

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

16. Mexico - USA: Women’s Studies & Political Science

Contents

Section 1: General Course Information	2
Section 2: Issues of Language	4
Section 3: Curricular Information	5
Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used	6
Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used	8
Section 6: Assessment Information	9
Section 7: Institutional Support	10

Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

Course Title	Institution(s)	Discipline	Academic Level
Feminisms in Comparative Perspective: Immobilities, Inequalities, and Transnationalisms in North America	University of Cincinnati	UC: Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	UC: 4th year and graduate
	Universidad de las Americas Puebla	UDLAP: Political Science	UDLAP: 4th year

2. The team

Team Member #1	
Name:	Dr. Anne Sisson Runyan
Role on Team:	Faculty (Co-Instructor)
Institution:	University of Cincinnati
Position at Institution:	Professor (and Interim Director of Taft Research Center)
Department and/or Program:	Dept. of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
Team Member #2	
Name:	Dr. Marianne H. Marchand
Role on Team:	Faculty (Co-Instructor)
Institution:	Universidad de las Americas Puebla
Position at Institution:	Professor and Canadian Studies Coordinator
Department and/or Program:	Department of Political Science
Team Member #3	
Name:	Carolyn Stoll
Role on Team:	Instructional Designer
Institution:	University of Cincinnati
Position at Institution:	Instructional Designer
Department and/or Program:	College of Allied Health
Team Member #4	
Name:	Dr. Olga Sanmiguel-Valderrama
Role on Team:	Faculty (Spanish language resource person)
Institution:	University of Cincinnati
Position at Institution:	Assistant Professor
Department and/or Program:	Dept. of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

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?
<p>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.</p> <p>For an advanced undergraduate seminar, offered face-to-face except for the online elements with UC, this is about average..</p>

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 paqueterias (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
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
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.

The information contained in this document has been reproduced with the consent of the Institute Fellows. Should you like to contact one of the Fellows, please send an email to coilinfo@suny.edu. This document and its related project have been funded with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. This report reflects the views only of the authors and the NEH cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE
Humanities



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

