


DK184604 - Community Development

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--|
|  | SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT: URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | FACULTY: CIVIL, PLANNING, AND EARTH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COURSES NAME | COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COURSES CODE | DK184604 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEMESTER | VI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CREDITS | 2/ 3,20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LECTURER | Karina Pradinie Tucunan, ST, M.Eng | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Study Materials: | Paradigm, history and urgency of collaborative planning process approach / communicative planning / community based planning | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Related conception of community development of the concept of community, social capital and participatory development planning | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mechanical understand the community: the dimensions of space and perception, stakeholder mapping (salience and conventional), group dynamics | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Community engagement techniques: use of ICT in community engagement, social mapping, FGD, | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Social data analysis techniques: fishbone, RCA, LFA / RBM, Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Applications collaborative approach in a variety of spatial cases: rural, region, city and coastal | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Community-based planning models: applications, criticism and the potential and problems faced | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLO) | Specific Knowledge | 1.3 | Able to apply the methods of spatial planning/aspatial in decision making | | | | | | | | | | |
| | General Attitude | 3.2 | Able to demonstrate the positive attitudes necessary to be beneficial to the society including devoted to the One Almighty God, accountability, social and environment responsibility, and uphold the value of humanity based on moral and ethics | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 3.3 | To internalize cultural diversities, local wisdom, values/norms in urban and regional planning process | | | | | | | | | | |
| COURSES LEARNING OUTCOMES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Able to organize and differentiate the techniques and processes in a collaborative planning / <i>communicative planning</i> as a medium for community involvement in the planning aspects: technique to understand the community, involve the community and with the community's aspirations merusmuskan | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Able to implement and integrate techniques - such techniques in the document - document the planning / research there | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Being able to explain and make comparisons on the social phenomenon, people's behavior and interaction in planning issues through the observation of the conditions of social, economic and environment so as to formulate a strategic issue in the context of spatial | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Being able to interpret the data social through the formulation of appropriate data requirements in accordance with the strategic issues and planning approaches that utilize ICT (video and audio online, usage-based aspiration system online) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Being able to draw a conclusion on the link between spatial characteristics (spatial) cities, regions and coastal understand social phenomena, people's behavior and interaction as well as the existing social system | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Being able to apply logical thinking, critical, systematic and innovative in the context of the development of community-based planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MAP OF PLO-CLO | CLO | PLO-1 | PLO-2 | PLO-3 | PLO-4 | PLO-5 | PLO-6 | PLO-7 | PLO-8 | PLO-9 | PLO-10 | PLO-11 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | CPMK-1. Mastering spatial/aspatial methods in decision-making and being able to approach society and participatory planning processes | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | CPMK-2. Able to explain and make comparisons to social phenomena, people's behaviour and their interactions in planning issues through observation of social, economic and environmental conditions so as to formulate strategic problems in the context of spatial planning | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | CPMK-3. Able to interpret social data through the formulation of appropriate data needs in accordance with strategic issues and planning approaches that utilize ICT (online video and audio, the use of online-based aspiration systems) | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | CPMK-4. Able to implement and integrate techniques in facilitation to the community and practice in the framework of demonstrating a positive attitude to benefit the community | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COURSE LEARNING PLAN
EVEN SEMESTER OF ACADEMIC YEAR 2021–2022**

| LECTURE | LEARNING OUTCOME (from weekly materials) | Scope(learning material/weekly materials) | Learning Methods (Week 1-7) | Course Duration (minutes) | Modes of Delivery (Presentation, task, discussion, quize, practice) | Grading Policy | Assessment (%) |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | Related conception of community development of the concept of community | The facts and concepts of community development and the history of its development | classical and class discussions | 200 | discussion | | 0 |
| 2 | Social capital and participatory development planning. | norms of social capital components, trust and networking. The use of social capital in participatory development | classroom discussion | 200 | discussion | 0 | 0 |
| 3 and 4 | Understanding Techniques Society: Social Mapping and Stakeholder Analysis. | Mapping the social component; demographic conditions, traditions, norms, economic and influence stakeholders | simulation | 400 | simulations | students are able to explain the techniques to understand the communities | 10 |
| 5 and 6 | Understanding Techniques Society: PRA, FGD | pre and FGD components, the stages of practice both | simulation | 400 | simulations | students are able to explain the techniques to understand the communities | 10 |
| 7 and 8 | Social data analysis techniques at: Fishbone Diagram and Root Causes Analysis | Fishbone Diagram composing stage and Root Causes Analysis of a case study area | simulation | 400 | simulations | students are able to explain the technique to get the community's aspirations | 10 |
| 9 and 10 | Formulation Techniques Aspirations: participatory mapping | how to do participatory mapping stages of a case study | simulation | 400 | simulations | students are able to explain the technique to get the community's aspirations | 10 |
| 11 and 12 | Formulation Techniques Aspirations: LFA / RBM | stages perform LFA / RBM | simulation | 400 | simulations | students are able to explain the technique to get the community's aspirations | 10 |
| 13 | survey research sites | data collection on location | group discussion | 500 | assignments, discussion | 0 | 0 |

| LECTURE | LEARNING OUTCOME (from weekly materials) | Scope(learning material/weekly materials) | Learning Methods (Week 1-7) | Course Duration (minutes) | Modes of Delivery (Presentation, task, discussion, quize, practice) | Grading Policy | Assessment (%) |
|---------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 14 | assistance | formulate the concept of community development | group discussion | 200 | assignments, discussion | | 5 |
| 15 | assistance | formulate the concept of community development | group discussion | 200 | assignments, discussion | | 5 |
| 16 | Presentation huge task | implement the concept of community development (PKMM) | large class discussions | 300 | Presentation | | 40 |

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| References: (Max 5) |
| Main library: |
| § Blackburn, James&Jeremy Holland (1998), Who Change?. Intermediate Publisher. London |
| § Bernard, Russel (2000), Social Research Methods, Sage Publications. |
| § Kothary, Uma dan Bll Cooke, The Tyrani of Participation. |
| § Sumarto, Hetifah SJ (2003), Inovasi Partisipasi dan Good Governance, YOI. |
| § Sutomo, Sumengen, et al (2002), Perencanaan Partisipatif, CV. Cipruy. |
| § Pamungkas, Adjie. Diktat Kuliah Pengembangan Masyarakat. Prodi PWK FTSP ITS |

Evaluation

1. Individual evaluation:
 - a. Simulation 1 (10%)
 - b. Simulation 2 (10%)
 - c. Simulation 3 (10%)
 - d. Simulation 4 (10%)
 - e. Simulation 5 (10%)
 - f. Quiz (20%)
2. Group Evaluation:
 - a. Group Reports (30%)

EVALUATION PLAN AND ASSIGNMENT PLAN

The tasks in this Community Development course are divided into two, namely Group Tasks and Simulation Tasks in 1-5 practice simulations.

1. Group Tasks

- a. This task aims to enable students to be able to do social mapping on community development efforts according to case studies. Case studies in the form of social mapping or stakeholder mapping for activities that support development-related activities in the community, FREE study locations but PRIMARY SURVEY and INTERACTION with the community are required;
- b. This task is done in groups with the number of students in one group is a maximum of 5 students



Community at Work 2007, Sam Kaner, *Facilitators Guide to Participatory Decision Making*, 2nd Ed.

- c. In this task students are asked to:
 1. Able to apply stakeholder analysis methods according to the object of observation;
 2. Students are able to apply ONE of the goals of forming facilitation groups (looking for data, providing information, providing vision of community improvement (advance thinking), improving communication/ group dynamics, forming communities for specific purposes, building community capacity on a particular theme and deciding something);
 3. Able to practice one of the tools in social mapping according to the object of observation;
- d. The reviews for this task are:
 1. Complexity and uniqueness of the case raised;
 2. Expected facilitation outcomes (students are not required to carry out an advocacy process for the community);
 3. Accuracy and sharpness in conducting stakeholder analysis according to the object of observation;
 4. The accuracy of the process and sharpness in formulating social mapping approaches according to the object of observation.
- e. General format for preparing group reports:
 1. Introduction (background, goals and objectives, scope of research) (max:2 pages)
 2. Methodology (max: 3 pages)
 - Facilitation approach to the community;
 - Selection of cases;
 - Selection of analysis tools
 3. Process and Image Problems (max: 5 pages)
 - General description of location;
 - General description of the problem;
 - Documentation of ongoing processes (audio, video or visual).
 4. Analysis and Discussion (number of free pages)
 - Stakeholder mapping;
 - Results and discussion.
 5. Conclusion (max 2 pages) 6. Bibliography (number of free pages)
 6. Attachment (analysis output) (number of free

pages)

- Transcripts;
- Photographs of image / video or audio stimulus used;
- Flip chart photos or results formulated with the community.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - GROUP FINAL PROJECT

| Sub Bab | 86-100 | 76-85 | 66-75 | 56-65 | 0-55 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Preliminary | Empirical and theoretical facts are very complete and very relevant, the urgency of the problem is high | Complete and relevant empirical and theoretical facts, but the urgency of the problem is lacking | Empirical and theoretical facts exist but are irrelevant and not urgent | Empirical and theoretical facts are incomplete, irrelevant, not urgent | There are no empirical and theoretical facts and cannot formulate problems |
| Literature review | The substance of the complete literature review by mentioning more than the specified reference, the correct synthesis of the library | Complete substance of the literature review in accordance with TOR, the synthesis of the appropriate library | Less complete but according to the topic of the task, the synthesis of the library is not quite right | Less complete and not in accordance with the topic of the assignment, improper library synthesis | Incomplete and incompatible and there is no library synthesis |
| Methodology | Data needed, how to obtain data and techniques to process data precisely and explained in detail | Data needed and how to get the right data but the technique of processing data is not right | How to get the right data, the data needed is less, the data processing technique | Data needed, how to obtain data and data processing techniques is not right | Data needed, how to obtain data and data processing techniques is not appropriate |
| Data and Analysis | Complete data, analysis right with the appropriate interpretation | Complete data, precise analysis without interpretation | is not right Complete data with inappropriate analysis | Complete data but not suitable and without analysis | Data is incomplete and not suitable and without analysis |
| Conclusion | The quality of conclusions is appropriate according to the results of the analysis and answers the research objectives | The quality of conclusions is appropriate according to the results of the analysis but does not answer the research objectives | The quality of conclusions is appropriate according to the results of the analysis but does not answer the research objectives | The quality of conclusions is not in accordance with the analysis and does not answer the research objectives | The quality of conclusions is very inappropriate |

2. Class simulation tasks

1. This training assignment aims to make students understand the operationalization of the techniques taught and able to apply various techniques in the context of community development for planning and development.
2. Students form groups with a maximum of 5 members.
3. This task is done in class
4. Simulation assessment applies to each individual with a weight value per each simulation of 10%
5. The simulation process will be carried out by the lecturer and assistant.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - SIMULATION

| Dimension | Very Good | Good | Average | Bad | Very Bad | Score |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Group Simulation | The group simulation successfully establishes and implements the results of the simulation very precisely that have been analyzed in accordance with the tools or concepts presented | The group simulation has been good at presenting and implementing the simulation results that have been analyzed according to the tools or concepts presented | The simulation group presents and implements the simulation results fairly well which have been analyzed and are sufficiently in accordance with the tools or concepts presented | The group simulation presents and implements the simulation results that are less suitable in analyzing the tools or concepts presented | Simulation does not work | |
| | 86-100 | 76-85 | 66-75 | 56-65 | 0-55 | |
| Substance | Content is able to inspire listeners to develop their minds and contain elements of creativity and / or uniqueness Students demonstrate Attitude and responsibilities as facilitators | Complete accurate contents. Listeners add new insights to the topic Students demonstrate Attitude and responsibilities as facilitators | Accurate but incomplete contents. Listeners are less active in discussing the topic Students demonstrate Attitude and responsibilities as facilitators | The contents are not accurate because there are no supporting facts/data Students show less attitude and responsibilities as facilitators | Contents are inaccurate and too general. Listeners don't get any learning Students do not show Attitude and responsibilities as facilitators | |
| | 86-100 | 76-85 | 66-75 | 56-65 | 0-55 | |
| Discussion | Argument Right with an example that matches the simulated tool | The argument is right but not in accordance with the simulated tool | Arguments are not precise and are not in accordance with the simulated tools | Arguments are incorrect and do not match the simulated tools | The argument and suitability with an improperly simulated device. | |