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

25. Turkey - USA: Economics

Abstract

The International Migration and Development course between SUNY Cortland and Anadolu University in Turkey was taught during Fall 2012. There were about 15-students from both institutions from the Business Economics at SUNY Cortland and Business Administration at Anadolu University. This was a face-to-face class alternating with teleconferencing every other week and two in-person visits by each instructor to each other's institutions during a period of 8-weeks. An introduction to some cultural issues was done during the first teleconference meeting with the participation of the International Programs office at SUNY Cortland. The ice-breaking activity also included participation in posting a picture from their surroundings on the class Facebook account created for this purpose. After that the class alternated between regular lectures with invited speakers on both sides and team assignments consisting of two students from each institution. Students did three team assignments in consultation with each other while also exchanging some ideas during the teleconferences. The communication was left to the individual teams over Skype or any other medium. Topics covered included the meaning and measurement of economic development, poverty and inequality, urbanization, international migration, foreign direct investment, debt crisis, international finance and social entrepreneurship. Each instructor graded his own students' research papers and assigned course grades on the same basis.

Contents

Section 1: General Course Information

1. Courses

Course Title	Institution(s)	Discipline	Academic Level
Economic Development and International Migration	SUNY Cortland Anadolu University	Economics	3rd year undergraduate

2. The team

Team Member #1	
Name:	German A Zarate
Role on Team:	Faculty
Institution:	SUNY Cortland
Position at Institution:	Chair and Assistant Professor
Department and/or Program:	Economics
Team Member #2	
Name:	Mary Schlarb
Role on Team:	Guest Lecturer
Institution:	SUNY Cortland
Position at Institution:	Director
Department and/or Program:	International Programs
Team Member #3	
Name:	Bilge Kagan Ozdemir
Role on Team:	Faculty
Institution:	Anadolu University
Position at Institution:	Professor
Department and/or Program:	Economics

3. When?

Fall 2012

4. Number of students enrolled from each institution

15 from each institution

5. Is this typical for classes of this type?

The class was smaller at SUNY Cortland than usual due to the globally networked nature of the course

we wanted to keep a small number (total 30)

Similarly, this class was exceptionally smaller at Anadolu University than usual due to globally networked nature of the course.

Section 2: Issues of Language

6. Languages(s) of instruction at each institution
English
7. Primary language of most students in each class
English and Turkish
8. Language of course collaboration
English
9. Language fluency
Varied but in general it was good.
10. Language proficiency difference
Did not seem to affect the basic communication part and we only noticed it when writing papers together.

Section 3: Curricular Information

11. Online or blended?
Face-to-face meeting
12. Duration
About 8 weeks
13. Class work or discussion related to their collaboration before and/or after the actual collaboration period
Faculty members exchanged visits to each other classes and institutions during the semester as part of the course. Students at SUNY Cortland had a brief introduction to Turkey prior to the first face-to-face meeting but no assignment was given related to the collaboration.

Section 4: Asynchronous Technologies Used

14. Tools
Blackboard 9.0, Facebook (20%) and e-mail (10%)
15. Server location
Provided by SUNY Cortland.
16. Technical problems
No
17. Frequency of use
At least once a week. Students were expected to login at least once a week.
18. Informal communication
They were encouraged to use Facebook to post pictures and thoughts about their environments. Faculty also participated in this activity.
19. Re-use
Yes. I would add wiki or google docs.

Section 5: Synchronous Technologies Used

20. Tools
We had 5 video conferences.
21. Server location
Were provided by both participating institutions.
22. Technical problems
No
23. Frequency of use
Videoconferences were about every other week during the 8-week period. We advise them to get in touch once a week but we did not keep track of their usage.
24. Informal communication
Other than the Facebook page we did not.
25. Re-use
Yes.

Section 6: Assessment Information

26. How?
Unfortunately we did not do any formal assessment during or after the course and relied completely on the COIL assessment. We have not seen the results of such endeavor.

27. Common assessment rubric
Yes. We had a common rubric for the three written assignments that we required. The syllabus and the three assignments will be mailed separately.

28. Assessment outcomes
N/A

29. Peer assessment
We had an informal session during part of a class both in Cortland and Anadolu what their impressions were and what their suggestions may be. They were useful to understand their level of interaction and the problems they faced in cooperating.

30. Charter guidelines for student interaction
No but we think it could have been helpful to set guidelines for interactions. We would consider doing this next time around.

31. Attrition
Zero.

32. Is this typical for similar classes at your institution?
A very small percentage of students drops out of regular classes but this time students were carefully selected so it is not surprising not to have any dropouts.

Section 7: Institutional Support

33. Type of support
On the administrative side, the Dean allowed the Cortland class to go with only half the usual enrollment. On the technical side we had a video technical person available to us every time we encounter an issue. This person also provided all the training necessary to use the equipment at the beginning of the course.

34. Engagement with the international programs office
The Cortland IP Director gave a class on cultural issues at the beginning of the semester and the Anadolu IP did not participate.

35. Importance given to globally networked learning
I think they believe it is important and they have offered their support but it is not yet a part of their mission.

36. Commitment
It was primarily a singular commitment on our part. We have made known in our Department but apart from a single inquiry nobody else has shown interest in these types of courses at the moment.

37. Future iterations
We have discussed offering it again but in a slightly different context. We would like to do it once a year (or perhaps every other year) with a field study included. Possible target date: Spring 2014.

38. New globally networked courses
Yes. One Cortland faculty member in the Economics Department has expressed interest. Emre Demirci at Anadolu University is planning to offer such a course. Vicki Boynton from the English Department at SUNY Cortland is currently offering such a course from Anadolu University.

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
They expressed support but they do not back it up with financial resources and my guess is that the small class nature of the course will not be allowed to go on in the long-run. I have no way to confirm this though.

40. Institutional commitment to further developing globally networked courses
Encouraging but cautious.

41. How to nurture the development of globally networked learning
Given the amount of time and effort involved it would be helpful to provide some extra compensation. This could be monetary or non-monetary (extra time for example).

Section 8: Reflections

42. Goals set
Complete the course successfully; Avoid any major technology mishaps; Set a precedent for international cooperation.

43. Goals achieved
We feel we accomplished these goals.

44. Most unique aspect for students
The face-to-face meetings we had when we visited each other's institutions.

45. Most successful aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective
Creating a space in which American and Turkish students have an opportunity to know each other's career interests and general aspects of their environments that are not in the textbooks. Sharing very important speakers with the class on topics that are also not generally covered in textbooks.

46. Most problematic aspect(s) from a pedagogical perspective
Language barriers among students. It takes time to develop a trust and understanding of what this project is about. Monitoring student interaction.

47. Changes for future iterations
Not so much teaching differently but monitoring interactions, adding more of a cultural component and including more frequent assessments.

48. Technical support
No, it did not include an instructional designer.

49. International programs person
The IP office has not been involved in any sort of class appearances before other than for informational purposes. Their future involvement would depend on what we specifically request of them and from my informal conversations they would be willing to support the effort if it is within their skill set.

50. Time commitment
We did not keep track of time but we have a clear sense that it is more time consuming. From scheduling video conferencing rooms, to learning to use the equipment, to scheduling speakers, to reading students' posts so in general I would say about a third more time but it is a very rough estimate.

51. Was it worth it?
It was worth it. We can certainly build another interaction of the same course but developing a new one with a different partner would not be as easy given our already established relationship.

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