CIC
COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

CourseShare: Report to the CIC Deans of Arts & Sciences

March, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Last year, the CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences launched an effort to establish a voluntary, systematic method of sharing courses interinstitutionally and across the curriculum to enhance student access to specialized and low-enrollment offerings that become increasingly difficult to sustain. The Deans approved a plan in December 2005 that described their vision, goals, processes, principles and timeline for the initiative. The objective is to offer 10 courses in the fall of 2006, 15 in fall of 2007, and 25 in fall of 2008.

To further refine that plan and to more clearly guide future work, the Deans asked the CIC staff to prepare this summary report of past and present shared courses in the CIC – primarily in the colleges of arts and sciences – to identify lessons to be learned from them. This report aims to provide a framework for selecting the courses to be offered and inform the principles that will govern the sharing.

Through close work with CourseShare Campus Coordinators appointed by the Deans (or other campus administrators), more than a dozen shared courses were discovered as well as interest in sharing over 50 future courses. Campus Coordinators conferred with as many departments as possible in the short time available during the preparation of this report. It is expected that as processes are further developed for engaging interested faculty and departments, this list will more closely reflect the wider interest in course sharing in Liberal Arts & Sciences.

The lessons learned guided the development of recommendations for two models of course sharing that emphasize the themes of value, reciprocity, and sustainability. Other important lessons identified synchronous technologies (such as video conference and desktop collaboration tools) as the low-threshold, high educational value technologies of choice by faculty, and that are readily available on most CIC campuses. It was also generally reported that teaching a shared or collaborative course requires more faculty time than a typical classroom course requires and therefore, sustainability depends on finding creative solutions that allow faculty to value sharing courses. A final key lesson is that it is important to identify initial and recurring costs as well as any anticipated savings so departments can make accurate decisions about whether the course sharing opportunity matches their departmental goals.

Next steps include "match-making" host campuses with those campuses expressing student interest, working with Deans and Campus Coordinators to develop principles and policies for course sharing, engaging and supporting faculty interested in course sharing, and seeking outside funding as appropriate. Our initial investigation suggests the Deans will be successful in achieving their goals of sharing at least 10 courses this fall.

Prepared by
Amber Marks, Program Manager, Interinstitutional Course Sharing
Karen Partlow, Associate Director, Technology Collaboration
Catherine M. Player, Assistant Director, Academic and International Collaboration

INTRODUCTION

This report will provide CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences with recommendations for sharing low enrollment, highly specialized, primarily graduate courses through CIC CourseShare, an administrative framework to facilitate interinstitutional sharing of courses, beginning with the Fall 2006 term.

RATIONALE

The CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences articulated the following vision for the curriculum collaboration project: (December 2, 2005-Appendix A)

> The CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences propose to launch an effort to establish a voluntary, systematic method of sharing courses across the curriculum to enhance access to specialized and low-enrollment offerings for all participating CIC universities and their students. Although this model will be developed for Arts and Science courses, **it is fully expected that this model can and will be applied to courses in other areas of the university as well**.

> The initiative will focus primarily on offerings that can be "technology facilitated" to eliminate barriers of time and distance for participating students and campuses during the regular academic year, as well as other non-traditional models of instruction (e.g., seminar, summer course, etc.). It is further expected that the effort to identify courses for sharing will highlight areas of curricular focus (e.g., less commonly taught science courses and languages, American Indian Studies courses, specialized seminars in the social sciences or humanities, and other low-enrolling courses). As areas of focus emerge, the CIC staff, working with faculty and deans, will pursue external grant funding and support to accelerate the effort.

PREPARATION

In preparing this report, CIC staff explored course sharing models across the country as well as opportunities for course sharing within the CIC network of institutions. Staff consulted leaders of multiple course sharing projects and maintained ongoing relationships with these contacts. In winter 2006, CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences designated CourseShare Campus Coordinators (Group Listing-Appendix B) as primary campus contacts for interinstitutional course sharing (Job Description-Appendix C). The Campus Coordinators participated in conference calls, responded to inquiries from CIC staff, liaised with faculty and registrars, and provided responses to survey questions. Finally, the **Curriculum Collaboration Vision, Goals, Processes, Principles, Timeline** document approved by the CIC Deans of Arts and Liberal Sciences, as well as conversations with the deans (and especially those deans who serve as advisors for this project) and notes from their prior gatherings guided the development of this report.

The Deans had a broad initial vision of sharing graduate courses that including low enrollment, specialized courses that departments wished to retain but were extremely expensive to sustain. This paper recommends a refining of that vision based on the lessons learned from previous and current efforts to share courses interinstitutionally. In fact, these lessons have led to the recommendation of two models of courses that appear to have the greatest opportunity for success using CourseShare, both of which emphasize the themes of **value, reciprocity,** and **sustainability**. For the purpose of discussion of this recommendation, definitions of these terms are offered below:

Value: The benefits of learning opportunities otherwise unavailable to students on their Receiving/Home campuses.

Reciprocity: A symbiotic relationship between two or more CIC institutions whereby each institution delivers and receives one or more courses; in so doing, each institution draws upon the resources of the other to expand the learning opportunities for all of their students.

Sustainability: The capacity for a course to be shared between two or more institutions with reasonable likelihood of enduring resources for the foreseeable future. Resources influencing sustainability include department endorsement; funding; faculty interest, expertise, and availability; technology; and student interest.

MODEL #1 COURSES: AGGREGATIONS OF SIMILAR BUT UNIQUE COURSES

Course attributes:

A. Courses, when aggregated and offered consortium-wide, provide learning opportunities that would either be difficult or expensive to offer individually, thus increasing the marketability and value of graduate degrees at CIC universities. (Value, Reciprocity)

B. Courses require minimal development time and resources. (Sustainability)

C. Courses utilize synchronous technologies (e.g., videoconferencing and other interactive video and audio technologies) that are easily used by faculty and do not require extensive training and changes in approach to teaching. (Sustainability)

D. Courses are either not available or rarely available on student's home campus but significantly add to the value of that student's graduate education. (Value)

E. Courses provide instruction for a skill, technique, or process or present contextual or cultural knowledge that enhances student's education but is not his central area of research. (Value)

F. Course content often cross departmental boundaries and draw students from multiple disciplines. (Value, Sustainability)

G. Courses employ campus and college technology resources. (Sustainability)

Examples of aggregations of similar but unique courses:

- Less commonly taught languages
- Folklore courses
- Area and cultural studies studies courses
- Quantitative methods

MODEL #2 COURSES: COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPED COURSES

Course attributes:

A. Courses are identified by interested departments and faculty as having significant student interest and need. Courses meet departmental requirements for graduate students. (Value, Sustainability)

B. Course may be developed by team of faculty from a subset of CIC universities, resulting in broad faculty support and buy-in of the course as well as unique opportunity for professional development for faculty. (Value, Reciprocity, Sustainability)

C. A group of related courses (leading to an emphasis, minor, or degree) may be identified by a team of faculty from participating CIC universities, with each developing a different course or module(s). (Reciprocity, Sustainability)

D. Course development and delivery demands on faculty time are acknowledged by the department; faculty and department incentives provide motivation and reward. (Sustainability)

Examples of courses with potential for collaborative development:

- Courses that form a joint degree program in Bio-informatics
- Courses that form an American Indian Studies emphasis/minor
- Graduate seminars that include faculty participation from multiple universities

It should be noted that the Model #2 courses will require more time and resources to develop and therefore should clearly meet a student need and support departmental goals.

COURSES SHARED BY CIC INSTITUTIONS

The following list, while not exhaustive, presents examples of courses currently or previously shared by CIC institutions as identified by Advisory LAS Deans, Campus Coordinators, faculty contacts, and CIC representatives. The lessons learned closely align with the recommendation themes of value, reciprocity and sustainability and support the development of the CourseShare program as outlined in the CIC Deans of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Collaboration Vision, Goals, Processes, Principles, Timeline document (Appendix A). Funding models for shared courses vary widely between universities and even departments and are not a focus of this report.

Please note: Teaching/Host institutions are designated by an asterisk (*).

KAZAKH (FALL 2004-SPRING 2005)

Instruction Method: Videoconference with local native speakers as conversation partners
Grad/Undergrad: Both
Participating Institutions: Indiana*, Michigan, Michigan State

Description: Funded by a 4-year grant from the National Security Eduation Program (NSEP), Indiana provided beginning Kazakh via videoconference to students at Michigan and Michigan State in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005. The course instructor was also funded by the grant to travel to each Receiving/Home university during the term and meet the Receiving/Home students and to receive instruction on teaching using interactive video conferencing.

Lessons Learned:
   A. Videoconferencing format worked well for language instruction.
   B. Faculty and students perceived that the inconvenience of different time zones and campus calendars (semester vs. quarter) could be managed to allow students access to this language.
   C. This less commonly taught language is a good example of a course for which the Receiving/Home university has no faculty nor plans to add faculty but has graduate student interest—often due to research and/or heritage interests.
   D. Technical staff is not always required at Receiving/Home institution. In some cases, the students set up the video conferencing equipment themselves on class days.

CHEMICAL INFORMATICS (FALL 2004-SPRING 2005)

Instruction Method: Synchronous, interactive audio/video desktop application with lecture materials shared via Internet
Grad/Undergrad: Graduate
Participating Institutions: Indiana, Michigan

Description: This is a 3-hour graduate course aimed at introducing students to the fundamental informatics techniques for chemistry-related disciplines. The class covers a wide range of topics, including representation and use of chemical structure information, computer-aided drug design, 3D visualization and computation, and handling of large volumes of chemical information. The course drew student interest from different areas of study including health sciences and informatics.

Lessons Learned:
   A. Desktop applications free students from having to be physically on campus to take a course, and eliminate the need for use of videoconferencing classrooms.
   B. This course was initially shared because the same faculty person at Michigan was also adjunct faculty at Indiana, allowing students from both universities to take the course from a distance. The faculty member has since become full-time at Indiana only, and Michigan and Indiana are currently in discussion about future sharing of this course and other related courses.

STUDIES IN WAR, SOCIETY AND CULTURE (MULTIPLE TERMS, RECENTLY DISCONTINUED)

Instruction Method: Videoconference
Grad/Undergrad: Graduate
Participating Institutions: Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*, Ohio State

Description: Studies in War, Society, and Culture existed as a joint program offering elective courses between the departments of history at Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Ohio State. Instruction involved video conference and face-to-face sessions with faculty from both institutions under the direction of Illinois history faculty.

Lessons Learned:
A. Structured lecture format with question/answer opportunities is comfortable for both faculty and students using videoconferencing technology.
B. More than one faculty member in the classroom concurrently is cost prohibitive.
C. Without ongoing funding from Illinois, the project could not continue. Faculty interest remains strong.

E-LEARNING @ PENN STATE COOPERATIVE (FALL 2004-PRESENT)

Instructional Method: Mostly online asynchronous courses
Grad/Undergrad: Undergraduate
Participating Universities: Penn State system universities

Description: The E-learning Cooperative focuses on sharing large enrollment, low-level undergraduate courses that meet a general education or diversity requirement. Courses are taught during the regular academic year, but many are also available in summer. An online tool informs campus administrators of the courses to be shared and the "seats" available so they can select courses and add to their campus registration database.

Lessons Learned:
A. Penn State's decision to share large-enrollment, required undergraduate courses ensures ongoing student need for these courses.
B. Use of asynchronous technology allows for much larger course enrollment.
C. Penn State has a network of campus administrators who use a web tool designed to facilitate course sharing with support from LAS staff assigned to operate the Cooperative.
D. Merely offering excellent courses and a convenient way to enroll (both big hurdles of course) doesn't automatically translate into interest on the receiving end. Communication is key; sustainability relies on ongoing promotion and endorsement of the program at all levels.

PORTUGUESE (FALL 2003-SPRING 2004)

Instruction Method: Online instruction and local native speakers as conversation partners
Grad/Undergrad: Both
Participating Institutions: Michigan State*, Illinois at Chicago, Penn State, Wisconsin-Madison in Fall 2003; Michigan State* and Wisconsin-Madison in Spring 2004

Description: Portuguese 201 and 202 were taught primarily using an online course created by Michigan State and supplemented locally by native speakers serving as conversation partners at Receiving/Home universities. The CIC LAS Deans provided some seed money to Michigan State to develop the course with the idea that perhaps the application could be used to teach other language courses in the CIC.

Lessons Learned:
- A. The online course format was selected as being more appropriate over videoconferencing for teaching large numbers of students. Course development required much more time and resources to create than was anticipated, including over $200,000 in reported direct and indirect costs.
- B. Working collaboratively across campuses to develop a course results in a longer development period due to logistics and differences in goals/objectives than working independently. However, working independently on course development precludes the opportunity for buy-in from other universities' faculty and departments and may negatively impact sustainability in the long run.

INTEGRATED SEMINAR IN NURSING INFORMATICS (SPRING 2003)

Instruction Method: Videoconference
Grad/Undergrad: Graduate
Participating Institutions: Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin at Madison

Description: This collaboration of four faculty from four CIC universities applied distance education strategies to leverage the scarcity of nursing informatics faculty and at the same time offered students a wealth of research projects and innovations across multiple institutions.

Lessons Learned:
- A. Faculty reported that they greatly appreciated and enjoyed the opportunity to share with their peers during the course.
- B. Students reported great value in interacting with both faculty and students from multiple campuses and despite some technology challenges, found the experiment greatly worthwhile.
- C. Faculty found collaborative teaching approach to be significant increase in work load.

UZBEK (2003-PRESENT)

Instruction Method: Videoconference with local native speakers as conversation partners
Grad/Undergrad: Both
Participating Institutions: Indiana*, Ohio State

Description: Funded by athe same NSEP grant (see Kazakh), Indiana has offered first and second semester of elementary Uzbek taught via videoconferencing to one or two different Receiving/Home universities. The course instructor is also funded by the grant to travel to each home university during the term and meet the Receiving/Home students and to receive instruction on teaching using interactive video conferencing.

Lessons Learned: See Kazakh

RUSSIAN, EAST EUROPEAN, AND EURASIAN STUDIES (IOWA REEES) DISTANCE LEARNING CONSORTIUM (2002-CURRENT)

Instruction Method: Videoconferencing
Grad/Undergrad: Both
Participating Institutions: Iowa, University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State University

Description: The Iowa REEES Distance Learning Consortium is a collaborative effort supported by Iowa's three regents' universities along with generous support from the U.S. Department of Education Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages (Title VI). They began teaching elementary Polish and Czech in 2002 and added intermediate Polish and Czech along with elementary Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian in 2003.

Lessons Learned:
- A. Videoconferencing technology was selected because of delivery quality and cost, ease of use, effectiveness and portability.
- B. Largest part of investment was in one-time equipment costs.
- C. Interinstitutional collaborative development of select languages based on faculty expertise and student demand.

CIC COMMON MARKET OF COURSES AND INSTITUTES (1998-2000)

Instruction Method: Varied from online to videoconference to face-to-face
Grad/Undergrad: Courses varied and included graduate and advanced undergraduate
Participating Institutions: Various CIC universities Taught/Hosted 79 courses and 1 institute but only 25 students from different CIC universities participated in 8 of these courses.

Description: The Common Market of Courses and Institutes (CMCI) was developed as a experimental mechanism by which graduate and advanced undergraduate students in the CIC could take online courses provided by any CIC university. The Market provided a virtual space in which faculty could "register" their online courses as available and where students could view the offerings. This project was intended to provide faculty with access to more graduate students and students with more access to unique course offerings. The process of registration, admission, and fees was handled on a per student basis. CIC headquarters staff, registrars and admissions staff, and university administrators were all involved in the process. It should be noted that the CMCI was conducted with no budget, no full-time staff to promote or administer it, and with a web site developed by volunteers.

Lessons Learned:
- A. The CMCI indicated a need for a streamlined admissions, registration, and fee support structure undergirding the effort.
- B. The CMCI experiment indicated that basing the Common Market on voluntary course contributions without thought to the development of a coherent set of offerings does not generate interest from faculty or students, and is difficult to "promote."

TOPICS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS; TOPICS IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS (FALL 1998, SPRING 1999)

Instruction Method: Videoconference
Grad/Undergrad: Graduate
Participating Institutions: Minnesota*, Wisconsin at Madison, Stanford
Description: The MacArthur Foundation funded a grant for collaborative instruction of graduate seminars: Spring 1999, Topics in International Relations: New Dimensions in International Security, and Fall 1998, Topics in Comparative Politics: Human Rights and Legacies of Authoritarianism in Latin America.

Lessons Learned:
- A. Instructor presence should be limited to one faculty member for cost effective delivery.
- B. Lecture format with question/answer period resulted in greater student discussion participation than graduate seminar style presumably because of unfamiliarity with video conference technology.
- C. Grant funding was available for unique course offerings but upon grant completion, departmental funding would likely not be available. This course was therefore discontinued.
- D. Graduate student assistant provided valuable service as webmaster and WebCT coordinator.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM COLLABORATIVE LANGUAGE PROGRAM (1998-CURRENT)

Instruction Method: Videoconferencing with on-site native speakers as learning facilitators
Grad/Undergrad: Both
Participating Institutions: All UW-System schools

Description: The UW-System Collaborative Language Program was established as a grant-funded program and based on three primary initiatives:
1. Creating collaborative programs was of great interest to all UW system campuses.
2. Distance technology and particularly videoconferencing was believed to now be pedagogically sound and functionally feasible to support collaborative language instruction.
3. The program's foundation was built on the results of a needs and course availability survey which identified five critical less commonly taught languages including Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian. Hmong will soon be added to the program.

Lessons Learned:
- A. Videoconferencing technology preferred pedagogically for language instruction because it most closely matches the face-to-face contact in traditional classrooms that has been shown to be effective in language learning.
- B. Courses selected based on student need and course availability has proven sustainable.
- C. Teaching Assistant turnover impacts course quality and creates transition challenges.

ADVANCED POLITICAL METHODOLOGIES PROGRAM (1995-PRESENT)

Instruction Method: Videoconference
Grad/Undergrad: Graduate
Participating Institutions: Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Minnesota, Ohio State, Wisconsin at Madison (*Teaching/Host university rotates each module)

Description: Since 1995, four universities have collaboratively offered the Advanced Political Methodologies program via iTV. As described on the web site (http://psweb.sbs.ohio-state.edu/faculty/jbox/ITV/ITVAbout.html), "The project was intended to build a larger community of scholars in quantitative methods, improve the quality of faculty and student work, and overcome a very practical problem: the expensive nature of graduate instruction in the area of quantitative methods (Freeman and Shively 1995)." Faculty from Ohio State currently oversee the iTV program's efforts. The iTV project will provide six advanced methodology modules in 2006-2007 along with interactive colloquia from political methodologists at the forefront of advanced quantitative methods.

Lessons Learned:

A. Faculty remain actively involved because they find ongoing value in learning new techniques and keeping up with current research.

B. Reciprocity among participating institutions balances responsibilities and ensures sustainability.

C. Departments gain more than they contribute because each institution offers two modules per year, but can offer students 8 modules per year.

D. Students value access to otherwise unavailable resources via collaboration.

E. Academic expertise is so specialized that no one institution could offer the program, making collaboration essential.

F. Students and faculty tolerate technology challenges for the value of access to the experts.

G. Modules extend 7-10 weeks to accommodate differing academic calendars (semesters, quarters) and to reduce faculty workload. Because these modules require approximately 150% of the time involved in a 'regular' course, faculty requested 1.5 load credits. This was not possible, but an abbreviated term was an agreeable solution.

H. Students engaged in presentations early in the module adjust to the video environment more quickly and will actively participate in discussions throughout the semester.

I. Campus and college technology resources, rather than department-owned video equipment, prove more cost effective and ensure availability of technical assistance.

J. Other institutions have expressed interest in joining the partnership. Due to technology constraints and enrollment numbers, the existing partnership has elected not to expand but is willing to help initiate similar models elsewhere.

K. Faculty availability to serve on dissertation committees at partner institutions energizes faculty, increases student opportunities, and reduces the possibility of students transferring to another partner institution.

CIC TRAVELING SCHOLAR PROGRAM (1963-PRESENT)

Instruction Method: Mostly traditional classroom with occasional online courses
Grad/Undergrad: Graduate
Participating Institutions: All CIC universities

Description: The CIC Traveling Scholar Program enables doctoral-level students at any CIC university to take advantage of specialized courses at any other CIC university without change in registration or increase in tuition. Approximately 200-300 CIC students use the Traveling Scholar program annually. Only recently, through an online application form, has the CIC been able to capture information about courses students are interested in taking via the Traveling Scholar Program.

Lessons Learned:

Patterns have been noted among the approximately 200 courses that CIC students have applied for through Traveling Scholar for the 2005-2006 academic year in Liberal Arts and Sciences:

- Psychology (12 courses) = 6%
- Sociology (7 courses) = 3.5%
- Philosophy (10 courses) = 5%
- History (14 courses) = 7%
- Folklore/Anthropology (4 courses) = 6%
- Less Commonly Taught Languages (31 courses) = 15%
- Area and Cultural Studies (20 courses) = 10%
- Quantitative Methods (4 courses) = 2%

SHARED COURSES ANTICIPATED FOR 2006-2007

The following table presents information gathered from multiple sources including Campus Co-ordinators, faculty contacts, Advisory Deans, CIC staff, and others. This information continues to change daily as additional course needs and offerings are identified.

T: Teaching/Host Institution
R: Receiving/Home Institution
T/R: Teaching and Receiving shared between campuses

Course Name	UC	UIC	UIUC	IU	Iowa	UMich	MSU	UMN	NWU	OSU	PSU	PU	UW-Mad
Advanced Political Methodologies			T/R					T/R		T/R			T/R
Cochlear Dis-order					R								T
Tibetan						T				R			
Ukrainian						T							R
Uzbek						R							T
Uzbek (second offering)				T	R?		R			R			

Institution Abbreviations:
UC: University of Chicago (not participating at this time)
UIC: University of Illinois at Chicago
UIUC: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
IU: Indiana University
Iowa: University of Iowa
UMich: University of Michigan
MSU: Michigan State University
UMN: University of Minnesota
NU: Northwestern University
OSU: The Ohio State University
PSU: Pennsylvania State University
PU: Purdue University
UW-Mad: University of Wisconsin-Madison

ADDITIONAL COURSE SHARING CANDIDATES

In the time available during the preparation of this report, the Campus Coordinators conferred with as many departments as possible and identified dozens of additional courses that might be available for sharing with other institutions, as well as several courses which are currently needed on one or more campuses. It is expected that as processes are further developed for engaging interested faculty and departments, this list will more closely represent the wider interest in course sharing in Liberal Arts & Sciences. This information will provide opportunities for Campus Coordinators and CIC staff to explore further collaboration.

Table 1 identifies courses for which we potentially have institutions both willing to share and interested in receiving.

TABLE 1

COURSE AREA	INSTITUTION MIGHT BE ABLE TO TEACH/HOST:	INSTITUTION EXPRESSED INTEREST IN RECEIVING:
Arabic	UIUC (Sanskrit, colloquial), UIC (robust introductory level), UMICH (yr 3-4 & dialects), OSU	PSU (or develop)
Chinese	UIUC, UMich (yr 3-4), UIC (yr 1-2)	UIC (wants more sections)
Folklore courses	OSU/IU	OSU/IU
Hebrew	UMich	UIC (wants advanced & biblical)
Hindi	UIUC, UMich(yr 1-2-3)	UIC, PSU, NU (yr 3-4)
Indonesian	UW-Mad, UMich (yr 1-2-3)	PSU
Korean	UIUC, UMich (yr 3, 4)	PSU -4 sem+ (or develop), NU
Swahili	UIUC, PSU (maybe), UW-Mad	MSU (maybe), PSU
Turkish	UIUC	NU (yr 3-4)
Yiddish	UMich	UIC, UIUC

ADDITIONAL COURSE SHARING CANDIDATES

Tables 2A and 2B identify additional courses with possible Teaching/Host institutions though Receiving/Home institutions have not been identified.

TABLE 2A: LCTLs

COURSE AREA	INSTITUTION MIGHT BE ABLE TO TEACH/HOST:
Advanced Literary Arabic	UIC (2 courses)
Advanced Russian	UMich
Ancient & Modern Greek	UIC (very low enrollment), UMich
Brazilian Portuguese	UMich
Catalan	UMich
Czech	UIUC, Iowa
Classical Chinese	PSU
Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian	Iowa
Croatian	UIUC
Dakota	UMN
Dutch, Advanced	IU
Filipino/Tagalog	UMich (yr 1-2)
Finnish	UMN
Hmong	UW-Mad
Japanese	UIUC, UIC (yr 1-2)
Kazakh	IU
Macedonian	IU
Medieval Japanese	PSU
Norwegian	UMN
Ojibwe	UMN
Polish	Iowa, UMich (yr 2-3)
Quechua	UIUC, UMich
Serbian	UIUC
Several in advanced Spanish & Italian	UIC
Sub-Saharan African (Bamana, Wolof, Zulu)	UIUC
Swedish	UMN
Thai	UMich (yr 1-2-3)
Urdu	UMich (yr 1-2)

TABLE 2B: Other Courses

COURSE AREA	INSTITUTION MIGHT BE ABLE TO TEACH/HOST:
Grad Seminars in Theatre History, Literature, Criticism	OSU
Mathematics of Options, Futures, and Derivative Securities I & II	UMN
Music 694D: Music's Meanings	OSU
Patterns in Andean and Mesoamerican Pre-history	UIC
Political Science Research in Mathematical Political Science	OSU
Polymer Chemistry and Physical Chem. of Polymers	UMN
Qur'an course	UIC (low enrollment)
Upper level Art Education courses	OSU

The final table presents course areas that have been requested by Campus Coordinators and other institution representatives. Teaching/Host institutions have not yet been identified.

TABLE 3

COURSE AREA:	INSTITUTION EXPRESSED INTEREST IN RECEIVING:
Aramaic	UMich
Bengali	PSU
Medieval Italian	UMich
Old Norse	UMich
Pakrit	UMich
Pali	UMich
Persian/Farsi	NU (yr 3-4), PSU
Theatre proximity courses: Stage combat, playwriting, dialect work, etc	OSU

Below is a summary list of the lessons learned that will help guide the future sharing of courses in the colleges of arts and sciences in the CIC:

1. Institutions that share courses must feel a sense of reciprocity either through tuition sharing or a developing a model that results in participating departments receiving more courses than they each give to the initiative.

2. Synchronous technology is commonly selected for shared courses because it more closely resembles the classroom and is therefore more comfortable for faculty, and it requires less course adaptation and expense than web-based courses.

3. Although technology continues to change and evolve, there are two current models of synchronous technology identified as most favored by faculty, described below:
    *   Interactive video conferencing: Video conferencing (VC) provides two-way audio and video communication to one or more remote sites. Typically video conferencing equipment and/or a special video conferencing classroom are used. These facilities are available at differing levels of access and cost at all CIC universities. Faculty often choose VC because the 2-way audio-video most closely resembles a traditional classroom. Also, in some courses it is preferable to have remote students in the same room as a sub-cohort.
    *   Desktop synchronous collaboration applications: Synchronous collaboration software allows students to receive live video, audio, data, and chat simultaneously at their desktop. Currently eight of the CIC Universities and UIC have access to one or more of these tools either through campus license or distance/continuing education. Although 2-way capabilities are possible with most software, it often requires more bandwidth than is typically available from non-campus student housing, so 1-way audio and video is more often used. However, many students (and faculty!) greatly prefer the flexibility of being able to connect to class via a desktop not necessarily on campus.

4. Most successful course sharing examples that have used video conferencing have also funded occasional instructor travel to remote campuses or employed local course facilitators; faculty report that this practice has increased student involvement and learning.

5. Web-based courses may still be preferred by some faculty for certain subject matter. Although they require greater upfront costs, they may be easier to sustain.

6. Faculty, students, and registrars who have shared courses believe the added value of the course outweighs the challenges presented by differing time zones and academic calendars.

7. Teaching a shared or collaborative course requires more faculty time than a typical classroom course would require. Therefore, sustainability depends on

finding creative solutions that allow faculty to value sharing courses.

8. Shared courses using technology will likely incur incremental costs. It is important to identify up-front and recurring costs as well as any anticipated savings where possible so that departments can make accurate decisions about whether the course sharing opportunity matches their departmental goals.

9. Faculty interested in exploring course sharing will often require assistance and support to negotiate partnerships with other universities.

10. A web tool is needed that will facilitate "match-making" between host and home schools.

11. The two models of shared courses identified through this analysis should help guide faculty and department heads in the selection of courses to be shared.

NEXT STEPS

Based on what we have learned through the various communications and analysis involved in developing this report, we continue to support the plan approved for this course sharing initiative by the CIC Liberal Arts and Sciences Deans on Dec. 2, 2005 (see Appendix A). In addition, the report serves to guide the foreseeable work of CIC headquarters staff in the following specific ways:

- **Focus on "match-making."** Work with Campus Coordinators and faculty to match host and home institutions. Develop simple web tools to assist with this process.

- **Develop principles and policies for sharing.** Work with the Deans and Campus Coordinators to develop an agreed to set of principles and polices for sharing similar, aggregated courses (Model #1) and developing collaborative courses (Model #2) addressing issues such as tuition sharing, intellectual property, enrollment minimums/maximums, and funding and support models.

- **Engage interested faculty.** Outline and execute a strategy with Deans and Campus Coordinators for assisting and supporting faculty and departments who indicate interest in sharing courses with other CIC universities, including assessing cost issues and exploring funding models.

- **Begin seeking funding.** Work with Deans to pursue grants and funding that will facilitate course sharing, and in particular, help with improving access to robust synchronous technologies on campus.

**CIC Deans of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Collaboration:
Vision, Goals, Processes, Principles, Timeline
December 2, 2005**

The following is an overview of a process agreed upon by the CIC LAS Deans and further shaped by the Deans' advisory group for launching the curriculum collaboration initiative.

CIC Curriculum Collaboration: A Vision

The CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences propose to launch an effort to establish a voluntary, systematic method of sharing courses across the curriculum to enhance access to specialized and low-enrollment offerings for all participating CIC universities and their students. Although this model will be developed for Arts and Science courses, it is fully expected that this model can and will be applied to courses in other areas of the university as well.

The initiative will focus primarily on offerings that can be "technology facilitated" to eliminate barriers of time and distance for participating students and campuses during the regular academic year, as well as other non-traditional models of instruction (e.g., seminar, summer course, etc.). It is further expected that the effort to identify courses for sharing will highlight areas of curricular focus (e.g., less commonly taught science courses and languages, American Indian Studies courses, specialized seminars in the social sciences or humanities, and other low-enrolling courses). As areas of focus emerge, the CIC staff, working with faculty and deans, will pursue external grant funding and support to accelerate the effort.

Goals:

By September 2006, deliver at least 10 Arts & Science offerings
By September 2007, deliver at least 15 Arts & Science offerings
By September 2008, deliver at least 25 Arts & Science offerings

During 2006, the CIC will:

- Prepare a summary report of online courses available across the CIC
- Create online tools to support the project (website, catalog)
- Seek outside funding for experiments and course development/delivery
- Promote the project through meetings with faculty and college coordinators
- Communicate with and report to the Deans' advisory group regularly
- Begin to develop necessary policies, including those related to tuition reimbursement, enrollment, and course approval

During 2006, Deans will (with the assistance of the CIC):

- Discuss models for tuition sharing and/or reimbursement (that can be used after the pilot period) and course approval
- Review and approve policies as developed
- Promote the project with faculty
- Identify and appoint campus coordinators

Processes and Principles:

Identifying courses to be shared

Deans will identify a campus coordinator who will serve as the primary point of contact for inter-institutional course sharing to faculty, students, administrators, and the CIC staff. In addition, the campus coordinators will be integral to identifying potential courses for sharing. Initially low enrollment upper level and graduate courses that are already taught using via technology will be targeted for sharing. However, coordinators will

also work with departments to help identify unmet student needs, unique campus offerings with resident student interest, and faculty interest in sharing and/or collaborating on a shared course. Efforts to share less commonly taught languages will continue, and other areas of study facing enrollment challenges that could benefit from sharing courses will be identified.

Gaining campus course approval for shared courses

Campus approval for courses will require two levels of approval; Dean approval and approval through the campus curriculum review process.

During the first two years of this initiative and until the Deans determine the specifics of any formal agreement, the Deans agree that those principles that underpin the CIC Traveling Scholar Program will guide this effort:

- Department heads and faculty from interested universities will agree to allow students from participating schools to enroll in the shared course.
- The teaching university will establish the calendar of the shared course, but in consultation with the receiving schools.
- Shared courses will not be treated as "transfer courses" but will be allowed temporary curriculum approval through the established campus "fast-track" process and listed in the campus course timetable so students can register for the shared course at the same time and in the same way they register for other resident courses
- No tuition will be shared for shared courses during the first two years of the initiative
- The technology used by the teaching university to deliver the course will be used by the receiving universities

If after the first two years of course sharing the participating Deans, faculty and department heads determine they would like to continue sharing the course on a long-term basis, then the course should be submitted to their respective campus curriculum review process. However, since each shared course will have already been approved by the teaching university's curriculum review process, it may be preferable to seek an alternate approach to course review through local curriculum committees. Such an alternate approach would seek to avoid redundancy in course approval and streamline the course sharing process while still determining how the course will be positioned within the participating departmental offerings. Campus coordinators will explore this alternative with their respective campus curriculum approval committee.

Encouraging faculty and departments to share courses interinstitutionally

Participating Deans will use a variety of inducements for encouraging faculty and departments to develop and share courses interinstitutionally using technology, depending on their own individual and campus situations. Possible inducements include:

- Emphasizing this initiative as a college priority
- Funding individual or collaborative faculty development of shared courses
- Enforcing existing or creating new policies that specify minimum course enrollment, and allowing requirements to be met by aggregating students from other CIC schools
- Providing a portion of the tuition dollars back to the departments
- Providing some release time for faculty to develop courses
- Providing support for faculty collaboration
- Providing a special teaching stipend (not on a per student basis)
- Aligning shared courses with departmental goals
- Providing course load credit for teaching faculty
- Buying faculty teaching time for shared courses through Dean's office

CIC LAS Deans Curriculum Collaboration Project 2005-2007		
Deliverables	**Principals**	**Timeline**
Present goals, timeline and deliverables to LAS Deans for review and approval	Deans, CIC staff	Fall 2005
Identify and appoint college coordinators	Deans	Fall 2005
Meet with CIC Registrars to review and revise administrative system for course sharing as necessary	Registrars, CIC staff	Fall 2005 -Winter 2006
Prepare summary report of online courses taught at CIC universities with an emphasis on Arts & Science courses	CIC staff	Winter/Spring 2006
Create online tools to the support project (website, catalog)	CIC staff	Winter/Spring 2006
Begin seeking outside funding for experiments and course development/delivery	Deans, CIC staff	Winter/Spring 2006
Promote the project through meetings with faculty, college coordinators and other campus partners	Deans, Faculty, CIC staff, campus coordinators	Winter/Spring 2006
Demonstrate different technology options for course delivery	LAS Tech. Leads, Deans, Dept Heads, Faculty, CIC staff	Spring/Summer 2006
Provide annual assessment towards project goals, adjust as necessary	CIC staff	Summer 2006
Deliver 10 Arts & Science offerings	Faculty, registrars, campus coord, CIC staff	Fall 2006
Develop all necessary policies, (where applicable) tuition reimbursement, enrollment, course approval, etc.	Deans, advisory group, registrars, Graduate Deans, CIC staff	Spring 2007
Provide annual assessment towards project goals, adjust as necessary	CIC Staff	Summer 2007
Deliver 15 Arts & Science offerings	Participating faculty, CIC staff	Fall 2007
Conduct evaluation, provide summary project report for review and determination of project future	CIC staff	Spring 2008
Deliver 25 Arts & Science offerings	Participating faculty, CIC staff	Fall 2008
Communicate with and report to the Deans advisory group regularly	Advisory group, CIC staff	Ongoing
Work with faculty who bring forward courses for consideration (e.g., physics, American Indian Studies, informatics and others where there is need and interest expressed).	Faculty, Deans, CIC staff	Ongoing

APPENDIX B CAMPUS COORDINATORS

University of Chicago
not participating at this time

University of Illinois at Chicago
Jeremy Teitelbaum
Associate Dean
Math, Computer Science and Statistics
851 S. Morgan Streetw
Chicago, IL 60607
Phone: (312) 996-5237
Fax: (312) 413-2511
Email: jeremy@uic.edu

University of Illinois-UC
Ann Marie Mester
Assistant Dean
Liberal Arts and Sciences Administration
294 Lincoln Hall MC-448
702 S. Wright Street
Urbana, IL
Phone: (217) 333-1350
Fax: (217) 333-9142
Email: mester@ad.uiuc.edu

Indiana University
Catherine Larson
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education
College of Arts and Sciences
Office of the Dean
104 Kirkwood Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405 USA
Phone: (812) 855-1646
Fax: (812) 855-2060
Email: larson@indiana.edu

University of Iowa
Anne Zalenski
Associate Director
Credit Programs
116 International Center
10 Ferson Avenue
Iowa City, IA 52242
Phone: (319) 335-2048
Email: anne-zalenski@iowa.uiowa.edu

University of Michigan
Robert E. Megginson
Associate Dean
Undergraduate & Graduate Education
College of Literature, Arts & Sciences
6530 Haven Hall
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1045
Phone: (734) 764-0320
Fax: (734) 764-2697
Email: meggin@umich.edu

Michigan State University
Brendan Mullan
Associate Dean for Academic & Student Affairs
College of Social Science
202 Berkey Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: (517) 355-6673
Email: mullan@msu.edu

University of Minnesota
Robin Matross Helms
Office of the Senior VP for Academic Affairs
234 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 626-5598
Fax: (612) 624-5824
Email: rmhelms@umn.edu

Northwestern University
Mary Finn
Assistant Dean
College of Arts & Sciences
1922 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
Phone: (847) 491-7567
Email: mfinn@northwestern.edu

Ohio State University
Edward Adelson
Executive Dean
Arts and Sciences
114 U Hall
230 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: (614) 292-3537
Email: adelson.3@osu.edu

Pennsylvania State University
Jack Selzer
Associate Dean
Graduate and Undergraduate Studies
33 Burrowes Building
University Park, PA 16802
Phone: (814) 865-1438
Fax: (814) 863-7285
Email: jls25@psu.edu

Purdue University
Coordinator to be appointed

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Nancy Westphal-Johnson
Associate Dean
College of Letters and Science
306 South Hall
1055 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 263-2506
Fax: (608) 265-2275
Email: westphal@ls.admin.wisc.edu

CIC Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences Curriculum Collaboration Project

January 5, 2006

POSITION TITLE: Campus Coordinator for Interinstitutional Course Sharing

FUNCTION: The Campus Coordinator serves as the primary contact person for the colleges, students, faculty, staff, and university administrators and the CIC headquarters in relation to the campus's participation in the CIC CourseShare Project.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Specific duties will evolve as the project is defined but may include:

- Receiving approval and support for course offerings from the Dean, department heads, curriculum committee in accordance with the campus's course review processes
- Reacting to and suggesting improvements to proposed administrative processes for the initiative
- Gathering pertinent shared course information from faculty and sharing with CIC headquarters
- Assisting students seeking to enroll in a shared course, as needed (or deputing this role to other staff who report back to Coordinator)
- Communicating with teaching faculty about course roster, student concerns, etc.
- Communicating with Registrar's office about courses approved for interinstitutional sharing
- Arranging and communicating with college technical support about course needs, as necessary
- Publicizing campus course enrollment information for courses taught at other universities prior to the academic term