

CUS519 Creating Urban Commons: Learning from International and Local Experiences

Course Title	:	Creating Urban Commons: Learning from International and Local Experiences
Course Code	:	CUS519
Recommended Study Year	:	Any
No. of Credits		3 credits
Mode of Tuition	:	3 hours of lecture
Class Contact Hours	:	3 hours per week, 42 hours for the whole course
Category in Major Prog.	:	MCS (Core course for the Digital and Cultural Innovation (DCI) Concentration)
Discipline	:	Cultural Studies
Prerequisite(s)	:	N/A
Co-requisite(s)	:	N/A
Exclusion(s)	:	N/A
Exemption Requirement(s)	:	N/A

Brief Course Description

Urban commons are resources in the city which are managed by the users in a non-profit oriented and prosocial way. They boost a new relationship between us and the urban space we inhabit. This course is the mixture of conceptual debates and grounded practices that introduces the concept and practice of urban commons in the context of cultural studies. It focuses on the ways in which institutional and cultural factors affect the planning, development, and management of urban commons in contemporary societies. Issues of alternative democracy, social economy, participatory community, spatial justice, and gendered and classed subjectivity will be discussed in the context of specific forms and processes of cultural governance.

Aims

- To introduce students the basic concept of urban commons and theoretical debates relating to the shaping of different forms of commons;
- To familiarize students with the alternative and grounded practices of democracy, equality and community sharing in the process of formulating urban commons as a tool of advancing UN SDGs

Learning Outcomes (LOs)

On completion of the course, students will be able to:

- 1) apply the themes and theories in studies of the production, reception and participation of urban commons
- 2) analyse urban commons concepts in relation to related to cultural institutions and practices
- 3) design the questions of democracy, equality and sharing to raise meaningful questions in the area of urban commons in relation to UN SDGs
- 4) write feasible proposal about the formulation of urban commons in a specific area or focus, and discuss their feasibility

Indicative Contents

Theoretical foundations

- What is urban commons? Theories, debates, and models
- capitalism, space, and the city
- UN Sustainable Development Goals

Urban commons in different settings

- A feminist and cultural studies approach toward economies
- Feeding the people: food, rural-urban relation, and the environment
- The collective: Women, worker, and co-op
- Social innovation: creativity, design, and application
- Digital technologies and urban commons
- Urban commons: local experiences

Commoning as method

- Commoning as method: knowledge, participation, and intervention
- Student project presentations

Teaching Methods

Lecture, seminar discussion, and term project.

- The lectures facilitate students' learning of urban commons through theoretical discussion and sharing media examples.
- Student presentation in seminars will discuss various academic articles and real-world cases of urban commons
- The term project is a group project where the students draw on theoretical foundations and real-world cases to create their own Urban Commons project to address local issues in HK

Measurement of Learning Outcomes:

LO: \ Assessment:	Class participation and discussion	Progress Presentation	Term Project
	(20%)	(20%)	(60%)
LO1	v		
LO2	v	v	
LO3		v	v
LO4			v

Assessment

100% continuous assessment, including class participation and discussion (20%), progress presentation (in groups of 4-5) (20%) and term project (in groups of 4-5, of approximate length of 7,000 characters in Chinese or 5,000 words in English) (60%).

Assessment Rubrics

1. Class participation and discussion (20%)

Criterion	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (60-89%)	Pass (30%-59%)	Failure (0-29%)
Level of participation (3%)	Participates actively and constructively all the time.	Participates actively most of the time	Participates most of the time but sometimes requires prompting.	Student does not attend tutorial.
Engagement with course materials (4%)	Engages constructively with, all course material (assigned readings, issues, concepts).	Demonstrates a good understanding of, and engages constructively with course material.	Demonstrates a basic understanding of most of the course material and engages with it, though not always successfully.	Student demonstrates little or no understanding of course material, lacks engagement with it
Quality of analysis and discussion (10%)	Provides insightful analyses, raises critical points, and advances and deepens	Frequently provides helpful points or asks questions that advance and deepen group	Sometimes makes positive contributions that advance group discussion.	Little or no engagement / participation in group discussion even with prompting.

	group discussion.	discussion.		
Engagement with others (3%)	Consistently appreciates others' contribution and engages with their ideas sensitively.	Generally appreciates others' contribution and engages with their ideas sensitively.	Attempt to appreciate others' contribution and to engage with their ideas sensitively, with some success.	Shows no appreciation of others' knowledge and skills.

2. Progress presentation (20%)

*peer assessment will be conducted as a reference for assessment of one's contribution to the group presentation or project.

Criterion	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (60-89%)	Pass (30%-59%)	Failure (0-29%)
Content (15%)	Identifies clearly the main issues to be addressed Examines the issues from all important perspectives. Overall logic is clear.	Identifies most of the main issues to be addressed Examines the issue / problem from most of the important perspectives but not all relevant arguments and counter arguments are fully examined.	Identifies an issue area, but without specific delineation of the main issues to be addressed Examines the question/ issue/ problem from some of the important perspectives.	Fail to identify an issue area and the main issues to be addressed No critical engagement with issues, and themes. Presentation characterized by serious inaccuracies and misunderstanding
	Presenter(s) engage the audience at all times, actively seeking for suggestions from the audiences and incorporate these insights into the final project in thoughtful ways	Presenter(s) engage the audience most of the time, consistently seeking for suggestions from the audiences, and incorporate these insights into the final project	Presenter(s) attempts to engage the audience, tries to seek for suggestions from the audiences, and to incorporate these insights into the final project	Presenter(s) seem to make little attempt to engage the audience.

Team-work (5%)	Excellent performance of teamwork. Demonstrates full communication with formal roles for each group member. Equal distribution of workload.	Good performance of teamwork. Demonstrates some communication with roles for each group member. Moderate distribution of workload.	Fair performance of teamwork. Demonstrates limited communication with informal roles for each group member. Some distribution of workload.	Poor performance of teamwork. Demonstrates no communication with unclear roles for each group member. Unequal distribution of workload.
-----------------------	---	--	--	---

3. Term Project (60%)

*peer assessment will be conducted as a reference for assessment of one's contribution to the group presentation or project.

Criterion	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (60-89%)	Pass (30%-59%)	Failure (0-29%)
Level of effort (5%)	Production process and end-product demonstrates great effort and care.	Production process and end-product demonstrates sustained effort and care.	Production process and end-product demonstrates inconsistent effort and care.	Production process and end-product demonstrates little effort and care.
Critical Intervention (20%)	Production process and end-product demonstrates unique and thoughtful critique of social issues	Production process and end-product demonstrates creative and rather thoughtful critique of social issues.	Production process and end-product demonstrates in some respects creative and thoughtful critique of social issues	Production process and end-product demonstrates no critique of social issues
Use of resources & problem-solving skills (15%)	Production process and end-product demonstrates creative use of resources, and strong problem-solving skills.	Production process and end-product demonstrates careful use of resources, and good problem-solving skills.	Production process and end-product demonstrates some use of resources, and some problem-solving skills	Production process and end-product demonstrates little use of resources, and little problem-solving skills
Creativity in production & Social	End-product demonstrates a unique sense of	End-product demonstrates considerable	End-product demonstrates some level of creativity in	End-product demonstrates little creativity and

Intervention (15%)	creativity in terms of media production that offers effective critical intervention to real-world issues.	level of creativity in terms of media production and is clearly aimed for critical intervention to real-world issues.	terms of media production and aims at critical intervention to real-world issues.	without an intention for critical intervention to real-world issues.
Teamwork (5%)	Excellent performance of teamwork. Demonstrates full communication with formal roles for each group member. Equal distribution of workload.	Good performance of teamwork. Demonstrates some communication with roles for each group member. Moderate distribution of workload.	Fair performance of teamwork. Demonstrates limited communication with informal roles for each group member. Some distribution of workload.	Poor performance of teamwork. Demonstrates no communication with unclear roles for each group member. Unequal distribution of workload.

Important Notes

1. Students are expected to spend a total of 12 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 9 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course learning outcomes.
2. Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations and Course Work. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is "the presentation of another person's work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student's own work". Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
3. Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
4. To enhance students' understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course "Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness" is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.
5. Students must adhere to the University's guidelines and practices when using Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools. The official documents "Guidelines for Using GAI Tools at Lingnan University" and "Best Practices for Ethical and Responsible Use of GAI Tools in Course Assessments" can be found here: <https://www.ln.edu.hk/tlc/generative-artificial-intelligence/gai-guidelines-best-practices>.

Required/Essential Readings

Amin, A., & Howell, P. (2016). *Releasing the commons: Rethinking the futures of the commons*.

Routledge.

Dellenbaugh-Losse, M., Zimmermann, N., & de Vries, N. (2020). *The urban commons cookbook: Strategies and insights for creating and maintaining urban commons*. [Publisher if known].

Dellenbaugh, M., Kip, M., Bieniok, M., Müller, A., & Schwegmann, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Urban commons: Moving beyond state and market*. Birkhäuser.

Gibson-Graham, J. K., Cameron, J., & Healy, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Take back the economy: An ethical guide for transforming our communities*. University of Minnesota Press.

Mulgan, G. (2019). *Social innovation: How societies find the power to change*. Bristol University Press.

Roelvink, G., St. Martin, K., & Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2015). *Making other worlds possible: Performing diverse economies*. University of Minnesota Press.

Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning real utopias*. Verso.

Xu, B. Q. (2002). *Zibenzhu yi bushi shenme* [Capitalism is not what]. Oxford University Press.

Chen, Y. H. (2017). *Huan jing yuan lai zhe ye shi hezuo she: Da bu lie dian COOP ta che bao gao* [Co-ops are not just welfare societies: UK COOP field report]. Kaixue Wenhua.

Pan, Y., Chen, F. Y., Gu, J. H., & Lu, Y. Y. (2013). *Bu—yang de Xianggang shehui jingji* [Different Hong Kong social economy]. Hong Kong Commercial Press.

Zou, C. M. (2017). *Kaifang hezuo ji shifang Xianggang shequ li shouce* [Open cooperation: Handbook for unleashing Hong Kong community power]. Tu po Chubanshe.

Zou, C. M., & Wang, A. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Bu shi wutuobang: Shequ jingji lilun yu shijian* [Not utopia: Community economy theory and practice]. Oxfam Hong Kong.

Zou, C. M., Han, J. X., & Yang, M. Y. (2012). *Yong xiaofei gaibian shijie: Gongping maoyi @ xin shehui jingji yundong* [Using consumption to change the world: Fair trade @ new social economy movement]. Yinxiang Wenzhi.

Zou, C. M., Huang, Y. Q., & Ruan, Y. Q. (Eds.). (2014). *Gongxiang chengshi: Cong shehui qiye, gongping maoyi, liangxin xiaofei dao gongxiang jingji* [Shared city: From social enterprise, fair trade, ethical consumption to sharing economy] (Vols. 1–2). Yinxiang Wenzhi.

Recommended/Supplementary Readings

Barthel, S., Parker, J., & Ernstson, H. (2015). Food and green space in cities: A resilience lens on gardens and urban environmental movements. *Urban Studies*, 52(7), 1321–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012472744>

Bollier, D., & Helfrich, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Patterns of commoning*. Commons Strategies Group.

Borch, C., & Kornberger, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Urban commons: Rethinking the city*. Routledge.

Benfield, K. (2017, [date if available]). Strengthening the urban commons: Beginning principles (Part 2). *Smart Cities Dive*. <https://www.smartcitiesdive.com/ex/sustainablecitiescollective/nurturing-and-strengthening-urban-commons-some-beginning-principles-part-2-2/165096/>

Berlant, L. (2015). The commons: Infrastructures for troubling times. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775816645989>

Chan, K. F. (2018). Mundi: Articulating a post-Umbrella common(s). *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 449–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2018.1497905>

- Colding, J., Barthel, S., Bendt, P., Snep, R., van der Knaap, W., & Ernstson, H. (2013). Urban green commons: Insights on urban common property systems. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 1039–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.05.006>
- Cooke, B., Landau-Ward, A., & Rickards, L. (2019). Urban greening, property and more-than-human commoning. *Australian Geographer*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049182.2019.1655828>
- Fitzpatrick, D. (2018). Book review: *Common space: The city as commons* and *Patterns of commoning*. *Planning Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095217750671>
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006a). *Postcapitalist politics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006b). *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243–1248.
- Huron, A. (2017). Theorising the urban commons: New thoughts, tensions and paths forward. *Urban Studies*, 54(4), 1062–1069. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098016685528>
- Kim, S., Lee, Y., Shin, H., Jang, S., & [other authors if listed]. (2020). Korea's consumer cooperatives and civil society: The cases of iCOOP and Hansalim. In M. Altman et al. (Eds.), *Waking the Asian Pacific co-operative potential*. Academic Press.
- Krzywoszynska, A., & Marchesi, G. (2020). Toward a relational materiality of soils. *Environmental Humanities*, 12(1), 190–204. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-8142218>
- Leung, D. S.-C. (2021). Convivial agriculture: Evolving food and farming activism in South China. *China Perspectives*, 2021(2), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.4000/chinaperspectives.11674>
- Lewis, T. (2016). Sustainability, lifestyle, and consumption in Asia. In T. Lewis (Ed.), *Green Asia: Ecocultures, sustainable lifestyles, and ethical consumption*. Routledge.
- Murdoch, J., & Miele, M. (2004). The new aesthetic of food? Relational reflectivity in the "alternative" food movement. In M. Harvey, A. McMeekin, & A. Warde (Eds.), *Qualities of food*. Manchester University Press.
- Pan, L., & Shin, H. (2018). Uncommon commons: Rethinking affects, practices, and spaces of urban activism in Asia. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 355–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2018.1497893>
- Park, I. K., Shin, J., & Kim, J. E. (2020). Urban commons as a haven for the excluded: An experience of creating a commons in Seoul, South Korea. *International Journal of the Commons*, 14(1), 508–524. <https://doi.org/10.5334/ijc.1038>
- Probyn, E. (2016). *Eating the ocean*. Duke University Press.
- Shareable. (2018). *Sharing cities: Activating the urban commons*. <https://www.shareable.net/sharing-cities/>
- Zou, C. M. (2020). Cong shehui dao shequ, cong lilun dao shijian, cong chuangye dao chuangxin [From society to community, from theory to practice, from entrepreneurship to innovation]. *Duli Meiti*. <https://www.inmediahk.net/node/1079269>
- Shequ Huoban. (2013). *Luodi shenggen: Shequ zhichi nongye zhi suming* [Taking root: Community-supported agriculture movement]. Shequ Huoban.
- Xu, B. Q. (2012). Wenhua jingjixue yu qingxu zhengzhi—Xianggang de xin ziyou ziben zhuyi [Cultural economics and emotional politics—Hong Kong's neoliberal capitalism]. <https://our-global-u.org/oguorg/zht/download/Conferences/ssfs2/xubaoqiang.pdf>
- Pan, Y., Yan, H. R., Gu, J. H., & Gu, X. B. (2014). *Shehui jingji zai Zhongguo—Chao yue wode shehui de*

lilun he shijian [Social economy in China—Theory and practice beyond my society]. Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe.

● ◦

Peer Assessment Form

Team: _____

Instruction: Evaluate your peer team members, on their participation in the term project. Due on submission day with the term project.

	Name	Criterion	Ratings (1-10)	Further comments (optional)
1		Participation in project activities		
		Fulfilment of her/his roles		
		Leadership		
		Overall		
2		Participation in project activities		
		Fulfilment of her/his roles		
		Leadership		
		Overall		
3		Participation in project activities		
		Fulfilment of her/his roles		
		Leadership		

		Overall		
4		Participation in project activities		
		Fulfilment of her/his roles		
		Leadership		
		Overall		
5		Participation in project activities		
		Fulfilment of her/his roles		
		Leadership		
		Overall		

** peer assessment will be counted into the final mark.