

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

21. Russia - USA: Intercultural Communication & Foreign Languages

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.

Contents

Section 1: General Course Information	3
Section 2: Issues of Language	5
Section 3: Curricular Information	6
Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used	7
Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used	9
Section 6: Assessment Information	11
Section 7: Institutional Support	12
Section 8: Reflections.....	14
Section 9: Course Collaboration Narrative	16
Section 10: Student Feedback.....	18

Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

Course Title	Institution(s)	Discipline	Academic Level
Intercultural Communication in the Global Classroom	SUNY Geneseo	Communication	We targeted seniors but the course was open to any year.
Using Information and Computer Technology in Intercultural Communication	Moscow State University	Foreign Languages and Regional Studies	The course targeted Sophomores.

2. The team

Team Member #1	
Name:	Meredith Harrigan
Role on Team:	Faculty Member
Institution:	SUNY Geneseo
Position at Institution:	Associate Professor
Department and/or Program:	Communication
Team Member #2	
Name:	Mira Bergelson
Role on Team:	Faculty Member
Institution:	Moscow State University
Position at Institution:	Professor
Department and/or Program:	Foreign Languages and Regional Studies
Team Member #3	
Name:	Becky Lewis
Role on Team:	International Programs
Institution:	SUNY Geneseo
Position at Institution:	Assistant Provost for International Programs
Department and/or Program:	International Programs
Team Member #4	
Name:	Corey Ha
Role on Team:	Instructional Designer
Institution:	SUNY Geneseo
Position at Institution:	Associate Systems Administrator

Department and/or Program:	Milne Library
3. When?	
Spring, 2012	
4. Number of students enrolled from each institution	
SUNY Geneseo: 16 MSU: 17	
5. Is this typical for classes of this type?	
<p>16 is a much smaller class size than typical at SUNY Geneseo. A typical Intercultural Communication class would have 25-30 students.</p> <p>The enrollment was usual, plus I had to add another small group of MA level students to match the size of the Geneseo group. Also, it is hard to speak about the 'enrollment' per se, as the Russian system deals with 'student groups' taking the course, not individual students signing up for the course.</p>	

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Language(s) of instruction at each institution
English
7. Primary language of most students in each class
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.
8. Language of the course collaboration
Yes, the collaboration took place entirely in English.
9. Language fluency
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.
10. Language proficiency difference
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?
It was a hybrid course that blended asynchronous outside-of-class communication with synchronous communication during class meetings via video conferencing.
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
<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 <p>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.</p>

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
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
21. Server location
<p>The Tandberg System is owned by SUNY Geneseo. Although Skype is cloud-based, SUNY Geneseo’s Department of Communication owned the Premium account.</p>
22. Technical problems
<p>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.</p>
23. Frequency of use
<p>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.</p>
24. Informal communication
<p>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.</p>

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 serves 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
<p>SUNY Geneseo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. <p>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.</p>
34. Engagement with the international programs office
<p>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.</p> <p>At MSU, NONE. The SUNY-MSU Center Director was interested how this course could be useful for their image, but did nothing.</p>
35. Importance given to globally networked learning
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
36. Commitment
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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
<p>When we first met at the Global Center, we created the following shared learning goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.1. 4. To demonstrate mindful communication in a cross-cultural interaction.
43. Goals achieved
<p>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.</p>
44. Most unique aspect for students
<p>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. Students had a first-hand opportunity to apply the various theories and concepts they were learning in class.</p>
45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective
<p>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.</p>
46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective
<p>None come to mind for either faculty member.</p>
47. Changes for future iterations
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.

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/).