28. How did you assess your course? Please discuss both your assessment of the development of intercultural awareness and your evaluation of the disciplinary learning which took place.

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.

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.

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 based on a set of predetermined questions.

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 it’s 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.”
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.

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

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.

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.
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.

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.

Exit Survey Tool

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.

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).
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 oversea interests.

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).

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.

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.

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.

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 another.
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

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.

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’ intercultural experiences and of keeping track of their progress and of any changes in their attitudes towards other cultures.