COIL Institute for Globally Networked Learning in the Humanities
Course Development and Implementation Case Study

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.

Contents

Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

Course Title	Institution(s)	Discipline	Academic Level
World Science Fiction	Texas Tech University, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena	English	graduate seminar

2. The team

Team Member #1	
Name:	Bruce Clarke
Role on Team:	instructional faculty
Institution:	Texas Tech University
Position at Institution:	Professor
Department and/or Program:	Department of English, Literature area
Team Member #2	
Name:	Dirk Vanderbeke
Role on Team:	instructional faculty
Institution:	Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena
Position at Institution:	Professor
Department and/or Program:	Institut für Anglistik/Amerikanistik
Team Member #3	
Name:	Kelli Cargile Cook
Role on Team:	support faculty
Institution:	Texas Tech University
Position at Institution:	Associate Professor
Department and/or Program:	Department of English, Technical Communication area

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

Did the class meet your expectations?

US 1	Yes
US 2	Yes
DE 1	I did not know what to expect exactly from the overall course because of its new approach to teaching (at least the transatlantic seminar was new to me!). Content-wise I expected some theory on Science Fiction and some insight on the readings we had and both were fulfilled.
DE 2	Yes and no. yes: interesting intercultural discussions, no: often too much professors dialogue.
DE 3	In relation to the discussion of the texts, it did. In relation to the work with the American students it didn't but I can see that essay assignments are a better way to have two groups work together over such a distance, than discussions.

Did the class fit into your current level of studies?

US 1	Yes
US 2	Yes
DE 1	You had to bring in a lot of knowledge from more basic, methodical courses, so it was on a good level for someone far enough into his studies. A student in his/her first or second year would have had some problems.
DE 2	A little bit above my current level.
DE 3	Yes

Were the assignments sufficiently challenging / too challenging?

US 1	While the logistical difficulty of this experimental class is understandable, for students to have a sufficient group project, I don't think one week is not long enough particularly when our means of communication is only the Internet with the time difference.
US 2	The assignments were challenging, but just challenging enough to improve my skills.
DE 1	cf. second question
DE 2	Challenging especially insofar as communication between USA and Ger was sometimes difficult and hardly any specification of how the outcome has to look like was given.
DE 3	The reading assignments were adequate.

What (if anything) did you like about the class?

US 1	I have never been taught by two professors simultaneously, so that observing two professors debating was an interesting experience. As of the particular class environment, I wish we had more time for collaborative work with a German counterpart since it had slowly become an effective and interesting conversation.

US 2	I liked working with the German students and Professor Vanderbeke (he is an excellent resource on science fiction).
DE 1	It was very important that the lecturers put emphasis on assignments and which were to be done by whom, mixing up the American and the German parts of the class. This cultural and academic exchange was the whole point of the course to me, even more so concerning the topic of Science Fiction technology and alien communication :)
DE 2	The whole concept and idea, the intercultural/global aspect, especially when it comes to natural foreign language speakers and to POVs of people with other socialization/education.
DE 3	The selection of texts and the discussions where both sides of the "screen" were actively participating.

What did you dislike?

US 1	I wish we had a different communicative tool in class, such as text chatting. While using a Web camera as a virtual classroom is effective, the instability of the Internet connection was problematic. It would have been much better if each student could try to present their idea through a different tool if they prefer.
US 2	The meeting time was quite early (but understandable because of the time difference).
DE 1	It seems that we haven't arrived at the point of Lem's *Fiasco* in which every single part of the technology works like a small cog in the big wheel!
DE 2	Often too much of professors lecturing and arguing with each other. It is sometimes interesting, but not always. The lack of clear guidelines of how works would have to look like.
DE 3	Discussions that consisted of the reading of essays.

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 arc significant for this class, the discrepancy between students· seriousness and interest. Some arc 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?

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.
US 2	Not me personally, but were a problem for the class as a whole in the beginning.
DE 1	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.
DE 2	In the beginning yes, but after all things got set out straight, not anymore.
DE 3	Not really

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

US 1	Both Dr. Clarke and Dr. Vanderbeke show different interpretations of a given text. It was very beneficial although sometimes their conversation left students behind.
US 2	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.
DE 1	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!
DE 2	V: 2+ C:3
DE 3	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.