consideration (previously aegrotats). The same goes if you are unable to attend your project peer assessment due to extenuating circumstances beyond your control. Applications are made via the examinations office (http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/exams/) but prior to this please contact your course coordinator, as other options may be more appropriate. It is normally required that

you do this within five days of the assessment due date. The Reflective Journals are not able to be assessed using the special consideration procedure. This is because the reflective journals are effectively a weekly assignment of 2.5% and it is more appropriate to just hand in what you have done for consideration.

Academic Honesty

Every year several students fail Geography courses due to dishonest academic practices such as copying other students' work, web or literature sources, plagiarism or sharing UC computer account details. All GEOG assignments may be processed through the plagiarism checking software Turn-it-in http://turnitin.com/.

There are several useful UC guides to understanding plagiarism and other dishonest academic practices can be found via the main UC webpage search tool. If you at all unsure, please feel free to consult with your course coordinator(s) regarding concerns about avoiding dishonest academic practices – **we are here to help before you hand in your assignment.** BUT ultimately it is your responsibility to make sure you know what dishonest academic practices are, and to avoid them.

If your assignments contain problematic material, you will be invited to meet with the Geography HOD and course coordinator to explain this. If you choose not to meet, or cannot offer an acceptable explanation, then you may be given an automatic zero grade or referred to a UC Proctor. If you are found guilty of dishonest academic practice, then your details may be recorded on the university's dishonest practice register for future years, and other penalties may be applied.

"Plagiarism?" But my roomate gave me permission to use his paper and said I didn't have to cite him."

Assessment Instructions

GEOG351 Reflective Journals

Throughout this course, you are required to keep a reflective journal. The point of this journal is to record your reactions and thoughts while reading assigned materials and considering points raised in class. The journal gives you the opportunity to explore learning outcomes 1 and 3, so you may like to consider the learning outcomes as you prepare your journal.

I welcome any form of journal – whatever helps you to communicate your growing reflective capacity. Many students prefer to keep a handwritten journal in a small A5 hardcover notebook, because it is easy to carry around and write in as you read. Some students prefer to publish a series of blog posts that enable comments and discussion with classmates and other friends, or private blogs where only the lecturer may see the posts. I am also open to video logs, or you might try the online audio recording function on Learn that I have enabled for this assignment. Please feel free to discuss this with me early in the course.

Reflective Journal

Length: as required. Approximately 1-2 handwritten pages per week.
Format: Handwritten journal, blog, v-log, audio recording, word file. Correct references at the top of each entry, or inserted into video or audio descriptive text.
Submission: In hardcopy or via electronic submission on Learn, **twice during semester** (check assessment due date timetable). In both cases I want the whole journal resubmitted so I can track development.
Worth: 30% of your GEOG351 grade

In addition to the reflections on readings, the reflective journal is a good space to reflect on the process of designing the project proposal. You can also comment on the following in your journal:

- o   Your group's original desire and ideas, and how these were shaped throughout the process.
- o   The difficulties in matching recipient needs to donor priorities.
- o   The process of making a project that is measureable and fits into the template.
- o   Reflections on how the template itself changed your project idea, if at all.
- o   Reflections on how the process matches with critiques of development practice that we have covered in class.
- o   Reflections on how power and personality dynamics in your group influenced the final result
- o   Any frustrations or lightbulb moments you experienced.
- o   Any reflections on the aid system as a whole.

Marking Criteria

A +(90-100%)	The journal shows growing reflective capacity, linking reading and assignment work with the author's life, other readings, theory, and self-analysis. The journal concisely and thoughtfully engages with almost every assigned reading, and shows strong evidence of critical thinking and advanced application and analysis with regards to the project proposal. No errors with regards to referencing.
A (80-89%)	The journal shows growing reflective capacity, linking reading and assignment work with the author's life, other readings, theory, and self-analysis. The journal concisely and thoughtfully engages with many of the assigned readings (averaging more than one per week), and shows strong evidence of critical thinking and analysis. Few or no errors with regards to referencing.
B (65-79%)	The journal shows a degree of reflective capacity, linking some readings and some assignment work with the author's life or other work. The journal engages with at least one assigned reading every week, and shows evidence of having completed and understood them. Attempts to be relevant, if not concise. Few errors with regards to referencing.
C (50-64%)	The journal shows some attempts at reflection, linking some readings in some way with the author's real life or other work. The journal engages with an average of one assigned reading every week, and shows some evidence of having completed and understood them. May focus too much on summarising rather than reflecting, and thus not particularly relevant or concise. Errors with regards to referencing. Writing/communciation may be difficult to understand.
D (40-49%)	The journal shows little or no attempt at reflection, with little or no attempt to link the material with author's life. Engages with very few readings, and appears to have either not done or not understood them. Major errors with regards to referencing. Writing/communication may be difficult to understand.
E (0-39%)	The journal shows no attempt at reflection, no attempt to link material with the author's life. Engages with very few readings. Appears to have not attempted readings. Referencing not attempted. Writing/communication may be difficult to understand.

GEOG351 Community Development Project Proposal

In this assessment, your group will design a small project to intervene in a development issue that is important to you. You are pitching your project at the New Zealand Partnerships for International Development Fund (https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid/Partnerships-temp/PF-ADD-Template-Sept-2016.docx) so you will need to research their priorities and make a case for your project using their language. Because this project requires you to be part of an organisation, you need to **choose a real NZ based organisation and invent a project** that fits with their expertise and the needs of **a local partner organisation IN one of the NZ partnerships priority developing areas.**

Some examples:
- A project where an NZ-based midwifery organisation assists a Himalayan NGO with a community-based participatory analysis attempting to investigate and intervene in the high infant mortality rate on the Tibetan plateau.
- An NZ-based para-church group (e.g. Anglican Aid) works towards women's empowerment and political representation in Papua New Guinea, through a local church-based women's group.
- A Christchurch engineering firm assists a community organisation with post-disaster rebuild plans for a community hall in Haiti.

You will also need to think carefully **about the local partner** in the proposed project community in order for your project to be successful. This can be based on an **organisation you have researched,** or you can **make one up** that fits a likely reality (often no web-resources to draw on, but for example, a church-based women's group could be realistically imagined and described).

Top Tip
Your project proposal will be developed and submitted as a group. One person can submit the project on behalf of the group, but you need to make sure your group is up to date on Learn so that grades are distributed to all in the group. The projects will be checked via Turnitin and any identical or similar text will be checked out for plagiarism. All group members will need to submit a statement estimating relative amounts of work put in by each member.

The project proposal consists of two parts: the proposal itself (group submission), and a critical reflection on the process of writing and researching it (individual submission).

Significant assistance *will be provided for this assessment throughout the tutorial times. Each of the tutorials will focus on the principles and activities behind a section.*

10

The project proposal should include the following sections:

Group Submission:

The real project template is available here: https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid/Partnerships-temp/PF-ADD-Template-Sept-2016.docx . Please download and use it, although some sections are omitted due to the fictional nature of this assessment.

Individual Submission:
Please also submit an Individual Contributions Report. Please make some comments about relative contributions to the group assignment using the template provided. You can comment on quality, time, quantity, and willingness of participants. Group work can be frustrating, but does develop real world skills. Please be generous in your comments and honest in your assessments, because we all have times when we are unable to do as much as we would like. Comment on any negotiations you made as a group (eg, person taking a leadership/managerial role may write less, for example, as they have to chase everyone up; or someone who spent a lot of time researching but not so much writing due to English language levels).

PROJECT PROPOSAL
Length: *Group work:* Maximum 35 pages USING ACTUAL TEMPLATE, and deleting instructional text. This includes the final reference list (estimate 1-2 pages). *Individual work:* Maximum 1 page detailing contributions of each group member.
Format: Using the project proposal format. Your names and student IDs should be clearly indicated on a cover page for your assignment.
Submission: online, via the Assignment Dropbox link on the GEOG351 LEARN homepage.

Worth: 30% of your GEOG351 grade.

Marking Criteria:
The online form for peer assessment will be visible on learn under 'Peer Assessment Demo', closer to the due date. This will show you the marking criteria for the assessment (it is basically checking you have done all the things the template asks, plus some rating of the quality later according to the MFAT partnerships fund criteria).

Project Proposal Peer Assessment

In this assessment, copies of the group proposals will be accessed in the Week 7 Tutorial. In your groups, you will be required to assess the quality of another groups' proposal and make a recommendation for funding or not. Please bring laptops/ipads/tablets to the Tutorial if you have them. Some tablets may be available.

Length: One page.

Format: Online Form. You must have joined your group via LEARN. One submission per group. (Note, other group members will come up 'this person has not submitted anything'. Do not panic – as long as your group leader has submitted, your grade is secure).

Submission: <u>online</u>, via Peer Review tool on the LEARN homepage.

Worth: 10% of your GEOG351 grade.

Marking Criteria:

The peer review tool automatically compares your grade with the grade I have the same assessment, on a point by point basis (rather than average or total). Your group is assigned a grade based on how close your assessment is to my assessment. All participating members get the same grade for their peer review skills. **You are being graded on your ability to grade to a set of criteria**, which is an important skill in the workplace.

Top Tip
If you do not finish the assessment in class, then work out any extra writing or editing required and the final submission of the results between you. Please note, the online form will not save unless something is entered in every field. So just put 0 on each one and remember to change later!

GEOG351 Final Case Study Essay

Drawing on the material and ideas taught in this course, particularly from the textbook, you will research an instance of economic diversity in your own community or elsewhere. The idea is to highlight the assets already present in the community and help you to rethink community development conceptually.

Your Essay:
Using the community economies approach to rethinking development (outlined below and in your textbook), analyse one of the suggested case studies, or another of interest to you (suggestions over the page).

ESSAY
Length: 3000 words maximum, excluding the final reference list.

Format: word processed/typed, 1.5 line spacing, 11-12 point font size. Your name and student ID should be clearly indicated at the top of the first page of your assignment, as well as a word count (which excludes the reference list).

Submission: online, via the Assignment Dropbox link on the GEOG351 LEARN homepage.

Worth: 30% of your GEOG351 grade.

Background to topic: Some postdevelopment writers argue that the development project needs to be discarded completely, because the dominant visions of the economy are irretrievably Eurocentric and capitalocentric, and reproduce a world where the majority are somehow marginalised (eg. Esteva, 2009; Escobar, 2005). Others argue that the economy (and thus development) can be reimagined in some non-Eurocentric, non-capitalocentric way, in order to materialise a 'postcapitalist' world (eg. Gibson-Graham, 2005; McGregor, 2009; Mckinnon, 2006, 2011;). In *Take Back the Economy (TBTE)*, Gibson-Graham, Cameron and Healy offer a vision of community economies, where the economy can be 'taken back' for communities 'as a space of ethical action rather than a machine that must be obeyed' (2013: 189). They argue that recognising the diversity of the economy offers more options for different

ways of doing things. They suggest 6 key ethical concerns that community economies might negotiate around:

surviving together well and equitably

distributing surplus to enrich social and environmental health

encountering others in ways that support their well-being as well as ours

consuming sustainably

caring for – maintaining, replenishing and growing – our natural and cultural *commons*

investing our wealth so that future generations can live well (Gibson-Graham, Cameron & Healy, 2013: 189)

Case Study Suggestions

- *Clean Clothes Campaign (Europe & International)*
- *Fureai Kippu (Japan & International)*
- *GapFiller, Cultivate or Life in Vacant Spaces (Christchurch)*
- *Ghana Thinktank (International)*
- *Grameen Bank (Bangladesh & International)*
- *Kerala Soap Pledge (India)*

- *Ngai Tahu Corporation (NZ)*
- *SEWA – Self Employed Women's Association (India)*
- *Thankyou Payroll (NZ)*
- *Trade Aid (Christchurch, International)*
- *Unlad Kabayan (Phillipines)*
- *Another organisation or programme from your community or elsewhere (please discuss with me for help!).*

Suggested Outline

TITLE: Rethinking Development: [Case Study Name]

1. Introductory sections: Outline why we might need to 'rethink development' (using academic literature from the course), and introduce your case study (using evidence from books, articles, and web).
2. Body/analysis: Identify which of the 6 key concerns the case study is negotiating (using *Take Back the Economy* and information above, there may be more than one, but one is enough).
3. Body/analysis: Apply some of the tools in the appropriate chapter of *Take Back the Economy* to explore the ways the case study initiative is negotiating around the key concern identified (e.g. diverse economies identifier, people's accounting etc.).
4. Discussion/Conclusions: Connect it back to Rethinking Development – to what degree does the initiative enable a different (non Eurocentric and/or non-capitalocentric) vision of development and/or the economy?
5. References: appropriate references relevant to the topic at hand. You should reference any material you get from the internet about the organisations

15

according to APA or Harvard standards. You should have academic references drawing on the reading you have been doing all semester, plus other relevant pieces you have discovered yourself.

Top Tip
You will need to address the 'essay question' with a coherent argument using evidence from reading. You will be expected to have mastered basic academic writing competencies such as referencing, formatting, grammar, spelling and non-sexist/non-racist writing. The marking criteria are outlined below.

GEOG351 Essay Marking Criteria

A +(90-100%)	Wholly and precisely answers essay question, through the development of a clear argument well-supported by evidence. Showing creative flair, evidence of strong critical thinking and intelligent engagement with literature, both required readings and further reading (at least 7 academic references). Little or no errors with regards to basic competencies, well-developed fluent and clear writing voice showing originality and creativity.	
A (80-89%)	Answers the question comprehensively through the development of a clear argument supported by evidence. Shows evidence of critical thinking and engagement with literature both required and further reading (at least 7 academic references). Few errors with regards to basic competencies, clear, fluent and professional writing style.	
B (65-79%)	Answers the question coherently through the development of an argument supported by some evidence. Draws on required literature, showing evidence of understanding it (at least 7 academic references). Few errors with regards to basic competencies, fluent writing style.	
C (50-64%)	Attempts to answer the question in full or part with a flawed or poorly constructed argument, or an argument not well supported by evidence. Attempts to draw on required literature but with gaps in understanding it (less than 7 academic references). Some errors with regards to basic competencies, confused or unclear writing style.	
D (40-49%)	Little or no attempt at answering the question, with little or no evidence of an argument, with little or no evidence supporting. Appears to have either not done or not understood required readings, little or no academic references. Major errors with regards to basic competencies, with a lack of competency in the basics of academic writing.	
E (0-39%)	Little or no attempt at answering the question, with little or no evidence of an argument, with little or no evidence supporting. Appears to have not done required readings, little or no academic references. Major errors with regards to basic competencies, with little or no understanding of the basics of academic writing.	