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Introduction

To our knowledge this document is the first of its kind: collecting over 20 detailed case studies describing Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) course development projects. COIL (also known as virtual exchange and globally networked learning) is a new approach to teaching and learning that brings together geographically distant instructors and students from different lingua-cultural backgrounds to communicate and collaborate through online communication tools. The COIL method promotes interactive shared coursework, emphasizing experiential learning and gives collaborating students a chance to get to know each other while developing meaningful projects together. This broadens and deepens their understanding of course content while building cross-cultural communicative capacity through academic and personal engagement with the perspectives of global peers.

In 2010, the SUNY COIL Center was awarded a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to create a 3-year project to embed COIL courses into humanities curricula across the United States. In order to be selected, each institution was required to provide evidence of senior leadership commitment to COIL, at least one faculty member interested in creating a COIL course, demonstrated support by instructional design staff and/or staff from the international programs office on campus, and an international partner institution interested in developing the course together.

A total of 21 US institutions were selected from a national call for participants to design and develop pilot COIL initiatives. Some institutions developed two courses and/or had two international partners. Thus ultimately the Institute included 25 international partner institutions from 19 countries across all of the world’s inhabited continents (see Appendix 1 for institutions and locations). Faculty and staff from all institutions were appointed as COIL Institute Fellows and led their campus’ involvement in this new initiative, eventually developing 24 successful COIL courses.

The Institute was focused around five discipline-specific tracks: Human Societies, Languages and Literature, International Studies, Media Arts and Culture, and Freshmen Foundations. Each track was led by two experts with experience developing and implementing COIL courses in that specific area. Together with SUNY COIL Center staff, an Instructional Design specialist, and Cross-Cultural Communications specialist, these experts provided support and hands-on training in the design, development, and implementation of COIL courses, with a specific focus on cross-cultural and pedagogical issues related to technology.

As part of our efforts to capture the results of those experiences, each of the teams that fully implemented a COIL course was asked to complete a detailed case study describing their course development and implementation process. Fellows were given an online template (see http://tinyurl.com/cool-cs-template) and asked to collaboratively complete the 59 questions divided into 10 sections. Where possible, they were also asked to provide extra documentation such as syllabi, student work, etc. The aim of the case studies as explained in the template was “to understand what our peers have accomplished [...] and serve as] a valuable resource for future developers of globally networked courses who can learn from the collective experience of the Institute.” Two-thirds of the teams completed the majority of the template while nearly half provided extra documents. Most teams carried out the task collaboratively whereas a few case studies only have the ‘voice’ of one or two team members (usually the US faculty member). A case study narrative was also completed by one US faculty member whose partnership did not move forward to a successful collaboration (see India-USA).

Given the emergent nature of COIL, to date the Institute is the largest cohort of educators and institutions creating campus-based globally networked initiatives within the same support network. This document, therefore, provides a valuable and timely account of the details, complexities, successes and failures of COIL.

---

1 The term ‘Freshmen Foundation’ comes from work done by Elmer Poe and Rosina Chia at East Carolina University (see http://chronicle.com/article/East-Carolina-U-Uses-Simple/44302/). The two, who were also track leaders in the COIL Institute, started the global understanding project to link freshmen students at ECU with peers in other countries.

COIL Institute for Globally Networked Learning in the Humanities: Case Studies
courses in many different institutional and disciplinary contexts. Given the length of the document, and the different ways people might choose to read it, we have provided a detailed table of contents to allow readers to focus on courses within specific disciplines or to investigate the same course development aspect in different courses. The case studies have been arranged in alphabetical order based on the international partner’s country followed by the discipline(s) of the COIL course. They have also been made available individually.

*Note: Most language used in the case studies has been left in the authors’ original words. However, in some cases minimal editing was carried out during the compilation of the case studies.*

In publishing this document, the SUNY COIL Center hopes to not only provide useful information for present and future practitioners, but also to open up dialogue across disciplines and geographic borders. Collaborative online international learning is still in its infancy, but by sharing experiences and best practices, we may all improve how such courses are created and implemented, thus helping promote its integration at institutions across the globe. More information about COIL courses, and how to join in such dialogue can be found on the COIL website: [http://coil.suny.edu](http://coil.suny.edu).
1. Australia - USA: Film & Screenwriting

Abstract

An international online collaborative course exploring cinematic storytelling across cultures proved to be a rewarding experience for both faculty and students. This is evidenced by course design that reflects the varied artistic sensibilities of content creators in formulating a rich syllabus with assignments and discussions that drew much out of the students. The combined aesthetics of the instructors resulted in a challenging curriculum that made the teaching experience a memorable one. Technical glitches were minimal and therefore the cyber nature of the course supported the maximum potential of the collaborative experience.

Students, for their part, were energized by what they indicated was a unique opportunity in online learning: to forge creative friendships with what could, in the best case scenario, become lifelong film industry contacts and collaborators. The energy was demonstrated by their always lively and carefully-considered responses to discussion board topics and the zeal with which they applied themselves to all aspects of the course building to the key final assignment – writing a film treatment in collaboration.

In retrospect, faculty may have done better to streamline grading procedures to avoid the pitfall of trying to come to a consensus on creative work. Another aspect of the course for future iterations involves implementation of additional and more specific creative touchstones built into the assessment of the student writing process and measurable in the final deliverables.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cinematic Storytelling</td>
<td>National University (U.S.)</td>
<td>Film and Screenwriting</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across Cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinematic Storytelling</td>
<td>Griffith University (AU)</td>
<td>Master of Screen Production</td>
<td>Post graduate coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across Cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Bettina Moss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>National University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>MFA in Professional Screenwriting – SOPS (School of Professional Studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>James Napoli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>National University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Core Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>MFA in Professional Screenwriting - School of Professional Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Herman van Eyken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Griffith University – Queensland College of Art –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Griffith Film School, Master of Screen Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Hugh Burton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Griffith University – Queensland College of Art –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Sessional Lecturer in Screenwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Griffith Film School, Master of Screen Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

September/October 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

Five American and Five Australian

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

Typical for screenwriting workshops @ NU - National University
Griffith University - This class was exceptionally small, and we could only offer it if it was of strategic importance for the further development of the film school. - Griffith University

Section 2: Issues of Language

| 6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution | English for both |
| 7. Primary language of most students in each class | English |
| 8. Language of the course collaboration | Yes, all in English |
| 9. Language fluency | Primary language of all participants |
| 10. Language proficiency difference | Very few considerations along this line as both groups of students were native English speakers. Occasionally, colloquialisms would arise which created more amusement than confusion. |

Section 3: Curricular Information

| 11. Online or blended? | Online only with weekly synchronous audio class meetings and student collaborations via Skype |
| 12. Duration | Eight weeks |
| 13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period | No collaboration prior. In most cases, significant collaboration after, with at least three pairs of students continuing to work on their screenplays together following the end of the course. |

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

| 14. Tools | E-college (all), Skype (all), email (all) |
### 15. Server location

E-college provided by National University

### 16. Technical problems

NU response: None through e-college. A few students had moments of technical difficulty with the chats but these were minor.

Griffith response: From the Australian perspective there were some technical issues that did affect how students interacted with the course material. These were ultimately circumvented but did create some confusion.

At the course design level the Australian partners wanted to have an interactive peer review questionnaire, where students would be paired up and review each other’s work. It was our desire that this review would have an interface like most online questionnaires, with multiple options and different threads opening up depending upon responses to questions, to take full advantage of online interactivity. I wanted the results to then be viewed by the student whose work was being reviewed rather than be collated in a central database. We were not able to make this happen so we had to use a word document that they filled in and posted online.

Our NU partners created a beautiful design for the presentation of pages of course information. They contained notes about each of the films being studied and embedded videos. Many students experienced difficulties accessing the embedded videos, some were not able to view all the videos and some were able to access them via alternative methods.

### 17. Frequency of use

ECollege was used for the online audio meetings once a week. The Discussion Boards within the course design were used by the entire group and by the individual pairings to share analysis and collaborative ideas throughout. Students in pairs Skyped at least two times a week during their work together.

### 18. Informal communication

The impression was that personal interaction outside of the class project occurred naturally during student Skype sessions and Discussion Board postings. Certain personal details often came up when in the process of comparing ideas (personal tastes and preferences and personality quirks).

### 19. Re-use

Yes. (NU)

Our NU partner hosted the system under which we operated; we were therefore compelled to adopt the associated software. Future partnerships would require the same arrangement. There may be some debugging that could occur to ensure videos were accessible, and our university could provide a back-up option for viewing all the material. (Griffith)

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

#### 20. Tools

ClassLivePro is the synchronous audio class meeting tool used through Ecollege, as detailed above.
Students used the e-college system for posting their discussion threads and evolving drafts. They used Skype for partner-to-partner discussions.

### 21. Server location

ClassLivePro provided by National University through ECollege. Skype was cloud-based.

### 22. Technical problems

None of any significance. (NU)

(Griffith) The “Live Chat” function within e-college would not launch for many of the Australian participants who were Mac based. The technical support people at NU and in Australia provided a pathway through the problems and they did not recur. It did however undermine confidence in the system with that initial difficulty. Fortunately we had encountered the difficulties prior to the course going live so we ran a test session with the students before the first live chat, where we debugged our connections. It did appear to be a Mac related problem, however most film students in Australia are Mac based so this is something to be mindful of in the future.

Professor Burton runs a hybrid face-to-face and online course in Australia with between twenty and thirty external students with live chat sessions where video is supported. This is extremely beneficial in helping to establish a real sense of community. We understand that this was not possible via the e-college system, possibly due to the spread of participants across the globe.

NU note: Mac and e-college are not as compatible as PC and e-college. E-college purports to be working on this issue but have never really given NU faculty a satisfactory response. NU Faculty continue to bring this to the attention of NU administrators.

### 23. Frequency of use

Once a week for the synchronous meetings. Students were expected to Skype at least once a week to brainstorm and nail down ideas for their scripts, and in almost every case exceeded that.

### 24. Informal communication

The impression was that personal interaction outside of the class project occurred naturally during student Skype sessions and Discussion Board postings. Certain personal details often came up when in the process of comparing ideas (personal tastes and preferences and personality quirks).

### 25. Re-use

Yes.

Professor Burton would prefer to be able to have video images and would like to investigate an option of teleconferencing future live chat class sessions.

NU note: We have heard some discussion of future iterations of e-college embedding SKYPE software to enhance ease of video conferencing. We have yet to see it in practice however.
26. How?

Point scores for each assignment (total of 100 points for entire class). There was no formal measurement of cross cultural awareness per say but intrinsic to the learning process was the expansion of an international awareness concerning the film markets and aesthetics of both countries.

27. Common assessment rubric

NU note:
Yes, Professors Burton and Napoli collaborated on a rubric for the final project via email exchanges (the film treatment) by deciding upon criteria for grading various aspects of the writing and assessing how well the students grasped the concepts outlined in the course through their execution of the final treatment. We would both admit that in hindsight we may well have created rubrics for some of the other assignments, which would have eliminated some grey areas around assessment and given us a clearer guideline for our reasoning in grading creative material.

The rubric is in word table format and does not properly copy into this space. There does not appear to be a way to attach a document to google.docs. I have placed the content of the rubric in a comment (Moss) but it is not in proper format.

Griffith note:
There does appear to be a significant cultural difference in approach to assessments that is in part represented in the rubric: It is Professor Burton’s opinion that film schools in Australia value innovation, thus the creative, conceptual elements are emphasized whilst the formal technical requirements are acknowledged. This can result in a significant spread of assessment results. Students in Australia understand that it is the ideas behind the assignments and the degree of skill in realizing those ideas that are of greatest importance in relation to assessment.

A significant difference that arose between the two partners was the grade point average for the subject. In Australia marks are awarded for excellence, thus the average mark is normally around 75% to 80% with occasional High Distinctions (above 85%) for exceptional work. This appears to be at odds with the system in the USA.

Students worked in teams, with their partners. They were assessed by academics from their own country. It seemed unjust if one partner obtained a different mark to their colleague for mutually constructed outputs. Thus the Australian partners adjusted their marking in line with the USA assessment. There was one discrepancy of 0.5% for one assessment which caused concern from one of the students, which we resolved by increasing the mark to align with their partner’s final mark. It is an area that needs further consideration for the future.

28. Assessment outcomes

As we have mentioned in our COIL update posts, we found out belatedly that each institution should probably have graded their own students. We tried a little too hard to create a collaborative grading agreement and it did lead to some stress and miscommunication among students who, on admittedly rare occasions, felt they were shortchanged when each professor assessed work differently without having time to confer with each other because of their other teaching responsibilities.
### 29. Peer assessment

Yes, there was an entire course module devoted to Peer Review, with a specific set of questions designed by Professor Burton for students to assess each other’s work. This was a word document questionnaire which has been attached here as a comment.

### 30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

Nothing for the course itself but the American students, when given the opportunity to participate in the course, were asked to formally commit to doing so with an agreement letter. This was via email communication. Griffith University has a charter for students covering the relevant interactions. There were distinctive aspects of this course where the development of some guidelines may prove advantageous, especially in relation to expectations of how the cross-cultural pairs function and partner responsibilities.

### 31. Attrition

One American student dropped due to new job responsibilities.

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

Outside family and work pressures are usually the reason students drop courses at NU. This student’s dropping was atypical for her. It was not related to anything having to do with the globally networked nature of the course, which actually inspired a commendable level of commitment from all the students aside from the drop. Students were attracted to the novelty of developing a script with a stranger from another country. There was an element of chance in success of the partnerships; however there was also considerable support and encouragement from Burton and Napoli when differences of opinion arose within pairs. This process of working through differences and finding compromise is obviously a central plank in the construction of cross-cultural learning. Thus the excitement stemming initially from the novelty and ultimately from the quality of input from all participants was no doubt a significant factor in retention. The oppositional force of the high workload and short turnaround time did create some challenges for students with other commitments, but did not overshadow the positives.

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

**National University Institutional Support**

The COIL Fellowship was brought to the attention of lead faculty Bettina Moss by her then dean Karla Berry. During the writing of the fellowship application the Provost of the university, Dr. Eileen Heveron, was brought into the discussion and she wholeheartedly supported the endeavor.

Once the partnership with Griffith University was established, the fellowship application submitted and our partnership chosen by COIL, the Provost again provided support in agreeing to allow the e-college platform to be used to host the course. The Provost’s office also supported the participation of Del Mackey from NU Cris (community outreach arm of NU) as co-instructional designer. NUCris contributed financially towards Del’s travel to NY (per diem). The Provost also provided travel funds for Core Adjunct James Napoli as this was not covered for the first conference due to the participation of an International Coordinator from NU (Amy Portwood) who is no longer involved in the project.
The Provost’s office did not get involved in content development other than to agree that the subject matter and the technical means (e-college) would be supported by the University.

Griffith University support:

When contacted by Bettina Moss, I was rapidly convinced that this was an experiment worth taking. Australia, as a country of immigrants is very interested in cross-cultural collaboration, and the field of screenwriting is one of the few relevant fields to develop online courses, and therefore long distance collaborations. As non US Fellows, there is no financial support, but Herman Van Eyken did travel to NY for the first conference on course development funding coming from the film school’s budget. Hugh Burton was predestined to come on board, though he was not a Full Time Faculty member of the film school. Instead he had online screenwriting course experience, and Herman Van Eyken considered this a major asset for the further development of the course.

I presented the course to the College Committee and the faculty board, and found overall support of further develop the course. Griffith had a previous good experience with one of the COIL Fellowships in the field of Criminology. That course has now evolved into a very successful online course. The Dean of the faculty is now looking into the matter for a sustainable offer of the course, and therefore both Hugh Burton and Herman Van Eyken continue to follow up on the peer evaluation, assessment of the course.

### 34. Engagement with international programs office

| NU: None. Although a coordinator from the International Division was part of the first conference, she has since left the Los Angeles area and is now based in another state. There has been no additional interaction with our International Division specifically. |
| Griffith: None, but that is normal within GU policy, but they were kept informed and are genuinely interested in the development of this course. When time comes, they will act upon this initiative and encourage us to develop the course further, and help assure its delivery within an international context. |

### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

| NU Note: Initially there was approval from the then head of the International Division, Dr. Jack Paduntin, whom the Provost brought into the process. NU does have an institutional desire to engage in global learning. One of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (#4) states: |
| - Demonstrate cultural and global awareness to be responsible citizens of a diverse society. |
| Additionally, as part of the National University System there is a National University International (NUI) division, the goals of which state, in part: |
| - To create educational collaborations for the National University System with partners abroad |
| - To enrich the student experience within the National University System by promoting cultural understanding through educational exchange. |
| It is through the Provost that awareness of the COIL Fellowship is being disseminated to the university at large and to NUI. |
| Additionally, just this past month, the Clum Charles and Gwendolyn Bucher Endowment Faculty Scholarship Abroad Award was established at NU. The purpose of the endowment is to enhance the recognition of National University, its programs and its faculty members in the international community; encourage the pursuit of scholarship by full-time faculty members through foreign study; and allow mutual exchange of faculty members as teachers with foreign universities. Lead faculty Bettina Moss will be applying for this Endowment award with the hope of being chosen to further the establishment of joint courses and/or future programs in partnership |
with Griffith University Film School.
Griffith note: Absolutely, and I can confirm that this has become one of the priorities of the strategic plan of the university

### 36. Commitment

NU: We began with a singular commitment but are both very open to developing future programs/classes together. This will be further discussed at the COIL conference in April.
Griffith: Fully second this opinion.

### 37. Future iterations

NU: Not scheduled as of yet. Awaiting further in person discussion at COIL conference.
Griffith: Fully second this opinion.

### 38. New globally networked courses

There are no formal plans but I believe NU is very interested in pursuing this.
Griffith: Fully second this opinion.

### 39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

NU: This has not been discussed as of yet. NU and Griffith would have to bring a specific proposal to the attention of the Provost in order to pursue again.
Griffith: GFS has opened these discussions now, in preparation of the Capstone meeting in NY. The major role in this will be the Dean’s contribution or support, and I will be able to report more in detail about his reaction and commitment in NY.

### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Informally, I believe NU is very open to further international course development for the MFA SCR program. I have not had a specific discussion with the dean or provost about such.
Griffith - Ibid #42 response

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

At NU it would be university wide willingness to support expansion that is proposed which I believe would be agreeable to them.
Griffith: An ongoing group to share development ideas and to discuss solutions to specific challenges.
# Section 8: Reflections

## 42. Goals set

**National:**
- Demonstrate the viability of International student collaboration in the field of screenwriting
- Keeping the course working technically
- Encouraging cross cultural experiences and awareness of similarities and differences
- Fostering an international creative network for opportunities in the film industry

**Griffith U:**
- To design and implement an innovative course where cross-cultural creative collaboration would provide a mechanism for filmmakers to contextualize their practice
- To encourage reflection by participants upon creative processes in addition to acquisition of practical skills.
- To engage a learning community beyond the confines of the physical institution
- To develop a course that would demonstrate the strengths of online and interactive learning
- To create a model they could be built upon and expanded in the future

## 43. Goals achieved

**NU:** The technical aspects went very smoothly, the student engagement and enthusiasm about making new friends in a creative field was hugely evident. The gauging of cross cultural effectiveness was a little difficult to establish owing to the many similarities in language and attitudes toward filmed entertainment, but it was very clear that students from both countries viewed this as a remarkable opportunity and this was reflected in their intense level of engagement in the course.

**Griffith:** There was considerable discussion and preparedness to listen and contribute that reflected effective student engagement and practice analysis. Student responses were enthusiastic. They have continued to develop their stories and to keep in touch, so the course has spawned an ongoing community. The initial activities did provide a framework for participants to learn about each other. The process did create a discernible progressive development in the work of all participants. It has proved to be viable and effective.

## 44. Most unique aspect for students

**NU:** Again, the opportunity to work on a creative writing project with, essentially, a stranger from another country. It seemed to energize everyone.

**Griffith:** The opportunity for artists to work creatively with people from a different culture whilst being physically based within their familiar environment. There was considerable collegiate respect engendered by the mixture of distance and virtual intimacy of participants.

## 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

**NU:** The logistics of getting everyone together in and out of class meetings went surprisingly smoothly, with most students (some lagged at the beginning owing to outside work commitments) immediately enjoying the Skype sessions and Discussion Board postings. The level of intellectual and academic rigor was also very satisfying from a faculty standpoint, with students never at a loss for words! Also, the willingness to collaborate and change and modify ideas based on each other’s input in the student pairings was superlative.

**Griffith:** The contributions from students who had a different cultural perspective broadened the cultural base from which a work was created. There were times when this provoked discussion between the partners, which
produced outputs that were the sum of both viewpoints. This broadening of the cultural foundations for creation of screenplays is enormously advantageous as the potential final function of a screenplay is a film that should ideally transcend cultural barriers. A distinctive feature of this course was that it enabled the locus of engagement to remain within a familiar environment: participants were able to create work from within their culture whilst allowing it to be scrutinized by colleagues from outside of that culture. The common alternative is for participants to physically relocate, however the very nature of creating artistic work in an unfamiliar context is likely to have profound destabilizing consequences. Both approaches have advantages. The central platform of creating expansively, from the Critical Axis, (or original point of inspiration for the story) outwards was a feature that made this course distinctively different from a more conservative approach. This appeared to synchronize with expectations to examine influences in the creation of a film script.

46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Well, having a student drop was probably the most problematic, as Professor Napoli had to step in as a collaborator (although there was a good balance in which the “student” hat was worn pretty effectively without blurring the lines into taking on a teaching role when creative collaboration was the goal). Some students did report a little frustration with finding convenient times to Skype, and finding the right approach to grading individually in each institution, as mentioned, provided a few headaches.

A goal of the course was to provide course material and exercises that provoked reflection upon processes of creativity relevant to the field, in addition to the opportunity for students to collaborate in a supportive environment. The eight-week time frame for the course that was necessary to align with the unit structure of our USA partner meant that there was very little gestation time and students and staff had multiple simultaneous tasks. One solution would be to expand the course across two units of study and thus allow more time for reflection.

One point that slipped through the net in the development stage related to the term ‘draft’ the original intention was to create just three drafts: the final assignment would be the third draft. However a final (fourth version) was added, which did create additional work for the students and staff. So a reduction to just three would be advantageous.

47. Changes for future iterations

Different approach to grading. The issues around how to grade creative work were not unique to the COIL course offering. This is something the NU MFA faculty contends with often as NU is not primarily an arts college and therefore we must find unique ways to adapt the standard grading system to take into consideration the creative process.

Building in a Rubric that emphasized creative achievement would help to define and measure a key objective.

Expanding the course over two units to allow scripts to progress to a more advanced stage whilst building in some gestation time would be ideal.

48. Technical support

Del Mackey was the participating Instruction Designer. The courses I have worked on previously have mostly been in-house or specialized course flows, so having to design to a radically broad and dynamic audience was interesting. One of the biggest hurdles and challenges when approaching the course was the differentiation between the students from the different institutions, who had varying levels of experience in working in an online course framework. With that in mind, testing the tools and thinking about ease of flows was a big part of
designing that I never had to approach previously. The thought was always for design from an immediate level, whereas the COIL course had to feature designing around a beginner level, and how those beginners would have to understand accessing and using the course.

### 49. International programs person

The person involved from the International Division is no longer part of the fellowship. There are no reflections from her.

### 50. Time commitment

I (Napoli) would estimate at least 100 hours. I would also estimate that the globally networked aspects added at least 20 or 30 hours to the process.

Hugh Burton spent in excess of one hundred hours on course design and planning. Implementation and assessment was an additional fourteen to twenty hours per week for the eight weeks. Taking the total to around one hundred and seventy hours. The collaborative aspect of course delivery would have added at least thirty hours to that process. Having said that, this would no doubt have been the case even if it had been a collaboration with another university within Australia.

### 51. Was it worth it?

Napoli: Most definitely worth it, and yes, much of what we learned in creating this course could cross over into another subject or institution to make the process less complicated the second time.

There is no question that what we delivered was an exciting, exceptionally engaging and rewarding course. Our students are continuing to develop the work that they began within the course. Burton believes that what we designed and implemented took full advantage of the ability to transcend physical space, and thus created a unique opportunity for the participants.

There is no question that what we delivered was an exciting, exceptionally engaging and rewarding course. Our students are continuing to develop the work that they began within the course. Burton believes that what we designed and implemented took full advantage of the ability to transcend physical space, and thus created a unique opportunity for the participants.

---

**Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative**

One of the core objectives in designing the course was to foster contextualizing creative processes and outcomes of writing for the screen. Participants were at an advanced level and thus interested in refining their skills. Course content was therefore designed to encourage reflection upon creative processes and how they might affect outcomes.

The FlashMeetings that occurred as respective program leads Bettina Moss and Herman van Eyken and adjunct faculty James Napoli and Hugh Burton designed and prepped the course proved fruitful. We established that the first week would address sharing cultural experiences with family stories and favorite films, as well as having students from each country read (and comment upon to the best of their abilities) a critique of the film industry from the other's home nation as a way into experiencing how each country approaches independent film. From there, the course design included pairing the students into teams, brainstorming and, ultimately, the co-creation of a movie story in treatment form. Along the way we included critical analysis of films and of storytelling from
the classic 3-act structure point of view versus a more theme-based approach. Drawing upon the unconscious as a source of inspiration via Dream Journals and the concept of the Critical Axis was intended to encourage powerful original ideas and story development.

After the substantial preparation and launch of the course the first and most encouraging experience was that our debut synchronous audio class meeting between the U.S. and Australia in the e-college platform went off without any technical glitches. It’s natural to be concerned about the tech side not throwing things off too much, so having our first class meeting "work" was a great boost. The discussion covered lots of intriguing side topics, from ethnic identity to the need (or not) for a character in a story to grow and change in order to make the script satisfying to an audience. The framework for our first discussion was the response to a series of American and Australian short films that conveyed specific themes and whether or not, through the lens of culture, students might have experienced them differently. The most telling aspect of the conversation was when it veered into the idea of American romantic comedies being obsessed with the notion of a "soul mate," which was seen by some of the students as a uniquely American spin on movies that does not seem to be present in Australian storylines all that often.

There was an extremely high level of interaction on the Discussion Boards throughout the course, and our "Ice Breakers," were no exception. Students shared a "Family Story" in third person, talked about an all-time favorite film, and responded to readings about the film industries in each other's country. The opinions and stories were eclectic and far-ranging, but there seemed to be great commonality and sharing of experience in the family stories. There was an interesting level of camaraderie among the Australian students, who, although engaged in the online environment, all share a physical campus together. They are quick to send each other a quip on the chat board during our class meeting sessions and, delightfully, the National students joined in.

One of the most significant differences that arose between the two Institutions resided in philosophy of assessment. NU has a ‘top down’ approach where students start at a perfect mark and may lose points for errors, whereas in Australia the majority of students would receive an ‘average’ mark and the exceptional achievers would receive an exceptional result (above 85%). Having the entire class receive results in the “exceptional” category is unacceptable to Assessment Boards in Australian Universities. The dilemma here is where teams complete assignments (comprised of students from both countries) yet the results are different, if grading parameters of the two countries are applied. It also seems problematic if students are submitting very similar quality work yet being given radically different marks. The students do chat with each other so the discrepancies would become known. As there did not appear to be any apparent solution in the short term Australia adopted the USA marking system. However it would be valuable to hear from others who may have encountered similar challenges and found a solution.

Hugh and James, who guided the class and did the hands on teaching came to a "meet halfway" point, in which they thought they’d each grade their own students when the assignment was "individual" (for example, a Discussion Board posting or a homework assignment), but would have conferences about the team assignments and decide on a grade/point score in tandem for those. In retrospect, especially in light of feedback given by Jon Rubin, director of the COIL Institute, it seems that simply having each professor grade their own students would have been the way to go.

One big challenge occurred when a student on the American side dropped out. In a course designed to pair one Australian with one American for collaboration on a written project (and in which students signed letters of agreement regarding their ability to commit), this was something that needed to be dealt with immediately, since one of the Australian students was left without a partner. After reviewing many options, most of which involved plunking someone down into the course to step in and were therefore impractical (since familiarity with the course and its concepts was crucial), the only course of action was to have James step in as the partner for the Australian student. We stared down the "blurring the lines" issue, by making sure only Hugh graded the final product, so that James would not be assisting in the creative process and grading at the same time. And,
since it had already been determined that for non-collaborative assignments each professor from each country would grade their own students, it worked out reasonably well. But this was of significant concern. Fortunately, the Australian student had no problem with the new circumstances.

The course model of pairing students is crux of the creative and cultural sharing. It does however create vulnerability for collapse if a partner drops out or fails to contribute. This is an area where we need to attempt to build in a contingency, preferably one that does not require lead staff to step in to fill the void. It did solve the problem in this instance but a plan for any future occurrences would be strategically prudent.

The incorporation of a 3-step treatment approach (each step expanding upon the other) provided a great, gradual approach that took the pressure off the short time in which the students had to create. Another concept implemented was that of defining the "Critical Axis." This is separate from a film's "central idea" (such as "we all need love" or "man's inhumanity to man"), and is rooted more in the impetus for creating the story. Hugh stated it aptly when he elucidated that the critical axis is the aspect of the story that the writer wants to survive the development process. It comes from a larger overview of an idea as opposed to a "universal theme." In guiding students on how to define this it was suggested that they take a scene or moment connected to the critical axis and build their entire story around it, rather than starting at point A and going to the end – which is the more typical linear method of screenplay creation in American screenwriting practice. The idea was to let the emotion inspired by the key moment inform how the beginning and end unfold around it.

The Week 5 class meeting was the first implementation in the course of roundtable discussions of everyone's ideas, and it soon became apparent that it needed refining. It turned into one team presenting, getting feedback from faculty and then repeating the process. We learned that it would have been a more constructive teaching outcome if we had gotten everybody involved in the feedback in a more active manner and the result would have likely been less "dead air" during the roundtable.

The model where James and Hugh guided students in the early weeks and then opened up discussion in the later weeks to the broader group did, at the end of the day prove to be very successful, we thought. It enabled all the students to listen to the discussion and development, whilst ensuring there was a clear and consistent thread for each team to build upon. If the discussion was opened to the larger community earlier it would have reduced the input from James and Hugh and could have introduced conflicting suggestions at an early and vulnerable stage of development.

In that same week, the students wrote their "dream narratives," describing a dream and analyzing it in terms of mythic images and their own lives. The plus side of this exercise was the level of trust shown by the students, who shared quite revealing thoughts from their unconscious and wrote about them fairly compellingly. They each gave their own interpretations of two other students' dreams and did so with caring and insight.

The intention of the Dream Diary and the Dream Narrative was to raise awareness of an expanded or alternative approach to how stories or elements of stories may unfold. Just by asking students to keep a Dream Diary, whilst explaining how it can assist (with video support from John Cleese) would be a learning process. In fact several students did incorporate elements of their dream material into their final stories.

On the down side, we had hoped for the outcome of the exercise to be more about how dreams contain stories and can unlock story structure, but looking back that was not as built into the description of the exercise as it could have been. It may also have been a casualty of the increased pressure on the students to crank out their treatment drafts. It's a constant gamble whether or not to continue academic assignments in the midst of the writing work, but in the end it likely elevates the academic rigor necessary in a graduate course.

As we wound down, we found one aspect of course design that should definitely be addressed in future incarnations. As the third drafts of the movie treatments came in it became apparent that some chinks in the armor of the students' stories were showing (character definition, story clarity, etc.). Upon reflection we realized we had nothing built in to the 3-tiered writing process to gauge these aspects along the way. While by no
means a "deal breaker", it is something that showed itself over the three weeks of writing the treatment (weeks 6, 7 and 8). We realized a lack of interim assessment steps for the treatment made it more complicated for the instructors to gauge this overall grading process for the final deliverable.

Our focus had been more on the nuts-and-bolts aspects of two students from different countries collaborating, and, in service to that, we laid out the basic tenets of how we thought they should build out their treatments. Caught up in the idea that the very collaboration was happening, in hindsight we realized we lacked some specificity regarding artistic touchstones. More emphasis was put on their effective communication together and their willingness to let the story grow and change during collaboration. These are, to be sure, fine things on which to basing a grade but in future designs of the course, we would do well to make a point to track the progression of the subtleties of the storytelling by implementing assessment touchstones above and beyond the collaborative-based elements. Given that an objective of our course was to foster innovation in screenwriting, it would be logical consequence that multiple assessment criteria reflect this.

Finally, a keenly rewarding aspect of the entire experience was the fact that many of the students we paired continued to collaborate on screenplays after completing their treatments. Included below is a recent update from one of the American students, Kristen Johnson (who explained that her Australian counterpart would also have responded but he was coping with a very bad illness at the time):

“I was partnered with Nicholas Burgess, and what a great team we have made. We have continued collaborating, and are well into writing the first draft of our script, THE COMPANION PROJECT. Prior to Nick’s illness, we made a point of Skyping once or twice a week….Now we text daily….We’ll pick up again when he’s ready. Ultimately, Nick and I have talked about being writing partners in the television area, should we be able to land a staff job at some point. He very much wants to come to LA and do that, and hopefully that will come to pass at some point. We also want to pursue writing more features, entering more competitions, and creating excellent careers. And we have you and COIL to thank for creating such a great opportunity so that we could meet.”

---

Section 10: Student Feedback

Griffith University is still in the process of retrieving these. We promise we will have these written out when we are coming to the Capstone meeting in NY. 

NU anonymous student responses:

"The past eight weeks have been an enlightening experience. Professors Napoli and Burton tackled a logistical nightmare, coordinating chats, assignment due dates, and feedback with ease. The course began with an ice breaker, favorite film, discussion instead of the typical introduction biography and stimulated conversation between students on both sides of the Pacific. The short films from Australia and the United States that we watched during the first week of the class illustrated the subtle differences between the two countries approach to storytelling. This became extremely important as I began collaborating with my writing partner. Professor Napoli was always available for questions and his timely responses to questions via emails ensured there was little to no downtime while working on our treatments. Professor Napoli also went a step further and followed up after providing his initial answer to verify his solution, advice, or guidance was understood. During the chat sessions, Professor Napoli was always prepared with thought provoking questions based on student comments. I was impressed by his strong facilitation skills and how he involved the entire class in his discussions. I was honored to be a part of this pilot course and I firmly believe the collaboration between the two universities should be continued. Although my writing partner and I got off to a somewhat rock start, we have agreed to continue collaborating on our project outside of school."

---
"An excellent class. Here's hoping it will lead to future collaborative courses for the universities. One thing to consider tweaking in the course load- don't schedule the 3-Act Assessment and the Peer Review in the same week, as they are each very demanding and thus forced many of us to split time and attention, affecting the quality of both assignments. Perhaps push the 3-Act Assessment into early in the 8th week. Or maybe make that assignment's deadline flexible, so that students can choose when to turn it in. One of the things that really helped my partner and myself to work together was that we chose a story with multiple narratives. Because of this, we didn’t step on each other's toes as much. If this class is offered again, that might be a helpful direction to steer students toward. Thanks!"

"The time change between Australia and US was difficult to manage at times with schedules. Otherwise, I think it was a worthwhile endeavor."

"I have found James Napoli to be an amazing professor, and he did not disappoint in this pilot program. I always appreciate that he pushes me to excel - it makes me feel like he believes in my talent. Additionally, we had Hugh Burton to add his perspective and wisdom, which was a lovely element to the course. The biggest hurdle was the time difference between us and Australia. Because of that, we struggled a bit with the deadlines, but we still managed to make it work. For the next group, I’d suggest allowing a bit more time to get those treatments off the ground, with some peer reviews earlier in the process. That said, I am so pleased with the results and very grateful that I had the opportunity. It was a fantastic experience."

"For treatment feedback, please get them to us well before the next phase of the treatment is due."
2. Australia - USA: History & Anthropology

Abstract
Dr. Effy George, Lecturer at Victoria University (VU), Melbourne, Australia, and Irma Victoria Montelongo, Lecturer at The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), partnered to create the VU-UTEP Global Learning Community (GLC). The GLC project linked two first year Liberal Arts core curriculum classes that resulted in a transnational co-course entitled Imagining Nations, Imagining Regions: The Making of Cultural Diversity in Australia and on the U.S.-Mexico Border. Topics of study included colonialism, nationalism, culture, migration, gender and sexuality in Australia and on the U.S.-Mexico border. The UTEP-VU GLC provided a rich environment for inter-institutional teaching and learning as the two institutions became curricular design partners, sharing problems and resolutions, in an ever deepening knowledge transfer relationship.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagining Nations, Imagining Regions: The Making of Cultural Diversity in Australia and on the U.S.-Mexico Border</td>
<td>Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia and The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>History and Anthropology</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories Across Cultures: Mobile Worlds and the Politics of Belonging Amongst Communities in Australia and the United States</td>
<td>Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia and The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>History and Anthropology</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th>Name: Irma Victoria Montelongo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution: Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Entering Student Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Member #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Dr. Effy George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>College of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Liberal Arts (Foundation course)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. When?

**UTEP - VU:** Fall and Spring 2010-2012

### 4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

**UTEP - VU:** Approximately 20-25 per class, per semester, per university

### 5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

At UTEP the average freshman foundation class is 28 students, but for the purpose of the Global Learning Community we capped the class at 20. The main reason was that video conferencing was part of our collaboration and UTEP’s video conference rooms accommodate approximately 20-25 people comfortably. The other reason that we capped the class enrollment was because we wanted to be sure to maintain an intimate environment that fostered discussion and collaboration between students at both universities.

Similarly, at VU the average Liberal Arts foundation class is 30 students. For the first iteration of the Global Learning Community the class was capped at 25. However, this class size was not sustainable due to internal faculty funding. At first, I thought it would create a problem, especially for the interactions of the collaboration. However, a larger video conferencing venue was provided and it did not lead to any significant change in terms of communication with the UTEP students.

### Section 2: Issues of Language

### 6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

**UTEP:** English; **Victoria University:** English

### 7. Primary language of most students in each class

At UTEP the primary language is English but about 10% of our student body utilize English as a second language. In my Global Learning Community classes I would approximate that I had 2-4 students who were in the process of learning English with their primary language being Spanish.

Similarly, at VU, the primary language is English. However, approx. 70% of the student cohort are from non-English speaking backgrounds. The majority of students are second generation migrants and the others are recently arrived migrants who have studied several prerequisite courses in ESL (English as a second language). Typically, the former group are from europe, southern europe and Vietnam. The latter are from Africa and...
elsewhere in Asia and the Pacific.

### 8. Language of the course collaboration

Yes, our collaboration took place in English.

### 9. Language fluency

Most students were very fluent, again at UTEP may 2-4 students per class lacked some proficiency in the English language. At VU (Liberal Arts), most students had a good command of English. However the students articulating into Liberal Arts from the ESL courses lacked confidence in speaking and writing English. For me this was an interesting situation as the collaboration required students to independently upload posts and comments to the site. I instituted a private email editing service for these students, whereby students emailed me with their draft posts and ideas. This turned out to be a confidence building exercise and soon enough, these same students began independently posting.

### 10. Language proficiency difference

I would say that for the UTEP - VU collaboration it wasn’t so much the potential in language skills but rather the lack of experience with cultural diversity. On one occasion we had the students make a digital story of how they “imagined” each other’s nations/regions and there were some rather unpleasant stereotypes that emerged. This made for an initial tense and somewhat uncomfortable exchange of ideas that blossomed into a positive teaching and learning moment as we worked together to sort out ideas and perceptions.

As stated for VU in question 11, differences in English language skills was mainly due to a lack of confidence amongst recently arrived migrants and this was dealt with in a one to one situation. However, as Irma has said, what was more salient, was the cultural stereotypes that the students brought with them to the collaboration. Indeed both groups reacted, and at times diplomatic civility was lost. Yet it was this affront to their cultural sensibilities which yielded greater communication and indeed the desire to rekindle communication. Some student in fact took on the role of mediators!

---

### Section 3: Curriculur Information

#### 11. Online or blended?

It was a blended format with face-to-face time at each university, as well as a NING social networking site, and two live video conference meetings.

#### 12. Duration

7-8 weeks per semester.
13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

In the fall semester Victoria University began their class 3 weeks before UTEP. This was a valuable time to explain the collaboration and to impart a little background information about El Paso. This was followed by several homework exercises where students were asked to provide further information for discussion in the upcoming classes. These were fruitful exercises for introducing the broader themes of the collaborative course and the idea of imagining nations. For many of my students what they knew of their own country and El Paso or America was equally steeped in popular stereotypes. This was the kick start for the collaborative course and the critical inquiry of how nations are formed.

In the spring semester UTEP began class 3 weeks before Victoria University and so we would start by introducing our students to the nation of Australia. We engaged in a general survey of the geography, history, peoples, cultures, and politics of Australia. I also had the class engage in a scavenger hunt of sorts where they did an exercise where each student had to find three different facts about Australia. This encouraged early collaboration amongst their fellow students as well as learning about the peoples and the nation they were about to engage with. After attending COIL in September of 2012, I implemented the DIVE exercise as well to further their thinking on cultural diversity and it was very successful.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

We created a Web 2.0 platform using NING that consisted of our lectures, readings, discussion forums as well as a video link that allowed our students to upload the short digital stories that they created throughout the collaboration. Additionally, the NING site allowed each student to create their own personal pages where they were able to communicate with one another on a personal level. This was important because it allowed them to form personal friendships, which enhanced their trust in one another and made their experience more comfortable.

The Ning site catered for all asynchronous communication. Prior to the collaboration there were many discussions about how we were to approach this. What did eventuate was a well-planned design architecture which anticipated many different types of communication. This I felt would serve students with special needs (i.e. recently arrived migrants reluctant to post their work in a public forum). So the most important consideration was to create public and private spaces on the site, not only for assessment tasks but also for informal conversations between students. As Irma has stated above personal pages served their purpose. In short, private and discreet communication was allayed with semi-public and public spaces.

I also used email communication. This became a direct line to remind students of upcoming readings or postings.

15. Server location

The site was provided by UTEP but designed by both faculty members and the multimedia specialists from both universities.

The Ning site is an open source site and therefore cloud based. This proved especially useful for both institutions. If a LMS system was used it (i.e. from VU or UTEP) this would have created many problems with regards to logging on students. Initially both VU and UTEP offered an internal LMS configuration, but I strongly
believed this would have compromised the collaborative nature of the venture. A UTEP member of staff suggested Ning, and after exploring this and paying a price to remove the advertising, both VU and UTEP created a unique site without borders.

16. Technical problems

No, we did not encounter significant problems our video conferences ran smoothly and the NING site did not encounter any down time.

17. Frequency of use

The students were broken down into groups of 3 and each week a particular group was expected to post their critical responses of that week’s readings and/or videos. Then after the critical responses were posted, all students at both universities were expected to comment and discuss the responses, videos, and films together for the duration of the week and even collaboration if they found the topic interesting and felt the need to continue collaborating on a certain topic even if we had moved on to another. Neither Effy nor myself ever felt the need to stop a conversation that continued to grow and expand their knowledge.

Irma and I worked very closely on the structure of the collaborative course and assessment tasks. It seemed rather incongruous not to employ similar strategies. Students were divided into work groups for particular readings and set screenings. I also used the major themes of the readings as a springboard for promoting further research by students. As Irma states, there were particular themes which captured the students’ imagination and this in itself created a flurry of conversations and further explorations. This was the hallmark of the GLC. Students sharing personal knowledge and learning from each other.

18. Informal communication

We created a discussion forum that was not intended for academic discussion. We entitled it the UTEP-VU Forum. In this forum the students could discuss their weekend events, their jobs, entertainment venues, hobbies, music, etc. It often turned into a vibrant site where our students began sharing videos of themselves and their passions. For example there were some very good photographers who shared amazing photos, and some students who danced competitively and shared videos of their dance competitions. It often became a venue for introducing themselves to one another in a more relaxed environment.

The information architecture of the site was planned to provide informal and formal forums. As Irma has noted, students were most willing to share their personal interests and activities. Additionally, one particular assessment task was aimed at the sharing of individual family histories.

19. Re-use

Yes we would. As it stands right now UTEP is in the process of creating a new Learning Management System but there is still much work to be done with it so in the meantime I believe that the NING sites created thus far will continue to serve the purpose of the UTEP-VU Global Learning Community. Once we perfect the new LMS then we will probably change.

Ning is the perfect platform as it is cloud based. It reflects the spirit of a collaborative framework beyond borders.
Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

We videoconferenced twice during each collaboration. The first time that we ever videoconferenced we scheduled our meeting for one hour. After our initial meeting our students complained that this was not enough time. We then increased our meeting times to an hour and a half and sometimes they extended as long as two hours because the conversation was lively and exciting.

Despite the rather archaic nature of video conferencing, students respond well to seeing each other in the ‘flesh’. In fact with each collaboration, the students always ask for more time to video conference!

21. Server location

Each institution had their own video conferencing facility

22. Technical problems

No we did not. UTEP and VU have been collaborating for a number of years now so their video conferencing equipment is very compatible.

23. Frequency of use

The classes collaborated for 7-8 weeks and in that timeframe the classes collaborated twice by video conference. Outside of class they were expected to access the Discussion Boards on NING and they did. Most students were quite active on the discussion boards.

24. Informal communication

We provided a separate discussion board that was strictly informal where the students could discuss anything but class assignments. They discussed movies, music, they asked each other questions about their respective locations, like how much is minimum wage and what do you do on weekends, ...

NING also allows students to create personal pages and many of them communicated informally in this venue.

25. Re-use

Yes until we find something that provides more than what NING provides us we will keep using it.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

We administered a pre-assessment survey to measure the student’s knowledge of both Australia and the U.S.-Mexico Border and we also queried their technology skills. Then we administered a post-assessment survey to measure knowledge gained. At UTEP we also had focus group sessions with the students. We put the students in two groups of 10 and each group met with our Research Associate where they discussed their experiences...
Over the 7 week collaboration the students developed intercultural awareness in a number of ways. After attending COIL we used the DIVE exercise prior to them meeting each other. We also placed the students in groups of 3 and their first assignment was to create a digital story on how they imagined Australia (UTEP students) and the U.S.-Mexico Border (VU students). Near the end of the collaboration the groups made another digital story but this time they presented their region and/or country to the international students. The students also shared readings over the 7 weeks and each week a different group from each university was responsible for leading discussion for that week’s reading.

I undoubtedly believe that the class assignments facilitated a deeper learning of different regions and cultures. The students began doing research on their own and creating their own digital stories to further inform one another of their cultures and homelands. They also asked us to keep the NING site open for a period of time after the semester ended so that they could continue communicating with one another.

Additionally, the website and video conferences provided a forum for UTEP and VU students to exchange ideas related to global issues. I think that the VU students showed more interest in the border region but I also think that the media and its reporting of the drug violence had a lot to do with this because often that was what they asked about. For my UTEP class, however, this turned into a teaching and learning moment as we discussed the manner in which the media constructs political and cultural spaces and borders in particular. UTEP and VU students also enhanced their knowledge of technological resources and developed social and academic networks.

VU and UTEP students were also asked to write a reflective essay and to consider the course content, the collaboration and their personal experiences. This proved especially worthwhile and indeed was a measure of the success of the collaboration.

As one student wrote; “To conclude, it was a very enlightening experience for me with UTEP students who are on the other side of the world and our students. I thoroughly enjoyed myself and its sad that it has come to an end...I would like to thank Effy, Irma, UTEP students and my group for a wonderful experience and great discussions and thank you for allowing me to share my views.”

27. Common assessment rubric

The pre and post-assessment surveys were common to both universities and the digital stories and group discussion posts were common.

The group discussion posts were based on the shared reading(s) for the week and students were assessed on their analytical and comprehension skills and their ability to produce a short summary of the key ideas of selected texts.

As for the digital stories, students were assessed on their ability to do research on either Australia or the U.S.-Mexico border and put together a creative 2-3 minute digital story. The UTEP students also received a workshop training to learn the necessary software. In this training they were assigned a short exercise to familiarize them with the necessary tools and they received a grade for that as well.

Unfortunately, the resources at VU were rudimentary at best. Film skills were harnessed from the students themselves or from students doing one of my other units. But this did not dampen VU student enthusiasm.

28. Assessment outcomes

The activities exposed the students to multiple cultures and environments and expanded their cultural literacy through structured interactions and academic content. The role of technology was important in enhancing their
access to global and multicultural interactions and we managed to pique their interest in participating in study abroad.

Moreover, the assignments increased student knowledge about Australia and the U.S.-Mexico border and assisted them in addressing and clarifying stereotypes about the U.S.-Mexico border and Australia. I think that the group discussions about the readings and the video conferences increased engagement in the course content and created an “energized” class atmosphere.

The students also improved their communication skills and gained an ability to examine multiple perspectives.

29. Peer assessment

No at UTEP

At VU, students were asked to submit a confidential individual report about their group work (either film or written summaries) via email. The details of the report were read only by me. My main objective for the exercise was to allay the concerns of some group members who felt that some of their peers had not contributed to the required task. The dynamics of group work was a subject that I addressed directly in class in order to promote student collegiality. Interestingly, the exercise of confidential reports was abandoned some time after. Most students worked well.

30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

This is from the UTEP syllabus:

Student Conduct: [From the Handbook of Operating Procedures: Student Affairs]: Each student is responsible for notice of and compliance with the provisions of the Regents Rules and Regulations, which are available for inspection electronically at http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules/homepage.htm.

We will have frequent discussions and students are expected to tolerate and respect the opinions of others. All students are expected to behave as responsible adults.

31. Attrition

UTEP: 1-2 students out of an enrollment of 20

VU: 2-3 students out of an enrollment of 30

32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution

At UTEP this is not typical, the drop-out rate is higher in other classes and I definitely think that globally networked nature of the course had a lot to do with it. Once the class started and the students became aware of how it was going to function, they were comfortable, and attentive.

At VU the dropout rates are the result of extraneous factors. Difficulties at home or financial constraints do matter. Students often juggle paid employment, the demands of family and study. However, it is rare for a student to drop out of the GLC. Those who have were for the above reasons.
## Section 7: Institutional Support

### 33. Engagement with the international programs office

At UTEP we are now working closely with the Director of Study Abroad who comes to the class every semester to discuss study abroad options with the students. The International Programs Office and Study Abroad are located in the same office so there is contact with both.

VU has worked closely with UTEP in order to foster study abroad programs. The International Programs Office facilitates these activities through grants and scholarships. Most students who have completed the collaborative course desire to visit UTEP. Typically, those who have taken up the exchange give a lecture to the next GLC cohort.

### 34. Commitment

Yes, both institutions have made substantial commitments at the administrative, teaching, and technology levels to keeping the global learning collaborations intact. There is one in session right now and two more planned for fall 2013. We are also looking to expand the classes with new faculty members and themes.

### 35. Future iterations

It is being offered again this semester and there are two classes scheduled for fall 2013.

### 36. New globally networked courses

We do. It is my understanding that the directors of the units that are implementing the classes are discussing the expansion of the classes. They are in the process of identifying faculty members and possible themes.

### 37. Response of deans, chairs, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

At UTEP there is strong support for globalization and there has been positive response to the Global Learning pilot. Presentations on the GLC have been done all over campus to a number of deans and chairs who are willing to host a GLC. If a faculty member is willing to create such a learning space there is support. Health Sciences has a similar learning collaboration with VU at the graduate level.

The VU charter embraces internationalisation. Indeed the GLC has inspired many other faculties to adopt such collaboration. The creative writing faculty has already done so.

### 38. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Overall UTEP’s relationship with Victoria University is well-established and the GLC is just one of many commitments that the universities have with one another and there is no doubt that the work we have begun will be further developed.

The VU GLC is one among many initiatives that have developed between UTEP and VU. To echo Irma’s sentiments, we have plans for many more!
### 39. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Connections to more international partners.

### Section 8: Reflections

#### 40. Goals set

- To find a way to examine the differences and commonalities of peoples located halfway around the world.
- To build a collaborative learning experience between two classrooms.
- To compare and organize themes for successful student interaction.
- To identify the tools that would allow our students to share and exchange experiences and perceptions of their different cultures.

#### 41. Goals achieved

I think that we achieved the vast majority of our goals. There is always room for improvement and this is a work in progress. We have a solid and stable array of technological tools but we have changed readings, videos, and weekly themes at times to accommodate a change in discussion.

#### 42. Most unique aspect for students

Meeting and interacting live with people who are on another continent. Learning about new cultures, languages, foods, music, art, history, etc.

The most unique experience of the GLC was the cross-cultural dialogues between students. This served to lessen cultural stereotypes. For the VU students, their knowledge of the US was confined to popular culture as seen in Hollywood westerns. The distinctive and diverse culture of the El Paso region shattered many of their preconceptions and led to many embracing the diversity and heterogeneous nature of American society. In short, many of the VU students not only saw similarities in the formation of the two nations but were able to historically contextualize their differences.

Another unique experience was the personal and academic collegiality that blossomed between students (and staff for that matter!)

#### 43. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The video conference discussions were usually designed around a film that was screened by both classes prior to the conference.

From a pedagogical perspective, ideas about teaching and learning developed well beyond the confines of the institution. This was an exhilarating experience. With regards to the practice of teaching, it enabled a more reflective approach to the processes in which students learn. For example regular classroom teaching is bound by weekly class times and the course schedules i.e. a two-hour class per week and a course calendar. At times, there is a tendency to over-elaborate and intervene so as to get through the course material. Clearly, the amount of time left for student reflection or problem solving is confined to assessment tasks. With the GLC this process of reflection and problem solving for students was not bound by class time and in fact was turned upside down.
As we found out, the forums also were a great pedagogical tool for instigating critical thinking and reflection. Students were conversing 24/7. The process of reflection and problem solving was ongoing with students sharing personal knowledge inspired from the course readings and then networking these ideas through the forums, which created peer collaboration. Often, students would reflect back to the course readings to substantiate their comments. The tendency of the instructor to hold back and not intervene in this process was a new experience.

### 44. Most problematic aspects from a pedagogical perspective

At VU, the 8 week collaboration needed to be longer. The possibility of extending the collaboration for an entire semester would be terrific. Other than this there were no problems at all.

### 45. Changes for future iterations

It would be terrific to extend the collaboration for an entire semester.

### 46. Technical support

The UTEP instructional designer was a hands-on person who responded to our requests and our conception of how the site needed to be organized. These pedagogical requirements were taken with utmost seriousness and facilitated a smooth communication between all parties. As this was the development of the first GLC it does not compare to any other course offered at either universities.

### 47. International programs person

For VU once the platform had been decided upon, it was clear that the input of the instructional designer from UTEP was invaluable, as he had used the platform previously. However, in terms of organizing the type of forums, and catering for private and public areas on the site, this was largely conceptualized by the teaching staff. His invaluable contributions of site-specific graphics for the collaboration was inspirational.

### 48. Time commitment

Planning started several months (3-4) prior to the collaboration. Possible collaborative courses were discussed. Once this was agreed upon, the teaching staff collaborated on course content. Irma and I brought in mutual themes from two separate courses, in order to consolidate the material into one course.

Planning the timeline and length of the collaborative course was essential. Difference in semester dates and the coordination of these was vital for the success of the project.

The HOW? Discussions on how to deliver the course and the type of platform to be used was paramount in ensuring the success of the collaboration. It took approximately a month to decide which was the best option. Instructional designers from both UTEP and VU were called in and they showcased possible options especially existing LMS at VU and UTEP. We felt these options compromised the spirit of the global collaboration and that the platform needed to be cloud based. Suggestions for creating an independent website were touted until the instructional designer suggested the Ning site, an open source cloud based platform. This was perfect for students. They could log on without any institutional licensing barriers and the sharing of resources became non problematic. It was a site without boundaries. The only pitfall was a fee charged for the removal of advertising. Initially this was a meager fee of $40. However, this has changed once Ning became a fee-paying site.
49. Was it worth it?

Most definitely! For both students and staff, the collaboration enhanced cultural flows across borders. The course; *Imagining Nations, Imagining Regions: The Making of Cultural Diversity in Australia and on the U.S.-Mexico Border*, ran smoothly during the UTEP fall semester and the VU semester 2. The delivery was well coordinated and well received by the student cohort. What is important to note here is that any new iteration of the same course will render different results largely as the student cohort brings with it a different set of interests and personalities and thus changes the nature of each iteration. This unexpected quality gives this form of collaborative teaching its dynamism.

We believe that such collaboration has limitless possibilities and a different faculty member would also bring a new sensibility, just as a different/additional institution would. Therefore these types of collaborations are staff, student and site specific.

Section 9: Student Feedback

**UTEP Comments:**

“*Besides gaining friends, this was a new experience that most people haven’t experienced yet. Even though it was an “experiment,” I believe it turned out to be very successful. We learned together and we could ask each other for help. I think we learned tolerance, too, because of so many topics we had to express. Everyone had different opinions and point of views.*”

and

“*Prior to taking this course, I had a very vague and incorrect view of Australia...however, with this [GLC] collaboration, I was fortunate to learn many things about the country. It is incredible for me to have realized that our region [U.S.-MX border] has noticeable similarities than I would have never imagined.*”

**VU Comments:**

“*My understanding of other countries and cultures has been enriched so much as a result of the GLC. I felt being able to interact with the UTEP students allowed me to gain more knowledge of the US-Mexico border, especially because it is coming from their personal perspectives.*”

“*I believe interacting with UTEP students helped me to achieve my course objectives. Their questions and curiosity about our issues, history, culture etc. made it even more interesting and motivating to research the information myself with the intent of sharing it with everyone. I felt it was a good relationship and we all contributed well.*”
### Abstract

The international collaboration between The Actors College of Theatre and Television Training in Sydney, Australia and Corning Community College in Corning, New York has been an innovative project to create a partnership between theatre students in the area of voice and movement training. Instructors in both locations have had experience with similar approaches to voice training, however, our student populations were enrolled in their respective institutions for disparate reasons. The application of our pedagogy was therefore necessarily slightly different at each school, and the level of engagement of the students with one another tended to reflect these differences in intensity and immersion in the work.

Our narrative is an overview of the weeks of collaborative assignments between our two classes, and an assessment of their relative successes and challenges. Technology, timing, facilities issues, and time for assessment were major factors that sometimes hampered the process, and in the specific case of the latter assessment piece, have left the process in many ways to be continued.

Our conclusion about the value of our collaboration as faculty, artists, and course designer is unanimously positive, and we share a belief in the great potential of such academic/artistic international collaborations for enriching the educational experience of young artists in training and providing opportunities for students in less-privileged circumstances to avail themselves of international partnerships. The broadening of the artistic experience of students in separate cultures by sharing a class in a performance-specific discipline via online technology is a positive and desirable outcome of our project.

Our caveats about the undertaking include a recognition of the importance of keeping assignments simple and manageable, and a recognition of the significant additional time needed for planning, implementation, and assessment of an online, international collaborative course. Administrative leadership and support, and access to adequate instructional resources, including proper facilities, audio-visual media technology, and funding are key to the success of these projects. Unexpected challenges as well as triumphs will emerge in the implementation of the coursework, and in order to properly manage and assess these, the proper time and respect for the discipline and its unique requirements is necessary to develop the process.
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### Section 1: General Course Information

#### 1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Voice and Movement</td>
<td>Actors College of Theatre ad TV, Australia; Corning Community College</td>
<td>Theatre and Voice</td>
<td>Freshmen and Sophomore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Mary Guzzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Corning Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Communications and Humanities-Theatre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Jayne Peaslee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Corning Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Director of the Center for Teaching Innovation &amp; Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Learning Resources Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Linda Nicholls-Gidley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Actors College of Theatre and Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Voice and Dialect Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Voice Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?
Spring 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution
Corning Community College - 15 students
Actors College of Theatre and Television - 20 students

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?
For Corning Community College, this was a typical size class for performance courses.
For Actors College of Theatre and Television, this class is slightly smaller than in previous years. In the past the class size has been around 24 students for this course.
At CCC, this was a slightly larger class than usual. Two students who had taken the course before, asked to re-enroll and take the course again because of the global network opportunity.
## Section 2: Issues of Language

| 6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution |
| Corning Community College - English |
| Actors College of Theatre and Television - English. |

| 7. Primary language of most students in each class |
| Corning Community College - English |
| Actors College of Theatre and Television - English. However, we had a French student and an Italian student as well as a number of second language speakers in the class. The Actors College of Theatre and Television has in the past enrolled at least one international student per year. |

| 8. Language of course collaboration |
| English |

| 9. Language fluency |
| The student participants were fluent in English. |

| 10. Language proficiency difference |
| At Corning Community College, I observe that many students are not as adept at articulating their experience in writing, although they can verbally express their insights when they feel comfortable. Two students expressed to me that they sometimes felt intimidated by the level of articulation the Actor’s College Students exhibited in talking and writing about the course work. While this is not specifically a basic language skills issue, it does speak to an issue that I find particularly critical at our college: our students are very sensitive to appearing “stupid” or “foolish” in front of other people, and so they often tend not to speak at all or to share their thoughts freely with people they don’t know well. I observed, both in the audio posts and the written posts in Blackboard and on Facebook, that CCC students tended to limit a lot of their comments to “Great job!” They were more articulate in early audio posts. As technology difficulties and schedule differences began to weigh in on the course work, I found that on our students’ side, the engagement tapered off even more, although they remained engaged in our face-to-face class. |

In the past I have always asked my students to write their observations in a more traditional format, either essay style or journal style. I was aware that the students seemed to discuss their experiences in more detail in the audio/video posts and was often surprised by the links and parallels that they drew in discussion. Their final assessment task, which involved a written reflection of the vocal techniques covered and their overall understanding of the work lacked the same depth. In terms of overall communication the language barrier was absent, but as Mary points out there was a divide evident in the responses from CCC and ACTT. |
Section 3: Curricular Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Online or blended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each course was offered in a blended format using the Blackboard CE version 8 learning management system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our classes collaborated about nine weeks. We also attempted to keep the students in contact with each other beyond that period by creating a class Group page on Facebook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After the actual collaboration period students continued to communicate for a limited time using a Facebook group page. Initially I think the students were quite excited to be connecting through a more friendly user interface. It provided an easy forum for both Mary and I to post final performance ‘product’ and it allowed for each class group to observe where the other took the voice work. The Facebook interaction lasted until the end of the ACTT semester, and aside from the video posts by Mary and myself there was very little posted or commented on by the student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both classes used Blackboard CE version 8, YouTube, a Facebook Group page and Windows Audio Recorder. Students used smart phones, laptops, desktops, iPad, Tablet for communication and recording movement and voice. The instructors and the instructional designer met frequently, as many times as once a week, via Skype. Email was the main source of communication between instructors and the instructional designer due to time differences. Australian students mainly used smart phones to communicate with the American students via Blackboard and Facebook. The American students used primarily laptops and desktops. The highest percentage was with the Blackboard LMS, as they were required to post on the LMS once a fortnight. Approximately 80 percent of engagement would have been via Blackboard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Server location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard was provided by Corning Community College.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Technical problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC students and I encountered varying levels of difficulty ranging from moderate to extreme. The Blackboard version we used made posting audio and video links somewhat complicated. As students were relying on whatever personal computers, smart phones, tablet hardwared and software they owned or had access to, the differences in these technologies often led to great difficulty for some students to complete assignments. As an instructor, I attempted to video students’ final assignments using my personal Samsung Galaxy tablet, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
found when reviewing what I had captured that the sound quality was so poor on most of the videos, that I couldn’t post them. The acoustics in the room where the class had to be held are very poor, and added to the mediocre sound recording quality of my equipment, made most of what I recorded unusable.

An additional problem that I felt strongly was the tension between trying to deliver the course content, and also be a video and audio technician in class in order to try to capture adequate images and sound to share. One of the most important aspects of beginning Voice and Movement training, particularly in our environment at CCC, is to help students let go of self-conscious, self-monitoring behavior, and to allow the voice and body to become free and uninhibited. I wanted to keep the camera or recorder in the background, so that students would not focus on the fact that they were being recorded, which can often lead to further inhibition in people who are already locked or blocked vocally and physically. For that reason, the technical quality of what I was able to record of our class work suffered. When it came to a choice between the students’ educational experience of the Voice and Movement work and doing a professional video of the work, I had to choose the former.

In any future collaboration of this nature, I feel it would be very important to have a videographer working with the instructor, and time for an editing process after the class work is done, in order to be able to share students’ actual process and progress in the class, and provide an adequate visual record for discussion and feedback. That is NOT to say that “failures” would be edited out, but rather that the technical quality of the images and sound would be sufficient for actual educational benefit to both instructors and students in both locations. A good videographer becomes like part of the furniture in the classroom, so that students and instructor forget about him/her and the camera and mics, and can go about their work unselfconsciously.

I recognize that this requires more resources, more personnel, and more time to adequately support the delivery of this type of online learning. But, I firmly believe that in order for online education to be in any way as effective as face-to-face classroom instruction, this is what it takes.

The main technical difficulty for the ACTT students was accessing the Blackboard LMS. Initially we had difficulty with enrolling the students and then when they were enrolled the passwords (based on date of birth) that we were provided with were incorrect, so it took some time to work out which passwords were valid and which weren’t and how to rectify the problem easily from Australia without having to wait for CCC to come on-line. Many of the students found the blackboard system difficult to navigate and often stated that they weren’t sure if they had posted in the right folder, or indeed if they had posted at all.

We had some difficulty with the age and processing power of the ACTT computers, the speed of the internet connection was fairly low, making uploads of audio and video files an arduous task. And as the school is housed in an old church building even the 3G network did not work as well as I had hoped, so streaming video/audio files posted by CCC students was difficult. I was also operating solo as ACTT has no technical staff and there was little understanding of our collaboration.

The students did not find recording via their smart phones and tablets difficult and I was able to overcome the difficulties regarding videoing the students by asking that the students take charge of the recording equipment.

17. Frequency of use

As a class, reference was given to Blackboard web links and file postings. Students were expected to login weekly and use the asynchronous tools outside of class with Discussion postings.

18. Informal communication

Both instructors encouraged “chats” and additional discussion threads on an informal level.

Cultural differences in communication contributed to the frequency with which students in both locations used these tools. As instructor, I posted several times to spur discussion and in response to some students’
comments.
The blackboard LMS was a little foreign to the students at ACTT, where no LMS is used. I think that if the facebook page had been introduced earlier greater informal engagement would have presented itself. I also think that the students would have checked in more regularly.

19. Re-use

Corning Community College now has Blackboard Learn 9.1 which is easier to incorporate video and audio files. Plus CCC has a new blade server that can handle these types of files without using a separate media server.

As instructor in the course at CCC, I would use the tools if I had adequate time to train and become proficient with them. As it currently stands, there is limited support for faculty to obtain release time for trainings and for projects such as the COIL project. As our project was admittedly one of the more ambitious undertakings, it would follow that we needed more support in the areas I reference. I did not get that support at the institutional administrative level. My contention is, and will be throughout this exercise, that at the administrative level of our institution, there must be an awakening of consciousness about the value of these kinds of projects for our students’ success in the emerging workforce and the workforce of the future, and that this awakening must lead to a change in the way we implement the projects we undertake. This means that the technology and the means to utilize it properly must be made available, and that the proper time and material and human resources be brought to bear upon these projects in the planning stages as well as the implementation of the course.

For a college like ACTT I would have to think more closely about whether the Blackboard LMS is a useful avenue to engage students in the kind of free-flowing and personal communication that performance work encourages. In the future I would lean towards a greater percentage of social media posting, such as a closed group page on Facebook, where the students already have a presence and feel more at ease.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

We did not use synchronous tools, because of the time difference between our countries. The instructors used SKYPE regularly (weekly when possible) to chat and check in about the progress of our courses.

21. Server location

We provided our own technology and software. CCC’s instructor used her home system, as she is not provided with SKYPE at the institution.

22. Technical problems

The satellite connection was often very sketchy. In upstate NY, I had recently moved to a new house that had problems with telephone wiring and the DSL connection. Severe weather would often cause my SKYPE connection to be wiped out. This situation seems to have improved after repeated complaints and visits from Verizon. In my experience last year, however, I often had to resort to texting during our regular SKYPE meetings, because we could not maintain the satellite connection and lost audio and video.

23. Frequency of use

See above. We did not use synchronous technology due to time differences.
### 24. Informal communication

The most effective thing we did was post our syllabus in Blackboard, and to finally set up a FaceBook group page.

### 25. Re-use

As instructor at CCC, I would use Facebook in a heartbeat. It is user-friendly, very easy to set up, and does not require multiple secret handshakes to access. Posting is very simple. The biggest drawback is the time it can take to upload videos. As someone whose workload requires her to run from class to meeting to rehearsal, often with five to ten minutes in between, five days a week, plus rehearsals on Saturday, I need my technology to be easy and fast and very user-friendly. Otherwise, I don’t have time to wrestle with it, and I won’t use it.

Mary and I agree on this one, I would use Facebook again quite readily. I understand that the new Blackboard LMS is more user friendly, but this doesn’t over-ride the fact that ACTT has no technical support and any support from CCC is a-synchronous, so a day away. Despite our instructional designers fantastic assistance with training on the system and the screen shots that allowed me to ‘train’ my class on the system, I still think that working on a social networking site, where being user-friendly is paramount, would suit my classes better.

### Section 6: Assessment Information

#### 26. How?

Students at CCC were assessed with a typical A-F grade at the conclusion of the course. Disciplinary assessment criteria used include on-time completion of assignments, attendance and level of engagement in the classroom, successful application or demonstrated progress in the application of breathing and alignment work, imaging, connecting vibration to breath, understanding and application of exercises to free the neck, the spine, the jaw, and other parts of the vocal instrument in order to allow free, expressive sound connected to a free, expressive body. We also did rudimentary work with the International Phonetic Alphabet, and explored British, Australian (specifically because of our collaboration with the Actors College), and Southern dialects. I did not have a graded assignment on IPA or specific dialect.

Assessment of the development of intercultural awareness has been informal. Our performance students at CCC, two of whom participated in last year’s Voice and Movement COIL class, asked for the first time in my experience at CCC to do a play that required a dialect in the Fall of 2012. This indicates to me that the students became more interested in exploring cultures different from their own. We produced Noel Coward’s BLITHE SPIRIT, and worked extensively with British Received Pronunciation and style in rehearsals. The students in the cast understood the importance of doing historical and cultural research in order to develop their characters. The two students who participated in the COIL class were leaders in encouraging this type of immersion into their roles.

Students at ACTT were graded as ‘competent’ or ‘not-yet-competent’. As with the students at CCC the ACTT students were assessed on timely completion of tasks, exploration and application of breathing and alignment techniques, demonstrated progress release of tension in the jaw, neck and shoulders, demonstrated understanding of phonation and demonstrated connection between the voice and body in a performance context.
27. Common assessment rubric

We did not create a common assessment rubric. CCC students take our course for different reasons from those of the students at the Actors College, and the two groups need different assessment criteria and tools.

FROM CCC FACULTY: At the outset of the course, I intended to create a rubric for the course with little boxes of words of the sort that we are asked to create for SUNY, and frankly, I just ran out of time, and have not created such a document for the Voice and Movement course yet. The form is still attached to the syllabus that Linda and I created together. As an acting and voice teacher, and as a director of my students’ performance projects, I am constantly assessing and feeding back to them my observations of their work. This real time feedback/critique is based on the training and assessment I have received both in the academy and in professional workshops that I have taken throughout my life as an artist and educator, in addition to my own artistic experience. Assessment of performance work requires that the instructor be constantly present in the moment that the student’s work is occurring, and very aware of where the student is coming from as well as how proficiently he or she is executing the current exercise or performing in today’s rehearsal. Providing feedback in a performing arts setting is different from grading an essay. The assessment tools and the process are different. They include an assessment of a student’s emotional and physical availability as well as intellectual acumen, and indeed their physical and emotional ability to rise to the demands of the work on a given day. I always take notes on specific aspects of students’ individual performance and also on their ability to connect to others in specific exercises in the work. From time to time, I have flights of fancy about writing up these observations and compiling them into a kind of Assessment Journal for the Voice and Movement, Acting, and even Production classes I have taught during the past seven years. Given that my course load is so varied, and so intense, and never lets up, this is a fancy that remains a fancy. It’s the thing that tends to fall through the cracks, because adequate time for reflection on the work we’ve just done in any given semester is not something that we have at our institution. We are on to the next round of committee meetings, and advising weeks, and textbook requisitions and course schedules and requests for what we’ll be doing next year before the current semester is even half over. Real recorded assessment in my particular situation remains a worthy goal, although I have created and completed assessment rubrics in other courses: Introduction to Theatre and Introduction to Acting. Prior to my arrival at CCC, no formal course assessment documents existed in theatre courses, so I am slowly creating them from scratch.

28. Assessment outcomes

N/A

29. Peer assessment

At CCC, I spoke to students informally about their experience in the COIL parts of the course, and their feelings about the process. We did not ask our students in the two different colleges to assess each other, although they often offered each other informal encouragement and feedback in audio or Facebook posts. I observed that the Actors’ College students were very generous in posting self-assessments on the Facebook page regarding their Voice and Movement work. Our students were less forthcoming with those self-assessments, although in class they often offered each other feedback. In hindsight, a formal student peer assessment might have been useful to help students focus and reflect on specifics of their International Collaboration, as well as on their experience of the class work.

I utilize peer assessment in a classroom setting during almost every class. At the beginning the assessment is about observation, what can they see in someone else, so that they can develop an understanding of what might be happening in their own voice/body. Towards the end of the semester students are asked to informally assess the work of others with a view to increasing their voice and movement vocabulary/lexicon (how they
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30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

N/A

31. Attrition

My recollection is that one student dropped the CCC class, or failed to complete the class and received a failing grade.

All enrolled students at ACTT completed the course.

32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

Attrition and drop rates in performance classes are low compared to the drop rates in other types of classes, in my experience. (I also teach a traditional lecture style survey class in Humanities, so I see how students relate to both types of classes.) I do not think the globally networked nature of this course had any bearing on the drop rate. Students were as engaged as they usually are, and perhaps slightly more so because of the opportunity to connect to a class in another country. I believe that the technical problems we experienced and the schedule differences (especially college breaks) caused some CCC students to become slightly discouraged with the collaboration at the end of the course.

If dropouts are to occur they usually happen at the end of the year rather than at the mid-point, so the collaboration, which was completed by the end of semester 1, would have had no bearing on any drop rates.

33. Please post anonymous comments from your students’ course evaluations if these are available. Group them by institution and include both positive and negative evaluations.

N/A

Section 7: Institutional Support

34. Type of support

FROM CCC FACULTY: I have alluded to some of the issues with institutional support above. At CCC, we did not apply for this grant as a team. An administrator who is no longer with CCC generated the grant, and invited faculty to participate. I was one of two faculty who responded to his invitation. This individual did a very thorough job of writing the grant, I believe. He was very helpful to me in reaching out to international partners. I directed him to the Voice and Speech Trainers Association (VASTA) for possible partners, and he helped very much in crafting language to describe the collaborative project I hoped to evolve. At the time the invitation went out to participate in COIL, I was -- as usual -- immersed in directing a big show. I did not have much input into writing the grant, but did communicate with the international voice faculty who responded, one of whom was Linda. Up until the Institute Workshops were on our calendars, we did not understand that our International partners’ travel to the workshops wasn’t funded by the grant. Our Communications and Humanities Division did come up with the funds to bring our partners from Australia and Mexico to participate in the first Institute workshops. I feel that this was exemplary support on the part of the Communications and Humanities Associate.
Dean of Instruction.

In getting all of the students from both institutions enrolled in the COIL course, there were some administrative hiccups in the beginning. CCC IT administration balked at first at allowing Actors’ College students into the course through our Blackboard, but eventually this was worked out, thanks to the efforts primarily of our technical partner, Jayne Peaslee, and members of the IT staff.

I am a one and a half person theatre faculty within the Communications and Humanities division. There was no one to provide any pedagogical support in Voice and Movement at my institution. Linda and I developed the bulk of our course at the Institute workshop and then via email in the three months following, before our courses began in January/February 2012. I feel that our similar backgrounds in Voice and Movement training and the intercultural awareness that was honed at the Institute workshops helped us to come up with a viable course outline, although our different schedules and the time zone differences made implementation of the work challenging from the outset. The technology issues added to the challenge. However, I can say unequivocally that the opportunity to connect with and work with Linda has been for me the very best experience. I learned a lot from observing the work she did with her class, and from the exchanges we had about the voice and body, our challenges as teachers of voice, and the exchanges I was able to have with both CCC and Actors’ College students on Facebook and in my classroom. This was not my first experience working with artists from other cultures, so that aspect of the collaboration was not new to me, though it was for my students. For me to have a colleague in the discipline, however, even one who was on the other side of the world, was worth any of the challenges of trying to make it happen. I hope one day that Linda will come and do a master residency in voice at CCC, or dialect coach a production that I direct. Those are the outcomes I hoped might happen when I volunteered to participate in the COIL grant at CCC.

The unflagging professionalism and support of Jayne Peaslee as our instructional designer was invaluable to our course having the success that it enjoyed. Jayne helped me to navigate the vagaries of Blackboard, set up our ways of connecting audio links and video links to YouTube posts by students.

Administratively, our strongest support came from our Communications and Humanities ADI, Byron Shaw, and technically from Jayne. It is my assessment that Linda and I performed well at delivering our course content and encouraging the intercultural exchange as well as the disciplinary exchange between our students. I am unsatisfied with my own ability to record final performances of the CCC students, and I did not do an adequate job of formal assessment. I also think CCC students did not communicate as generously about their experiences with the Voice work as the Actors’ College students did, although they were continually encouraged to do so. However, I observed a definite positive influence on the CCC students from their contact with students of another culture. Their horizons were broadened. They now know students who are pursuing training and careers in the arts in another country, should they choose to maintain those contacts. They have broadened their facility with dialects. Most importantly, they have had another exposure to the level of commitment and training necessary to maintain a life in art.

Overall, the great success of our project for me lies in having made a relationship with another teaching artist in the world.

The greatest weakness lies in the lack of administrative support for COIL, and the seeming lack of interest of the institution at large for fostering international collaboration; or any collaboration. The person who generated the grant at CCC did not support the faculty as a team. We did not have regular meetings, unless we begged for them, and even then, we had one meeting of Ryan Hersha, Jayne Peaslee, James Jansen, and myself. Faculty were unable to secure any release time to give the attention and time needed to support a new (to me) initiative in our work, nor were any additional resources offered to us.

I do not mind expressing that I feel anger and a sense of betrayal. I wanted to reach out and broaden my students’ and my own artistic and educational experience in this particular area of performance training. I feel
that I was not fully supported, and even punished for having taken the initiative to do something different. I took a great deal of extra work on -- certainly financially uncompensated -- to an already overstretched load. There has been no acknowledgement of this to date, and I do not expect any, nor that my initiative will be in any way encouraged or rewarded.

At ACTT I had no financial support, my trip to the COIL workshop was funded by myself and CCC, and then only organized (about a week and a half out from the workshop) and cemented when I offered to utilise my frequent flyer miles to pay for the bulk of the flight. My colleagues and the Director of ACTT believed that the initial introduction and planning was part of a greater scam that I was getting involved in. I had no administrative support, the Director of ACTT was concerned that there might be some ownership of material issues between the campuses and was also concerned for the student’s intellectual property rights, how long the Blackboard system would hold their posts etc, but other than that I had no conversations about how I was planning to administer the course or whether I needed any support from the college. Just getting a final class list from our administration team at ACTT to send to our Instructional Designer at CCC was an effort as they had other priorities. Pedagogical support came from my weekly Skype meeting with Mary and Jayne as did my technical support. As stated before, my director was interested only in the intellectual property of the students and was not sure that there was any gain for the college as a whole.

35. Engagement with international programs office

We have no international programs office at CCC.
We have no international programs office at ACTT

36. Importance given to globally networked learning

N/A

37. Commitment

See Above.

From the ACTT perspective, my director was happy for me to participate in the COIL project as long as she did not see any negative effects on the level of teaching or engagement of the students. To this end I embarked on this journey as a singular commitment, though I hope to remain connected with both Mary, Jayne and COIL in the future.

38. Future iterations

No. There have been changes in my international partner’s employment. She has moved to a more advanced performance training program, and that institution would not be a good fit with our beginning performance students.

39. New globally networked courses

I think that there might be other COIL courses in other disciplines. I do not know about the performing arts. I would love to be able to engage in ongoing international collaborations. However, the conditions have to change at CCC. Currently, there are no plans under discussion.
40. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

To date, there has been no response, since we no longer have a full-time media specialist and Jayne Peaslee has taken on the role of COIL Nodal Network Coordinator due to James Jansen’s resignation. CCC does not have an instructional designer nor a technical assistant to train faculty with online pedagogy.

41. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

After I learned that we had been awarded the grant to pursue these online international collaborations, I found out that a colleague in the Sociology department had already done a COIL project years ago. I would say, based on the fact that her project went institutionally unsupported, and the lack of interest I have felt for my initiative, that our institution is presently not ready to commit to further developing my work.

I think it highly unlikely that ACTT would be involved in such a collaboration again.

42. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

(FROM CCC FACULTY): Probably an independently wealthy person appearing and offering to bankroll it. Barring that, some kind of ongoing attempt to educate our institution’s financial and mid-level administrators (i.e., advising staff, accounting staff, dean support staff) about the importance of developing online technologies to support international collaborations. Certainly, funding is a huge stumbling block. Declining state support of its public educational institutions of higher education has placed many colleges in the position of instituting extreme austerity measures. We’re about to start cutting into the bone, so perhaps a COIL project in performing arts is viewed as a luxury by those who do not have an appreciation of the value of performing arts as a discipline.

In addition to Mary’s comments I think that there needs to be a shift in the idea that performing arts courses cannot be globally networked. Since embarking on this journey I have discovered many new avenues of eliciting responses to learning outcome, particularly in the posting of audio responses. I have also found that being globally networked is an important strategy for the new institution that I am working for. Colleagues are finding ways to post content on-line and I have a friend who is working on a project to enable holographic technology in the classroom, so that institutional partners could literally be ‘virtually’ in the room with the international partner - that’s exciting stuff for people teaching about presence! However, before any of that happens there needs to be an open discussion about what is possible and a willingness to let go of traditional learning systems in favour of more user friendly systems.

Section 8: Reflections

43. Goals set

(CCC) (a.) To explore the feasibility of online artistic/educational collaboration in an area of performance pedagogy.

44. Goals achieved

(CCC) Point (a.) was very satisfactorily achieved from my point of view. As an educator in performing arts, I gained new perspectives from my international partner from the outset, as well as confidence in my own approach toward my students at our institution. I am more convinced than ever that, with proper institutional
and technical support, these collaborations are invaluable for students and instructors around the world. Particularly for students with limited opportunities to travel abroad, the opportunity to share an educational experience with students from other cultures and countries is very important.

**45. Most unique aspect for students**

(CCC) The opportunity to speak via audio file with the Australian students, and to share information about their countries, regions, backgrounds, and aspirations in the field of performing arts.

**46. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective**

(CCC) First were the cultural “icebreaker” exchanges via audio file. Second was the introduction of dialect work for our students, which resulted in students asking for a production at CCC in which they could use dialect.

**47. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective**

(CCC) Most problematic for me were the video posts, as the acoustics in our classroom and the poor audio quality of my equipment prevented us from sharing much of our final work in class.

**48. Changes for future iterations**

(CCC) I would insist upon release time to allow for the additional time necessary to adequately assess and share insights with my partner on the assignments as they were being completed by 40 students. I might also pare down the number of assignments we tried to implement. Very important: I would work with a videographer/audio engineer to ensure high quality audio and video to post. In a voice class, the quality of the visual and audio information is critical to the process.

**49. Technical support**

Jayne Peaslee, Director of Professional Development, was asked to be the instructional designer for this project since she coordinates and facilitates Blackboard course development for faculty. Unlike other courses offered at CCC, Jayne needed to consider the least common denominator for recording audio & video among the Australian students and the American students. Since the Australian students used smartphones primarily for audio and video recording then the American students were recommended to do the same. Linda was unable to access the Blackboard server to post audio and video files so YouTube and Windows Audio Recorder were used to post video and audio files in Blackboard. In 2011-12 CCC faculty used professional video and audio recording and editing equipment. Files were stored on a Blackboard server which were linked to the Blackboard course. Collaboration with the Australian students required like-for-like equipment so we opted for less technical equipment such as the smart phones.

**50. International programs person**

N/A

**51. Time commitment**

(CCC) I spent as much time developing this one globally networked course as I spend developing a full theatre production, which is the equivalent of two or three courses, though it isn’t compensated that way. I would normally put about 100 to 140 hours into developing a completely new traditional course, and with the Institute, the emails and SKYPE meetings, and time spent on creation of the syllabus and course calendar, we far exceeded that number. I still believe that the time I expended was not enough time. Given the lack of adequate
technology (video and audio), I could not have given much more productive time to that aspect. At the end of the semester, the workload was so intense that I did not have adequate time to give to the final assessment piece of the project. I also had a professional opportunity for the summer that developed unexpectedly, and I had to give time in the summer that I previously might have donated to the COIL project to that job.

### 52. Was it worth it?

(CCC) To work with Linda Nicholls-Gidley was definitely worth it. To do it again, I believe would require paid faculty release time, higher quality media resources, and some additional staff (specifically a videographer). As much as I would like to have multiple international partners in the arts and relationships with other institutions internationally, both for the benefit of our students and my own professional development, I personally cannot see it happening again at present at CCC.

### Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

(CCC) Actors College students had quite a bit to say about working with the IPA and how it shifted their perception about how to create the vowel and consonant sounds of dialect, how the different musicality and rhythms of various dialects are produced. Some observed that learning to transcribe text in IP was like learning another language. By this time we had created a Facebook Group, and both Linda and I had some interesting exchanges with the Actors College students about the challenges of IPA.

CCC students and I visited the website that Linda had shared in-class, and I showed our students how to use the site to research different dialects. We also looked at the vowel quadrangle and the different consonant symbols, and listened to examples of British RP and Australian dialects to note the differences between them, and between American speech.

As I mentioned, in the Fall of 2012, CCC students were inspired to do a play in British dialect.

What seems not to have worked was a sharing of experience between the two classes of students. The CCC students were more reluctant to post about their work in this and other areas of the course. They also did not all participate in the video posts. I attribute this to the lack of space in which to record their exercises, and in many cases lack of equipment. It is here that a media technician who would have been available to our class to record videos at specifically scheduled times would have been very helpful. We have problems having access to adequate space at CCC, as everything is fairly rigidly scheduled, and access to cameras and rooms with adequate acoustics is also highly problematic.

Also, at this point, CCC went on Spring Break, and we went into tech week for our big Spring production. The focus and energy of many of the students in the class, as well as my own focus as director of the production, went into that, and we lost some focus on the class.

### What worked and what did not?

(CCC) The initial icebreaker exercises worked extremely well. The students enjoyed each other, and had a great time meeting and talking about their different countries, and talking about their images of their voices.

The Facebook Group page worked well, and would have worked better had we decided to do it at the very outset. Facebook is super-user friendly, compatible with a wide range of computers, smartphones and software, and very simply set up to accept video and audio as well as written posts. Given that we have complex teaching and professional lives, as instructors we don’t have large blocks of time to devote to navigating a learning management system like Blackboard or Moodle, which still depends on a number of “secret handshakes” to master all of its different components. For instructors who function primarily in an LMS environment, and assignments are primarily written, and written response or discussion-based, I know that Blackboard and similar
programs work very well. For a course such as ours, and for instructors in performance pedagogy, simple visual and audio technology and software that can be easily taught, shared, and monitored, and access to adequate instructional facilities are key to the success of a collaborative course such as this.

Less successful were the assignments asking students to post videos. The audio posts via Blackboard went better, although grading them was ghastly: time consuming, and Blackboard’s graphic format at the time was annoying.

I also think that there was a slight mismatch in student populations, in that CCC students are not enrolled in a dedicated performance program or conservatory, but are pursuing a general Associate’s degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences, perhaps with a Humanities concentration. CCC students tended to have less to articulate about the voice and movement work in specific, though it was clear to me that those deeply involved in theatre were trying to use the work in their other performance activities. They seemed less willing to share their thoughts and insights with the international collaboration.

Our disparate time zones and academic calendars also posed a challenge that I don’t think we anticipated. As faculty, we made extra efforts to communicate and connect, however, from the CCC students’ perspective at least, the course was only a part of the larger fabric of their lives, which included many other kinds of classwork, fulltime jobs in some cases, and production work, in others, as well as personal life issues.

A cultural difference I perceive in the CCC student population from other U.S. student populations, or perhaps students from past decades, is that college is not the top priority, even for fulltime students in this area. These students have not yet made a serious commitment to a path of study, career, or art necessarily. Many are still in an exploratory phase. Many place family or work commitments above their educational goals. This had a significant impact on those students’ visible contributions to the collaboration. The impact that the collaboration had upon a number of them, I think, was definite, albeit delayed.

**What prompts or activities took the class in unexpected but interesting directions?**

(CCC) Our class was motivated especially by the enhanced dialect work we did, working with the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), listening to samples of dialect from various nationalities, and from visiting the website that Linda Nicholls-Gidley shared from Sydney. In the following semester, students in the drama club requested that we do a show which required the use of British Received Pronunciation, and we produced the style piece, *Blithe Spirit* by Noel Coward in the Fall of 2012.

**How well did the technologies selected support the pedagogical goals of the course?**

(CCC) We were primarily using Blackboard 8.0, and to my mind it was fine for reading traditional written posts, but much less successful in accommodating audio and video posts from students’ varied personal equipment. Much better would have been more access to quality sound and video recording equipment that could have been in use during more of our classroom work, so we could have shared our classrooms asynchronously. Having students rely on personal smartphones and laptops for assignments was tricky, as some students had more trouble than others accessing their partners’ posts and uploading their own. Some of our students had to try to do their audio recordings in computer labs on campus, where lab supervisors were not knowledgeable or sympathetic to performance-oriented work on the computers. When I (CCC instructor) attempted to record final performances on my personal tablet video camera, the extremely poor acoustics of the classroom in which we had to work, and the difficulty of being my own cameraperson while still trying to assess the final work and not generate self-consciousness in the students made it very difficult to capture anything usable to share with our partners.

**What seemed to cause problems either for the students or for the faculty?**

(CCC) See discussion of technologies and LMS above. Additionally, the large number of students in our two classes (nearly 40 students between us) created a great backlog of Blackboard posts to read and try to assess.
Finding time to thoroughly read and monitor the posts and responses of our students in the midst of a packed semester, with a major production to direct became more and more difficult as we drew closer to the opening of our show in late April, and the end of the semester and Finals Week two weeks later. Once again, release time for undertaking a major new course initiative would have been very helpful to this faculty member.

Further, there was not a strong sense of cohesiveness in our CCC group of faculty and designers. Only one meeting was held between the four of us at CCC, and that had to be requested by faculty. The opportunity to raise difficulties, discuss both positives and negatives of the way the project was evolving, and a place to ask for help was not there. As we were attempting something relatively innovative for our institutions in Media Arts and Culture, we needed a stronger foundation of support to promote successful completion of the initiative.

**Did working through these problems lead to recognizable learning experiences or to defensiveness by some students or teachers?**

(CCC) I felt that our students adapted quite well to the challenges of the course structure. The difference between levels of immersion and participation in theatre arts at our two institutions may have led to some feelings of inadequacy among CCC students, however, especially in the initial icebreaker exercises, most of the student groups were communicating in a timely manner, and having a good experience with each other. As the calendar unfolded, and our breaks began to occur, some of the momentum of the communication was lost. Additionally, some students had difficulty with the technology, as their personal equipment was incompatible with Blackboard. Establishing the FaceBook Group helped to get some of the momentum again.

Jayne, Linda, and I communicated regularly via Skype and email, and our collaboration and communication was very strong. Our goals and our work were clear on behalf of our students. I observed that our students got from the international collaborative aspect of the course what they invested in it. I know that I gained insights from communicating with the Actors College students via the Facebook page, and learned from my discussions with my colleague about the day to day process of working with students on freeing their voices.

A new resource that I gained from Linda was the website that focuses on dialect. I would have liked to see the CCC students post more in-depth comments about their own work on their voices and physical instruments as young performers in training. While they would share with their classmates and me in-class, and to some extent in the breath journals we assigned, they were less forthcoming in either Blackboard or on the FaceBook site. Whether I would define this as defensiveness or not, I suppose, depends on whether one sees ‘fearfulness of expression’ as synonymous with defensiveness. In the case of the voice work, I probably would not express the idea quite that way to these particular students, as the very suggestion that they are defensive is apt to make them more defensive.
4. Belize - USA: English Literature & Composition

Abstract

Our first GNL collaboration (Spring 2012) connected a literature-based writing course (ENGL 1020) at Corning Community College with a Multicultural American Literature course (LITR 4507) at the University of Belize. Despite our courses being significantly distinct from one another in terms of academic level and many of the assigned readings, we developed several meaningful opportunities for students to connect internationally and achieve shared global learning outcomes. Using a CCC Blackboard discussion forum into which UB students were enrolled, at the beginning of the course participants introduced themselves using pictures and narratives and engaged in their first cross-cultural interactions for the course. Subsequently students were assigned to international partnerships, to which members were mutually responsible for arranging, conducting (using online video chat tools), and reporting in Blackboard on “International Interviews.” Students worked with the same partners in a multi-stage “National Anthems” exercise, for which they conducted research into the historical backgrounds of theirs and their partners’ national anthems, synchronously discussed the anthems, applied analysis to the anthems as literary texts, and offered constructive feedback on each other’s interpretive essays. Students also contributed regularly to international learning journals, encouraging personal reflection on their cross-cultural experiences and mindsets.

After this collaboration we immediately began planning a second course pairing, ENGL 2800: Special Topics in Literature at CCC and LITR 1157: Literature Survey, built around the theme of “Disease, Healing, and Transformation in Literature,” in which, in addition to some of the assignments described earlier, students discuss shared reading assignments (Yann Martel’s Life of Pi, Sherman Alexie’s The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian, and Junot Diaz’ The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao) and contribute to “Absolutely True Diaries” as members of International Groups in Blackboard.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural American Literature</td>
<td>University of Belize</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Composition II: Writing about Literature: International</td>
<td>Corning Community College</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1st year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> Ubaldimir Guerra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong> Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong> University of Belize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong> Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong> Faculty of Education and Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> Ryan Hersha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong> Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong> Corning Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong> Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong> English Dept.; Communications &amp; Humanities Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Semester One (U of Belize); Spring Semester, Jan-May (SUNY CCC)

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

UB - 8; CCC - 7

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

University of Belize: 8 students were enrolled which is a typical size for third and fourth year English majors; however, due to the lack of technological resources at their homes and preparedness in using certain tools, only 6 participated. I empathized with the two students particularly because they also had a very demanding schedule at work and at school. Furthermore, since it was my first time doing this, I wanted to feel assured that I had students who could remain committed to the new challenge, which in many ways was an entirely new venture for students at the university.

CCC: Most ENGL 1020s at CCC are larger than this. All 7 who enrolled were former students of mine to whom, I’d advertised the class. My guess as to why no one else enrolled was that the course had “International” in its name in the catalog, without any explanation, possibly deterring students. It wasn't until my second collaboration that I advertised the COIL aspects to the college as a whole.

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

University of Belize: English is the language of instruction.

CCC: English
7. **Primary language of most students in each class**  
Belize Kriol is the primary language of most students in my class.  
CCC: English

8. **Language of the course collaboration**  
Our course collaboration took place entirely in English; however, students were introduced to a couple works of Belizean literature, which included a mixture of English and Belize Kriol.

9. **Language fluency**  
At UB, the students in my class were for the most part multilingual, with varying degrees of fluency in each language.  
At CCC, the primary language is English and I don’t believe they had much familiarity with other languages in general

10. **Language proficiency difference**  
There was no substantial difference in English language skills which facilitated the completion of several collaborative assignments.

---

**Section 3: Curricular Information**

11. **Online or blended?**  
At UB, my course was offered in a blended format with both online and face-to-face meetings in the classroom. It was the same at CCC—though technically we wouldn’t call it “blended” here, which at CCC means there isn’t the usual number of in-person classes. According to the catalog, it’s a normal class, and we added supplemental online elements.

12. **Duration**  
9 weeks

13. **Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period**  
Students did complete journal entries in which at the end of the semester they reflected on the collaboration.

---

**Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used**

14. **Tools**  
Blackboard was the LMS and various emails were used to maintain asynchronous communications between
Students also used Google and Facebook to conduct their synchronous interview assignments.

### 15. Server location

Blackboard was provided by Corning Community College.

### 16. Technical problems

The only issue, which was promptly resolved by CCC staff and a little patience on the students’ end, was the creation of student accounts to access Blackboard. In one or two cases, there was a slight mix up with usernames and passwords, but Prof. Ryan and I were quick to resolve these issues.

### 17. Frequency of use

Students participated regularly in asynchronous discussion boards. The assigned frequency varied through the semester, but I would say one to two posts per week was typical.

### 18. Information communication

Students were encouraged to develop peer relationships through email or chat services. Also, an introductory discussion forum was a space created on Blackboard where students from separate institutions could continue to learn more about each other and their professors. Here students shared their tastes in music, film, food and in a variety of other areas.

### 19. Re-use

Blackboard has proven to be an efficient tool for asynchronous assignments that may be either academic or less formal. Students also found Google chat and facebook useful, though these were not assigned per se.

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

Synchronous tools used included gmail video and chat, facebook video chat. There was one assignment, a real time interview, which required them to use synchronous tools. After testing various tools such as Skype, gmail video and facebook, most students conducted their interviews through gmail video which proved to be the most efficient.

21. Server location

Cloud-based, though CCC students did use their CCC Gmail accounts.

22. Technical problems

The low bandwidth at UB made it difficult for students to conduct interview on campus. Therefore most of them had to conduct their interviews at their home, workplace or internet cafe.
### 23. Frequency of use

After students connected in real time for their interview, most used chat rooms to continue to engage each other on a personal or collegial level to follow up on collaborative assignments.

### 24. Informal communication

As mentioned before, students used their own initiative to engage on an informal level. They did this through a variety of tools ranging from becoming friends on Facebook to chatting in Gmail.

### 25. Re-use

These tools proved to be effective on multiple levels so, yes.

---

### Section 6: Assessment Information

#### 26. How?

We did not have access during that first collaboration to any standardized assessment tool, so my assessment was informal, based on student feedback and journals. - RH

#### 27. Common Assessment rubric

No.

#### 28. Assessment outcomes

N/A

#### 29. Peer assessment

They could have been then and they might be during our current collaboration as well, though we haven’t built anything formal into the course.

#### 30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

No, though CCC students were introduced to basic netiquette guidelines and we discussed related issues in class from time to time.

#### 31. Attrition

1 drop from the CCC course, or 1 out of 7, so 14%. No drop-outs in the UB course

#### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

If anything, I believe the globally networked nature of the course gives students reason to stick with a course. I’m sensing the same thing in my second collaboration. (CCC)

This is typical for students enrolled in UB’s Bachelor Degree in English.
### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

I am not 100% sure what CCC received or contributed at every phase financially during the first collaboration. Beyond financial support, however, COIL did offer significant pedagogical support, most importantly by connecting me with other COIL participants and their teaching experiences. I also believe COIL was helpful in presenting international collaboration as a viable and important teaching activity at the community college, which may have resulted in greater freedom and support for my COIL activities. Probably the most important thing COIL did, however, was to connect me with an appropriate partner. It is simply not likely for community college faculty to find appropriate and interested international partners without COIL or some other group facilitating it. - (CCC)

#### 34. Engagement with international programs office

Currently, UB does not have such an office. There is no international programs office at CCC either.

#### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

N/A

#### 36. Commitment

Administrators have repeatedly asserted their support for globally networked learning and have supported me in this work personally on an ongoing basis.

#### 37. Future iterations

After reviewing the benefits and challenges of our first collaborative effort, we have built another course which is currently being taught and contains students at a similar academic level.

#### 38. New globally networked courses

As stated in above, we are currently engaged in a new course, that has a different dynamic, taking into consideration some of the lessons learnt in the first collaboration. We will continue to gain feedback from students to also plan future globally networked courses. At UB, in my department I have engaged other faculty members who seem to be interested in doing the same. If given the time and resources, I plan to develop workshops based on my own limited knowledge and experiences; but I think the ideal situation would be for others in my department to possibly become fellows in COIL.

Prof. Guerra and I plan on offering another COIL course in spring 2014, and I am interested in facilitating the development of new COIL partnerships between CCC faculty and other international institutions, including UB.

#### 39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

At UB, chairs, deans and the provost have anecdotally expressed their support in my own pilot course. UB is just making attempts to develop online programs, which should bring about developments in technology which certainly would enhance its capacity to develop a broader program of globally networked courses.
At CCC, I have also heard encouraging words from administrative leadership, though no formal expanded program has been proposed yet.

### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

CCC: Positively.  
UB: Positively encouraging.

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

CCC: I’d like to find a way to shepherd interested faculty into partnerships more deliberately and with clearly articulated support. Perhaps an annual budget for COIL-related release-time and a regularized means of granting it might be helpful.  
UB: Developing an international programs office or committee and offering other faculty members the opportunity to engage in COIL workshops and conferences.

---

**Section 8: Reflections**

### 42. Goals set

I don’t recall setting specific goals beyond course outcomes, which did include global fluency outcomes. But personally I wanted my students to begin seeing literary texts in a global/cross-cultural context, developing their global mindset, and opening their minds to new ways of thinking about their culture and their lives. I also wanted Prof. Guerra and his students to have a positive experience interacting with my own and for the collaboration to be successful enough that we both would consider trying something again, as we are! (CCC)

### 43. Goals achieved

Very well. (CCC)  
I agree.  UB

### 44. Most unique aspect for students

My students emphasized that the collaborative experiences taught them how much they have yet to learn, not only about other cultures and history, but about their own culture and history. (CCC)  
My students really appreciated the freshness of opening their classroom to a global space. This concept was completely new to them, at times a challenge, but surprisingly and fortunately, most of them had sufficient technological experience to adapt relatively quickly. (UB)

### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

In my view, the intercultural exchange worked best and was a great motivational factor in engaging the classroom discourse as students were able to offer unique cultural insights on creative works from their partner’s nation. (UB)  
Hard to say. Aside from enhancing student interest in what they were learning generally, I really saw the
international aspects of the course prompting students to think about the texts from other perspectives, including other peoples’ personal, historical, and political perspectives. And by bringing me more forthrightly into the role of co-learner with them, I was able to model writing, reading, and learning behaviors. (CCC)

46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Really the only thing I can think of is that adding in collaborative work necessarily increases the student workload or takes away from other work. I feel on balance, though, that the assignments had much greater impact overall, and heightened student interest helped them to complete the additional work. (CCC)

47. Changes for future iterations

RH: We’re teaching it differently right now! Well, we crafted two new courses so they would match up better in terms of student educational levels.

48. Technical support

We do not have an instructional designer.--CCC
No designer at UB.

49. International programs person

We do not have an international programs person. Jayne Peaslee, however, served in this ad hoc role, and was helpful with arranging meetings and addressing roadblocks (for example with enrolling international students in Blackboard).

50. Time commitment

It’s hard to estimate, but Prof. Guerra and I spent a great deal of time preparing for that collaboration and managing it throughout the semester. All things considered, I’d guess we invested the equivalent of at least 3 credit hours the semester before and 3 additional credit hours (above and beyond the regular course) during the collaboration semester. Really a wild guess though. (CCC)

51. Was it worth it?

Yes, it was worth it, which is why we’re doing it again and looking forward to a third collaboration next academic year. I wouldn’t say our current collaboration feels any easier, but that may be because we’re building what seems to me like a more extensive collaboration with many more students. I do believe we’re getting better at this! Prof. Guerra and I have discussed the possibility of new partnerships. We’re both interested in welcoming our colleagues to globally networked learning.
5. Canada - USA: Political Science & Youth Culture

Abstract

“Canada? America? What’s the difference?”

These three questions, posted to a social media site known as StoryTimed, initiated a five-week collaboration that took place in May-June 2012 between students in Himanee Gupta-Carlson’s Digital Storytelling course through SUNY Empire State College and Janni Aragon’s Youth Politics seminar at the University of Victoria. The students differed in age, mode of learning, and national affiliation. In an effort to explore difference and build community with each other, the students discussed shared readings and other learning materials with each other and created a story together on StoryTimed.

The students communicated not only in StoryTimed but also via e-mail and a series of live chat mechanisms such as Facebook, Google, and Today’s Meet.

The collaboration in some ways answered the questions posed at the start of StoryTimed: The differences between Canada and America are bigger, broader, and perhaps more subtle than one might easily discern, and engagement with those differences is likely to provoke discomfort among participants.

The narrative and attached case study document the collaboration from Aragon and Gupta-Carlson’s perspective. We look forward to the COIL community’s thoughts on our endeavors.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital Storytelling and Youth</td>
<td>Empire State College and University of Victoria</td>
<td>Communications, Arts, Political Science, Hip-Hop Studies</td>
<td>Advanced undergraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role on Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Himanee Gupta-Carlson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institution: Empire State College
Position at Institution: Assistant Professor
Department and/or Program: Center for Distance Learning

Team Member #2
Name: Janni Aragon
Role on Team: Faculty
Institution: University of Victoria
Position at Institution: Senior Instructor/Assistant Teaching Professor
Department and/or Program: Political Science

Team Member #3
Name: Hui-Ya (Laura) Chuang
Role on Team: Instructional Designer
Institution: Empire State College
Position at Institution: Curriculum and Instructional Designer
Department and/or Program: Center for Distance Learning

4. When?
March-June 2012 at Empire State College; May-June 2012 at University of Victoria

5. Number of students enrolled from each institution
ESC: 15; U-Vic: 25

6. Is this typical for classes of this type?
The size was typical
The size was typical; Dr. Aragon chose to use a seminar course instead of a lecture class in order to more closely approximate the average class sizes of ESC.

Section 2: Issues of Language

8. Language(s) of instruction at each institution
English

9. Primary language of most students in each class
English
10. Language of the course collaboration
The collaboration was entirely in English.

11. Language fluency
All of the ESC and UVIC students were fluent in English. Many of the UVIC students also speak French; however their fluency varies from fully bi-lingual to elementary proficiency.

12. Language proficiency difference
The difference in language skills was not something that either the students or the fellows noted.

Section 3: Curricular Information

13. Online or blended?
The ESC course was fully online, with blended opportunities created through synchronous social media tools such as Facebook Live Chat, Google Chat, Today’s Meet, e-mail, and StoryTimed.
The U-Vic course was face-to-face, with blended opportunities created through the tools noted above. In addition, the U-Vic students maintained blogs that were specifically about the collaborated learning activities, and shared readings.

14. Duration
Five weeks

15. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period
The ESC students were enrolled in Digital Storytelling, and had a longer semester (15 weeks) than the U-Vic students (7 weeks). Dr. Gupta-Carlson prepared them for the collaboration beforehand by having them create a story in VoiceThread on the experience of being a stranger. She also introduced them to the concept of hip-hop as a storytelling and community building experience by having them visit hip-hop related sites, and storyboard an imagined digital story based on the individuals profiled in her article “Planet B-Girl.” After the collaboration, the students were asked to share insights on the experience with each other via a discussion forum and one-on-one with the instructor via a written assessment. They also were given the option of creating the fifth of their five story projects on the collaboration.
The U-Vic students were enrolled in Youth Politics, and had a seven-week semester that began at the approximate mid-point of the ESC semester. They spent the first week and a half of their semester reading from one of the main texts used by the Digital Storytelling students, and visiting and analyzing the same web sites that the ESC students were making virtual field trips to. The students engaged in a real-time face-to-face discussion about the collaboration during one of their regular meeting times with Dr. Aragon.
### Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We used StoryTimed and e-mail. Students worked with both tools throughout the collaboration. It is difficult to measure percentage time, but we would estimate that about 30-40 percent of the collaboration took place via these venues. Some students also used Facebook instant messaging, and others used emails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Server location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students used e-mails with which they had registered at their respective institutions. StoryTimed is cloud-based.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Technical problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The only challenge we encountered was that StoryTimed required a “friending” process and would only allow for one administrator. Therefore, the process of students sending friend-requests to a single instructor and then the instructor’s task of accepting the friend requests and adding students to the specific story group was a little slow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students were expected to make a minimum of three contributions to StoryTimed over what was initially a three-week period that we extended to five weeks, for the reasons cited above. Students were expected to hold at least two conversations with partners at the other institution. They were asked to use some specific questions related to shared readings and web sites but also were strongly encouraged to converse in an open-ended fashion with a goal of getting to know one another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Informal communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail ended up being an effective tool for some students to engage informally. We didn't create the venue; they made use of it themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Re-use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and we would consider other tools, as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We encouraged students to connect synchronously with each other via tools of their choice. We recommended Today’s Meet, Facebook Chat, Google Chat, and Twitter as possibilities but encouraged them to find their own venues. We also encouraged students to use Skype or to use the telephone. We really wanted them to take their initiative in finding out what tools would be most communicable for them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Server location

Everything we used synchronously was cloud-based.

24. Technical problems

The main problems that we encountered related to unfamiliarity with the tools (particularly on the part of ESC students), and reluctance on the part of some students to engage in audio exchanges via telephone or skype. Because of a requirement to provide written documentation of their conversation, the students generally preferred text-based tools that allowed them to save scripts of their conversations.

25. Frequency of use

We did not engage students in a classroom to classroom level synchronously because the mode of learning for students enrolled in ESC’s Center for Distance Learning is asynchronous. It would have been virtually impossible -- and against the spirit of the asynchronous learning -- to require the ESC students to be in a shared space all at the same time.

26. Informal communication

Again, some students took advantage of the tools to converse with each other informally.

27. Re-use

Yes.

Section 6: Assessment Information

28. How?

Dr. Aragon assessed the course via conversations with the students, feedback during the last seminar, then a review of the Course Experience Survey statistics, as well as the qualitative comments. Overall, the UVIC students enjoyed the collaboration; however, repeatedly many noted that they would prefer to work with other Political Science students.

Dr. Gupta-Carlson assessed the course via conversations with the students, a final written assessment that students submitted at the end of the semester, and through a review of her Student Assessment of Learning Experiences results (SALE). Students pointed to challenges they encountered in trying to arrange conversation times and modes with the UVIC students but generally enjoyed the collaboration. They offered insights and suggestions for improvement in their final written assessment but did not comment on the collaboration in the SALE survey.

29. Common assessment rubric

We discussed the possibility of a common rubric in several of our course-planning conversations, and ultimately decided that the differences in our institutional culture, learning modes of our students, and the content of the courses themselves were such that it would be best for each of us to assess our students individually. We both based our assessment on the collaborated activities on the degree to which students participated.
30. Assessment outcomes

See above

31. Peer assessment

No, the students did not assess one another’s work. However, there was lots of conversations in Dr. Aragon’s seminar about the efficacy of the Storytimed assignments and the online interactions with the American students. If anything, this attempt to internationalize the curriculum was met with some resistance by the UVIC students merely due to the other students being from a US based institution. This presented them an interesting opportunity to work with American students and some were excited and others were cautious because they had to work with American students!

The students in Dr. Gupta-Carlson’s course were interested in the opportunity to work with Canadian students, and shared in conversations on discussion forums and in e-mails with the instructor that they were surprised to encounter a negative view of Americans on the part of Canadians. Many expressed that the perspective made them more aware of how Americans and America might be perceived by others abroad.

32. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

Dr. Aragon’s students were instructed that shared respect was key to establishing trust and engaging in conversation between the two student groups.

Dr. Gupta-Carlson’s students were encouraged to see differences between themselves and their Canadian counterparts as opportunities to learn from each other.

33. Attrition

The UVIC course had no attrition during the collaboration with ESC.

Two ESC students withdrew from the course before the collaboration, and one additional student withdrew in the early phases of the collaboration. The reasons for the withdrawals were unrelated to the collaboration.

34. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution

No, this was an atypical exercise for the UVIC cohort and for Dr. Aragon. The cross-border collaboration also was atypical for ESC students and Dr. Gupta-Carlson.

Section 7: Institutional Support

36. Types of support

Dr. Aragon had a letter of support from Associate Dean Michael Webb, Social Science Faculty with the initial application. However, aside from this letter there was no support of any kind from UVIC or from COIL.

Dr. Gupta-Carlson received support from then Associate Dean Janet Shideler, Center for Distance Learning, and then Provost Meg Benke. She negotiated a change in her teaching schedule with CDL Dean Thomas Mackey who encouraged her to consider developing the collaboration through the Digital Storytelling course, rather than creating a new course from scratch (which is an expensive and time-consuming process for ESC.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37. Engagement with the international programs office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UVIC has an Associate Vice President of International Affairs since Fall 2012. To Dr. Aragon’s knowledge he has not been in contact with ESC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC is extensively engaged with international programs, and works closely with SUNY COIL. To Dr. Gupta-Carlson’s knowledge, there is no contact between ESC and UVIC at the international programs level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38. Importance given to globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UVIC is definitely moving forward with internationalizing the campus in terms of student population and the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC considers its relationship with COIL an important component of its internationalization efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This was the first collaboration between Drs. Gupta-Carlson and Aragon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Aragon will not teach the Youth Politics seminar during the 2013-14 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gupta-Carlson taught Digital Storytelling in September 2012 and is currently teaching it. She and her ESC colleague, Dr. Sheila Aird, have adapted and built upon many of the collaborated activities that Dr. Gupta-Carlson and Dr. Aragon developed, and have used these activities to team-teach within and across sections of the Digital Storytelling course in the ESC system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. New globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, this course was referred to at the UVIC Senate’s Learning and Teaching committee, as Dr. Aragon sits on the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gupta-Carlson has been offering a US History Since 1865 course to students at Nanjing University in China, via ESC’s international programs, and has floated possibilities of creating networked courses with instructors in India. She is unlikely to aggressively pursue these initiatives in the short-term future, however, because of other scholarly commitments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Aragon has had conversations with the Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre and others administrators about the course and they want to implement more collaborative courses and MOOCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gupta-Carlson has received favorable response from her dean for her efforts, but expansion of the course into a broader globally networked initiative does not seem likely at this point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For UVIC this will have to be pursued as a faculty led initiative and then hopefully supported by Chairs, Deans, and other administrators. The situation is similar at ESC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Financial incentive and course release for planning and implementation.

Institutionally, ESC is moving forward with globally networked learning initiatives; however, Gupta-Carlson anticipates that her role in these endeavors will become more active, post-tenure. Her commitment to completing final revisions for a forthcoming book, development of a second book manuscript in 2013-14, and supervision of her courses as ESC transitions its LMS from Angel to Moodle are taking priority for the next 2-3 years.

Section 8: Reflections

45. Goals set

ESC: Communication, Global citizenry, Connections
UVIC: Community building, Cross-national dialogue, Connections

46. Goals achieved

The students had to communicate with one another as part of the course(s) rubrics.

47. Most unique aspects for students

The UVIC students felt like they already knew American by virtue of the cultural, economic and political hegemony of the US; however, interacting online with American students was a different experience for them. The Canadian students learned lots and some had their biases or stereotypes confirmed!

The ESC students didn’t actually feel like they knew much about Canadians, beyond biases or stereotypes they had picked up in cross-border encounters. They were surprised to discover some of the rationale and underlying feelings that had perhaps given rise to the stereotypes. Since ESC students generally are older than the conventionally aged college student, the experience of communicating with a peer group that was considerably younger than them also was eye-opening for them.

48. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Drs. Gupta-Carlson and Aragon worked well in the planning and execution of the collaboration. Dr. Gupta-Carlson is extremely organized! Dr. Aragon is extremely efficient.

49. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The UVIC students were resistant on two counts: working with Americans, and working with non-Political Science students. They clearly held a bias that Political Science students are somehow the more intellectual students. This surprised Dr. Aragon as the seminar included strong students through struggling students.

The ESC students did not immediately see the less-than-warm-and-fuzzy exchanges between themselves and their Canadian counterparts as insightful learning experiences, and tended to treat these encounters negatively when they occurred. It took some work on the part of Dr. Gupta-Carlson to help them consider how the exchanges might be contextualized as intercultural learning experiences.
### 50. Changes for future iterations

In hindsight, Dr. Aragon realizes that her Pop Culture and Politics seminar would be a better fit to collaborate with Dr. Gupta-Carlson’s Digital Storytelling course. Dr. Gupta-Carlson has developed a new course, Hip-Hop America: The Evolution of a Cultural Movement, since the collaboration, and believes this course partnered with Dr. Aragon’s Pop Culture and Politics seminar would be a better fit for a future globally networked learning environment.

### 52. Technical support

Our team included an ESC instructional designer who attended the October 2011 COIL workshops with Dr. Gupta-Carlson and helped work out some of the initial technological possibilities for how the globally networked environment might be created. Most of the curriculum development work, however, was carried out by the two faculty members on the team.

### 53. International programs person

Our team did not have an international programs representative.

### 54. Time commitment

Dr. Aragon finds that putting together a new course normally takes forty hours and this course is no different; however, she and Dr. Gupta-Carlson kept in contact via email and phone. This was Dr. Gupta-Carlson’s first major reconfiguration of online course content, and she found that the development was about the same amount that she experienced in creating her new course, Hip-Hop America, later in 2012. Because the online course content had to be much more rigorously structured than a face-to-face course, Dr. Gupta-Carlson appreciated how Dr. Aragon’s adoption of course texts and other learning materials from Digital Storytelling into the Youth Politics course helped give the course shape.

### 55. Was it worth it?

Yes, it was worth it. The most insightful feedback was during class and from the students’ evaluations. It was extremely interesting for Dr. Aragon to see how biased some of her Canadian students were about Americans. This provided ample opportunity for “teachable moments.”

Dr. Gupta-Carlson found the feedback from both students insightful, and helpful in terms of understanding and dealing with cultural biases as well as issues of ageism. As noted above, Dr. Gupta-Carlson has continued to use the learning activities that she and Dr. Aragon developed, and feels that a similar iteration could be implemented without much difficulty when an appropriate occasion emerges.

### Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

The students in Himanee Gupta-Carlson’s fully-online Digital Storytelling course through Empire State College completed four shared activities with the students in Dr. Janni Aragon’s Youth Politics course at University of Victoria. Three of the four activities consisted of teams of ESC and U-Vic students discussing shared readings and learning materials such as websites and videos related to hip-hop as community building and youth political activism via communicative modes of their choice. Many of the teams started their communications via e-mail but then switched over to such "live chat" modes as Facebook chat, Google chat, and Today’s Meet. Gupta-
Carlson’s students shared observations about the communication via a discussion forum in our course Angel space and Aragon’s students shared their observations via blogs. In many cases, students posted a transcript of their conversations. Aragon forwarded her student blog links to Gupta-Carlson so she was able to track the conversations from that end. Gupta-Carlson didn’t have a good way of forwarding the discussion forums to Aragon but did copy and save the full forums for her to look more closely at what transpired on the ESC end. The transcripts as well as the summarizations revealed a lot of friendly, intimate exchange between the students and fairly solid and frank discussions about the collaboration itself. Drs. Aragon and Gupta-Carlson are both trained as political scientists, with an emphasis on theory and the relationships between theory and practice. We believe that this background, coupled with our commitment to the dialogic and conversational nature of feminist pedagogical practices, instilled in us a desire to keep the format relatively open, inviting the students to talk about U.S.-Canadian relationships as an aspect of building community across borders. Aragon’s students -- although studying Youth Politics -- were reading one of the Digital Storytelling texts used by Gupta-Carlson’s Digital Storytelling students. Gupta-Carlson swapped out many of the usual Digital Storytelling web sites that students make "field trips" to with the sites on youth activism that formed much of her course content. We encouraged the students throughout both of our respective courses to keep on connecting three themes: building community through telling stories, hip-hop as a practice of both storytelling and community building, and activism as a mode of working toward shared goals.

Students responded to this connectivity in interesting ways. They shared in their one-on-one conversations that many of them knew little about the other country. Gupta-Carlson’s students commented that they were surprised at how much US media had shaped Canadian public culture and many noted that they felt that media had fueled negative perceptions among Canadians of what Americans were like. Her students expressed surprise in some cases that the American students with whom they were communicating were “nice”. The students in both courses had varying racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds and these identity categories also seemed to influence how they communicated with each other.

Gupta-Carlson’s students tended to be older than “traditional” college age and often have been married, have children, and have worked for many years, while Aragon's students were more in the 20-21 year age range. Some of Gupta-Carlson’s students noted these differences, with one observing that a 21-year-old and a 35-year-old who has been married and divorced are going to think differently about the world, without a doubt. The age differences between our two groups of students turned out to be perhaps the most significant point of differentiation, and produced teaching and learning moments for both of us. While Gupta-Carlson’s students tended to be more understanding of the lives that younger adults live (perhaps as a result of experiencing these years of their lives already), Aragon’s expressed a certain degree of impatience and frustration in having to work with older students, older students who were Americans and non-political science majors on top of that. That differences related to age would surface did not surprise us, as we were aware of the demographics of our two student populations. What surprised us was the degree to which ageism became a factor in the students’ relationships with one another. Both of us considered this issue a learning experience for us, and a teachable moment that we were able to deploy partially in our collaboration and more effectively in our future teachings.

We did have one project in which all students participated collectively, which was to create a story together in a social networking space called StoryTimed. We presented the dialogue that we hoped would ensue in the story after the concept of the hip-hop cipher, which uses a “call and response” mode of participation to stimulate open-ended dialogue in an effort among participants to express something new. StoryTimed got heated at times, in what both of us felt was a good way, though students in both classes expressed to us, the instructors, as well as to each other in their more intimate e-mail and chat conversations some discomfort with the flow.

Gupta-Carlson asked her students to assess the value, insights, and challenges of the collaboration -- as well as to suggest possible changes if we were to do it again. Most of Gupta-Carlson’s students enjoyed the experiment though they pointed out that arranging meeting times with their Canadian counterparts and waiting for e-mail responses from each other added a great deal of challenge to the work. They demonstrated in their assessments
a heightened awareness of the world beyond American borders and a willingness to stretch their learning further in that direction. Their comments also indicated to me that the connections between political activism, community building, storytelling, and hip-hop culture had clicked for them. Aragon’s students responded less positively to the collaboration in their final assessments of the course, displaying again aspects of the ageism alluded to earlier. Aragon and Gupta-Carlson discussed the course outcomes in a two-hour telephone debriefing following the collaboration and again via e-mail exchanges in the ensuing months. Gupta-Carlson also consulted with one of her former ESC mentors, Janet Shideler (now Dean at Siena College), as to how to make sense of the varying assessments. Dr. Shideler suggested that differences in the culture of the two institutions might also have been factors in shaping the differing student responses to the collaboration as well as differences in the socio-political structures that inform higher education in the United States and Canada. Shideler’s insights have helped Gupta-Carlson reflect more deeply on the sensitivities that might be provoked in putting students from two different environments into conversations with each other, and have given her much to ponder.

Both of us felt that we learned a great deal about what it means to collaborate as we worked over the months leading up to our actual course to devise ways of putting our students together. Both of our institutions place a high value on developing collaborative projects, and see collaboration as an important component to the internationalization of curricula. Both of us also as feminist scholars with a deep interest and passion for teaching also view our work of research and teaching as aimed at encouraging collaboration. Perhaps what we gained the most from this experience was a deeper understanding of collaboration – collaboration intertwined with a mission of internationalization. Gupta-Carlson outlined a few lessons that she and Aragon learned in one of her course log reports to the COIL Commons. We reiterate them here:

1. Collaborating is creative, dynamic, and fun. It’s sometimes stressful because we are both respectful of each other’s space and work load and try not to impose too much expectation on the other, especially because we realize that both of us are on parallel career paths that nevertheless are different because of the institutions where we work, the disciplines into which we have found ourselves, and our own personal lives, needs, and aspirations. The up-side of that respect is that we are friends and colleagues, and when we are able to make time to converse, our discussions are energizing and lively. The challenge is that perhaps we do not always quickly communicate because we understand the huge work/life juggle that the other faces.

2. The best learning in a globally networked learning environment may be in modes that are simplest and easiest for students (and instructors) to grasp, especially when the instructor teaching philosophies are quite close. Working where I work and listening to others talk about skype, wikis, this tool, that tool, so on and so forth often left me feeling rather stressed that I was not incorporating enough technology into our collaboration. What has really ended up working best has been finding out that we can bridge differences in our respective curricula through shared readings and through what I think will be simple, shared communication modes: e-mails with documentation that make the most sense for each of us in our respective courses -- blogs for Aragon’s students and discussion forums for Gupta-Carlson’s students. Aragon initiated this step by adopting one of the texts used in the ESC Digital Storytelling course, an institutional constraint that Gupta-Carlson could not work around, for her course, where she has much more flexibility in terms of choosing what students read and study. That flexibility helped Gupta-Carlson see that if Aragon could teach Youth Politics through a Digital Storytelling text, she could teach Digital Storytelling through articles and web links to Youth Politics sites. Our common glue remained hip-hop, which is about the best glue that exists in our contemporary age.

3. Since Gupta-Carlson’s course ran for 15 weeks (while Aragon’s course was an intensive seven-week summer seminar), Gupta-Carlson tried to prepare her students to collaborate in advance. She replaced many of the "set" digital storytelling virtual field trip assignments with hip-hop oriented sites and retooled several story projects so that they were oriented toward getting students to reflect on what it means to be a "self", what it means to remember history of significance, and what it means to be in an encounter with a stranger. Students responded extremely well to these questions, which gave the community-building, autobiographical, and interactive premises that inform Digital Storytelling a stronger intellectual dimension for Gupta-Carlson. She felt that her students were engaged in discussion and self-reflection in ways that were stronger than any other student group
I have worked with in the past. She also found that US students loved learning more about the history of hip-hop and using it as a vehicle to understand digital storytelling. Learning about hip-hop in a digital storytelling format also is internationalizing students in ways that she did not anticipate, and the approach educated me about the backgrounds and needs of her students in ways that she did not anticipate.

4. At the same time, both Gupta-Carlson and Aragon reached a final conclusion that while collaboration is a valuable endeavor, the process of collaborating does not erase power relationships and privilege, and often masks the presence of these factors in ways that ultimately can run the risk of being detrimental to the spirit of collaboration if they are not kept present and respected.

As stated in other sections of the case study, both Gupta-Carlson and Aragon have many other scholarly and college service commitments as pre-tenure faculty at their respective institutions. While both of us appreciated the opportunity to create such a unique teaching collaboration, we feel that we will not embark on such an ambitious activity again in the short-term. We have discussed putting our students together, however, for single short-term assignments tied to specific events that would hold international implications. Gupta-Carlson, for instance, traveled to Washington DC in January 2013 to attend the public inauguration of President Barack Obama. With an iPhone in hand, she communicated with educators, students, colleagues, and friends around the world via Facebook and Twitter. Among her followers was Aragon, who re-tweeted Gupta-Carlson’s Twitter hashtag to her students and followed the posts on Facebook.

Gupta-Carlson also became involved with another, much more informal international collaboration at the same time that she was collaborating with Aragon via COIL. Ten Chinese students (also of more traditional college age than the typical ESC student) enrolled in a section of U.S. History Since 1865 that she oversees. She decided to teach the section and create a few collective activities that would bring a consideration of events in China into the eras of U.S. history that the course was covering. She was happy to discover that these activities were relatively easy to create and had a wonderful impact on internationalizing the outlook of the American students and of acquainting the Chinese students more with America’s rather checkered past. A new group of Chinese students have enrolled in the U.S. History Since 1865 course in ESC’s March 2013 term, and Gupta-Carlson worked with the instructor assigned to that section to refine the previously created activities. The experience of working on both of these courses has encouraged Gupta-Carlson (as a fairly US-centric educator) to open her own curricula to a more global perspective and to seek out future opportunities to collaborate with faculty across borders when possible.

**Section 10: Student Feedback**

Please only collaborate with Political Science students. Negative UVIC
This was a great experience and I enjoyed it, even if I felt like a guinea pig! Positive UVIC
Please use different books. Negative UVIC
Working with the American students was better than I expected. Positive UVIC
Referring back to the collaboration segment, I realized, very early on, that I was not up to date with current world events. My partner was insightfully more political than I was, which I felt was frustrating more for her. Overall, I felt my personal experience was not beneficial because my partner was hesitant to open up to me, and when she did, she did not relate much. Most of my observations were founded on outside research. Negative ESC
Reflecting on the collaborative component with the UVic students offered additional global views on world events or even on our close distance relationship between the neighboring countries. My partner Alex was quick and responsive and demonstrated a keen understanding of political activism. His familiarity also underscored personal activism in Canadian politics helping to recall the current Toronto mayor and helping to elect
alternative candidates. As email correspondence can become formal, the Today’s Meet live web chat tool offered a much more casual tone.

Overall, both Alex and I have liberal based political philosophies so found agreement on much of the discussed topics. As the discussion led to music styles debating the hip hop narratives, I was pleased to offer a U.S. counter perception. As commercial hip-hop artists characterize a segment of the culture as vapid superficial consumers, these messages become telegraphed to the world. While this still resonates in a portion of the American psyche, the indie music message transmitting from the country’s center is harvesting more of an evolution. Positive ESC

Regarding the collaboration between us and the University of Victoria students, there were three insights that I gained about how me and my partner (and more generally Americans and Canadians) perceive the United States, Canada, and the rest of the world, which were American and Canadians have the ability and resources to connect with other worlds effectively. Multiculturalism has the capability to transcend through common interests such as hip hop, politics, and personal interests. Lastly, we discovered through Storytimed that the Canadian American relations need to be strengthened through vital communications and dialogue. The most enlightening moments for me during the collaboration was realizing that America is a very conceited country who thinks too much of itself and often disguises its conceit through a false patriotism. The need for sensitivity and understanding was addressed through Storytimed briefly, but more actions need to be taken. Positive ESC
6. Croatia - USA: Rhetoric and Composition

Abstract

We designed the writing tasks of this course with the intention that students would begin to see language difference as a resource rather than simply a barrier to making meaning in intercultural communication. At the same time, we hoped that through the experience of globally networked learning, students would recognize those moments when they, or their instructors, privileged one form of language use over others. So far, our experience teaching these two globally networked courses demonstrates that the discussion board, in isolation, clearly tends towards the sort of sterile exchange that is reflected in the term "Pleasantville." For that reason, opportunities to re-examine and question cultural attitudes are not taken unless we make structural efforts to foster risk taking.

Clearly, students see the online forum as a place to present their public self. Even when students from one class- or peer group may not shy away from direct peer-to-peer confrontation in writing, students outside of that group tend to avoid risking confrontation; at least in the context of low-stakes, online discussion. Although serious, sometimes controversial, issues of cultural and language difference were written about by students in the Café Bar, other students seemed to avoid the more contentious issues in favor of “safer” issues, unless they felt comfortable or safe with one another.

In the context of high-stakes collaboration on writing, however, students seemed more willing to engage directly in issues of difference. We witnessed potential for conflict and misunderstanding when students collaborate on written assignments in which they may not share the same underlying assumptions about authorship, and authority. Unless structured carefully, these interactions have the potential to strengthen, rather than correct, the kinds of stereotypes of other cultures that we hoped our course would address.

The issue for us as instructors is how to facilitate more substantive responses to cultural and language difference, through the structure of assignments, our own responses to students’ written texts, and expanding class discussion. With so many original posts produced in each class, the number of discussions that raised such issues was overwhelming and we missed numerous opportunities for exploring relevant issues within and between each section. By taking a more deliberate role in managing the discussions, and then creating roles for different kinds of response, we believe we can provide students opportunities to learn from one another and also gain a deeper understanding of the issues such collaboration brings into the foreground. For example, after every student introduces themselves in their “Welcome to my world” post, we could form the students into four different groups for the “Cross Cultural Resume.” While the first group might post an initial response to the prompt, a second group of students could provide a thoughtful common to the original post. The third group could respond in a shorter post with the final group of students working to relate the ensuing discussion to course readings and/or in-class discussions. Regardless of what roles the different student groups may play, asking students to do more than simply respond to two of their peer’s posts would likely do a lot to help us all think more deeply and learn more about negotiating meaning from positions of cultural and linguistic difference.

While it is comparatively easier and safer to write directly about cultural issues in the informal context of an online discussion, it is quite another matter to negotiate meaning across cultural and language when they surface unexpectedly during other course tasks like peer review and collaborative writing. Given the aims of our course, moments of tension or conflict when working collaboratively on a project are pivotal for the learning of the course. For this reason, working with students to do meaningful reflection on these issues within online discussions will certainly help students negotiate their difference when working together to produce writing.
Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Seminar</td>
<td>ACMT</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Seminar</td>
<td>RIT</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>First Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: David Martins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: RIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution: University Writing Program Director &amp; Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program: University Writing Program/English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Rebecca Charry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: international programs faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: ACMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution: full time instructor (senior lecturer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program: English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Michael Starenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: RIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. When?
Spring Quarter AY2011/12, Fall Quarter AY2012/13

### 4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Spring Quarter</th>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACMT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Is this typical for classes of this type?
Both sections at RIT were smaller than is typical, the fall term in particular. Typical enrollment in for “Writing Seminar”/“First Year Writing” is 21.

ACMT enrollments were typical size. At ACMT, the Spring course was designated an “Honors” section. Students were invited to enroll based on A or B grades in the prerequisite Basic Writing course. The fall quarter course at ACMT was not an honors section.

### Section 2: Issues of Language

#### 6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution
English is the language of instruction at both institutions

#### 7. Primary language of most students in each class
RIT students are predominantly, but not exclusively, native speakers of English (some international students were enrolled in the course)

ACMT students are predominantly foreign speakers of English (one or two native speakers in the group)

#### 8. Language of the course collaboration
Croatian words or short phrases were used spontaneously in a few rare occasions (online discussion posts) by ACMT students. English explanations were given for some of them.

#### 9. Language fluency
ACMT students’ English skills range from nearly fluent to intermediate. English language is always a challenge/barrier for a few ACMT students in every course, particularly in formal writing, and academic reading. However, they are fully accustomed to conducting their academic work in English.

#### 10. Language proficiency difference
Differences in English language skill turned out to be less of a barrier than we (particularly Rebecca) expected.
Neither the students, nor the instructors, seemed to find language skills a significant barrier to collaboration. While language differences were noticed, and commented on, by students, and informally addressed by instructors, we did not feel that it interfered with the collaboration. Particularly, we did not sense a power or prestige differential between the two groups, based on English skill.

**Section 3: Curricular Information**

**11. Online or blended?**

Both iterations of the course were offered in a blended (or hybrid) format the combined face-to-face and scheduled asynchronous online interaction and synchronous peer-review sessions; the first iteration also held three synchronous whole-class online meetings. During the first iteration of the course, the sections at RIT and ACMT met fully face-to-face, respectively, with mostly asynchronous but some synchronous online interactions between the RIT and ACMT sections scheduled throughout the term. Realizing that students needed more experience, instruction and reflection on online learning, we designed a more fully blended format (that is, some classroom time was replaced by online interaction). During the fall term, for example, Martins assigned online activities/instruction in place of the one of the two weekly class meetings during 4 out of the 10 weeks.

**12. Duration**

Our collaboration was spread throughout the ten-week term. Nearly every week students in the two sections participated in the Cafe’ Bar discussion forums, conducted synchronous peer review, and collaborated on writing tasks.

**13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period**

While there may have been some informal, student-to-student interaction after the conclusion of each course, not formal work or discussion was assigned before or after either iteration of the course.

**Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used**

**14. Tools**

First during the spring term of 2012, and again during the subsequent fall term, two sections of the required first-year writing course offered by RIT and ACMT were electronically linked using a shared learning technology, myCourses (Desire2Learn).

**15. Server location**

RIT and ACMT share a common general education and program curriculum, as well as an enterprise-wide LMS, namely D2L.

**16. Technical problems**

Generally speaking, we did not experience significant technical problems with our LMS.
### 17. Frequency of use

We did not use our LMS for class-to-class asynchronous communication. Apart from completing the asynchronous online assignments, students were not asked to log in to myCourses on any particular days or any particular number of times per week.

### 18. Informal communication

The online “Cafe Bar” assignments were designed for “low-stakes writing” (a.k.a. informal online interaction).

### 19. Re-use

Yes.

## Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

### 20. Tools

In the spring 2012 iteration we conducted one class-to-class session during Week 2 using Adobe Connect, an RIT-supported technology, and one session at the end of the class using Skype, which RIT does not official support. In the middle of this class we did attempt to conduct synchronous bibliographic instruction using RIT’s “Access Grid” (a.k.a. Internet2), which is intended mostly for research communication. Alas, attempting to stream instruction from RIT’s Wallace Center librarians with students at RIT and ACMT participating actively proved fruitless. For the one-to-one interviews and peer review sessions, students could use any synchronous technology they wanted to use, though the majority used Skype.

### 21. Server location

See question 22.

### 22. Technical problems

Yes. Due to limited bandwidth and design issues, Adobe Connect did not work well for class-to-class sessions (it’s designed for use by individuals sitting in front of their own computers). We did have better success with Skype for class-to-class sessions, perhaps due to the fact that Skype has more servers world-wide than Adobe Connect. The limitations of both technologies restrict spoken communication to turn-taking or speaking one after the other.

### 23. Frequency of use

See question 22.

### 24. Informal communication

Students may have used Skype on their own, but we have no evidence of such interaction. In the fall quarter, most student interaction occurred through traditional email, particularly for the interview assignments.

### 25. Re-use

Because class-to-class online synchronous communication largely failed in the first iteration of the course, we...
made no attempt to use the mode of communication in the second iteration. In addition, we did not see much educational benefit in using class-to-class online synchronous communication. For these reasons, we will likely not use class-to-class online synchronous communication in future iterations of this course. We will, however, continue to use Skype (or similar) for one-to-one interviews and peer-review sessions.

**Section 6: Assessment Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students were assessed on a variety of formal and informal writing assignments, as well as class participation/professionalism. Intercultural awareness played an important role in class discussions but was not directly assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Common assessment rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Several assignments were graded on a Credit/no credit/resubmit basis. This rubric was suggested by David, who had used it successfully in the past. This was a new assessment strategy for Rebecca. This rubric was used for smaller, less formal assignments which we saw as building blocks for larger assignments. In David’s words, students are “writing to learn” in these activities, and our goal was to reward active participation, and also to reduce student anxiety about grades. These smaller assignments included discussion board posts, profiles, participation in in-class peer review, and bibliographies, each worth a relatively small number of points. For these assignments, students who followed instructions and submitted thoughtful work on time, were given full credit (100% of point value). Students whose work showed a lack of effort or understanding of the assignment, were given a grade of Resubmit (50% credit) with the opportunity to revise and resubmit for full credit if they chose. Students who simply did not do the assignment received no credit. Larger assignments (final researched essays, academic “coming to terms” paper, final reflective essay, class participation/professionalism) were evaluated using a scoring guide that highlighted rhetorical awareness, genre conventions, and use of sources/texts. For example, the “coming to terms” assignment asked students to select a “text” and then analyze it by describing the author’s aims/goals for the text, summarizing the key/significant ideas used in the text, and articulating the uses and limits of the text. When assessed, the following scoring guide was used as the basis for peer response and classroom discussion of the students’ writing, and was then used by instructors to evaluate the essay (comments to the student writer have been included to show the use of the scoring guide):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Guide**

Elements for “coming to terms” with an artifact/text described by Joseph Harris have served as the basis for peer response and our classroom discussions. All of this will now be the basis for my evaluation of your essay.

**Introduction** — A strong introduction presents a brief overview of your essay by presenting relevant background/contextual information on the artifact and by highlighting the scope and organization of what is to follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your first paragraph, [students name], you didn’t actually introduce your own essay. You set the stage by focusing on how parents don’t help their students prepare for life in higher education, but don’t introduce the issue that seems to be the focus of “over protective” parenting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coming to Terms** — A strong essay offers an explanation with evidence from the text for each element of this analysis: defining the author’s project, noting keywords or passages, assessing uses and limits. Be sure to quote from the text, using it for support for your claims.
In the body of your essay you have selected some interesting quotes and seem to have focused on summarizing key points of the text. When it comes to the author’s project, however, I am not sure what you would say is Rubin’s aim. Is he, for example:

- Offering parents new ways of helping prepare students for college before they go?
- Writing to students in attempt to help them prepare themselves for college?
- Convincing students not to go to college because their parents haven’t prepared them?
- Telling parents that what they are doing isn’t preparing their children for college?

Tell your reader what you think Rubin is aiming to “do” with this article and offer support from the text for why you think is what he is aiming to do. There are also other keywords that should come out of this analysis, and it will help you identify the uses and limits of what he has done.

**Conclusion** – A strong coming to terms essay offers a generous reading of the artifact and demonstrates the significance of the text. In short, a strong conclusion answers the question: “So What?”

**Needs Work**

Your one sentence conclusion, tacked on at the end of the last paragraph, seems to be the end of your identifying of uses and limits rather than addressing the “so what.” Your experience, as presented in the essay, seems to counter what Rubin presents in his article. For example, you seem to be able to identify with what Rubin describes as “over protective” parents (although you don’t clearly describe what such a parent looks like from Rubin’s or your own perspective), but then you point out that you were able to adjust well because you are independent and were ready to leave home. Help me understand how you became so independent and what made you read to leave home and come to college. Your experiences seems to offer evidence against what Rubin presents. If you experience supports what he has shown, help me see better what he has done in his article.

**Format/Mechanics/Process** – A strong essay is essentially clear of error and follows MLA formatting guidelines.

Did you proofread? 
You need a handbook à Are a proofreader?!

Your essay had some errors, but not many that were distracting. Be sure to go over your essay looking for errors before you turn it back in.

**Grade:** Please revise and resubmit.

When students completed their “Literacy Narrative Assignment” a scoring guide was again used in-class and as the means of evaluating the students final written work. That scoring guide, included below, presents instructions for how students can use it for their peer response::

**Introduction** – A strong introduction captures a reader’s attention and imagination, presents a brief overview of the essay by presenting relevant background/contextual information to what will be explored in the narrative, and highlights the scope and organization of what is to follow.

**Narrative Elements** – A strong narrative essay tells good stories. Good stories have enough detail to animate the issues discussed, and illustrate the ideas and situations teaching the author about literacy.

**Use of Relevant Source Information** – A strong literacy narrative uses information from the profiles, database research, course readings and the author’s personal experience. In doing so, the author uses information to accomplish a clear purpose (the project is clear), evaluates the information and its source critically, integrates and documents sources into the narrative.

**Conclusion** – A strong literacy narrative presents a clear understanding of literacy learned through the process of writing the narrative. In short, a strong conclusion answers the question: “So What?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format/Mechanics/Process</strong> – A strong essay is essentially clear of error and follows MLA formatting guidelines.</td>
<td>Did you proofread?</td>
<td>You need a handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are a proofreader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space is typically left to enable students and/or instructor to leave specific written comments on how author can revise to improve the draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this type of assignment-based assessment, we have also worked to evaluate our use of the online discussion board. A discussion of that evaluation is presented in question 30.

### 28. Assessment outcomes

The scoring guides described above facilitated student revision of essays, and were not used to evaluate the cohort as a whole. Although a typical Writing Seminar focuses primarily on issues of rhetoric, composition and research, increased intercultural awareness was added as a goal of our globally linked version of the course. Included among the student learning outcomes normally listed on course syllabi, our learning outcomes indicated that students would directly address issues of language difference and the varied sources of discursive resources:

- Students will recognize, analyze and synthesize cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences, and use those differences as available means for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening.
- Students will identify and analyze a range of influences – social, linguistic, cultural, technological and national – that have shaped them as writers, students, and individuals.

Adding these learning outcomes was based on our belief that by directly engaging with one another in writing, students would have to negotiate meaning with each other in academic discourse. In the process, reified notions of the homogeneity of language and academic discourse could be challenged directly and indirectly. We are in the early stages of a project to evaluate the student writing as a means to understanding the effectiveness of our class activities for achieving these outcomes.

We have completed an initial assessment of our use of the discussion board. A summary of that assessment and its outcomes follows:

During the first iteration of the course, only one of the six discussion topics posted to the Café Bar directly prompted reflection on issues of cross cultural communication. After introducing themselves in a post entitled, “Welcome to My World” in the first week, students were asked in the second week to share their “cross cultural resume,” detailing their previous contact and experience with “various cultures and languages other than your own, perhaps related to your family background, travel, friendships or reading.” None of the other discussion topics prompted reflection on issues of culture directly, but rather offered students the opportunity to get to know each other better by sharing photos, recommending music videos or books, or describing hobbies. We expected that issues of cultural and language difference would surface as a result of these conversations, but we were more concerned that these low-stakes interactions establish a tone that would provide students familiarity with one another so that they would feel comfortable working with one another on the more academic writing tasks.

To encourage open communication, discussion posts were assessed, as described in question 29 above, on a credit/no credit/resubmit scheme. Students who submitted thoughtful posts according to announced deadlines and followed instructions typically received full credit no matter what they wrote. The table below shows the students’ high level of participation in the discussion forum, the
difference in numbers of original posts relative to the number of students enrolled in the course, the posting activity of both classes and instructors (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACMT - 18 students</td>
<td>ACMT - 16 students</td>
<td>RIT – 16 Students</td>
<td>RIT – 6 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Original posts</td>
<td>31 Original Posts</td>
<td>22 Original Posts</td>
<td>22 Original Posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 non response (ACMT)</td>
<td>7 no responses (2-RIT, 5-ACMT)</td>
<td>0 no response</td>
<td>0 no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Posts (total)</td>
<td>79 Posts (total)</td>
<td>111 Posts (total)</td>
<td>81 Posts (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACMT – 58; RIT – 47</td>
<td>ACMT – 51; RIT – 28</td>
<td>ACMT – 68; RIT – 43</td>
<td>ACMT – 51; RIT – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 instructor responses</td>
<td>3 instructor responses</td>
<td>29 instructor responses</td>
<td>5 instructor responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Student and instructor participation in online discussion forum.

In the first round of Café Bar discussions, while some students chose noncontroversial topics, such as summer vacations, others in both sections showed an immediate interest in issues of social justice. One female student shared an image of the men’s rugby team that she played on, describing her experience being a woman playing a stereotypically male sport at a traditionally male-dominated institution. While this student also commented on the overall percentage of female students at RIT, and noted the small number of women enrolled in her section of Writing Seminar, another student in Dubrovnik responded with stories of her own experiences as a woman in male-dominated martial arts practice. A third student, from RIT, described his experience as a member of an ethnic minority overcoming disadvantages in high school and now college.

According to self-characterizations, many students in the spring section came to the course with a relatively high level of awareness of “cultural difference,” and seemed to value cross cultural experience for its own sake. When given an opportunity to introduce themselves to the group, or to take a photo of a text from their everyday lives, several students also spontaneously chose to address issues of social justice and demonstrated knowledge of, and interest in, the wider world around them. In addition to the issues regarding diversity in US higher education, one student, for example, wrote about a controversial gay pride parade that had been held in Split, Croatia. Demonstrating a general interest in promoting equality, justice, and tolerance other students wrote about female participation in college athletics, environmentalism, homelessness, consumerism, and humanitarian responses to the earthquake in Japan.

In the Café Bar prompt entitled, “Cross Cultural Resume,” students in both groups discussed their family roots and significant life experiences with different cultures and languages, including Ghana, Vietnam, Korea, Spain, Germany, inner-city Rochester, and New York City. Even with all of the attention on broad-based linguistic and cultural experiences, five of the 16 students in the Rochester
class identified themselves as not having much cross-cultural experience and/or identified themselves as somewhat impoverished in this regard. These were students whose experience was limited to brief vacations or foreign language study in high school or who felt estranged from immigrant family roots over generations. When writing about his limited experience one student wrote: “I cannot honestly say that I'm a particularly culturally knowledgeable person [...] Which is actually kind of sad.” Other students wrote about their cross-cultural as “not much to say,” it was the “bare minimum,” that they were “sheltered culturally,” or of their “unfortunate” lack of experience. There seemed to be a general consensus, however, that cross-cultural awareness and experience was to be desired, and that students could only benefit from such experiences.

Based on our experiences during the spring term, we decided that the issues being raised in the Café Bar were too generative to leave as informal writing meant primarily to improve the relationship among the students in the class. For that reason, we altered the Café Bar prompts to address specifically the issues raised in course readings. Because we didn’t alter our own approach to responding to the posts, we again observe numerous missed opportunities to bring the discussions occurring in the Café Bar into broader class discussion.

The fall offering of the course started out similarly to the spring, with icebreaker activities meant to acquaint the two groups that included creating and exchanging introductory videos of each group, which students seemed to enjoy. Participation in the first café bar discussion was high, with students posting photos and commenting extensively (see Table 1). There were 22 original postings, and each student was required to response to two postings. Because the numbers of students in each class were so different – 16 at ACMT and only 6 at RIT – the participation of the instructors were also high. Roje Charry and Martins, for example, wrote a combined 29 responses to student posts.

Generally speaking, as the examples above demonstrate, we saw that some students in both sections came to the course with an already established interest in cross-cultural issues, and felt free to express opinions which could be considered provocative. Their posts seemed to invite the kind of larger discussion that could have helped students investigate and even question some of their own cultural values. However, these potentially provocative ideas were rarely responded to in the online environment. Rather than provoking useful discussion, the online forum tended towards what we have come to think of as “Pleasantville.” The silence in response to these posts suggests that students seemed reluctant to offend, disagree, or rebut, instead focusing on creating an atmosphere of polite civility. We understand this to be the result of students’ concern about presentation of self in a public forum to their peers and their teachers; that is, especially in these discussion posts early in the class, students are presenting their best selves, engaging in polite conversation and demonstrating to their teachers that they can effectively complete the assigned tasks which require response to issues raised by their peers. While there is clearly some risk avoidance within the written posts, students in both sections openly expressed interest in some of the more substantial issues addressed above. The issue for us as the instructors is how to facilitate more substantive reflection on such topics through the structure of assignments, our own responses to discussion posts, and class discussion.

A more complete analysis can be found in Roje Charry, Rebecca, and David S. Martins “High Quality (Transnational) Learning Environments: Promoting Authentic Intercultural Dialogue on Social Justice Issues Online.” In Globalizing On-line: Telecollaborations, Internationalization, and Social Justice. Eds. Nataly Tcherepashenets (State University of New York, Empire State College) and Florence Lojacono (Universidad de Las Palmas, Gran Canaria, Spain).
29. Peer assessment

We did schedule a number of peer review sessions in the course, both within each section and across the globally linked sessions. Students did not grade each other, but simply offered feedback and suggestions. It was during one of these peer feedback sessions, in the fall quarter, that we encountered the most significant conflict/misunderstanding/difficulty. Looking back, we realized that part of the problem was our instructions for the assignment, and a big difference in student expectation for the purpose and type of feedback that was expected of them. (See section 10 for more details).

Peer review was a new concept for most of the ACMT students. They welcomed the idea in general, but many said at the end of the course that it was not very useful. They expressed a strong preference for feedback from the instructor on their drafts, rather than from their peers, particularly when their peer review partner was randomly assigned, either within their own section or from the RIT section.

30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

We did not develop any guidelines for students interaction. Though because of our experiences, it may be something we explore in the future. The form or scope of such a guideline, however, is an open question. We did spend time in class talking about providing peer feedback, especially after a somewhat dramatic experience during the second time we taught the class:

As part of the assignment sequence meant to help students identify and analyze the range of influences that have shaped their own development as writers, students, and individuals, students interviewed each other and wrote “literacy profiles” of two classmates. Because of the disparity in class sizes, each RIT student interviewed and profiled one ACMT student, and small groups of ACMT students interviewed one RIT student. In-class discussion identified the challenges of such group interviews, with particular attention to the difficulties of online, asynchronous interview conducted over email. Students were encouraged to “get to know each other” before the conducting the actual interview, using live chat or Skype to discuss hobbies or other low risk topics. They were also encouraged to follow up on written answers to questions before writing their final drafts. However, in practice, students completed this interview process on their own, outside of class, without synchronous communication, and without direct instructor supervision or oversight.

Because of the time difference, Charry was able to alert Martins to a situation in which one of the RIT students responded negatively to the profile written about her. Martins was then able to spend half that morning’s class period discussing this particular peer review and ways of making peer review more productive. As a result of the early intervention, the student was able to revise her comments and the other five students in the class who had not yet responded to the profile written about them were primed to respond in potentially more productive ways. It is impossible to know how they would have responded without the class discussion on the first student’s response. However, because the initial response occurred, the class was able to focus on meaningful cultural and language differences, and begin altering their own discursive resources for negotiating meaning in writing.

At ACMT, during the class meeting immediately following this exchange of online feedback, students were noticeably upset. As class began, one student volunteered casually, “It’s funny that in a class that is supposed to make us more friends with the Rochester students, it ended up making us not like them.” Sensing the tension, Charry asked students to write down their general reactions to the feedback they had received from their RIT classmates. This feedback was intended for the instructor
only, and students were told it would not be shared with the Rochester group. While students whose profiles had received only minor fact checking corrections seemed to feel that the process had been “good” or “easy enough,” students who received extensive feedback beyond fact checking from their peers were dissatisfied and felt that their own creative process and even authority to write the paper had been undermined, and that the RIT students were just “too sensitive.” In the next class discussion the students at ACMT were encouraged to think about whether they had actually misunderstood or misrepresented their RIT classmates, or whether issues of language difference had been at work. As a group, they seemed to resist self-criticism and continued to blame the RIT students for being too sensitive.

Charry and Martins discussed ways to address the situation in class, so presented each class with a Café Bar prompt on the topic of “authority in writing.” Students were asked to respond to a course reading by sharing a story about a writing experience that drew attention to the factors they believe led to a sense of authority, and that sense affected what they did to complete the writing task. The one post that focused on the peer review of the profiles, and that raised issues of authority in writing, the scope and nature of feedback, and ideas about the role of dialogue, was not responded to by any of the RIT students. One ACMT classmate did respond, but simply voiced general support. After a rather dramatic and somewhat difficult asynchronous confrontation, students seemed to return to “Pleasantville.”

### 31. Attrition

Only one RIT student dropped out of the Spring 2012 offering of the course.

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

ACMT and RIT dropout (withdrawal) rate was typical for this course.

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

As stated earlier in this case study, RIT and ACMT share a significant amount of infrastructure: curriculum, calendar, online resources and course management platform. The institutional mission of RIT and its relationship with ACMT fully supported the activities of the Institute process, even to the point the for Martins, all the activities were made part of his “plan of work.” That plan of work then served as the basis of his annual merit and tenure reviews. Starenko supported the project as part of his regular duties as an instructional designer. The situation was somewhat different for Charry....

#### 34. Engagement with international programs office

Last year, in the midst of the Institute’s activities, RIT created an office of International Education and Global Programs and hired an Associate Provost-level position to head the office. That individual has been aware of our activities, and as he has worked to coordinate all International efforts on campus, Martins has been included in numerous discussions for ongoing development of curriculum and assessment.
35. Importance given to globally networked learning

Yes. Internationalization is a high priority at RIT, and the office of International Education and Global Programs has seen our experience with globally networked learning as important to ongoing discussion. Additionally, RIT has just this year created an “Innovative Learning Institute” focused on fostering innovative online learning strategies, such as GNLEs. Starenko is an instructional designer in the ILI.

36. Commitment

The interests are great, and there is strong institutional commitment. Although a clear plan to develop globally networked initiatives has not been articulated, many different efforts on campus are focused in this direction.

37. Future iterations

The course has been offered twice, and we have plans to offer the RIT/ACMT course again Fall 2013.

38. New globally networked courses

The possibility of additional sections at other branch locations are being explored. RIT has degree-granting relationships with a number of institutions.

39. Response of deans, chairs, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

The response has been incredibly strong and invested. However, the enormity of changes on our campus has produced a situation where Martins is not yet clear on how RIT will continue to develop globally networked classes in a sustainable way. But he has no doubt it will continue to be developed. Other faculty have also begun to write grant proposal and identify development opportunities related to globally networked learning.

40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Very committed.

41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

We think the key to nurturing GNLEs at RIT would be for upper management to include such courses as a “normal” mode of teaching and learning at the Institute. Online and blended courses are already achieved that status, and the “flipped classroom model” is not far behind. We think the same could/should happen with GNLEs.

Section 8: Reflections

42. Goals set

- Design a course that focuses primarily on issues of writing competence, but that would also address issues of language difference and the varied sources of discursive resources:
  - Students will recognize, analyze and synthesize cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences, and use those differences as available means for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening.
- Students will identify and analyze a range of influences – social, linguistic, cultural, technological and national – that have shaped them as writers, students, and individuals.
- Develop online writing pedagogies that engage students with literacy practices important in higher education
- Collaborate with colleagues at two affiliated campuses to deliver effective writing instruction
- Broaden individual teaching practices using online, collaborative modalities
- Create an exciting, new experience for students

### 43. Goals achieved

Generally, goals were achieved. Personally, I feel that my teaching has been challenged and invigorated, students have experienced a unique learning environment, and everyone involved has learned. (Rebecca) I feel very positive about this teaching experience. Although we are still working on charting a course somewhere between “my way or the highway” and “pleasantville,” this experience has definitely improved and invigorated my teaching.

### 44. Most unique aspect for students

The opportunity to collaborate with students from “somewhere else” on assigned writing tasks.

### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Creating some dynamic interaction among students in two sections of first-year writing. Also, the Cafe Bar encouraged students to write and share sincere opinions and ideas, without grade pressure. I think the cafe bar environment succeeded in motivating students to do more thoughtful writing and commenting.

### 46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

When the assigned writing tasks produced challenging moments for negotiating meaning across language and cultural difference that they were designed to produce, I did not feel entirely prepared to adequately and effectively respond to the situation. Rebecca -- I too felt unprepared to respond the some of the moments of tension. It is not clear whether the issue was true cultural differences, or simply individual personalities, or even the way that we wrote the assignments.

### 47. Changes for future iterations

Some ideas for changing the course have already been piloted in Charry’s recent section that was not taught in collaboration with an RIT section. Charry added numerous multimodal elements, including videos, photos, and songs. Students, for example, practiced “coming to terms” with a recent New York Times column by Roger Cohen on "oversharing" in social media, and then on the songs "Mother, Mother" by Tracy Bonham and "One of Us" by Joan Osborne. Using these songs to talk about ambiguity, close reading, and interpretation added a new level of excitement in the class. Charry also emphasized coming to terms, and allowed students numerous opportunities for ungraded practice and teamwork in preparation for the graded individual paper. In addition, she eliminated the interviews and profile assignments, instead focusing much more on autobiography, and replaced journal article readings with multiple examples of multimodal literacy autobiographies. Finally, she reduced the number of Café Bar posts to only 4, which allows more time to students and instructors to reflect and comment on the discussion, and to integrate those online discussions into face-to-face class discussion. All of these changes will be incorporated into the third globally networked version of the course.
## 48. Technical support

While Starenko feels regret about the technological and pedagogical failure of the class-to-class synchronous online component, he feels good about the design and positive effect of the Cafe’ Bar discussions. All in all, he thinks that his role in this project was similar to his role in scores of other projects involving online and/or blended course design. Because Martins and Charry copied Starenko on their voluminous email correspondence, he was able to discern three themes in the course design and “delivery” processes:

1. Challenge of “team teaching” a course designed and previously taught by one of the two instructors
2. Difficulty of assessing the educational benefits of asynchronous compared to synchronous communication modes and technologies
3. The various impact of different instructional/linguistic environments (i.e., ACMT students working online in one computer lab, whereas Rochester students working online in their individual rooms)

## 49. International programs person

From Starenko’s perspective, the first iteration took relatively more time to develop and support on account of the class-to-class synchronous online sessions. Conversely, the second iteration took much less time because the course was already developed it did not include any class-to-class synchronous online sessions. The Cafe’ Bar synchronous discussion assignments took only a little more time to develop compared to a “typical” blended course, which usually have one asynchronous online discussion assignment per week. The development of “the course,” which was 80-90% “traditional” in format (that is a blend of collaborative class time and independent reading and writing time), was a completely different matter.

## 50. Was it worth it?

Starenko thinks that it will be much easier to support another iteration of the course because no class-to-class synchronous online communication will be used.

### Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

We designed the writing tasks of this course with the intention that students would begin to see language difference as a resource rather than simply a barrier to making meaning in intercultural communication. At the same time, we hoped that through the experience of globally networked learning, students would recognize those moments when they, or their instructors, privileged one form of language use over others. So far, our experience teaching these two globally networked courses demonstrates that the discussion board, in isolation, clearly tends towards the sort of sterile exchange that is reflected in the term "Pleasantville." For that reason, opportunities to re-examine and question cultural attitudes are not taken unless we make structural efforts to foster risk taking.

Clearly, students see the online forum as a place to present their public self. Even when students from one class- or peer group may not shy away from direct peer-to-peer confrontation in writing, students outside of that group tend to avoid risking confrontation; at least in the context of low-stakes, online discussion. Although serious, sometimes controversial, issues of cultural and language difference were written about by students in the Café Bar, other students seemed to avoid the more contentious issues in favor of “safer” issues, unless they felt comfortable or safe with one another.

In the context of high-stakes collaboration on writing, however, students seemed more willing to engage directly in issues of difference. We witnessed potential for conflict and misunderstanding when students collaborate on
written assignments in which they may not share the same underlying assumptions about authorship, and authority. Unless structured carefully, these interactions have the potential to strengthen, rather than correct, the kinds of stereotypes of other cultures that we hoped our course would address.

The issue for us as instructors is how to facilitate more substantive responses to cultural and language difference, through the structure of assignments, our own responses to students’ written texts, and expanding class discussion. With so many original posts produced in each class, the number of discussions that raised such issues was overwhelming and we missed numerous opportunities for exploring relevant issues within and between each section. By taking a more deliberate role in managing the discussions, and then creating roles for different kinds of response, we believe we can provide students opportunities to learn from one another and also gain a deeper understanding of the issues such collaboration brings into the foreground. For example, after every student introduces themselves in their “Welcome to my world” post, we could form the students into four different groups for the “Cross Cultural Resume.” While the first group might post an initial response to the prompt, a second group of students could provide a thoughtful common to the original post. The third group could respond in a shorter post with the final group of students working to relate the ensuing discussion to course readings and/or in-class discussions. Regardless of what roles the different student groups may play, asking students to do more than simply respond to two of their peer’s posts would likely do a lot to help us all think more deeply and learn more about negotiating meaning from positions of cultural and linguistic difference.

While it is comparatively easier and safer to write directly about cultural issues in the informal context of an online discussion, it is quite another matter to negotiate meaning across cultural and language when they surface unexpectedly during other course tasks like peer review and collaborative writing. Given the aims of our course, moments of tension or conflict when working collaboratively on a project are pivotal for the learning of the course. For this reason, working with students to do meaningful reflection on these issues within online discussions will certainly help students negotiate their difference when working together to produce writing.

Section 10: Student Feedback

FROM ACMT SPRING QUARTER GROUP: This course really was something new, because we actually got to communicate with another campus, though I think that it would have been a better experience if everyone had done everything in time, and not two weeks later.

This class was a totally new experience. At the beginning I had a feeling that it will be a stupid class not worth taking. Well I was wrong and I enjoyed every lecture. The discussion Cafe bar was excellent. Having a chance to share your writing, reading, music, experience, stories, literacy actually a part of your life with people that I have never met before was great. We made new friends. :) The peer review is an excellent idea because I had a chance to hear others opinion about my work and it helped me a lot to improve my writing as did this whole course. Thank you for allowing us to choose the construction of this class by this I mean the discussion topics. Maybe few more live video chat in the future would be great.

In ACMT fall quarter group, only 3 of 16 students completed evaluation and none left substantive comments.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Environmental Politics and Political Ecology</td>
<td>La Universidad San Francisco de Quito and Coastal Carolina University</td>
<td>Anthropology and Politics</td>
<td>3rd and 4th year primarily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Dr. Diego Quiroga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>USFQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Dr. Pamela Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>CCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Politics and International Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Mr. Geoff Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>CCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Director International Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>International Programs Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Team Member #4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jennifer Shinaberger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>CCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program</td>
<td>CeTEAL (Center for Teaching and Learning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **When?**

Spring 2012

4. **Number of students enrolled from each institution**

CCU - 15 and USFQ 15

5. **Is this typical for classes of this type?**

Average for an upper level class at both.

### Section 2: Issues of Language

6. **Language(s) of instruction at each institution**

   English.

7. **Primary language of most students in each class**

   English.

8. **Language of the course collaboration**

   English

9. **Language fluency**

   Very fluent as students were international students from all over the world at the Galapagos Institute program.

10. **Language proficiency difference**

    N/A
### Section 3: Curricular Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Online or blended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully online and Dr. Quiroga visited CCU in Feb. 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students met via videoconference twice and then conversed in groups of 3-5 students to form small, blog groups. The class consisted of 3 communication modes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. videoconference (twice and one time recorded for later viewing in the Galapagos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. blogs – students blogged in small groups 4 times formally throughout the semester. They also informally (not for a grade) blogged about their experiences multiple times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In-person visit- Dr. Diego Quiroga visited the CCU campus in Myrtle Beach to give an in-person lecture to CCU students, as well as promote the CCU-USFQ exchange partnership and create new endeavors between the two institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard and it was quite effective and well received at both institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Server location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCU provided the Blackboard access, but USFQ uses it as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Technical problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, but once students arrived in the Galapagos, high winds downed satellite connections for Internet, which disrupted our class communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They were expected to use them once per week, but this stopped after 5 weeks due to technology failures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Informal communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student blogs throughout the semester are available at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://ccuglobalenvironment.blogspot.com/">http://ccuglobalenvironment.blogspot.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A CCU student, James Johnson, managed this site and created the 6 small groups for the class. Another student, James Clark, from USFQ helped students in Ecuador navigate the blog and communicated to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
professors when there were technology issues.
Located in these blogs are the collaborative contracts, blogs, and student wikis.

19. Re-use

Yes and I would teach this course again if technology improves because both sets of students enjoyed and benefitted from the interaction.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

Skype videoconference and adobe connect.

21. Server location

Provided by CCU. We also used Eluminate from USFQ.

22. Technical problems

No, the connection from Quito was excellent when we used them.

23. Frequency of use

We were to have done this 4 times, but only managed twice.

24. Informal communication

Students had access to skype and elluminate accounts. They did use skype informally throughout the semester.

25. Re-use

Yes, I would use skype. While it is not always reliable, it is generally understood by students and already on many of their devices. This makes informal communication much more effective and approachable. Adobe Connect is an excellent source as well, but more cumbersome for the instructor.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

Interactive Blogs will be assigned throughout the semester as indicated on the schedule below to facilitate dialog and analysis between USFQ and CCU students on significant issues in global environmental politics and political ecology.

Joint research Wiki project – Students will select a topic of interest in the area of global environmental governance and turn it in by class time on the due date. Specific assignment guidelines will be posted in blackboard.
The project presentation will take place on the wiki project due date in class. This presentation will be a maximum of 15 minutes, summarizing the paper’s main findings and how they relate to the class.

The midterm will be a simulation on a challenging issue to global environmental politics. This simulation will include role-playing, position paper writing, and in and out of class negotiation on environmental policies. You may not be absent for this assignment.

The final exam and reflection on the CCU-USFQ Globally Networked Learning Class will be a cumulative assessment of learning in this class. It will take place on the scheduled final exam day per the Coastal Carolina University schedule and will include a reflective essay about the GNLE experience and its impacts on student learning.

27. Common assessment rubric

CCU and USFQ collaborated on all assessment rubrics below.

Class Interactions:

The student blogs throughout the semester are available at:

http://ccuglobalenvironment.blogspot.com/

A CCU student, James Johnson, managed this site and created the 6 small groups for the class. Another student, James Clark, from USFQ helped students in Ecuador navigate the blog and communicated to the professors when there were technology issues.

Located in these blogs are the collaborative contracts, blogs, and student

Local/Global Blog Activity:

Write a multi-media blog that includes the following:

1. Minimum of 2 paragraphs of text explaining the local environmental issue that you have found; its challenges; and its connections to the larger global ecological system and/or global environmental governance system. (60 points)
2. Include a rich media source, such as photo or video or both (20 points)
3. Pose a final question(s) that you were left with after discovering this issue. (10 points)
4. Excellent grammar and organization. (10 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Media Work Quality</th>
<th>Exemplary Work (100-86 points)</th>
<th>Satisfactory Work (85-70 points)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (69 points or below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary description of the issue, the challenges, its global context, and/or its relationship to global environmental governance. The student exceeds the minimum</td>
<td>Satisfactory description of the issue, the challenges, its global context, and/or its relationship to global environmental governance. The student meets the minimum requirements and demonstrates an</td>
<td>Missing or unsatisfactory description of the issue, the challenges, its global context, and/or its relationship to global environmental governance. The student does not meet the minimum requirements and fails to demonstrate a proper understanding of the subject matter. The text may be incomplete and/or inadequate/inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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requirements and demonstrates a mastery of the subject matter.

understanding of the subject matter.

The media source is of excellent quality and exceeds the minimum requirements of the guideline. It is both appropriate and accurate in content and contributes to the overall quality of the assignment.

The media source is of good/satisfactory quality and meets the minimum requirements of the guideline. It is largely appropriate and accurate in content and contributes to the overall quality of the assignment.

The media source is missing or unsatisfactory. It fails to meet the minimum requirements per the guideline. It may be appropriate and/or accurate in content. It fails to contribute to the overall quality of the assignment.

The final question is well thought-out and thought provoking. It demonstrates a deep understanding of the issues being discussed.

The final question is adequate and thought provoking. It demonstrates an understanding of the issues being discussed.

The final question is missing or inadequate. It demonstrates a lack of understanding and/or effort with the assignment.

The student’s grammar and organization are perfect. They demonstrate effort and forethought and aid in the overall quality of the assignment.

The student’s grammar and organization are appropriate for a college level assignment and meet the minimum requirements. There is evidence of effort and forethought and errors are minor in nature.

The student’s grammar and organization are not college level and fail to meet minimum standards. Errors may be glaring and/or plentiful. Student display’s a lack of effort and forethought and/or the work appears rushed. Errors distract and/or hinder the assignment’s overall quality.

Blogs on the readings:
1. Minimum of 2 paragraphs outlining the arguments of the readings and your response to them (60 points)
2. Must include evidence/data/examples to support your perspective(s) (20 points)
3. May include multi-media or photos, etc, if relevant (0-10 points)
4. Excellent grammar and organization. (10-20 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blog Work Quality</th>
<th>Exemplary Work (100-86 points)</th>
<th>Satisfactory Work (85-70 points)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (69 points or below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument Outline and Response</td>
<td>Exemplary description of the readings and the issues pertaining to it. Argument outline is objective and unbiased, and portrays both the pros and cons of each</td>
<td>Accurate description of the readings and the issues pertaining to it. Argument outline is objective and unbiased. It portrays both sides of the argument. The</td>
<td>Missing or inaccurate description of the readings and the issues pertaining to it. Argument outline is biased or uneven. It does not portray both sides of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples, Evidence, and Facts that support the student’s response.</strong></td>
<td>“side.” The student’s response is both clear and thorough. It addresses the opposing viewpoint and makes a counter-argument. The student exceeds the minimum requirements and demonstrates a mastery of the subject matter.</td>
<td>Student’s response is both clear and easy to understand. It also addresses the opposing viewpoint. The student meets the minimum requirements and demonstrates an understanding of the subject matter.</td>
<td>Argument. The student’s response is missing or unclear. The student may have constructed a “strawman” argument to unfairly “spin” the blog to their point of view. The student fails to meet the minimum requirements and demonstrates a lack of understanding of the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Media</strong></td>
<td>The student does an excellent job of supporting their argument with clear, valid, and logical examples, evidence, and facts. The material stems from a trusted source and is directly connected to the issues.</td>
<td>The student does a satisfactory job of supporting their argument with clear examples, evidence, and facts. The material is connected to the issues and supports the student’s point of view.</td>
<td>The student does not provide or does an unsatisfactory job of supporting their argument. Examples, evidence, and facts are missing, unclear, or flawed. The material is not connected to the issues and may not support the student’s point of view. The student is unable to provide valid reasons for their view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar and Organization</strong></td>
<td>The student’s grammar and organization are perfect. They demonstrate effort and forethought and aid in the overall quality of the assignment.</td>
<td>The student’s grammar and organization are appropriate for a college level assignment and meet the minimum requirements. There is evidence of effort and forethought and errors are minor in nature.</td>
<td>The student’s grammar and organization are not college level and fail to meet minimum standards. Errors may be glaring and/or plentiful. Student display’s a lack of effort and forethought and/or the work appears rushed. Errors distract and/or hinder the assignment’s overall quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this assignment is to allow you to delve deeper into topics of your interest outside of class. We will have a rolling due date process, which means that you will sign up for different due dates that roughly correlate with the topics we have in class. This also allows you to schedule your paper due date around your own schedule. Given this level of flexibility, I urge you to pay close attention to the date you choose as I will not accept late projects (unless you have a valid and very traumatic excuse!). Separately, I will provide you with a list of ideas for paper topics. Ten pages/2500 words is not very lengthy, so you should narrow down your topic so as not to be as broad as say, climate change, but not so narrow so that it hinders your ability to explore the area. This is a multi-disciplinary subject and thus, you can research anything that you desire within the global environment. For instance, you might be interested in water pollutants in our oceans. This would require some basic understanding of water quality science, as well as the politics of it. This is where global environmental policy is headed and anyone who is serious about learning about it, working in it, or studying it should get a good grasp of the science and the politics. Plus, what could be more fun, really?

The GNLE difference: You’re all in groups of about 4-5 people and have been throughout the semester. By now, you should have been discussing various global and local topics and readings, and should have a good feel for your common interests. Maybe, given the nature of this course, the group would like to focus more on a topic in the Galapagos and have our USFQ students do field research for some of the project. That would mean the CCU students would do the scientific (cited) research. With 4 of you, 2500 words (about 10 pages of text) should not be difficult. However, a wiki is more than text. It’s making a multi-media and aesthetically pleasing presentation of a topic. You need to tell us all about the topic, cite it in APSA format within the wiki as footnotes or endnotes, and you need to embed multi-media to make the topic come to life for the reader.

Hints for organization:
1. Roles: Divide the topic and issues within it for research; Who will be the writers? Who will be responsible for multi-media? Will anyone be in the field? Who will be the editor(s)?
2. Write various drafts. Wikis are “built,” not written last-minute as you may have previously done with papers. They are a learning process. Start early!
3. Refer back to your collaborative contract for conflict resolution if problems arise. Group work across international borders is the way of the world today.
4. Be sure you all review your final project and its academic rigor + aesthetic appeal. Brains and Beauty count here!
5. Have fun with this and enjoy the scientific learning process!

Grading Guidelines:
Thesis statement/Clear, Defined Topic
Introduction with map of overall wiki
Review theory and previous science on the issue
Excellent Understanding of the Issue and its Challenges
Original Research with hyperlinked citations (don’t’ use Wikipedia, please)
Conclusions and Findings
Future Suggestions for Research
Multi-media/photo – either from web or original throughout
Writing Structure, Style, and Organization
Total

5
10
10
10
20
10
5
20
10
100
28. Assessment outcomes

Student Learning Outcomes:

Students applied their individual course readings to the common readings and exchanged ideas through the blogs. Students also shared other environmental concerns on the blogs. This enhanced their local-global perspective, particularly with the addition of the photos and insights from the students in Ecuador. The common readings correlated with the timing of the student trips to various sites in Ecuador – glaciers, Andes, Amazon, Galapagos.

The most significant outcome of the course was the deep connection of student reflection to the readings as both groups were personally exposed (either live or digitally) to the environmental issues being covered in class. The blogs by USFQ students created a number of CCU in-class discussions on the reality of environmental politics in pristine areas like those visited by the USFQ students. For example, James Clark, a USFQ student, posted photos and wrote about his deep disappointment in what he saw near the Tiputini Biosphere Reserve in Yasuní National Park in the Ecuadorian Amazon. While this is classified as one of the most pristine places on the planet, just next to it, local residents are selling endangered species and meat in market. James posted pictures of the market. CCU students, who had only read about Tiputini from their professor’s (Martin) writing, could not fully understand the complexities of development in the Amazon until they read another student’s accounts and saw the photos.

This exchange also impacted the midterm simulation of the Yasuní-ITT Initiative, which is a global initiative on the part of the Ecuadorian government to have the international community contribute to a UN multilateral development fund to keep oil underground in this Amazonian park – the same park that USFQ students visited and about which they blogged and posted photos. Additionally, CCU and USFQ students reviewed the Convention on Biodiversity and the International Convention on Endangered Species, both of which cover issues relevant to the Amazon and the meat market that USFQ students visited. They immediately recognized and made the real world connection between complex international conventions and the difficulty of enforcing them in remote, local areas of developing countries.

Another example can be garnered from two experiences: Dr. Quiroga’s in-person talk to our CCU class on the reading of his article on the Galapagos and the “myth of nature,” and a common reading on Ecuador’s new constitutional approach toward sustainable development, called “buen vivir,” or well-being. Dr. Quiroga explained the complex science of the Galapagos archipelago and the societal challenges of mixing fishing, tourism, and Darwin’s legacy in this fragile environment to our CCU class. Students also read an article on the national and global impacts of an alterative approach to sustainable development, being implemented in Ecuador.

While CCU and USFQ students enthusiastically endorsed a new approach to sustainable development – a concept that has been both controversial and difficult to implement globally – they doubted the ability of Ecuador to actually develop a workable solution to creating a truly sustainable country – meaning protecting the environment and alleviating poverty through the creation of a new economy that melds humanity and nature. CCU students doubted that anyone in Ecuador actually knew this constitutional term existed. In fact, USFQ students saw it all over the country, and posted pictures of it in the Galapagos. Yet USFQ students also noted the ironies of such a concept as they observed increased pollution on the islands and a lack of concern among some residents and tourists for the protection of the fragile archipelago. At the same time, they noted policy changes in the Galapagos toward a new sustainable approach of “buen vivir.” This opened the eyes of CCU students who experienced virtually the deep inconsistencies and complexities of sustainable development and the struggle of local communities to make a living within some of the world’s most prized and pristine ecosystems.
29. Peer assessment

N/A

30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

N/A

31. Attrition

N/A

32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

Had this course continued, this would have had a very positive outcome on both campuses. In fact, we are working to successfully implement another GNLE course.

**Section 7: Institutional Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33. Type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial: CCU paid for Dr. Quiroga’s visit, for a stipend for Dr. Martin, and one fall course release for Dr. Martin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34. Engagement with the international programs office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have a student studying in Ecuador who was in this class and was inspired by it. CCU and USFQ have signed a joint collaborative research agreement in which faculty and students from both institutions collaborate on 2 research projects per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. Importance given to globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our campus is working to expand our abilities to continue such courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36. Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was a singular commitment, but we do see more interest now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37. Future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hope to offer it again in the future as technology permits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38. New globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam is working on another course for 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

I would say there is commitment broadly, but few funds for incentives and infrastructure due to budget constraints. The biggest obstacle to this is the time it takes to do such a course. Faculty would need course release and stipends to do such activities, or at the very least for the first time they offer a GNLE course.

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked courses

Training, course release time, and monetary incentives, plus support in arranging the technology and connections with other institutions.

### Section 8: Reflections

#### 42. Goals set

1. to develop global perspectives on the environment
2. to include real world case examples in our classrooms through technology
3. to effectively use technology to collaborate

#### 43. Goals achieved

Despite our technology challenges, we did pursue a common collaboration program and students did gain global perspectives from our brief communications and blogs.

#### 44. Most unique aspect for students

**Tangible Results:**

As a result of Dr. Quiroga’s visit and this class, we have strengthened our relationship in various ways between the two institutions. They are:

1. Two students from the CCU Global Environmental Politics course will be attending the USFQ campus next academic year.
2. CCU and USFQ have agreed to a joint program (funded by both universities) to strengthen ties between the institutions in the form of a student-faculty scholarship to encourage joint research teams between the institutions. This was a result of Dr. Quiroga’s visit. The first projects will begin during the 2012-13 academic year.
3. The schools of Education, Business, and Sciences will begin new partnerships between CCU and USFQ, including a teacher education program and exchange.

This COIL grant has provided us with the guidance and positive reinforcement that we needed to continue our global connections. Dr. Martin will be meeting with other USFQ faculty in June 2012 to discuss new GNLE possibilities for the 2012-13 academic year in an in-person visit to Ecuador. We greatly thank the COIL faculty and staff for their patience with us and support, as well as the immensely helpful training institute in October 2011.

#### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Videoconference is the best form of communication when it works, but students enjoyed blogging as well.
46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Internet connections for videoconference.

47. Changes for future iterations

Choose a partner institution with stronger Internet connections and easier access. Quito campus has such access and connection.

48. Technical support

N/A

49. International programs person

N/A

50. Time commitment

This course requires approximately 5 hours extra per week.

51. Was it worth it?

Absolutely! These experiences are personally and professionally enriching for both students and faculty.

Section 9: Student Feedback

Thank you for your efforts to create something of the USFQ-CCU classrooms.
This is a student of the GAIAS program in spring 2012.

I just wanted to say thanks for your effort and am a little sorry it didn't work out, but I believe that if you're paying attention things happen for a reason. I am inspired by your work, which we read on several occasions and appreciate what you did.

Though you were not directly a huge influence on my Ecuadorian experience, your presence was felt and as this new year rolls in I want to express some gratitude towards those who have had a role in what may have been the most incredible year of my life to date.
8. Germany - USA: World Science Fiction

Abstract

The World Science Fiction course connected Bruce Clarke’s graduate seminar at Texas Tech University with Dirk Vanderbeke seminar at the University of Jena. The collaborative seminar met synchronously by video Skype, an arrangement made possible by both classes being relatively small—5 students at TTU and an average of 9 at Jena. Accounting for the non-coincidence of the American and German academic semester, we developed a syllabus concentrating on literary readings and assignments to international student research groups. These groups were organized around themes and issues we set forward on the seminar Web sites. The personnel of the student groups varied from one assignment to the next, but always paired American and German students; they met asynchronously to collaborate on the group responses, which they brought into discussion during the weekly synchronous seminars. Sorting out the technical demands of the synchronous classes and the scheduling demands of the asynchronous discussions was perhaps the main hurdle to be overcome in the first month of the collaboration. The students varied in terms of their commitment to resolving the challenges of the seminar, and we learned over time the need to tighten up our course policies. But on the whole, especially once the technical issues had been largely resolved, we were both gratified by the character and quality of the students’ interactions, uniquely enabled by the international collaborative format.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Science Fiction</td>
<td>Texas Tech University, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>graduate seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Bruce Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>instructional faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Department of English, Literature area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. When?

Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

Five graduate students at TTU / Eight at Jena

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

On the TTU side, this was a small graduate seminar, but not untypically so. The globally networked nature of the course likely made little or no difference to the course size. More significant would be that in fall semesters at TTU, required seminars are more in demand, while elective courses such as this are less in demand. For Jena the class was rather small, probably due to the fact that we started October 1, that is three weeks before the usual beginning of the semester in order to catch up with the American group. The students who were willing to start early did so because they were interested in the “global experiment.”

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

English. At Jena all classes in English studies are taught in English.

7. Primary language of most students in each class

At TTU it is English. In Jena it is German.

8. Language of the course collaboration

Yes, English.
9. Language fluency

All students were fluent in English. At TTU one of the students was Japanese. His English comprehension was excellent, but his spoken accent was thick, and this led to some difficulties in his being comprehended by others in both seminars. And the Germans, as non-native speakers, would make the occasional mistake. Not all of the German students actually studied English - there was a PhD student from physics and a PhD student from anthropology who joined because they were interested in the topic and the international form, but their English was also quite acceptable.

10. Language proficiency difference

Viewed from the TTU side, the English facility of the German students was truly excellent, and offered no impediment to the networked seminar. From the perspective of the German group, any difference in skills was irrelevant.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?

Except for one session in which the technical facilities broke down and the groups continued individually, the two groups always met online for synchronous three-hour seminars, the TTU seminar beginning at 9:00 with the German seminar beginning at 16:00, depending on differences in regional changes between standard and daylight time zones.

12. Duration

10 weeks.

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Bruce Clarke’s TTU group started its regular American semester at the end of August, and devoted the first four weeks, prior to being joined by the German group, to the study of an anthology of science-fiction criticism and theory. Dirk Vanderbeke as the instructor of the Jena group joined in from the beginning, and occasionally some of the German students would also be present. The full collaboration began on October 1, three weeks before the official start of the semester in Jena, and lasted through the first week of December, when the TTU semester ended. During this time the assignments were mutual readings of science-fiction short stories and novels. By the end of the American semester, the German group had fulfilled the required hours for a seminar (30), but the Jena students expressed the wish to go on until Christmas because they enjoyed the topic and the discussions, and so the group had a few more sessions.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

Email addresses and Skype addresses were distributed to all concerned, and the students were invited to experiment with different means of communication. During the ten weeks of the mutual period of the two
seminars, all students were divided into smaller international groups, and these groupings would then be changed or self-regenerated to allow for temporary interest clusters to coalesce around announced topics of discussion. On the TTU side, the general sense of the students was that due to the time difference, Skyping outside of the common seminar period was difficult, and so networked communications tended to default to asynchronous email threads.

The German group used a Moodle variant (Wordwise) that is common in their institute, the American group was also invited to join this LMS, but they rather relied on the American system in use at their university, which for Clarke was a continuously updated course Web site.

15. Server location

The course Web site was located on the English departmental server at TTU, Wordwise provided by the institute in Jena.

16. Technical problems

No.

17. Frequency of use

These tools—email, Web site construction through Microsoft Expression Web at TTU, the Wordwise Moodle site at Jena—were not used in the virtual classroom, which ran on Skype. There were no stated expectations for student use other than what was needed to carry on international discussion and to fulfill group assignments to prepare responses for synchronous presentation.

18. Informal communication

See above.

19. Re-use

Yes.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

We spent several weeks before the beginning of the American semester attempting to find a software platform that could both (1) provide advanced facilities such as simultaneous multiple screens, and (2) be successfully integrated with both the American and the German university systems. However, the technical staffs of the two universities could not agree on the suitability of a specific software—each basically claimed that they used the standard software and that the other university should follow suit. This impasse was frustrating for us, but we found no solution to that problem. So eventually we gave that up and just used Skype for video and audio.

21. Server location

Skype is cloud-based.
22. Technical problems

It took another month until the technology worked well. At first Skype was only marginally satisfactory, and we had to break up one session and continue in individual groups, as we could no longer understand each other. To a large extent, it was a matter of increasing the bandwidth of the Skype connection. Perfecting this platform demanded the upgrading of equipment on the TTU side. This included dropping a 1-Gigabyte LAN port into the seminar room and the provision of a 52-inch monitor with a dedicated desktop computer and a freestanding omnidirectional microphone. After much trial and error, by the end of October we established a stable and largely satisfactory synchronous platform, allowing both seminars full and undistorted visual and audio contact during the synchronous seminar periods.

23. Frequency of use

Each week there was one session of three hours (9:00-12:00 in Texas, 16:00-19:00 in Jena). In the course of the semester, students were given three assignments to collaborate on in small international groups of between 2-4 participants. For these assignments, the students were encouraged to make contact via Skype, but most preferred to rely on email instead. The reason given was chiefly the difficulties posed by the time difference between Texas and Jena. At least one American student was personally opposed to direct contact via Skype. As opposed to the German students, who were perhaps more cosmopolitan in outlook, several of the American students were relatively recalcitrant, and there was a distinct division among them between three who gave the collaborative component of the course less effort, versus two who did their best to rise to the occasion.

24. Informal communication

See above.

25. Re-use

Bruce Clarke: Yes, the available tools are fine.
Dirk Vanderbeke: Yes, but the experiences of this class would lead next time to an earlier check up on the technical facilities and to stricter requirements for the students to actually use synchronous tools on the group work.
Bruce Clarke: I agree with Dirk here. This time being our first attempt at such a course, we left the assignments too open-ended and relied on the students’ volunteering the time to make them work. Now that we have a sense of how the tools function, we could refine and strengthen the collaborative assignments accordingly.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

We gathered the regular student evaluations required by our respective institutions. Of course, these contained no intercultural awareness components. In order to generate feedback on the unique intercultural components of the networked seminars, we developed an internal evaluation form—see 29 below.

With regard to assessing the disciplinary learning, the situation was different in America and Germany. At TTU, Clarke assigned shorter and longer writing assignments, and based semester grades largely on success in these normal activities, along with a holistic estimate of each student’s overall application to the course. By these measures, the American students exhibited a typical mixture of accomplishment, from significant to marginal scholarly progress. In Germany the group activities were not officially graded - and as only one students needs the credits anyway, it would not have made much sense.
27. **Common assessment rubric**

We created an informal evaluation sheet for this specific class. In Jena the students were quite well known to the instructor and thus problems and points of critique - basically all about the early difficulties with the technology - were expressed and discussed directly. Here is the common assessment rubric we created for the networked course:

Bruce Clarke and Dirk Vanderbeke

Student Evaluation for the seminar “World Science Fiction”

**Content**

- Did the class meet your expectations?
- Did the class fit into your current level of studies?
- Were the assignments sufficiently challenging / too challenging?
- What (if anything) did you like about the class?
- What did you dislike?
- What would you suggest to improve a class delivered in this fashion?
- On a scale from 1 (best) to 5 (worst), how would you grade the class?

**Format**

- Did the intercultural collaborative character of this class meet your expectations?
- In your efforts to establish collaborative relationships, what worked best?
- In your efforts to establish collaborative relationships, what problems did you encounter?
- Did you profit from the collaboration with your partner(s) from abroad?
- Did the online teaching contribute to the success/failure of the class?
- Technical problems were to be expected for this class. Did they present a serious impediment for you?
- How do you rate the teachers individually and as a team?

28. **Assessment outcomes**

As one would expect, opinions ranged. Clarke’s students were divided, as noted previously, between those who embraced the seminar’s opportunities and those who did not. Vanderbeke’s students were more united in their overall positive assessment. See the sample evaluations below in 35.

29. **Peer assessment**

No.

30. **Charter or guidelines for student interaction**

No.

31. **Attrition**

There were no drop-outs from either seminar.

32. **Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?**

Clarke: Lack of drop-outs was typical for the TTU seminar: American graduate students at public universities have their stipends factored into their enrollments, so they drop out of seminars only under exceptional duress.

Vanderbeke: In contrast, in Germany there is on average a 30% drop-out rate - students do not have to pay tuition and so they enroll in far more courses than they need and then drop out of some. For this class I had told
them that some special commitment was required, but then I did not have the feeling that any considered dropping out anyway.

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

The TTU Department of English provided the resources to purchase the equipment upgrades discussed in section 24. Otherwise, only technological support was required and we received it from both institutions. For problems between the German and American technical support, see above, section 22.

#### 34. Engagement with the international programs office

Clarke: We have an Office of International Affairs, but I never thought to involve them in the project.

Vanderbeke: The international office was informed of the collaborative class. They will receive a full account at some later point - in Jena the semester has only just ended.

#### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

Clarke: see directly above.

Vanderbeke: The international office was rather interested, but then such collaborations seem to be rather new over here. I will discuss the possibilities with members of the international office at a later time.

#### 36. Commitment

Clarke and Vanderbeke: It was a singular mutual commitment to coordinated individual efforts.

#### 37. Future iterations

Clarke: No, at the moment it was a one-time event. It effectively illuminated both the possibilities of and the impediments to such a pedagogy. A lot hangs on the sheer contingencies of scheduling, and when going east-west these can be particularly difficult to negotiate. It may well be much easier, in the Americas, to go north-south.

Vanderbeke: Courses are not repeated in our institute. I would very much like to take part in other international courses - certainly with Bruce Clarke, but also with other instructors. However, the problems of different semester schedules in Germany and America will probably render such collaborations an exception.

#### 38. New globally networked courses

See directly above.

#### 39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

Clarke and Vanderbeke: We have not approached any of these people about this issue, and so no answer is possible at the moment.
### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Clarke: Not needing prior approvals or commitments, we took this on together as a scholarly challenge between ourselves.

Vanderbeke: Interested, but not overly enthusiastic.

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked courses

Clarke: Active promotion by myself and Dr. Cargile Cook among our immediate colleagues and administrators.

Vanderbeke: A greater flexibility of universities concerning semester schedules. My students agreed to start almost a month earlier than the official start of the semester - and my university did not present any problems. I was informed by Bruce Clarke that no similar flexibility would be possible at his university, and so his group started alone at their usual time and the collaborative work already ended when the semester closed in America and ours would still go one for two more months.

### Section 8: Reflections

#### 42. Goals set

- To provide a unique classroom experience to ourselves and our students.
- To explore the pedagogical possibilities of a collaborative international course environment.
- To sample the learning outcomes of a collaborative international course environment.
- To overcome any impediments in the way of teaching a successful seminar.

#### 43. Goals achieved

Clarke: I am satisfied and also gratified by the sense that our seminar largely succeeded in what it set out to do. Without doubt a unique experience was presented, calling upon experimentation and improvisation by all concerned. I did learn that my TTU students were not uniformly invested in seizing the international occasion, but those who did had a valuable encounter, as documented for instance in the student evaluation labeled Clarke 2.

Vanderbeke: I consider the course to have been successful as a seminar and, if slightly less, as an international collaboration. Intercultural awareness was not an issue for the students in Jena, as interculturality is part of their chosen subject. All of them were abroad frequently and some have been to the US. Most of the students were not very familiar with science fiction, but seemed to be very interested and managed to catch up with the American group that had already one month of immersion into sf-theory before we started. Only one of the German students actually enrolled because he wanted to take credits - his paper is due March 31 and so I cannot yet assess it.

#### 44. Most unique aspect for students

Clarke: The presence of an international sister seminar in real time, gathered as a group on a single monitor, allowing for simultaneous oral instruction and discussion, and the opportunity to have and build upon out-of-class contacts with foreign peers, were entirely unique for all concerned.

Vanderbeke: I agree.
### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Clarke: The out-of-class collaborative assignments for smaller student groups were a hit-or-miss affair; it would seem, from the variable quality of the ensuing classroom reports. Some TTU students were sociable, outgoing, and dutiful, while others were more closed up and non-forthcoming. So for me, what worked best was the synchronous classroom. Based on a standard seminar format, this was an arduous three-hour session weekly, broken halfway through by a ten-minute break. These head-on international conversations almost always prospered. As reflected in the student evaluations, often Dirk and I had the chance to rehearse our occasional critical disagreements, in a manner that the more astute among the students were able to value for the intellectual breadth this provided. But more often the students themselves carried the class discussion, and I was always thrilled when a lively give-and-take developed that was truly international, weaving together the Lubbock and Jena seminars into a single whole.

Vanderbeke: I agree with Bruce. I would like to add that for the German students this offered the chance of interaction with their American peers, and as my students study English and American literature and culture, this directly contributed to their chosen field of education. This may have added to the slightly different attitudes between the German and American students.

### 46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Clarke: As mentioned directly above, the off-seminar collaborative work depended greatly upon the goodwill and application of the individual students concerned. Not knowing what to expect, Dirk and I did not set fixed goals for these collaborations, nor did we grade them, and that was perhaps a mistake.

Vanderbeke: I agree. In addition, for the next time it might be more useful to plan and set the assignments earlier - some of my students pointed out that only one or two weeks were not sufficient for substantial work based on asynchronous collaboration.

### 47. Changes for future iterations

Clarke: I would conceptualize the off-seminar collaborative work more carefully prior to the course, and work up a more explicit set of instructions for them, along with, for the American students, the sort of grade incentives that they’re used to having.

Vanderbeke: I agree, and see directly above.

### 48. Technical support

Not applicable.

### 49. International programs person

Not applicable.

### 50. Time commitment

Clarke: The time I spent developing the World Science Fiction seminar was somewhat more than would be involved in a regular seminar, due mainly to the amount of preliminary planning involved in working up the professorial collaboration with Dirk Vanderbeke and to the inputs requested by the COIL process. I did not apply myself fully to those program requests, but I did do so, I feel, sufficient to the seminar’s needs and to the spirit
of the contract with the COIL program. It was an unusually demanding exercise, but as we state below, we were well rewarded by the experience.

Vanderbeke: In Germany we do not “implement courses” in the same way it is done in the US. I always teach different classes as our modules are ‘filled’ with new topics every semester. Of course, it took more time to prepare this course as the technological facilities had to be arranged and the two instructors had to agree on texts and assignments etc. But I also occasionally teach joint interdisciplinary classes with colleagues from my faculty or institute, and in those cases the required time for preparation is comparable.

51. Was it worth it?

Clarke: Yes. It opened up a fascinating space of possibility and involved me in teaching processes and experiences I would never have imagined were possible before, and which I came to value. Of course, it would be far easier to replicate this sort of course if it were confined within national borders. The international component vastly increased the technical difficulty of the exercise, but solutions are now in hand for most if not all of those problems. International networking places the bar much higher, but fortunately, at least in our circumstances, we could rely on the superb English preparation of our foreign partners. In line with Dirk’s situation, graduate seminars are not usually “iterated,” or if so, only after several years’ lapse. I could be persuaded to iterate the form of the course with Dirk, although with with different content, as well as with a new partner in a new institution. But it would take the emergence of a particular situation, of the scholarly desirability of a new collaboration, to bring it to fruition. The difference is that I now know that such a thing is possible at all.

Vanderbeke: Yes, it certainly was. I very much enjoyed it, and I had the feeling that my students also did. It will not be possible to teach this course again soon - it could be repeated in five or six semesters but not earlier. I would also consider developing or simply teaching a course with a partner from another faculty or institution, but then a major part of my enthusiasm for the project was founded in the collaboration with Bruce whom I have known for some years. I assume that co-teaching requires a personal effort that is based on mutual understanding and sympathy, and I expect that problems can arise easily between partners who do not know each other to some degree.

Section 9: Student Feedback

We have posted entire evaluations from a random selection of students in both courses, two from Clarke’s seminar and three from Vanderbeke’s.

Student Evaluation for the seminar “World Science Fiction”

Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the class meet your expectations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the class fit into your current level of studies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the assignments sufficiently challenging / too challenging?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What (if anything) did you like about the class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you dislike?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DE 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DE 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DE 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What would you suggest to improve a class delivered in this fashion?**

| **US 1** | First, it would be better if we had an entire semester for a collaborative work since it takes time to set a tone which all students have never had before. We only had about 2 months. If it can be coordinated as a two-semester course, it could make collaboration more effective. Secondly, while students with different expertises are significant for this class, the discrepancy between students' seriousness and interest. Some are for credits while some are not, seems problematic. Some students didn’t work enthusiastically enough during a collaborative work, and having such a student in a group hinders organizing an interesting group project. |
| **US 2** | Adding required Skype time between the students of both universities and facilitating this by having the class on multiple days (one for lecture and one for discussion between groups). |
| **DE 1** | - Provide an online platform on which students can exchange opinions and files. It felt like I was in the Stone Age communicating via email.  
- Have shorter classes. I found myself drifting away after having stared at a Skype screen for 3hrs (maybe 2-3 longer sessions throughout the semester are more viable and endurable)  
- After one class like this, the technological requirements should be clear enough to have clear audio/video for the next course in this fashion. |
| **DE 2** | More guidelines and a few suggestions on how to interact in class more sufficiently. |
| **DE 3** | When groups have to prepare a topic it should be enough to prepare keywords to facilitate a discussion. Maybe the time should be changed, but I guess the time difference doesn't leave much choice |

**On a scale from 1 (best) to 5 (worst), how would you grade the class?**

| **US 1** | 3 |
| **US 2** | 2 |
| **DE 1** | 2 |
| **DE 2** | 2 |
| **DE 3** | 2 |

**Format**

**Did the intercultural collaborative character of this class meet your expectations?**

| **US 1** | Yes. |
| **US 2** | It exceeded my expectations. |
| **DE 1** | cf. above |
| **DE 2** | Yes. |
| **DE 3** | yes |

**In your efforts to establish collaborative relationships, what worked best?**

| **US 1** | Constant emails work better than trying to have a synchronized discussion on Skype although one needs the degree of students’ commitment into consideration |
as a variable. It seems emails allow time to think. So that even though the amount of communication is limited, emails can lead a meaningful discussion.

| US 2 | Emails were the most efficient but a Skype conversation was the most beneficial in exchanging ideas in real-time. |
| DE 1 | The preparation meeting via instant messaging (Skype/Facebook) was probably my best experience because I got to know the students from Texas a bit better than in class environments. To break the ice between students is always the best way for me to have a nice atmosphere in class. |
| DE 2 | Email, of course, and for papers/discussions google.docs. |
| DE 3 | One long skype session after everyone had thought about the topic on his or her own first. |

In your efforts to establish collaborative relationships, what problems did you encounter?

| US 1 | Some students are not serious as I was. The time difference also makes difficult to communicate. |
| US 2 | The time difference exacerbated problems like work and school schedules. |
| DE 1 | Time differences, most of all. Also, my weekly schedule did not coincide with my fellow students (both USA and Germany) I was only able to prepare for class during the weekend, which is quite late for others. |
| DE 2 | Time and schedule difficulties. Also the effort to communicate (on US side especially) leaves room for improvement. |
| DE 3 | Technical problems and time zone problems |

Did you profit from the collaboration with your partner(s) from abroad?

| US 1 | Yes. One of our group members was a very committed scholar. She provided a foundation for discussion. |
| US 2 | Very much so. |
| DE 1 | Absolutely, although I wouldn't necessarily say this has something to do with them being from another country! |
| DE 2 | I practiced my English in speech and writing. I profited from the collaboration as a whole. |
| DE 3 | yes |

Did the online teaching contribute to the success/failure of the class?

| US 1 | |
| US 2 | I believe it contributed to the success of the class to have a common resource available to all of the parties involved. |
| DE 1 | There was certainly some appeal to it; nevertheless, it did not explore the whole range of what was possible. cf. first suggestion for improvement above |
| DE 2 | Online teaching? When we talked to each other in class on Mondays or when we wrote emails? Not much of actual teaching, in my opinion. |
| DE 3 | success |

Technical problems were to be expected for this class. Did they present a serious impediment for you?

<p>| US 1 | Yes. While the instability of the Internet communication was the issue at the beginning, there is another issue. The fact that there were two types of ESL people with different linguistic backgrounds sometimes made very difficult to understand what my counterpart was saying. Even while native English speakers seemed not having such an issue, it would have been more comfortable if I had a keyboard in front of me to type my idea instead of speaking it since verbal communication between two different ESL people pose a different kind of difficulty. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
<td>Not me personally, but were a problem for the class as a whole in the beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 1</td>
<td>In the beginning, yes. But I am astonished that we actually got this sorted out now in the end. I half expected to “just deal with it,” but a lot was improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2</td>
<td>In the beginning yes, but after all things got set out straight, not anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 3</td>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How do you rate the teachers individually and as a team?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 1</td>
<td>Both Dr. Clarke and Dr. Vanderbeke show different interpretations of a given text. It was very beneficial although sometimes their conversation left students behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
<td>As a team the teachers were great. It was fun to watch them exchange ideas and theories about a given piece of literature because their knowledge is so encyclopedic. Individually, they are still excellent professors. Professor Clarke inspires critical thinking by asking the right questions and raising points not previously considered. He is very good at directing a lecture so all of the concepts are grasped by everyone. Professor Vanderbeke has such a knowledge of the genre and critical theory surrounding it that he becomes an essential resource for the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 1</td>
<td>They sometimes tended to relish in a lengthy dialogue that, at one point, left the plane of comprehension that any student with an average schedule can possibly have. I do not criticise the fact that this can happen from time to time, but it became quite apparent in the end. It was also very interesting to see two different approaches to teaching clashing together!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2</td>
<td>V: 2+ C:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 3</td>
<td>Two different ways of teaching: one is more focused while the other tries to bring in as much as possible; personally I prefer the focused approach. As a team they complemented each other, because Prof. Vanderbeke got Prof. Clarke back on track, while Prof. Clarke on the one hand brought in lots of ideas and on the other hand provided us with a review of the basics from time to time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Ghana - USA: Film & Media Studies

Abstract

Re-Envisioning Diasporas was an overall positive collaborative and learning experience for faculty and students. Each individual made adjustments for new ways of learning and performed to the best of their ability given the nature of diversity, intercultural exchanges, mediated connectivity, and working with teams. Future courses should take into consideration technological inequalities, budgetary disparities, institutional expectations and educational cultures.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-Envisioning Diasporas</td>
<td>Swarthmore College</td>
<td>Film and Media Studies</td>
<td>2nd-3rd year undergraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Sunka Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Swarthmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>German Studies, and Film and Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Carina Yervasi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Swarthmore College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>French/Francophone Studies, associated faculty in Film and Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. When?

Spring 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

7 (Swarthmore), 33 (Ashesi)

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

Class at Swarthmore was slightly smaller than average (10-15)

Yes, since this was not a required course for any major, students were wary of the unknowns involved in committing to an internationally taught hybrid course

Class at Ashesi was probably slightly larger than average (25)

Prof. Antoine mentioned a few times that “we are stars on campus” (due to the collaboration with the US)

---

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

English at both

7. Primary language of most students in each class

English (Swarthmore), different languages from Arabic to French and Ghanaian dialects (Ashesi)

8. Language of the course collaboration
Yes, English. But students reflected on language use and their own mother tongue using VoiceThread.

9. Language fluency

From our oral/aural assignments, we could gather that speaking/listening fluency of Ashesi students was adequate but varied from proficient to struggling. Reading was a different matter - our impression was that students had not been exposed to lengthy texts with a heavy emphasis on critical studies and theory (whether in English or another language). Even though Ashesi had more stringent objectives and requirements for writing, only ⅓ of Ashesi’s class contributed regularly and in depth to our weekly online writing activities.

10. Language proficiency difference

Potential proficiency difference in English might have made certain Ashesi students more hesitant in responding or initiating online written work - Wordpress and Skype group presentations helped to alleviate this somewhat in that each member of the group had to participate.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?

blended form for each campus

12. Duration

for 13 weeks

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Swarthmore: 30 minutes of synchronous collaborative time vs. 45 minutes face-time Tue and Th until DST
Ashesi: 30 minutes synchronous collaborative time vs. 1:30 hours of face-time Tue and Th until DST
After DST change: 1 hour synchronous time on Wednesdays for both

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

Moodle, VoiceThread, Youtube, Xythos network storage

15. Server location

Both Ashesi and Swarthmore use Moodle as their LMS ... the course in this instance was hosted at Swarthmore. The goal was to make access to the course seamless and equal to students from both institutions. We achieved this by creating a “trust” relationship between the Moodle servers at Swarthmore and Ashesi. Xythos network storage was provided Swarthmore. VoiceThread and Youtube were cloud based.
16. Technical problems

Moodle was meant to be a central communication tool as well as provide access to many documents, media, tools and discussions for the course. Instability with the Ashesi network and Moodle server in the first weeks of the course did impede access to materials for the students from Ashesi. It became necessary to create accounts on the Swarthmore server for all the Ashesi Students to facilitate their access. That made access slightly less seamless. The cloud based services were not a problem.

17. Frequency of use

Each student was tasked with asynchronous activities for each Tue and Th session, but intensity and workload ranged from shorter exercises (forum posts, blogposts, Wiki entries) to longer assignments over the weekends and the final Wordpress projects.

18. Informal communication

They used Skype, Facetime, Google Hangout etc. as well as email and blogs.

19. Re-use

Yes. Administration should support a better discussion/group platform. Skype is all right, but not reliable enough for classroom use.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

Skype was the major tool for synchronous communication between the classrooms. We purchased equivalent cameras and microphones for both classes to use.

21. Server location

Free … not cloud-based or institutionally provided.

22. Technical problems

Skype wasn’t so much a problem as bandwidth and network stability in Accra. There were frustrating periods of dropped calls, audio fallout and video freezes. Even at the best of times there was often an echo in the audio that was disconcerting to users. The students worked around the problems as best as possible, though it did make it difficult to achieve momentum in discussions. We explored the possibility of backup network connections, but that proved impossible.

23. Frequency of use

Classes were scheduled so to make synchronous contact between the classes possible during every class. Daylight savings time changed that mid semester, forcing some activities and the schedule of classes to be altered. Students were assigned regular group discussions, blogs, wikis and creative projects around various themes and readings. The goal was to have group discussions summarized and reported for the class in synchronous sessions. Despite ice-breaker activities and other efforts it took some time for groups to work
24. Informal communication

Class groups were encouraged to use Skype for discussions. Office hours were conducted over Skype.

25. Re-use

It’s not so much the tools that were an issue, more of the bandwidth and DST being an issue.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

Exit Survey Tool

27. Common assessment rubric

Yes, the Survey

28. Assessment outcomes

Students, who were already critically engaged or were developing critical engagement with the material of the course and the pedagogical method, responded using the vocabulary that had been provided over the course of the term rather than from emotional or situational reactions. The same percentage of students who seemed to have superficial knowledge or engagement with the materials from the course (see #11) remained fairly consistent with results.

29. Peer assessment

In almost all online activities, students directly responded to and assessed each other’s work - the final projects were peer-reviewed with constructive critique encouraged.

30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

FMST 59: Re-Envisioning Diasporas Course Charter

The course will take place on two campuses, Ashesi University in Accra, Ghana and Swarthmore College in Philadelphia, USA. The class will utilize a hybrid of face-time and online or digital communication. For 30 minutes each class day, we will attempt a synchronous classroom experience via Skype, video chat or satellite. For this reason, intercultural communication and collaborative learning are central to our work this semester.

Because many of the topics we will be discussing this term may be of a sensitive nature – race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality, geography – and may impact each member of the class in different and overlapping ways, we need to be mindful of the line between ideas and lived experiences. We can talk about these issues in the abstract but recognize that these may result from and affect real experiences. Tips: Ask questions, situate yourself, which includes situating your own assumptions. This will set the tone for discussion with others in the class. If ever you need clarification during or after a communication, ask first: “What did you mean by that; maybe I didn’t understand?”

1. Student commitment to the course:
Please adhere to the following protocol for all activities, assignments and group meetings

Email and chat etiquette:

- Be respectful, consider cultural and linguistic differences before using irony or sarcasm.
- Use standard English, no abbreviations or emoticons (for example: LOL, smiley faces etc.).
- If you are asked to comment on other students' work, write more than one line following the 5 Ws: who, what, when, where, why.
- Comment first on a post with the least responses, and make sure you don't overlook early entries.
- Stay on message when responding, dialoguing and discussing topics in and out of class!
- Be mindful of the 5 hour time difference: 3 pm Swarthmore is 8pm Ashesi time.
- If you encounter technological difficulties when communicating, try another technological tool. Example: if skype is down, chat – if email won’t work, blog. Do not get frustrated, seek practical solutions.
- In case of communication delays, technology is usually the culprit. Try a different mode of communication to reach your partner. If experiencing prolonged silence (3 tries over 72 hours), please contact one of your instructors.
- You will be working in teams across continents and cultures. You will need to plan your work accordingly, which means: ample time to contact each other, to gather and access information, to meet, to discuss, to write, etc. and review and submit. For a typical asynchronous homework assignment, you will probably need to figure in at least 5 instances of back and forth contact.
- For visual assignments: the most important part will be content, not production value; that you show your understanding of the course materials in a clear and analytical way.
- For written assignments: please refer to the section on writing in the syllabus, but remember to adhere to professional standards, which include always citing outside sources to avoid plagiarism, and citing each other’s ideas.
- For synchronous assignments: Listen well! Hear each other out! Don’t interrupt! Mind the gap—there is always a few seconds delay with our technologies. If one of you is consuming more than 80% of airtime, something is wrong with the hierarchy of the discourse.

2. Faculty commitment to this course

- Faculty members will communicate regularly with each other and with the students in an honest and open way.
- Faculty will review all student work. This includes daily homework and group projects, and we will look for the grasp of historical information, film/visual analysis, intercultural competencies, writing, and the on-going participation in the course. Faculty will follow local grading procedures for own school groups, while keeping a grade log for all three faculty to see.
- Faculty will discuss grades for final projects and offer comments to each student.
- Faculty will collectively monitor blogs and wikis, but will "officially" write comments for students on the teaching units for which we are responsible.

Assessment: Faculty will invite students to assess the course progress, technologies, and learning points with short anonymous response requests throughout the term. Faculty ask that students be candid and honest so that we can improve the course as it unfolds.

Office hours: To facilitate student-faculty interaction and on-going assessment in an informal environment, faculty will hold joint office hours online on Fridays.

Procedure for intervening: Faculty will step in if/when necessary. While we hope to never have to intervene in student work, students should be aware that we are here to provide a safe and productive space in which they may work. We will get involved and arbitrate in a case by case basis, especially if students are not following the above protocol.
### 31. Attrition

No attrition at Swarthmore - at Ashesi probably 5-10 students

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

The 7 students at Swat were and stayed - for the most part - very committed to this pedagogical experiment. The workload at Ashesi seemed to be a problem as well as the interdisciplinary humanities methodology in a very science-and engineering-heavy learning environment.

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

During the initial grant-writing phase, we were supported by our institutions to varying degrees. Swarthmore’s provost wrote us a letter of support and agreed to some financial help with equipment purchase and small stipends. IT, through the work of Michael Jones, was very supportive and responded to our class’s needs throughout the process. At Ashesi, there was some confusion about who would take on the administrative role of support, but that eventually worked out. Financially, Swarthmore paid for and sent the shared equipment and Ashesi agreed to pay import taxes on new media equipment. Over the course of the term, Michael and Swarthmore IT worked out most of the glitches in the courseware and other technical problems. But on the Ashesi side, there was a campus-wide moratorium of internet use during our synchronous meeting time to make sure we had available band-width for our Skype meetings. Pedagogical support was achieved by having the four team members meeting and/or speaking regularly about the progress of the course. This course’s topic at Ashesi worked into the existing curriculum as a required course on African culture and was originally a part of Mikelle’s teaching course-load. At Swarthmore, faculty cross-listed the course with Film and Media Studies and Black Studies, but it was an elective course for students. Team-teaching created internal support that worked at all phases of the COIL grant.

#### 34. Engagement with the international programs office

Very little at Swarthmore during the implementation of the course. Ashesi faculty had a connection to the international programs office and would have liked to see some kind of exchange program develop from our course. Swarthmore faculty agreed and would have liked to create an exchange component for the course. Currently Swarthmore administration is working with Ashesi administration to create such an exchange or study abroad but it would not be linked to this course.

#### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

Ashesi is well aware of the importance of globally networked learning and Patrick Awuah, the president of Ashesi came to meet with Swarthmore administration last year. Swarthmore international (off-campus study) office is primarily engaged with sending Swarthmore students abroad.

#### 36. Commitment

When the application was made, the administrations at both campuses seemed to be interested in having a commitment to developing globally networked programs. Now, the course itself feels like it might have been a singular commitment.
### 37. Future iterations

No. Ashesi faculty is no longer at the institution. Swarthmore faculty are assigned to teaching courses in their disciplines. It could potentially be offered in the future at Swarthmore, but team-teaching would need to be approved and a new international partner found.

### 38. New globally networked courses

Expectations are low that other globally networked courses will take place at Swarthmore, however, our tricollage consortium colleagues at Bryn Mawr are running such a course, entitled *Global Shakespeare* with a partner institution in Japan through the tricollege Digital Humanities initiative. It also supported *Re-Envisioning Diasporas*.

### 39. Response of deans, chairs, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

At first, administrators seemed interested, but with time it became clear that any changes can only come from the faculty with no compensation. So it would be hard to predict who might have the time for such endeavors.

### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Swarthmore may develop at the administrative level with a partnership for student exchanges rather than globally networked classes. Ashesi seems to understand the importance of continuing developing globally networked classrooms and having student exchange. But neither school has announced further developments.

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

A new perception: globally networked learning has to be perceived as something that is a skill set for a liberal arts education and as non-threatening at the administrative, dare I say budgetary level.

---

**Section 8: Reflections**

### 42. Goals set

- create an environment for intercultural learning about global diasporas, and for students to gain access to cross-cultural awareness of language and modes of communication: visually, aurally, textually, digitally
- offer an opportunity to students to learn with different pedagogical tools and spaces than in a standard classroom
- develop a course that would engage our method and our content in both faculty and student collaborative modes

### 43. Goals achieved

Some of these goals were met spectacularly for example with the students’ VoiceThread discussions about language and their relationship to it. It opened the floor to have dialogue about cultural differences and made it possible for students to express their perceptions and learn from each other. The use of new technologies in the classroom was beneficial to everyone: Sometimes frustrating when bandwidth didn’t cooperate, sometimes challenging when encountering a new way to present information, sometimes rewarding when student collaboration was cohesive and smooth.
### 44. Most unique aspect for students

Most unique was the intercultural learning experience and the opportunity to think about connectedness of diasporic communities through the students’ and faculties’ own virtual connections to their collaborators.

### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The more specific the asynchronous and synchronous activities were, in questions, methodology, tools and time-frame, the better the assignments and collaboration seemed to work. The more dedicated and less fussy students were about the give and take, the better the student-run collaboration worked. The more we stayed in touch and voiced our concerns in a constructive manner and sought pragmatic solutions, the better the teamwork among the three faculty worked.

### 46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

a) The unevenness of the workload was problematic – our Swarthmore team spent much more time on the planning and implementation phase of the grant, developing and fine-tuning the weekly syllabus, developing analytical questions for inquiry, and responding to online work in adequate time.

b) While the course was clearly laid out as an interdisciplinary venture, the fact-oriented historical methodology of our partner often trumped our more analytical media-oriented approach by default. Since we had a smaller class, could rely on a better overall educational preparation for our students, and had less asynchronous time per week than our Ashesi partner, we could and had to push our students harder and faster to reach a higher level of analytical inquisitiveness of texts, theories, representations, often resulting in a skewed dynamics that also impacted the student teams: while we could assume that students here understood the “what” and “when,” and could challenge them to ask “why” and “how” during asynchronous and synchronous times, our partner at Ashesi would often (have to?) be content if her students retold “what and when.” Horizons of expectations regarding assignment outcomes would thus vary greatly.

c) Transparency – while Carina and I were very adamant about sharing all of our asynchronous coursework – posting it on Moodle etc. – we were often surprised by our partner’s asynchronous coursework (tests, quizzes, lesson content) in retrospect. On occasion, this would lead to parallel, rather than integrated pedagogical trajectories. Some of it had to do with the greater sum of time at her disposal and some with a more essentialist pedagogical approach.

d) Focus on Africa combined with experience-based approach on the Ashesi side sidelined some of the other case studies to the point of oblivion. Since such heavy emphasis was placed on students’ experience (of the aftermath of slavery, for example) it was very hard for them to think about another diaspora systematically, historically and analytically.

e) Forum-Discussion Questions – on several occasions, our partner would post and require the entire class to respond to forum discussion questions without consulting about them with us. While some of them spurred on great discussions, overly generally phrased others, on the other had, would encourage students to feed off of each other’s prejudices and stereotypes, just when we wanted all of them to question them.

f) Our heavy emphasis on Skype did not serve us well – we should have had some other synchronous tools on stand-by (Facetime etc.), although most of the troubles stemmed from bandwidth issues.

### 47. Changes for future iterations

We would probably look for a partner with an equal background in media studies, and an institutional setting that prizes and encourages a higher level of analytical discourse throughout the semester. We would give equal
time to preparing students for the analytical frame of questioning representations as to the case studies of diaspora.

We would give equal time to the set-up of specific case histories, treat three in depth rather than six in a hurry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>48. Technical support</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our team did not include an instructional designer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>49. International programs person</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our team did not include an international programs person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>50. Time commitment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-five hours per week during the early design phase, which began in earnest almost 8 months before the course was implemented. Once the course was set-up, we worked about 2 hours per week meeting to discuss class and prepping, 3 hours to prep new materials in disciplines or subjects we were unfamiliar with, 3 hours in class, 1-2 hours to respond to Forum comments, 1-2 hours online office hours. It was not just the globally networked course that added time it was the team course implementation and team-teaching. A traditional course with some innovative elements would take a fraction of the time, about 80% less time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>51. Was it worth it?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be significantly easier to implement and support another iteration of the same course, yet we know that this will not happen. Partner faculty at Ashesi has left and the schools are already working on other projects outside the purview of our course. In the end, yes, it was worth it. But institutional support needs to meet the faculty half-way. If schools aren’t going to support this kind of course, it is a waste of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 9: Student Feedback

There are no evaluations from Ashesi Swarthmore

Positive: “there was clear thought put into the structure of the the course, and that was very evident (and appreciated!)”; “there was a lot of freedom with assignments, which gave room for creativity and synthesis”; “I would recommend this course to others - it was an incredible opportunity, very eye-opening, and innovative”; “I would recommend this course because this class allows students to observe things from a number of different perspectives that would usually never be considered” the most interesting aspect “that there are always more perspectives on the world other than your own”

Negative: “just cut down on the readings or split it up more in the beginning”; “we often had more readings than were discussable in class”; “this course as a whole would have been far more interesting, exciting and valuable to my life if we had paid far more attention to our communication with Ashesi”; “we should have spent much more time discussing our backgrounds, honestly hunting down our biases, assessing the differing strengths in the students’ educations--these things would have made the course incredibly exciting.”
The collaboration between Ashesi University and Swarthmore College for *Re-Envisioning Diasporas* was overall a positive experience. Operating under the auspices of COIL with the series of weekly "deliverables" kept faculty and IT on track to prepare the course. We worked collectively on the general introduction, ice breaker, mid-term, final, and technologies selection. For each case study, faculty members worked individually on the weekly assignment that best represented her own specialty and IT supported each case study. We invited a guest professor to teach Cuban diaspora and several guest speakers during the semester to bring others into dialogue with students and our globally networked classroom. Student teams were formed with 1 student from Swarthmore and 6-8 students from Ashesi. In retrospect, we were able to see that this had some drawbacks such as the most common form of contact among students is texting, and the lone Swarthmore student couldn't text his/her teammates internationally whereas Ashesi teammates were in constant contact. Interestingly enough there were three teams that set themselves apart from the others. One became the dream team: 8 very bright women who got to know each other well, were enthusiastic, wrote to each other, Skyped regularly, prepared in advance, spoke eloquently, asked great questions. Yet surprisingly they produced a mediocre final project that stood in stark contrast to their daily and weekly course assignments. On quite another scale of achievement, two teams that faced the most attrition from the Ashesi side were combined to create a mega-team with 2 Swarthmore students and about 10 Ashesi students. This team however produced the most innovative final project even though it had the fewest ongoing participants. They had worked in adversity but had presented in critical discourse and analysis studies of diaspora what few groups showed in their finals: cohesion of topic with individual pieces complementing the whole. Clearly, we did not find the magic formula to team-creation, and it was anything but predictable. Rather than merely showing collaborative team-teaching, in the future, faculty should consider giving students readings about what it means to work in a team.

Focusing on our course description and our educational outcomes we can sketch a curve that pulsed up and down depending on faculty general enthusiasm for the topics presented, student focus and interest, and more importantly, demands on student time from external sources. For our course description we proposed the following at the beginning of the semester:

This trans-continental course (Berekuso, Ghana and Swarthmore, USA) explores the different and global dimensions of Diasporas. From the forced Diaspora formed by the Atlantic Slave Trade (15th-19th centuries) to present-day forced migrations, we will study the historical, cultural, representational, and theoretical specificities of different Diasporas by examining how visual and literary productions deal with questions of race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, nationality and globalization from a perpetual state of “elsewhere.” How does the Diasporic experience mark the conceptualization, aesthetics, and politics of the artistic process and textuality? What role do language, body memories, and visualization/projection play in the works we will discuss? How do virtual and real-life diasporic communities interact with their imagination and reception? Students are encouraged to do work in their first and secondary languages.

The question we have to ask ourselves is whether we made it through all these ideas and all the materials in support of our description. The main objective: "...we will study the historical, cultural, representational, and theoretical specificities of different Diasporas by examining how visual and literary productions deal with questions of race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, nationality and globalization from a perpetual state of “elsewhere”was met through enforcing our collaborative mode and method rather than through the emphasis on content. The clear intention of the faculty on this project was for students to develop a critical apparatus of learning collectively and globally with content that constantly mirrored our methodology. If we asked students to study the "digitized diaspora" by reading websites and looking at diasporic communities online, we were also asking students to reflect upon their own situational digitization within the course. To understand how distance and association create different digital modes of culture for diasporic subjects abroad, our students had to begin to understand the dynamics of learning and creating with others through different modes of mediated connectedness. In other words, our students were put into that "perpetual state of `elsewhere'" every time they
Learning within paradox, although not a stated educational goal, became evident at every turn of our project with the students.

An example of robust team work

As we headed into the first third of the course, students were finally getting to know to their teams/teammates and were regularly relying on each other for information. During week 5 (February 13 -17 Case Study 2: Europe and Diasporas: The Case of Francophone African cinema), student were required to watch a film and report back as a team about the relationship between diaspora, documentary, and the avant-garde. They needed to talk over the film collectively, record their conversation (using Forum in Moodle), and ultimately come up with an accurate account of the discussion to be presented by one team member to the entire class for 5 minutes or less during synchronous class time. This activity demanded some individual accomplishment (seeing and understanding the film), but the majority of the activity to be assessed by classmates and faculty was collective and collaborative in nature. This was a successful exercise in part because students displayed comfort in working with each other, but faculty believe it was also successful because students had to write up their comments in a forum that constantly and quickly shared information with the whole team (and with faculty) and they had a week to complete the task. The ongoing discussion was mediated through the forum and email as it took place over time, and clear ideas were formulated. The presentations were then, in a sense, lifted from the ongoing (written) commentary. Because no group had access to other teams' forums the presentations were both surprising as well as familiar. Many groups had arrived at the same conclusions, but when a group presented a new idea everyone was so familiar with the material from which the examples were drawn it generated lively (sometimes instantaneous) discussion. While writing reinforced ongoing dialogue in small groups, it was speaking about the film over Skype synchronously that produced an entirely different experiential event building knowledge through connectedness at many levels and feelings of mediated distance without alienation.

Examples of what caused problems

DST - Daylight savings time would be the first on our list of problems from which it was hard to recover. The students were on board with the work, but DST changed the dynamic of T/Th regular class times for both schools to exceptional meeting times early Wednesday mornings for synchronous class. The students and faculty rearranged their schedules and made it work, but the momentum of the course was gone. The teams remained strong, but class meetings were strained. Students mostly resented having their schedule disrupted. The change affected Swarthmore students more than Ashesi students. After a few weeks, students recovered enough to complete their weekly tasks, but faculty wondered whether the lackluster final project performance was a direct result of this inconvenience. Bandwidth, the second culprit in an otherwise smooth-running course, is huge. One cannot overstate the importance of bandwidth to run a globally linked course. This became an issue for several reasons. Budgetary: We did not have the funding to pay for a digital platform for our course on both campuses. Personnel: Staffing the connected classroom at Ashesi with an IT specialist who could immediately deal with issues arising from our connectivity loss was impossible. Class Design. Because our course was designed around weekly synchronous meetings, both faculty and students relied on the good connections with Skype to accomplish each week's goals. Uneven disadvantage: The Ashesi campus went into "blackout" mode turning off all idle connections to the internet and requesting that people respect internet down-time during our synchronous class to assure the proper bandwidth would be available for our students to Skype. Presentations, lectures, Q & A with guest speakers, simple sharing of reactions to readings or films became nerve wracking. Faculty originally chose Skype because of its relative dependability and its budget-neutral cost. It was one of the few technologies that allowed what we thought would prove equal-footing for both campuses. It turns out though that Skype highlighted the privilege of Swarthmore in an unexpected way: privilege of bandwidth, something that most American students and faculty take for granted. If this course or another globally networked course were to be offered in the future with two schools that are clearly financially unequal, the
wealthier school should have to commit funding for a more reliable communication platform.

Did we meet all our educational outcomes?

Over the course of the semester, faculty became mindful of an unexpected feature: as students learned, they generated their own materials and case studies that ultimately formed their individual essays at the mid-term and their group final projects. It must be said, however, that although students had ample time to get the work done, many of the final projects were unsatisfactory examples of this serendipity. Students fell back into learned patterns of what a final project ought to look like and wrote fairly banal papers and posted them as blogs. The real measure of our achieving our educational goals and seeing the unexpected came during synchronous time together when no one necessarily recorded the whole session but where presenting, developing questions, organizing thoughts, and speaking off the cuff formed the truest moments of intercultural learning. (NB: We rarely used the idea of "cross-cultural" learning because it became quite clear to us that Ashesi and Swarthmore students did not represent monolithic examples of culture that would somehow "cross" in a simple trajectory, but more specifically students came from such varied backgrounds in both locales that intercultural learning took place within both asynchronous and synchronous time.)

Breaking the ice with questions about analyzing images, interrogating how media has a hand in generating ideas of otherness, sharing thoughts on one's mother tongue, being open to critique by writing and posting a weekly report, asking difficult questions of teammates, tracking teammates down given a 6 hour time difference, learning to critically assess difference and using it to create, seeing how world historical events develop both specificities and distinctions among living subjects, producing a final project that encompasses all the above challenges, these form the real objectives of any globally connected class.
10. Ghana - USA: Introduction to Global Citizenship

Abstract

In the Fall semester of 2012, Lehigh University, Drexel University, and University of Ghana-Business School collaborated in a unit related to social responsibility in the fields of education, business, and global citizenship. The purpose was to develop shared understanding of philosophy and history of social responsibility so that students could apply those lessons in their particular context. The courses were comprised of students of diverse ages, backgrounds, and academic levels, adding to the richness of experience each brought to the course. Through use of Moodle as the technological mediator, students had the opportunity to talk in forums across borders, share information on a collaborative Google Map, and share findings of asynchronous interview projects.

Lessons we hope to share with the other teams are ones emphasizing flexibility, effective communication, and working around logistical challenges to collaboration. Through both the successes and the challenges, the teams learned valuable information on maintaining international partnerships, and those lessons will inform future collaborations. While this experience was certainly positive, we wish that the challenges of time, unreliable internet access, and managing heavy workloads were less so we could have done even more with the course. In short, the team experience was a positive and enriching one, and a partnership that could lead to potential future collaborations.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Global Citizenship</td>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>First Year/Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ghana - Business School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Tina Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Drexel University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution: Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Sarah Stanlick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Interim Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Global Citizenship Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Daniel Ofori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of Ghana Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Business School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Daniel Ofori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of Ghana Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Business School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

Lehigh University - 23 First Year Students

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

For Lehigh’s cohort, they are part of a special certificate program that normally admits 20-25 first year students each year.
**Section 2: Issues of Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language(s) of instruction at each institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary language of most students in each class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language of course collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly fluent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language proficiency difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common language skills were not a barrier to successful implementation of the class work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3: Curricular Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online or blended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lehigh and University of Ghana Business School courses were face-to-face with a technological complement of an online course management system with discussion boards. The Drexel course was entirely online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moodle was the LMS used to support the class structure and student interactions. We also used Google Maps to create a visualization of participant’s hometowns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Server location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh hosted the Moodle interface, with Drexel and U-Ghana Business School given login information to connect to the system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tools themselves were not a problem, but the unreliability of electricity and computer space time for the students in Ghana inhibited a more robust interaction that was originally planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. How often during the collaboration did the classes engage each other on a classroom level using these asynchronous tools? How often were students expected to login and use these asynchronous tools outside of class?

Asynchronous tools were a huge help, as students who could not easily access technology were able to connect on their own time and contribute to the discussion boards.

17. Re-use

The tools were necessary parts of our experience, as synchronous aspects of the project were challenged by infrastructure issues such as rolling blackouts and unreliable internet capabilities. Through the use of asynchronous tools, students could engage with one and other on their own time schedule and when the technology cooperated accordingly. Furthermore, the age and variability of student circumstance (full-time, part-time, online, face-to-face, etc.) was a challenge that could easily be overcome through the technology-mediated, asynchronous design of the program.
Narrative
Beau Pihlaja, UTEP (University of Texas El Paso)

“Missed Connections: Anatomy of a Failed GLC” The UTEP and Annamalai University Global Learning Community

I. Abstract
In 2011, UTEP attempted to establish a GLC with Annamalai University in Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India. The course was ultimately unable to be developed. The major issue in the failed attempt to connect had primarily to do with differences in partner expectations and the difficulty of cross-cultural asynchronous communication. Recommendations from the experience include increased development time, personal connection of direct partners, and clear institutional expectations on both sides.

II. Personal Reflection
I was very excited to hear in the summer of 2011 that a colleague at UTEP had lined up a potential partner institution in India with which to develop a GLC. I have lived there hoped to return and partner with educators as well as connect our students with students in South Asia.

Given the necessary strictures of the timeline for the COIL initiative the relationship had to be established and developed very quickly (less than 6 months). My first communication with my potential partner was in late June. With the first COIL seminars beginning in September, there was not a great deal of time to get to know one another and plan the basic outline of our global learning community.

I began with an email introducing myself to my potential partner and laying out the expectations for the COIL initiative and the possible steps to be taken to begin developing the GLC. I felt it my responsibility to orient my partner to the COIL initiative’s requirements as he was being introduced to the project late and we were inviting him to join us.

As the summer progressed, communication between my partner and I became spotty and unproductive so I switched to a more personal tone, talking about my family and our experience living in India. My partner too shared a little bit about himself and it seemed as if we were able to make a bit of a connection that bode well for the partnership.

Going into the first seminar at COIL in September my partner and I had not been able to complete the institute’s required steps to prepare for the discussions in NY. My partner had not been able to attend the NY seminar either in person or virtually making planning difficult. There was no opportunity for synchronous communication and all work, such as it was, was being conducted via email. I discussed the matter with COIL fellows and staff and they provided suggestions for how to proceed and encouragement to continue in the process.

I was scheduled to visit India on other business in November of 2011 and planned a trip to visit Chidambaram at the end of my visit. This trip, due in part to some miscommunication between my partner and I and a misunderstanding about the distance and conditions of travel, proved more difficult than expected but I ultimately made it and was able to spend the better part of a day with my potential partner and the institution.

During this visit it became clear that the expectations for what my partner and his institution believed was happening and what I--and to some extent COIL--desired to happen, did not match and that reconciling them would be difficult.

Further complicating the issue was that we were operating under the assumption that UTEP’s official agreement to participate with Annamalai U. through COIL would be sufficient for the purposes of partnering together.
through 2012 on a GLC. It became clear when I visited that this would not be the case for Annamalai U. They had institutional expectations and requirements, specifically pertaining to the issuance of an official Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that I was not able to fulfill, nor were we able to fulfill in time to complete the GLC.

That these expectations were not voiced on either side until late in the relationship further exacerbated confusion on both sides.

Attempts to reconcile the issue and move forward without the MOU in Spring of 2012 failed and I informed COIL in the summer of 2012 that we would not be able to complete the GLC in the prescribed time.

III. Assessment

Reflecting on the sheer speed with which the partnership was initiated in the summer of 2011, I am impressed with my colleagues and department’s ability to put me in contact with a potential partner. But unfortunately the speed with which it needed to be fully developed by the fall of 2011 could not be matched. Given that all communication needed to occur asynchronously with mismatched language skills, the likelihood of quick success in this area was low.

Specifically reflecting on my communications to my partner, my initial email in the summer of 2011 was a bit of a data dump and may have not facilitated understanding and confidence in what was happening at the outset. If I had to do it again I certainly would have attempted to ease into the relationship a little more “softly,” especially given the very “relational” nature of work in South Asia.

Though, to be clear, in the absence of the bureaucratic formalization of the partnership in the form of a separate MOU or an extended previous relationship between the institutions, it is not obvious that anything would have moved us forward. Here “fault” is really not an appropriate word. It had to do largely with differing institutional expectations for what constituted a “partnership.” On the UTEP side we expected the letters from COIL accepting the partnership and our signing and indicating our desire to work with Annamalai to be sufficient to move forward with this particular project. The expectation being that a fuller, long term relationship could be negotiated after the COIL initiative was successful.

On our partner’s side it is now clear that this was not sufficient. The expectation on Annamalai’s part was that the relationship should be formalized at the outset and that work really could not be initiated until this was complete.

While a number of minor issues kept the partnership from succeeding, mismatched (and unarticulated) expectations on both sides ultimately prevented the successful partnership of Annamalai and UTEP.

Recommendations as a result of this experience:

1.) Clarify institutional and bureaucratic partnership expectations up front.

2.) Institutions should give themselves one year’s lead time (at least) in the development of the partner relationship. This gives instructors time to get to know one another and negotiate differing expectations at the individual and institutional level. Of course if partnering faculty know each other personally prior to the initiation of the formal partnership, this time can be greatly reduced.

3.) Some portion of this development time will require synchronous if not face to face contact and communication, preferably over several months.
12. Japan-USA: Global Studies and English as a Foreign Language

Abstract

The course conducted through collaboration between UWM and Osaka University within the context of the COIL framework was a successful experience upon which the team is eager to further build. The technologies used provided a solid platform for the conducting of module activities and movement toward goals of enhanced communicative ability and critical thought concerning the role of culture in our communications.

In any future iteration of the course, the reduction of technologies used might help students overcome any feelings of technological overload. Greater instructor familiarity with case studies on Facebook and Twitter usage may go far in overcoming or avoiding some of the problems inherent in Facebook and Twitter usage, including ingrained usage patterns. Offering the course to a different student demographic may work well to quickly congeal the community through perception of having mutual aims and interests as opposed to proximity. The Living Learning Community environment for the UWM students proved an asset in terms of meeting the students on their own territory, thus allowing the students to incorporate the course into their daily lives; however, because the students were freshmen and thus with differing interests and without majors, establishing a setting in which students are absolutely certain why they are together took valuable time. In the future, second-year or above Japanese language learners would be a fantastic target group, also allowing for further specification of goals in addition to an enhanced language aspect and shared linguistic pressures and responsibilities.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Online International Learning Course in UWM Living Learning Community: Confronting Cultural Stereotypes (Global Studies 192)</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Osaka University</td>
<td>Global Studies (UWM) English (Osaka U.)</td>
<td>1st Year (UWM) 4th Year (Osaka U.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Jason Christopher Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Japanese Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Jennifer Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Administrative Support and International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Associate Professor of German and Scandinavian Literature, Associate Dean of the Humanities, College of Letters and Science, Associate Director, Center for International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Matthew Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Design Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Learning Technology Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Sara Tully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Administrative Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Center for International Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Junko Takefuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Osaka University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Osaka University Cybermedia Center, Multimedia Language Education Research Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Issues of Language

#### 6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

- **UWM**: English
- **Osaka U**: English (for networked activities) and Japanese (for non-networked activities)

#### 7. Primary language of most students in each class

- **UWM**: English (Korean x 1, Japanese x 1)
- **Osaka U**: Japanese

#### 8. Language of the course collaboration

English, though some UWM students had very limited Japanese knowledge.

#### 9. Language fluency

Fluent enough to fully participate in scaffolded activities, but perhaps not enough to confidently participate in spontaneous activities.

#### 10. Language proficiency difference

English language skills were a central consideration throughout course planning and throughout the actual course. Modules were, therefore, built with this consideration in mind.

### Section 3: Curricular Information

#### 11. Online or blended?

The course was blended, with the interactive parts between students of course occurring online. Scaffolding for the modules took place face-to-face.
### 12. Duration
Approximately 10 weeks.

### 13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period
Because of the timing of the Japanese academic year, Junko was able to use the spring semester as a primer for the Osaka U students. Collaboration before the course at UWM was not possible because the course was open only to 1st year students just entering the university in the Fall semester. Junko and I have had some time for discussion after the course and are collaboratively working on a paper.

### Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

#### 14. Tools
Desire2Learn  
Facebook  
We focused on Facebook usage for communicative and coordination tasks because of its hooks into mobile technology with notifications.

#### 15. Server location
UWM provided D2L.

#### 16. Technical problems
There were a few technical problems with Facebook converting video uploads to Flash (yuck) and then those videos not actually showing up on the group page. This was solved by using Vimeo or YouTube.

#### 17. Frequency of use
Interaction took place at least once per week. Once students got the hang of the technologies being used (Facebook, Twitter, Springpad, Vimeo, Pathbrite), we promoted the completion of activities outside class time.

#### 18. Informal communication
One of the reasons we used Facebook was to allow students to engage on an informal level and to be certain that the students could maintain their connections even after completion of the course.

#### 19. Re-use
I would use Facebook for informal communication perhaps. However, I am interested in other tools with the ubiquitous notification capability of Facebook, but without the short memory span of Facebook. Facebook posts begin to feel lost and irrelevant with the addition of new posts, and this is not always appropriate.
Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools
We primarily used Skype for synchronous activities.

21. Server location
Cloud-based. The institution, however, made certain that we had access to the proper hardware, including speakers, webcams, and a conferencing camera.

22. Technical problems
The worst problem was one of bandwidth. Despite both networks being advanced, the UWM network could not handle the simultaneous Skype video conversations. Also, Skype for Windows was quirky during our class-to-class conference call.

23. Frequency of use
Students engaged each other about five times over ten weeks, with most of the synchronous activities occurring in the latter half of the course. Outside of class, students were expected to contact each other synchronously at least three times throughout the course.

24. Informal communication
Students were encouraged to use Skype outside the context of the course and to communicate with each other on an informal level. Because the modules are task-based, however, students primarily communicated when they needed to complete some objective.

25. Re-use
I would use Skype again. Though quirky at times, it is convenient because of its ubiquitous presence on multiple devices.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?
Course assessment took place through five methods. Three of them were course surveys: One was the COIL survey (the results of which we are looking forward to); another was a technology survey; the last was a general course survey. The fourth survey method was extremely informal, but offered what I thought were the best responses and most candid feedback—in class discussions on what students felt were going right, what they felt could be made better, and how they thought we should proceed with certain activities. This placed the students in a position of responsibility and they reacted well. The fifth survey consisted of having the students post videos of what they have done with their overseas partners, and what they feel they have learned.

27. Common assessment rubric
As the courses have slightly different goals, the assessment criteria do not completely overlap. This is something that we would like to address in a future iteration of the course.
### 28. Assessment outcomes

Most students saw the course favorably. Some felt that some of the uses of technology were superfluous. Assessment method #4 above helped us adjust throughout the period of the course.

### 29. Peer assessment

Peer assessment was a constant at UWM because of the nature of the course—a Living Learning Community taking place in one of the student housing residences. The students lived together and worked together in an environment of constant cooperation in terms of the production of content, the overcoming of technological or technical hurdles, and the overcoming of interpersonal disagreements related to how a certain task should be completed.

Osaka U had a dedicated Teaching Assistant to provide feedback for the course, while UWM had a dedicated Residence Assistant to provide feedback and to keep things running smoothly.

### 30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

We did not have any shared guidelines, perse. Instead of using written guidelines, Junko spent the spring semester providing scaffolding for the Osaka University students in terms of how to communicate, while I spent the beginning of the fall semester discussing issues of cross-cultural communication with speakers of English as a second (or sometimes third) language.

Having led the course once, I would probably develop written documentation concerning expectations for student interaction as an additional means of scaffolding for the students.

### 31. Attrition

UWM had one student drop out in the beginning of the semester. We also gained a student in the beginning of the semester.

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

This is fairly typical at UWM. Though most students complete the courses for which they have registered, some do leave the course for various reasons.

---

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

**Grant Application Stage**
- **Financial**: Little financial support necessary at this phase.
- **Administrative**: Great deal of support from the Center for International Education, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, the Learning Technology Center, and the Office of the Provost at UWM.
- **Pedagogical**: Great deal of collaboration between Jason Jones and Jennifer Watson, and Jason Jones and Junko Takefuta.
- **Technical**: Great enthusiasm from the LTC and Matt Russell.

**Institute Workshop Participation**
- **Financial**: Fantastic financial support for the US teams through the COIL Fellowship. Junko used her own...
research travel stipend to attend the workshop.

- Administrative: Administrative support was full-on at this stage.
- Pedagogical: The pedagogical aspects were being covered primarily between Jason, Junko, and Matt at this time. Cooperation between these three was necessary throughout every period of the course and course development.
- Technical: Matt and the LTC gave their full support.

**Course Development Phase**

- Financial: Received a grant from the UWM Center for Instructional and Professional Development. This grant funded both a technological purchase that allowed for much easier course development as well as a graduate assistant. Osaka University funded a Teaching Assistant for the Osaka University course.
- Administrative: The Global Studies Program, Center for International Education, and Living Learning Community organizers lent full support to ensure that the backbone of the course was sturdy. It was through their work and diligence that the course was able to go on without a hitch.
- Pedagogical: Again, the pedagogical aspects were being covered primarily between Jason, Junko, and Matt at this time. Cooperation between these three was necessary throughout every period of the course and course development.
- Technical: Matt and the LTC gave their full support. Here as well, Matt, Junko, and Jason met online and in person periodically to discuss the technological aspects of the course. I was also fortunate enough to see Junko in Osaka over the summer of 2012.

**Course Implementation Phase**

- Financial: Financial support came in the form of additional computer equipment in addition.
- Administrative: Here too, The Global Studies Program, Center for International Education, and Living Learning Community organizers made certain that all administrative aspects of the course were handled thoroughly.
- Pedagogical: The course required constant adjustment based on student feedback and self-evaluations by faculty. Thus, the pedagogical aspects were handled primarily between Junko and Jason.
- Technical: Matt provided technical and technological support throughout the implementation phase. The Language Resource Center also provided technical and technological assistance with the hardware and software necessary for group-group synchronous activities.

**Course Assessment Phase**

- Financial: We saw little financial need for the completion of this phase.
- Administrative: The Global Studies Program conducted course surveys.
- Pedagogical: Surveys of pedagogical concerns were given throughout the course by faculty.
- Technical: The Learning Technology Center conducted course surveys.

**Capstone Reporting Phase**

- Financial: Again, fantastic financial support for the US teams through the COIL Fellowship.
- Administrative: Little administrative support need for this phase.
- Pedagogical: Cooperation between Jason, Junko, Matt, and Gerry of the LTC.
- Technical: Little technical support need for this phase.

### 34. Engagement with the international programs office

The UWM students were in contact with the Global Studies Program and its advisors throughout the course. There were also monthly meetings between Jason and Global Studies Program advisors to discuss course progress and student relations in the Living Learning Community.
### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

The international programs office, including the Center for International Education and the Global Studies Program most certainly do see this initiative as relevant to the work that they are doing. We have begun discussing holding another iteration of the course in the near future.

### 36. Commitment

At Japanese institutions, inter-institutional relationships are usually concluded only after inter-departmental relations have been in place a certain number of years. Inter-departmental relations occur after inter-faculty relations have been in place for several years. Therefore, it was the faculty element of the course that was aligned for this, initial course.

### 37. Future iterations

N/A

### 38. New globally networked courses

Gerry Bergtrom in the UWM Learning Technology Center is already planning a course that would be heavily based on the COIL model and ideology.

### 39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

Administrators have been extremely receptive to the expansion of such courses, though meeting will probably need to be held so as to assess the feelings of individual chairs, deans, provosts, etc.

### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

UWM was greatly committed to the first course and I have received nothing but encouragement concerning the conducting of another course on this model.

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

I would say that this requires an approach on two fronts. As long as internationalization and the development of global networks are seen as priorities of the upper echelons of the universities, such courses will receive attention and if not financial support outside of instructor salaries, at least administrative backing. Also, it is important for the faculty and instructional technology development side to push the envelope concerning what such courses have to offer, making them more appealing to students. Both the upper echelons and faculty need to have room to “play”, or in other words, to experiment with courses to see what works and what doesn’t. It may also be a good idea to initiate transparent, meaningful reward structures, particularly for tenure-track faculty. Otherwise, some people may not see the merits of developing and offering such a course.
## Section 8: Reflections

### 42. Goals set

- Further develop critical thinking skills in terms of how you perceive culture and nationality.
- Further develop creative thinking and problem-solving skills through performing interactive and intercultural tasks.
- Develop enhanced oral communicative ability through working with international students who speak English as a second or third language.
- Developed teamwork skills through completion of synchronous and asynchronous activities between team members at the home institution and international partner institution.
- Further developed intercultural knowledge and competence.

### 43. Goals achieved

My personal feeling is that the first goal was moderately achieve, the next three greatly achieved, and the final goal moderately achieved.

### 44. Most unique aspect for students

I think that the connection with students at the partnering institution was the most unique experience for students in the course. The UWM students were also able to “live” the course, as it was given on their home territory in the residential housing. Also, I think that the variety of activities and the unique combination of synchronous and asynchronous activities always kept students on their feet.

### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Junko and Matt are simply a pleasure to work with. It was this interpersonal connection behind the pedagogical development of the course that kept it going and that allowed us to adjust quickly. The variety of technologies used were tightly linked with pedagogical aims, which helped us rethink their use.

### 46. Most problematic aspects from a pedagogical perspective

Being able to see where you want to go, but being unable to get there because of road design was problematic. In other words, sometimes the technology gets you close to where you’d like to be, but because of issues of implementation or hardware limitations or inertia (i.e. People have become used to using a certain technology in one particular way and that usage has become ingrained), it could sometimes be difficult to arrive at the hoped for destination.

### 47. Changes for future iterations

I would:
- Begin synchronous activities sooner.
- Open the course to Japanese language learners to create a more even platform.
- Conduct more activities with a “playful” structure. (For instance, the cooking activity was probably one of the best activities throughout which students were focusing more on the act of communicating than on the fact that they had to communicate for the course. The course and its artificial confines faded into the background, as did the technology. We designed the course modules so as to increase the likelihood of this occurring from the beginning, but ironically, it was the production of something that had nothing to do with digital technologies that allowed the students to make best use of the digital technologies.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48. Technical support</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. International programs person</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Issues you did not foresee would be problematic</td>
<td>Interestingly enough—or perhaps not so interestingly for all of the attention that Junko and I paid to the matter of time and time zones, there were several instances in which we made errors in designating the time zones and days of the week. Our students were guilty of the same. However, I would argue that having students arrange to Skype one another and thus contemplate how time zones complicate international communication and develop strategies of communicating so that this does not happen, was one of the merits of the course. I would also say that issues of technology were surprisingly always at the top of my mind. I live and breathe technology and am often the first to dive head-first into whatever technological sea lies before me. But using this technology for very specific goals was a challenge with which I still lack the confidence to say I have coped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Time commitment</td>
<td>Unfortunately, I did not tally up the hours of planning, replanning, re-replanning, discussions between me, Matt, and Junko, meetings with Global Studies, time spent with students outside of the official course time, and everything else that went into the course. I’m certain that the same is true for Junko. I think we spent an excessive amount of time obsessing about the course and feeling tortured over the implementation and details—Are students getting anything from this activity? Is the module format moving us toward a tenable goal? etc.—particularly because this was our first time giving the course. I’m not sure if a properly done face-to-face course would be less work. But it would most certainly be work of a different sort, and would only become less work after many implementations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Was it worth it?</td>
<td>The course was definitely worth it. Throughout the course, I found myself constantly thinking of ways that I could make the course better, so I think that it would be easier to implement another iteration of the course or even a slightly different one. I’m not certain how much I would enjoy developing the course with a different partner so soon. I would like to continue to work on another course with the same partners so that we can implement what we have learned about developing such courses, as well as what we have learned about working with one another. Again, I cannot sing enough praises for Junko and Matt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

SJSU and Kagoshima University in Japan implemented collaborative online course over 10 weeks. We formed 8 international teams according to the research topic they chose and they achieved their research project cooperating each other. What we felt as most problematic was the selection of proper communication tools. As a result of trial and error, we found that using two communication tools such as SKYPE and WEBEX with two computers was the best way for whole class synchronous sessions, while for group-unit sessions, a recordable free communication tool, Google hangout, which allows 10 people to communicate at the same time showing their faces was the best. However, in order to use the Google hangout in the best condition, the students needed to use computer with earphone individually, which resulted in reserving individual room with Ethernet per group. We held 6 synchronous sessions in total using Japanese language mainly. In the first two sessions we introduced each other in the quiz format using mysterious or landmark photos. In the following 2 group-unit sessions, we introduced each country’s proverbs and discussed about our health management such as when we get cold and have fever, how we deal with it, what we eat, how we prevent and so on. In the last two sessions, we interviewed and cooperated with each other on our research topics to make final group presentation and to write a paper in the end.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese culture</td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>Japanese program</td>
<td>upper division course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar in Representational Culture</td>
<td>Kagoshima University</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>advanced course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Yasue Yanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: San Jose State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Position at Institution: Assistant professor
Department and/or Program: World Languages and Literatures/Japanese program

Team Member #2
Name: Katsunori Takeuchi
Role on Team: Faculty
Institution: Kagoshima University
Position at Institution: Professor
Department and/or Program: Humanities

Team Member #3
Name: Mark Adams
Role on Team: Instructional Designer
Institution: San Jose State University
Position at Institution: eCampus Lead Instructional Developer
Department and/or Program: Academic Technologies

3. When?
Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution
30 students at SJSU, 40 students at Kagoshima university

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?
This is typical number for this class of SJSU.
This is a little bit larger than the classes of this type (Kagoshima).

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution
Japanese and English at SJSU.

7. Primary language of most students in each class
Japanese at SJSU.

8. Language of the course collaboration
Japanese
9. Language fluency

Different depending on the students, but between ADVANCED HIGH and INTERMEDIATE LOW in ACTFL (Japanese).

10. Language proficiency difference

We used Japanese language for the collaborative work.

**Section 3: Curricular Information**

11. Online or blended?

Some of the Kagoshima students had an opportunity to meet the SJSU students since they visited us in last September.

12. Duration

We were supposed to do over 7 weeks, but Kagoshima side found out that the last week fell on the university anniversary and ended up with 6 weeks.

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Before the period, No, because we have not gotten the students’ list yet, but after the period, the SJSU side asked the Kagoshima students to proofread the students’ Japanese reports. Kagoshima university’s semester is still going on until February, so they will work together upon Kagoshima students' request.

**Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used**

14. Tools

We used D2L (Desire 2 Learn) and google email, but some of my students were using Facebook individually.

15. Server location

D2L was provided by the SJSU. Also, we decided to use google email since we adopted google hangout for the synchronous session between students.

16. Technical problems

SJSU side did not because we are used to using the D2L. Also, it is not the technical problem, but as a nature of email, when the Kagoshima University students do not check email so often, my students had a difficulty to get Japanese language help from Kagoshima students timely.

17. Frequency of use

Every week on the SJSU side. Every assignment was assigned and submitted through D2L. Also, when the
18. Informal communication

I was thinking to use Facebook before starting this course, but I heard negative comments on that in a conference such as Japanese students are not used to using Facebook, and it is an informal venue and not suitable for language learning, so I gave up this time. Kagoshima students are not used to using D2L, so D2L was used for showing interview task sheet and what we did in our class before Kagoshima university's semester began. The D2L worked very effectively on an informal level on the SJSU side such as when we had discussions on our introductory presentation to Kagoshima students, and when commenting one another on our final presentations.

19. Re-use

We have to switch to Canvas next semester because our university LMS will be changed to Canvas from this semester and we will no longer be able to use D2L.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

We explored three communication tools, Skype, Webex and Google Hangout. We used Webex for the first two sessions. Also, Skype was added from the second session because we realized that we need to use two kinds of communication tools from two computers in order to show both presentation slides and the presenters' faces simultaneously in such a size that everyone can see them clearly in the classrooms. After that, the first group-unit synchronous session was done by Skype since the use of Webex was limited to only faculty at that time. However, Skype is free only between two parties and it cannot show 3-4 people's faces at the same time. Thus, for the rest of the three synchronous sessions, we switched to a new communication tool, Google Hangout, which enables us to talk with 10 people at the same time for free showing their faces. Gladly, the suggestion was made by a SJSU student in his journal after the first group-unit synchronous session.

21. Server location

As for Webex, SJSU provided the tool, but the other two tools are cloud-based.

22. Technical problems

As for Webex, the sound was not big and clear enough. Skype and Google Hangout had better sound, but Skype is neither free for multiple parties nor has recording function, so we ended up choosing the Google Hangout. However, for the clearer group-unit synchronous communication, we needed to reserve an individual room with Ethernet per a group and letting students use their own laptop computer and earphone individually. But, sometimes the recording function connected with YouTube stopped for some reasons and could not get the sessions recorded. The recording function was important in terms of my students' Japanese language learning.

23. Frequency of use

Once a week for 40 minutes (during daylight saving period) or for 90 minutes (after the daylight saving period).
per class. When they could not finish their interview task within the time, they did contact outside of the class. Also, when they got their paper proofread, they had synchronous session individually outside of the class.

24. Informal communication

They get to know each other through skype and google hangout during class session at the beginning.

25. Re-use

Yes, because I (Yasue) liked google hangout better from various reasons such as FOC, sound, recordable, image, many apps and that function that 10 people can communicate at the same time.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

I think my course (SJSU) contributed to enhancing my students' intercultural awareness because even the students who did not like this course state that they became more sensitive to the differences between people and cultures in the questionnaires. I think the COIL course was a challenging course for those who are used to knowledge-based culture course in lecture style and those who are not used to communicating with people from other culture using skype and google hangout. There are many students who stated that they learned a lot from this course, while there are some students who stated that they did not learn anything from this course, which I found it very interesting. Also, it was surprising for me that the first-class and well-behaved students tended to declare that they preferred lecture style in the questionnaire. Those students might have felt anxious that the answers were not always given from me and felt inefficient to do trials and errors in the course.

In collaborating with SJSU, the course at Kagoshima was really successful in creating the intercultural awareness. Especially, our students produced video works based on the discussion with the SJSU students. Those videos, focusing on Japanese culture reflected in the American people’s eyes, such as marriage, bushido, popular culture, job hunting, etc., express the students’ attempt to understand the cultural interaction. This experience led them to explore more in the academic field related to their own interest. I think the online talk with the SJSU students worked both as the chance for looking at Japanese culture from the American point of view and the chance for presenting the result of their researches and video production responding to the overseas interests.

27. Common assessment rubric

No. Since we collaborated partially during our semester due to our differences in semester period and objectives between SJSU and Kagoshima university, we did not create common assessment rubric. Also, For Kagoshima university, the class was year-round class, whereas it was just one semester class for SJSU.

28. Assessment outcomes

N/A

29. Peer assessment

Yes. SJSU used the student peer evaluations when they presented their research in the class. Also, I included self-assessment as well for the presentations. I think it contributed to keeping their attention on the
presentations and getting various types of comments from different perspectives.

The Kagoshima course also used the peer evaluations. The students created the video works based on the online discussions with the SJSU students. They watched each other’s work and evaluated them. All the teams received various comments from the peers.

### 30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

I set up the interview topics for my students to talk about with Kagoshima students for the first two group-unit sessions, such as proverbs that they think represent their culture and they like and health management. Students were supposed to prepare what they would like to say along with the topics in their assignments and I corrected and gave them some feedbacks in advance.

### 31. Attrition

0 percent, although there was a student who failed this course due to no submission of her homework and paper. But, she, too, participated in the class all the time. I think it is partially because I paid attention to their relationship and problems in each group by letting them write journals on their group work weekly and I meddled in when necessary. I myself positioned and designed this course as a venue where my students experientially learn intercultural differences and solve the problems that occurs in the course of achieving a research project together within the group, so they could not back out due to the collective responsibility.

0 percent at Kagoshima. The students were divided into 8 production teams. The members of each team successfully supported each other and created good atmosphere where they completed the video productions.

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

No. Usually, there are at least one or two students who drop out from the course. Maybe, yes it is also due to the nature of this globally networked course, because in this type of class, students’ positive participation is indispensable. They cannot be passive in the class.

---

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

<SIJSU>

- **Financial aspect**

I applied for SJSU junior faculty grant for this COIL project and was able to win the grant $5000. I used the grant money to buy a new computer, a webcam and related books for the collaborative online course and even to go to Japan to see my international partner and students in person in advance. Also, this grant money was spent for the portions the COIL institute did not cover when I went to the workshop in 2011 Fall. Further, the former college Dean Karl Toepfer financially supported my substitute teacher’s salary during my absence. I applied for another junior faculty grant for the Capstone conference and the following international conference, but the result has not come yet.

At Kagoshima, the budget for providing the classroom with the audio device implementing the online discussion was obtained.
When I applied for the COIL grant, thanks to Dean Karl Toepfer and Professor Takeuchi things went forward at the fastest speed. Dean Toepfer wrote a letter for me to the Dean of Kagoshima university, and Professor Takeuchi brought it up and made it pass so quickly in the board meeting on the Kagoshima side and wrote a strong supportive letter for me. Further, to continue this program with Kagoshima University it was necessary to have MOU for university-wide partnership on the side of Kagoshima University, and the MOU was exchanged in April 2012 with supports from Professor Ide, Executive Director of Kagoshima University North American Center on the Kagoshima side and the former interim Deans Dr. Karl Toepfer and Dr. Sheila Bienenfeld in my College and Mark Novak in International Extended Study program and the Acting Chair Anne Fountain in my department on the SJSU side.

There was no pedagogical support from my institute, but I learned it from the COIL workshop.

I received a lot of supports from Mark Adams, Lead instructional developer, for D2L, and from Klaus Trilck, Technology support coordinator, for webex.

---

### 34. Engagement with the international programs office

Dean Mark Novak is the one of the members who encouraged my participation in COIL and Mark Adams was sent to our team SJSU from international program office as an instructional developer.

### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

Yes.

### 36. Commitment

It was more a singular commitment on the part of the participating faculty Fellow. Although I asked for a teaching assistant or teaching load reduction to my department chair, not only I was not able to get either of them until I got sick, but also I had to do additional duties due to the budget crisis and my Japanese program coordinator's sabbatical leave. Also, the Japanese program coordinator always asks me when I can get rid of this COIL project from his point of view as a Japanese program coordinator. Thus, I had been caught between the Dean (+COIL staffs) and the Chair and Program coordinator in my department. I hope that a new Chair of my department and a new Dean of my college will understand this COIL project well and make a substantial commitment.

### 37. Future iterations

It will be offered 2013 Fall again with the same international partner Kagoshima university.

### 38. New globally networked courses

I have just finished the first trial and there is no specific other courses being offered until 2013 fall, but team San Jose is thinking to promote this kind of globally networked courses not only to other faculty members within SJSU and Kagoshima university, but also other countries. One of candidates is Pakistan now. Also, I will cooperate with the cross cultural communication class in Kagoshima University next Fall.
39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

Dean Mark Novak in International Extended Study program and Dean Sheila Bienenfeld in college of Social Sciences definitely have ideas of expanding this pilot courses, but I am not sure my current college Dean and department chair have the same idea because they are new and I have not had chances to discuss further on how they want to do this COIL project, although I have explained this COIL project to them a several times when I had chances to talk with them.

40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

At this moment we have just finished the first trial, and I think our team SJSU needs to brief and appeal what we did to the Deans first to get substantial commitment from our institutions for the further development and dissemination of the COIL project.

At Kagoshima University, this trial with SJSU is gathering attention from the faculty members and the university’s international relationship bureau. I see much educational possibility in organizing a systematic curriculum composed of the online collaboration class, short stay programs, and exchanging students programs. In Japan, the institutions expect such international educational programs develop more.

41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

To get teaching load reduction for campaigning this globally networked learning within and outside the campus.

Section 8: Reflections

42. Goals set

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
1. analyze Japanese/American ways of thinking, attitudes, behaviors and/or products themselves using various information sources.
2. describe Japanese/American ways of thinking, attitudes, behaviors and/or products with their socio-cultural backgrounds.
3. evaluate situations and choose appropriate communication strategies to meet their intention in intercultural settings.

43. Goals achieved

I think my SJSU students were able to achieve the objectives 1 and 2 completely through the international team projects (small ones and a big one) and case studies. The students were able to analyze and describe, for example, the similarities and differences in job hunting between Japan and America including why they are different with the socio-cultural backgrounds, using articles, web videos, statistics, and interviews with Kagoshima students in Japan as the information sources. As for the objective 3, I think my students came to be able to evaluate situations, but most of them did not reach the level where they can independently choose and use appropriate communication strategies to meet their intention in the actual intercultural settings. One of the reasons is that most of them were not used to using Japanese language with Japanese native speakers and the web communication tools. They have knowledge, but they could not use it appropriately without my help. I think the period itself was too short for them to achieve the goal.
The students at Kagoshima were able to achieve the objective 1 by making researches on how American people looked at Japanese culture and by making sure of their research results during the online talk with the SJSU students. They were able to achieve the objective 2 by creating the video works based on their researches and the talk with SJSU students. As for objective 3, they should have utilized more chances to talk online with SJSU students outside class periods and improve their communication skills in more various settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Most unique aspect for students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In usual culture class, students learn Japanese culture from an instructor and literatures in a knowledge-centered way. However, this course let them learn the culture experientially by actually communicating with Japanese students in Japan. Also, I think that the group work was the best venue for American students to learn what intercultural communication is and to foster intercultural competence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This kind of collaborative course gives experiential type of learning to students, so the interview tasks we had were the best parts and worked well although there were some misunderstanding on the task at the beginning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46. Most problematic aspects from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Until we settle down on google hangout, we could not provide a stable communication environment to students, exploring several communication tools and environments to find the best conditions for their virtual communication technically. But I think this cannot be helped for the our first trial because we cannot test it until the class actually begins. The experience was valuable for the next time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47. Changes for future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to increase the virtual communication assignments outside the class. This time, I was not sure how Kagoshima university students correspond to our e-mails and how my students react to individual synchronous sessions, so I did not include them on a full scale, but the chances to talk with counterparts during class time are limited, so I would like to utilize the occasions outside the classroom to the full in the form of class assignments. And, I also want to change the class time in the way that we can have the same amount of time for each synchronous session. Also, I learned that Japanese students come to class late, so by starting the class 30 minutes later, we will be able to have 60-70 minutes session each time substantially regardless of before or after the daylight saving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48. Technical support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mark) Early on, months before the course was offered, I met with Yasue to experiment with web camera’s and a different, high tech classroom that no one seemed to know how to use as it had no consistent. We decided to switch to the Incubator classroom which has very good, daily technical support staffing. We also met another time to discuss the instructional design the course, and I offered suggestions for structuring teams, encouraging mixed teams (2 Japanese and 2 American), but it was determined it would likely be too difficult for the students to coordinate. Once the course started, my role was limited as the instructors preferred to work independently and use the incubator classroom staff as needed. I did attend the sessions and offered to assist in training for the LMS and or the web conferencing tool “Elluminate/Collaborate,” a powerful but more complex web conferencing tool. But it was determined that simpler solutions (Skype or Google Hangout or Web-Ex) would be preferred by these instructors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. International programs person

N/A

50. Time commitment

I think there is no so much difference between classes not globally networked and globally networked except time and semester differences. Time differences including time lag and daylight saving time make this kind of international collaborative course more difficult than a similar course with is not globally networked. Also, international collaboration always faces semester period difference between two countries, so it makes difficult to do the exact same classes between two countries. In my case, SJSU was from the end of August to the beginning of Dec, while Kagoshima university was from the beginning of October to the beginning of Feb.

51. Was it worth it?

I feel it was worth it because I was able to experience how it goes. I can predict more or less how students react and what kind of points I have to emphasize doing this kind of international collaborative course, so it would be easier to do the similar course again. It might be an idea to explore some private universities which overlap with SJSU semester system more.

Section 9: Student Feedback

<SJSU+>
Wide, interesting variety of learning content helped all students better understand the extent of cultural competence.

Very good at getting real world experience for students.

I think that connecting with the Kagoshima univ. students is a very good idea. It is definitely a more effective way to learn about Japanese culture than reading books, etc.

Had great learning experience interacting with Kagoshima students.

<SJSU->
Slight lack of organization, but this was on experimental class.

Lots of trails and errors.

Section 10: Course Collaboration Narrative

In designing this international collaborative online course, I had three fundamental ideas in my mind. One was the use of Japanese language as foreign language for my students in its communication because my students are all Japanese major or minor students who usually do not have chances to communicate in Japanese with the native speakers. Another was letting them choose the topics of their interest to research by themselves and include the interview result of Kagoshima students in their presentations. It is because when they research and present the topics of their interest in the former Japanese culture courses, students looked more involved and motivated than just listening to my lectures, and because that will be the way they will take after this class to fulfill their intellectual curiosity. The third point was inclusion of group work. Since I took COIL workshop, I have been thinking to make such an international collaborative class that can foster my students’ intercultural
competence. I believe that intercultural competence can be trained only through actual communication and collaboration with others from different cultures. Also, intercultural competence can be raised not only through intercultural communication overseas, but through the communication and collaboration with their own classmates because each of us has different culture. However, generally speaking, American students are not good at doing group work and they prefer individual play. Thus, I thought that I wanted my students to learn group dynamics and synergy through this group project in this course, although I knew that it was not a smooth path for them.

It is not too much to say that other elements of the course than these three basic pillars were determined by the nature of the international collaborative course. Most of them are related with the temporal issues. One of them is the time lag between Japan and the U.S. (Pacific time). We cannot help setting the class in the morning in Japan, which is late afternoon in the Pacific time. Another is the difference of semester period between Japan and the U.S.. Kagoshima University’s Fall semester starts in October and ends in January, and the Spring semester starts in April and ends in July, which is common among National universities in Japan. On the other hand, SJSU’s fall semester begins at the end of August and ends at the beginning of December, and the Spring semester begins at the end of January and ends in the middle of May. In such a situation, we could not help choosing Fall semester when the temporal overlap is the longer even though it is only two and half months. The third temporal issue was daylight saving system. Japan does not employ daylight saving system, so at the point where we chose the fall semester, we were doomed to have the time change during the semester. However, we cannot change class time each other according to the daylight saving system, so the only solution was setting longer class time more than two hours on the SJSU side. The fourth temporal issue was the difference in length of class time. Interestingly, it is designated that all classes in Japanese national universities are 2-units, 90 minutes classes by once-a-week class meeting without any exception. Thus, our online collaboration was naturally limited only once a week for 90 minutes at most. These temporal restrictions naturally narrowed down what we can do and the frequency of our synchronous sessions during the semester.

Due to the temporal restrictions above, we were able to have 6 synchronous sessions this year. Before starting the sessions, the SJSU side had one and half months (6 class meetings 15 hours in total), we spent the time for the following things:

- to get used to the LMS (D2L) and communication tools
- to know classmates and oneself through activities and psychological questionnaires
- define and explore what culture is
- to read some literatures related with intercultural competence, Japanese communication, Japanese selfness and the topics they chose of their interests
- to do extralinguistic analysis by observing Japanese people’s behaviors, gestures, pause, gaze, and so on, watching Japanese videos.
- to do case studies of miscommunication and cultural conflicts between Japan and the U.S. using D.I.E methods
- to make 8 groups according to their interest (3-4 members)
- to prepare for the SJSU and the area introduction and group introduction.

Once we started doing synchronous sessions, we spent two sessions for introducing each school and area. It was done by quiz format showing mysterious or landmark photo pictures. The first session had communication problems at the beginning due to our lack of our experience in using communication tools in classroom setting. They were, for example, sound problems of Webex and extended mic (hauling or no sound), poor illumination problem and screen size problems of the slides and people. Therefore, we decided to use both Webex and Skype with two computers at the same time in the second session. This worked really well. The topics students chose covered a wide variety of topics, such as job hunting, Japanese pop-culture, gender and marriage, education, religion, advertisement, energy and environment. Based on the information they got from the icebreaking
introductory activities, students formed international teams that consist of Kagoshima students and SJSU students ranged from 6 to 10 students per group. The selection was made by students taking their research topics into their consideration. From the third synchronous session, we moved to the group-unit sessions, and at first we mutually introduced each country’s proverbs that we think represent our culture and then proverbs we personally like. The idea of this activity was very good to know each country’s social values as well as individual values, but it turned out that Kagoshima students did not prepared for the activity since they believed that they would do it in the following week for some miscommunication, so the follow-up interview were done by my students through emails. Also, it took time to be ready for the communication since it was the first group-unit session using Skype and we did not know Japanese students usually come to class late. From the first group session, we learned that the Skype was not good enough for the group session because it cannot show 4 people’s faces on the screen and it prevents some students from their active participations. Then, following recommendation from a SJSU student, we decided to adopt a new communication tool Google hangout instead, which not only allows 10 people to talk at most simultaneously showing their faces for free, but also allows us to record the sessions being linked with Youtube. The second group-unit session was on the ways of health management in each country. We learned that when we get sick and injured we sometimes do completely opposite things with the reasons behind. The informational exchange itself was fun and successful, but still it was the first trial of using Google hangout, so it took time for all students to be ready to talk. Also, some group’s communication became choppy due to network overload because students used their own lap-top computer individually with earphone for communication with the Google hangout, although I assigned three different WiFis by 2-3 groups. The third group-unit session was led by Kagoshima students who made introductory videos on their research topic. I reserved rooms for each group and recommended them to use two computers per group (one computer per two students) using Ethernet for better communication quality. This worked perfectly, and in the fourth group session led by SJSU students, students completed their own research topic interviews with Kagoshima students without any worries except their Japanese language competence. Also, they send their questions in advance, so Kagoshima students were ready to answer all the questions.

The presentations given by SJSU students were excellent and concentrated, including interview results which show Japanese young people’s individual and variable opinions on the research topics in addition to what they researched individually using various information sources such as articles, videos, statistics and so on. I think that my students learned that they did not have to speak perfect Japanese to communicate and they can develop their language skill by actually using it in this way even after this class. Also, the group work functioned really well to foster their real intercultural coordination competence. In fact, the students experienced frustrations on the process of making a presentation with their teammates, but they overcame and gave excellent presentations in the end.

The students’ paper written in Japanese, too, was much better than usual, having Kagoshima students edit their papers, although some of the students seemed not used to correcting foreigner’s Japanese language. I felt the need to guide this part more carefully, including how to simplify and paraphrase what they want to say and how to negotiate the meaning with proofreaders, so that they can get better proofreading.

In the next class, which will be offered in Fall 2013, I would like to improve the following points based on the comments from my students and my own observations and reflections. One is that I want to increase the chances to let them talk with their partners individually. In the first trial, I was not sure how group work and individual communication would work, but after observing students’ communication with Kagoshima students, I became more confident to let them communicate individually. Some students got stressed when they did not have enough chances to talk, and some students depended too much on other students who can speak better in the group. Since the time of in-class sessions is limited, by increasing individual sessions outside the classroom as assignments, they can build closer relationship with Japanese partners and have more chances to talk in Japanese. Second, I would like to increase the dates of presentations. The presentations given by students were very concentrated and each presentation was worth one lecture. By increasing the presentation dates, I will be
able to deepen and follow up the topics more. Third, I need to have stronger communication with my students and my international partner in order to avoid miscommunication. I think I did my best for the first trial, but since this class is only once a week, so the communication tended to become less. The journals my students wrote each time after the synchronous session and e-mails played an important role to fortify the communication between us, but still sometimes some students did not know what to do during the sessions although the related assignments were given in advance each time. Also, professor Takeuchi and I talked online and e-mailed every time, but still miscommunication occurred once, so I think how much we communicate, we cannot communicate too much. Last, but not least, I would like to explain the course objectives and goals and the meaning of activities we do in the course more in detail and to warn and exclude the students who do not like to communicate with Japanese students online. I learned that some students prefer lecture styled course to experiential typed course and if the style does not fit them, it would be unfortunate for both of us.
14. Japan - USA: Sociology-Global Youth Culture

Abstract

In Fall 2012, San Jose State University (SJSU) in California and Kwansei Gakuin University (KGU) in Japan offered Global Youth Culture as a COIL course to its students. Ruth Wilson taught the SJSU course which included 17 students and met once a week on Thursdays, from 6:00-8:45 p.m. On Friday mornings at KGU, Mr. John Wilson taught three 50-minute sessions of the COIL course, each with 20 students. The three classes of Japanese students met back-to-back, overlapping the SJSU Thursday evening’s 6:00-8:45 p.m. time slot. This was the only time periods when the courses could meet and overlap with each other. We used SKYPE, webcams, smart phones, laptop computers, the Internet, Microsoft Office software, and Desire2Learn to link SJSU students to the KGU students studying English speaking and presentation skills.

We combined traditional pedagogical approaches of lecturing and assigning readings with multimedia presentations, experiential learning experiences, class discussions and small peer group learning (discussions, projects, and other activities). Lectures include summaries and analysis of assigned readings, as well as slides and video clips from the instructors travels in Japan and the United States. Short video clips and slide shows of contemporary youth in San Jose and in Osaka stimulated class discussions, as did students’ Internet research of videos, photos, and articles. A significant portion of students’ grades depended on their ability to collaborate in developing a research project and make presentations during our joint sessions. The research projects focused on aspects of youth culture that were shared globally: fashion, media and technology use, entertainment, holidays and national celebrations, and other problems faced by youth. Although all joint sessions were conducted in English, the lecturers provided students with skills that taught them how to be considerate when communicating with persons who have a different first language.

Our case study summarizes the institutional support, components of the COIL activities that did and did not work, intracultural activities planned and implemented, support of technology for our pedagogical goals support of, and the power of COIL to provide a bridge for college students interested in foreign exchange and travel abroad programs.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Youth Culture</td>
<td>San Jose State</td>
<td>Sociology, Anthropology</td>
<td>Upper division (no freshmen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159 | COIL Institute for Globally Networked Learning in the Humanities: Case Studies
2. The team

| Team Member #1 |  
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Ruth P. Wilson |
| Role on Team: | Faculty |
| Institution: | SJSU |
| Position at Institution: | Faculty |

| Team Member #2 |  
| --- | --- |
| Name: | John Wilson |
| Role on Team: | Instructor of Record, faculty |
| Institution: | Kwansei Gakuin Univ |
| Position at Institution: | Associate Lecturer of English |
| Department and/or Program: | Social Policy Studies |

| Team Member #3 |  
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Mark Adams |
| Role on Team: | Instructional Developer |
| Institution: | San Jose State University |
| Position at Institution: | eCampus Lead Instructional Developer |
| Department and/or Program: | Academic Technologies |

| Team Member #4 |  
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Yoko Baba |
| Role on Team: | Faculty |
| Institution: | SJSU |
| Position at Institution: | Faculty |
| Department and/or Program: | Sociology/Justice Studies |

3. When?

Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

3 Classes of approximately 23 students. (KGU); 1 class at SJSU 17 students
5. Is this typical for classes of this type?
The minimum class size at our institution is 15. (Kwansei Gakuin)
SJSU courses may vary from 15 to 300 or more students. We had an upper limit of 20 for this class (verify).

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution
KGU and SJSU, English. (Though in Japan, sometimes Japanese is used for clarification.)

7. Primary language of most students in each class
KGU, Japanese; For SJSU in California, English. For two SJSU students Spanish and Japanese was the primary language of one exchange student from KGU.

8. Language of the course collaboration
Yes (English)

9. Language fluency
KGU; many students were false beginners (ESL terminology) though about 45% were comfortable with English as second language. All SJSU students were fluent in English

10. Language proficiency difference
Very significant. Students needed “communicative skill” training to ensure understanding had been achieved. Students from SJSU were invited to omit filler words (for example, “and um”, “ya know”, “and like”). While using Skype, Japanese students were instructed to confirm that they had been understood (“Do you understand?” “Do you have a question?” etc).
Occasionally, SJSU students were instructed to check in with the Japanese students to validate that they understood what was being stated, and to use gestures and other non-verbal cues to verify that they understood a statement or phrase.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?
The SJSU-KGU course was a blended course. Students had face-to-face interactions with three online synchronous sessions between the two campuses. Students worked in small groups developing presentations; they worked individually responding to emails and chatting with their international peers. They shared photographs and movies with their class members and their international counterparts. SJSU students took reading quizzes online, they interviewed youth on campus and in the community who were born in the USA and in other countries.
KGU students conducted interviews with their parents and shared the results with SJSU students via their
powerpoint presentations, in emails and in synchronous SKYPE sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleven weeks. The two KGU courses shared three synchronous sessions via Skype and 8 asynchronous sessions interacting via email, chat, and an the LMS (learning management system - Desire2Learn--D2L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actually collaboration period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. One particular synchronous session involved sharing presentations on recycling. Using D2L, via Skype, students shared photos from their research. SJSU students portrayed photos and videos of California redemption value bar codes on aluminum cans and bottles and showed recycling centers where these recyclables may be redeemed for cash. Both sides showed students at their work place recycling paper and other disposable goods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We created and used a “Global Cafe” discussion session in D2L. Students also developed relationships with students outside of the tools used in class (their own facebook page, personal email).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Server location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2L access was provided by SJSU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Technical problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant ones, no; however occasionally there were glitches in the Skype transmission. We had three technicians (two student assistants, one IT tech, and Mr. Mark Adams the Instructional Designer) working to resolve problems in SJSU. Mr. Wilson was a solo technician in KGU. From time to time our tech team would be in direct communication with Mr. Wilson assisting him to resolve tech problems in his classroom in Japan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About 12 of the 17 SJSU students routinely interacted with KGU students inside the classroom environment and outside of class time. Expectations varied as the semester went along and workload increased. KGU students were intimidated by D2L, and there were some login challenges early on (alpha, numerical passwords given O vs. 0 and confusion.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Informal communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGU and SJSU students generally worked independently after 3 weeks of in-class assistance logging in and actively posting in class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 19. Re-use

The SJSU is changing its LMS to CANVAS as of this spring, thus the ground is shifting. Mr. Adams will check in regarding how this will impact the class in the future. D2L, we would love to. We are interested in Google Hangout. Skype can be glitchy.

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

#### 20. Tools

Skype, D2L: SJSU students spent about 15-20 minutes of class time in chat. Additionally, some, but not all spent more time chatting individually with KGU students, however, the instructor did not monitor that. SJSU and KGU shared three SKYPE sessions. The SJSU students spent 2 hours engaged with this activity. Comparatively, Japanese students spent between 40-50 minutes engaged with SKYPE, depending on whether or not there were technical problems.

#### 21. Server location

Skype is a free, downloadable app that students can use anywhere, anytime, for free. Desire2Learn is an LMS provider that SJSU has contracted with for managed hosting services.

#### 22. Technical problems

Having support from SJSU proved invaluable. Some small login challenges, Skype was glitchy on KGU side due to bandwidth issues.

#### 23. Frequency of use

Students engaged each other in the formal setting (during class time) three times. For SJSU students this meant nine hours. In two out of three sessions, students were giving introductions and adding photos synchronously while 6-8 students (3-4 on each side) used Skype and short conversations.

Varied.

#### 24. Informal communication

Yes. We used the tools and they did.

#### 25. Re-use

Yes. The more technologies introduced, the more facile students were in learning to use new tools. Most sjsu students had some experience with D2L before entering the class, but not Skype.

### Section 6: Assessment Information

#### 26. How?

Presentation skills, research ability, how well they worked together in groups and transferred their skills with
technology, how their interviews and research report evidenced that they had learned more about cultures other than their own.

Observations from listening during the asynchronous sessions, their conversations in class. Responses to the assessment instrument I administered in class. Their spontaneous comments after each session.

KGU; written essays (2), using D2L, digital portfolios (hundreds posted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Common assessment rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Assessment outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Peer assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGU: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJSU: Yes. The student peer assessments helped students to recognize how to critique their own presentations. However, they were not included in assessing the students’ final grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31. Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About 5 SJSU students had a lull during the World Series, however, they returned and did not drop out permanently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Section 7: Institutional Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32. Type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the start, the SJSU Deans were highly supportive of our efforts, encouraging us to apply for the SUNY grant, following up on required signatures and documentation, and even funding an additional person’s travel expenses early on in the process, as the first session of Global Youth Culture was team taught. Their constant support and encouragement was very motivating and continues to be as we begin the process of determining how we can extend the COIL process across the university’s many departments. SJSU also made available what we call the “incubator” classroom, which is a versatile, high tech classroom with multiple projectors and screens, modular seating (tables on wheels), laptop computers, wireless microphones, and inexpensive webcams. Though the extra technology was not necessary, the room provided a comfortable, high tech space that students seem to appreciate. In addition to the technology in the room, the incubator class is staffed by technicians who assisted in set up and trouble-shooting as issues arose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Engagement with the international programs office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None directly, though the “virtual abroad” program was discussed as a potential next step for those with interest in foreign travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34. Importance given to globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Without a doubt, from the SJSU President to the faculty, internationalization of the curriculum has become an important theme in discussions about preparing students for 21st century jobs and citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Initially at SJSU, it was a singular commitment as far as developing a globally networked initiative--if it was on the horizon at all. Now that SUNY has announced a potential member supported website to support the ability of interested faculty to find and connect with global partners interested in COIL style course projects, it will be much easier to move forward with a GNC initiative.

Also, during the COIL grant timeline, SJSU was successful in winning a $1.1 million dollar grant to build online capacity with Allama Iqbal Open University (AIOU) in Pakistan, with the COIL model of globally networked courses being featured prominently in the grant proposal deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36. Future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
As part of the Pakistan grant, SJSU will be offering numerous COIL style course opportunities where SJSU and AIOU students will work together to build multicultural competencies in the domains of Computer Science and Education (see our website: http://sjsuaiou.wordpress.com/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37. New globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
KGU has expressed interest in continuing globally networked courses, and the Dean of International and Extended Studies have expressed and encouraged expansion of the globally networked courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
We SUNY COIL fellows have been asked by our Deans to propose a strategy for training faculty to offer COIL courses across the curriculum. We are hoping one take away from the 2013 COIL Capstone and Conference will be COIL approved training materials that we can customize as needed at our institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
While still early (in the pre-proposal stage), the initial meetings we’ve had with our administration (namely our Deans) has been very encouraging. We would assess it as “positive.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1) A SUNY COIL approved and developed training course and materials that we could use and customize as needed to offer to interested faculty at SJSU.

2) A SUNY COIL affordable membership website that provided a global, web based faculty matching service for those interested at SJSU.
Section 8: Reflections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. Goals set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) At SJSU, to provide a positive, introductory experience in global networking for students that resulted in new insights, increased interest in global issues and friendships, and development of multi-cultural competencies to prepare them for 21st century citizenship and employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42. Goals achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, at SJSU the comments from students were positive and expressions of gratitude for the unexpected opportunity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43. Most unique aspect for students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At SJSU, many students are from other parts of the world, so interacting with multi-cultural students is not unique; but the opportunity to interact with natives in their native land and compare and contrast in a conscious, structured, and reflective way was very different.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Collaborative online learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In class group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sessions that included lectures and multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data analysis, sharing results from interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviewing activity, creating knowledge through collecting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student led presentations, enjoyment of creating knowledge and sharing it with peers, peer learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous sessions with technical glitches - no sound, no picture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46. Changes for future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend more time organizing the course with the co-instructors; things were often rushed, squeezed. we needed assigned time to do course development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47. Technical support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At SJSU, for this Global Youth Culture course we used a minimalist approach to the use of technology--Skype, laptops, and a single stream between the universities. In the other COIL course (Japanese Culture), a more sophisticated technological approach was used, with two streams--one for video and a separate one for the computer screen (usually Power Point presentations, websites, or videos). Very little time was spent preparing the students for either online work or web conferencing work; in reflection, as instructional designer, I would recommend greater student and faculty preparation to optimize the use of technology, which I think would result in both higher satisfaction and increased digital communication skill acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48. International programs person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. Time commitment

J W and RW began discussing teaching a joint course shortly after he arrived at KGU five years ago. Ideas about Youth Culture in the USA and Japan arose during visits: Ruth to Japan in 2009/10. Photographs taken and shared in both USA and JAPAN. Our observations created the basis for further conversations, which later took flight when KGU asked RW to approach the Dean of CoSS regarding an exchange program. At the same time VAP applications, Dr. Baba was interested in VAP and, two months later Dean of IES solicited faculty interest in COIL. Dr. BABA and I put forth the first proposal in one month, brainstorming, phone and email conversations with Dr. Takako Yamada, Skype with JW during summer 2011. VAP course was precursor to COIL course. Wilson and Wilson revamped the activities of the synchronous sessions. Wilson and Baba met weekly, developed grading rubrics for evaluating student work, tasks for student assistant.

Lessons learned from teaching other course. Freelisting ideas for the course assignments. Using what we learned at coil for objectives of the course.

Dr. Baba and I combined mutually shared interests ( I had a protocol for interviewing students, she understood protocol for introducing new course and clearing them through curriculum committee. and the topics, literature search, Manga, her expertise and strengths, her interest in Manga and japanese culture, Our syllabus was a shared with Japan Takada, then John, shortly before the class began, made modifications prior to going on vacation .

We focused on what worked when we did the COIL class-- but didn’t anticipate the baseball effect during COIL in fall 2012.

Time zone issues

I am interested in globally networked course with a USA class in other sections of the country, e.g., northeast or southeast, to get students out of their comfort zone, or Toronto, Canada, as well as South Africa.

Comparatively, courses based only on RWs primary area of expertise might require 40-80 hours, easily accommodated during the summer months. Of course it would take longer than that to clear through our campus curriculum committees, however, faculty know their students, and what will work in the classroom setting. The VAP COIL course required increasing skill in a high tech classroom, design activities that worked with movable furniture

group learning, collective learning, sharing ideas, presentation skills, learning tools in word and powerpoint, learning management systems, etc.

50. Was it worth it?

Absolutely yes! At SJSU we now have the experience and confidence to move this very powerful COIL pedagogy forward to many other interested faculty and departments. Thank you very much SUNY COIL program and Jon Rubin and John Fowler in particular!
15. Lebanon – USA: Human Rights

Abstract

Dr. Alexandra Moore and Dr. Alexander Hartwiger partnered to offer a globally-networked course on human rights for students at UNC-Greensboro and American University of Beirut. The course was successful in providing a rigorous academic experience and offering a meaningful cross-cultural engagement. The topic of study, the intellectual history of human rights, allowed us to discuss global issues in a global environment. At times there were technology related issues, but for the most part, the course objectives were met. The non-traditional learning environment promoted inter as well as intra class discussions as the presence of an outside audience often lead to important self-reflection. The course culminated with a collaborative project in which the students had to present about a current human rights issue, its history, and possible solutions. This final project, presented synchronously in the classes, brought to fruition the partnerships that were started at the beginning of the semester. The students walked away with a transformative experience that we think will shape their future cross-cultural interactions.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level (e.g. freshman, 3rd-year, graduate, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are Human Rights?</td>
<td>American University of Beirut</td>
<td>Civilization Sequence Program</td>
<td>open to all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights for Whom?</td>
<td>The University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>Lloyd Honors College</td>
<td>open to all levels of Lloyd honors students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Alexander Hartwiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>American University of Beirut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program</td>
<td>English Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Alexandra Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program</td>
<td>English Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Spring 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

American University of Beirut: 18 students; University of North Carolina at Greensboro: 12 students

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

Yes, at both institutions.

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

English

7. Primary language of most students in each class

At institution #1 most of the students have Arabic as a primary language but are completely fluent in English. At institution #2 the primary language for students is English.

8. Language of the course collaboration

English

9. Language fluency

All of students were fluent in English
10. Language proficiency difference

There was minimal difference in English skills in most cases and only one student at AUB struggled with being understood.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?

The courses were not offered online. Each location required regular face-to-face meetings with virtual meetings frequently between the two sites.

12. Duration

11 weeks

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Since the courses had staggered start times there was opportunity for students at UNCG to discuss collaboration prior to the collaboration period and students at AUB conducted follow up work on collaboration once UNCG completed its semester. The most significant work in this process stemmed from the ability of Dr. Hartwiger to travel to Greensboro to address questions students at UNCG might have about the collaboration and for Dr. Moore to travel to AUB at the end of the collaboration to assist in follow up conversations. One assignment that UNCG students conducted was establishing terms for successful online engagement prior to the collaboration. AUB students produced a reflection essay that enabled them to think critically about the collaboration.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

We used Blackboard as our shared site. We also used VoiceThread and Prezi for collaborative assignments.

15. Server location

Blackboard was provided by UNCG

16. Technical problems

There were a few small technical problems. Dr. Hartwiger was unable to receive emails through the site. For students at AUB the uploading speed for images was very slow. VoiceThread caused some problems for students at AUB. They were unable to log in.

17. Frequency of use

Students used Blackboard on a weekly basis. Blackboard was the primary space for the dissemination of ideas and the space for online discussion so students would log in several times a week.
18. Informal communication

The discussion forum in Blackboard provided a space for students to share images from their daily lives. In general we found it was less helpful at engaging at informal levels.

19. Re-use

We would use Blackboard to house the course and for the formal assignments. When eliciting feedback from students we were informed that a Facebook group might be helpful for building informal relationships.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

The two primary synchronous tools we used were Skype and FaceTime. The decision of which video resource to utilize depended on technological compatibility. Skype tended to be the more frequently used tool. On occasions when we had joint presentations or guest speakers we used video conferencing. The percentage was 75% Skype and FaceTime and 25% video conferencing.

21. Server location

These were cloud based.

22. Technical problems

Lebanon has very slow internet speeds and AUB has trouble with bandwidth so Skype and FaceTime often were unreliable. In those situations students often relied on text based chatting.

23. Frequency of use

We connected as classrooms approximately every other week. As the semester progressed, students had increasing contact synchronously outside of class. In the last few weeks of the course students were in contact at least once a week if not more.

24. Informal communication

While we did not monitor all of the informal communication, we heard stories of students chatting online or having casual conversations in addition to doing their work.

25. Re-use

We would use these same technologies again but only because of the lack of better alternatives. If video conferencing was a consistent option (AUB does not have video conferencing in classrooms) we would use that more often.
## Section 6: Assessment Information

### 26. How?
Both Dr. Moore and Dr. Hartwiger administered pre-collaboration and post-collaboration intercultural awareness surveys. Both teachers assessed their classes independent of one another. Evaluation of disciplinary learning was conducted through assessment of informal assignments (journals, discussion boards, participation) and formal assignments (essays and presentations).

### 27. Common assessment rubric
We did not create any formal rubrics for common academic assessment but we did have informal conversations. AUB and UNCG have different grade distributions and expectations which made joint assessment more difficult.

### 28. Assessment outcomes
A common understanding of the expectations of students work and a shared view of what was valued as a disciplinary outcome.

### 29. Peer assessment
Since the institutions have different grading expectations, we did not utilize much peer assessment. As a part of student final projects there was a space to discuss group dynamics and workloads.

### 30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction
Both classes established independent guidelines for student interaction and then through a collaborative effort worked to blend those two sets of guidelines into one shared document. This process worked well and we would probably not change it in the future.

### 31. Attrition
At AUB there was a little bit of turnover during the first week of classes which is the traditional drop/add period. UNCG stayed consistent.

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institutions?
Both Dr. Moore and Dr. Hartwiger tried to notify students in advance of the globally networked component of the courses the minimal turnover was normal.

## Section 7: Institutional Support

### 33. Type of support
- **Financial** - AUB provided support for Dr. Hartwiger and Dr. Moore to travel to each other’s class. This was incredibly helpful as it made the collaboration “real” for the students.
- **Administrative** – For the most part this initiative was undertaken by Dr. Moore and Dr. Hartwiger and so there was not much request for administrative support. We were, however, fortunate that both the CVSP (which housed the course at AUB) and the Lloyd International Honors College (UNCG) were extremely forthcoming in
helping to make the courses available, assigning premium classroom space, etc.

**Pedagogical** – COIL was instrumental in helping think through the development of the syllabus but there was not much pedagogical support sought at UNCG and AUB.

**Technical** – There were varying amounts of technological support. UNCG was very helpful in maintaining Blackboard. Both institutions helped with the specifics of video conferencing and the initial setup of other synchronous technologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34. Engagement with the international programs office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific engagement with the International Program Office throughout the course was minimal. However, updates on course progress were shared throughout the term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. Importance given to globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the international programs center finds globally networked learning as relevant to our internationalization efforts. In 2010, our Provost appointed the UNCG Internationalization Taskforce (ITF) to serve as the campus leadership team for UNCG’s participation in the American Council on Education’s (ACE) Internationalization Laboratory, to carry out the directive of the 5.3 Strategic Planning Committee, which called for a university-wide assessment of the level of internationalization at UNCG and to make recommendations to broaden and deepen internationalization at the university. Supporting and developing globally networked learning opportunities is of specific interest to the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36. Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both institutions are eager to continue to develop globally-networked learning environments as they see it as an important development in globalizing their respective institutions. That being said, this specific course stems more from a singular commitment on the part of the participating faculty Fellows and if it is run again, it would be at the initiative of the two Fellows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37. Future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is talk of running the course again in the spring of 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38. New globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this point, there are no plans for other globally-networked courses to be offered by the Fellows outside of the current one. Both institutions seem interested in continuing to foster this type of learning environment and this partnership course has aided in solidifying that commitment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There has been no specific statement by either administration about expanding plans for globally networked learning. The Lloyd Honors College at UNCG does seem interested in recruiting more partnerships but this appears to be happening at an informal level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no question that both institutions would support future collaborations but this would happen through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the initiative of the Fellows and not at the institutional level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At AUB a classroom with appropriate technology for globally networked learning would increase the development of these type of courses. At UNCG increased funding for face-to-face meetings in support of networked courses would help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 8: Reflections

42. Goals set

- maintain substantive course content
- foster cross-cultural learning
- better understand what globally networked learning environments offer beyond the traditional classroom experience

43. Goals achieved

There is a shared sense that these goals were achieved, especially in a pilot course.

44. Most unique aspect for students

The most unique part of the experience for the students was learning to learn from others as opposed to learning only about others. Additionally, the destabilization of the traditional notion of what a classroom looks like helped students erase the false dichotomy between the classroom and the world. As such, learning was understood to occur through their interactions with their counterparts across the globe not just from their teachers.

45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The subject of the course, the intellectual history of human rights, was greatly enhanced by the networked learning environment. The course was scaffolded in a way that traced the development of human rights which was great, but the real success occurred in having several of the tensions of human rights, especially the complex relationship between the universal and the particular, play out through the experience students had in working with each other.

46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

One of the most difficult pedagogical challenges was establishing shared expectations of deadlines. Since the semesters were staggered, students at UNCG felt the pressure of the final presentation as a last task for completion of the course whereas students at AUB still had a month left after the final presentations. The discrepancy between these two perspectives caused some challenges for groups that could not find a common understanding of the level of urgency needed in that project.

47. Changes for future iterations

In general the course was deemed a success, but in the future there might be more explicit discussions about deadlines and shared responsibility in collaboration. Additionally, there could be changes to the types of
technology used based on the previous experience. We also faced pressure to provide an intellectual history of human rights in addition to all of our case studies, interactive work, and final projects. We would be interested in narrowing the historical focus of the class.

### 48. Technical support

Anita Warfford at UNCG set up the Blackboard platform for the course, and then the instructors made day to day adjustments and changes.

### 49. International programs person

While there was initial consultation with international programs at each institution, there was no direct involvement in the course.

### 50. Time commitment

There was a significantly larger time commitment necessary for successful implementing this course as compared to a traditional classroom setting. In fact, it was probably double the amount of preparation mostly due to the amount of communication necessary between teachers and with students. In order to maintain the same pace of the courses and to ensure that parallel discussions were taking place when the classes were not engaged in direct contact, the Fellows were in constant, almost daily contact.

### 51. Was it worth it?

Yes, there is joint agreement that it was both worth it and that it would be significantly easier to implement the same course again. One of the observations both teachers had was the importance of having a positive working relationship with a collaborative partner. In fact, this one aspect might be the most important component in running a successfully globally networked course. Both Fellows would consider other partnerships in the future but with strong consideration of the partner faculty member. In general, the course was influential in helping both Fellows expand their perspectives on teaching human rights and pedagogical approaches in general. It proved to be a very important learning experience.

### Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

In the spring of 2011, we (Dr. Alexandra Schultheis Moore and Dr. Alexander Hartwiger) were presented with the opportunity to teach a collaborative course that explored the intellectual history of human rights. We partnered with the Center for Online International Learning (COIL) at the State University of New York (SUNY) to develop a globally-networked class between students at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) and American University of Beirut (AUB).

The partnership between UNCG and AUB was a bit unlikely given the contrasting demographics between the institutions. As a regional state university, UNCG draws many of its 18,000 students from the surrounding communities in central and western North Carolina. AUB, on the other hand, is a private institution of 8,000 students and has a more cosmopolitan student body. Additionally, there were internal diversities among each institution that emphasized different perspectives on dealing with human rights issues. At UNCG the racial makeup between white students and black students was an important characteristic both for the students at UNCG and AUB. At AUB, the religious diversity also played an important role in shaping the conversations on human rights. Perhaps the biggest difference between the two groups was in the socio-economic status. Typically, the students at UNCG and AUB come from different social strata in their respective societies.
Obviously this also contributed to different viewpoints on human rights issues. At AUB the course was housed in the Civilization Sequence Program (CVSP). Every student at AUB passes through CVSP as it serves as a general education requirement. At UNCG, the course was offered in through the Lloyd International Honors College. For students in this program, there is an expectation of study abroad and study of a foreign language. Our course was offered in the late afternoon in Beirut and the morning in Greensboro. There was a little stagger at the beginning and end of the semester as UNCG started three weeks before AUB. In total, there were eleven weeks of collaboration.

The nontraditional class structure, synchronous and often virtual, also presented us with the opportunity to address many of the challenges of human rights through the practical realities of working across cultural, religious, geographic, and political differences. For instance, rather than examine abstract philosophical claims of human rights’ universality, we put this assertion to the test through the day-to-day activities of the course, as students negotiated the efficacy and meaning of various human rights concepts across multiple contexts. As such, students learned many paradoxes of human rights inductively through experiencing them instead of just reading and thinking about them. The benefit of this approach is that human rights become attached to material realities instead of just residing in a theoretical space.

We decided that the first few weeks at UNCG would work through the pre-classical and classical period and the work they produced would be for the purpose of helping students at AUB get caught up to speed quickly. One of the ways in which we facilitated this work was through the use of the program VoiceThread. It provides an online space for students to comment on a series of questions and images that Dr. Moore put together for the students at UNCG. The students were reminded that not only are they developing the conversation with their peers at UNCG but that they are also providing background information for the students at AUB. This idea of a dual audience is one that made them more self-reflexive in their responses. It required students to be accountable beyond their local space for the ideas they contribute. Unfortunately, the VoiceThread program also presented a technological challenge, and it took a couple of weeks to get all the AUB registered with it and able to comment. We continued with this approach of dual audiences—through different course media, however—throughout most of the semester with very positive results.

During the second week of class I (Dr. Hartwiger) was able to visit Dr. Moore’s class in person. Throughout my visit, I had an opportunity to field questions and talk about the background of the students at AUB. I also turned the table on the UNCG students and asked them what information they wanted me to share about them when I returned to Beirut. We reminded them that there is often a difference between the way they see themselves and the way others see them. I framed this question specifically within our content area of human rights. What do human rights mean in the US? The conversation that followed was productive. Students engaged in a discussion about race and the fact that there are still unresolved rights issues in the US. To me, it was helpful that students in Greensboro were beginning to see their own perspectives as situated in various ways, rather than as automatically shared. In a class in which everyone is from the US, there might be a tendency to leave uninterrogated some assumptions about rights. The idea of having another presence in the classroom sparked an awareness of the limits of each individual’s perspective. We noted, for instance, that the U.S. students, knowing that their primary audience is their AUB counterparts, didn’t comment at all on Islam, though they weighed in frequently on Christianity and Judaism.

As the semester progressed, we attempted to keep an eye on big picture issues. One of the issues was content specific. In providing a space for examining the intellectual tradition of human rights through pre-classical, classical, Enlightenment, and contemporary moments we constructed a very linear, Western-oriented trajectory of human rights discourse. Throughout the semester we worked to ensure that in teaching this content we were not simply replicating this structure. In other words, we thought it was necessary to provide critical distance from the material in order to have productive observations and deep analysis of the ways in which rights have emerged in our contemporary world. We did not want to teach a course which might reify potentially problematic narratives about human rights as they emerge through a particular intellectual tradition. In showing
how each period informs the next, we worked to understand more about why rights look like they do today.

The first virtual meeting provided an interesting moment of first contact. During the last fifteen minutes of class the two classes Skyped. There was the first awkward moment but overall there was a good energy. There was one memorable comment from an AUB student. She wanted the students in Greensboro to talk about what they thought the AUB students would look like and what they would wear. The students at AUB were very anxious about how they would be perceived by their peers in North Carolina.

One little observation about why the guidelines for engagement are important. Our first photo posting assignment asked students to post one picture of something precious in their life and one picture of something that causes them stress. Nearly all of the students posted the regular things you might think of: family as something precious and a source of stress, school as a source of stress, religions as something precious, etc. However, one student posted a very graphic picture of an abused woman, and she mentioned that this was a cause of stress. We did not yet have the terms of engagement up so it was rather problematic to point to a specific guideline about posting. Lesson learned: Make this the first activity and have it up before posts start.

During the semester, we deviated from the syllabus slightly to address the Kony 2012 phenomenon. This was a very productive decision to go off script so to speak because it put into practice many of the theoretical principles we were studying. Additionally, this was a crucial conversation that we continued both domestically and transnationally because it spoke directly to the issues the students confronted when they designed their own final projects (which were largely visual). Thinking about issues of representation, depictions of suffering, audience, and implied response were all essential to that final project, and the KONY 2012 video made the stakes of those issues very clear.

Another significant moment for the class came in the form of a lecture by Dr. Habib Malik about his father, Charles Malik. Charles Malik was one of the primary framers of the UDHR along with Eleanor Roosevelt and China’s P.C. Chang. In fact, Malik was responsible for writing the preamble, which we discovered he did over the course of a weekend. Dr. Habib Malik’s talk was thoughtful, reflective, and celebratory of both his father and the UDHR. One of the aspects that struck me about the talk was the importance he placed on a non-binding document. Dr. Habib Malik repeatedly suggested that the UDHR, for him and others, was more significant than conventions which have the potential to be ratified by member states. He argued that the UDHR is a source of inspiration for those who wish to claim their rights. For example, he pointed to the UDHR’s role in igniting opposition to communist and socialist regimes, ostensibly playing a part in bringing down the Soviet empire. While these were Dr. Malik’s impressions of the role of the UDHR, it was very helpful for students to consider both the history of the document as well as the way the document lives on today. Our classes had spent time examining the document and looking at its structure, but we had not had such a personalized account of the framing of the document. It changed the way a lot of the students understood its importance.

Another interesting, partially improvised assignment the students had last week was to post two newspaper articles, one from the US and one from Lebanon, on the current crisis in Syria, and then to compare the two approaches in discussion within the groups. This constituted another turning point in the class, as suddenly the AUB students were, by far, "closer" to the crisis. Whereas much of what we’d done in the middle section of the class (Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech, the UDHR, Kony 2012) really used the U.S. as the central point of reference, in this case the focus shifted to Lebanon’s neighbor and a crisis with profound implications for the country. It was interesting to see the students respond to this shift. In one case, an AUB student offered as the first comment in the group’s discussion a long, detailed overview of the relationship between politics in Syria and Lebanon and why it matters. She was, in effect, saying that there was no point trying to compare the articles until everyone knew something more about the situation (which in turn spoke back to what the newspaper articles either assume or ignore). In another group, the UNCG student began with a kind of summary of what the articles each “did” (without any interpretation) and then followed her summary with questions to her AUB group members for more information. Another (AUB) student posted as his contributed article a blog
commentary comparing Kony 2012 to the treatment of Assad in the media. In short, we really saw how students have come to understand one another's different positionings as sources of knowledge.

As we progressed throughout the semester we developed higher stakes work, moving beyond the get-to-know-you activities to deeper engagements. This was particularly observable during our reading of Joe Sacco’s graphic narrative Palestine. At AUB, the students were not only eager but also prepared to engage in discussions that had an overtly political dimension. Lebanon lives with the reality and reverberations of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict everyday with Palestinian refugees, a closed border with Israel, etc. As such, the students at AUB were not shy about discussing Sacco’s work and specifically his representation of the conflict. The dimension that was really interesting and demonstrated the productive nature of globally-networked learning was that as the students read the narrative they constantly had the UNCG students in mind. In other words, in-class discussions at AUB were informed by the presence of students from the United States even on days when there was no real time interaction. The four walls that house the class became permeable and students’ knowledge production was informed not just by local conversations but through the presence (sometimes real and sometimes imagined) of another class. As we reached the conclusion of the text, students at AUB formulated questions about the difference in reading Palestine in Lebanon and the US for students at UNCG. The questions prompted some very interesting discussions on Blackboard.

The culmination of these activities was a final joint presentation in real time through the Prezi program of a particular human rights issue. Students had to work through background and context as well as questions of representation and solutions. While this was logistically challenging both in producing the work and in the actual presentation, all the groups were able to put together final presentations. This final project revealed an important outcome of the course. In order to do significant work, students were required to consider perspectives that often challenged their own strongly held views. In particular, we asked them to think about how their study of the course material would have been substantively different without the collaboration (this is the prompt, in part, for the course reflection essay, too). We wanted them to be cognizant of the ways in which one can "love humanity, but dislike people" in the famous quip, and how actually having to negotiate tasks, values, projects, readings with other people, with all the technological, personal, temporal, cultural logistical/philosophical complications that entails, makes the stakes and challenges of "human rights" all the more concrete and pressing.

After UNCG finished their semester, Dr. Moore traveled to Beirut to meet with the AUB students and also give a talk for the Center for American Studies and Research (CASAR). The visit provided good closure and symmetry to the semester. We felt like the experience was productive for us as teachers and very valuable for students as it challenged them step out of a traditional mode of learning. We are most pleased with the fact that students left the class having benefited from the collaborative nature as it extended the content in ways that would not be possible in exclusively local sites of learning.

Section 10: Student Feedback

AUB

“Logistically speaking, however, this course was more complicated than what I originally expected. I still cannot believe that a dual presentation was created and presented so smoothly for all the groups!”

“It was hectic...too many assignments not enough time to rest in between...The technology was a bit challenging at times especially with the slow internet connection.”

“Beyond the material of the course I really benefited a lot from the way the course was structured, specifically the AUB-UNCG collaboration. It was fascinating to see the different perspectives concerning the topics we
discussed in the course. It was interesting to see how we generalize our opinions while in reality they might be just exclusive tous.”

“I consider this course one of the most important and unforgettable courses I have taken at AUB. The experience and the communication skills I have acquired in this course was far more informative than any other communication course or humanity course. I have learned to interact with strangers that live overseas and be close friends with them. I have learned to express and describe my feelings towards anything possible, such as pictures on VoiceThread with comments, discussions on blackboard, Skype, visual presentations (Prezi), conferences and even lectures.”

“I had to learn to trust that when I woke up in the morning, parts of the project would be more complete than when I went to sleep – and that my own section of the project may have been altered or shifted. We all had to become better negotiators because there is no way to force anyone to do their share of the work.”

“After we were able to conduct smaller discussions as a group, I got to know each of my group members a little deeper, so when we had larger discussions, I could navigate them more easily because I would always start with reading what [my group members] were saying, and I would go from there to decide which posts I would respond to.”

“Any communication in this class had to first be filtered through the fact that you were talking to students of a completely different culture whom you barely knew. This reality surprisingly did not hinder our conversations with the AUN class. It gave me the chance to take that extra time to reflect on what I was going to say before I said it. The idea of reception is almost as important in human rights as the actual violations discussed.”

“I may be overly empathetic to people I do not know, but I am just like that in general. I feel everything. But I also tend to be quite ignorant about what other cultures are actually like and what they have actually suffered and experienced. [...] That is what I liked the most about this class. I already have empathy for people just because they are people, but I am moved even more once I learn their stories and it becomes that much more real. [...] It is also the simple things that I learned about life in Lebanon. [...] I started this class hating technology and maybe a little bit afraid to talk to people who are from another culture for fear of seeming stupid or something, and now, I still hate technology but I have come away with a much bigger realization of the world.”
16. Mexico - USA: Women’s Studies & Political Science
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminisms in Comparative Perspective: Immobilities, Inequalities, and Transnationalisms in North America</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>UC: Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies</td>
<td>UC: 4th year and graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universidad de las Americas Puebla</td>
<td>UDLAP: Political Science</td>
<td>UDLAP: 4th year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Anne Sisson Runyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty (Co-Instructor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor (and Interim Director of Taft Research Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Dept. of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th>Name: Dr. Marianne H. Marchand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty (Co-Instructor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Universidad de las Americas Puebla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor and Canadian Studies Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Department of Political Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th>Carolyn Stoll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Position at Institution:** Instructional Designer  
**Department and/or Program:** College of Allied Health  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Olga Sanmiguel-Valderrama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty (Spanish language resource person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Dept. of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. When?

Spring 2013

### 4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

12 at University of Cincinnati and 12 at UDLAP

### 5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

This number is a little lower for a mixed undergraduate/graduate course in Women's Studies, although the majority of students are graduate level and this is an average for graduate classes. We feel the lower mixed number was due to the course being online in this discipline. Typically this class offered face to face would have larger numbers.

For an advanced undergraduate seminar, offered face-to-face except for the online elements with UC, this is about average.

### Section 2: Issues of Language

### 6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

- UC: English
- UDLAP: Spanish and English

### 7. Primary language of most students in each class

- UC: English
- UDLAP: Spanish

### 8. Language of the course collaboration

Yes, entirely in English, although some attempt to have some Spanish elements in readings and postings.

### 9. Language fluency
UC: fluent in English, although first languages for two were Arabic and Farsi and some had second languages (French, German, Japanese)

UDLAP: most fluent in English (Spanish was first language for most, English the first language for a couple)

10. Language proficiency difference

Fortunately thus far, relatively low significance given UDLAP has mostly bilingual instruction and students.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?

UC: Entirely online except for two group meetings for group skyping.

UDLAP: Entirely face-to-face there (one class meeting per week), but engaged with UC students online through Blackboard, Facebook, and Skype.

12. Duration

Shared Module: Transnational Feminisms in North America runs from March 11 to April 23 with one week of spring break per institution within so 4 substantive weeks with final joint wiki papers due in the 5th week.

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Did begin connecting prior to the collaborative module through a group skype, the creation of group Facebook page, and a “paqueteria” exercise in which UC students were introduced to a crowdsourcing/geomapping project UDLAP students were doing on how immigrants and their families send packages/remittances between the US and Mexico. Co-Instructors engaged in an actual experiment with paquerias (places where immigrants and their families go to send packages and remittances--typically in Mexican grocery stores in the US). UDLAP students and their instructor gathered inexpensive Mexican and UDLAP artifacts and mailed them through a Puebla paqueteria to the UC instructor and the UC instructor gathered with her Mexican student assistant UC and Cincinnati artifacts to mail to the UDLAP instructor through a paqueteria in Cincinnati. Both packages just arrived, making their way through multiple hands and courier/mail systems designed to enable immigrants and their families’ cheaper ways to send large amounts of goods and remittances.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

Both UDLAP and UC use Blackboard 9.1, so for the shared modules, we created visitor accounts for the UDLAP students and added them to our Blackboard course. This necessitated the UDLAP students having two Blackboard course sites, one for the unshared portion of the class, and one for the shared portion, but this seemed the least disruptive, least logistically difficult way to offer the shared the modules.

The Blackboard tools that were used in the collaborative modules were the Discussion Board and the Wiki. There were three dedicated discussion boards for the shared modules of the class. The Google Earth Tours were posted to a discussion board, and students were required to both post their own tours and respond to a tour.
from a student from the other country. The students from each country were also paired up to discuss reactions to two films on feminicides in Canada and Mexico. Finally, students were required to post their reactions to a branching scenario in which they attempt to cross borders between Mexico and the United States and the US and Canada.

The Blackboard wiki was used by students from both institutions to collaboratively write research papers. The Blackboard wiki was used for two collaborative assignments - one a collaboratively written analytical paper written by teams of UC students, and the other a collaboratively written research paper written by transnational teams from UC and UDLAP.

In addition, the students were required to friend each other on Facebook to create connections they could use in working on collaborative projects. The two classes also created their own Facebook page and shared information between them this way. Through this Facebook group, they formed their teams for their collaborative research project this way, which was fascinating because this was student led, not instructor initiated.

Finally, students made use of Google Earth to create tours of each other’s campuses to share with their counterparts in the other country. This effort combined tools, as they posted their .KMZ tour files to the Bb discussion board.

As a percentage, I would say that approximately 75% of the time was spent on Blackboard, and 20% of time spent on Facebook, and 5% of time spent on Google Earth.

15. Server location

The shared Blackboard site was provided by UC, and Facebook and Google are cloud based.

16. Technical problems

The only technical difficulties were in Google Earth tours. Some people had issues with hearing the audio. We were never able to track down exactly what the issue was, but it seemed related to what type of system (Mac or PC) the tour creator used as well as what operating system the viewer used. Windows 7 PC seemed to work the best to both record and listen to the tours.

17. Frequency of use

These took place over 4 weeks, with one week of Spring Break for each institution. With initial postings and responses, students had to login to the Discussion Boards at least twice per week. Wiki activity was left up to the students to determine, but firm deadlines meant that they had to form groups and work independently to plan, write, and revise their papers before the end of the term.

18. Informal communication

We encouraged students to connect on the Discussion Board beyond the required two postings. Since the course is currently ongoing, the only active board is the Google Earth tour. With 24 student from both institutions, the total number of postings as of today is 45, so obviously not a lot of interaction is occurring beyond the requirements.

The Facebook page was suggested by the UDLAP students as a way of better connecting, and was set up by them. There were no stated requirements, but activity was brisk with students friending each other, forming groups for the collaborative research paper, and arranging exchanges of packages of artifacts via the paqueterias exercise from each country to each other.
### 19. Re-use

Since the class isn’t over yet, it’s hard to say with any degree of certainty. The wiki created research paper is barely under way, for instance. I’m sure Anne, Marianne, and I will have some sort of “debriefing” after the course to discuss what went well, and what would need to be changed. I would probably suggest that we formalize the creation of a Facebook page early on for students to interact in. Clearly students from both countries were more comfortable in that environment, and made use of it for informal interaction to a much greater degree than the more formal environment of Blackboard.

The Google Earth tours went well enough, but I’d like to research why some people had so much trouble with audio while others didn’t. Still, we seemed to be able to overcome those obstacles, and the exercise seemed well worth it.

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

#### 20. Tools

Skype was used for facilitating communication for work on collaborative projects and for combined real time class meetings between the UC and the UDLAP students. Video tutorials were provided for students unfamiliar with setting up a Skype account, and UC students were required to post their Skype addresses to the class Discussion Board.

UC and UDLAP also held two combined synchronous meetings via Skype. While UC’s class was completely online, all the students were local and they gathered physically at Anne’s offices to Skype with the UDLAP students during their regularly scheduled class time.

It’s hard to estimate the time students might have used Skype to collaborate on their projects. That might make a good question on our end of course evaluation. Each Skype session between the two full classes lasted around an hour.

#### 21. Server location

Cloud based

#### 22. Technical problems

I was not present during the first Skype session, but my understanding is that everything went well.

#### 23. Frequency of use

The class has conducted one Skype session and is planning a final one on April 23. Students were encouraged to contact each other synchronously via Skype, but to my knowledge that was not tracked.

#### 24. Informal communication

Again, students were encouraged to communicate with each other via Skype to collaborate on assignments, but that wasn’t tracked.
25. Re-use

As with the asynchronous tools, this is somewhat difficult to answer as the course is still in progress, but my sense is that yes, Skype worked well, and we would likely plan to use it again in the future.

### Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

Are creating a survey monkey to administer during week of April 22.

27. Attrition

None at either institution after first week.

28. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

Dropouts are more typical in larger undergrad classes at UC, but students in the UC course were looking forward to the collaboration as a particular incentive to remain in course.

### Section 7: Institutional Support

29. Type of support

UC: One course release during the development phase for Co-Instructor given by her department head and Instructional Designer, although changing jobs midstream and thus no longer responsible for helping faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences, stayed with the project and gave considerably of her time and enlisted two other designers to help us with our branching scenario exercises. No other administrative or pedagogical assistance at UC.

30. Engagement with the international programs office

UC International was aware of the project and was asked to help publicize the course, but no engagement came from them unfortunately.

31. Importance given to globally networked learning

Apparently not yet at UC. They, Honors, and the University remain focused on moving bodies through short and longer term study abroad within and beyond courses, providing funding only for this. Would welcome suggestions on to how they can become better engaged and more supportive of GNL.

32. Commitment

While a singular commitment at present at UC, several other faculty in department with international colleagues are positioned to consider this model, but our college must put in place real instructional design support for the model to take off within and beyond department, backed up by other university actors who could promote it (UC International, Honors, Center for Teaching and Learning).
### 33. Future iterations

Not as yet, still to be discussed.

### 34. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

The UC College of Arts & Sciences for Undergraduate Affairs is interested in the model to encourage more online courses that would be attractive to faculty who question the purposes of online delivery. College resources are starting to go into online training for a few, but real instructional design support is needed and new ideas like GLN need to be circulated. We have offered to give a workshop in Fall 2013, which may be one way to increase stakeholders.
Abstract

The Global Village is an experiential, globally networked, honours course co-taught by Loes Damhof, Intercultural Communication at Hanze University in the Netherlands and Janine DeWitt, Sociology, Marymount University USA. Twenty-three students joined us for this pilot course, offered in Fall 2012. Developing and delivering this course was an interesting and demanding journey for both faculty and students. Relationship-building and face-to-face interactions were two critical factors that enabled us to collaborate and bridge differences during course development phase of the project. The course was offered in a blended format with 50% of the class sessions conducted in a face-to-face setting on each campus, 25% of the class sessions conducted together online and 25% of the class sessions planned for exploring the local community. Our students collaborated for 17 weeks.

Students from both universities completed three course modules, applying insights from sociology & intercultural communication and working collaboratively. These modules included opportunities to engage with one another and the communities in which they live. In the first module, the class members examined how their daily lives are affected by globalization using photography. In the second module students focused their study on how globalization affects the movement of people across national borders and their resulting citizenship rights. In the final module, students worked in intercultural teams to formulate their answer to “What does it mean to be a member of the global community?”

Part of our challenge when teaching the course came from the need for students to learn from intercultural experiences. Students needed an appreciation of the importance of developing a shared “value” system that comes from the experiencing the implications of different ways of understanding. We found that the university educational systems in the United States and The Netherlands are similar and yet different with regard to time management, meaning of deadlines & grades, and course load. As instructors, we experienced the impact of these same differences when working together developing the course.

Facilitating learning in a way that is culturally sensitive became critical in our global classroom, particularly when we asked students to negotiate complexity in terms of the subject matter (globalization) as well as to develop their intercultural communication skills. The role of instructor “guidance” in a global classroom seemed to differ from that in a traditional classroom. Technology enabled the project but also presented barriers in terms of access in a way that created a common ground in the blended classroom.

The team members from this project have requested their entire Case Study not be reproduced here. You may contact COIL (coilinfo@suny.edu) if you would like to contact any team members directly to find out more about the project.
18. Romania – UK – USA: Political Science & Public Administration

Abstract

We launched our GNLC as Transatlantic Public Administration & Policy (TRANSPUB), which was team taught by six faculty from four universities in three countries (US, UK, Romania). Our course as “live” from October 22-December 13. It included two modules based on readings, thinking questions, and discussions. Our third module was a “hands-on” applied problem involving contracting out of a call-center from a local authority in the UK. Students were divided into groups at the beginning of the GNLC and worked in these groups in all three Modules throughout the GNLC. Our GNLC experience suffered mainly from diffusion of leadership, but our Atlantis grant afforded us the opportunity to meet in person on several occasions to develop this course. The teaching team and the students had to flexible and innovative. We plan to teach this course again in Fall 2013, but it has not yet been determined whether all four institutions will be involved.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transatlantic Public Administration and Policy</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State, SUNY Cortland, Manchester Metropolitan University (UK), Babeș-Bolyai University (Romania)</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>undergraduate (at Buffalo State, Cortland, BBU &amp; MMU )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transatlantic Public Administration and Policy</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State (graduate students - PAD prefix)</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>graduate at Buffalo State. Buffalo State graduate students are matriculated in the MPA program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Natalia Cuglesan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Babeș-Bolyai University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Department of International Studies and Contemporary History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Beth Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Laurie Buonanno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor, Director of Graduate Studies (Public Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Political Science/Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Keith Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Coordinator of Government Track, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Political Science/Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Henry Steck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Cortland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Lee Ann Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member #7</td>
<td>Team Member #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Assistant Dean of International Education (recently retired from the deanship)</td>
<td>Politics Section Head and Leader for Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Modern Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td>Politics, Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Annabel Kiernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Principal Lecturer, Faculty Teaching and Learning Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Politics, Public Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. When?**

Fall 2012

**4. Number of students enrolled from each institution**

- 7 undergraduate students (UBB);
- 4 undergraduate students (SUNY Cortland--three were MMU students on exchange to SUNY Cortland under our US Department of Education Atlantis grant) and one was a SUNY Cortland student selected as an Atlantis fellow to study at MMU;
- 0 from MMU (MMU recruited students for this course, but non registered),
- 7 undergraduates from SUNY Buffalo State (three of Buffalo State students were from BBU on Atlantis exchange and three had been awarded scholarships to go to BBU in Spring 2013. Only one of the undergraduate students was not an Atlantis fellow);
- 5 graduate students (MPA) from Buffalo State.

Total enrolled:
18 undergraduate students (politics/public administration)
5 graduate students (MPA)
5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

We run some small seminars at Buffalo State for new and experimental courses. We’re not pressured to attract 12-15 students (the desirable range for undergraduate seminars) for experimental and topics courses. Five graduate students is fairly typical for an experimental course as well.

This was taught as an independent study. Dr. Steck met with the students once per week and other instruction was online in the GNLC on ANGEL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2: Issues of Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English at all institutions except Babeș-Bolyai University (Romania, German, Hungarian, English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primary language of most students in each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English with Romanian for BBU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Language of the course collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Language fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the students were very fluent in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Language proficiency difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was never an issue in our course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3: Curricular Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Online or blended?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBU-fully online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Cortland - a one hour session/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State - undergraduate section met Tuesdays for one hour and twenty minutes, the rest online. Uniquely, several of the students met because we ran an Atlantis Cohort experience in Buffalo in early October in which the Cortland/MMU and Buffalo State/BBU students in the GNLC course met for a three-day event funded by our Atlantis grant. The event included one-day meeting government officials in the City of Buffalo and Erie County, trip to Niagara Falls, Day two-EU graduate conference at University at Buffalo, SUNY, and Day Three, leadership &amp; creativity workshop for Atlantis students. Substantial bonding took place during this event, which likely earned goodwill and tolerance for the problems we were experiencing teaching the GNLC portion of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo State - graduate section met online completely, although on occasion the graduate students would drop into the f2f Tuesday session. (one of the graduate students participated in the cohort experience because he had been my GA the previous semester and had helped out on Atlantis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Duration

The actual GNLC portion of the course lasted just six weeks, due to the late start and Thanksgiving vacation. We had planned the GNLC as four modules taking place over eight weeks, but there was a great deal of confusion as to who was responsible for what portions of the course, when they should post their materials, what materials SHOULD be posted, and who SHOULD manage the discussion boards for those modules. Because there were so many actors and moving parts of this initiative, our project suffered from “leadership diffusion,” which we will explore in the narrative section of this case study.

It was also expected that Module 3 (which was originally Module 4) would take place throughout the entire eight weeks. This is because Module 4 was planned as the capstone simulation. The idea was that the students would learn about a public administration dilemma/challenge facing both US and European public administration (contracting out of public services) and then develop their own outsourcing plan. We did accomplish the simulation (discussed later in this case study), but on a rather uncomfortably tight time schedule. The content Modules 1-3 were supposed to be two weeks long with Module 4 eight weeks.

ACTUAL GNLC SCHEDULE:
Module 1-October 22-November 3
Module 2-November 4-November 17
Module 3-November 18-December 13 (capstone simulation)

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Buffalo State - the class met and worked for 8 weeks prior to GNLC start.
Cortland - the class met and worked for 4 weeks prior to GNLC start. Also, Cortland students were entered into Buffalo State’s ANGEL course (that was not part of the GNLC). I think it caused more confusion than helped. The purpose was so that Dr. Steck and the students could download readings.

BBU - the students in this class were located in different faculties at BBU and some were at graduate programmes outside of Romania; therefore, it was difficult to bring students together prior to the course.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

The team elected to use Buffalo State’s ANGEL instance to offer Transatlantic Public Administration. This offered the advantages of faculty familiarity with the LMS and offering help desk services to all course participants. Each of the non-Buffalo State students were created a guest account within the LMS.

LMS choice was problematic:
There was a great deal of confusion and non-response in the months leading up to the decision to utilize Buffalo State’s LMS. Dr. Buonanno did not want to use her system because she had the sense that it would place additional burdens on her and Buffalo State. She thought that it would be best to use Atlantis funds to build our own site on Moodle. Unfortunately, no one in the team seemed to have the skills or the desire to build a site from scratch. There is now talk--if we teach this course again in the fall (Buffalo State is reserving judgement until after this case study and COIL institute whether to participate)--of MMU taking responsibility by hiring a
graduate student to build a site on Moodle. It is unclear at this time, however, whether MMU would use its LMS (which is Moodle) or would house on Moodle’s free hosting.

Buonanno felt strongly that part of the COIL training should be to offer a Moodle template to facilitate the building of a GNLC. In this way, no institution (and therefore, an extra burden is placed on that faculty member) has to be responsible for the LMS. She also thinks it complicates ownership and branding.

FACEBOOK

Dr. Natalia Cuglesan (BBU) created a Facebook site prior to the fall semester, which proved to be very helpful in bringing everyone together into the ANGEL course housed on Buffalo State entitled “Transatlantic Public Policy Course” [http://www.facebook.com/groups/474925389206869/]. It turned out to be very, very active - the team leaders (we will discuss the team project later in this case study) used Facebook heavily as a means to get in touch with their group members.

VIMEO

Dr. Buonanno purchased a one-year subscription to VIMEO for the team to post an instructional video for the capstone simulation. The students also posted their “pitches” to VIMEO.

http://vimeo.com/52697687 (GNLC team introduced to students and Professor Carr provides background and instruction for the simulation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Server location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State provided the LMS. Students interacted on discussion boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimeo-purchased by Dr. Buonanno, but it may be covered in the Atlantis grant. It was only about $60/year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Technical problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vimeo was a bit of a learning curve because we wanted to keep the channel private (otherwise we would have used YouTube). The main problem was trying to get the passwords to the students. Also, because one of us actually “owns” the channel, it means that the “owner” (Dr. Buonanno) has to manage the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were three GNLC modules (down from an original plan of four modules:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership in Transatlantic Public Administration (Module Leaders: Carr &amp; Henderson--the original modules were “leadership/Carr and Henderson/Transatlantic Public Administration--but we started the GLNC too late)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brussels &amp; Washington (Module Leaders: Buonanno, Cuglesan, Steck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Case Study: Contracting Out &amp; Simulation (Kiernan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originally, this last module was planned to take place over the entire 7-8 weeks of the GNLC. In the end, we ran it from November 18 through our final exam week in SUNY (December 13 when the videos were posted to Vimeo).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Informal communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANGEL—we created team discussion boards for each of the five teams consisting of 4-5 students (red, blue, purple, green yellow, indigo). Each faculty member and graduate student was assigned to a color team to act as a mentor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 19. Re-use

I would use Facebook, Vimeo, but not ANGEL. I would advocate for Moodle or another LMS that is not connected to the campus.

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

#### 20. Tools

Video (posted to VIMEO) for Module 3

Team leaders set up Skype meetings, but how many students participated in these (they reported difficulty in getting all of the students together for a Skype meeting at one time). But we think that this module DOES work for teamwork—it’s just that we threw this at the students with little time for them to schedule their meetings, learn the topic (outsourcing), and prepare their pitch.

We had planned to use web-casting for the expert consultancy phase, but instead used an asynchronous discussion board. It worked out well, but we would likely use webcasting if we teach this course again in Fall 2013.

#### 21. Server location

Not provided by participating institutions.

#### 22. Technical problems

Well some of us hated ooovoo, even if we liked the price. It often froze and put all sorts of cookies on our machines. We could use some training on Flash, which seemed to work well with COIL meetings.

#### 23. Frequency of use

Again, we just don’t know how many of the students actually participated in their skype team meetings.

#### 24. Informal communication

We left this up to them. Obviously, however, they needed to engage with one another in more than Facebook and email because they were preparing a team project together. We will explain the details of the team project in the essay (below).

#### 25. Re-use

We would use:
- LMS-Open Source
- Vimeo for our introduction to the students and for them to post their video pitches
- Webcasting software (which type, we don’t know)
- Flash or Skype for team meetings. We tested out ooovoo and experience problems—we were loaded with pop-ups and it just didn’t work well. We never quite figured out Flash. How students managed with Skype was by two students sitting in front of the computer in Buffalo and the other two in Romania. When they had three sites-Cortland, I have no idea how they manage without paying for three-way.
## Section 6: Assessment Information

### 26. How?

First, it should be noted that we did not assess intercultural awareness. We’re not even certain that this is one of our goals in this course if “intercultural awareness” is taken broadly. Our goal is for American and European students to study and explore the challenges of management in the public sector together. Because we are facing similar challenges, we think it’s useful for future public managers on both sides of the Atlantic to explore these issues together. Along the way, we hope that they are learning more about how each approaches these challenges, and, also are forging professional relationships on which they can draw in their careers.

Two sets of assessments:
1. Pre-GNLC
2. GNLC

**GNLC assessments:**

**UNDERGRADUATE**
1. Discussion Board Commentary and Response (which were based on thinking questions which the faculty managers for their modules drafted and posted).
2. Simulation (assessments consisted of four parts and were submitted by each team—see narrative)
   a. Submitting questions to the expert consultant to assist in their presentation to the Fulchester Council (ANGEL discussion board)
   b. An Executive Summary of their pitch (ANGEL digital dropbox)
   c. Power Point Presentation (ANGEL digital dropbox)
   d. A video pitch posted to Vimeo (public)—the pitch had to use the Power Point presentation

**GRADUATE**
1. Discussion board mentoring posts (same as faculty)
2. Outside experts - each wrote a paper and posted to ANGEL discussing the pros and cons of contracting out public services

### 27. Common assessment rubric

**Discussion Board (Thinking Questions)**

We agreed on a discussion post rubric. We used the SUNY Learning Network rubric.

**Simulation Rubric**

We didn’t have a formal “rubric” with which we graded the four parts of the simulation. The faculty mentors for the simulation (Carr & Kiernan) sent a narrative assessment of the performance of the teams. Each of the faculty members emailed the others their rankings.

### 28. Peer assessment

We had planned to include student peer assessments, but given that we felt the students did not have enough time to work together (only four weeks versus eight), we repeatedly stressed to the students that this was a pilot project and that all of their peer assessments would be informal. (We talked with the students about the experience.)

### 29. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

DISCUSSION MODULES
COMMENTARY (300-350 words)
For each module your team has been assigned two of the six thinking questions to discuss. (See Team Assignments.) Your team will compose one commentary discussing the two questions.
Each team leader is responsible for ensuring your team commentary is posted on time.
The questions should be interpreted broadly. Students should not “over” analyze the questions. They are “thinking” questions to help you think about the subject. Students should feel free to move beyond the question.
Faculty and students will read, reflect and engage

RESPONSES
Each member of the group must provide two responses in Modules 1 & 2. One response must be on the discussion board (conference) your group posted a commentary. The other must be on one of the other two discussion boards.

MECHANICS
How to Post to the Discussion Board
A "thread" is started each time you submit a discussion item. Each response (reply) to the original post is indented once - a response (reply) to a response (reply) is indented a second time - etc. This system of indents helps all of us to determine which responses go together. A threaded discussion is the web equivalent of a classroom discussion.
Descriptive Subject Line
Include a descriptive subject line.
Responding to the main item
To compose your response (reply) to a main discussion item you are reading, click on the "Reply" link located at the bottom of that page. (There are several options—reply, edit (which only works for posts you contributed—you can’t edit others’ posts), e-mail author (ANGEL course mail—it will stay in the system), and delete (again, only works for your own posts).

Responding to someone else's response
If you are reading someone else's response document, click on the "Reply" link located at the bottom of that page to respond to that response. Make sure that you respond on the document intended so that your contribution will line up in the threaded discussion in the right place.

Submitting your response
When you have completed your response, click the "Save" button at the bottom of the page.

Netiquette
As discussion is of a public nature, please observe proper "netiquette"—courteous and appropriate forms of communication and interaction over the Internet (in online discussions). This means no personal attacks, obscene language, or intolerant expression. All viewpoints should be respected.
30. Attrition

Only one student dropped out of the course and this was before the GNLC period started.

31. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

This was a carefully selected group for this pilot project. Not typical of the department undergraduate majors. Most of the students are Atlantis scholars (past and present).

Section 7: Institutional Support

32. Type of support

SUNY BUFFALO STATE

Financial

Laurie Buonanno wrote the COIL grant application. Admin was very supportive of our participation. There was an initial bump in the road when our Educational Technology support refused to sign on to Beth Burns supporting our work, but higher administration intervened so that Beth could participate. This seemed indicative of Buffalo State’s eagerness to be involved in COIL’s work.

Buffalo State admin financed the participation of Beth Burns, Laurie Buonanno, and Lee Ann Grace (travel and lodging) to attend the COIL International Studies Institute (Fall 2011). The EU side of the Atlantis grant financed Natalia Cuglesan’s participation. Annabel Kiernan participated for part of the October 2011 COIL workshop via Skype.

The team met twice since the October 2011 workshop: March 2012 (Brussels) and October 2012 (Manchester). These meetings were financed by our Atlantis grants.

No admin has stepped up to the plate to finance our return to COIL so Beth Burns and I will need to use the Atlantis grant to participate in the COIL Capstone Institute. The EU side of the Atlantis grant is financing Frank Carr’s participation in the COIL Capstone Institute. In defense of Buffalo State administration, however, spring budgets are very tight and Buonanno was late in asking for financial support.

Administrative

Buffalo State’s administration has been supportive of our work with COIL, but I think it’s fair to say that it has not been high on their agenda. I think we would need to demonstrate our completed course, admin would need to meet students who participated in the course, etc. Buonanno hasn’t spent much time touting this course at Buffalo State and would not feel comfortable doing so without being sure that the team is able to iron out its differences and ensure that the second go round was an enjoyable and pleasant experience for all of the instructors and was not unduly burdensome on others.

Pedagogical

We haven’t sought out an pedagogical support because Buonanno has been teaching online since 2001.

Technical

Our technical support for the course is at Buffalo State with Beth Burns. Buonanno found Beth to be very responsive in establishing a dedicated ANGEL site for the COIL course and providing access to the course for all of the faculty and students who are not affiliated with Buffalo State.
### 33. Engagement with the international programs office

**Buffalo State:**

The international education office is very engaged with us in terms of our Atlantis exchanges. This course, it must be remembered, is one piece in a larger project to establish a shared certificate/minor in transatlantic public administration and policy. The idea is for the COIL course to be the capstone in this experience.

### 34. Importance given to globally networked learning

**Buffalo State:** Dr. Grace has been very supportive. She retired from the office prior to this course going “live,” but has remained very interested. We expect that she will be an advocate for COIL’s work with the new assistant dean of international education.

### 35. Commitment

At this point, it’s a singular commitment. I think that at Buffalo State, Beth and I would need to offer a workshop on our experience.

### 36. Future iterations

**Buffalo State (Buonanno)**

Whether to offer this course again is currently under discussion. The idea is to teach in Fall 2013. Buffalo State students have said that it should be taught again and that it is well worth pursuing this course. Buonanno was disappointed with the leadership in the course and so for her it was far from a satisfactory experience. She believes that there were several problems that worked against this being a smooth experience. Fortunately, some have resolved themselves:

1. Buonanno was the only member of the team who had ever taught an online course (RESOLVED!)
2. It sometimes seemed to her that some of the faculty did not realize the enormous amount of time it takes to plan, organize, post lectures, etc. to an online course (RESOLVED!);
3. Faculty had not been trained in managing discussion boards (Not quite there yet, but better than when we started);
4. There was a change in leadership in the Atlantis grant during this time period so that the US and Romanian team had to acquaint themselves with a new PI at MMU (Kiernan). There have been some “growing” pains in this regard and the team has not always worked well together (we’re still working on this);
5. No students at MMU registered for the course, which obviously put less (to no) pressure on Carr and Kiernan. They didn’t have to face students who registered for the course and were promised that they would be working with students from MMU and BBU. (RESOLVED-it’s now a required course at MMU);
6. Also, as a result of lack of enrollment, Carr and Kiernan arranged to count the three MMU students at SUNY Cortland as their students, which then required that Dr. Henry Steck (who had not been involved with the project) set up an independent study for the MMU students (and all of the attendant problems--it being off load, finding a time when all four could meet, etc., etc.);
7. This ties into an overall problem—that the COIL course requires a great deal of time and, therefore, dedication. Without a course release to compensate for this time, I’m afraid that the GNLC often took a back seat to my other many duties on campus. (Now that we have taught the course once, posted thinking questions, etc., it should not be as labor-intensive as an experience as in summer/fall 2012).
37. New globally networked courses

**Buffalo State** - at this point, we don’t know. Our campus online committee—to which both Beth and I belong—has not acted on our presentation of the course (over a year ago). Also, the international education office has been understaffed and leadership has been in flux. A new assistant dean has been hired, but we do not know his priorities at this time.

38. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

The significant advantage we have had is that we combined this experience with a major US Department of Education grant. It has cost our administration very little other than their willingness to allow small enrollment courses to move forward.

Buonanno suspects what is needed is a presentation to the faculty to show them how this work was set up and operated. It is her feeling that this would be premature. The course needs to be taught one more time before she would consider presenting it to Buffalo State or reporting on it at a conference or to a journal. It is her understanding that Dr. Kiernan at MMU is presenting a paper on this course in March, although she has not seen a draft of this paper.

39. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

I think Buffalo State would be amenable to support GNLC, but they need a workable plan. Our course isn’t “there” yet.

40. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Funding. Faculty will want course releases, travel funds, and a student assistant.

Section 8: Reflections

41. Goals set

1. Students will demonstrate their ability to apply their understanding of different administrative cultures and political systems to a real world problem.
2. Building an online course as a capstone in a planned course of study in transatlantic public administration & policy.
3. Building linkages between Atlantis faculty and students.

42. Goals achieved

We seemed to achieve all three. We think our funding agencies will be pleased.

43. Most unique aspect for students

The simulation.
### 44. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

Both aspects—discussion boards and simulation. The simulation was difficult, however, because the groups didn’t always work well together. But the time was very compressed for the students to coordinate. The stronger leaders (very active on Facebook rallying the troops) ultimately produced the best proposals.

### 45. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The diffusion of leadership and the complexity of our GNLC plan. It was sometimes simply overwhelming to contemplate. We had very much wanted a webcasting component, but without someone (we didn’t have the graduate assistant we expected) acting as secretary, we never could figure out a real time when we could meet to pitch the proposals. Therefore, when we met in October 2012 in Manchester, we decided to have students shoot and post videos of their pitches and post to VIMEO.

### 46. Changes for future iterations

1. Icebreaking for two weeks.
2. Figure out the best method for computer telecommunications and train the students.
3. Include “live” component of simulation—webcasting of pitches, live questioning of teams, voting.

### 47. Technical support

I was very excited to work with the TPA team on this project. It offered many opportunities for collaboration and an expanded world view. I joined the team after it had been established and the grant had been awarded, so there was already a clear vision of how the course would be organized and conducted.

One of the initial questions posed was the choice of learning management system for the course (whether open or proprietary). I discussed a few solutions with the team, but the team eventually decided on ANGEL since it was the most comfortable space for the lead instructors to design in. From a management perspective, using Buffalo State’s ANGEL instance was different in the sense that users had to be manually created, added, and maintained, but this proved to be an easy task.

Additionally, the lead instructors of the course determined the progression, layout, functions, and design of the course based on their own extensive online teaching experience. I was able to suggest a few potential tools (ex: wikis, the potential for synchronous meetings and potential web 2.0 tools to facilitate such meetings, etc.).

Overall, the course appeared to run very smoothly and with very few technical difficulties. The instructors divided up the sequential modules between them, and once the process for uploading content was established, development went smoothly.

### 48. International programs person

N/A

### 49. Time commitment

Much more time involved in the GNLC, even more so because it was a new course. This was problematic, but in the end we began to appreciate the return on our investment.

### 50. Was it worth it?

It was a long, hard slog, but we think that we have a winning formula.
51. Unforeseen difficulties

The different length of the semesters and holidays.

Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

Introduction

Overall, as this case study will seek to show, our launch of a four-campus, cross-listed (undergraduate and graduate) transatlantic GNLC—Transatlantic Public Administration and Policy (TRANS PUB)—operated extremely well. We achieved our objectives and laid down solid foundations for the future. We experienced the usual bumps in the launching of a new and complex GNLC and we endured and survived the typical anxiety in the first year of a rather complex scheme for a GLNC. A team of dedicated faculty, IT administrator, and international program officer worked collaboratively in the partnership to meet our goal of creating a new course that enrolled students from four campuses. We credit our reasonably good working relationships to a set of agreed objectives, time line, and constant communication (via email/telephone and several face-to-face meetings) to our pre-existing relationships and need to meet the requirements of our external funding agencies (US Department of Education and the EU’s Education, Audiovisual & Cultural Agency). Specifically, our granting agencies require that we jointly create and launch a capstone course for our planned certificate/diplomas/minor in transatlantic public administration and policy.

Background

There are four universities involved in developing TRANS PUB. This consortium of European and American universities was established as a mobility project for the improvement of transatlantic undergraduate educational opportunities in public administration among the partner institutions. The European Consortium is comprised of two universities—Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) in the United Kingdom and Babeş-Bolyai University (BBU) in Romania. MMU is the lead university for the EU grant. The U.S. Consortium is comprised of two universities that belong to the State University of New York (SUNY)—SUNY Buffalo State (C) and SUNY Cortland. Buffalo State is the lead institution of the US grant. The campus project directors are Professors Adrian Ivan (BBU), Annabel Kiernan (MMU), Laurie Buonanno (BSC), and Henry Steck (Cortland). During the course of this four-year grant, the EU PI, Professor Neill Nugent, retired from MMU and was replaced by Dr. Kiernan.

Timeline for TRANS PUB Development

April 2009

Atlantis grant submitted jointly to the US Department of Education and the EU’s EACA for a four-year grant (2009-2013).

July 2009

Notified that TRANS PUB consortium was awarded funding. Total funding of $449,987. (FIPSE $194,000; $254,897 (Euro exchange in dollars at 2009 rates).

October 2009

Atlantis Project Directors’ Meeting in Boston where faculty met from the partner institutions—Natalia Cuglesan (BBU), Henry Steck (Cortland), Mary Maguire (Cortland), Frank Carr (MMU), Laurie Buonanno (Buffalo State), Keith Henderson (Buffalo State). We agreed to write an edited book and develop a course themed to the book entitled “Transatlantic Public Administration and Policy.”

However, after this initial meeting we became pre-occupied with the student exchanges. (The grant provides student fellowship of $5000/€5000 apiece of 12 exchanges per year, three each from the four partner
Work did proceed in identifying contributors for the book.

October 2010

Atlantis Project Directors’ Meeting in Berlin

Natalia Cuglesan (BBU), Neill Nugent (MMU), and Laurie Buonanno (Buffalo State) attended. Natalia and Laurie attended a workshop that showcased various methods consortia used to facilitate communication among students. None of them had been able to persuade the students to take full advantage of the sites they developed—whether they were joint blogs, joint websites on WordPress, and social media. We walked away from the workshop realizing that bringing European and American students together required student control and management, not faculty direction. In other words, we had to build a worthwhile educational experience for them and find a platform that would be convenient for them to use. We reasoned that the students were already on Facebook and that the disappointing experience of other projects demonstrated that we needed to take TRANSPUB to the students on their own turf. Therefore, Natalia together with the first class of Atlantis students, Stefana Ignea, established a TRANSPUB facebook site. This site has seen increasingly heavy traffic, with many Atlantis alumni viewing photos, sharing experiences, etc. with current students on exchange.

April 2011

Buffalo State hosts the first formal consortium meeting. Attendance—Neill Nugent, Annabel Kiernan, Natalia Cuglesan, Keith Henderson, Laurie Buonanno, Henry Steck, Zenon Wasyliw (external evaluator). We agreed to launch the online TRANSPUB course in Fall 2012.

Annabel and Keith agreed to be team leaders for this project. Laurie also engaged a faculty member from DePaul University who was involved in two Atlantis grants to share his ideas for linked our Atlantis scholars through social media and other technologies. He taught a session on any number of techniques, including ways to improve the productivity of the team (google docs, dropbox, wordpress). He did not, however, have experience working with an Open Source LMS. So on that point we were back to square 1. Where to host this course?

In the course of this consortium meeting we discovered that only Laurie had taught an online course. (She has been teaching online since 2001) She relayed her experience in attempting to team-teach the government and policy of the European Union through a cross-national experience (MMU) along with three SUNY schools. She had written a grant (2003) with the European Commission to provide stipends to two faculty members at MMU to teach and bring students into the course. While the professors wrote lectures for the course, they did not interact with the students and did not bring any of their students into the course. The American students were very disappointed as we had promised them that they would have the opportunity to discuss the EU with British students on the course discussion boards. She said it would be best if everyone received training from COIL so as to avoid the replication of the previous experience. All agreed that she should write this grant and that they would pencil in the COIL workshop dates in the event that we were awarded this grant.

Summer 2011

It was very difficult to persuade faculty members of the TRANSPUB team to post to the COIL Commons about the pre-Institute readings. Beth Burns (IT) and Lee Ann Grace (International Education) from Buffalo State posted and perhaps one or two faculty members eventually posted. There was some vague suggestion that they were confused about our (COIL and my, as grant writer) expectations.

October 2011

TRANSPUB team participates in COIL workshop. Keith Henderson, Lee Ann Grace, Laurie Buonanno, Beth Burns (all from Buffalo State), Natalia Cuglesan (BBU). Frank Carr and Annabel Kiernan were unable to attend.
Annabel skyped into some sessions, including one of the team’s working sessions.

At the COIL workshop, we agreed to an 8-week shared course, agreed on the modules, and in a major breakthrough, agreed on a capstone simulation. We proposed “outsourcing” in the UK because Prime Minister David Cameron had made this new policy a centerpiece of the Conservative Party. We knew that Annabel (who was unable to Skype into that particular session) would be interested in this simulation because this is an area in which she had special expertise. It would also be a good simulation for American students because outsourcing is the normal way of “doing business” in local/county government where private-public partnerships for the delivery of services are the rule rather than the exception. Romanian students, too, would benefit from learning the costs and benefits of outsourcing because this notion of public management has now reached into Central and Eastern Europe. It seemed an excellent simulation to have our students work on a realistic issue that they themselves might be involved in whether they elected to have careers in the non-profit or public sectors and at any level-local, state, regional, or federal/national.

We laid out a very complex simulation that would involve webcasting. In the end, we didn’t webcast, but did manage a simulation with video.

April 2012

Several members of the team met in Brussels for the annual Atlantis Project Director’s Meeting: Frank Carr, Annabel Kiernan, Laurie Buonanno, Natalia Cuglesan, and Lee Ann Grace. We focused most of our discussion on TRANSPUB GNLC and gave a presentation about how we envisaged the course. There was a great deal of interest in the audience and it seemed everyone wanted to develop a GNCL in their consortia, but didn’t have the faintest idea how to start.

PROBLEM WITH SELECTING LMS: We had still not yet agreed to a LMS. Laurie was reluctant to build the site on Buffalo State’s ANGEL because she thought with so many partners, it made more sense for the team to build its own site with an Open Access system such as Moodle. Beth Burns did not support Moodle because Buffalo State is an ANGEL campus. What to do? In the end, Laurie and Beth had to agree to Buffalo State’s ANGEL because again, we were running out of time and had to move forward.

Suggestion: COIL provide a Moodle site/template for GNLCs.

We learned at this meeting that no students had signed up for TRANSPUB at MMU. Annabel and Frank toyed with the idea of bringing students in from another course (leadership), but we all realized that this was not desirable. Annabel and Frank decided to try one more push to interest students in the course.

We did agree to the layout of each module as follows:

1. Readings
2. PowerPoint Lecture
3. Thinking/Discussion Questions
4. Discussion Board

This was great progress and turned out to be a very good template for our modules.

We were not in complete agreement as to the subject of each module and decided to continue to discuss via email and Skype.

We left Brussels promising to hold weekly Skype meetings. We did manage two or three Skype meetings, but we found it extremely difficult to bring all of us together at one time. Three time zones, three sites, and soon four when we realize (below) we needed to bring Cortland in to the mix. We tried OoVoo and found it very unsatisfactory. We never seemed to get around to learning Flash. Definitely a “diffusion of leadership” problem which plagued are four campus, six instructor project. Our project increasingly mirrored that of an anarchist.
syndicalist group. It seems hilarious in retrospect, but it was very, very uncomfortable situation at that time.

What we would have done differently: In retrospect, we should have selected a course leader from the UK and one from the US for a two-way Skype and then to relay dates, etc. to the other team members.

Spring 2012

Beth Burns creates a development site on ANGEL called “GNLC-TRANSPUB” and enters faculty into this site. There is some activity such as Annabel and Frank setting up the template for each module. There is some discussion as to how the simulation will operate.

Early Summer 2012

It was apparent that no MMU students would participate in the course. Annabel and Frank asked Henry Steck (Cortland) to have their three students (who would be at SUNY Cortland from August-December). Henry is old school in some respects (certainly not in all as he is an entrepreneurial academic) and did not use Cortland’s LMS. Unfortunately, Laurie was under an extremely tight deadline to finish her ms for a book and could not free herself to go to Cortland to work with Henry. Time was ticking away and the course was to launch October 1 with icebreaking exercises schedule for the end of September. Furthermore, Henry would be expected to learn an LMS, meet once a week with his students, and do his part managing discussions all off load.

We made little progress during the summer…

August 2012

Laurie begins teaching her course at Buffalo State as a cross-listed (undergraduate political science, graduate MPA) course entitled “Transatlantic Public Administration and Policy.”

Section 10: Student Feedback

We were very impressed by student discussion of the thinking questions and all four items required for the Fulchester Local Council simulation.

Buffalo State assessed the the undergraduate section. We don’t do course evaluations for graduate students. Buonanno used the standard departmental course evaluation that we post to ANGEL for hybrid and online courses. Three students filled out the evaluation. We don’t know who fills these out because we set ANGEL assessment to “anonymous.”

Question #24 Please comment on course content, requirements, or any other aspect of the course.

Student #1: The course was very challenging and quite fun. Collaborating with other students was a bit challenging, but I think that the other student’s professors did not really communicate with their students

Student #2: Blank

Student #3: Excellent course!

Question #25: Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the Instructor.

Student #1: Dr. B knows her stuff.

Student #2: blank

Student #3: Great teacher, nothing to be improved.
Question #26: What changes would have improved the experience in this course for you?

Student #1: As the course continues to be offered to students, it will be perfected and difficulties can be addressed. It needs more time.

Student #2: Blank

Student #3: Blank

The next several questions dealt with the “cohort” experience (mentioned above). These were needed to report to the US Department of Education, which funded this part of the course.

Question 33 dealt with the GNLC-

This is a space for you to express yourself as to your experience with all aspects of the Fulchester Council simulation. What worked? What didn't work? What you liked? What you despised?

Student #1: Since I am new to EU policy, the course was really a great learning experience for me. Meeting with students from Cortland for the weekend conference was a whole lot of fun and should be repeated for future students. The course was practical and hands on and was helpful in teaching us professional skills needed for future employment. Collaborating was a bit tough, but only because I think other professors did not communicate correctly with their students, unless we just had a bunch of slackers on the other end. Overall, great course, I would absolutely recommend it to future students, and I would recommend that any Poli Sci student take courses with Dr. B.

Student #2: I believe that the simulation, still has some kinks to be worked out, but all in all it was an excellent experience and I enjoyed it all a lot.

Student #3: It was difficult to correlate the opinions within my team. People think different. Secondly, it was harder than I expect to do the video because I supposed to do it based on what other members of my team wrote. And I wasn't completely satisfied with what they did.

**Final Comments**

We feel we have a lot to learn, but also have learned a lot. We don’t think many college professors would have the guts to do what we did - but it should be recognized that we had a major grant that could fund our f2f meetings. Without the Atlantis grant, we could never have managed such a complex endeavor. And even then, there were times we thought we would fail. Reflecting on the experience, we’re quite proud we saw this through.

The next challenge is that 30 students will be in this course from MMU in Fall 2012... We do not yet know how many students will enroll from Buffalo State or MMU. It’s likely that Cortland will take a pass, although we hope that Cortland can be involved.
19. Russia – USA: Women and Gender Studies & Linguistics

Abstract

During the fall of 2012 The College at Brockport (SUNY), and Novgorod State University, conducted a collaborative COIL course, titled Gender Roles Across Cultures. The course explored the similarities and differences of gender and human sexuality between the different cultures with an emphasis on feminist perspective within the interplay of biological, psychological, and cultural factors in the patterning of sex and gender identity. Course subject matter included feminist perspectives; sex and gender identity; violence against women; abortion and reproductive freedoms; sex as capital, women and family; and changing patterns of gender and sexual behavior in the U.S and Russia.

The course was designed to be a blended experience that included planned videoconference collaborative classes between Brockport and Novgorod, joint online interactions and assignments, and regularity scheduled face-to-face campus classes between each university’s faculty and students.

The online component utilized Google tools for the class Learning Management System (LMS), course blogging, and YouTube for viewing select videos and as a conduit for presenting final Public Service Announcement assignments. The class website, blog, and YouTube channel were strategically placed in an open access site outside the confines of either network to support the collaborative nature of the course.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Across Cultures: Brockport/Novgorod</td>
<td>The College at Brockport (SUNY) Novgorod State University, Russia</td>
<td>Women and Gender Studies Linguistics</td>
<td>3rd level undergraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Barbara LeSavoy, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>The College at Brockport (SUNY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Director, Women and Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Director, Women and Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Ann Giralico-Pearlman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Design Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>The College at Brockport (SUNY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Design Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CELT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Elena Lukovitskaya, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty, International Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Novgorod State University, Novgorod Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Sociology, Gender Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

20 students in Brockport; 11 students in Novgorod

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

This is typical enrollment for an Honors Section at Brockport.

Russian enrollment was typical for students which studying linguistics.
### Section 2: Issues of Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English at Brockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian at Novgorod, but for this COIL course, Russian students were studying linguistics and using English as a communication/learning tool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Primary language of most students in each class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English, Brockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian, Novgorod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Language of the course collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entirely in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Language fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian students were proficient in English, but this is their second language, although Russian students were working to perfect their English literacy skills. We provided Brockport students with some basic Russian greetings to use in communication, but Brockport students were 100 percent reliant on English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Language proficiency difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because the Russian students were seeking to perfect their English literacy skills, and because these same students were quite proficient in English, there were little difficulties to communication. Still, for synchronous class meetings, American students’ English pronunciation, non formal or slang usage, and talking speed were important variables to Russian students’ understanding. If Brockport students spoke too quickly, or used informal vocabulary, Russian students had some interpretation challenges. Communication via written text using the class blog was very clear and sophisticated in language and meaning. This appeared true for students in both counties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3: Curricular Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Online or blended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blended format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

LMS used was Google Sites and Google Blogger (75%), YouTube and Lecture Capture (25 %) for asynchronous instruction. All course learning resources were also made available on the Brockport Angel LMS.

15. Server location

Cloud-based

16. Technical problems

In the beginning of the semester, it was important to make sure all students had full access to the cloud tools used for the course. Making sure all students had gmail accounts separate from college email enabled wider access. There was a small learning curve here for Brockport students who were reliant on the college email and Angel system.

In Russia: our students seldom use University accounts, but not all my students had gmail accounts. So in the beginning of the course we spent time for creating new gmail accounts.

17. Frequency of use

Students were asked to interact on the course blog weekly, and sometimes two or three time a week. Course topics and synchronous class meetings prompted these dialogues. Additionally, the Google course website housed all instructional materials including course notes, powerpoints, lecture captures, and video which students accessed multiple times. Students did exchange email addresses and were encouraged to email each other outside of class time.

18. Informal communication

Email and Skype in assigned across countries teams were encouraged although students were not very active here.

19. Re-use

Yes, we would use these tools again because they proved accessible and enabled egalitarian learning platforms across institutions.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

We used video conferencing (polycom system) for 7 synchronous class meetings.

21. Server location

The video-conferencing system was provided/supported by both campuses.

22. Technical problems
No real problems emerged. Each campus provided the necessary technical support to realize the video-conferencing and all video-conferences went off without any hitches even the final two sessions devoted to students’ PSA presentations. But some key considerations to course logistics on the Brockport side did present in ways we did not anticipate.

Because these face-to-face meetings were high stakes, there was some anxiety waiting for the call-in to start for each synchronous class. This anxiety appeared more American based and reflects real-time logistical boundaries around course scheduling blocks. American students and faculty having to move to the next class session were variables that made the video-conferencing tight time-wise. While negotiating a time block and meeting frequency for the COIL course that would accommodate frequent synchronous instruction with an 8/9 hour time difference, we overlooked the limitations of 50 minute class sessions. The frequency of 3 meetings a week seemed desirable because it offered some built in flexibility in synchronous scheduling throughout the semester. This did prove useful as we bumped around a few of our class meetings together. But if we were to repeat the course, we would move it to a 75 minute, 2X a week time-block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The classes met seven times over a fifteen week period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Informal communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email and Skype in assigned teams across countries were encouraged although students were not very active here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. Re-use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, we would. The video-conferencing added important human dimension to the course. We were able to see gestures and hear voice and emotional tone which brought more familiarity and intimacy to the online exchange. Students reported this as very helpful and identified this as one of the variables that they liked most about the course. Interestingly, most students were more forthcoming in the blog spaces of the course compared to our synchronous class meetings, but the in-person meetings helped establish ground for these blog discussions and often served as prompts for further discussion. Given the wide range of learning styles and cultural diversity of the students enrolled, compounded with sometimes sensitive course topics on sex and gender identity, the face-to-face meetings filled an important real-time instructional need for students and faculty. The real-time meetings were opportunities to further develop topical electronic exchanges and often opened the doors of communication in meaningful ways that might have otherwise gone unspoken. The class discussions on abortion and reproductive freedoms and on maternity capital as understood in both the US and Russia as examples were fruitful dialogues that engaged complex ideology. Learning became organic to discussion and many key questions emerged as a consequence to the video-conferences. Even with this, the video-conference itself sometimes emerged as a barrier to fluency in dialogue because students were uncertain to the boundaries around back and forth communication. Who speaks when and at what point was sometimes awkward even with explicit guidelines, strategy, protocol, and expectations for participation on both sides. And Russian students were often more outspoken in our face-to-face-meetings compared to American students who sometimes were shy and reserved, despite preparedness and pre/post openness in classes independent of cross-country video connections. Physicality is likely at play here. The projection screen, while enabling real-time exchange, brings some distancing limitations, although this may be more constructed perception vs. true obstacle. And frequency in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practice may be the simple solution here. Using a video chat tool more frequently could perfect skills that best enable organic dialogue in a real-time setting. Everyone in the course seemed to become more comfortable and forthcoming as the semester progressed with the physicality of the screen and video equipment fading into the background vs. the foci to course exchange. And as is the case with in-person course learning formats, as students become more familiar with each other, dialogue increases. This proved true for student interaction in our synchronous class meetings.

Section 6: Assessment Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We assessed student learning of disciplinary course topics using our own tools on each campus, although we shared exams and grading rubrics. We are still in process of assessing the intercultural awareness outcomes as we consider and reflect on student learning and interaction across countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Common assessment rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Peer assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Charter or guidelines for student interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 at both schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7: Institutional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32. Type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial:</strong> There was institutional contribution to support Elena’s travel to NYC to attend the COIL training in September, 2011. This support was in response to a funding request from COIL Fellow Barb LeSavoy to her Dean, the Office of International Education, and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Brockport. There was no institutional financial support provided for course development and teaching load.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Administrative:** Our campuses have been excited about our COIL participation and interested in our collaborative work. Still, administrative support in terms of resources was not available. The fact that this was not in the COIL funding formula is important to note. Not knowing the full extent of our workload, we did not consider requesting administrative or resource support. Since our COIL work began, our Provost at Brockport is |
supporting travel expenses to Russia for COIL faculty fellow Ann Pearlman for a planned trip in Spring 2013. Coil faculty fellow Barb LeSavoy’s travel to Russia on this same trip is being supported by Linkages, Rochester/Novgorod Sister City Program, in association with LeSavoy’s work chairing the Rochester/Novgorod Linkages Women’s Partnership Committee. The trip is designed to see our COIL work forward.

**Pedagogical:** The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CELT) and the Department of Learning Instructional Technology Services (LITS) at Brockport provided important teaching support. Faculty fellow Ann Pearlman’s campus role intersects these two departments at Brockport, so there was a built-in support network available throughout the COIL teaching process. The Director of CELT at Brockport, Dr. Christopher Price, is active with the Levin Global Workforce Project, which importantly, helped prompt and realize this COIL project.

**Technical:** As mentioned above under pedagogical support, both CELT and LITS at Brockport contributed significantly to our COIL success. Technical support for set-up and maintenance for the video conferencing was supplied throughout the course. Also, LITS team members were available to assist in developing cloud communication tools. This is true for both campuses. Having an Instructional Design Specialist (IDS) serving as a COIL faculty fellow on the Brockport side enabled the platform for realizing the COIL partnership. Additionally, the IDS at Brockport participated in classroom instruction and guided students in all electronic applications. This included helping students set-up gmail accounts, instructing on media literacy, and assisting with students’ final PSA projects.

### 33. Engagement with the international programs office

International Education has been aware of and interested in our COIL work and provided institutional contribution to support COIL faculty Elena Lukovitskaya’s travel and attendance to the COIL training in September, 2011. This support was in response to a request from COIL fellow Barb LeSavoy to the Office of International Education. Given our success to this project, the Office of International Education is interested in future prospects for international collaboration.

### 34. Importance given to globally networked learning

The COIL opportunity is relevant and the Office of International Education supports these activities. But, the “work” is not done by our office but rather by dedicated faculty members on campus. We consider our office in the role of providing encouragement and support rather than part of our work load.

All parts of a University are interrelated and have an effect on the other parts. Thus the Department of Women’ and Gender Studies adds to the atmosphere of enquiry and knowledge in a way that impacts students and researchers in the Department of Sociology and so on. So in a very broad sense, the COIL globally networked learning activities affect the depth and breadth of the academic experience at Brockport.

More specifically, the Office of International Education considers COIL to be an important part of internationalization because it provides a very rich avenue for international learning and exposure to both domestic and foreign students. We do not at present consider this endeavor a part of Study Abroad, International Internships or International Recruitment. We do consider this to be a part of international relations and international research/teaching/learning activities – and thus could be considered a “vector” of international activity. Thus this is a small but important part of Brockport activities at present.

Globally networked learning at Brockport needs to have support from the Office of International Education but should probably be promoted by the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT). This office does an outstanding job of helping faculty to try new endeavors and to build new pedagogical approaches into the vast array of learning opportunities on campus.
35. Commitment

The COIL project began as a singular initiative prompted by the Fellows involved. We believe all parties involved are interested in seeing future COIL courses, but resource support is important to see such projects forward. While we have not had the opportunity to discuss future ventures with our administration, we believe our Dean and Provost are interested and supportive of international collaboration at the college. The Dean at Brockport has affirmed this interest.

36. Future iterations

The course is being offered again on the Brockport campus, but COIL collaboration is not currently in place. Given resource support, we are open to the possibility of offering the course in a COIL format.

37. New globally networked courses

COIL Faculty Fellows ran a CELT sponsored brown bag session at Brockport discussing their COIL work. This session included presentations from both Brockport COIL faculty and video-conference presentation from COIL faculty in Novgorod. Brockport faculty in attendance at the brown bag session expressed high level interest in offering this type of collaborative course. Additionally, COIL faculty fellows have proposed workshops to present their COIL course at The National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) Conference in November 2013 and at the SUNY COIL Conference in April 2013. These workshops are designed to inform other institutions about our COIL work, and importantly, to model ways faculty/staff at other institutions can replicate this international, collaborative teaching/learning paradigm.

The Brockport/Novgorod team would love to consider opportunities for future collaboration. Faculty LeSavoy and Pearlman are being supported to travel to Novgorod in March 2013 to further study and sustain their COIL collaboration. Additional possibilities to present and replicate our COIL work are being considered. One area of interest is the International Media Ecology Conference, and also, a scholarly paper on our work is in the conceptualization phase with research and writing planned for spring/summer 2013.

38. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

The Brockport School of The Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences (TAHSS) Dean has confirmed her interest in seeing future COIL courses such as ours offered again and developed across other courses and disciplines. The Dean recently indicated that she would entertain any proposals for teaching innovations such as COIL, including potential course releases for such work, and that COIL is aligned with our school and college strategic goals in efforts to foster global citizenship, civic engagement, and cross-cultural competence student learning outcomes.

Brockport’s Provost indicated that globalization of the curriculum is a strategic objective for the Division of Academic Affairs. Expansion of this pilot course is met with enthusiasm by the provost.

39. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Administrative support for the expansion of the pilot already exists. The key to that expansion will be generating enthusiasm among the faculty.

40. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

This COIL work is rich in possibility, but demanding in time and resources given other full time work
responsibilities. A funding formula to support teaching innovations like COIL would help see such future projects forward in a strategic and sustainable way.

Section 8: Reflections

41. Goals set

- Engage in cross-cultural dialogue within our Russian/Brockport partnership to see and understand ways gender equality is structured across cultures and to establish cultural competence
- Engage in cross-cultural dialogue between Russia and Brockport using insight and sensitivity to difference.
- Develop cross-continent teaching collaboration using open access technology
- Explore the boundaries of classroom instruction and understand ways students develop media literacy across cultures and gain skills to operate in a global atmosphere

42. Goals achieved

Based on student feedback, the final PSA assignment, and exit interviews, we believe the cross-cultural communication and appreciation of cultural difference goals met and or exceeded our expectations. In areas of media literacy, students were surprisingly less competent or adventurous when engaging with new communication tools. Although prompted to interact independently outside of class time, students often dropped the ball in pushing communication and collaboration forward. Variables that impacted student interaction included time difference, cultural differences in assignment expectations, greater comfort with independent work, and lack of time/initiative to engage in electronic innovation.

These conclusions make us want to pilot this COIL course again to assess and study lessons learned and structure course assignments in ways that better facilitate student-to-student interaction outside of synchronous classroom instruction. Understanding campus-to-campus logistics is important in defining faculty and student roles. This is particularly true of team teaching relationships heightened further by the intrinsic complexities that come with cross-continent teaching collaborations.

43. Most unique aspect for students

The most unique COIL outcome for students was the synchronous video conferencing when students were able to see and interact with each other face-to-face. Also significant were students' final PSA projects where students in each country were able to present their work in a global arena for a global audience.

An additional variable unique to this experience was the Women and Gender Studies course topics, which largely facilitated student engagement among COIL participants in each country. This topical appeal is true of Women and Gender Studies as an area of knowledge that intersects the human condition, which offers a wonderful hook to bring diverse student groups into the fold of an international course. Because of its multidisciplinary dimension and its contemporary application, the Women and Gender studies discipline lends itself to studying other cultures, and it provides a strategic backdrop to overlay and link in a COIL partnership.

A final point significant to this COIL partnership was its discipline duality where students in Russia were studying English in addition to gender. The linguistics goal and bilingual competency of our Russian partners enabled an English language teaching and learning platform, which opened the door for American students to interact and communicate with Russian students in ways that would not have been possible as part and parcel to a Brockport General Education Women and Gender Studies course. Students on the Brockport side gained significantly here in areas of cultural sensitivity and cultural competence. Equally noteworthy, many Russian
students wrote of their linguistic training goals and their appreciation of the opportunity to practice and perfect their English language speaking and writing skills.

### 44. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

From a pedagogical perspective, the Google course blog worked well for asynchronous assignments, and as already mentioned, the synchronous video conferencing proved the most effective tool to engage dialogue, discourse, and student learning. The final course PSA projects also worked extremely well in providing students with a platform to research and further learn about a Women and Gender Studies course related topic. It also provided students with an oral presentation opportunity delivered to a global audience, which is a valuable skill-building activity.

Importantly, the opportunity for students to learn from faculty in another country was extraordinary as realized by students in each country.

### 45. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

As already mentioned, logistical time constraints around class and teaching responsibilities were significant. Given more time and flexibility would have facilitated additional opportunities for extended interaction and collaboration. All faculty fellows carried extraordinary full-time teaching and administrative responsibilities in addition to their COIL work. These variables are important to consider when conceptualizing optimal conditions necessary for COIL success.

### 46. Changes for future iterations

As already mentioned, we would position the COIL course we taught in a longer time block. We would also attempt to balance our other work responsibilities in ways that provide time and space to nurture and develop our COIL work. Also, as already mentioned, if we were to teach this COIL course again, we would try and push students to use technology with more collaborative innovation outside of classroom instruction.

Importantly and on the flip side, the larger part of our COIL course development and implementation was extremely successful, and much of the activities that we did implement in teaching the course we would replicate. It is always helpful to repeat a course preparation and fine-tune content and pedagogy. This seems an almost essential next step to perfecting this COIL work.

### 47. Technical support

The biggest difference in the IDS’s role was the global connection. The IDS had to consider the technology capabilities on the home and Russian campuses. The other aspect that makes IDS’ role different was creating the COIL course in an open access site compared to within an on-campus fully supported LMS. This meant creating a course template independent of the college, which brought responsibility to instruct student users across both borders. Trying to integrate ID’s instruction into course content also was challenging in the face of time limitations and established curriculum goal for the discipline. There is teaching involved in media ecology and technology literacy that is important to consider alongside course content in COIL course delivery logistics.

From a Media Ecologist perspective, the ID feels the most impressive outcome of the collaborative course was to see the human interaction that took place between the two campuses. This is something that would not have happened without the COIL course, and it is an extension of the best practice models that we are trying to incorporate in blended and online courses offered by our college. This across country human interaction outcome also supports SUNY-wide global interdependency goals where colleges seek to develop citizens who
are able to function effectively in a global society.

### 48. International programs person

Elena: This course was my first experience in an international online teaching. Before I had just research international experience.

What was new for me in this course:

1. Using of new technical capabilities - carrying out of videoconferences, a hard work in our joint blog, access to electronic articles, lectures, presentations of my international partner, an exchange of opinions, significant assistance from Ann Pearlman in blog creation and support.

2. Bigger debatable potential of the course - a lot of themes were actively discussed in the blog, on videoconferences (our usual reading courses include more lectures)

3. Acquaintance with teaching experience of my international partner - Barbara LeSavoy (PSA, recommended articles, textbooks) and also with education system structure in Brockport College.

4. Acquaintance with cultural teacher/student’s experience in the context of the course.

### 49. Time commitment

Time to develop the COIL course was considerably more than developing a singular course because development demanded collaboration with other faculty and staff, which necessitated time for communication and sharing of course materials. The Brockport/Novgorod team engaged in several Skype planning sessions in addition to our attendance and participation in the COIL training. We also devoted considerable time to electronic communications in the months prior to the offering of our course where we fine tuned course syllabi and assignment logistics. Similarly, we continued this electronic and Skype correspondence throughout the semester that we taught as we coordinated campus to campus instructional delivery components and mediated and directed student participation and learning contributions.

Course development included coordination with other campus departments under IT services. Additionally, to meet our synchronous course teaching and learning outcomes and accommodate Brockport course scheduling blocks, Russian students came back to campus outside of their regularly scheduled class time. Brockport was grateful for this Novgorod attendance gesture which enabled our rich and diverse face-to-face class meetings.

Implementation of our COIL course also required additional faculty time when compared to implementing a singularly taught course. The Brockport course met three times a week in addition to delivering instruction online. The course blog and Brockport’s use of lecture capture were time consuming and amplified the teaching workload.

Despite the extraordinary human capital required in developing and implementing our COIL course, time devoted to instruction was extremely fulfilling. Contributions to the course blog for example were substantive and meaningful, which made time dedicated to online instructor responses worthwhile. Similarly, students’ final course PSAs were remarkable, an outcome that reflects back to the guided instruction students received in conceptualizing and producing sophisticated final course projects.

### 50. Was it worth it?

Yes, our COIL work was incredibly worthwhile. There is no question that it would be much easier to run the same course again using lessons learned. However, it is important to recognize that instructional collaboration, even
in a repeat preparation, does require additional planning and teaching time.

Developing a new course with a new partner would be very exciting because it offers an extraordinary opportunity to learn about Women and Gender Studies in another culture. The many positive experiences that we pulled from this COIL course underscore this conclusion.

In developing best practices, institutional support and resources should be allocated to COIL course development and implementation. Course release time for faculty engaged in COIL work would prove fruitful in realizing successful and productive collaborations, where faculty fellows are not pulled in competing directions in efforts to meet full time work responsibilities while pioneering a COIL teaching/learning partnership.

Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

Introduction:

This narrative documents the fall 2012 COIL Gender Roles Across Cultures Brockport NY/Novgorod, RU, a collaboration between The College at Brockport (SUNY), Brockport, NY and Novgorod State University, Novgorod, Russia. The collaboration began on 8/27/12 and concluded on 12/07/12 with final Public Service Announcement (PSA) presentations that students constructed/presented across countries. COIL faculty included Dr. Barbara LeSavoy, Women and Gender Studies Director/Professor, The College at Brockport, teaching 20 honors program students; Dr. Elena Lukovitskaya, Novgorod State University Sociology/Gender Professor, teaching 11 students; Ann Giralico-Pearlman, Instructional Design Specialist, The College at Brockport, delivering teaching and technology support to both classrooms, and Konstantin Krasnoshchekov, providing background technology support in Novgorod.

Course Framework:

We constructed and mounted a course template in Google Sites where we posted course syllabi, class notes, readings, and selected video for student access to online materials. We also set up a class blog using Blogger which we used as a communication/assignment tool throughout the duration of the course. We designed the course to be a blended experience with face-to-face meetings via video-conferencing, asynchronous blogging, and asynchronous classes held in Brockport and Novgorod. We selected Google Sites strategically, seeking to place our instructional materials in an open access site that sits outside the confines of Brockport’s Angel Learning Management System (LMS). This worked fairly well. The blog in particular was very effective in connecting students to each other and in serving as a platform for meaningful discourse and collaboration. Faculty and students from both countries prepared blog questions and the blog provided Russian students time for writing and translation, although translation tasks imposed additional time demands that American students/faculty did not experience. The frequent interaction the blog required also challenged already stretched faculty time. The blog attracted 9 of 11 Novgorod and all Brockport students.

Using Google as the LMS was a new experience that required adjustments throughout the semester. Brockport’s contract for student Gmail accounts provides access to Google Sites, Blogger, YouTube and Docs, but these tools do not allow students to add a profile photo or blog imagery. Given this, we created personal Gmail accounts for students, which imposed a learning curve for class members. Barb also posted course materials in Angel as a backup. Elena found Angel helpful to access/send readings to her students, but in Brockport, Angel became a hindrance to Google use vs. a course augment, and subsequently, something we strategically do not recommend in future COIL courses. The Google course site as a LMS met our collaborative instructional needs making Angel, in duplication, a potential Google Sites distraction. Another technology note: in the second part of the semester, Barb added lecture capture to her PowerPoint lecture notes. All Brockport lecture notes were in PowerPoint.
and posted on the Google course site. Elena also sent her PowerPoint lectures for electronic posting and distribution to students. Lecture capture in voice was piloted to explore its value to students learning at a distance and in a second language. Still, Russian students did not make much use of the lecture capture. It was added midstream, absent of good directives, so extrinsic push to use this tool seemed minimal. Using lecture capture at the start of the semester with questions to report back on lecture content would provide better structure to assess its use and effectiveness.

Course Content and Delivery:

During Week I, as an ice-breaker activity, we asked all students to post to the course blog in an exercise called, “A Day in Your Life,” where we prompted students to introduce themselves to each other and share details about their age, family, living circumstances, hobbies, and interests. Additional question prompts were directed at, “likes, fears, wishes, and challenges,” which added texture and dimension to responses, and where several students in each country conversed back and forth on commonalities they discovered in each other. COIL faculty also posted a welcome to the class using the “A Day in The Life” prompt, and we each made a point to comment on each student’s individual posting in both Brockport and Novgorod as a way to communicate our interest and encourage student comfort in talking with us in this format. The blog is fascinating to read and shows incredible diversity in person and place.

On 9/14, following the “Day in Your Life” ice-breaker, we held our first of several scheduled synchronous classes. This was an extremely successful class where students had the opportunity to meet face-to-face and ask each other questions about our beginning unit on sex and gender identity. Our learning partners in Russia were very enthusiastic and outgoing – more so than our Brockport students -- who became somewhat reserved in this initial video-conference setting. Our Russian partners displayed perfect command of English, and in cross-cultural gesture, we provided our Brockport students with some basic Russian greetings to use in communication. Our Brockport class met @ 9:05 a.m. That morning, Barb enthusiastically greeted our Novgorod class with a Russian good morning – Russian students broke out in laughter because of course it was 5:00 p.m. and the start to their evening. It was a lighthearted but humbling moment. This first synchronous class meeting was very exciting and affirmed our semester partnership was fully operational on both human and electronic levels. Ann videotaped this and all subsequent synchronous class sessions.

Our team followed up this first video-conference with faculty emails to check on how we each perceived ways our students received this class, and we each asked students, in designated teams of three (2 Brockport, 1 Novgorod), to email each other as a follow up. Students gradually started to find their way to their Brockport/Novgorod partners – some with more success than others. During this check, Elena stressed the importance of American students speaking slowly and without slang which we reinforced repeatedly on the Brockport side. Also during week I, Elena identified and shared a survey on views of feminists and feminism and we both administered this survey to our students. We referenced this survey at many points throughout the semester as we and students in both countries considered our/their own and others’ perceptions of feminists and feminism. While our feminisms span geographies and capture cultural variations across continents, we discovered that negative stereotypes attached to feminism are universal across countries. Despite believing in and desiring gender equality, the majority of students in both class were hesitant to own the feminist label. This stayed relatively true as a post instruction measure although students in both countries did shift ideologies in understanding the social construction of gender roles and ways structural variables in spaces of work and family roles contribute to inequalities among women and men in the US, Russia, and many world cultures.

In a follow up to our synchronous video conference, Barb posted to the course blog to dialogue with students on Brockport instructional progression. The Brockport class watched parts of the film, “Middle Sexes,” which Ann linked segments of the film via YouTube on our Google site. The film served as an in to talk about sex and gender identity, and as a lead-in to our next course unit where we discussed women’s bodies and also gender-based violence. Questions on the blog prompted students to consider similarities/differences across cultures.
when we consider incidences of rape, domestic violence, and ways media sources objectify women’s bodies. Blog responses were engaging and robust, although not all Russian students viewed the film. Elena commented that her students would have preferred reading papers on separate themes here which would have better informed their points of view.

We held our second synchronous class meeting on 9/28. The class topic was abortion and reproductive freedoms in the US and in Russia. Prior to this class, the students blogged and responded to faculty posed questions on sex and gender identity, comparing practices in US and Russia. Also, in preparation for the synchronous class meeting, students watched film segments of “If These Walls Can Talk,” and also read on this topic and its controversy. As additional backdrop, students read some background readings on sex as capital in modern Russia. Women’s bodies as a site of commerce and political scrutiny was a common theme throughout. Once again the face-to-face class meeting was interesting and dynamic. Abortion is very sensitive topic on the US side. Our American students who oppose abortion were less vocal in class despite a transparent teaching goal to see the diverse complexities here and to tolerate differing views where the question intersects personal and public spaces across countries. Comparatively, students in Russia were very open about this topic and were curious about US practices, and during class dialogue, appeared less conflicted in personal standpoint about abortion practices in Russia. Elena and Barb shared PPT lecture notes on their respective country practices. Also, Barb posted follow up blog questions directed to both Russia and Brockport students. Of particular interest here were questions around emergency contraception and its use/availability in Russia and the extent if any that religious ideology intersects abortion practices. American students also questioned whether schools in Russia provide contraception and/or offer education about sex and birth control. Blog dialogue here was substitutive and robust as students wrestled with hard questions around women’s bodies and reproductive freedoms as comparatively understood in the US and Russia.

Elena led the third synchronous class meeting as our students began studying a unit on women and family. Elena facilitated a lecture and discussion on maternity capital in Russia and students learned about maternity leave policies in Russia, the US, and around the globe. We followed up this synchronous class with a blog post on behalf of our American class per questions about students' thoughts on maternity capital in Russia. American students were curious about whether Russian students viewed the Russian maternity capital provided to mothers as adequate. American students questioned whether state supported incentives for reproduction assist women and families, or, if such incentives further pigeonhole women as mothers, and thus, potentially restrict women's opportunities for paid employment outside the home. Students thoughtful, purposeful blog responses raised hard questions while also exposed the complexities associated with maternity capital benefits. The need to support women and family emerged as universal to students' points of view. Similarly, expanding maternity capital as a benefit to parents vs. only women carried broad appeal. As students' reflections indicated, the conditions around maternity capital produce a paradox where maternity benefits are necessary and supportive while also potentially problematic and exploited. Students in both countries were stunned to discover that the US is a country with no national maternity policy and with one of the poorest support systems for pregnant women and new mothers in the world. Using the blog, students learned from each other in diverse and remarkable ways.

A fourth and significant video-conference followed by asynchronous blogging was instruction devoted to women and religion with a particular focus on the Russian girl punk rock band Pussy Riot, which intersected course content and lent itself to reading, research, and comparative cross-cultural discussion. Elena emailed several Russian news pieces on Pussy Riot, which we translated using Google translator and posted on our course site. Students dialogue face-to-face on this topic and then turned to our class blog for follow-up discussion. Students were interested in questions around separation of church and state as is relates to Pussy Riot’s performance at Christ the Savior Cathedral in Moscow and also questions around artistic and freedom of expression. Students discussed ways church and state are legally separated in both countries but that religion still creeps into and influences government decisions, particularly in the US as it relates to marriage equality and
women’s reproductive health. The nuances here were many where knowledge around feminism, politics, religious ideology and practices, activism, and popular culture were examined across cultures. Blog discourse was lively and generated diverse experience and point of view.

A fifth video-conference was dedicated to the topic of feminisms. This was a particularly textured class where a Brockport graduate student studying for the fall semester at Moscow State University, visited Novgorod and was present in Elena’s class. A reporter from a Rochester newspaper working on news story about our COIL work was also present in this class session. Students dialogued back and forth on their understanding of feminists and feminism, and as mentioned previously, students’ reluctance to own the feminist label was a common theme throughout. Although there was good back and forth questions and answers, discourse was somewhat stifled on each side. We attributed some of this hesitancy to the reporter’s staged presence along with student uncertainty in finding voice and point of view.

Final PSA Projects

As the second part of the semester unfolded, we dedicated class instructional time to think forward students’ final PSA class projects. We identified and assigned course topics across students and then asked students to collaborate on this in teams. Research on the today’s students, considered digital natives, states that they adapt well to new technical tools, but are more likely to use media for social communication versus academics. For the final assignment, students were given choices to create a poster, a PowerPoint or Presenter presentation, or video. Overall, students selected electronic media to craft meaningful PSA messages that supported their research topics.

Although cross country collaboration on PSAs was not successful, students did work together on topics and did consider cross country perspectives in their research. Three of the Brockport student groups worked with Ann to create video PSAs, coming to her with pre-production material and concepts and imagery for their presentations. And students in both countries did present their PSA in two final video-conference classes dedicated to this effort. Ann placed these projects on the class LMS for access and final presentations. In post reflections, assignment logistics with a template that identified precise contributions for each team member in each country may have better facilitated collaboration. Conversely, the merit of students’ singular projects as a course outcome should not be overlooked. Students’ final PSA projects were extraordinary in topic and presentation. This shines back on the merits of the COIL course and the many successes of our semester long teaching/learning partnership.

Section 10: Student Feedback

In an end of semester course evaluation in Brockport, students were asked to rank, on a scale of 1 terrible, 2 poor; 3 good; and 4 wonderful, their experiences with the COIL partnership. 9 of 20 students rated this as a 4, and 9 or 20 students rated this as a 3, two students rated this as a 1. Per the COIL exchange, when asked to name one thing they liked most about the course, 18 of 20 students identified the COIL Brockport/Russian partnership. Students responses included:

“I like the partnership of our Russian COIL group. It has been a fun and interesting way to learn of different
"I really enjoyed the video-conferences; it was really cool to work with the Russian students."

"I liked interacting with other students in Russia."

"The Russian video chats was one thing I liked most about the course."

"Working with the Russian students."

"I really enjoyed the COIL Program and communicating with students from Russia."

"I enjoyed learning a more-cross-cultural perspective than what I already had and learning with Russia was very interesting."

"The video conferencing with our Russian partners was amazing."

"I wish we had more time to talk with the Russian students."

"The COIL Russia interactions – extremely fascinating to view from a different country in real-time and to blog back and forth with them."

Additional student feedback included:

"For COIL, it would have been nice to have more time in class."

"I wished the conference classes were better quality and longer."

"The course as a whole felt worthwhile to spend my time in... can’t really say that about all my courses."

"We should have done more video chats"

"We needed more class time; 50 minutes was too short."

"Coming into a women’s studies class, I was concerned that the professor would force us to become very liberal or feminist. However this was not an issue at all. The professor was very good at accepting different points of view which was amazing."

"I did not like the participation aspect of this course. Because feminism is a very opinionated topic, it is sometimes hard to speak your mind conformably without feeling like someone else might shove their opinion back at you."

Novgorod Students:

"It was my first real communication on scientific themes in English. From the first lesson this subject was interesting for me. I felt that I had a lot of common with the American students though our background and culture are different. I think that there should be more conferences under this course and they should be more extended(I.)"

"I think we all did great job! Halloween costumes of American students were the most surprised for me :)” (V.)

"I really liked Garret’s lecture about “Solder mother s” and the fact that he and his friend came to Novgorod to share their experience and thoughts” (I.)

"The most interesting for me were videoconferences with American students, possibility to share our experience with them and to hear their point of view and experience (I.)

"This course was splendid and very necessary. Just continue to teach this very useful subject” (K)
20. Russia - USA: History

Abstract

The newly-created George Mason University - National Research University Higher School of Economics history course on how states and societies have or have not dealt with the aftermath of mass violence was operated primarily as a face-to-face course via two video conference classrooms. On the whole, the faculty members were pleased with the results, especially with respect to in-class activities which included lectures, class discussions, and group student presentations. Out-of-class activities, primarily online discussion boards and the process of creating group presentations, were considered less successful areas for improvement in the next iteration of the course. The largest sources of difficulties were logistic, including an unanticipated offset of the course times after the U.S. ended daylight savings times and the difficulties of getting students to meet together synchronously given their extremely busy schedules and the time difference. On the whole, the faculty were so pleased with the results of the course that they already plan to teach the course again in the spring 2014 semester.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coping with the Aftermath of Violence</td>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Undergraduate - any level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Steven Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: George Mason University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution: Associate Professor of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program: Department of History and Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Rick Reo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Division of Instructional &amp; Technology Support Service (DoIT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?
Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

GMU - 30 students
HSE - enrolled - 14, dropped - 7

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?
Probable about average for a George Mason course of this type.
This is an average size class for an optional course; however the dropout rate was exceptionally high.

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

English at George Mason
Russian and English at HSE

7. Primary language of most students in each class

English at George Mason
Russian at HSE

8. Language of the course collaboration
Entirely in English.
## 9. Language fluency

Students at Mason are English speakers; those at HSE had moderate English language skills.

## 10. Language proficiency difference

From Steven Barnes’s perspective, the differential language skills had a relatively small impact on the course. I overestimated the problems from language skills and underestimated the problems caused by logistic issues. In classroom discussions, the Russian students as a group more than held their own. I would estimate that they easily did 50% of the talking and usually without any extra prodding--certainly no more than the prodding that was sometimes necessary to get the George Mason students talking. The Russian students were slightly less adept in written English and seemed more reticent in the online discussion boards. All in all, I think the Russian students did an amazing job with their English usage in the class.

From Irina Filatova’s perspective language was a problem. Students with poorer English were not coping with required reading and as a result their contributions were not as good as they would have liked them to be. Some felt shy because of that (though this was certainly not the general problem). Language was also one of the reasons for a high dropout level. Those whose English was better from the start, blossomed, others felt that the course required too much effort without bringing the pleasure of success, and as the course was not obligatory, they simply left.

---

## Section 3: Curricular Information

### 11. Online or blended?

The course was really more of a face-to-face course with an online component for some of the assignments.

### 12. Duration

12 weeks, I think was the final number depending on how you count due to various holidays.

### 13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

The George Mason semester started about two and a half weeks before HSE. Steven Barnes used that time with his students to prepare them to some degree for what they would face in the collaborative aspect of the course - giving them some basic background on Russian history and culture, discussing the challenges faced by students in both classrooms in such a course, orienting them to Blackboard and having a training session in the use of Blackboard Collaborate—a potential tool for them to use in meeting their Russian counterparts for project preparation. The George Mason students were also asked to prepare group presentations on their daily lives and the best three were chosen in a class vote to be presented to HSE students in the first joint meeting.

HSE students only had one meeting before our first joint session. Irina Filatova asked a few of her students to make a presentation to the George Mason students during that first session. They did not have as much time to prepare as did the George Mason students, but it still made for a nice introduction of the students to one another.
## Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

### 14. Tools

Blackboard was the primary method, although the students on their own made use of some other technologies—primarily email—to communicate with one another.

### 15. Server location

We used the George Mason Blackboard system and HSE students were given access for the semester.

### 16. Technical problems

Reports on the use of Blackboard Collaborate from the students were decidedly mixed, as some students loved it and others hated it. Otherwise, I know of no significant technical problems using the discussion boards on Blackboard.

Russian students were slow to engage in a meaningful debate on the blackboard; some never did, because they thought that their English was inadequate. But all read other students’ comments, so it was a useful tool.

### 17. Frequency of use

We don’t really understand what is meant by engaging “on a classroom level.” We can say that Blackboard was primarily used for hosting discussion boards in the course. Students were required to write at least one post and one response during each case study.

### 18. Informal communication

I don’t think Blackboard was useful in an informal sense during this course. Part of that is the technology itself. (Students noted, for example, that they might have gotten to know each other better if their posts were connected with a profile picture—allowing students to put faces with names.) Part of that was that we could have used it in different ways. (For example, I think we could try hosting an additional discussion board for general discussion instead of just the ones on each case study which lent themselves to formal responses to specific assignments.) This was one area (informal contacts) where the course did not succeed as hoped.

Yes, there was, indeed, very little personal contact between the students. One of the reasons for this was the time difference. When they tried to engage via Skype while preparing their common presentations it turned out an uphill task, as they could not find time when they could connect. Facebook could be a good idea.

### 19. Re-use

I think Blackboard could still have a role in a future iteration of the course, though the features used could also be found in other LMS systems or merely through hosting a course blog outside of an LMS altogether. Students indicated a desire to perhaps have a Facebook page for the course. This might also enable them to make additional informal connections beyond the confines of the course.
## Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

### 20. Tools

Approximately 3 out of every 4 class sessions were held jointly via videoconference.

### 21. Server location

Tech support was utilized at both universities.

### 22. Technical problems

Tech problems were quite rare. For one class session, we were never able to connect due to technical problems. Fortunately, this was a day in which Steven Barnes gave a lecture. We recorded the lecture and made it available to Russian students via internet. For one class session, we had significant audio difficulties. This was more difficult, as it was during a student group’s presentation to the class. Tech support was able to lower the video quality part way through the class which improved audio quality, and the students handled the situation well, but it was not ideal. Otherwise, technical connection of the two classrooms was high quality without significant delays, losses of video or audio, etc.

### 23. Frequency of use

For each case study, we met with the two classrooms together three times and had one face-to-face session in two separate classrooms. We had hoped students would meet synchronously when preparing group projects. For the most part, they handled preparation asynchronously, and in fact, all too separately. Here, the logistical issues proved a major hurdle. From the George Mason perspective, our students largely live extraordinarily busy lives--often taking a full course load with significant hours of employment or being full-time employees while taking significant numbers of courses (and not uncommonly, they combine “full-time” work with “full-time” student schedules.) As a result, they have relatively few unscheduled hours for synchronous meetings with other students, even when only among George Mason students. Then, when one adds in the 8/9 hour time difference with Moscow, the logistical impediment to synchronous meetings was usually too large to be overcome.

Busy schedules were a huge problem for HSE students too. Many also work, some full time, and at some point during the course they had an exam session. In addition to this HSE buildings are scattered around Moscow, and it took some students up to an hour to get to the venue where classes were held: quite a big sacrifice on their part.

### 24. Informal communication

This is an area in which the course did not succeed as we wished.

### 25. Re-use

I would definitely stick with the videoconference format for the course. This part worked quite well. It is in the area of student contact beyond classroom time that improvements are needed. We will be interested to hear experiences from others in this area.
## Section 6: Assessment Information

### 26. How?

We evaluated the students primarily through their written work and oral presentations. In addition to sharing the main course assignments, we had slightly different examination practices. The students were required to make contributions to online discussion on each of the course’s case studies and to participate in one group presentation (with a mix of Russian and American students) on a case study. Students wrote individual papers to accompany their group presentation. George Mason students wrote a final paper and took a final written in-class examination. I would not say that any of the course evaluation was aimed specifically at the issue of the development of intercultural awareness.

### 27. Common assessment rubric

We chose to do assessment for our students separately.

### 28. Peer assessment

No. I (Steve) am not sure what might have come from such peer assessment but will be interested to hear of others’ experiences.

I (Irina) discussed my students’ contributions to collaborative presentations in class. Other students participated in these discussions.

### 29. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

No. Students were informed in class of the need for respect of opposing viewpoints. Having more informal time with my students at the beginning in the class sessions held prior to the start of classes at HSE, I (Steve) did make a particular point to inform the students that the subject matter of the course was difficult and could lead to strong emotional responses. I urged them to come to me with problems and to treat one another respectfully, to treat the classroom as a safe space in which people of good will would exchange possibly conflicting opinions, and warned them in particular of the possible discomfort that might come when hearing criticism of one’s own country from students in another and to think about that issue also when we discussed the Russian case study.

No particular problems developed in the realm of student interaction. In fact on HSE side we have not had any.

### 30. Attrition

At George Mason, 2 students out of 30 failed to complete the course. In one case, the student showed up most of the semester and disappeared right at the end.

For HSE, as described above, the drop-out rate was significantly higher at approximately 50%.

### 31. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

This was typical for a George Mason course.

This was atypical for an HSE course.
### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 32. Type of support

At George Mason, the Office of Global and International Strategies initiated the participation in the Institute and contacted Dr. Barnes about being part of this. Their support in preparing the application was critical. Dr. Barnes took care of initiating contact with the History Faculty at HSE and the chair of that faculty brought him and Dr. Filatova into contact. They corresponded to decide on a potential course topic. The course was new for both professors. Attendance of the George Mason team at the COIL Institute workshop was supported financially by COIL. The workshop, attended by Dr. Filatova remotely, was critical to working out the outlines of the course. Course development was primarily completed by Drs. Barnes and Filatova. The George Mason provost’s office provided one course release both as incentive for Dr. Barnes to participate and to provide adequate time for course preparation (which proved absolutely critical when Dr. Barnes severely broke his leg and ankle in the spring of 2012). Rick Reo, instructional designer, provided training and advice to Dr. Barnes on using the Blackboard LMS system along with ways to think about structuring assignments on Blackboard, group presentations, etc. He also helped with the process of getting HSE students enrolled into Blackboard. The Global Office provided financial support for hiring a student to run cameras at George Mason during the course. This may not be absolutely necessary in the future, though it did help. The Video Conference Technologies staff at George Mason handled connections of the two classrooms—including opening their office early when a sudden mid-semester realization that Russia no longer changes time in the winter forced the class to move from 9am to 8am for the remainder of the semester. Most important for future renditions of the course is continued availability of one of the two video conference classrooms on the George Mason campus.

The main failure in support came in the area of access to the resources of George Mason Libraries, as they were not able to provide HSE students with access to our journal databases. This made finding appropriate, open-access readings critical to give the students a shared knowledge base for the course. Continued search for better open-access readings will be important to further development of the course.

Irina Filatova received a lot of support from the staff of HSE History Faculty and the University's Foreign Relations Department in advertising the course. Without the assistance of the Videoconference Technologies staff the course would have been impossible. Irina also received financial incentives from the University which are common practice for such courses: HSE remunerates lecturers who teach in English and particularly those who teach videoconference courses with foreign universities.

#### 33. Engagement with the international programs office

At George Mason, the Office of Global and International Strategies brought the COIL program to my attention. They helped write the application to be part of the Institute. They provided financial support to hire a student to run video cameras in the George Mason classroom. Representatives of that office twice came to observe the class.

Foreign Relations Department at HSE was important at the initial stages of correspondence between the universities and was prepared to fund Filatova's trip to New York for the workshop, but the trip did not work out because of logistical problems.

#### 34. Importance given to globally networked learning

Yes, this initiative is certainly relevant to the mission of our Office of Global and International Strategies. We are in the process of developing strategies to include this form of learning as part of strengthening Mason’s global education curricula.
I (Irina) am not sure about the opinion of the international programmes officer about this particular course, but it is well known fact that HSE is deeply interested in internationalization of its teaching and does a lot to promote globally networked learning. In that sense HSE is a pioneering institution in Russia.

### 35. Commitment

Yes, our partner institution, the Higher School of Economics, was very eager to continue such collaborations. They have expressed their interest through co-teaching another globally networked linked course with our Sociology & Anthropology department as well as committing to teaming with Mason again for Spring 2014.

HSE has a number of globally networked courses in different disciplines with different partners. It certainly is interested in developing this experience.

### 36. Future iterations

The course will be taught again by Professors Barnes and Filatova in the spring 2014 semester.

### 37. New globally networked courses

Yes, the work of Profs. Barnes and Filatova has already generated similar courses in Mason. Another course on human rights and inequalities partnered with the Higher School of Economics also took place in Fall 2012. Other globally networked linked courses are being planned and discussed.

### 38. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

Our Vice President of Global Strategies, Dr. Anne Schiller, is very interested to expand globally networked courses to George Mason’s curricula. She has identified this as one of its priorities to promote globalization in Mason.

As I said, globally networked courses are one of HSE’s priorities. Prof. Alexander Kamensky, Dean of History, is certainly interested in developing this initiative.

### 39. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

The Office of Global and International Strategies is very committed to plan and develop a viable strategy to continue the work that Mason’s team has started.

HSE as an institution is highly committed to developing and promoting this experience.

### 40. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Developing globally networked learning requires strong partnerships (internal and external), our institution will benefit from COIL’s community of practice as a resource to move globally networked learning forward. Ideas on securing funding to help faculty build more effective partners and building sustainable globally networked courses would be ideal as well.

I (Irina) taught two videoconference courses with GMU in 2012. In my experience one of the most important things for the success of the course (apart from the technical side of it) is the human factor: two partners have to be able to work with one another, understand one another’s ideas and agree on basic things. No amount of assistance (which is necessary, of course) can help if there is no such mutual understanding. I think that in that
sense Prof Barnes and I were lucky - we could work together well.
I (Steve) would like to second Irina’s comment here. She and I had never met before we started on this venture. I was put in touch with her by her department chair, whom I had met with at HSE in Moscow in 2010. In many respects, we were just lucky to find that we were very compatible in our approaches to teaching, our thinking about the course subject matter, and the like. The entire course would probably go quite poorly indeed if the two faculty members were not so well-matched. I think we also benefited from the fact that this was a new course for both of us. As such, we developed it together in its entirety rather than trying to take a course one of us had already developed and fit the other faculty member and student body into the confines of something that already existed.

Section 8: Reflections

### 41. Goals set

**HSE** - I wanted the students to get the experience of an open debate with their American counterparts as equal partners, despite the impediment of the language. Of course, I wanted them to be interested in the course and to "advertise" it by word of mouth.

**GMU** - I think I had two goals when we started. 1) To give the students a firm understanding of and ability to analyze different incidents of mass violence and ways to try to deal with their legacies. 2) To acquaint the students with Russian peers and to show the American students some of their own unexamined assumptions about the world by showing them the same in others.

### 42. Goals achieved

**HSE** - not quite. Some students shied away from both written and oral discussions until the end. But they spoke highly of the course both to me and to their peers.

**GMU** - I feel as confident with the subject matter knowledge gains as I ever can feel. That is, they understood the material relatively well during the course and much of it came as a genuine surprise to them (especially with regard to the public spectacle nature of many lynchings in the American case study), but I am left wondering what if anything they will keep from the course in the long run. On the intercultural interaction, the results were more mixed. Students did not get to know their Russian colleagues as well as I would have liked, but I think the students gained some respect for their peers (though again, what long term impact that might have is unclear.)

### 43. Most unique aspect for students

**HSE** - The opportunity to listen to lectures of an American professor and to compare it with what they are getting at their own university in term of intents and presentation, as well as to speak directly with American students in class. I also think that they learnt a lot from the course, taking into consideration the fact that the majority were not historians and thus did not know much even on the history of Stalinism.

**GMU** - I think the students found the very nature of the course unique. They did make comments from time to time in our separate classroom discussions that made me feel the discussions with Russian students were opening their eyes to another world beyond the United States. They seemed particularly impressed that these Russian students were undertaking significant college level work in a second language. I tried repeatedly to impress upon them that the Russian students were doing the same work as the Americans but doing it as if at the same time in a foreign language class. This really did make an impression. I also think from our discussions
that they found the course topic deeply moving and often troubling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSE - Definitely work in class: lectures, discussions and student presentations. The Blackboard discussions did not work very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU - I completely agree with Irina. It is primarily in the things that happened outside of the classroom that improvements are needed. The classroom discussions were on the whole terrific. The student group presentations got significantly better as we proceeded through the course. (Initially, they were to a significant degree a mere repetition of the lectures and class discussions, but about half-way through the course, the students really took them to another level, really bringing in new topics that we had never mentioned in class. It was really the initiative of one particular group presenting on Cambodia that made this change. Subsequent groups were never quite as good, but definitely saw something of an exemplar in the Cambodia group. I think next time we can make our expectations on the group presentations clearer from the beginning, especially that they bring something to the table beyond the lectures, readings, and discussions.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSE - Blackboard discussions, as I said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU - And, the lack of any real personal connection among the students, as discussed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46. Changes for future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSE - I think both professors should engage in the non-class discussions with students. My students definitely saw it as a drawback that we didn’t. I would attempt a better non-class communication between students. I would also introduce admission criteria for the course, selecting students with a certain level of English. There were a couple of first year students who attended but could not really participate in the discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU - I would leave the basic structure of the course material unchanged, but give some additional thought to these outside-of-class interactions as discussed repeatedly above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47. Technical support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of my early insights from the COIL institute workshops was that the majority of the work required to develop and implement a GNL course was similar to that required for any online or hybrid course. And typical with my experience assisting non-GNL faculty, most of this work was performed up front in the design/development phase. Intercultural interactivities can be treated as any other learning goals and so follows the same process to develop effective activities based on proper alignment of teaching strategies to assessments to technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GNL aspects of the course were related to choosing appropriate intercultural learning goals and working with faculty and logistics that involved another campus, culture, language, course and time zone issues. This makes the faculty-instructional designer collaboration a little more complicated but not unlike other online courses. Many of the course design and logistics issues were simplified with the decision to use classroom videoconferencing as the central mode of interaction for the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48. International programs person

This is the first time the Office of Global and International Strategies has partnered with faculty to support a globally networked course. We are in the process of learning how to better support such efforts. We see challenges but there are also lots of potential to expand learning across cultures in creative ways so we are eager to see how far ahead we can enable this in Mason.

HSE - no international programmes person participated.

49. Time commitment

HSE - development of the course did not take longer than it normally does with any other course.

GMU - I would agree. Things were more compressed than one would have liked for extraneous reasons (i.e. I broke my leg and ankle severely at precisely the point in the spring when I would have ideally devoted time to preparing the course.)

50. Was it worth it?

Absolutely worth it. We already plan to teach the course again. I (Steve) am not sure about developing another new course along these lines--not because I did not get something out of it, but because I am not sure if it would fit into the range of courses I feel a need to teach. I will certainly think about it. I would particularly like teaching a graduate-level seminar in a connected classroom like this, but the logistical hurdles may be too high in that case. (For example, doing so with a Russian university would be impossible, as the nature of our graduate student body demands that all history graduate seminars are taught from 7-10pm at night--in other words starting somewhere between 3-4am in Russia.)

HSE: my other videoconference course was at postgraduate level on our side, but undergraduate on the American side. This simply did not work. A common post grad seminar in history would be really great, but obviously this cannot be done.

Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

We created this new course on how states and societies coped (or didn’t) with the aftermath of mass violence with the intention that it would run largely like a traditional face-to-face course but with the two classrooms joined into a single classroom via video conference. We were largely satisfied with the course and with the use of video conference and face-to-face methodology. Neither of the faculty had experience with teaching online courses and were mostly uncomfortable with using that type of methodology for this course.

Immediately prior to the beginning of the course, the first of a few logistical obstacles occurred. The course at HSE was relocated from one building to another. While on most U.S. university campuses, this would be a minor hassle, it was more serious at HSE where the university is spread among a number of different locations across the city of Moscow. It can easily take an hour to get from one HSE building to another. As a result, enrollment was lower than initially expected at HSE, as some students who would have otherwise taken the course were no longer able to do so simply for geographic reasons. In the end, this left us with a large imbalance in the size of classes with 30 students at George Mason and generally around 10 at HSE. (The HSE numbers changed during the course as the dropout rate was unexpectedly high.) The primary impact was on our group presentation assignments. We had hoped to have groups of four or five comprised of approximately 50% Russian and American students. In the end, we went with larger than ideal groups of eight in order to ensure that no Russian
student would be the sole Russian student in a group. The size of the groups may have been one feature that had the students work on their “group” projects in a more “individual” fashion than we would have preferred. (See below.)

George Mason started classes approximately 2 ½ weeks earlier than HSE. We very much wanted the students to start on the same level, so the GMU classroom devoted this time to some getting-to-know-you activities, some discussion of Russian history and culture, and the preparation of small group presentations on the daily life of a “typical” George Mason student for presentation to the HSE class during our first meeting. Relatively little on the substance of the class was discussed during this first period. This gave the GMU classroom a bit of a feeling of “suspended animation” during these initial class periods as we really were biding time until the class came together.

The HSE class met once separately before the first meeting together. The first joint session was largely devoted to introductions to the professors and via the presentations on student life. The HSE students had not as much time to prepare these as the GMU students. (One of the GMU groups had even created a video introduction complete with some touring around the campus.) Nonetheless, I think it gave the students a little sense of life at the other university. Unfortunately, the class size was really too large to get the students acquainted on an individual basis through this activity.

Next we started the series of case studies that made up the heart of the course. Generally, the case studies were divided into four class sessions each (with a few modifications due to holidays and Hurricane Sandy interruptions). The first session was devoted to an introductory lecture by one of the faculty members. The second was separate group discussions in each of our two classrooms. The third was a joint class discussion. The final session was a group student presentation. (Each student was assigned to a group for one of the five case studies.) The cases discussed in order were South Africa after Apartheid, Europe after the Holocaust, Cambodia after the Khmer Rouge, the United States after lynchings, and Russia after Stalinism. We specifically left our two countries for last in order to let the students approach the topic on more neutral ground before launching into potentially more sensitive discussion of our own countries.

The joint class discussions were for me (Steve) the highlight of the course. I found the level of student engagement in the discussions to be quite high with participation from large portions of both classrooms. As a group, the Russian students held their own and were quite easily understood by the American students. I do not think this was always the case in the other direction. I repeatedly reminded the American students to speak slow, loud, and clear, but they still often spoke too quickly or too quietly and were often bringing in pop culture references that probably were not easily understood by the Russian students. (I think particularly of one students extended comparison with American football with which Russian students are unlikely to be familiar enough to have followed the full measure of his analysis.) Hopefully at least reminding the American students frequently of these kinds of things had some impact in opening their minds to how one must communicate with people from outside their own country.

/On the HSE part I (Irina) agree with Steve's appreciation of the joint class discussions. HSE students had an additional benefit from them, that of improving their English. They all started to understand American students better by the end (there has never been any problem understanding the lectures). They also started to communicate better, as they felt less shy about their language. I would still try to select students with better English next time./

In addition, during each case study, students were required to write one original response to the assigned readings on Blackboard and to respond to at least one other student’s post. Due to the size of the class, we created two discussion boards for each case study and assigned students to one or the other. After the first case study, we tried to institute a requirement that students respond to the post of a student from the other university. This did not work as well as hoped. The Russian students were a bit less active in the discussion
boards, and at times American students complained that they had no post from a Russian student to which to respond. All in all, the discussion boards were the least successful part of the course. I (Steve) do not believe I was clear enough with the students about expectations, and I never fully settled for myself the question of whether and how much I should be part of the discussions. I simultaneously worried about being an overly dominant voice in the discussion that I hoped would be free flowing while also failing to provide the feedback that would impress on students the importance of the activity. If we continue this practice in the next course iteration, improvements need to be made.

/HSE students made it clear to me (Irina) that they would have appreciated our interventions, comments, suggestions. They said that in other classes such interventions by professors invariably made the discussions more interesting and valuable. It's a pity that this conversation happened only after we finished the course./

Finally, during each case study, the students that created the group presentation were required to write a short paper devoted mostly to the subject matter but also including a page on the work process of the group. We each graded these separately, and I (Steve) was mostly disappointed in the quality of the papers. Again, here, I think I was not clear enough about expectations, and students did not take the papers as seriously as I would have liked.

/Exactly the same at HSE. The papers were not great, as the students did not try very hard: there was definitely a feeling that by completing the "joint" part of what they needed to do by participating in discussions and presentations and writing in the blackboard they have made a fair contribution to the course which was not obligatory. Papers were perceived as an extra and not very exiting burden. We'll have to think how to make this task more interesting for the students./f

We also asked the students to discuss the process of creating the group presentations during the Q&A session following their presentation. Here we learned that the students were largely handling the assignment individually and contact was asynchronous mostly by e-mail. Basically, the students split up the assignment into eight discrete topics and each student essentially did an individual presentation on that topic. This was one area where we had really hoped for student interaction across classrooms, and it largely did not occur. It is an important area for improvement next time.

In early November, we ran into the biggest logistical hurdle in the course. We had failed to anticipate the impact of the change in Russian law in 2011 that eliminated the winter time change. As a result, once daylight savings time ended in the United States, the time difference between GMU and HSE changed from eight to nine hours and the course was no longer scheduled to occur at the same time. Since I (Steve) had often arrived early for the class, I knew that there was nobody using the GMU classroom before our class meeting. In addition, I knew from early discussions that none of the students in the GMU class had an earlier class. As such, I forced the GMU students to start one hour earlier (going from a 9:00am start time to an 8:00 start time). This was mostly handled smoothly, though the number of students arriving late increased after the change and absenteeism rose slightly. (For one student, I had to make special arrangements as she was a divorced mother who needed to be home to get her children off to school and could not reliably arrive before 8:30. She was one of the best students in the class, and she handled the issues splendidly.) I obviously felt I could not penalize the students for absence and lateness, as this was quite a sacrifice on their part given almost no GMU classes start before 9am.

/The Russian students were very grateful for this sacrifice on the part of the Americans/

Hurricane Sandy and a variety of holidays in each country through the month of November also caused some shifting around of schedules. As a result, one additional class session was devoted to the US case study in the GMU classroom; and one additional class session was devoted to the Russian case study in the HSE classroom. We were also left with only a single class session for wrap-up after finishing the case studies.

Final assignments were handled separately. GMU students wrote a final paper in which they were instructed to advise a fictitious country emerging from a situation of mass violence on how they should cope with the
problem. They were to draw on specific evidence from the case studies in making their case. They also took a written final exam which was primarily focused on judicial versus non-judicial methods of coping with the aftermath of mass violence. On the whole, I (Steve) was pleased with the results of these final assignments, as the students showed good familiarity with basic concepts we had studied, with the various case studies, and with drawing together elements from multiple historical examples in analyzing and making an argument.

Russian students did not have a final exam, but had a colloquium instead. It was an interesting reflection of what they learnt from the course. The most important conclusion of the discussion was that there were no simple solutions to coping with violence.

Section 10: Student Feedback

Unfortunately, Steven Barnes is on research leave and out of the country this semester. As such, he does not have access to the student evaluations no doubt sitting in his mailbox at George Mason. We did spend the last joint session of the course in discussion with the students about what worked and what didn’t. Like Irina mentions below, I found the students on the whole quite positive about the course with some specific criticisms, especially as Irina notes on the issue of personal contact with the Russian students. Clearly there is some desire for personal contact, but it needs to be easy enough that the students are willing to fit it into their busy schedules.

I (Steve) do have access online to the numerical data on course evaluations done by the American students. Particular areas of note (all responses have a maximum score of 5):

1) On the statement, “the course was well organized,” the students gave a 4.10 where the department average was 4.57 and the university average 4.42. This no doubt came from two things. First, we were a little disorganized at the beginning as HSE suddenly had the course relocated to a different part of Moscow, creating upheaval for Irina in enrollment. As a result, we were making a number of shifts as the course started to deal with a mismatch in class size. (30 at GMU and in the end around 10 at HSE). This caused us to rethink some of our assignments. Second, after the U.S. changed time in early November, we suddenly realized that our synchronous course was no longer synchronous as Russia recently eliminated the bi-annual time changes. As a result, for the last month of the semester, the George Mason class was pushed back from a 9am to 8am start-time. Only a small number of classes at George Mason start before 9am and this was seen as a major imposition by students, but given our classroom was empty prior to our class, it was easier to move the GMU class than it would have been to move the HSE class.

2) On the statement, “the instructor showed respect for the students,” the students gave a 4.95 where the department average was 4.76 and the university average 4.71. I think this speaks to the rapport in the classroom while discussing difficult topics.

3) On the statement, “the instructor made the course intellectually stimulating,” the students gave a 4.95 where the department average was 4.47 and the university average 4.32. Hopefully this means the students felt that they were forced to think.

4) On the statement, “the instructor encouraged the students to be actively involved in the material through discussion, assignments, and other activities,” the students gave a 4.95 where the department average was 4.40 and the university average 4.43. This is particularly gratifying given the nature of the video-conference class could have led to student disengagement, especially given that we were often running group discussions involving some 40 students.

5) On “my overall rating of the teaching,” the students gave a 4.75 where the department average was 4.53 and the university average 4.37.
6) On “my overall rating of the course,” the students gave a 4.37 where the department average was 4.35 and the university average 4.17. The distinction between the teaching rating and the course rating is worth thinking about and probably reflects a lot on point (1) above.

Of course, we will learn more once we see their narrative comments.

Irina Filatova is in South Africa and is unable to provide such evaluations either. However both during the course and at its end the students said that they found it very interesting and useful. Each lecture ended with applause. However, they found that preparation and travel took too much of their time (for an optional course). They also said that they were disappointed by the fact that there was very little personal contact.
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Abstract

Intercultural Communication in the Global Classroom was a globally networked course designed to bring intercultural communication theory to practice for students at the State University of New York (SUNY) Geneseo and Moscow State University (MSU). While student partners differed in their institutional affiliations, major areas of study, academic year, and national culture, they were united in their quest for knowledge regarding intercultural communication. The collaboration which was comprised of thirty-three students took place over an eight-week period between February and April of 2012. Students and faculty members communicated synchronously and asynchronously through various online channels to meet their learning objectives. Students worked in culturally diverse teams. Each work team was challenged to create social advertisements for each of the partnering cultures. For organizational purposes, the course was divided into five modules and delivered using Moodle as a learning management system. In addition to the project tasks, students were required to complete a pre-task activity and post-task activities. Pre-task activities encouraged relational development whereas post-task activities emphasized critical and reflective thinking. The course experience exceeded the faculty team’s expectations and proved to be a valuable, high impact and transformational learning experience for students and faculty alike. While we learned to bring various intercultural communication theories to practice, expanded our knowledge of Russian and U.S. culture, and developed mindfulness, we also developed skills in teamwork, public speaking, listening, interpersonal communication, and computer-mediated communication, competencies that continue to be central to our personal and professional relationships.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication in the Global Classroom</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>We targeted seniors but the course was open to any year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Information and Computer Technology in Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>Moscow State University</td>
<td>Foreign Languages and Regional Studies</td>
<td>The course targeted Sophomores.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th>Name: Meredith Harrigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th>Name: Mira Bergelson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Moscow State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Foreign Languages and Regional Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th>Name: Becky Lewis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Assistant Provost for International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #4</th>
<th>Name: Corey Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Systems Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Milne Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Spring, 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

SUNY Geneseo: 16
MSU: 17
**Section 2: Issues of Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Primary language of most students in each class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was divided between English and Russian. The primary language of SUNY Geneseo students was English. Although, one student was bilingual in English and Russian. The primary language of most MSU students was Russian, yet they were all fluent in English and many, if not all, were multilingual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Language of the course collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the collaboration took place entirely in English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Language fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students were very fluent in English. Linguistic differences never seemed to become problematic. If anything, differences in communication styles and/or nonverbal communication were more impactful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Language proficiency difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (Meredith) do not believe that language differences were impactful to our collaboration. As I mentioned above, differences in communication styles or nonverbal communication seemed to be more challenging, yet not problematic, for students to negotiate. From Mira’s perspective, though MSU students had quite different level of English they did not complain, and I did not feel that English was of any problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3: Curricular Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Online or blended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was a hybrid course that blended asynchronous outside-of-class communication with synchronous communication during class meetings via video conferencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. For how many weeks did your classes collaborate?
Our collaboration took place for 8 weeks, from February 22, 2012 through April 18, 2012.

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period
There was much preparation and communication between the instructors, actually, working out all the details, goals, tasks, instruments as well as logistics of the joint activities (videoconferences). We were communicating with each other via Skype during the course period as well. Usually it would take place after a videoconference between our classes, so that this follow up would allow us to exchange opinions, check experiences and sum up what we achieved and what must be corrected.

SUNY Geneseo students started their semester on January 18th, therefore we had plenty of time to discuss intercultural communication theories and concepts that would relate to our collaboration. For example, we discussed units on the following topics prior to the start of our collaboration:

- Why Study Intercultural Communication
- Striving for Engaged and Effective Intercultural Communication
- Culture, Communication, Power, and Context
- White Privilege
- Language and Intercultural Communication
- Nonverbal Codes and Cultural Space

MSU’s semester began much closer to the start of the collaboration. Students enrolled in this course took previous course work on Intercultural Theory which provided important foundational material for our collaboration.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools
Faculty members required students to use certain channels, whereas students were also asked to use channels to maintain communication among members of the work teams. Moodle was used as our learning management system. The channels faculty members required students to use include: (a) discussion boards via Moodle, (b) Voicethread, and (c) Animoto. Students tended to favor social networking sites including facebook and the Russian site В контакте (=Vcontacte).

15. Server location
Moodle was provided through Moscow State University. Voicethread and Animoto are cloud-based.

16. Technical problems
We did not encounter significant problems. However, there were lessons we learned for more effective implementation in the future. For example:
- when collecting video-based work as we did using Animoto, collect hyperlinks to their videos rather than the videos themselves.
- stay aware of browser differences because they often impact the functionality of certain technologies.
• when collecting photographs for students as we did using Voicethread, collect saveable pictures rather than links.
• consider the impact of system upgrades on the functionality of certain technologies. SUNY Geneseo went through a system upgrade during our collaboration which impacted our ability to access a Russian website including Moodle.
• stay aware of what we referred to as the “new” digital divide. We found that Geneseo and MSU students seemed to frequent social networking sites differently. In turn, students had different expectations regarding the frequency and timeliness of interactions. Different access to or use of Smartphones was the main factor that contributed to the differences.

17. Frequency of use

There were four specific instances when students were asked to use the faculty imposed (i.e., discussion boards, Animoto, and Voicethread) technologies for class purposes. First, during the first two modules of the course, students were asked to use the discussion board to post personal reflections about their learning. Second, students had to create and share with their classmates a self-introduction video using Animoto. Third, students were asked to use Voicethread to engage in the DIVE (Describe, Interpret, Verify, Educate) Exercise. This assignment required students to post a culture-specific picture to be the focus of the interpretation as well as post audio commentary about their interpretation of their teammates’ picture. Fourth, each team was asked to use Animoto to create a video that encapsulated the identity of the team.

Students used social networking sites and other preferred channels based on their need. Each student was part of a team that was charged with completing a project. Thus, they needed to interact as frequently as needed to complete their work. We did not track the number of exchanges students had using media of their choice.

18. Informal communication

We did not track the frequency of students’ informal communication. However, it was evident from their class-to-class interaction that they had developed friendships. Thus, our assumption is that social networking sites or other media of choice were regularly used by them to informally communicate.

19. Re-use

Yes. Our overall assessment of the course is that it functioned well. Therefore, we would continue to use these channels but make necessary adjustments to their implementation as noted in our answer to #18.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

We had four class-to-class videoconferences. To conduct these conferences we used the Tandberg Edge 95 System to connect. According to a campus technology specialist, Bill Meyers, “It is an IP based system and if set up for DHCP could basically plug into any network port on campus to be ready to make a connection. It uses the H.323 protocol, and can handle up to a 2 Mbps connection.” We chose to use this system rather than using Skype to connect due to success we have had with it in previous videoconferences.

Students were given access to SUNY Geneseo’s Skype Premium account in order to conduct a team meeting in Module 4 of the course. The purpose of this meeting was to provide students with the opportunity to offer feedback to one another in a face-to-face and small-group, setting.
21. Server location

The Tandberg System is owned by SUNY Geneseo. Although Skype is cloud-based, SUNY Geneseo’s Department of Communication owned the Premium account.

22. Technical problems

We didn’t encounter significant problems. Although, we think it would have been more productive if students connected for their team meeting using their chosen channel. For example, we originally assumed that each teammate (typically four students) would be meeting at their own personal location. The large number of connecting points would necessitate an appropriate technology such as Skype Premium. However, we found that meetings were often conducted between only two computers, one shared by two SUNY Geneseo students and one shared by two MSU students. Therefore, our requirements of having them log on through the SUNY Geneseo Communication Department account and, in turn, necessary, scheduling of meetings, appeared to be unnecessary. In short, we complicated the process.

23. Frequency of use

We had four class-to-class video conferences. Outside of these conferences, students were only required to meet in real time with their teammates one time, via Skype.

24. Informal communication

The first class-to-class videoconference was designed for the collaborators to meet one another. Thus, it was mainly social in form and function. The following three class-to-class videoconferences involved student presentations. Therefore, they were centered on the course project. However, we did incorporate the opportunity for questions, feedback, and brief small talk in each conference. The required team videoconference was project-related in that students were to use this time to provide project-related feedback to one another. However, since it appears that students developed friendships with their teammates, we can assume that they also took some time to interact informally.

25. Re-use

I (Meredith) would suggest that we continue with the Tandberg system for class-to-class videoconferences. However, I would suggest that although we make Skype Premium available to student groups, we give them the opportunity to choose a videoconferencing channel that best meets their needs.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

Our disciplinary learning goals and intercultural awareness were one in the same since this course focused on Intercultural Communication. We chose to have each faculty member access her own students based on the specific criteria she created. The criteria were consistent with the norms and values of their professor, department, and academic institution.

27. Common assessment rubric

No, we used individual rubrics to assess our home students.
28. Assessment outcomes

NA

29. Peer assessment

No, we did not. However, during three of the class-to-class videoconferences, students were asked to share their reflections about their intercultural communication processes. These reflections serve as self and peer assessment.

30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

We did not.

31. Attrition

None of the enrolled students withdrew from the course. However, one or two students on my (Mira’s) side needed additional stimulation to make their part of teamwork on time.

32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

In my (Meredith’s) courses, I typically have a low withdrawal rate. A typical course would see 0 or 1 student withdraw. For me, (Mira), the positive effect was that Russian students did feel more responsibility and obligation before their international partners. And I did ‘exploit’ this stressing that their class must look good and act responsibly.

Section 7: Institutional Support

33. Type of support

SUNY Geneseo

- Financial support for travel was offered through our Office of International programs when support was unavailable through COIL. This support allowed us to attend and present our work at the COIL conference.
- Administrative support was offered by allowing me (Meredith) to have a smaller than normal class size. This support was necessary for the quality of collaboration we sought.
- Technical support was offered by both our Instructional Design Team and members of CIT (Computer & Information Technology). The Instructional Design team was critical in helping us develop many of the online activities we implemented into the course. CIT was critical to making the class-to-class video conferences run smoothly. In future offerings, I (Meredith) would find value in having access to improved technology such as desk-based microphones, dual projection screens, and rotating cameras.

MSU

MSU input was technical and administrative: I was allowed to travel to NYC for the seminar, then I had good technical support with videoconferences. There was financial support for me to fly to NYC by the partner institution (SUNY, Geneseo) and a lot of pedagogical and technical support by the COIL program and its leaders: Craig Little, Prof. Christiansen (?), COIL Director Jon Rubin and John Fowler.

34. Engagement with the international programs office

At SUNY Geneseo, the Office of International Programs was involved in the identification of a potential
international partner and has supported travel costs for both faculty. At MSU, NONE. The SUNY-MSU Center Director was interested how this course could be useful for their image, but did nothing.

### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

At SUNY Geneseo, the Office of International Programs considers this initiative as very relevant to its work, so much so that Geneseo has become a member of COIL’s Nodal Network. The OIP, the Provost, and many faculty are excited by the potential of globally networked learning.

At MSU, I (Mira) assume yes, but they are not engaged at the department level. In terms of being a vector of internationalization, yes, they are, but there are too many levels of bureaucracy.

### 36. Commitment

My (Meredith’s) understanding is that SUNY Geneseo is committed to globally networked initiatives. As such, our participation in the COIL institute was initiated by The Office of International Programs. Although our Department supports these initiatives, I don’t believe it is considered a primary goal of ours.

It was commitment by my (Mira) Chair – Prof. Alla Nazarenko and our former Dean Prof. Svetlana Ter-Minasova. Actually, the mission of our Chair/Department is exactly to develop and give globally networked courses. And our course is just one of the several examples. Probably, the most accomplished and substantial case, but there is one more global course and a few international distance-learning programs as well.

### 37. Future iterations

The course only ran once, in the spring of 2012.

### 38. New globally networked courses

Yes, at SUNY Geneseo, a few faculty members are in the process of proposing a globally networked course. At MSU, Mira is currently participating in another globally networked course.

### 39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

At SUNY Geneseo, we have not had explicit conversations about this process. At MSU, everyone will be happy to repeat it with or without slight changes. As for expanding and due to the fact of rigid curriculum at MSU, it will demand approaching deans of other departments and probably the office of international programs, which will entail so much bureaucracy with no guarantee of success that I am not much interested to go to them.

### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

Because I (Meredith) haven’t had an explicit conversation with administrators at SUNY Geneseo, I cannot assess their commitment.

My (Mira’s) institution is very interested in continuing this kind of international classes of distance-learning or better say, of integrating telecommunication technologies in the instruction process.
### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Continued financial and administrative support would be most helpful to the development of globally networked learning at SUNY Geneseo. In terms of financial support, faculty would need to attend conferences and workshops that center on cross-cultural courses, co-teaching, and online technologies. Additional, as I responded in #36, I believe we would need additional technology to enhance the flow of the course and, in turn, the learning experiences of the students. In terms of administrative support, we would continue to need approval to work with smaller than typical class sizes due. As a result, adjunct instructors might be necessary to cover the number of students we typically serve in a given semester, especially since we have a very large student to faculty ratio.

We, at MSU, need to develop procedures for incorporating these courses in the regular curriculum and make them available for students from different departments. But there is clear understanding of the importance of such international technology-based initiatives.

### Section 8: Reflections

#### 42. Goals set

When we first met at the Global Center, we created the following shared learning goals:

1. To demonstrate the ability to navigate intercultural communication across different contexts.
2. To demonstrate an in-depth understanding of communication processes associated with cultures previously underexplored by students.
3. To demonstrate an understanding of mindful communication.
4. To demonstrate mindful communication in a cross-cultural interaction.

#### 43. Goals achieved

We believe we did an effective job of meeting these goals. Most impressive to me was our accomplishment of goals #3 and #4. As I reflect on the course, what stands out in my memory are the many conversations I had with students that reflected their increased mindfulness of their own communication processes. Although students might have initially thought our main goal was to increase their knowledge of Russian communication, the outcome we hoped to (and did) achieve was increased knowledge and understanding of their own communication. Numerous times during the course, students would come to me newly aware of the role culture plays in communication to discuss how best to negotiate communication differences.

#### 44. Most unique aspect for students

The ability to bring theory to practice made this course unique. We were fortunate in that the content of the course (i.e., Intercultural Communication) is itself the heart of globally networked courses. Thus, students had a first-hand opportunity to apply the various theories and concepts they were learning in class.

#### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The arrangement of students in culturally diverse work teams. Each team included at least two MSU students and 2 Geneseo students. The team arrangement “forced” them to interact across cultural lines.
## 46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

None come to mind for either faculty member.

## 47. Changes for future iterations

I (Meredith) believe the course ran effectively and would make few changes to the course. We might consider allowing students more freedom in choosing synchronous channels of communication for team meetings. I also like the suggestion Mira makes below about adding “traditional knowledge-providing activities” to allow students to learn not only through the process of their practical work, but also from engaging with each faculty member.

I (Mira) very much like our design that combines teamwork by international small groups, joint videoconferences to exchange the results of the group work, result-oriented activities and other aspects. It could be nice to add some more traditional knowledge-providing activities like mini-lectures.

## 48. Technical support

Corey

One of the things that was different for this course was the scope of my involvement. In the past, when working with faculty, my role usually involved brainstorming on specific tools that could be used to increase student engagement and participation. However, with this course, in addition to brainstorming on different tools, I was involved with the design and structure of modules in Moodle (LMS used for the course). After the initial design of the course modules, I provided suggestions and comments specifically focusing on workflow from a student point-of-view (who were from two different cultures and time zones) that the modules were easy to navigate and the instructions for each module were clear. I also tested all the links making sure they worked before opening the course to the students. It was a pleasure to work with such faculty who were very enthusiastic and supportive of the instructional designer. It was a creative and collaborative atmosphere throughout the entire process.

## 49. International programs person

In this project I (Becky) viewed my role as supporting the faculty and instructional designer so they could run the course. It was the first time we have run a globally networked course, so I cannot compare it to facilitating a globally networked course, but in comparison to facilitating a study abroad course, it was far easier and less stressful . . . no worries about flight delays or student behavior overseas. At the same time, I believe that students in this course may have had a more intercultural experience than many students do on a faculty-led study abroad course in that they had to work with students from another country on a shared project, making the experience more similar to a semester abroad program. At the same time, because of the experience and dedication of the faculty and instructional designers, and the support of our institution (provost, department chair), I did not have to do much, other than provide some financial support for travel.

## 50. Time commitment

I (Mira) think that as compared to a regular course I spent 50% more time. My students’ estimates are the same.

I (Meredith) agree with Mira that preparation and development of this course took approximately 1.5 the time of typical course prep. Much of the preparation time was dedicated to learning about new technologies and choosing the technologies that best matched our learning goals. Thus, time was spent
meeting with members of our Instructional Design Team” In addition, because we were, in a sense, co-
teaching the course, it was necessary to take time each week to meet in order to assure that our
expectations and instructions matched. Third, happily, I spent more time talking with students before
and after class as well as during office hours than I experience in a typical course.

51. Was it worth it?

From our conversations, it is evident that both faculty members strongly assert that our course was incredibly
valuable to both our students and our own learning and professional development. As such, we affirm that the
time and energy spent developing and delivering the course was time very well spent.

Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

Intercultural Communication in the Global Classroom was a globally networked course designed and developed
to bring intercultural communication theory to practice for students at the State University of New York (SUNY)
Geneseo and Moscow State University (MSU). Faculty Members, Administrators, and Instructional Designers
collaborated to create a high impact and potentially transformational learning experience for all those involved.
While student partners differed in their institutional affiliations, major areas of study, academic year, and
national culture, among other qualities, they were united in their quest for knowledge regarding intercultural
communication.
The collaboration was comprised of thirty-three students took place over an eight-week period between
February and April of 2012. Students and faculty members communicated synchronously and asynchronously to
meet their learning objectives which consisted of the ability (a ) to demonstrate navigation intercultural
communication across different contexts, (b) to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of communication
processes associated with cultures previously underexplored by students, (c) to demonstrate an understanding
of mindful communication, and (d) to demonstrate mindful communication in a cross-cultural interaction. The
collaboration was structured into five modules and delivered using Moodle as a learning management system.
Moodle was made available to faculty and students by Moscow State University and met the needs of the
course well.

Each enrolled student was placed in a working team comprised of both SUNY Geneseo and MSU students. The
course featured a total of eight teams. Each work team was challenged to create a total of two social
advertisements, one for each of the partnering cultures. Teams were instructed to have the MSU students take
the lead in developing the social advertisement for Geneseo and, in turn, students from Geneseo were asked to
take the lead developing the social advertisement for Russian culture. Although students’ demonstration of
mindful intercultural communication was a primary learning objective assumed to be accomplished through the
teamwork methodology, the nature of this specific task required students to develop cultural knowledge and
use that knowledge mindfully in their creative work. For example, each team’s choice of topic, text, image, and
channel should be made only after carefully considering the norms, values, attitudes, and perspectives of their
partner culture.

For organizational purposes, the course was divided into five modules with each module centered on a certain
step in course project. For example, Module #1 asked students to make important decisions such as whom they
would target and what they will have as the subject of their social advertisement. Module #2 involved
information gathering. In particular, students were asked to collect necessary data in preparation for their
creative work. Module #3 centered on the creation of first drafts. Module #4 centered on revisions. Finally,
Module #5 asked students to finalize their social advertising and present it to the class. To encourage students’
active participation and critical thinking throughout the collaboration, they were required to complete a pre-task
activity and post-task activity for each module. The pre-task activities encouraged relational development whereas the post-task activities emphasized critical and reflective thinking. Pre-task activities included creating and sharing self-introductory videos using Animoto (for Module #1), creative metaphorical backpacks of culture for each partnering culture (for Module #2), engaging in team videoconferences (for Module #3), engaging in the DIVE (Describe, Interpret, Verify, and Educate) exercise via Voicethread (for Module #4), and creating team videos again using Animoto (for Module #5). Post-task activities included written participation in discussion forums and oral participation in class-to-class videoconferences. Students were asked to consider what they have learned about their partner’s culture as well as about intercultural communication.

As is experienced with any course, at times, students struggled with motivation, deadlines, and understanding. However, for the vast majority of the collaboration, students demonstrated active engagement and professionalism. In many ways, the course experience exceeded the faculty team’s expectations. For instance, first, the social advertisements that students produced were sophisticated, professionally constructed, and carefully crafted using the cultural knowledge they gained during their collaboration. The social advertisements covered a large variety of topics ranging from eating disorders to smoking to elder care. Second, and perhaps most importantly, students frequently demonstrated mindfulness in terms of their own communication. Through this process, students’ accomplished the faculty members’ “hidden” agenda of having them learn about themselves as they engaged in this intellectual journey centered on learning about others. Students mindfulness was often followed by appropriate self-monitoring, effective perception-checking and careful negotiation of differences in communication styles.

From a technological perspective, the course functioned smoothly. As we began this pursuit we anticipated technological glitches, However in our actual experience, technological glitches were few and far between. No one technological challenge disrupted the course or threatened the learning outcomes. However, the glitches we did experience resulted in important lessons for the faculty to keep in mind as they prepare for future globally networked courses. For example, we learned to be aware of the potential impact that browser differences and system updates can have. For example, at one point in the course, a system update prevented Geneseo students from accessing “ru” websites from a campus computer. The problem was quickly identified and remedied with the assistance of our CIT (Computer & Information Technology) staff. In addition, we learned to carefully consider the advantages and disadvantages associated with various methodologies for submitting work. For example, to navigate space limitations, we learned that students should submit hyperlinks to videos rather than supply the videos themselves. The lessons learned were appreciated and will be valuable in future preparation. Central to the success of the course was the variety of support we received from a multitude of sources. For instance, our class-to-class video conferences functioned effectively due to the support of our Computer and Technology professionals. The innovative assignments students completed were created as a result of collaboration between faculty members and instructional designers and attendance at workshops offered by COIL at the Global Center. Attendance at conferences was also vital to the construction of the course which was enabled by funding from COIL and campus administration. Additionally, quality interactions between faculty and students were made possible as a result of having departmental support which resulted in a relatively small class size. As we move forward to develop and deliver additional globally networked courses, continued support will remain crucial. Financial support to attend conferences and workshops as well as to enhance current technology will be especially important.

In ending, Intercultural Communication in the Global Classroom, a globally networked course between SUNY Geneseo and MSU, proved to be a valuable, high impact and transformational learning experience for students and faculty alike. While we learned to bring various intercultural communication theories to practice, expanded our knowledge of Russian and U.S. culture, and were reminded of the importance of mindfulness, we also developed skills in teamwork, public speaking, listening, interpersonal communication, and computer-mediated communication, which are all competencies that continue to be central to our personal and professional relationships.
Section 10: Student Feedback

(From Meredith) Most of the comments center on the evaluation of the professor. However, what follow are comments about the course itself:

- “I loved this class. I was engaged in the projects from start to finish. I definitely learned a lot about intercultural communication.”
- “The class definitely was challenging, but doable. Hard work is expected and if you put in the time and effort, you will do well.”

However, in the reflective analyses that SUNY Geneseo students submitted at the completion of the collaboration, they frequently and enthusiastically spoke to the valuable role the course played in their learning. I (Mira) don’t have any formal evaluations – they are not, unfortunately, part of our routine at MSU. But I heard from many of the students how much they enjoyed the course, how interesting it was etc. Recently, a year after the course, I got a thank-you from a student one more time. They always stress that it was an interesting, motivating and new experience. And they value it.
22. South Africa-Denmark-USA: Music

Abstract

Using elements of Jazz - improvisation and managing uncertainty - the North Carolina Central University (NCCU)-University of South Africa, Pretoria (UNISA)-Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, (RAMA) COIL Fellows share research in planning and implementing a course between the largest of the 23 COIL Institute teams. Fellows from each cohort - joined by students from the course participating via live stream - outline the inherent problems and solutions encountered in the design and implementation of a GNLE amongst three countries. Team fellows will discuss the two-tiered course design that facilitated tackling insurmountable challenges for successful course outcomes, and the presentation will reveal student cultural competencies in class video footage and project samples.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz! Born in America, Created internationally.</td>
<td>University of South Africa, Pretoria (UNISA)</td>
<td>Media Arts and Cultures</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended new &amp; pre-existing course: MUSL 1300 OL (Online); and MUSL 2940 Directed Study. Course Subtitle: Jazz! Born in America, Created Internationally</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University, (NCCU)</td>
<td>Discipline: Jazz</td>
<td>Undergraduate &amp; Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz! Born in America, Created internationally</td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus/Aalborg (RAMA)</td>
<td>Music Performance</td>
<td>Bachelor and Master students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Arisa Voges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of South Africa, Pretoria (UNISA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Director: Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Directorate Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Dr Charl du Plessis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Unisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Part-time contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Directorate Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #3</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Madeleine Short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer/Technical and administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of South Africa, Pretoria (UNISA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Administrative officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Directorate Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #4</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Sean Adams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of South Africa, Pretoria (UNISA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Subject Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Directorate Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #5</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Dr Mageshen Naidoo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of South Africa, Pretoria (UNISA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Deputy Director: Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Directorate Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #6</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Dan Reis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Instructional Designer/Technology support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member #7</td>
<td>Name: Lenora Helm Hammonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty, COIL Lead Fellow for team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University, (NCCU) Durham, NC USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #8</th>
<th>Name: Emmanuel O. Oritsejafor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University, (NCCU) Durham, NC USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Interim Chair, Department of Political Science, AND Director, Office of International Affairs - changed position to only Interim Chair near launch of course, Fall 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Department of Political Science, Office of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #9</th>
<th>Name: Lana Garland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Consultant, New Media &amp; Instructional Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Insibah Media, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Consultant to entire team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Affiliation through North Carolina Central University. Primarily worked at beginning of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #10</th>
<th>Name: Robert Trowers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty (support to Lenora Helm Hammonds). Assisted with Jazz History content of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University, (NCCU) Durham, NC USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Jazz Studies (Jazz History)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Jazz Studies, Department of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member #11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Baron Tymas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty (support to Lenora Helm Hammonds) Assisted with Jazz Theory and Performance concepts of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>North Carolina Central University, (NCCU) Durham, NC USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Interim Chair, Assistant Professor, Assistant Direcotr of Jazz Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Department of Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #12</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Keld Hosbond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, Denmark (RAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Head of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #13</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Jens Christian Kwella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, Denmark (RAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Jazz/Pop/Global Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #14</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Christian Vuust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, Denmark (RAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Jazz/Pop Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>Jan Trane Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role on Team:</strong></td>
<td>IT setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, Denmark (RAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Head of IT and Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department and/or Program:</strong></td>
<td>Adm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team Member #16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Sine Flarup Budtz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>IT design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, Denmark (RAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>IT developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Adm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Semester 2 - Fall 2012 Semester (NCCU, UNISA, RAMA)

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

Unisa: 15 students enrolled. NCCU: 26 students enrolled; RAMA: 10 enrolled

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

**UNISA:** Unusual for Unisa. Unisa is a distance learning university and the Directorate Music does not offer tuition. There are no students on campus.

**NCCU:** This is about normal for a course size for a distance education course, although of the courses where Lenora Helm Hammonds had been the principal instructor, this course was about 20% larger than her distance ed course enrollments. Additional students (about 3) were involved in track 2 (student performers), but not officially enrolled in the course. These students performed with UNISA students when they traveled with Lenora Helm Hammonds and Baron Tymas to South Africa for their International Jazz School, and participated and performed in the weekly sessions online and in face-to-face sessions with the students from RAMA

**RAMA:** Unusual - one of the first attempts to introduce distance learning as a tool for international classes. However the size of the class corresponds to normal ensemble teaching small-group classes.

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

Unisa: English, NCCU: English, RAMA: Danish /English

7. Primary language of most students in each class

Unisa: English/Afrikaans, NCCU: English, RAMA: Danish

8. Language of the course collaboration

Yes, our course was taught entirely in English.

9. Language fluency

All students were fluent in English from each institution.
10. Language proficiency difference

**Comment from Lenora:** The students at UNISA and NCCU were comfortable speaking and written communications. However, some students from RAMA did mention the language challenges only with regard to understanding subtleties in perception or description of experiences. The NCCU students did speak to me about trying to be careful in their comments, and/or live conversations so they would be understood by students in Denmark.

### Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?

**UNISA:** Fully online. Some face to face meetings and music-making during Unisa International Jazz School.

**RAMA & NCCU:** The course was offered in a blended format with both online and face-to-face meetings in the classroom with students and faculty.

12. Duration

Twelve weeks in total. Four weeks per institution.

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Yes, we had a two weeks of pre-course activities written into our syllabus. It is below:

*Pre-Week 1*

Pre-course Preparatory Tasks - NCCU/UNISA/RAMA
- Students complete review of introductory handouts
- Review Glossary for Syllabus,
- Set-up You Tube channel,
- Practice sessions on course website;
- Choose Listening Sample to share with class
- Find jazz venue to attend concert in Course Wk 2

*Pre-Week 2*

*Pre-Course Assignment: Icebreaker: “Who I Am in Music”*

Every student should submit or have begun work on the Icebreaker Task before the first class, with the intent for it to be due by Course Week 1.

### Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

LMS: Lore.com - used for communication with and between students, resource library, course calendar, and assignment submissions: 60%

Recorded class sessions: students not able to participate in the live class session were able to watch the class on-demand: 20%

YouTube: students viewed and created videos: 15%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Google Docs (Drive): Used for technical documentation to assist students with the technology: 5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Server location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud-based. We didn’t use an institution supported LMS because students from each institution were not able to get access to the other institution’s LMS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Technical problems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: Lore.com is a very new tool and they updated their product several times during the semester. The updates modified the layout of the site, changed the locations of several functions and led to confusion for the faculty and students. Important information, like assignments, were moved. We updated the technical documentation after a major update to help clarify where things were moved. Also, has a very different layout than traditional LMSs like Blackboard or Moodle. That may have led to additional confusion for the faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Frequency of use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lore.com: Use was inconsistent among the students. Some students from NCCU and RAMA used Lore during the live class sessions to recap important points, ask questions and socialize with the other students. UNISA students rarely (if ever) interacted on Lore. Students also posted assignments on Lore. Students were expected to use Lore regularly but those expectations may not have been clearly communicated. Recorded class sessions: Students were asked to view the recorded sessions if they didn’t participate in the live class session. YouTube: Students viewed YouTube videos created and posted by faculty and students throughout the semester. One assignment required students to create a video describing their experience with Jazz to other students. Additional videos not created by the faculty or students were also shared on Lore. Google Drive: Students were not required to use Google Drive but used it to access technical help documentation. The links to the help documentation were on Lore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Informal communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lore was chosen because of its potential for informal student interaction. The center piece of Lore is the Discussion where students can leave comments, resources, and questions for the class. There was also a way to chat with individual students from any institution at anytime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Re-use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lore.com: unsure - changes in the LMS layout causes disruption in the class. Lore has seem to mature since we began using it. The potential for easy student-to-student interactions is still appealing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used**

| **20. Tools** |
| Video conferencing facilities on each campus: 70% |
| Lore.com: Was used during the real-time video conferences to gather student text-based comments and... |
### 21. Server location

Each campus used its own video conferencing facilities and NCCU bridged the video streams. NCCU recorded the class sessions and made them available for those not able to participate in the live session. Lore.com is cloud-based.

### 22. Technical problems

A technical limitation was that students needed to be at a video conferencing facility to fully participate in the live class sessions. Students were able to view the live sessions from their own laptop but they were not able to audibly talk to the other students. They could text chat in real-time with the class on Lore.

### 23. Frequency of use

Video conference: Each campus communicated every week over video conference. If they weren’t able to participate in the video conference because they weren’t on campus, they were expected to watch the class session and participate in the conversations on Lore.

Yes, students at NCCU did connect synchronously online via chat with students from RAMA on Facebook, sharing song links, video links and comments. Students were not instructed that this was necessary, but did it on their own accord.

### 24. Informal communication

Video conference: Because the video conferences required presence in a video conferencing facility, informal video chats among students were not possible outside the regular class meeting time.

Lore: Lore was our venue for the students to communicate with each other and with the faculty. Students had access to any other student or faculty member in the course at any time on Lore. Students could post a message for the entire course or to individual students/faculty at any time on Lore. I think we could have done a better job of encouraging the interactions or create assignments that required interactions outside the regular class time.

### 25. Re-use

Video conference: Yes, we had no problems with the live video conference. The connection was reliable and worked on each campus. Any issues were handled by the professional staff at each location.

Lore: Unsure, the opportunity for informal interactions is appealing. If we did use it again, additional technical training should be a priority so students and faculty know to communicate with other students.

---

### Section 6: Assessment Information

#### 26. How?

The synchronous activities (online lectures/discussions), provided the best platform for the development of intercultural awareness as students from the different continents were able to interact and engage with one
27. Common assessment rubric

No, we created desired outcomes: the observations of the students demonstrating the following:

**Student Learning Outcomes (NCCU):**

Demonstrate ability to evaluate and compare listening samples of jazz repertoire.

Demonstrate ability to identify jazz styles.

Demonstrate ability to perform jazz repertoire.

Create a project using characteristic jazz elements.

Demonstrate understanding of impact of Jazz in respective cultures in the media.

**Course Competencies and Objectives: Upon successful completion of this course, student will be able to:**

Recognize the characteristic musical elements fundamental to jazz music;

Recognize names of jazz icons and artists in jazz in the global jazz community

Participate in a group collaboration representing Jazz music concepts of improvisation, solo and ensemble performance via creation of a group project.

**Student learning outcomes: (Royal Academy of Music, Aarhus, Denmark (cont’d.))**

For level 2:
- Ability to access and use tools to take part in jazz ensembles, jazz improvisation and possible composition in practice.
- Ability to understand the characteristics of jazz from South Africa, USA and Denmark
- Ability to be included independently in a musical context (with participating students from other countries)

For level 1
- Ability to recognize and describe tools needed to take part in jazz ensembles, jazz improvisation and possible composition.
  - Ability to understand the characteristics of jazz from South Africa, USA and Denmark

**UNISA**

**To know:**

Level I:
- Demonstrate the ability to evaluate and identify concepts in the jazz repertoire.
- Evaluate and compare listening samples of jazz
- Identify jazz styles from three continents

Level II:
- Demonstrate ability to create a project using characteristic jazz elements

**To do:**

Level I:
Demonstrate the ability to perform jazz repertoire and exhibit a basic knowledge of style and some improvisation.

Level II:
Demonstrate the ability to perform advanced jazz repertoire and improvisation.

**To be:**
Determining a definition for What is Jazz

28. Assessment outcomes

Students who participated expressed learning about Jazz, the cultural impact resulting from Jazz and the particular aspects of the Jazz music characteristic in each country.

29. Peer assessment
Yes, students gave feedback to other students on their performances, and compositions.

### 30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

Yes we did develop a charter or what we termed our “10 Golden Rules” for student interaction. It is as follows:

**10 Proposed GOLDEN RULES for the COIL course**

1. Have sensitivity and respect for cultural differences
2. Be honest and avoid plagiarism
3. Have an open mind for new ideas
4. Be creative in your approach
5. Submit on time
6. Listen Listen Listen to as much jazz as possible and know what you are listening to
7. Be spontaneous to react and comment other opinions, and be respectful to classmates and faculty as you comment. If there is a concern you would like to have addressed, please email the faculty at your school immediately.
8. Be proud of your own cultural heritage and write/think from that perspective
9. Music and the experience of it remains objective, therefore let your taste guide you
10. Always try and sing or play what you learn to apply your knowledge

**One more golden rule or thing to be aware of:**
Please note that English is a foreign language for Danish students and teachers. Please remember anyone can inadvertently say and write things that can be misunderstood. We may therefore sometimes need for others to speak slowly, using vocabulary that is not too advanced.

### 31. Attrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNISA</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMA</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

UNISA: No. Negative impact included: 1. Challenges with broadband internet. Students experienced challenges in online participation due to limited broadband internet access (poor connections). 2. Different time zones proved to be problematic. Synchronous activities for Unisa students fell during the later afternoon/early evening time period.

NCCU: Yes, students enrolled in distance education courses usually remain for the duration of the course.

RAMA: only very few comparable courses - drop-out rate higher than in ordinary courses

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

**UNISA**: Financial support from Unisa’s side was enabled through existing strategic project funding. Without this funding participation would not have been possible. Administrative support was limited because of the small size of the Directorate Music.

Technical: Each campus used their own video conferencing facilities. This helped greatly because our tests with consumer video conferencing tools were not successful due to inconsistent internet speeds across the institutions. It may have been useful if we could have used a campus LMS instead of using a cloud-based LMS. Using an institution LMS would have meant that some of the faculty/students would already know how to use it
- instead everyone was new to the LMS.

**RAMA:** Technical and Financial Support from Management - esp. salary for instructors - otherwise the course would not have been possible.

**NCCU:** Lenora Helm Hammonds: - From the very beginning, our senior administrator (Dean Carlton Wilson) and our Department of Music Interim Chair (Baron Tymas) and Director of Jazz Studies (Dr. Ira Wiggins) were enthusiastic about the opportunity of the proposed COIL project for our campus. In March, 2011, I traveled (using my personal funds) to NYC for the COIL conference of workshops and presentations from pilot projects. I received the time release to attend the conference, and administrative support to assist with the writing of the grant to respond to the RFP from COIL. At that time, the support was seen as faculty professional development. Once the grant application was awarded and NCCU was designated as lead partner, I was given a green light, and a directive to engage other faculty to assist with pedagogy and course design. I approached our Center for Teaching and Learning staff, and that initial conversation with our subsequent IT designer and specialist, Dan Reis, also garnered his enthusiastic response and, from his request, support from his supervisors - specifically to agree to time release for his availability to work on the COIL project.

The technical support at NCCU was also impactful for the success in facilitating the weekly online workshops. Our teleconference facility was made available each week, with assistance from a partner organization that set up the bridge connection between UNISA-NCCU-RAMA. So, in addition to the NCCU COIL Fellows, we had an “technical staff” of 2-4 additional persons per week involved with creating this weekly teleconference session.

The benefits of the financial and administrative support from senior administration in the grant application, planning stage, and trip to NYC in October for the COIL workshops was also key:

**Financial Support:** I was reimbursed for incidentals, meals and related travel costs related to the October travel to NYC, and to a related trip for research to the Distance Education conference in August, 2011 in Copenhagen, Denmark. This August 2011 trip was a significant milestone as it allowed relationship building with our Danish partner, Royal Academy of Music, who also had staff attending the conference. Another important demonstration of financial support from NCCU, which allowed relationship building and for facilitation of the Track 2 portion of our COIL syllabus was for NCCU faculty and students to travel to South Africa to participate in UNISA’s International Jazz School. And finally, as we prepare to attend the Capstone Conference, and in assessing our course to complete this Case Study, I have been allowed time release from course work to complete the necessary proposals, narratives and communication with international partners. I also have been granted financial support with coverage from NCCU for the registration fee and incidental travel costs.

**Administrative Support** also came in the form of recognition. As the collaboration moved through the various phases of conceptualization, weekly online meetings, planning and implementation, it became clear how labor intensive the project would be. NCCU created a buzz on the campus about the COIL collaboration and course, spotlighting it in the campus magazine, sending press releases and invitations to present the COIL course in technology symposiums on campus. The attention from senior administration raised the profile of the COIL collaboration and had an impact on faculty in other areas. Many faculty related to me of their being inspired to create or infuse curricula with global components or asked for feedback on new courses in development.

### 34. Engagement with international programs office

**NCCU:** Lenora Helm Hammonds - I learned of the RFP for the COIL project and intitiated contact with our Director of International Affairs, Emmanuel Oritsejafor. Dr. Oritsejafor had a Memorandum of Understanding in place with UNISA (in other areas outside of the Directorate of Music) for previous projects before the start of the COIL Project. When the COIL project was first being considered by NCCU, Dr. Oritsejafor identified the appropriate person at UNISA to approach to ask for their interest in the COIL collaboration. That person was Arisa Voges, and she approached her university and appropriate offices to begin discussions to establish the
collaborations, hiring the remaining parties at UNISA and appointing them to the project. Lenora also reached, through a professional musician colleague, the name of the international programs officer at RAMA. This person was Keld Hosbond, who repeated the same scenario as Ms. Voges, approaching the appropriate persons at RAMA, and identifying the team at RAMA best able to facilitate the collaboration. The international programs officers at each institution were key in connecting all parties.

**NCCU: Emmanuel Oritsejafor** - The international programs office at NCCU has been instrumental in the development of the project partnership between UNISA, NCCU, and the Royal School of Music in Denmark. The Office of International Affairs hope to sustain and strengthen the existing international partnership through other collaborative projects that will reinforce network teaching of jazz.

**UNISA:** Contact with NCCU was initiated through the international office at Unisa. Further contact was established when an NCCU contingent visited Unisa during the International Jazz School.

### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

**UNISA:** Partnership development is considered very important but internal structural matters are limited.

**NCCU:** The international programs office at NCCU has been instrumental in the development of the project partnership between UNISA, NCCU, and the Royal School of Music in Denmark. The Office of International Affairs hope to sustain and strengthen the existing international partnership through other collaborative projects that will reinforce network teaching of jazz.

**RAMA:** This program is considered very important as a strategic tool for extending distance learning based courses and to fulfilling the strategic goal of realizing a “global mindset” among students and staff.

### 36. Commitment

**NCCU:** Yes, for NCCU, enhancing our curriculum with global connections is a university-wide directive and a core element of our 2020 Strategic Plan. All areas of the college are encouraged to create programs to bring global engagement to curricula. As a result, the conversation with senior administration for support of the COIL project was easier than expected. However, because there were no programs on campus that had engaged a course design like the COIL project, a huge learning curve was encountered by the NCCU faculty to market the course to students. Additionally, the NCCU Distance Education Department had not encountered a course of this scope. So, in addition to the groundwork of the NCCU 2020 Strategic Plan for a globally enhanced curriculum creating a positive environment initiating the COIL collaboration, the commitment by faculty, Lenora Helm Hammonds was helpful to overcome obstacles at her institution.

Also, the singular commitment of faculty across all three institutions was key to overcoming obstacles in the course design around the different program make-up: UNISA being a distance education only campus; NCCU having mixed enrollment of graduate and undergraduate; musician and non-musician student participants, and RAMA - a school of music, having all student musicians.

**UNISA:** Yes. Unisa as one of the largest distance learning institutions has made great strides in adopting the Open Distance Learning model.

### 37. Future iterations

Yes, it will be offered again at NCCU and UNISA and RAMA are in agreement to offer the course in the future as well. NCCU would like to offer the course in Fall 2013.
38. New globally networked courses

**RAMA:** The results of the program are expected to be carried over into new globally networked courses in the future.

**NCCU:** Yes, we will use the lessons learned in this pilot project and secure funding and invite faculty to use our course design as a template for future courses both in our Department of Music, and in the College of Liberal Arts.

39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

**NCCU:** The Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences (Dr. Carlton Wilson), The Interim Chair (Baron Tymas) for the Department of Music, the Assistant Provost of Academic Programs (Dr. Janice Harper) and the Director of Jazz Studies, Dr. Ira Wiggins have all given enthusiastic support for continuing the course, and creating a broader program of globally networked courses.

**UNISA:** Globally networked courses are encouraged by Unisa Management in line with the Open Distance Learning policy.

**RAMA:** Globally networked courses are a part of the overall strategy.

40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

**NCCU:** On a scale of 1 - 10, our institution is fully committed (a 10) to further developing the work we have begun.

**RAMA:** On a scale of 1 - 10, our institution is fully committed (a 10) to further developing the work we have begun.

41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Investment in technical support and infrastructure to support global learning. Better internet connectivity.

**Section 8: Reflections**

42. Goals set

**RAMA:** Our goals were:

1. To learn about what jazz means for the students and teachers in the other countries involved.
2. To share our perceptions and interpretations of jazz with the other countries involved.
3. To learn about the technical possibilities and limitations for long-distance learning.
4. To build an international network for both students and teachers.

**NCCU:**

Lenora Helm Hammonds

1. To build a globally networked learning environment to use as a template for successful course design
2. To learn about Jazz in other cultures and foster this interest in students
3. To understand how to collaborate across programs and ideologies
4. To learn best practices in distance education course planning and implementation

**Emmanuel Oritsejafor** - When the course began I had the following goals:

1. Identify external funding to sustain the initiative beyond the funding circle
2. Identify ways in which project partners could continue similar project
3. Discuss the replication of the project locally to engage high schools and higher education partners in developing a curriculum that deepen international education at these institutions.

**UNISA: Mageshen Naidoo and Sean Adams and Charl du Plessis**

Our goals were to:

1. create an awareness of South African Jazz
2. explore the core elements of Jazz in other cultures
3. explore the expansion of Unisa’s Open Distance Learning mission within a globally networked learning environment
4. expand our own knowledge of the technological tools available from the international online learning environment, for engaging with students.
5. explore the perception of South African jazz from an American and Danish perspective and to see how the cultural background influences the objectivity of the participants.

### 43. Goals achieved

**RAMA:** For me as a teacher the goals were largely achieved. During certain periods it was difficult to get most of the students to engage themselves and therefore the aims were not so much achieved in their case.

**NCCU: Lenora Helm Hammonds** I feel I learned a great deal from resources and training provided by the COIL Institute, and had an extraordinary time building relationships with my international colleagues. I feel ready to create the course anew and build a more dynamic impactful experience - yes, I feel I have an understanding of what is needed for a successful globally networked learning environment and distance education course. My students were very impressed with what they learned and who they met, and we created some new Jazz lovers!

**UNISA: Mageshen Naidoo and Sean Adams and Charl du Plessis**

The positive response and interest shown by students from Denmark and the USA was a good indication of the success of our first goal. Participating in this project provided us with deeper insight into our technological limitations in terms of our involvement in this collaborative course. Even though the student participation in SA was not high the insight and knowledge gained in these weeks were most valuable.

### 44. Most unique aspect for students

**RAMA:** The most unique thing was when they could talk to and play for the students in the other countries.

**NCCU:** The most unique experience for my students was the ability to interact and forge relationships with international students, and to learn how similar they are, though they are from different cultures.

**UNISA:** Online interactive learning is a relatively unique experience in South Africa as a whole. We would have loved to see more of our students make use of this experience. The culture of this kind of study needs to develop amongst the music students.

### 45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

**RAMA:** I think that it worked best when the students were active in the lessons and had to talk about a topic or
play something for each other.

**NCCU**: I also think that the students enjoyed the opportunity to interact in discussion online and/or in online or in-person performance(s). The discussions about the interaction were most impactful for measuring the cultural competencies reached.

**UNISA**: Live interaction created a more immediate teaching and learning environment. It created a platform for instant feedback on the issues raised and the music performed/played. The person view of participants added a reflective and sometimes quite revealing insight into the perception of live music making.

### 46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

**RAMA**: The most problematic was the technical difficulties in the lessons. In addition, it may subsequently be discussed whether syllabus was too extensive and thus confusing for students. And perhaps also teachers.

**NCCU**: I would have like the weekly sessions to be a bit longer perhaps 90 minutes instead of one hour. Access for internet connectivity was the most problematic I would have to say.

**UNISA**: Internet connectivity was a major challenge. The unavoidable disparity in time zones required after hours commitments from South African students which impacted negatively on their participation. The lack of Unisa full time students attending any classroom activities was problematic as it does not match the academic culture from the other two universities.

### 47. Changes for future iterations

**RAMA**: We would choose to limit the topics and to focus more on very specific musical points. More "hands on".

**NCCU**: I agree with limiting topics for future installments of the course and discern what few course outcomes are most desirable, and then plan for those outcomes carefully. I would also suggest having a clear understanding between partners of student expectations for the course.

**UNISA**: We would shift the focus of the lectures more towards addressing intercultural understanding rather than the technical and structural components of the music.

### 48. Technical support

**NCCU**: All of the IT designers discussed how detailed they needed to be, with respect to particular needs of each university, and for choosing amongst the many IT tools best used for pedagogical purposes. Often in training faculty to use tools in the course, they are discussing potential uses and impact of tools. The very hands-on nature of our course design required individuals to be patient and attentive to the faculty’s ideas, even as ideas are being vetted. Flexibility and a breadth of knowledge of up-to-date resources was necessary for the instructional designers and IT specialists.

**UNISA**: We agree with the above. The IT issues were addressed collectively as well as by individual institutions.

### 49. International programs person

**RAMA**: A quite different role - the international staff and academic staff need to work closer together than in most regular courses, which makes it interesting and more time consuming in terms of coordination.

**NCCU**: The international programs staff person, Emmanuel Ortisejafor, had to be involved in planning and implementation in a more hands on way - especially in the beginning. Additionally, Dr. Oritsejafor traveled to
the trainings in NYC, and the International Jazz School in South Africa. It was important that he had experience as a faculty member to allow his input during our planning of course outcomes, and this experience is recommended for international programs designees in a course of this scope.

**UNISA:** We did not appoint an international programs person although we interacted with Dr Ortisejafor during our International Jazz School.

### 50. Time commitment

**UNISA:** Due to problems with internet connectivity, many sessions/hours were lost for months in the initial planning stages.

**RAMA:** The time spent was very substantial. An estimate is that a course is not globally networked could be developed using 10% of the time spent on planning this course.

**NCCU:** Lenora Helm Hammonds: This course was extremely time consuming. It required work time release from my teaching load, and a personal commitment of time during my Summer, Holiday and Weekend time. If I had to compare, the course communications requirements alone added an additional 50% of time to the regular needed to develop, implement and support a similar non-globally networked course.

### 55. Was it worth it?

**RAMA:** It was very much worth it. We have all become much wiser about how to plan and execute such a course. In addition, students and especially teachers gained an invaluable international network. And not least, new friendships.

**NCCU:** We concur! The collaboration was groundbreaking for our campus, and facilitated personal and professional relationships with our South African and Danish students, faculty and staff network. The learnings garnered from the many layers of planning, design and implementation in our COIL Course will be invaluable in our humanities coursework across our campus. We look forward to sustaining and building more global networks in the future.

**UNISA:** We concur with our colleagues. The collaboration and interaction with international faculty members and students were beneficial to our growth as academics, educators and students.

### Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

**Calculating Improvisation Through a Cultural Lens: *Jazz! Born in America, Created Internationally***

This course examines jazz music from the beginning of the 20th century until today. The core of the course is designed for online delivery, with designated course-related activities occurring in classroom settings or on performance stages. Designated course-related activities include master classes, workshops, performance combos and concerts. Students will utilize various technological venues facilitating access to course contents and activities. Students interact and learn with international partners in the United States, South Africa and Denmark for a virtual study abroad experience of a globally linked classroom. This course provides an overview of jazz music history from an international perspective, jazz repertoire, performance concepts, and the cultural impact of Jazz music around the globe. Students of all arts and humanities disciplines are encouraged to enroll. The class (Level 1) meets online weekly at a designated time to interact with international students between partner institutions, and are encouraged to participate in course-related activities with Level 2 student
performers.

PRE-COURSE LAUNCH

The commitment of the COIL Fellows of the three international partners for Jazz! Born in America, Created Internationally was very clear from the very beginning of the collaboration. All partners had representatives in Copenhagen Denmark (August, 2011) to attend a Distance Learning Conference in Higher Education in Music. All partners attended the COIL Workshops (October 2011) to experience the information that lay the groundwork for the course planning period. These pre-course meetings and conferences were a key component to the success of the course for several reasons. First, the partners were able to meet together and digest the information while learning the elements of successful courses outcomes. Second, the face-to-face time was important to build trust and comfort with each other that was useful when challenges came up in communications. Third, when personnel changes at each university created a shift in team dynamics, the core personnel were intact, and had fully enrolled their university administration in the COIL vision and potential. For such a large team, and in facing the inherent challenges in maintaining a shared vision while planning and implementing a globally networked learning environment between universities with very different program structures, those initial relationships were the glue upon which we relied.

COURSE ACTIVITIES

Jazz! Born in America, Created Internationally is a course designed to observe and explore the cultures of Denmark, South Africa and the United States, through the lens of Jazz. The significant course activities included:

1. weekly meetings via live teleconference sessions between international partners;
2. online chat during weekly teleconference sessions for students unable to attend in-person;
3. viewing videos of iconic jazz performers;
4. viewing of historical film footage;
5. course readings;
6. student-created video bios;
7. composing music and/or lyrics;
8. learning songs to perform together in class;
9. student performances during weekly live teleconference sessions
10. short writing assignments
11. listening to mp3s of recordings for assignments
12. analysis of recordings and videos for assignments
13. discussion of observations and perceptions of evidence of cultural customs in conversations, writings and media

Secondary course activities included:

1. performing in concert events at UNISA International Jazz School (for our track 2 students);
2. attending workshops at UNISA International Jazz School (for our track 2 students);
3. conversations with NCCU Guest Faculty and Artist-in-Residence Branford Marsalis in culminating class;
4. viewing of concert footage of performances of student musicians;
5. viewing archived weekly live teleconference sessions
6. faculty-led workshops (Sean Adams @ NCCU and NCCU and RAMA faculty at UNISA)
7. internet research
8. student-to-student informal discussions

The above primary and secondary course activities unfolded in practice in the weekly assigned tasks during the online teleconference sessions, through access to course content on the LMS, Lore, and in visits between universities (UNISA to NCCU and NCCU and RAMA to UNISA). The weekly lesson plans from the syllabus incorporated synchronous and asynchronous activities to allow students who were not able to join the weekly
teleconference sessions to also experience the course content and engage in dialogue with their classmates. Because RAMA had two locations of their campus dialed into our teleconference connection, the student participants from RAMA’s remote locations were able to be included and interact in the weekly teleconference sessions.

Class Discussions:
During the weekly live teleconference sessions, students and faculty would discuss the assigned videos, course readings and listening links (mp3s) related to each weeks’ topic. The discussions allowed the students to reflect on observations about numerous cultural comparisons, related historical events and their impact on Jazz music. For example, a discussion ensued one week about the similarities and differences of treatment of American jazz musicians being discriminated against during Jim Crow and South African jazz musicians during Apartheid, and Nazi German officers who reportedly convened clandestine listenings to Danish Jazz musicians during the German occupation in Denmark.

Submission of Assignments:
Short writing assignments (reflections and research), student-created video bios and student compositions were submitted by students, uploaded to our course LMS, Lore.

Student-Led Discussions:
Informal student-to-student discussions took place on our LMS. We chose Lore because it functioned much like Facebook - a platform we felt, because of its familiarity to most, would facilitate communications amongst all partners. Students were able to freely post comments and respond to faculty and student posts about assignments, uploaded material and/or results of research.

Online Performances:
Students were given assignments to create and submit compositions, or create derivative compositions based on traditional folk songs or traditional repertoire. These compositions were performed by the students during weekly live teleconference, or, were submitted through student-created videos of their performance(s).

Guest Faculty Presentations and Interviews:
Guest faculty, Baron Tymas and Robert Trowers led discussions on weekly live teleconference with students to facilitate a deeper experience of Jazz History (Trowers) and Jazz Theory (Tymas). During the last class, Branford Marsalis joined the class for a candid and lively discussion about global cultural perceptions of Jazz music.

Live Concerts and Workshops:
Travel between international partners allowed students and faculty to deepen relationships and perform together. These interactions were especially important later in the residency as we learned of the challenges with online connectivity and access through Lore and the weekly teleconferences for the South African students. Some of those South African students attended the UNISA International Jazz School, and were able to meet and interact with the NCCU and RAMA faculty and students in Track 2 who travel to South Africa.

ICEBREAKERS AND INTERCULTURAL INTERACTIONS
The faculty decided upon an icebreaker required for students and faculty of a video bio, and the assignment was called Who I Am in Jazz. This assigned task was done in the two weeks prior to the course launch, and designed to be an informal and fun introduction between classmates and faculty. It was also a way to test the students’ comfort level with using video, using the course LMS, and using new media. Those students that completed the task were very engaged with this exercise. The video bios were required to be uploaded to Lore and remained there throughout the course.

The intercultural interactions were assisted by weekly assignments; many assignments required students to
identify a comparative example of a concept or event represented in their culture. One example is a discussion about organizations that support Jazz or promote Jazz on television or radio resulting from an assignment to listen to an NPR (National Public Radio) segment dedicated to Louis Armstrong. Our initial discussions and inquiry of similar programs in Denmark or South Africa garnered a short research excursion for Danish Students, who returned the next week with information of a new discovery of an historical radio program and series in Denmark. Further intercultural interactions that were notable are discussions about South African icons - Jazz singer Miriam Makeba and pianist Abdullah Ibrahim, and comparisons with American Jazz singer Nina Simone and American ex-patriots in Europe.

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS
We had two key areas of challenge:

Program Structure Differences and Student Expectations
We never were able to completely overcome our very different program structures. NCCU is a liberal arts university of undergraduate and graduate students, and our participants were music majors and non-music majors. The course was primarily offered as a distance education course - with the added feature of a weekly online meeting time, and with some student musicians recruited for the Track 2 component, to assure performers to interact with the student musicians at RAMA. Though it was a distance education course, most students were on campus for traditional courses. Many of the NCCU enrolled students had never taken a distance education course, but rather, were interested in the course description and wanted to participate due to the nature of the globally networked environment feature. UNISA is a distance education university, and does not have students on campus. Additionally, the bandwith capacity or accessibility for students was not consistent across students enrolled. And lastly, some students at UNISA commented being VERY insecure about participating online or in weekly teleconference meeting. Some were uncomfortable interacting face-to-face, citing that Jazz was a very new field and area for them, and they instead preferred to take an observer-only approach. RAMA is a program designed entirely of music majors, and though the students were informed that the goal of the course design was to learn about each other’s culture through the lens of music, were expecting to perform together with their international classmates in every class. Because of this expectation, the discussions and assignments that did not involve performing seemed less desirable to the RAMA students. However, many RAMA students did state that they enjoyed the exposure to cultural learnings and related historical events, as well as iconic contributions of South African and American jazz musicians.

We tried to address the different program structures in a two-tiered syllabus design. Student performers and musicians would demonstrate Jazz concepts, characteristic elements in Jazz music and create compositions and lyrics in weekly class sessions. All students would complete written assignments, reflections and prepare to participate in discussions. Some students would travel to perform.

What may have created more realistic expectations for students is a clearer understanding amongst all faculty of the need for integrative and comprehensive course outcomes. Because some faculty came onboard after the October COIL training workshops, there was a learning curve, and a training-after-the-training dynamic that did not become apparent until the assessment phase of the project.

Time Changes
A very unexpected challenge, caught many of us by surprise - Daylight Savings Time. When the time changed in the U.S. our European and South African partners were inconvenienced with moving the class back, and then forward again, arising out of a misunderstanding in communication. Even though we all discussed this expected change of time, some thought the course would not have to be moved to the new Daylight Savings time. It was a scramble, and was a bit of frustration for everyone. Eventually we discussed a solution, and the RAMA students and faculty, in the spirit of cooperation, moved their class to accommodate the change. It was a learning experience for everyone involved, albeit uncomfortable, as we chalked it up to miscommunication.
UNEXPECTED AND INTERESTING DIRECTIONS

Some interesting directions arose out of the students performing online together, and with students and faculty performing together in concert. Memories were frozen in time for some students, who never imagined traveling to South Africa to perform, or having the ability to perform with international musicians online in real time in-person. Comments from students, who before the class had not met anyone from another country to interact with online, ranged from being floored at the commonalities with their musician peers in tastes in music, to surprise at kindred journeys and shared interests. The last class and conversation with Branford Marsalis was also a memorable moment - and unexpected - in the course. It allowed for a nice touch for the closure of the conversations that had arisen from the course content.

TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORTS

We chose the LMS, Lore, after our IT specialists provided several sample formats to explore. We wanted the tools to be accessible at a variety of bandwidths, and for the access to be free. Also, it was important that the functionality resemble platforms the students were already familiar with. Everything we needed was in Lore. However, the internet speed and accessibility was problematic for our South African partners.

During our planning stages, we used the access to Moodle and to COIL Commons to begin gathering information and receiving training and resources from the COIL Institute. As our planning progressed and moved toward implementation, our team staggered between Google + and Flash Meeting for our weekly discussions, and for our small and large group meetings. We found Flash Meeting to be the most reliable and easy to use amongst the team.

We had a unique addition to our team in American born, Danish speaking New Media consultant, Lana Garland, who, though not affiliated directly with a particular university offered her services to the course mission and outcomes. She videotaped concert and workshop footage used in our course syllabus, and was a key player in the conceptualization and planning stages. Her professional obligations did not allow her to continue in full capacity with the team for the duration, but her imprint was an important element of the success of the course.

CLOSING THOUGHTS

Inherent in the mindset within Jazz is a predisposition to uncertainty and the need for adaptability. Because of the familiarity, whether as jazz performers or jazz lovers, faculty and staff comprising this NCCU-RAMA-UNISA COIL team of fellows demonstrated an innate ability to somehow move from challenge to challenge with calm and steadiness, as if performing an elaborate jazz solo. Though our planning and implementation was deliberate and calculated, a pervasive feeling that we could all flow, create, adapt and recreate remained throughout the collaboration. Everyone expressed having their creative needle move and their cultural lens sharpened. Everyone worked extremely hard, and everyone wants to come back and do it again. This is a sign that overall, the collaboration worked. We are grateful for the nurturing support of the COIL Institute leadership, and of the attentiveness and expertise of Jon Rubin in our Media, Arts and Cultures track.

Section 10: Student Feedback

I enjoyed the class, but due to it being on-line and me having a class on thurs, i did not get to be in all the live classes which i really enjoyed. I now listen for jazz music in almost everything i watch on tv. like movies and commercials

Jazz is the perfect way to express how you feel in song; the instruments help you to feel it deep down in your soul touching your musical spirit.
Very interesting listening to Michelle relate childhood playing to jazz. So true how you have to learn how to walk before you learn to run, same in jazz. Fundamentals are so important especially to the concept and skill of improvisation.

Profound words: "Everytime I play jazz I get to know myself better". Wow.

It’s amazing to be a jazz musician here in Berlin. The level of players is extremely high, and I benefit a lot from being in the middle of it all.
23. South Korea - USA: Technical Writing & Communication

Abstract

The TTUMJU COIL collaborative course was a success. However, from the beginning of the course, instructors initially faced three key challenges in this globally connected classroom:

- Language differences: Students in these courses did not speak the same languages, so we had to find ways to communicate in spite of this difference.
- Institutional calendar differences: The semester calendars were quite different between TTU and MJU. TTU classes started earlier than MJU students. Additionally, holidays at each institution were quite different: MJU students had more holidays earlier in the fall semester while TTU students had more holidays at the end of the semester.
- Technology differences: Log-in and registration problems with the course blogs created a collaborative challenge, but, with instructor support, students were still able to collaborate on multiple assignments.

Because of these challenges, we often had to find “just-in-time” solutions, identifying problems and making decisions about them through instructor email exchange. We discovered quickly that we needed to be flexible with the course schedule, assignment deadlines, and collaborative activities. We also learned that we had to address these challenges frankly and openly with students, so they understood why we needed to be flexible. These decisions allowed us to resolve most challenges as the semester progressed. Serendipitously, these challenges also allowed both instructors to discuss with their students the challenges that globally connected teams often face and to illustrate to their students how teams continue to work, in spite of challenges that arise.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 2311 Introduction to Technical Communication</td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Technical Communication</td>
<td>Sophomore (second year) designation, but most students who take the course are juniors (third year) or seniors (fourth year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMA02104 Writing</td>
<td>Myongji University</td>
<td>Technical Writing</td>
<td>Many of the students are freshman but some 2\textsuperscript{nd}-4\textsuperscript{th} year undergraduate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Kelli Cargile Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>English Department, Technical Communication and Rhetoric Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Sokjin Jang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>International Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>MyongJi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Bangmok College of General Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When?

Fall 2012 (For both institutions, the semester ranged from September to December 2012)

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

Texas Tech University--Twenty students enrolled, but eighteen completed: one dropped the course within a week of its beginning and a second quit attending because of a family health emergency.

MyongJi University--Thirty one students enrolled and all of them are finished completely the course.

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

Texas Tech University--At Texas Tech, our online ENGL 2311 classes enroll twenty (20) students per semester. The enrollment for this class was typical.

MyongJi University--This is typical for classes every semester. Class size of 30 students is good to teach and practice for writing.

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution

Texas Tech courses are taught in English.

MyongJi courses are taught in Korean.

7. Primary language of most students in each class

Texas Tech students speak English primarily, although three students in the class used other languages in their
homes, most frequently Spanish. MyongJi students speak Korean primarily, although almost all of them also can speak and write in English as a foreign language.

8. Language of the course collaboration

We designed the class to allow students to use their native languages primarily. Texas Tech students did not know Korean, so they could not address the MyongJi students in Korea; however, MJU students did address Texas Tech students in English. Speaking both languages was not a requirement for the course. Students could complete the major assignments in the course without using language. Major requirements, for the most part, required technical images or video, not texts.

9. Language fluency

Texas Tech students had little, if any, familiarity with the Korean language. One student had a Korean high school exchange student in her home, which provided some assistance, but for the most part, Texas Tech students could not speak or read Korean.

MyongJi students are not good to communicate perfectly with others in English. All of the university students in Korea, had been learned English from middle school. English had been taught by grammar oriented to pass the examinations not actual or practical. But many of them are some experiences to study abroad in a short time to learn English.

10. Language proficiency difference

Texas Tech—Surprisingly, students were more frustrated by time differences between the US and Korean than the language differences. Students were able to collaborate remarkably well in spite of language differences. I do think the amount of posting/corresponding, other than on major assignments, was reduced because of language differences. The MyongJi students seemed somewhat shy about their language use, but the Texas Tech students were impressed with the MyongJi students’ fluency, given how few languages our Texas Tech cohort spoke.

The Wordpress makes easy way for MyongJi students to understand Texas Tech students and trying their wishes to communicate each other’s. Especially, the video project using YouTube is better way to understand how to explain to do something to others.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?

Texas Tech students attended class fully online. We used a Moodle classroom environment for information specific to the Texas Tech course and for asynchronous work outside of the collaboration. We used Skype for weekly meetings (each meeting lasted between 1.5-3 hours). We used WordPress blogs and YouTube for collaboration between Texas Tech and MyongJi students.

MyongJi students attended class fully offline face-to-face meetings.
12. Duration

Students were connected for about 12 weeks, but, with holidays, actual collaboration time was about 10 weeks.

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Yes, Texas Tech students engaged in discussions about international collaborations in technical communication, virtual team development, and swift trust.

MyongJi students discussed how to make team and allocate their role before collaboration.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

Texas Tech students used Moodle all semester. The Moodle contained course requirements, a forum for questions related to the TTU assignments, and weekly assignment descriptions. We used WordPress blogs for the first two assignments collaborating with the MyongJi students, and we used YouTube for the final collaborative assignments.

MJU students used a course blog called ‘knowledge hank cafe.’ The blogs are used to publish the news and gathering the data depending on technical communications, uploading their assignments, QnAs, and useful tips.

15. Server location

The Texas Tech Moodle was provided by the Texas Tech English Department. WordPress and YouTube are free, cloud-based technologies.

MJU students used cloud-based their cafe blog.

16. Technical problems

The WordPress blogs were challenging to both Texas Tech and MyongJi students. We divided students into cross-institutional teams, but we struggled to get all students enrolled in the specific blogs they were assigned to. The blogs were hard to enroll in and Professor Jang had to post most of his students’ comments and work. The WordPress blogs were not easily usable for Texas Tech students either. It took us several weeks to figure out. They were challenging to navigate and to post within. Students had trouble uploading images. Surprisingly, YouTube was a much easier technology for both sets of students to use. Students were easily able to upload their videos; each cross-institutional team created two videos (one original; the second a copy of the other’s teams “translated” into their own language.) In future classes, Kelli would not use the WordPress blog configuration; she would seek a more usable platform for collaboration.

It is good to combine the functions of WordPress and YouTube.

17. Frequency of use

Students at both institutions logged into the blogs multiple times during the week. The challenge for our collaboration was the time zone differences. We had trouble establishing a rhythm for making assignments,
Giving students time to complete them (in both locations), reviewing the assignments, and responding to the other class’s assignments. The technologies really weren’t the main problem; figuring out the pacing of assignments, given the extensive time lag between institutions was a more significant factor.

It may be most barriers on the MJU class time that is separated 2 hours in Tuesday and 1 hours in Thursday when TTU students has 3 hours a day.

### 18. Informal communication

Students could engage in the blogs, and some did. Blog enrollment issues hampered this activity, in Kelli’s opinion.

MJU students can meet their group members at any time they decided freely and engage in the blogs too.

### 19. Re-use

The WordPress blogs, at least in the way we configured them, were not successful. In retrospect, I wish we had used a more easily accessible platform like the Moodle for our initial collaborations. Students could have easily enrolled in a Moodle and teams could have more easily collaborated once they were enrolled.

### Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

#### 20. Tools

Because of time zone differences, our students did not work synchronously.

### Section 6: Assessment Information

#### 21. How?

Each instructor assessed his or her students individually. Students were evaluated on their processes, the assignment deliverables, and with a final course portfolio and reflective statement. The final course portfolio reflective statement was the most directly applicable evaluation of student intercultural awareness. At TTU, students also completed an online evaluation form, but the university has not yet released these evaluations.

#### 22. Common assessment rubric

No, each instructor used individual assessment measures.

#### 23. Assessment outcomes

TTU—Twenty students began the online ENGL 2311 course at TTU. Of the twenty, one dropped the course immediately following the first meeting. A second student stopped attending after the sixth course meeting because of a family health emergency (her mother was diagnosed with cancer). Eighteen students completed. Of this eighteen, ten students earned an A, seven earned a B, and one earned an A.
24. Peer assessments

Students worked collaboratively with their globally connected partners to complete the first assignment, which required them to exchange images of their house layout. Students also worked with their institutional peers to peer review drafts of each major assignment, except the portfolio. Peer reviews were completed asynchronously as part of the asynchronous participation requirement.

25. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

To guide students in their collaborations across institutions, we used a collaborative course blog where we posted assignments: [http://mjuttu.wordpress.com/2012/10/08/house-description/](http://mjuttu.wordpress.com/2012/10/08/house-description/)

The blog was challenging for all students to find and use. I would not use it again (Kelli, TTU). I would use a Classroom Management System that more easily accessible and more centrally controlled (by one or the other institution).

26. Attrition

TTU--As mentioned above, two of twenty students of the TTU group dropped the course.

27. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

I do not think the globally connected nature of the course affected the number of TTU students who dropped.

Section 7: Institutional Support

28. Type of support

TTU--After winning the COIL fellowship, Kelli was able to apply for an internal grant to visit Korea. The grant paid for roundtrip airfare, hotel, and per diem for a five-day trip, which Kelli completed in November. Additional monies from the grant supported a trip to the Association for Teachers of Technical Writing national conference, where Kelli will present on her collaborative experiences. While in Korea, Kelli was able to speak at the Korean Technical Communication Association meeting and visit three universities. This work was sponsored through Sokjin’s support.

(Not applicable in MJU)

29. Engagement with the international programs office

None during the collaboration at TTU--The International Programs officer assigned to our project resigned and the director was too short-staffed to replace him. Since returning from Korea, Kelli has made contact with the International Office about developing student exchanges but so far, no work has been completed in this area.

30. Importance given to globally networked learning

The interests of the two institutions resolved smoothly, the GNL will be a very desirable program. At TTU, the concept of globally connected learning is appealing, but, unfortunately, the staff is so overworked, they have little time or energy to contribute.
### 31. Commitment

MJU - It was primarily a singular commitment on the part of the participating faculty Fellows. If the questionnaire was covered, the continuity of the study will be guaranteed. The COIL project was primarily an individual commitment, but I expect more collaboration to follow.

### 32. Future iterations

We hope to offer the class again in the future, and we have begun to talk about additional means of collaboration.

### 33. New globally networked courses

Sokjin is expected strongly. Kelli agrees. We will collaborate again in the future. We are not yet sure of the actual means of collaboration at this time.

### 34. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

At Texas Tech, the Technical Communication and Rhetoric program in which Kelli works is developing an awareness of the value of globally connected classes, and the faculty is working on several international initiatives to continue this kind of work.

### 35. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

TTU has evolving interest in this kind of work. The challenge is to find teaching release time for a professor to teach an introductory course. These courses are more typically taught by graduate instructors. Finding the right instructor to teach the course is essential.

### 36. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

At TTU, the interest and desire to collaborate globally are present; the time is more challenging as the course we used is not regularly taught by full-time faculty. Finding a way to integrate graduate-part-time instructors into the mix may be the key to continued success.

### Section 8: Reflections

#### 37. Goals set

(Developed at the COIL workshop):

1. to have the ability to overcome language and teamwork challenges and
2. to have a positive attitude about cross-cultural team experiences

#### 38. Goals achieved

TTU-- Most TTU students left the class with a greater awareness of cross-cultural team challenges and strategies for overcoming these challenges. They were positive about their classroom experiences.
### 39. Most unique aspect for students

I think actually communicating with students in another country was a unique and compelling learning experience for the TTU students. They enjoyed their interactions with MJU students and requested additional interactions. I think future class iterations could provide even more collaborative working experiences successfully.

### 40. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The assignments were particularly effective in overcoming language barriers. The video exchange assignment was the most effective. Students developed technical communication skills, language skills, technology skills, and cross-cultural collaborative skills through this assignment.

### 41. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

The initial exchanges in the blog were most problematic, not because of any failure on students’ participation but because the blogging format was too challenging and incomprehensible from a cultural standpoint for the Korean students. The WordPress blogs simply did not work well as an international collaborative tool.

### 42. Changes for future iterations

As I noted earlier, I would build a more closed learning environment where students did not have so many pages and passwords to navigate and use the system.

### 43. Time commitment

This is hard to say. At TTU, Kelli worked with a graduate student to create the collaborative spaces and she and the student met weekly to prepare course materials and grade. So the time was double for this class. In addition, Kelli and Sokjin exchanged lengthy emails weekly and posted in the instructor’s blog. I would estimate that the collaboration doubled typical class preparation time.

### 44. Was it worth it?

From the TTU perspective, Kelli thinks the collaboration was absolutely worth it. She would definitely repeat the experience with the MJU team and is looking forward to developing other partnerships with Korean universities.
24. Spain - USA: Spanish & English, Languages & Cultures

Abstract

The major challenge we had was the time difference, but we found the solution, and worked a couple of Sundays. Collaborative activities were infused through the creation of tasks in three categories. First, information exchange, will allow students to establish personal relationships with partners and will increase awareness of cultural differences. Sample tasks include students’ presentations of themselves and their cultures to their future partners through cultural autobiographies, students’ interviews of each other on certain cultural topics and a production of a virtual presentation (e.g. via Voice Thread) or a written report based on the interview process.

Second, in order to enhance practice of the intercultural skills of observation and to defy stereotypes, students were engage in the tasks, which involved comparison and analysis. Activities in this group joint reading of Sandra Cisneros’s Casa en Mango Street, and discussions of different intercultural issues, including most controversial ones related to politics, religion, environment, music.

Third, the development of intercultural communicative competence was fostered through collaboration in product creation. Sample activities include a creation of a blog or power point presentation by students in both classes on a topic of mutual interest (topics included family, education, food, etc.).
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Spanish: Language and Culture</td>
<td>SUNY, Empire State College</td>
<td>Modern languages</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengua BIII Inglés</td>
<td>Universidad de Las Palmas, Gran Canaria, Spain (ULPGC )</td>
<td>Modern languages</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Nataša Tcherepashenets</td>
<td>Role on Team:</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>SUNY, ESC</td>
<td>Position at Institution:</td>
<td>Associate Prof., Area Coordinator World Languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program:</td>
<td>Center for Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Team Member #2                |                          |                              |                          |                          |
| Name:                        | Richard Clouet           | Role on Team:                | Faculty                  |                          |
| Institution:                 | ULPGC                    | Position at Institution:     | Dean of the Faculty      |                          |
| Department and/or Program:   | Faculty of Translation and Interpreting |                          |                          |                          |

| Team Member #3                |                          |                              |                          |                          |
| Name:                        | Florence Lojacono        | Role on Team:                | International Programs   |                          |
| Institution:                 | ULPGC                    | Position at Institution:     | Vice Dean for International |                          |
| Department and/or Program:   | Faculty of Translation and Interpreting |                          |                          |                          |

| Team Member #4                |                          |                              |                          |                          |
| Name:                        | Hui-Ya Chuang            | Role on Team:                | Instructional Designer   |                          |
| Institution:                 | Empire State College     | Position at Institution:     | Curriculum Instructional Designer |                          |
| Department and/or Program:   | Center for Distance Learning |                          |                          |                          |

3. When?

Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

SUNY, ESC 11
ULPGC (Spain): 13

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

Regular for advanced level (ESC)
ULPGC: It is not the typical size. This course was offered on a voluntary basis. This means that students enrolled in it were also enrolled in all the required courses for the semester.

**Section 2: Issues of Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. language(s) of instruction at each institution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the course, Spanish for SUNY, ESC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULPGC : Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Primary language of most students in each class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English (SUNY, ESC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULPGC : Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Language of course collaboration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULPGC : Between instructors: in English Between students: both in English and in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Language fluency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULPGC : students were fluent in English (level B2 within the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Language proficiency difference</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Though the difference was rather significant, it did not have many implications for the communication (ESC perspective)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULPGC : the potential difference did not represent any kind of gap that could jeopardize the common activities scheduled for this course. On the contrary, the aim of the course was to build on this potential gap to turn it into an opportunity to learn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3: Curricular Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Online or blended?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULPGC : The common course (under the common name of Advanced Spanish/English) was offered fully online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Duration

10
ULPGC: students began to post their entries in week 2 and posted e

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period

Reflections in Journal entries
ULPGC: students also had the possibility to meet the instructor (Richard Clouet) as they were following another English course with him in a F2F format. We took this opportunity to set up 2 training sessions. Photos and 2 videos about these sessions are available in the COIL Log. Topics covered were: how to log on Angel, how to navigate on Angel, how to navigate through Blackboard Collaborate, how to build a Voice Thread presentation, how to make this presentation public for other to add their comments. In one of these sessions, Richard and I decided to set up several dedicated spaces for each team on Angel where they would be able to share and comment their work > see screen capture in the COIL Log.

Team 1: ULPGC 2 posts (same student, speaker of the team) / ESC 1 post
Team 2: ULPGC 2 posts (2 different students, 1 as speaker of the team) / ESC 1 post
Team 3: ULPGC 3 posts (3 different students) / ESC 3 posts (same student)
Team 4: ULPGC 0 post / ESC 1 post

The work involved by both students and teachers at ULPGC was very important, since Spanish learners were full time students who studied from 8am to 2pm at the ULPGC every day and had to log on the Angel platform every afternoon to complete the activities or meet their American classmates at around midnight. The follow-up by ULPGC instructors also had to take place at night, even if we had to be back in our traditional classes the following day at 8am! However, it’s something all of us (both students and teachers) did with great pleasure and enthusiasm.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools

Angel + Blackboard Collaborate
ULPGC: students from both institutions were interacting on the Angel platform, the ESC LMS. This means that the ESC students were “at home” and that ULPGC student were “guests”. ESC students did not need to learn how to navigate through a new LMS but ULPGC needed to; ESC did not need to learn how to navigate through Blackboard Collaborate but ULPGC students needed to. In addition to the LMS, some ULPGC students used email, Skype and Facebook to communicate with their ESC classmates.
### 15. Server location

SUNY, ESC  
ULPGC: the LMS for this course was the ECS’s one as a requirement. Using email, Skype and FB was personal initiatives of our students.

### 16. Technical problems

No  
ULPGC: We did not encounter any significant technical problem. It’s our opinion, based on personal experience, that technical aspects of any web-enhanced course are viewed as a problem if it is so for the instructor. It turns out to be obvious that instructors showing enthusiasm with ICT will experience fewer difficulties and transmit that same enthusiasm to the learners. Those who don’t may transmit the opposite effect. Another point is that cloud-based and personal ways to communicate among students are sometimes undermined by faculty because these tools don’t offer enough tracking (who has done what, how many times and when). As we all know, faculty need data to write papers and will prefer tools that facilitate an easy data collection to any better learning tool which doesn’t offer this opportunity.

### 17. Frequency of use

Every week.  
ULPGC: students were expected to log on the common LMS (Angel) at least once in each module. And so they did, or more, from September through to December. They were not expected to have any specific number of contacts using alternative tools such as email, Skype and FB. Nonetheless, this occurred.

### 18. Informal communication

Informal space was created for groups to meet in Blackboard Collaborate  
ULPGC: During our 2 training sessions we engaged our students to use the tool that best matched their needs and usual practices in order to connect with their US classmates.

### 19. Re-use

Yes  
ULPGC: We would build much more on these tools as they are much more appropriate for quick and easy connections. The accent would be laid much more on fostering real intercultural contacts, no matter the ways they may occur, than on fostering institutional connection for their tracking capability. We believe that social justice and intercultural awareness are the aims of the course. Techniques should help us to meet the goal for this course; technics should not downsize our pedagogy to make it more “article friendly”. As faculty members, we should acknowledge, and even welcome the fact that techniques will push us out of our comfort zone.
Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools

Blackboard collaborate

ULPGC: 2 synchronous sessions were scheduled (see the COIL Log). The tool was Blackboard Collaborate, the tool used at the ESC. The first session was scheduled during ESC student’s regular real time online class requirement, this mean at 7.00 pm in New York and midnight in Las Palmas. ULPGC students logged in during their free (and night) time, on a voluntary basis. Nonetheless, almost all ULPGC students participated in the 2 sessions.

21. Server location

SUNY, ESC

ULPGC: it was an ESC requirement.

22. Technical problems

NO

ULPGC: no problem at all.

23. Frequency of use

At least 3 times during the course (introduction, midterm project discussion, and final project presentations)

ULPGC: 2 synchronous sessions required and scheduled by both institutions. ULPGC students were not asked to demonstrate other synchronous contacts. They did so, but on a voluntary basis.

24. Informal communication

Virtual rooms were created for students to meet

ULPGC: During our 2 training sessions we engaged our students to use the tool that best matched their needs and usual practices in order to connect with their US classmates.

25. Re-use

Yes

ULPGC: same answer as 21.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?

We used rubrics (for discussion and final projects) and self-tests

ULPGC: our course was aimed at real intercultural awareness and therefore the whole experience was
extremely worthwhile. Evaluation criteria were based on participation. Evaluated activities were
1) participating in writings forums (ESC topics)
2) build 2 common presentations (advertising and final project).

Before starting the course, during the course and at the end of the course, students were also required to
regularly record their ideas and perceptions both in the activities and online interactions with foreign students,
as well as the cultural facts they could observe. It was a way of gathering information on the students’
tercultural experiences and of keeping track of their progress and of any changes in their attitudes towards
other cultures.

27. Common assessment rubric?

We did not collaborate in assessment formally, though, I knowhat students provided each other a very
valuable feedback that was clear from the discussion posts, but also in collaborative projects
ULPGC : unfortunately not. Each institution runs its own evaluation.

28. Assessment outcomes

There were obvious signs that indicated that students acquired intercultural communicative competence (at
least to some extent), and more in-depth appreciation of the target culture

ULPGC : The combination of two kinds of assessment, both direct and indirect, will hopefully help us understand
students’ ICC capacities, providing an empirical basis for future studies in three areas: tracking development,
examining outcomes, and indicating areas for instructional improvement within the field of social justice
through an online environment.

29. Peer assessment

Not formally, but we saw that students sometimes corrected each other

ULPGC : Yes, we will definitely consider peer-assessment in a next course, above all as this kind of assessment is
conducted on a regular practice in the English courses at our Faculty and as we gained some expertise in this
field.

30. Charter or guidelines for student interaction

ULPGC : We did not develop any guidelines for student interactions. We built and taught our course keeping in
mind that, as instructors, our most important goals were
1) to motivate students (especially because the course was on a voluntary basis, without any extra credit of
academic advantage)
2) to stress the importance of intercultural awareness in a globalized world. The fact that, in this specific
situation, they took the initiative to use no institutional ways to contact with their US partners by themselves is
for us the most evident sign of the success of the course.

31. Attrition

1 student (due to the wrong placement)
32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

Yes

ULPGC: Yes, this is quite normal. Furthermore, the rate of dropout in this course was less important than the average percentage in required courses where attendance is part of the requirement.

Section 7: Institutional Support

33. Type of support

Administrative (allowing to share the platform with Spanish university)

ULPGC Institutional support:
- Financial: grant for travel expenses
- Administrative: none
- Pedagogical: none
- Technical: none

34. Engagement with the international programs office

None (USA)

ULPGC: The Vice-Dean for International Relations was part of the team. Prior to this course, she visited ESC twice and met the members of the Center for Distance Learning (CDL). She spoke with Meg Benke (Provost) and with Tom Mackey (Dean of CDL) about the possibility to have a framework agreement signed between the 2 institutions in order to collaborate on a formal basis and to participate together to ICT-based initiatives. See here (2010):


35. Importance given to globally networked learning

I hope so (USA), but I am not sure (USA)

ULPGC: Internationalization is a key component of the ULPGC policy. Furthermore, internationalization matched with mobile learning (OpenCourseware included) is the way the ULPGC chose to face the needs of students engaged in a globalized world. The ULPGC is an Open University.

36. Commitment

I think first of all faculty, however the institution also supported Instructional designer

ULPGC: The idea to apply to the COIL arose after the visit of the Vice Dean for International at ESC (Saratoga Springs). It was primarily a singular commitment on the part of the participating faculty Fellows.
### 37. Future iterations

I would love to offer it again, of possible. However, it is almost a double teaching load, and should be recognized as such. Next Fall, I am on sabbatical though. (US)

ULPGC: We don’t plan to offer the same course again, basically because we plan to build on this experience to learn more about synchronous and asynchronous communicating tools and to reframe our international syllabus accordingly, with both student’s comments and our own analysis.

### 38. New globally networked courses

I hope very much, as I think this experience has been extremely rewarding and enriching for our students and all involved. (US)

ULPGC: our work will have, and already had, an impact on our teaching. What we learned from this experience can be used in F2F teaching as well. To motivate students, to engage them in significant common work, to foster intercultural awareness are our goals, online or F2F.

### 39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses

Though I am thinking a lot about our internationalization effort,

I did not put forward any specific proposal, yet. However, in my opinion, if the institution would like to pursue these opportunities, we should develop a system of rewards, recognition.

ULPGC: We do hope to be able to expand this pilot course into a broader program of globally networked courses between ULPGC and other American institutions, not only around the issue of language learning but also by including aspects of collaborative translation projects between the two countries. Ever since its inception, the Process of Bologna (which has been taking place in Europe for the last 10 years) has given an extremely important place to internationalization and mobility (both physical and online). The Lifelong Learning Program published by the European Commission in December 2006 also invites Higher Education Institutions to promote this kind of mobility. It is thus the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria’s intention to carry on encouraging such initiatives and to foster other programs of globally networked courses.

### 40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses

There was no discussion, at least not yet.

ULPGC: Through the Vice-precedent for International Relations, the ULPGC is ready to carry on granting scholarships to encourage researchers like Florence and Richard to further develop the work they have begun. This can take the form of financial help for mobility and help for publishing their research.

### 41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning

Financial support

ULPGC: If we could have our framework agreement signed by our partner, this would open the way for further collaboration as this would allow us to apply for financial, technical and administrative help at our home institution.
### Section 8: Reflections

#### 42. Goals set

When I proposed to develop this course, I had 4 major goals in mind:

1. to expand students’ knowledge about culture(s) of the Spanish-speaking world and of the United States through the ‘live’ interaction with native speakers of the target language online;

2. to foster cross-cultural understanding and acceptance through engaging students in implicit debates on most controversial topics, including “natives”/“foreigners” dichotomy and immigration in its relationship to both American and European politics and globalization;

3. to develop respect for diverse members of world population, indispensable for the democratic citizenship in the era of globalization;

4. to prepare students for a teamwork with international partners, which is a highly desirable skill for the professional success in a globalized world in almost every area. (US)

**Goals ULPGC team:**

- Participate in all COIL activities
- To set up the course and to teach it, as planned
- To gain insight knowledge of cross-border team teaching
- To develop our ICT skills

#### 43. Goals achieved

This course exceeded my expectations (US)

**Goals ULPGC team:**

- Participate in all COIL activities COIL course: we participated from June 2011 to December 9, 2011. COIL Course Log (13 ULPGC entries)
- To set up the course and to teach it, as planned Done, Fall 2012 (15 week course)
- To gain insight knowledge of cross-border team teaching Yes, we are now more savvy about the nuts and bolts of cross-border team teaching.
- To develop our ICT skills We thought that the COIL course would be more ICT oriented, not written oriented. We participated to all activities until the course abruptly ended, our last posts remaining without any feedback. It was a pity not to take into consideration people who participated and to end the course in this way. We also expected the course to be much more interactive and not teacher-led. In June we ask to be able to edit the Glossary and to transform the teacher-led activity to a collaborative task, we did not receive any answer. As for the whole course, some activities were never finished (see the Glossary). No evaluation tool was provided for participants to evaluate the course which is very uncommon, above all in a US institution.

#### 44. Most unique aspect for students

ability to communicate both synchronously (they especially liked this part, I think!) and asynchronously with students, who reside in other country (US)

ULPGC: the whole experience was unique for our students, above all the fact of being part of another teaching structure. Academic diversity resulted to be pretty exotic and a drive for our students.
45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

- discussions, oral sessions, collaborative projects (US)
- ULPGC:
  - The written interactions (forums)
  - Team work within the ULPGC team (and this is very important as these are transferable skills that they can put into practice immediately in other courses)

46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective

- time difference was the major challenge
- ULPGC: Students were asked to put their work together and to present a single document. We found out that usually students from both institutions used to copy and paste their work on the asked format but didn’t really engage in real discussion. The work was not always seen as a whole but as the addition of both parts.

47. Changes for future iterations

- Did not think about it, yet. (US)
- ULPGC: we would stress that the common work should be common and not the addition of the different parts. We would also stick on a tool as VoiceThread (at the last minute we had to change it for a traditional PPT) as the recording capability is a key aspect in a language course. We will not do long (more than one hour) oral sessions where each group presents their own work while the rest of the class is listening. Instead we would create different breaking rooms to let students free to share their comments in a more fluent way and to make the most of this common real time session.

48. Technical support

- ESC: The role as instructional designer in a globally networked course is different. In this course, we worked with a bigger size of team; and when we were deciding which videos or which tools we want to adopt in the course, we need to confirm that students from both countries can have access to it.
- ULPGC: No “official” instructional designer was enrolled in this project.

49. International programs person

- ULPGC: The major difference between this course and a more traditional one (F2F and within the same class) was of course to deal with academic and geographical diversity (meaning: time zone, assessment, LMS, student’s attendance and requirements).

50. Time commitment

- The development of the course took almost 1.5. (from its conception). Twice as long as the regular online course
- ULPGC: this course represented a great deal of time. We spent a lot of time preparing the application, more than in the reading part of the COIL course and in the COIL course itself. When it came to our common course, we spent about 3 hours each week and more at the final stage of the course. Plus the 2 real time sessions (1 hour each) and the 2 training sessions (2 hours each).
51. Was it worth it?

Yes, most definitely (US)
ULPGC: Yes, it was absolutely worth it. Considering implementing such a course in the future we may have to rethink the distribution of the tasks and the time for each of them, but we know that such a cross-border project always include a great amount of time.

Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative

I honestly did not find any particular problems in this course. The major challenge we had was the time difference, but we found the solution, and worked a couple of Sundays. Collaborative activities were infused through the creation of tasks in three categories. First, information exchange will allow students to establish personal relationships with partners and will increase awareness of cultural differences. Sample tasks include students’ presentations of themselves and their cultures to their future partners through cultural autobiographies, students’ interviews of each other on certain cultural topics and a production of a virtual presentation (e.g. via Voice Thread) or a written report based on the interview process.

Second, in order to enhance practice of the intercultural skills of observation and to defy stereotypes, students were engage in the tasks, which involved comparison and analysis. Activities in this group joint reading of SandraCisner’s Casa en Mango Stree, and discussions of different intercultural issues, including most controversial ones related to politics, religion, environment, music.

Third, the development of intercultural communicative competence was fostered through collaboration in product creation. Sample activities include a creation of a blog or power point presentation by students in both classes on a topic of mutual interest (topics included family, education, food, etc.)

Section 10: Student Feedback

Though there are no anonymous comments. Here are examples:

“1 thought the Encounters posts were excellent and allowed a great view into the opinions of the Spanish students. I don’t know how I would improve on it. Group work, especially in an on-line environment has inherent difficulties.” (US)

“I think it was very difficult to communicate with the Spanish students. Even after we communicated about our final exam, they decided to take a different route and tell us about it the day of the presentation.” (US)

“I especially liked the interaction with US students and the comparison between both cultures.” (Spain)

“There should be more interaction in groups, not just to do the projects. Although, it was a little difficult because of the time difference.” (Spain)

ULPGC students:

What did you like best about this course?

1) I especially liked the interaction with US students and the comparison between both cultures.

2) I liked best the oral sessions, but I think we should have made more.

What specific things do you think could be improved in the structure or design of the course and learning
activities?

1) Me gustaría que se nos corrigieran los "posts" a los estudiantes españoles, porque así sabríamos los errores que cometemos y mejoraríamos nuestro "writing".

2) I think the whole ANGEL tool is quite complicated and hard to understand. Maybe there would be necessary some kind of tutorial very well explained about this.

3) I would have done more oral activities to improve our pronunciation and less writing tasks.

4) The structure is not that bad, but it could be better. As I said, there should have been more oral sessions and less writings and readings. Moreover, it would have much more funny if the oral sessions had been in pairs and not in groups.

What changes would you suggest be made to the pacing or sequence of the content and activities for this course?

1) Lo mejor sería planear más interacciones entre los alumnos, en vez de la presentación de trabajos orales, porque de esta manera lo que hacemos es practicar como lo hacemos en clase y no aprovechamos la ventaja de estar hablando con gente que domina el otro idioma y de la que podemos aprender mucho.

2) I would not change the content of the activities. I would just include more comparisons between both cultures but the activities were quite well sequenced.

3) It could be perfectly improved just by organizing the project a little bit. This web is not well organized. At first we didn’t know what we had to do and when
25. Turkey - USA: Economics

Abstract

The International Migration and Development course between SUNY Cortland and Anadolu University in Turkey was taught during Fall 2012. There were about 15 students from both institutions from the Business Economics at SUNY Cortland and Business Administration at Anadolu University. This was a face-to-face class alternating with teleconferencing every other week and two in-person visits by each instructor to each other’s institutions during a period of 8 weeks. An introduction to some cultural issues was done during the first teleconference meeting with the participation of the International Programs office at SUNY Cortland. The ice-breaking activity also included participation in posting a picture from their surroundings on the class Facebook account created for this purpose. After that the class alternated between regular lectures with invited speakers on both sides and team assignments consisting of two students from each institution. Students did three team assignments in consultation with each other while also exchanging some ideas during the teleconferences. The communication was left to the individual teams over Skype or any other medium. Topics covered included the meaning and measurement of economic development, poverty and inequality, urbanization, international migration, foreign direct investment, debt crisis, international finance and social entrepreneurship. Each instructor graded his own students’ research papers and assigned course grades on the same basis.
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Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and International Migration</td>
<td>SUNY Cortland</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3rd year undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anadolu University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: German A Zarate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team: Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: SUNY Cortland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution: Chair and Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program: Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Team Member #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mary Schlarb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team</td>
<td>Guest Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>SUNY Cortland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program</td>
<td>International Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Team Member #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Bilge Kagan Ozdemir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role on Team</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Anadolu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position at Institution</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department and/or Program</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. When?

Fall 2012

#### 4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

15 from each institution

#### 5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

The class was smaller at SUNY Cortland than usual due to the globally networked nature of the course we wanted to keep a small number (total 30)

Similarly, this class was exceptionally smaller at Anadolu University than usual due to globally networked nature of the course.

### Section 2: Issues of Language

#### 6. Languages(s) of instruction at each institution

English

#### 7. Primary language of most students in each class

English and Turkish

#### 8. Language of course collaboration

English
9. Language fluency
Varied but in general it was good.

10. Language proficiency difference
Did not seem to affect the basic communication part and we only noticed it when writing papers together.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?
Face-to-face meeting

12. Duration
About 8 weeks

13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period
Faculty members exchanged visits to each other classes and institutions during the semester as part of the course. Students at SUNY Cortland had a brief introduction to Turkey prior to the first face-to-face meeting but no assignment was given related to the collaboration.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools
Blackboard 9.0, Facebook (20%) and e-mail (10%)

15. Server location
Provided by SUNY Cortland.

16. Technical problems
No

17. Frequency of use
At least once a week. Students were expected to login at least once a week.

18. Informal communication
They were encouraged to use Facebook to post pictures and thoughts about their environments. Faculty also participated in this activity.
19. Re-use
Yes. I would add wiki or google docs.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools
We had 5 video conferences.

21. Server location
Were provided by both participating institutions.

22. Technical problems
No

23. Frequency of use
Videoconferences were about every other week during the 8-week period. We advise them to get in touch once a week but we did not keep track of their usage.

24. Informal communication
Other than the Facebook page we did not.

25. Re-use
Yes.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?
Unfortunately we did not do any formal assessment during or after the course and relied completely on the COIL assessment. We have not seen the results of such endeavor.

27. Common assessment rubric
Yes. We had a common rubric for the three written assignments that we required. The syllabus and the three assignments will be mailed separately.

28. Assessment outcomes
N/A
### 29. Peer assessment

We had an informal session during part of a class both in Cortland and Anadolu what their impressions were and what their suggestions may be. They were useful to understand their level of interaction and the problems they faced in cooperating.

### 30. Charter guidelines for student interaction

No but we think it could have been helpful to set guidelines for interactions. We would consider doing this next time around.

### 31. Attrition

Zero.

### 32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?

A very small percentage of students drops out of regular classes but this time students were carefully selected so it is not surprising not to have any dropouts.

### Section 7: Institutional Support

#### 33. Type of support

On the administrative side, the Dean allowed the Cortland class to go with only half the usual enrollment. On the technical side we had a video technical person available to us every time we encounter an issue. This person also provided all the training necessary to use the equipment at the beginning of the course.

#### 34. Engagement with the international programs office

The Cortland IP Director gave a class on cultural issues at the beginning of the semester and the Anadolu IP did not participate.

#### 35. Importance given to globally networked learning

I think they believe it is important and they have offered their support but it is not yet a part of their mission.

#### 36. Commitment

It was primarily a singular commitment on our part. We have made known in our Department but apart from a single inquiry nobody else has shown interest in these types of courses at the moment.

#### 37. Future iterations

We have discussed offering it again but in a slightly different context. We would like to do it once a year (or perhaps every other year) with a field study included. Possible target date: Spring 2014.

#### 38. New globally networked courses
Yes. One Cortland faculty member in the Economics Department has expressed interest. Emre Demirci at Anadolu University is planning to offer such a course. Vicki Boynton from the English Department at SUNY Cortland is currently offering such a course from Anadolu University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Response of chairs, deans, provosts or other administrators to the possibility of expanding this pilot course(s) into a broader program of globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They expressed support but they do not back it up with financial resources and my guess is that the small class nature of the course will not be allowed to go on in the long-run. I have no way to confirm this though.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging but cautious.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given the amount of time and effort involved it would be helpful to provide some extra compensation. This could be monetary or non-monetary (extra time for example).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 8: Reflections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42. Goals set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Complete the course successfully.  
- Avoid any major technology mishaps.  
- Set a precedent for international cooperation. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43. Goals achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We feel we accomplished these goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Most unique aspect for students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The face-to-face meetings we had when we visited each other’s institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a space in which American and Turkish students have an opportunity to know each other’s career interests and general aspects of their environments that are not in the textbooks. Sharing very important speakers with the class on topics that are also not generally covered in textbooks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers among students. It takes time to develop a trust and understanding of what this project is about. Monitoring student interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47. Changes for future iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not so much teaching differently but monitoring interactions, adding more of a cultural component and including more frequent assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it did not include an instructional designer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49. International programs person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The IP office has not been involved in any sort of class appearances before other than for informational purposes. Their future involvement would depend on what we specifically request of them and from my informal conversations they would be willing to support the effort if it is within their skill set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50. Time commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We did not keep track of time but we have a clear sense that it is more time consuming. From scheduling video conferencing rooms, to learning to use the equipment, to scheduling speakers, to reading students’ posts so in general I would say about a third more time but it is a very rough estimate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51. Was it worth it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was worth it. We can certainly build another interaction of the same course but developing a new one with a different partner would not be as easy given our already established relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1
List of Institutions that participated in the COIL Institute for Globally Networked Learning in the Humanities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating US Institutions:</th>
<th>Participating International Institutions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College at Brockport (SUNY)</td>
<td>Actors College of Theatre &amp; Television (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State College (SUNY)</td>
<td>American College of Management and Technology (Croatia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>American University Beirut (Lebanon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Carolina University</td>
<td>Anadolu University (Turkey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corning Community College (SUNY)</td>
<td>Ashesi University College (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>Babes Bolyai University (Romania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State College (SUNY)</td>
<td>Friedrich Schiller-Universität Jena (Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>University of Ghana (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>Hanzehogeschool Groningen (Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marymount University</td>
<td>Kagoshima University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University</td>
<td>Kwansei Gakuin University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Central University</td>
<td>La Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>La Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ) (Ecuador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University (United Kingdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
<td>Moscow State University (Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>Myongji University (Republic of Korea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Cortland</td>
<td>Novgorod State University (Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Geneseo</td>
<td>Osaka University (Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore College</td>
<td>Universidad de las Americas-Puebla (Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas El Paso</td>
<td>Queensland College of Art, Griffith University (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Royal Academy of Music (Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Belize (Belize)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of South Africa (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Victoria (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University (Australia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>