Research Article

Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad

Volume 36, Issue 1, pp. 531-562
DOI: 10.36366/frontiers.v36i1.794
www.frontiersjournal.org

Student-Faculty Partnerships as Intercultural Encounters: Co-constructing the Pathways to Global Learning

Olivia Jones Choplin[1], Emily Ford[2]

Abstract

It is widely recognized that learning interventions that help student sojourners prepare for and process their study abroad experiences can increase those students' learning gains. What if, however, students express skepticism or resistance to those learning interventions? This article offers a case study of a student-faculty partnership in re-designing and implementing a pre-, during-, and post-study abroad course sequence offered to world languages majors and minors at a relatively small private comprehensive university. We demonstrate that the student-faculty partnership led to increased buy-in from students and thus also to increased learning on their part. In proposing that student-faculty partnerships in course design can also be imagined as intercultural encounters, we argue that they can bring a unique richness and productive dialogue to designing powerful interventions for student learning abroad.

Abstract in French

Il est bien reconnu que les interventions d'apprentissage qui aident les étudiants en séjour à se préparer et à gérer leurs expériences d'études à l'étranger peuvent accroître les acquis de ces étudiants. Que se passe-t-il cependant si les élèves expriment du scepticisme ou de la résistance à l'égard de ces interventions d'apprentissage ? Cet article propose une étude de cas d'un partenariat étudiant-professeur visant à repenser et à mettre en œuvre une séquence de cours avant,

1 Elon University, Elon, NC, United States of America
2 New Hanover County Senior Resource Center, Wilmington, NC, United States of America

Corresponding authors: Olivia Jones Choplin, ochoplin@elon.edu

Accepted date: January 6th, 2024

pendant et après le semestre à l'étranger offerte aux étudiants spécialistes ou mineurs en langues dans une université privée polyvalente aux Etats-Unis. Nous démontrons que le partenariat étudiant-professeur a conduit à une adhésion accrue des étudiants et donc également à un apprentissage accru de leur part. En proposant que les partenariats étudiants-professeurs dans la conception des cours puissent également être imaginés comme des rencontres interculturelles, nous soutenons qu'ils peuvent apporter une richesse unique et un dialogue productif à la conception d'interventions puissantes pour l'apprentissage des étudiants à l'étranger.

Keywords

Intercultural learning, student-faculty partnership, study abroad preparation, study abroad reentry

Introduction

As a high-impact practice (Kuh, 2008), global learning (including study abroad) can promote student growth in many areas: personal, academic, social, intercultural. In order to maximize the transformative learning opportunities of study abroad, Vande Berg et al. (2009) suggest that students can benefit from pedagogical interventions to deepen their experiences. As study abroad educators from various disciplines, we hope to help our students achieve Hoggan's (2016) level of transformative learning which "involves a deep, structural shift in the basic premises of thought, feelings, and actions. It is a shift of consciousness that dramatically and permanently alters our ways of being in the world" (p. 64). This article will discuss one Department of World Languages and Cultures' iterative approach to increasing the transformative gains of the study abroad semester required for degree completion. The department's efforts led to the creation of a course sequence designed to support language majors and minors as they prepared for and processed the study abroad experience, encouraging deep cultural learning through a three-part course sequence pre-, during, and post-abroad. While the original goals of the course were laudable, faculty teaching the first iterations of the course faced obstacles related to student buy-in. Even though early offerings of the course series involved student cohorts who completed work that successfully demonstrated deep knowledge of the host culture in at least one area, students did not always achieve the full spectrum of intercultural gains aspired to by the department. Additionally, many of the students were unconvinced of the course work's worth and value to them during the course itself. To understand student

frustrations and make tangible efforts to improve both student buy-in and student achievement related to the course goals, one faculty member teaching the sequence invited a student partner to collaborate with her on the course redesign. This article examines the positive results of that student-faculty partnership and elucidates the benefits of student-faculty partnerships for designing transformative intercultural learning experiences. We thus answer the research question: What, if any, are the benefits of a student-faculty partnership model in the context of global learning interventions? We also offer a reflection on the particular relevance of student-faculty partnerships to the field of global learning.

Cook-Sather et al. (2014) define student-faculty partnership as: "a collaborative, reciprocal process through which all participants have the opportunity to contribute equally, although not necessarily in the same ways, to curricular or pedagogical conceptualization, decision making, implementation, investigation, or analysis" (pp. 6-7). In this case, the faculty partner invited a student who had already taken the departmental pre-, during-, and post-study abroad course sequence to join her in thinking about how to redesign the course and achieve the following ambitious goals: 1) help students see the value of fully engaging in the course so that they could gain the most from it; 2) help students understand how the type of critical reflection that they did in the course could serve them in other situations; 3) better structure the course to maximize student learning. Essentially, the aim of the student-faculty partnership was to improve the course itself while also improving the attitudes and outlooks of students and thus (by extension) the experiences of both the students and the faculty member.

This article uses the lens of this student-faculty partnership to unpack and reflect on the impact that the ethos of partnership had on student learning in relation to study abroad. Specifically, we explore how the student-faculty partnership used to debrief pedagogical practices was in itself modeling a form of cultural adaptation—as the faculty member and student partner learned to understand each other's cultural codes, increasing the effectiveness of the communication about the course between the faculty member and all of her students. As Sobania and Vande Berg (2020) point out in the Preface to the volume *Mind the Gap*:

> The stimulus for global learning is the dual recognition that, first, for any given object, value, or belief others are making meaning of that

> concept and themselves different than I or my group conceptualize it. Simultaneously and second, we must recognize that those others are also making meaning in ways that are similar to, or the same as, the way my group or I do [...] One of the challenges we face as educators is in helping others understand that the meaning of things isn't somehow in the things themselves—whether those things are "at home" or "away"—but in us. (p. xiv)

This key assertion about global learning—that different people may ascribe a different meaning to the same object—might indeed apply to *all* learning. We might argue that students and faculty must work together to negotiate their shared understandings of the meanings of the educational experiences of *any* given course—from goals and outcomes to activities, assignments, and rubrics. It is all the more important, then, that faculty involved in facilitating the global learning of students recognize and value the literal or figurative cultural differences that may exist between themselves and those students whose intercultural learning they are mentoring. We will thus argue in favor of student-faculty partnership models to facilitate shared understandings of how cultural learning can be achieved and also to increase students' intrinsic motivation and their successful achievement of deep intercultural learning related to study abroad.

To support our argument for these types of collaboration, we will briefly offer a case study of the course sequence at our university and discuss the elements of the course that early cohorts of students found problematic. We will then describe the role of the student partner in redesigning the course. Next, we will explain the changes that were implemented to the course design and the student response to those changes. Finally, we will discuss the implications of our work and argue in favor of the integration of student-faculty partnerships in the field of study abroad education.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Initial Course Design and Implementation

The students enrolled in the course sequence discussed in this article are generally majors and minors in the Department of World Languages and Cultures spending a semester abroad in a country where the language they are learning is the principal language of educational institutions. Most are studying either Spanish or French. The programs vary widely, but none are faculty-led

by instructors from our home institution. They are approved by the department and the study abroad office as affiliate programs meeting the needs of our students and led by organizations with administrators on the ground in the host country. Most, but not all, offer homestay options. All students take most courses in the target language, but some programs offer courses in English as well.[1]

In general, the 4-credit course sequence[2] is designed to offer culture-general instruction in the pre-departure course (1 credit taught in the final six weeks pre-departure), reflective writing in the online course while abroad (1 credit online), and processing and debriefing in the course when students return to campus (2 credits, meeting once weekly throughout the reentry semester).[3] The pre-departure course and the post-study abroad course both meet for 1hr and 40 min one evening per week; the pre-departure course meets only during the second half of the semester (for six weeks). In the pre-departure course, instructors introduce culture-general topics such as metaphors for culture, different categories of cultural learning (Paige et al., 2012), and distinguishing stereotypes from generalizations. Students set personal, academic, social, and linguistic goals for their semesters abroad and discuss strategies for achieving those goals. They are also assigned independent reading about the host culture of their semester abroad; they each choose a book that discusses the culture of their host country and read that book in tandem with the other course reflections that are graded for completion but receive feedback from the professor.

The second course in the sequence is conceived to be entirely online, and it involves students producing weekly writing during their time abroad which

[1] Over the past several years, the following demographic data has remained fairly stable (+/- 1 %). 61% of the student body identifies as female; 20% as ALANAM (African American/Black, Latinx/Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/American Indian, Alaskan Native, Multiracial); less than 1% are over 25. This institution seeks 100% access to global education experiences. 80% of the graduates of the class of 2020 had completed at least one study away experience. Many students study away during a three-week period in January known as Winter Term. During the years of 2015-2022 (excluding 2020 and 2021, the years most heavily impacted by COVID-19), between 1,400-1,600 students went abroad per academic year, and between 42-49% of students studying abroad chose semester-long programs. The total undergraduate enrollment during those same years was between 5,900-6,200 students.

[2] Our institution uses a 4-credit course model, so these three courses add up to one “whole” course.

[3] The authors are preparing a separate article detailing this course model and demonstrating its effectiveness in promoting student learning.

they post to an individual (but not private) forum on the course management system. In the first iteration, these writing entries were called blogs, language which sparked a negative response from students. There is a very simple rubric involving the level of detail and reflection required in their writing entries (see Appendix A for the initial rubric and the tweaked rubric), and students are graded based on a contract: 13 entries that "meet" or "exceed" expectations = A, 11 entries = B, 9 entries = C. The topics for their entries have been co-generated by students and faculty pre-departure to guide their thinking and reflection. The list of suggested prompts given to students includes more ideas than there are weeks in the semester, so their freedom of choice is significant (see Appendix B for the list of prompts). They are also told that they can write something not related to the prompts if they wish.

The third course in the sequence serves as a space for students to process their study abroad experiences in the company of peers who may have had different experiences, but whose experiences are framed in similar ways. The first half of the semester is dedicated to unpacking the emotional aspects of the experience with the aim of reducing reverse culture shock, encouraging community, and facilitating reintegration to the campus and the decompartmentalization of student learning. To that end, students brainstorm topics that they wish to discuss as a group and sign up to lead a discussion with their peers around that subject. Topics selected by students in both cohorts were: 1) How to talk about your study abroad experience (especially how to frame negative experiences); 2) How not to revert to "your pre-abroad self"; 3) How to keep up your language skills now that you are back on campus; 4) How to readjust to the campus social climate; 5) How to maintain contact with friends from abroad, and others. These topics are student-generated, though sometimes inspired by probing questions from the faculty member. Concurrent with these in-class discussions, students spend time outside of class drafting (in stages) the meta-analysis of their own writings from while they were abroad. The second half of the semester is dedicated to student work on their final projects designed to showcase their learning from their time abroad, and which they have traditionally shared at an informal presentation session open to other students, faculty, and staff.[4] These projects were graded traditionally according to a rubric shared with students.

[4] The final presentations from the course have generally been open to the public and are mostly attended by other students and faculty from the Department of World Languages and Cultures as

While an analysis of student work produced by the first cohort *did* demonstrate growth in knowledge and in certain habits of mind, the balance of students' perceptions of the course was primarily negative. They saw it as a waste of time, too much work for a two-credit course, and demonstrated high levels of grade anxiety related to the final project of the original pre-departure course, the writing while abroad, and the final project of the reentry course. The grade anxiety was of particular concern because it seemed to greatly influence students' perceptions of the course. Many of the students were high-achieving and task-oriented, so they were uncomfortable undertaking academic tasks that combined deep reflection with a certain amount of vulnerability. While all of the students in the first iteration of the course discussed for this article earned grades of B+ or above, they filled out their course evaluations before they had completed their final projects, and the grade anxiety was very clear in their narrative comments on the evaluations. Seven of the 16 students commented on grading in the course, stating, for example, that they wanted: "More clear guidelines about how to get an A in the course," or that "Many students have expressed that they feel as though we put a ton of work into meeting the standards but only ever get high B's and not A's even though we thoroughly followed instructions." These comments clearly demonstrate that student motivation for the course was fully extrinsic; they placed more emphasis on grades than on their learning.

In addition to the negative responses some students had to the course sequence, many students also denied its benefits, despite demonstrable learning that took place on their part. In a survey of students from the first cohort, one year after participation in the class, students were asked: "Looking back, are there any benefits to the thinking you did in the course that you have come to recognize, but did not understand during the course? Please explain." Though some students provided thoughtful feedback, 36% of student responses were a variation of "no." Students from this cohort did, in fact, demonstrate achievement of departmental goals related to intercultural competence. Despite their success, however, many failed to recognize the value of their learning. Clearly, the course design needed work if it was to help facilitate the

well as some staff members from the Global Education Center. The second cohort studied here did not participate in the public presentation of their work due to the coronavirus pandemic, but instead shared their work with their own classmates on the course management system with a two-minute video introduction.

transformative aspects of study abroad learning in a way that was not only successful in meeting the course goals, but also recognizable to the students themselves.

Cultural Mediators, Transparency, and Transformation

Convinced of the pedagogical value of the course and frustrated by many students' general dissatisfaction with it, the faculty partner invited a student from the cohort—an Elementary Education major and Spanish minor—to provide student feedback and input related to improving the course. The faculty member invited the student to participate in undergraduate research in the field of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) related to study abroad reintegration and to be a partner in the redesign of the course for future students. She chose the student partner for several reasons: 1) the student's work showed a deep commitment to reflecting on the study abroad experience; 2) as an Education major, she thought the student would be interested in exploring the pedagogical ideas of the course; and 3) the student was from outside of the faculty member's home area (French), so there would be no external pressure on the experience because of future courses with the faculty member.

The student-faculty partnership, in practice, consisted of weekly meetings that included discussions of academic articles on study abroad preparation and reintegration, discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of the first iteration of the course, and brainstorming how to improve attitudes and outcomes for the next cohort of students. Often, these conversations would begin with the faculty member's perspective and an explanation of how or why various assignments were created to meet the goals of the course. The student partner would then share the student perspective on how those assignments had been understood by her peers, providing insight on student attitudes towards the assignments.

The student partner explains,

> I learned a lot about what [the professor] was attempting to accomplish by listening to her vocalize the process behind creating the assignment. I had not originally understood this process, as a student, but it helped me understand the course better and appreciate the potential of the assignments. I also felt like I, as the partner providing the student perspective, could then explain how, as a class, students had misinterpreted the assignments. This gave me

> an opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings and point out ways to reframe an assignment to meet the audience.

The student-faculty partnership thus created a space where both parties were able to provide clarification and form new understandings related to the course and its outcomes: the student partner served as a cultural mediator, translating the professor's goals for learning into a format that students could better digest. The student perspective was therefore an integral part of the redesign process and facilitated the development of mutual understanding between the faculty member and her students. First unpacking the possible reasons for prior student confusion, the student-faculty partners then brainstormed together adjustments that would more clearly communicate to students the goals and value of the assignments.

If we consider Hammer's (2012) perspective on the building of intercultural competence, which "involves increasing self-awareness, deepening understanding of the experiences, values, perception, and behaviors of people from diverse cultural communities, and expanding the capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to bridge across cultural differences" (p. 116), then the student-faculty partnership did in some ways mirror the experience of intercultural learning. While the faculty member and the student partner did not hail from diverse cultural communities,[5] there is some merit to considering the "cultural" differences (attitudinal, generational, educational) that could impede mutual understanding between members of the "faculty" community and of the "student" community. Their work together was approached with cultural humility and the assumption that only via the development of a shared understanding could student learning truly be improved.

Adjustments to the Course: Reframing and Grading

As a partnership, the pair revised assignment descriptions, retooled rubrics, and reinforced the way that the course sequence was explained to students throughout the series as something that would better facilitate their

[5] Both are straight, white, cis-gender women, U.S. citizens, from middle-class backgrounds, although one grew up in North Carolina and the other in New Jersey.

understanding of the study abroad experience as one important period of what would ideally become a lifelong pursuit of intercultural learning.

Since the overarching goals of this course were to improve student thinking about themselves as culturally-situated beings, to encourage critical thinking about their own cultural rules and biases (potentially challenging concepts), the student-faculty partners decided that students needed to be relieved of grade anxiety for two main reasons: 1) to increase their comfort with asking themselves hard questions; and 2) to allow the faculty member to challenge them in their thinking without increasing their anxiety. Many scholars point out that grades can be detrimental both to student motivation and to their willingness to engage in deep and difficult critical thinking (Blum et al., 2020; Chamberlin et al., 2018; Tannock, 2015). In the revised pre-departure course, students were graded according to two factors: 1) contributions to the classroom community, and 2) reflective pre-departure writing and cultural analysis practice. The feedback on their work, however, was a critical part of the learning. Scholars have pointed to the ways that student collaboration with a faculty member during reflective writing practices can help move them from low levels of reflection to higher order thinking (Hunter & Hatton, 1998; Pedro, 2011, p. 62). Giovanangeli et al. (2018) point to the ways that mentoring is essential to teasing out intercultural learning. By shifting the grading structure so that *feedback* was disconnected from their *grade* in the course, the faculty member could guide and mentor students towards deeper critical thinking without students experiencing heightened grade anxiety. To achieve this shift, students in the post-redesign cohort self-assessed their participation according to a multiple-choice "quiz" which was posted on the learning management system each week (see Appendix C). Similarly, they self-assessed their preparation for class and their completion of reflective writing assignments simply by responding whether or not they had completed each element of the assignment according to the given criteria of 1) topic to be addressed, and 2) length of requested writing. In this way, the instructor could give students constructively critical feedback on their reflective writing, pushing them to be more precise in their thinking and expression without them being concerned that they would receive a "bad grade." The revisions to this course certainly resulted in an attitudinal shift related to student buy-in and appeared to foster more intellectual risk-taking with students from the second cohort. In addition to making these changes to the grading system, the student-faculty partners

discussed ways that assignments could be reframed and presented to students differently to encourage their personal investment in their learning.

An Ethos of Partnership

The philosophy of shared responsibility for the course sequence that guided the initial student-faculty partnership became central to the overarching redesign. In addition to the input from the student partner on the new syllabi and assignment descriptions, the student-faculty partners devised the culminating activity of the pre-departure course so that the *enrolled students* could design the final project that would be used to demonstrate their learning in the post-abroad course. As Cook-Sather et al. (2014) state,

> even if the ends of a course are fixed, the means often are not. For example, you might collaborate with students to decide how best to achieve the established learning outcomes. Encouraging students to become partners in this way puts students and faculty on the same team: striving together to reach goals (p. 21).

Taking a backwards design approach (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998), during the final exam period of the pre-departure course, students worked together to discuss and negotiate how *they* could *demonstrate* their achievement of the intercultural competence goals designed by the Department of World Languages and Cultures. Using the goal matrix shown in Table (1) on the following page, students discussed in small groups the types of artifacts they could collect while abroad and the types of texts they could produce that would demonstrate the various types of cultural learning they had achieved in relation to cultural knowledge, intercultural skills, and attitudes. After their small group discussions, each group presented its ideas to the full class, and the students, professor, and student partner debated the pros and cons of each type of assignment. This collaborative process served multiple purposes: it reminded students of some of the overarching goals of their education in world languages and cultures; it got them to think strategically about what they would need to do while abroad in order to learn *and demonstrate* their learning; and it invested *them* in the creation of guidelines for the final product that would be used to assess their learning.

Students will achieve advanced intercultural competence [6]	Capstone (Completion of a Major)	Milestone 2 (Completion of a Minor/upper-level 300)
Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	Demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates advanced understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Knowledge and Skills: Cultural self-awareness and openness	Articulates insights into their own cultural rules, judgments and biases learned through their interactions with culturally different others.	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules, judgments and biases through their interactions with culturally different others.
Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication	Articulates a detailed understanding of cultural differences apparent in verbal and nonverbal communication.	Recognizes cultural differences and incorporates that understanding appropriately in verbal and nonverbal communication.
Skills: Connecting linguistic difference to cultural difference	Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of and ability to ask complex questions about cultural perspectives revealed by differences in vocabulary and syntax. Is able to manage appropriately some cultural conventions within a variety of contexts.	Recognizes and makes hypotheses about cultural perspectives revealed by differences in vocabulary and syntax. Is able to appropriately manipulate the conventions of the target culture revealed through language within certain genres.

TABLE (1): DEPARTMENT GOAL MATRIX FOR WORLD LANGUAGES MAJORS AND MINORS

The resulting project was called the "Intercultural Journey Portfolio," and it took the form of a personal website that chronicled each student's study abroad experience. In the portfolio, students were asked to demonstrate the following: 1) Deep cultural knowledge about at least one element of the host culture; 2) A critical understanding of their own cultural rules and biases; 3) Knowledge of differences in verbal and nonverbal communication between their home culture and the host culture; and 4) An understanding of how linguistic differences are connected to cultural differences. This electronic

[6] Adapted from the AAC&U "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric."

portfolio was framed to students as something they could share with friends, family, potential graduate schools, and future employers to showcase their study abroad learning. Upon their return from the semester abroad, they were given great freedom to design the portfolio as they wished, but the overarching guidelines and the rubric can be seen in Appendix D. Since the project was completely new, the faculty member drafted the rubric and offered it up for feedback from her student partner and the enrolled students before making it official for the course. Thus, the partnership model, which began as a way to revamp the course to increase student buy-in and achievement of learning outcomes, infused the overall course development and encouraged student investment in the processes via which their learning would be assessed.

What Changed?

To assess the success of the new course, the student-faculty partners anonymized the student work and performed close readings of the "Blog/Journal Analysis" assignments from Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 as well as of the final portfolios from Cohort 2. They also examined the narrative comments from the Student Perceptions of Teaching forms collected as part of the university's evaluation of teaching. Applying the humanities skill of close reading to the student writing allowed for an in-depth analysis of recurring themes. To analyze these recurring themes within the student work samples, the partners used qualitative coding to separately annotate the compiled works of both cohorts. After coding, each partner wrote up a reflection on what information could be gathered from the cohorts separately and how student response differed from Cohort 1 to Cohort 2. Then, the partners compared notes and discussed their findings, which the student partner used to compose a table of student responses (see Appendix E). These close reading techniques also allowed the partners to determine key words and phrases that repeated across samples of student work, attaching those keywords to themes discussed by Hoggan (2016) in relation to transformative learning. They were therefore able to gauge shifts in the overarching attitudes of students as well as provide specific examples of moments when students successfully demonstrated their achievement of course goals—specifically in relation to the intercultural learning and growth that are particular aims of this course sequence.

Appendix E details the changes made to various assignments and their framing between the two iterations of the course sequence thanks to the student-faculty partnership. It also describes the student responses to those

changes, both attitudinally and in relation to learning outcomes. As shown in Appendix E, the student response to assignments in the second cohort was notably less negative than the student response of the first cohort. The contract grading system in the pre-departure course created a more positive classroom atmosphere than the one that had permeated the previous iteration of the course. This more positive atmosphere was also evidenced in Student Perceptions of Teaching data gathered from the second cohort. Students' anonymous comments about the course were more likely to note its benefits and the enthusiasm about study abroad that it encouraged in them: "Professor [...] allowed us to think critically about culture, and it makes me very excited to go abroad in the fall." Contrary to the previous cohort, they expressed no grade anxiety whatsoever. Analysis of the student work from each cohort showed a correlation between more positive attitudes to the work and more convincing critical thinking related to intercultural learning in Cohort 2. Despite the typically negative response from Cohort 1, it is important to note that the first iteration of the course sequence was not an outright failure. In fact, the first iteration included assignments that successfully fostered critical thinking related to the department's goals. According to the assessment of their work, students in the first cohort ended the course series with the ability to demonstrate deep knowledge of the host culture in one or more areas. However, many of the students *did not believe that to be true at the time of the series completion* and expressed frustration related to the course as an unproductive use of time. The student-faculty partnership effectively decreased the gap between students' perceived learning and their demonstrated learning, increasing both the perceived value of the course and its actual value.

Discussion and Conclusions

While we believe our departmental pre-, during-, and post-abroad course model represents a powerful type of intervention for maximizing the impact of study abroad for our students, the argument of this article is not for a particular model of *course* but more for a particular approach to *pedagogy*. For those who design global learning experiences and their paired interventions, including student voices in the thinking and framing of those interventions can lead to greater student buy-in and engagement. Discussing and negotiating *with our students* our perspectives on global learning outcomes and how they can be achieved and demonstrated also provides a powerful model for them for the

process of negotiating meaning across different perspectives in intercultural situations.

In their 2017 volume *Teaching Interculturally*, Lee et al. (2017) argue in favor of an intercultural pedagogy, which they describe as requiring a process that is "ongoing (not quick), intentional (not haphazard), developmental (not a singular event), complex (not simple), and integrative (not insular)" (p. 7). We argue that student-faculty partnerships can represent a powerful form of intercultural pedagogy as they encourage students *and* faculty to better articulate their investment in learning and negotiate how learning can best be demonstrated. Our case study demonstrates that the collaborative work between the faculty and student partners was a key factor that led to deepened student engagement with their own learning in the context of their study abroad experiences. The literature on student-faculty partnerships strongly supports the idea that integrating student perspectives in the design of assignments and incorporating their feedback, advice, and opinions related to the overarching structure of a course can lead to an increase in student understanding of the relevance of course assignments to their learning, improved student attitudes towards the course work, and an improvement in the quality of achieved course outcomes for any discipline (Cook-Sather et al., 2014). Student-faculty partnerships also "tend to make both students and faculty more thoughtful, engaged, and empathetic as they go about their work and life on campus" (pp. 100-101). The goals of thoughtful engagement and empathy are also central to intercultural development. Thus, in the complex world of study abroad education, where much recent research has focused on the importance of interventions to increase the transformative outcomes of study abroad, our project suggests that including students in the process of imagining the pathways to their learning can deepen their engagement in marked ways. Students-faculty partnerships foster the development of complex thinking skills that mirror those of global learning and intercultural competence. By this, we mean that student-faculty partnerships require both students and faculty to practice cultural reframing related to their role in the classroom to come to a mutual understanding. In doing this work, the hierarchy of student versus faculty is broken down to allow for collaborative work where, as partners, they can form new understandings of learning. This type of thinking is of utmost relevance to study abroad education and global learning and can be applied in any relevant intercultural encounter.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the students of WLC 301-303 who were willing to participate in this research project and make their work available for analysis. They are also grateful to the Writing Residency sponsored by Elon University's Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, which gave them time and space to write this article, as well as to members of Elon's Center for Research on Global Engagement Community of Practice on Intercultural Learning, who served as readers and thought partners in their work.

References

Blum, S. D. (Ed.). (2020). *UNgrading: Why rating students undermines learning (and what to do instead)*. West Virginia University Press.

Chamberlin, K., Yasué, M., & Chiang, I. A. (2018). The impact of grades on student motivation. *Active Learning in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418819728

Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. Jossey-Bass.

Giovanangeli, A., Oguro, S., & Harbon, L. (2018). Mentoring students' intercultural learning during study abroad. In J. Jackson & S. Oguro (Eds.), *Intercultural interventions in study abroad* (pp. 89-102). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315276595-6

Hammer, M. (2012). The Intercultural Development Inventory: A new frontier in assessment and development of intercultural competence. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 115-136). Stylus Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003447184-7

Hoggan, C. D. (2016). Transformative learning as a metatheory: Definition, criteria, and typology. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *66*(1), 57-75. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713615611216

Hunter, J., & Hatton, N. (1998). Approaches to the writing of cases: Experiences with preservice Master of Teaching students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(3), 235–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866980260306

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. AAC&U.

Lee, A., Poch, R. K., O'Brien, M. K., & Solheim, C. (2017). *Teaching interculturally: A framework for integrating disciplinary knowledge and intercultural development*. Stylus Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003447399

Namaste, N., Sturgill, A., Sobania, N. W., & Vande Berg, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Mind the gap: Global learning at home and abroad*. Stylus Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003446033

Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P., (2002). *Maximizing study abroad*: *A students' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. University of Minnesota Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Pedro, J. Y. (2005). Reflection in teacher education: Exploring pre-service teachers' meanings of reflective practice. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives, 6*(1), 49-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/1462394042000326860

Sobania, N. & Vande Berg M. (2020). "Global Competency: Where We've Been and Where We Need to Go." In Namaste, N., Sturgill, A., Sobania, N. W., & Vande Berg, M. (Eds.). *Mind the gap: Global learning at home and abroad*. (pp. ix-xiv). Stylus Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003446033

Tannock, S. (2017). “No grades in higher education now!” Revisiting the place of graded assessment in the reimagination of the public university. *Studies in Higher University*, *42*(8), 1345-1357. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1092131

Vande Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., & Paige, R. M. (2009). The Georgetown Consortium project: Interventions for student learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *18*(1), 1-75. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v18i1.251

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Young, G. E. (2014). Reentry: Supporting students in the final stage of study abroad. *New Directions in Student Services*, *2014*(146), 59-67. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20091

Author Biography

Olivia Jones Choplin, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of French and Associate Director of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning at Elon University. She coordinated the World Languages and Cultures Departmental pre-, during-, and post-study abroad sequence for three years. She regularly collaborates with the Isabella Cannon Global Education Center on faculty development programming for study away courses and recently co-led her first short-term study abroad course in France.

Emily Ford graduated from Elon University with a degree in Elementary Education and a minor in Spanish and received a Fulbright ETA for Spain in 2020. She used her passion for language learning, cultural exchanges, and experience from a semester in Cordoba, Argentina to serve as a student collaborator on this project. Currently, Emily serves as Community Engagement Specialist for New Hanover County Senior Resource Center, making a positive impact in her community.

Appendix A: Journal Rubrics

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations
Depth of reflection and analysis	Reflection and analysis includes an attempt to interpret or explain why things are the way they are in the target country.	Some reflection and analysis with a bit of interpretation.	Does not achieve minimal expectations for reflection and analysis.
Level of detail	Blog provides rich detail and description.	Blog provides enough detail that someone who is not present can understand what is going on.	Does not achieve minimal expectations for detail. Reader cannot visualize or understand what is being described.

TABLE (A1): INITIAL "BLOG" RUBRIC (COHORT 1)

Revised Rubric for Student Journaling While Abroad (Cohort 2):

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations
Documentation of thinking and feeling	Student not only documents their responses in the moment to the situation they are describing, but also makes an attempt to interpret or explain either 1) their thoughts and feelings or 2) why things are the way they are in the target country.	Student clearly documents their own responses in the moment to the situation they are describing and/or their thinking afterwards about the situation they are describing.	Student merely narrates a series of events with no documentation of their thinking about those events.
Descriptive detail	Journal entry provides rich detail and description.	Journal entry provides enough detail that someone who was not present can understand what was going on.	Journal entry does not achieve minimal expectations for detail. Reader cannot visualize or understand what was being described, or entry does not meet the minimum length requirement of 500 words.

TABLE (A2): REVISED JOURNAL RUBRIC (COHORT 2)

Appendix B: Journal Prompts

Students must respond to the 3 obligatory topics listed below by the due date indicated. These are related to the Intercultural Journey projects for WLC 303 and your goals. The other entries can be selected from the free choice list. **However, you must focus on a different topic each week.**

OBLIGATORY/MANDATORY journal entries

1. Reflection on goals written in WLC 301 and how you are progressing on them -- **By week 6**

2. Revisit and reflect on the Intercultural Journey Portfolio: What new insights have you developed since you have been abroad? Can you already demonstrate that you have met some of the goals that the department has for you? What resources have you gathered to demonstrate your deepened understanding? What do you still need to collect? -- **By week 7**

3. Specific "AHA" moments for the Intercultural Journey Portfolio: Choose a linguistic, a cultural, or a personal AHA! moment that has happened for you since you have been abroad. (By AHA! moment, I mean a newfound (and perhaps) sudden understanding of something (related to language, culture, or your own view of the world) that you did not know or understand before you lived in the host culture) -- **By week 8**

FREE CHOICE journal entries (in no particular order)

4. Your best day and why

5. "Sucky" day and why

6. Tell about a popular culture cultural activity you participated in (visit to a bar, a festival, market, film, etc.)

7. Tell about a high culture cultural activity you participated in (museum, concert, dance or theatre performance, etc.)

8. Interaction with homestay family (or with other members of your circle of local friends) and how it went

9. Interaction with a stranger (shop keeper, on the street, etc.) and how it went

10. Reflect on your experience with a local food – positive or negative.

11. Culture shock: Consider how you are adjusting to your new environment. Talk about a time when you had to go through the process of managing your emotional response due to a cultural irritation. Were you able to adapt your behavior or expectations? How?

12. How are you doing check-in? Share how you are feeling with the idea that others may be able to comment, help and/or commiserate.

13. Linguistic Aha! moment: Using the "What? So what? Now what?" model, reflect on a linguistic "Aha!" moments in which you learned something new about the vocabulary or grammar of your target language. Did you discover something untranslatable from the target language to your own? The moment you stopped translating in your head? Etc.

14. Cultural Aha! moment: Think about your own process from Euphoria, Confrontation, Adjustment to Adaptation (as mentioned in the chapter from the Paige book). Write about your own process of adjustment and what advice you would give someone else who is adjusting.

15. Cultural sleuth: write about some aspect of visible culture you observe and the invisible culture that it represents

16. Photographs: post 4-5 photographs with captions of things that grabbed your attention (e.g. food, posters, graffiti, advertisements) and why you pay attention or notice that repeated theme

17. Visit a “U.S.-American” space (e.g. McDonald’s, Starbucks) in your target country and explain the differences (and similarities) you observed and why you think they might exist

18. A place you traveled to that was not in your target country and what you did

19. A place you traveled to within the target country and what you did

20. Compare two cities in your host country based on your visit to or residence in both.

21. What social issue have you observed in your host country (e.g. homelessness, drug use or purchasing, public intoxication, etc.)? How did you react? How did local residents around you react?

22. What have you observed about technology and social media usage in your target country, particularly among young people? How has your own

technology usage changed (as a result of the culture's usage or the mere fact you are abroad)?

23. Talk about the feeling of self realization while abroad? Are you a different version of yourself?

24. Linguistic faux-pas and how you realized it and/or handled it.

25. First time you felt like your city was "home."

26. A response to a friend's journal entry - how did something your friend said make you think about your own experience differently?

Appendix C: Student Participation Self-Assessment

How did I contribute to the classroom environment this week?

Select one:

a. I volunteered my perspective often while being respectful of the contributions of others, was engaged with the professor and my peers, and I came to class having completed all of the assigned work. (100%)

b. I volunteered my perspective at least once, was engaged with my professor and my peers, and I came to class having completed *all* of the assigned work. (83.3%)

c. I volunteered my perspective at least once, I was mostly engaged with my professor and my peers (but I might have been distracted a bit), and I came to class having completed *most* of the assigned work. (75%)

d. I didn't volunteer my perspective this week, or I came to class unprepared, but I was present and I listened attentively. (66%)

e. I did not attend class this week, but I did complete work that was assigned online. (33%)

f. I did not attend class this week, and I did not complete any of the work that was assigned online. (0%)

Appendix D: Intercultural Journey Portfolio Assignment

The culminating project of WLC 3030, the Intercultural Journey Portfolio, should be a visually interesting and content-rich digital portfolio that showcases the deep learning you achieved both *during* your study abroad experience and during the time you have spent unpacking that experience. As a *whole*, it should demonstrate that you have achieved the intercultural competence and critical thinking goals listed below:

Students will achieve advanced intercultural competency.	**Capstone (Completion of a Major)**	**Milestone 2 (Completion of a Minor/upper-level 300)**
Knowledge Of cultural worldview frameworks	Demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates advanced understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Knowledge and Skills Cultural self-awareness and openness	Articulates insights into their own cultural rules, judgments and biases learned through their interactions with culturally different others.	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules, judgments and biases through their interactions with culturally different others.
Skills Verbal and nonverbal communication	Articulates a detailed understanding of cultural differences apparent in verbal and nonverbal communication.	Recognizes cultural differences and incorporates that understanding appropriately in verbal and nonverbal communication.

Skills: Connecting linguistic difference to cultural difference	Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of and ability to ask complex questions about cultural perspectives revealed by differences in vocabulary and syntax. Is able to manage appropriately some cultural conventions within a variety of contexts.	Recognizes and makes hypotheses about cultural perspectives revealed by differences in vocabulary and syntax. Is able to appropriately manipulate the conventions of the target culture revealed through language within certain genres.
Integrative Learning	Independently connects and interrelates his/her learning to previous studies within and outside the discipline.	Often independently connects and interrelates his/her learning to previous studies within and outside the discipline.

TABLE (D1): WORLD LANGUAGES AND CULTURES GOAL MATRIX FOR MAJORS AND MINORS

Your portfolio can take many formats, but it should contain (at a minimum) sections that deal with:

1) Deep cultural knowledge about one or more specific elements of the host culture. (Connecting the "above the iceberg" observable cultural practices and products to the "below the iceberg" values that underpin them).

2) An articulation of your understanding of your own cultural rules and biases and how they influenced certain aspects of your life in your host culture—and how you came to understand them via contact with the host culture. This might best be addressed via excerpts of your journal analysis and/or cultural or linguistic "aha" moments.

3) Examples of differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (video, photos, etc.) and explanations of your understandings of those differences.

4) Examples of different uses of vocabulary and syntax that carry cultural meaning—demonstrating that you understand the varied cultural meanings carried by those elements.

5) A section where you draw connections between your study abroad learning and the rest of your learning during your academic career.

Overarching Goal	Portfolio Element	Distinguished (A-A+)[7]	Very good (B-B+)	Satisfactory C-B-	Needs Attention C- or below
Knowledge of the host culture 60	Deep knowledge of a particular element of the host culture 30	Outstanding explanation of 1 or more elements of the host culture, using multiple texts, anecdotes, external research, and demonstrating a deep and nuanced understanding of the cultural practice in question.	Clear explanation of 1 or more elements of the host culture, including anecdotal evidence, textual artifacts, and external resources that support your claims.	Attempted treatment of 1 or more elements of culture using anecdotal evidence. Some external support for claims, but additional texts/artifacts are needed.	Surface-level or anecdotal treatment of 1 or more elements of culture with no external resources to support claims.
	Knowledge of cultural difference in verbal and nonverbal communication 15	Detailed and clear explanations of multiple differences in verbal and nonverbal communication styles, with several visual examples.	Clear explanation of more than one difference in verbal and nonverbal communication styles, with one or more visual examples.	Mentions one or more differences in verbal and nonverbal communication, but supporting examples could be elaborated, visuals enhanced	Surface-level or no commentary on a difference in verbal and nonverbal communication
	Knowledge of cultural differences related to	Detailed and clear explanations of multiple differences in vocabulary and/or syntax with	Clear explanation of more than one difference in vocabulary or syntax between host	Mentions one or more examples of "untranslatable" expressions from the target	Surface-level or no commentary on vocabulary or syntax differences between

[7] In subsequent iterations of the course, these letter-grade markers have been removed from the rubric.

Overarching Goal	Portfolio Element	Distinguished (A-A+)[7]	Very good (B-B+)	Satisfactory C-B-	Needs Attention C- or below
	vocabulary and syntax 10	supporting visuals and convincing explanations of the cultural implications of those linguistic differences.	language and native language, demonstrating reflection about the cultural implications of those differences.	language, but with either little explanation or unconvincing explanation.	target language and native language
	Self-reported ability to apply that knowledge + [8]	Explains and reflects on personal ability to adopt/adapt to host culture's communication styles and language use conventions. Explains and reflects on anecdotes from personal experience and offers video or audio demonstration of personal use.	Explains and reflects on personal ability to adopt/adapt to host culture's communication styles and language use conventions. Gives more than one anecdote from personal experience.	Mentions at least one occasion in which student adopted/adapted to host culture's communication styles and language use conventions	Little or no mention of how student adopted/adapted to differences in communication styles and or language use.
Understanding of own cultural-situatedness 20	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases	Explains and reflects on multiple moments of cultural friction and/or discovery. Articulates a clear understanding of	Explains and reflects on at least two moments of cultural friction and new understandings of self/home culture that	Student mentions recognizing own cultural rules and biases that caused friction in the host culture. Some self-	Little to no mention of new understanding of own cultural rules and biases and how

[8] Give an example of when you began integrating this new knowledge into your communication practices in the host culture. OR reflect on your difficulty with doing that.

Overarching Goal	Portfolio Element	Distinguished (A-A+)[7]	Very good (B-B+)	Satisfactory C-B-	Needs Attention C- or below
		how their own positionality in relation to their home and host cultures evolved during the course of the study abroad experience and/or in the post SA reflection period.	came from those moments. Demonstrates a clear understanding of personal vs. cultural preferences (in self and others).	reflection, but that reflection may remain surface-level.	they affected understanding of the host culture.
Presentation 20	Sensory appeal 10	Images are captivating and revelatory, placed in ways as to maximize their impact on the viewer. Video and/or audio files significantly enrich the portfolio. The portfolio beautifully captures the overall experience of the student.	All images are relevant, interesting, and visually appealing or revelatory. Video and/or audio files are embedded in meaningful and useful ways, and give a clear idea of the student's overall experience.	Images are present and relevant, but could be better positioned/sized to facilitate the viewer's experience. Audio or video links are present, but may be of mediocre quality.	Images may be limited, of bad quality, badly sized, inappropriate to context, or otherwise problematic. There are no embedded video or audio files, and the portfolio does little to capture the experience.
	Clarity of organization 5	The portfolio organization is perfectly clear and user friendly. The most important elements are highlighted in meaningful ways, and no key information is	The portfolio organization is clear overall, but there may be a few repetitive elements or some key information may not be easily visible.	The portfolio organization is mostly clear, but there may be some elements of the website that are not being put to their best use. All of the important information is present, but the logic of	The portfolio Is difficult to navigate and/or elements seem to be missing. They may be hidden, or there may be elements of the web

Overarching Goal	Portfolio Element	Distinguished (A-A+)[7]	Very good (B-B+)	Satisfactory C-B-	Needs Attention C- or below
		"hidden." A user can easily navigate through the entire portfolio without getting "lost" or feeling like the experience is repetitive.	Navigation through the portfolio is user-friendly, but could be perfected.	placement is not always clear.	template that have not been used properly. Navigation is challenging.
Integrative Learning	Making connections 5	The student clearly and eloquently makes several connections between the study abroad experience and previous learning within and outside the discipline of language study.	The student draws more than one connection between the study abroad experience and previous learning within and outside the discipline.	The student draws limited connections between the study abroad experience and previous learning within and outside the discipline.	The student draws no connections between the study abroad experience and previous learning within and outside the discipline, or the connections are not coherent.

TABLE (D2): INTERCULTURAL JOURNAL PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

Appendix E: Course Modifications and Student Responses

	First Iteration (Cohort 1)	Second Iteration (Cohort 2)
Pre-departure (WLC 301)	Assignment: Course Final ● Presentation of a project ● Students asked to identify an aspect of culture and assess it in the context of the U.S. ○ This would be the same topic to investigate abroad ● Project included cultural artifacts/various texts: videos, pictures, anecdotes, interviews, academic research, etc. as evidence to support hypotheses about cultural element	Assignment: Course Final ● Collaborative discussion ● Students were given the rubric with department goals and asked to brainstorm how they could demonstrate achievement of these outcomes ● Portfolio project of 303 (see below) was explained to them, so students were asked to brainstorm what the portfolio should include and what cultural artifacts students should collect while abroad
	Student Response: ● Students interpreted the project as a research project ● Students expressed confusion related to researching U.S. culture rather than host culture ● Project was seen as overly onerous and "too much work for a 1-credit class" ● Students left the course with vague understanding of "artifacts" to collect abroad	Student Response: ● Students expressed gratitude for the opportunity to unpack the rubric to deepen understanding ● Students expressed gratitude in being able to discuss options they saw would best demonstrate their learning ● Students left the course with a clearer understanding of the work required abroad and, later, for reentry
Study abroad (WLC 302)	Assignment: Reflective Writing ● Called "blogging" ● Posted to public forum ● Prompts were brainstormed during pre-departure course ● Prompts were suggested as a guide for reflection, but	Assignment: Reflective Writing ● Called "journaling" ● Posted to public forum ● Prompts were brainstormed during pre-departure course ● Prompts were suggested as a guide for reflection,

	First Iteration (Cohort 1)	Second Iteration (Cohort 2)
	only 3 were mandatory ● Students were allowed to write in target-language ● Rubric emphasized "depth of reflection" and analysis of cultural relevance of findings in the given context ● Students were told they would analyze their writings upon their return as a way of understanding their growth.	but only 3 were mandatory ● Students were allowed to write in target language ● Rubric emphasized "description of thoughts and feelings" - described as a snapshot of the moment ● Students were told they would analyze their writings upon their return as a way of understanding their growth. They explicitly understood that this would become part of their final portfolio.
	Student Response: ● Prompts were seen as "limiting" their reflection ● Prompts were interpreted as mandatory, no "freedom" ● Students expressed frustration about "having to" write in English ● Writing seen as tedious ● Students were worried about being graded on reflection and meeting a word count ● Complaints about sharing writing on a public forum	Student Response: ● Prompts were seen as "guide" for thoughtful reflection on learning/growth ● Students expressed gratitude for list, but did not see it as a mandatory list to complete ● No questions or complaints about word count from students while abroad ● Passive concerns about sharing writing on a public forum still came up, but less frequently
Reentry (WLC 303)	Assignment: Analysis of Writing ● Called "blog analysis" ● Purpose of the blog analysis is to analyze the student's own writing for evidence of change, learning, growth,and cultural and intercultural competency. Reflect on what the blogs did/did not show. ● Results seemed to be a venting opportunity for student feelings towards writing as an assignment ● Results included more blanket statements where	Assignment: Analysis of Writing ● Called "journal analysis" ● Purpose of the journal analysis is to analyze the student's own writing for evidence of change, learning, growth,and cultural and intercultural competency. Reflect on what the journals did/did not show. ● Results included more critical thinking and analysis of intellectual growth related to

	First Iteration (Cohort 1)	Second Iteration (Cohort 2)
	students declared themselves changed without providing evidence from journals to support those claims	intercultural competence • Results included more context and evidence from students' own writing to explain changes/growth
	Student Response: • Student work samples showed overall negative feelings towards journaling • Students used the assignment as a space to vent about writing • Few students cited their own writing to provide evidence of cultural competence or intellectual growth	Student Response: • Student work samples showed overall positive feelings towards journaling • Students used the assignment as a preliminary analysis of their growth • Many students offered deep analysis of the development of cultural competence and learning using direct quotes
	Assignment: Course Final • Presentation of culminating project focused on cultural topic (same as pre-abroad, but now about host country) that used artifacts collected abroad as evidence • Texts could include pictures, videos, anecdotes, interviews, and academic research • Presentations were to be approximately 8 minutes long • Presentations were shared in a public informal session	Assignment: Course Final • Online portfolio that included Cultural Aha moments, Linguistic Aha moments, analysis of personal and intellectual growth, and information about a topic in the host country's culture with supporting evidence/artifacts. • Students posted a two-minute video introduction to their portfolio on the course management system • Students recorded video responses to the portfolios of at least three peers.
	Student Response: • Students expressed frustration with the project related to the amount of work • Many students did not collect artifacts abroad and did	Student Response: • Students expressed some confusion related to guidelines, but overall were pleased with the final product

	First Iteration (Cohort 1)	Second Iteration (Cohort 2)
	the research while in home culture - students felt the work was counterproductive and tedious as a result	• Students used Journal Analysis as preliminary work that could guide the portfolio • Students expressed desire for examples for clarification

TABLE (E1): COURSE MODIFICATIONS AND STUDENT RESPONSES