

# Designing Globally Networked Learning Environments

Visionary Partnerships, Policies,  
and Pedagogies

Doreen Starke-Meyerring and  
Melanie Wilson (Eds.)



*SensePublishers*

DESIGNING GLOBALLY NETWORKED LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

EDUCATIONAL FUTURES  
*RETHINKING THEORY AND PRACTICE*  
Volume 20

*Series Editors*

**Michael A. Peters**

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA*

**J. Freeman-Moir**

*University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand*

*Editorial Board*

**Michael Apple**, *University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA*

**Miriam David**, *Department of Education, Keele University, UK*

**Cushla Kapitzke**, *Queensland University of Technology, Australia*

**Elizabeth Kelly**, *DePaul University, USA*

**Simon Marginson**, *Monash University, Australia*

**Mark Olssen**, *University of Surrey, UK*

**Fazal Rizvi**, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA*

**Susan Robertson**, *University of Bristol, UK*

**Linda Smith**, *University of Auckland, New Zealand*

**Arun Kumar Tripathi**, *Dresden University of Technology, Germany*

*Scope*

This series maps the emergent field of educational futures. It will commission books on the futures of education in relation to the question of globalisation and knowledge economy. It seeks authors who can demonstrate their understanding of discourses of the knowledge and learning economies. It aspires to build a consistent approach to educational futures in terms of traditional methods, including scenario planning and foresight, as well as imaginative narratives, and it will examine examples of futures research in education, pedagogical experiments, new utopian thinking, and educational policy futures with a strong accent on actual policies and examples.

# Designing Globally Networked Learning Environments

Visionary Partnerships, Policies,  
and Pedagogies

*Edited by*

Doreen Starke-Meyerring  
*McGill University, Canada*

and

Melanie Wilson  
*McGill University, Canada*



SENSE PUBLISHERS  
ROTTERDAM / TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-8790-473-9 (paperback)

ISBN 978-90-8790-474-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-8790-475-3 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,  
P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, The Netherlands  
<http://www.sensepublishers.com>

*Printed on acid-free paper*

All rights reserved © 2008 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes on contributors	vii
About the co-editors	xiii
Acknowledgements	xv
1. Learning Environments for a Globally Networked World: Emerging Visions <i>Doreen Starke-Meyerring and Melanie Wilson</i>	1
<b>PART I. VISIONARY PARTNERSHIPS AND POLICIES</b>	
2. Enabling and Sustaining Globally Networked Learning Environments: Visionary Partnerships and Policies <i>Doreen Starke-Meyerring, Ann Hill Duin, Talene Palvetzian, and Melanie Wilson</i>	19
3. The Global Classroom Project: Multiple Relationships in Global Partnering <i>TyAnna Herrington</i>	37
4. Growing Grassroots Partnerships: Trans-Atlantic Collaboration between American Instructors and Students of Technical Writing and European Instructors and Students of Translation <i>Bruce Maylath, Sonia Vandepitte, and Birthe Mousten</i>	52
5. Steps and Missteps in Negotiating a Joint Degree Program with a Chinese University <i>Kenneth T. Rainey, Herb J. Smith, and Carol M. Barnum</i>	67
6. Realizing the University Mission in Partnership with Nicaragua: Internationalization, Diversity, and Social Justice <i>Robbin D. Crabtree, David Alan Sapp, José Alfonso Malespín, and Gonzalo Norori</i>	87

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**PART II VISIONARY PEDAGOGIES**

7. Visionary Pedagogies in Globally Networked Learning Environments: Questioning Assumptions and Raising New Questions <i>Doreen Starke-Meyerring and Melanie Wilson</i>	105
8. International Collaboration and Cross-Cultural Communication: The Global Classroom Project <i>Justin C. Kennon</i>	114
9. Intercultural Collaboration in the Trans-Atlantic Project: Pedagogical Theories and Practices in Teaching Procedural Instructions across Cultural Contexts <i>Birthe Moustén, Sonia Vandepitte, and Bruce Maylath</i>	129
10. Closing the Distance Education: Using Technology to Bring Together Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Students of Mexico, the United States, and Canada <i>Brian Fitch, Alec Kirby, and Louisa Mary Greathouse Amador</i>	145
11. Intercultural Business Communication in Action: Analysis of an International Videoconference <i>Bertha Du-Babcock and Iris I. Varner</i>	156
12. When the Global is Local: Building a Local, Global Community through Partnership and Pedagogy <i>James Dubinsky</i>	170
13. Beyond Standard English: Re-Thinking Language in Globally Networked Learning Environments <i>James Melton</i>	185
14. Negotiating the Design of Globally Networked Learning Environments: The Case of a Collaborative Online Learning Module about the Sonoran Biosphere <i>Matthew McCool</i>	200
15. Globally Networked Learning Environments: Shaping Visionary Futures <i>Doreen Starke-Meyerring and Melanie Wilson</i>	218
Index	231

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Carol Barnum is Professor of Information Design and Communication at Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA, USA. She is a Fellow of the Society for Technical Communication and a Fulbright Senior Specialist with an interest in technical and professional communication initiatives in Asia, particularly China. Having first gone to China in 1987 as a visiting professor, she has subsequently returned five more times to lecture, study, and teach. Her most recent visit was to Northeast Normal University to conduct teacher training in August 2005. Barnum is the author of numerous articles and five books. Her most recent book is *Usability Testing and Research* (in the Technical Communication Series) published by Longman. The book won the top level “Distinguished” award from the STC International Publications Competition in 2002.

Robbin D. Crabtree is Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Communication at Fairfield University. Robbin’s research emphasizes intercultural issues in international education with recent field work in Brazil, Spain, Russia, Kenya, and Central America. This work has been published in the American Association for Higher Education’s series on service-learning, *Voices of Strong Democracy: Concepts and Methods for Service-Learning in Communication Studies*, and the *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. Robbin works with non-profit agencies in activism, consulting, and community-based research, and currently serves on the board of directors of Bridges to Community, a cross-cultural education, service, and development NGO.

Bertha Du-Babcock is an Associate Professor and Director of FHS International Exchange at the University of Hong Kong. She serves as a member of the Board of Directors-At-Large and is Co-Chair of the International Issues Committee of the Association for Business Communication (ABC). She was the recipient of the Meada Gibbs Outstanding Teaching Award by the Association for Business Communication (ABC). Her research interests focus primarily on the development of language-based communication zones and the comparative analysis of organizational communication in multinational corporations; and secondly, the teaching of professional communication and cross-cultural management. During her tenure at CityU, she has received over 30 research grants. Her research and publications have had a wider impact on the global academic professional communication community where she has received international academic and professional recognition for her contributions in the field of professional and business communication, including her recent research articles. Du-Babcock recently won the Outstanding Article Award in the *Journal of Business Communication* in 2007 and the Outstanding Article Award in the *Business Communication Quarterly* in 2001. Dr. Du-Babcock currently serves as an editorial review board member for the *Journal of Business Communication* and *Business Communication Quarterly*. She has also served as guest reviewer for international refereed journals, including *IEEE*, *Euro-Asia Journal of Management* and *Journal*

#### NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

James M. Dubinsky is an Associate Professor of English at Virginia Tech and directs the Professional Writing Program. A recent winner of a college award for outreach and the university's teacher scholar award, Jim's research focuses on community-university partnerships. He is the author/editor of *Teaching Technical Communication*, has contributed to journals such as the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, and recently edited an issue of *Technical Communication Quarterly* on civic engagement. Jim is currently the 1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President of the Association for Business Communication and also serves as vice-chair of the board for the YMCA at Virginia Tech.

Ann Hill Duin is Associate Vice President and Associate Chief Information Officer as well as a Professor of Writing Studies at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Hill Duin's over 30 years of teaching, scholarship, and administrative experiences focus on collaboration and excellence through innovative uses of technology. She is co-author of *Partnering in the Learning Marketplace* and co-editor of *Nonacademic Writing: Social Theory and Technology*, and her honors include best article awards as well as two distinguished alumni awards (Waldorf College and University of Minnesota). She has spearheaded system-wide partnerships in previous associate provost, vice provost, and senior associate dean positions, and at the invitation of the Higher Learning Commission, facilitates inter-institutional teams in the design of sustainable partnerships. Her ongoing goal is to serve as a catalyst for leveraging technology to advance and support extraordinary education, breakthrough research, and dynamic public engagement.

Brian Fitch is an Associate Professor in the Department of English and Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. He received his Ph.D. in English from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, with emphases in creative writing and twentieth century American literature. He is co-founder of the Diversity Connections Project at UW-Stout, which uses technology to create learning communities that cross ethnic, racial, geographic, and experiential boundaries to facilitate student learning. His poetry, fiction, or prose has appeared in *The North American Review*, *Prairie Schooner*, *Sewanee Review*, *Helsinki Quarterly*, *Ars Interpres Annual*, *Literary Magazine Review*, *ArtWord Quarterly*, *College Teaching*, the anthology *Censored Books: Critical Viewpoints from Scarecrow Press*, and others. He teaches courses in creative writing, American and world literatures, and composition.

Louisa Greathouse Amador is associate professor in the Institute of Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades in the postgraduate school of Ciencias del Lenguaje (Language Sciences) at the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma Puebla (BUAP) in Puebla, Mexico. She received her Ph.D. in Sociology from the same university. She is director of the academic exchange programs within the Instituto de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades of the BUAP. Her research interests, presentations, and publications focus on concepts and issues in identity construction, discrimination, cultural adaptation, second language and culture acquisition, tourism and social change, humane education as well as global education, including exchange programs and global citizen education. Her research in these areas has appeared in

#### NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

numerous edited collections and peer-reviewed academic journals. She is co-author of *Matices Sociales del Color de la Piel en México, Claroscuro Sobre una Realidad Oculta* (Impresos Angelopolis, 2005). She also serves on the editorial committee of *Revista Internacional de estudios sobre masculinidades*.

TyAnna K. Herrington is an Associate Professor at the Georgia Institute of Technology. Her research treats issues of policy and power in intellectual property law, such as in her books *Controlling Voices: Intellectual Property, Humanistic Studies, and the Internet* (SIU Press, 2001), and *A Legal Primer for Technical Communicators, Multimedia Developers, Graphic Designers, and other Creative Communicators*, (Allyn and Bacon/Longman Publishers, 2003). As a Fulbright Senior Scholar to St Petersburg, Russia in 1999, she was able to initiate the Global Classroom Project, a distance learning venture that electronically links students and faculty in St. Petersburg, Russia, Volgograd, Russia, Karlskrona, Sweden, and Atlanta, Georgia, USA, to engage in collaboratively developed analyses of issues in cross-cultural, digital communication.

Justin C. Kennon is a graduate and President's Scholar from the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, GA, where he specialized in a core curriculum of Science, Technology, and Culture. He began his research on cross-cultural communication through several interactive courses with students in Russia and Sweden and then continued his research by developing articles around the Global Classroom Project. Justin plans to continue his research relating to distance and global learning environments to further develop the topic's importance and exposure in the ever competitive business world. His other areas of interest and research are related to the business aspects of the communication industry; Justin spent a number of years as a business consultant for a leading communications and high technology firm in the Atlanta area before moving into the medical consulting field. His experience and skills from the Global Classroom project have proven quite useful in his present global interactions in the business world; he also plans to continue his research in the field of global learning environments and looks forward to future work in academia.

Alec Kirby is an Associate Professor of History and Government at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. He received his Ph.D. from George Washington University in American History, with an emphasis on twentieth century politics. He is co-founder of the Diversity Connections Project at UW-Stout, which uses technology to create learning communities that cross ethnic, racial, geographic and experiential boundaries to facilitate student learning. He has also published and presented on political reform and civil rights history. He teaches courses on African American history, the history of the Vietnam War, and other U.S. history courses.

José Alfonso Malespín is a Professor in the Facultad de Humanidades y Comunicación at Universidad Centroamericana de Nicaragua where he teaches courses in investigative journalism and transparency reporting, media analysis, environmental reporting, and human rights. His research emphasizes media accountability and new trends in local reporting. Alfonso has professional

#### NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

experience in radio news programming, newspaper and book editing, and web page design. He regularly contributes articles to local newspapers on media, politics, human rights, and environmental issues. He represents non-profit agencies as an activist and consultant. Alfonso came to the UCA after a successful career as a reporter and editor in regional radio and national newspapers. He oversees the communication components of the inter-institutional partnership between the UCA and Fairfield University.

Bruce Maylath is a professor of English at North Dakota State University, USA, where he focuses on linguistics and international technical communication. The events described in this volume took place while he served as director of the technical communication program at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, USA. As president of the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication (CPTSC), he helped launch the CPTSC/ATTW London2000 Roundtable held in conjunction with FORUM 2000. More recently he chaired the Milano2003 Roundtable in Italy. His current research takes up translation issues in technical communication. His best-known book chapters appear in Carolyn Rude's *Technical Editing* and Deborah S. Bosley's *Global Contexts: Case Studies in International Technical Communication*.

Matthew McCool is an Assistant Professor of Science Communication at Southern Polytechnic State University in Marietta, Georgia. He studied neuroscience at the Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, literature and philosophy at the University of Illinois of Springfield, and international communication at New Mexico State University. He is currently finishing a book title *Writing around the World* (Continuum).

James Melton is an Assistant Professor of Business Communication at Central Michigan University. His research focuses on intercultural professional communication and second language issues in professional contexts, including organizational training, offshore outsourcing, and global information systems. He is particularly interested in how research findings in these areas can inform professional communication curriculum and pedagogy.

Birthe Moustén is an assistant professor of English at the Handelshøjskolen i Århus (Aarhus Business School), Denmark, where she teaches courses in translation from and into English in the Faculty of Language and Business Communication. Her research focuses on defining localization and giving an account of the development and use of localization procedures and methods. This process includes the historical perspective of localization, how the concept has developed over time, and how it is used today within various domains and by the localization industry. She also places localization in linguistic perspective, where it is compared with existing theories and practice.

Gonzalo Norori is the Director of the Facultad de Humanidades y Comunicación and of the Carrera de Comunicación Social at Universidad Centroamericana de Nicaragua. His areas of specialization include Publicidad y Relaciones Públicas. At

#### NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

the UCA, Gonzalo teaches courses in organizational communication, public relations, investigative reporting, political illustrations/cartoons, and photojournalism. Gonzalo has collaborated with government and non-profit organizations such as UNICEF on the development of university-NGO collaborations, including a post-graduate degree in Communication and Children's Rights. He regularly contributes articles to local newspapers and radio on topics including politics and human rights. He also has research interests in the impact of technology on education and the mass media.

Talene Palvetzian is currently working for the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities in Ontario Canada where she is co-designing and developing a learning program to increase the capacity of policy and program staff to use evidence-informed decision-making in their work. Talene holds a Master's degree in Curriculum and Literacy Studies from McGill University – from where she first began researching the integration of globally networked learning environments into university policy contexts. She continues this work today, as a member of the Centre for International Governance Innovation's global IGLOO network community, and as a policy and practice advocate for the development of global literacies and engaging pedagogical practices.

Kenneth T. Rainey passed away in 2006 after retiring from his position as Professor of Information Design and Communication and Department Chair at Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA, USA, where he continued to consult for the joint degree program between SPSU and Northeast Normal University in Changchun, China. He published in such journals as *Technical Communication*, *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, and *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, among many others. In 1997 and 1999, he served as guest professor at Hochschule Magdeburg, under a fellowship from the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD); and from 2000 to 2005 as guest professor at Hochschule Anhalt in Köthen, Germany. His honors include Fellow of the Society for Technical Communication, Jay R. Gould Award for Excellence in Teaching Technical Communication, Distinguished Technical Communication from the annual Frank R. Smith outstanding article in Technical Communication competition, and Distinguished Service Award from the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication.

David Alan Sapp is an Associate Professor in the English Department at Fairfield University where he directs the undergraduate professional writing program and teaches courses on rhetoric, writing theory, and organizational communication. His recent research focuses on international and intercultural issues in professional writing and includes his article "Global Partnerships in Business Communication: An Institutional Collaboration between the United States and Cuba" published in *Business Communication Quarterly*, as well as others published in the *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*; *Technical Communication Quarterly*; *Computers and Composition*; *Journal of Studies in International Education*; *Issues*

#### NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

*in Writing; Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy; and College Teaching.*

Herb Smith is Professor of English, Technical Communication, and Media Arts at Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA, USA, where he serves as Director of Undergraduate Studies. He was guest professor of technical communication at Fachhochschule Merseburg in Merseburg, Germany, and has published in most of the major technical communication journals. He has served on the editorial review board of *Technical Communication Quarterly* and currently serves on the review board of the *Journal of International Languages Teaching and Studies*. He is co-author with Kim Haines-Korn of *Portfolios for Technical and Professional Communicators* (Prentice Hall, 2007) and has presented papers on Southern Polytechnic State University's collaborative degree program with Northeast Normal University at two national conferences.

Sonia Vandepitte is a lecturer of English at the School for Translation Studies, University College Ghent, Belgium. She was a Visiting Scientist at MIT and taught at Royal Holloway University of London. At UC Ghent she coordinates research activities one of which is focused on knowledge retrieval from texts, with a grant from the Institution for the Promotion of Innovation through Science and Technology in Flanders. She has published on causality and its expression in language, knowledge retrieval, and translation/interpreting. She is the research coordinator of the Faculty and the treasurer of the European Society for Translation Studies.

Iris Varner is the Director of the International Business Program and a professor in the Department of Management and Quantitative Methods at Illinois State University where she teaches International Management, Business in a Multicultural Environment, Advanced Managerial Communication, Introduction to Business, and Advanced Business Communication. Her research interests concentrate on cultural influences on international business, management of expatriation, and intercultural managerial communication. Dr. Varner is also an adjunct professor at the University of Lugano in Switzerland where she teaches in the Executive Communication Management Program. Dr. Varner has published three books and over 70 articles in refereed publications such as *Journal of Business Communication*, *Business Communication Quarterly*, *the Journal of Business*, and *the Singapore Management Review*. She also has presented over 80 papers in the areas of intercultural business communication/management, effectiveness of expatriates, and the role of human resource management in international business. During her tenure, she has also received 20 funded research grants. Dr. Varner was President of the Association for Business Communication (2000/01) and has served on numerous committees of the organization. She is a past recipient of the Meada Gibbs Outstanding Teaching Award by the Association for Business Communication (ABC).

## ABOUT THE CO-EDITORS

Doreen Starke-Meyerring is an Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Writing Studies in the Department of Integrated Studies in Education at McGill University in Montréal, Canada, where she co-directs the Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing. Her research focuses on advanced literacies, rhetoric, writing, and discourse in academic, workplace, and public contexts especially as these contexts undergo change as a result of emerging digital technologies and globalization. She is the co-editor of *Research Communication in the Social and Human Sciences: From dissemination to public engagement* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008). Her work has also appeared in such journals as *Technical Communication*, *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *Business Communication Quarterly*, and *International Journal of Web-Based Communities*. Together with co-author Deborah Andrews, she received the 2007 “Outstanding Article Award” in *Business Communication Quarterly* by the Association for Business Communication. In addition, her experience includes teaching rhetoric, writing, professional communication, and Internet studies at universities in Canada, Germany, and the United States as well as developing global partnership programs in professional communication. She has worked with numerous Internet-based higher education partnership initiatives over the last ten years, ranging from international academic curriculum and program partnerships to statewide public-private higher education partnerships.

Melanie Wilson is a doctoral researcher in the Department of Integrated Studies in Education at McGill University in Montréal, Canada, where she is currently investigating the implications of genre theory in globally networked learning environments (GNLEs), and specifically the role that orientation interventions may play in GNLEs. She completed her BA at McGill in Psychology and her MA at Concordia University in Educational Technology. Her Master’s thesis investigated the effect of orientation events on the persistence of online learners. She has volunteered as a facilitator with Soliya, a non-profit organization that uses web-based videoconferencing technology to connect small groups of university students from the United States and predominantly Muslim Countries in the Middle East. She has also worked at McGill University as an information systems trainer and an online instructional designer, where she has designed and developed a number of digital instructional resources for the McGill student, administrative, and academic community.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction. (Mikhail Bakhtin, 1984, p. 110)

This book reflects many dialogic interactions or conversations with faculty, administrators, students, and many others, and was made possible through much support from colleagues, associations, and institutions, for which we are deeply grateful. To begin with, we would like to acknowledge the support for this work from McGill University, especially from Teaching and Learning Services, in the form of a teaching and learning grant, and from the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication in the form of a research grant for a research project on emerging global partnerships in technical and scientific communication programs, which helped give rise to this book.

We would also like to express our deep gratitude to our contributors, who not only openly and generously shared their emerging visions of learning in global networks, but who have also been deeply committed to this project, supporting it in any way possible with their patience as well as with their collaborative spirit, which made the work on this project a pleasure.

We are also very grateful to the members of our review board for their commitment to reviewing individual chapters for this book and providing valuable comments to strengthen the chapters. In particular, we would like to thank Deborah Andrews, University of Delaware, USA; Doug Brent, University of Calgary, Canada; Michael Doxtater, McGill University, Canada; Ann Hill Duin, University of Minnesota, USA; Roger Graves, University of Western Ontario, Canada; Constance Kampf, Aarhus School of Business, Denmark; Victoria Mikelonis, University of Minnesota; Anthony Paré, McGill University; Jaclyn Rea, Brock University, Canada; Lil Rodman, University of British Columbia, Canada; and Mela Sarkar, McGill University.

As a special acknowledgement, we would like to dedicate this book to the memory of Ken Rainey as well as that of Victoria Mikelonis, both of whom influenced this book not only through their contributions as co-author or as review-board member, but also as unforgettable, cherished long-time friends, colleagues, and mentors on various cross-cultural sojourns.

Many other colleagues have provided support in many other ways. We are particularly grateful for Ann Hill Duin's constructive comments during the early phase of the book project and her collaboration in the early stages of the research project that helped give rise to this book. Our deep appreciation also goes to Colin Lankshear for his valuable comments on the book proposal as well as for his encouragement and support. We would also like to extend special thanks to Lil Rodman for her valuable comments and editorial support throughout the project.

In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the supportive and dialogic environment we have experienced here at McGill, especially the valuable support and advice we received from McGill's Teaching and Learning Services, in particular Cynthia Weston, Mariela Tovar, and Susan Cowan, as well as from Teaching Technology

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Services, especially Cindy Ives (presently at Athabasca University), Adam Finkelstein, Oksana Maibroda, and Mariette Xenopoulos.

Our deep appreciation and gratitude also go to the series editors, Michael Peters and John Freeman-Moir, for their support, patience, and encouragement throughout this project. Likewise, we wish to thank Peter de Liefde for his valuable support and encouragement for this book project and for developing an innovative model for academic publishing that allows us to share the visions presented in this book free of charge with colleagues in developing countries. After all, it is our hope that this book will inspire many more globally networked learning environments that overcome traditional barriers between colleagues in privileged and marginalized regions of the world.

Finally, there is no way this project would have been possible without the patience, relentless support, understanding, and encouragement from our loving families. No words can capture the meaning their ongoing encouragement and support has for us.

DOREEN STARKE-MEYERRING AND MELANIE WILSON

## 1. LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS FOR A GLOBALLY NETWORKED WORLD

### *Emerging Visions*

#### INTRODUCTION

There is perhaps not a single day that faculty, administrators, international program experts, and many others in higher education are not inundated with news about globalization with such title phrases as “world changing,” “discontent,” “survival,” “global marketization of higher education,” “global trade,” or “higher education under siege,” signaling the highly contested and charged nature of the discourse surrounding these terms. Often, this contested discourse is accompanied by growing pressures and urgent calls on faculty and administrators to act quickly—to “internationalize” their campuses, curricula, and classrooms; to position their institutions, programs, and courses in globalizing higher education environments or “global markets”; and to prepare their students for global work and citizenship. For educators, this contested discourse raises new questions: What might higher education look like in a globally networked world? What specifically might globalization mean for local classrooms? Do traditional models of locally bounded classrooms and separate study-abroad programs suffice, or what new visions for learning are emerging? And how do educators and students ensure their active participation in the shaping of these visions?

The ways in which educators respond to these questions have significant implications for the future of higher education, or what Marginson (2007) calls its “ultimate horizon.” As Marginson argues, this horizon is global, and it is wide open. However, it is also a highly contested horizon, with competing visions vying over its shape—over what higher education should look like in a globally networked world. Early visions, advanced by national governments, emerging for-profit postsecondary education businesses, and the World Trade Organization have predominantly advanced global trade in higher education in presumably untapped global Internet-facilitated markets (Basset, 2006; Peters, 2006, 2007a; Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004; Starke-Meyerring, 2004). Accordingly, hundreds of millions of public and private dollars have been poured into large-scale national or for-profit e-learning initiatives, which largely repackaged and reproduced traditional courses and programs for delivery over the Internet (Marginson, 2004). As Marginson (2004) observes, many of these initiatives have now closed or are struggling to survive, raising questions about alternative visions for higher education in a globally networked world.

*D. Starke-Meyerring and M. Wilson (eds.), Designing Globally Networked Learning Environments, 1–17.*

© 2008 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

Much research has examined these dominant visions and proposed alternative visions for the institution of higher education as a whole (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & McGill Peterson, 2007; Apple, Kenway, & Singh, 2005; Barrow, Didou-Aupetit, & Mallea, 2003; Basset, 2006; Breton & Lambert, 2004; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Carr-Chellman, 2004; Currie et al. (2003); Kapitzke & Peters, 2007; Odin & Manicas, 2004; Peters, 2007a; Peters, 2007b; Peters & Besley, 2006; Sidhu, 2005; Stromquist, 2002; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). However, less attention has been paid to the visions faculty have been developing and the partnerships they have begun to build for globally networked learning environments in order to position themselves and their learners as active participants in shaping this horizon. Nevertheless, as we argue in this book, it is these networked learning environments that represent an exciting paradigm shift for shaping this horizon—an innovation in learning that is critical to the development of a global civil society, that offers new opportunities for students to learn how to build shared learning and knowledge cultures across traditional boundaries, and that holds promise for renewing the cultural mission of higher education (Kapitzke & Peters, 2007; Peters, 2007a; Peters & Besley, 2006).

Because of the emerging and contested nature of globally networked learning environments (GNLEs), our purpose here is not to impose a definition that might normalize or limit the ways in which we envision these environments, but rather to describe them based on the approaches that have emerged as they appear in this book and to offer them as rich opportunities for faculty, administrators, and other educators in higher education to work together to deliberate and shape their visions at their institutions for learning in a globally networked world. Drawing on previous research (e.g., Brown, 2005; Herrington & Tretyakov, 2005; Palvetzian, 2005; Sapp, 2004; Starke-Meyerring, 2005; Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006; Starke-Meyerring & Andrews; Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007) as well as on the contributions in this volume, we characterize GNLEs as follows: They are learning environments that represent new visions of globally networked learning and extend well beyond the confines of traditional local classrooms. To realize their visions, they pursue innovative pedagogies: Instead of being limited to local classrooms, these learning environments link students to peers, instructors, professionals, experts, and communities from diverse contexts; challenge students to negotiate and build shared learning and knowledge cultures across diverse boundaries; and provide students with new opportunities for civic engagement in a global context. Perhaps what distinguishes GNLEs the most from traditional classrooms is that they are not the domain of individual faculty, but rather rest on partnerships to engage faculty, programs, institutions, companies, civil society organizations, community organizations, or other individuals and entities outside of a program in a shared networked learning and knowledge culture. As a result of their rootedness in partnerships, GNLEs extend across institutional and often national boundaries, thus operating in blended policy environments and calling for innovative policies.

And yet, rarely do faculty, program directors, administrators, and others in higher education receive guidance in designing visionary learning environments for globally networked learning or in developing the partnerships and policies to enable and sustain them. As a result, educators are left with many questions: What

visions might guide learning in a globally networked world? How might courses and programs be designed to prepare students for global work and citizenship? What does it take to develop learning environments to realize these visions? What partnerships and policies enable and sustain these learning environments and what pedagogies do these learning environments make possible?

This book addresses these questions by bringing together 25 college educators from nine countries who have taken the lead in developing GNLEs across four continents to facilitate faculty and student participation in the shaping of an emerging economic and social order in a globally networked world. This book shares the innovations of these educators in globally networked learning—the visions they create and aspire to, the work and passion they put into helping students learn how to build globally networked learning and knowledge cultures, the challenges they have faced, the successes they have celebrated, and the new opportunities for innovation in globally networked learning they have created at their institutions.

We offer these visions as well as the partnerships, policies, and pedagogies that sustain them here as opportunities for faculty, program directors, administrators, international program experts, instructional designers, faculty development experts, and others in higher education to work together to deliberate, develop, and shape their visions for learning in a globally networked world and to become active participants in the globalization of higher education through the partnerships, policies, and pedagogies they design. Our purpose here is not to endorse, normalize, or impose a particular vision for learning in a globally networked world. Rather, we offer a range of visions as they have begun to emerge as resources for faculty and others in higher education to discuss and shape their own visions for learning in global networks. In offering a range of visions and approaches, we hope that the case studies presented here will help educators:

- deliberate, inspire, and shape new visions for sustainable learning environments in a globally networked world that enable learners to become active participants in the shaping of an emerging social and economic global order;
- build global partnerships that are characterized by cultural respect, mutual benefit, collaboration, and shared leadership;
- find both conceptual and practical guidance in developing GNLEs as well as the partnerships and policies that sustain them;
- recognize and address the institutional change and commitment to innovation that is involved in designing partnered learning environments;
- stimulate new research, thinking, and practice in developing the partnerships, policies, and pedagogies that facilitate visionary global learning environments.

For this purpose, this introductory chapter introduces the visions for learning in a globally networked world that have begun to emerge and then introduces three main pillars needed to realize and sustain these visions: partnerships, policies, and pedagogies. To contextualize these visions, we begin with a brief discussion of the guiding questions that drive this book and the conceptual perspectives that inform these questions. These perspectives help situate the GNLEs presented in this book and are vital to shaping new visions because they provide a framework for making decisions about why we develop the visions we do for learning in a globally

networked world and why we develop the partnerships, policies, and pedagogies we do to realize them.

#### GUIDING CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

Although there are many ways of conceptualizing GNLEs, in our work, three interrelated theoretical perspectives have proven particularly productive for studying, designing, and understanding GNLEs: perspectives of globalization, of technological change, and of pedagogy. Globalization is, of course, a highly contested concept—one that has been theorized extensively from a wide range of perspectives, especially since the 1980s when the term came to be used more frequently and to take center stage in public debate (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & McGill Peterson, 2007; Apple, Kenway, & Singh, 2005; Barrow, Didou-Aupetit, & Mallea, 2003; Basset, 2006; Breton & Lambert, 2004; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Carr-Chellman, 2004; Currie et al. (2003); Kapitzke & Peters, 2007; Odin & Manicas, 2004; Peters, 2007a; Peters, 2007b; Peters & Besley, 2006; Scholte, 2005; Sidhu, 2005; Stromquist, 2002; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Our purpose here therefore is not to reproduce this debate. Rather, we build on this work to illustrate the diverse visions faculty have developed in addressing the implications of this research for the learning environments they design with their students to facilitate their participation in global networks. We therefore point out briefly some of the critical changes involved in globalization that call for new kinds of learning environments.

For education, Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Desirée Qin-Hilliard (2004) capture the significance of these changes aptly when they state that “globalization is generating changes of a magnitude comparable to the emergence of agriculture ten thousand years ago or the industrial revolution two hundred years ago. It will demand fundamental rethinking of the aims and processes of education (p. 14). Some researchers have observed that there have been numerous phases in human social and economic development that could be described as forms of globalization. These were often tied to the development of new means of production in the form of new technologies, such as ships or airplanes, that allowed for a more global distribution of production, especially by moving people and goods physically across large distances (Coatsworth, 2004; Jameson & Miyoshi, 1998). What is perhaps most significant about the current phase of globalization is that it affects not only the production and movement of goods, but—facilitated by the Internet—also the global production and distribution of services, which in many countries now constitute the largest sector of economic activity—in the United States, for example, more than 80% (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002).

As a consequence, businesses have become increasingly transnational, operating across nations rather than between nations to take advantage of differences in production conditions, for example, of differences in labor costs, rights, regulations, and education as well as differences in environmental, economic, and social regulations (Stiglitz, 2002; 2006). Because globally distributed production now also extends to the services sector, it affects more people than ever before, with most of them now working in globally distributed workplaces and teams, communicating across multiple boundaries through an ever-changing set of digital

communication technologies. At the same time, global governing institutions, such as the WTO, have emerged to influence local public policies in order to facilitate conditions for this globally distributed production, with many highly contested consequences for local communities (Stiglitz, 2002; 2006).

Perhaps the most well-known global decisions taken by emerging global governing institutions are those affecting products, such as the WTO efforts to remove local regulations on the sale and labeling of genetically modified foods, or other products that are regulated by local public interests. Increasingly, however, these global policies also affect traditionally public goods—now recast as tradable services, including education, and in particular higher education, especially now that higher education has been subsumed under the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) (Basset, 2006; Ziguras, 2005). For example, as the first country to propose the inclusion of higher education as a service commodity in the GATS, the United States has proposed that the 147 WTO member countries remove certain national policies, such as those involving the “prohibition of higher education ... offered by foreign entities,” “inappropriate restrictions on electronic transmission of course materials, ... [or] ... measures requiring the use of a local partner” (U.S. Department of State, 2000). From China, specifically, the United States has requested the removal of public policies limiting for-profit higher education (ACE, 2004). Although such national policies visibly reflect local public interests in the public and cultural role of higher education, according to the U.S. proposal, these local policies constitute potential trade barriers to the global sale of higher education via the Internet.

Increasingly, global decision making for access to global markets unfettered by local public policies has resulted in highly contested local consequences, including global injustice, inequality, and environmental crisis. At the same time, a global civil society has begun to emerge to address these local consequences of global decision making as well as the larger global social and environmental implications of globally distributed production. According to Jenson and Papillon (2002) and Muetzelfeldt and Smith (2002), the relationships that constitute the core of citizenship—those between citizens and governance institutions as well as those among citizens—increasingly extend across nations. To deliberate and influence the shape globalization should take, civil society organizations or non-government organizations, for example, have increased in number from fewer than 10,000 before 1980 to more than 45,000 now (Union of International Organizations, as cited in Tapscott & Ticoll, 2003, p. 190). Like businesses, they increasingly operate transnationally, across nations rather than between, realizing that humanity's most pressing problems—whatever their nature, economic, environmental, or social—are transnational and require transnational or global relationship building, debate, deliberation, and collaboration.

Conceptualizing GNLEs in this shift from traditional international concerns—those affecting the relationships between nations—to global concerns and the need for global collaboration and democratic participation in the shaping of an emerging global economic and social order, therefore, is a critical step in designing GNLEs if they are to prepare learners for the complexities of global work and citizenship. In particular, the distinction between globalization and internationalization is important because internationalization, while to some extent subsumed under the

processes of globalization, does not invoke the current struggle for democratic participation in the shaping of an emerging global social and economic order, nor does it capture the role GNLEs play in emerging global knowledge cultures (Kapitzke & Peters, 2007; Peters, 2007; Peters & Besley, 2006).

The emergence of global knowledge cultures provides an important framework for understanding the role of GNLEs in shaping the global horizon of higher education. As Stiglitz (2006) and Peters & Besley (2006) emphasize, the increasingly central role of knowledge as the main source of material and economic value creation in society entails an important difference between industrial production and knowledge production: Unlike many of the physical goods and resources that formed the basis of industrial production, knowledge is a largely public good in the sense that its value depends less on scarcity, but more on sharing and collaboration. This sharing and collaboration is increasingly facilitated in global digital networks, characterized by a shift from industrial institutional ecologies to those that facilitate peer production and collaborative knowledge making (Benkler, 2006). Benkler captures this shift as follows:

We find ourselves in the middle of a battle over the institutional ecology of the digital environment. ... How these battles turn out over the next decade or so will likely have a significant effect on how we come to know what is going on in the world we occupy, and to what extent and in what forms we will be able—as autonomous individuals, as citizens, and as participants in cultures and communities—to affect how we and others see the world as it is and as it might be. (p. 2)

It is this difference in how we as educators with our colleagues, students, and other stakeholders affect how we and others see the world that is at the heart of GNLEs. As Benkler (2006) and others (Lessig, 2006; Kapitzke, 2007) observe, digital network technologies have great potential for institutional and business shifts toward peer production and Internet-facilitated collaboration, shared knowledge making, and joint action across traditional boundaries—essentially the practices that characterize GNLEs. Digital network technologies thus allow individuals and organizations to reach out to new networks, to build new relationships, and to reach for new opportunities for growth.

This increased participation and interaction across traditional national, political, institutional, and linguistic boundaries involves a shift toward what Kalantzis and Cope (2006) identify as “multilingualism, divergence, and enduringly deep diversity” (p. 409). Indeed, as the authors argue, we have entered an era “in which diversity becomes a more fundamental dynamic than it has been within not just our living memories, but even our written, civilisational memory” (p. 403). This enriched diversity dynamic calls for renewed attention to the ways in which we inquire into, reflect on, and negotiate our locally situated, regularized, and habitual discursive practices—our ways of writing, speaking, thinking, and interacting with all the assumptions these entail about what is proper, expected, and common sense. More specifically, it calls on us as educators to revisit the ways in which we help students engage in such inquiry, reflection, and negotiation. This concern is central to our understanding of human interaction in such richly and more deeply diverse environments and also underlies—implicitly or explicitly—the visions for and

designs of the GNLEs presented in this volume because they are ultimately about new ways of making knowledge in a more deeply diverse world, which involves the questioning of our locally situated, deeply held assumptions of common sense.

Digital network technologies enable new learning environments for this purpose by extending across traditional institutional and national boundaries to invite participants from diverse economic, social, cultural, and political locations with diverse ways of knowing. These are learning environments that allow learners to challenge their own habitual, dominant, regularized, and normalized ways of knowing as reproduced in local environments; to inquire into, question, and negotiate diverse ways of knowing; and to learn how to build shared learning and knowledge cultures across traditional boundaries. They are thus learning environments that ultimately can prepare learners to engage in the kind of knowledge making needed to address pressing global questions, such as environmental crisis and social injustice. It is unlikely that this kind of knowledge-making can be facilitated by industrial models of traditional courses contained within local institutions even if they are repackaged for online delivery.

However, for GNLEs, we might take from Benkler (2006) the insight that these shifts emerge through a battle between traditional, established institutional practices and the new alternative practices enabled by digital network technologies. Often enabled through digital networks, GNLEs represent such alternative practices of knowledge making and learning. Reflecting such alternatives, they require concerted institutional effort in order to understand and deliberate the changes involved and to nurture the innovation in the face of longstanding, habitual, normalized, and traditional practices around which institutional resources, processes, and values are currently organized.

For educators, perhaps the most critical question becomes how we address these changes with students—how we can help them and ourselves navigate, participate in, and shape these changes as well as build rich shared learning and knowledge cultures in a globally networked world. As John Dewey (1961) reminds us, in addressing any question, the learning environments we design are vital because in Dewey's words, "we never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment. Whether we permit chance environments to do the work, or whether we design environments for the purpose makes a great difference" (p. 19). In other words, students learn what they do more so than what they are told, which is why a focus on learning environments and the kinds of knowledge-making practices they enable is vital.

Ultimately, the question that has guided our work on globally networked learning therefore is this: How do we as educators envision, rethink, and design learning environments in a globally networked world? This question also begs related questions: What visions drive GNLEs? And what does it take to realize these visions? As we show below, seeking answers to these questions takes us beyond traditional well bounded classrooms and requires attention to what we suggest are three key pillars of globally networked learning: visionary partnerships, policies, and pedagogies.

VISIONS FOR GLOBALLY NETWORKED LEARNING

Given their nature as innovation as well as their embeddedness in highly contested technological and global change, GNLEs require careful attention to the vision that is to drive them. International education scholar Jane Knight (2000) captures this need for vision aptly when she calls on us as educators to consider what is at stake and to take a hindsight perspective, imagining looking back at our work 20 years from now:

What achievements and values will be attached to internationalization—development, partnership, exploitation, solidarity, quality, commercialism, prosperity, homogenization, competitiveness, pluralism, advancement—when stakeholders and researchers of the future reflect on the past 20 years? Are we aware and alert to what the consequences of our actions might be? (p. 90).

Clearly, a vision that is focused on global trade in higher education markets will inspire very different partnerships, policies, and pedagogies and learning environments than a vision that is designed to facilitate learning for collaborative knowledge making, for the building of shared learning and knowledge cultures across various boundaries, or for civic engagement in the struggle for global justice.

What visions, then, drive GNLEs? To address this question, we draw on the case studies presented in this book. Given the emerging and contested nature of globalization, we invited contributions from faculty that reflect a range of visions as they are beginning to take shape. Again, our purpose in offering these visions is not to promote a particular vision, but rather to show the rich diversity, creativity, and emerging nature that characterize these visions and to provide a range of perspectives to facilitate robust deliberation and debate around the visions that are to shape the global horizon of higher education.

Perhaps one of the most prominent visions that drives globally networked learning involves enabling the active participation of learners, faculty, and educational institutions in the shaping of an emerging social and economic global order—be that in the globally networked workplace or in the emerging global civil society. To some extent, this overall vision reflects emerging concerns that the shaping of an emerging global order has been driven largely by economic interests, often top-down, excluding public interests and constraining public involvement in global decision-making (Stiglitz, 2002, 2006). Ensuring this participation requires citizens who can engage in robust deliberations of social change and collaborate across multiple boundaries to address emerging economic, social, and environmental challenges in their complex global-local interactions. GNLEs, therefore, are frequently concerned with facilitating this potential for deliberation, collaboration, and participation in the shaping of an emerging global civil society.

This larger vision entails a number of related visions, including the need for developing new knowledge cultures (Peters & Besley, 2006), building shared collaborative learning cultures, advancing pedagogies for globally networked learning by facilitating faculty development as well as raising new questions for pedagogies in GNLEs, and reaching out to new learners, citizens, professionals, and communities—in particular to those who have been marginalized and

disadvantaged in the current processes of global and technological change. For many, this vision also includes new opportunities for renewing the public and cultural mission of higher education in the context of globalization and emerging global knowledge cultures (Peters, 2007a).

The development of new knowledge cultures is at the heart of GNLEs. As Peters (2007a) explains, “knowledge cultures are based on shared epistemic practices, they embody culturally preferred ways of doing things, often developed over many generations” (p. 23). GNLEs enable the development of new knowledge cultures because they redefine who is invited to contribute to the knowledge making process and to the questioning of assumptions, norms, values, and habitual practices. Learning environments that bring together faculty and students from diverse contexts provide new opportunities for asking critical questions about what knowledge is legitimized, or in Apple’s (2004) words, “where knowledge comes from, whose knowledge it is, what social groups it supports, and so on” (p. 13). They invite new participants for questioning habitual and culturally bounded ways of knowing or what Apple calls “commonsense interpretations” that make our world with all of its practices, politics, and power relations become “*tout court*, the only world” (p. 4). It is this questioning of commonsense, culturally bounded assumptions, habitual and normalized ways of thinking, knowing, doing, writing, speaking, and engaging with others that GNLEs facilitate. In Benkler’s (2006) words, GNLEs are part of a new institutional ecology that allows us to understand and “affect how we and others see the world as it is and as it might be” (p. 2).

In the contributions to this volume, this vision is perhaps most strongly emphasized in the Global Classroom Project described by Herrington from a faculty perspective and by Kennon from a learner perspective as well as in the globally networked learning environment for Indigenous Studies described by Kirby, Fitch, and Greathouse Amador. As described by TyAnna Herrington, the Global Classroom Project facilitates a networked learning environment for graduate and undergraduate students in a course on digital communication at the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture at the Georgia Institute of Technology and in English courses at the Russian Academy of Sciences, the European University at St. Petersburg (Russia), Volgograd State University (Russia), and the Blekinge Institute of Technology, Karlskrona (Sweden). Piloted in 2000 after a Fulbright exchange at the European University in St. Petersburg, the partnership is designed to provide an experiential learning environment for intercultural digital communication. Thus far, more than 500 students have participated in this initiative. As Herrington notes, facilitating the active collaboration among the students is the main focus of the partnered learning environment as it is through this collaboration that students learn to invite and negotiate multiple perspectives on their taken-for-granted assumptions and on the normalized representations of world conflicts they encounter in their daily media experiences. In the words of Herrington and her partners, the goal is to provide students “with a forum for learning how to develop a critical cross-cultural literacy through negotiating multiple perspectives, and we base our project on the premise that we cannot impose this kind of learning on students ... that ... it cannot be taught, but only learned through experience” (p. 39). As Kennon emphasizes in his account of the Global Classroom Project from a student perspective, it is this

negotiation of multiple perspectives and multiple approaches to a problem that make the learning experience the most valuable.

Similarly, Brian Fitch, Alex Kirby, and Louisa Greathouse Amador relied on digital technologies to design a partnered learning environment that brings together Indigenous and non-Indigenous students from the University of Wisconsin-Stout, USA; University of South Dakota-Vermilion, USA; Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico; and First Nations University of Regina, Canada, in an undergraduate Indigenous studies course to examine dominant and marginalized identities in ways that are otherwise difficult to achieve. As the authors explain, through their dialogue in this networked learning environment, students experience the ways in which their interpretations of cultural texts are locally situated and rest on unexamined assumptions. These assumptions are being called forth and reshaped through the dialogue with their peers who contribute their richly diverse cultural experiences and perspectives to the joint project of making meaning of cultural texts. According to the authors, “this calling forth of assumptions for discussion and illumination is one of the most powerful tools and outcomes [of the project]” (p. 147).

Related to this vision for new knowledge cultures are visions for building shared collaborative learning cultures across multiple boundaries—oftentimes in digital networks. These are learning cultures that are culturally rich and distributed, bringing together the regularized, habitual daily practices and values of diverse participants situated in different local cultural, social, political, and economic contexts where these practices arise and are shaped (Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006; Herrington & Tretyakov, 2005; Sapp, 2004). They allow students to learn to appreciate the complex identities of individuals, to put inquiry before rash judgment, to negotiate diverse ways of knowing in order to build shared ways of learning with each other that bring out the best and fullest contributions of all members (Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006). Most importantly, they allow for negotiated, multi-perspectival contributions that are informed by diverse ways of knowing, diverse lived experiences, and diverse perspectives. By interacting with diverse ways of knowing, diverse perspectives, and cultural identities, students in GNLEs also have new opportunities to understand and critically examine the ways in which their own identities, ways of knowing, and daily practices are rooted in and shaped by the social, cultural, and political conditions of their lived experience.

This aspect of visions for globally networked learning underlies the Transatlantic Project described by Bruce Maylath, Sonja Vandepitte, and Birthe Moustén in this volume both from a partnership and pedagogy perspective. As the authors explain, the Transatlantic Project connects faculty and students in technical communication programs in the United States (the University of Wisconsin-Stout and North Dakota State University with students and faculty in translation programs in Europe, including the Université Paris 7 (France), the Hogeschool Gent (Belgium), the Handelshøjskolen Århus (Denmark), the Universität Graz (Austria), and the Università degli Studi di Trieste (Italy). Initiated in 1999 by Bruce Maylath, then at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, and Sonia Vandepitte of the Hogeschool Gent, the partnership originally linked students in their two courses through an electronic collaboration project in which students learn to examine the underlying cultural assumptions of their own texts through writing and translation.

The project now connects 13 instructors and 200-300 students at seven universities in Europe and North America in a given semester. The authors describe students' negotiation of these assumptions within the texts, and find that after participating in the project "[s]tudents have definitely become aware of the diversity of the world community in which their technical documents travel. Moreover, they have also learned to communicate and mediate internationally" (p. 140).

A similar vision is at the heart of the videoconferencing project described by Du-Babcock and Varner, who connect the students in their business communication courses at the City University of Hong Kong and at Illinois State University. As Du-Babcock and Varner note, for Chinese students as nonnative speakers in an English-dominated global business world, the confidence they developed in working through miscommunication with their native English speaking peers was particularly important for their future as confident participants in global business negotiations. Accordingly, for Du-Babcock and Varner, a key goal of their GNLE was to "provide ... [students] with a hands-on experience that would directly expose them to the intercultural environment" (p. 158).

In many ways, visions for globally networked learning also involve the advancement of pedagogy by facilitating faculty development, in particular by raising new questions for pedagogies in GNLEs. For faculty, GNLEs represent unprecedented opportunities for faculty development across institutional and often national boundaries (Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006). Because GNLEs rest on partnerships for shared learning cultures, they often involve extensive discussions among the partnering faculty about pedagogy, course design, the rationales underlying this design, the ways in which pedagogy is shaped by institutional and other local policies and practices, and much more. Their rootedness in partnerships also raises new questions for faculty about developing their visions for globally networked learning. James Melton in this volume, for example, stresses the need for critical discussions of language and dominant assumptions about standardized versions of English. He outlines the possible roles of participants in GNLEs, those of translator-mediators and critical language users, whereby cross-cultural and cross-linguistic communication can be more aptly facilitated and fostered. Similarly, McCool raises critical questions about negotiating the design of online GNLEs between partners who bring different conceptualizations of the subject matter with them, here in the form of deeply rooted cultural metaphors, suggesting that examining the metaphors that shape our perception of an online environment is not only possible in GNLEs, but is a prerequisite for negotiating their design.

Finally, because they involve partnerships across institutional and national boundaries, visions for GNLEs include outreach to new student populations, citizens, professionals, and communities, especially those at the margins. They allow universities to build relationships and connect with new networks of students and other stakeholders. In this way, GNLEs are not merely about reproducing existing practices and interactions with existing stakeholders, but they represent new opportunities for growth not only for students and faculty, but also for institutions. It is this aspect of visions for globally networked learning that perhaps has the greatest potential for universities to renew the subtle balance between their instrumental function of producing useful knowledge and of preparing professionals for the workplace and their civic functions of enabling an engaged

citizenry for democratic participation in a civil society and of producing the knowledge that is needed to create a more just and sustainable social and economic order.

As researchers have noted, with reduced public funding, this balance has recently come under pressure as universities have tried to compensate for reduced public funding by focusing on their instrumental functions (Brown, 2005; Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004; Peters, 2006, 2007a). On the one hand, GNLEs provide universities with new opportunities for growth by building relationships and networks with new populations and stakeholders, for example by strengthening relationships with globally distributed alumni (e.g., by involving them in the creation of these networks). On the other hand, GNLEs allow universities to renew their civic function, especially for an emerging global civil society by allowing students to learn how to build relationships, develop shared learning and knowledge cultures across boundaries, make new knowledge in new ways, and integrate their learning with civic engagement in an emerging global civil society.

Such a dual vision guides the joint degree program between the Humanities and Technical Communication Department at Southern Polytechnic State University (SPSU) in Marietta, Georgia, and the E-Commerce Department at Northeast Normal University (NENU in Chanchung, China, described by Ken Rainey, Herb Smith, and Carol Barnum in this volume. NENU had contacted the SPSU Department with a request for technical communication program development as the E-Commerce Department, which also offers a Bachelor's program in English, wished to offer a joint Bachelor's degree program in technical communication, a field that is not yet common in China. As authors explain, their partnership pursued a number of goals both for globally networked learning and for departmental growth: "The primary motivation of both universities for creating this program is to build a shared learning culture between diverse students, faculty, and institutions in support of the development of technical communication in China. In addition, there are other more practical benefits for SPSU that include a substantial increase in our undergraduate enrolment in technical communication and increased revenue for our programs" (p. 67).

The mission and the needs of the institution can also greatly influence the extent to which visions for globally networked learning involve the renewal of an institution's public mission. Civic engagement in a global context, for example, is central to the vision articulated in this volume by Robin Crabtree, David Sapp, José Malespín, and Gonzalo Norori, who unite with other colleagues and administrators on their campuses at Fairfield University in the United States and the Universidad Centroamericana de Nicaragua around their university's social justice mission to develop GNLEs at the course and program level as well as in other areas. As these authors stress, their vision is "to build international competency and awareness for our students, ourselves, and our institutions; to create meaningful partnerships with colleagues in developing countries; to engage in democratic research practices; and to enact more just and equitable global relations" (p. 88). Designed around a social justice mission, the partnership includes faculty development, faculty and student exchange, shared course projects in cooperative media production and web design, as well as the beginnings of a joint Master's degree in Communication Studies with

plans to include future partners in Guatemala and El Salvador. In line with the universities' shared social justice mission, the networked learning partnership has already provided opportunities for U.S. students to participate in civic engagement projects in poor Nicaraguan communities and conversely for Nicaraguan students to learn with their U.S. peers in similar projects in poor communities in U.S. cities, thus allowing faculty and students to learn together as they address social and economic inequities in the context of globalization.

Not all networked learning environments, however, require extensive linkages across national boundaries to address issues of globalization or to contribute to the renewal of the public mission of their universities. As James Dubinsky at Virginia Tech shows in this volume, the classroom learning environment can also be meaningfully extended to include local community organizations, such as the YMCA. Dubinsky explains the ways in which his undergraduate proposal and report writing class is networked with the local YMCA in an effort to secure funding for the community organization's work in assisting and facilitating the integration of an increasing number of immigrants into the local community. Through this networked project, the students not only learn about the rhetorical work of grant proposals in mobilizing people and organizations to effect change in their community, but also develop leadership abilities through civic engagement as they address the lived experience of immigrants in their local communities and thus directly address issues involved in globalization. In Dubinsky's words, "while the partnership doesn't send students into other countries, students learn much about the problems and issues faced by individuals who cross cultures. They learn about language barriers, cultural and religious differences, and the importance of community. Their assumptions about others are challenged" (p. 181).

Naturally, the visions highlighted here are only some of the visions that are emerging for globally networked learning. What these brief descriptions do indicate, however, is that emerging visions are richly diverse, are influenced by the contexts in which the partnering faculty are located, and hence engage in current global and technological change in diverse ways, responding to different pressures and opportunities. They thus reflect what Peters and Besley (2006) describe as the need for different types of learning environments with different visions to reflect different types of settings rather than for one singular normative vision to dominate.

Regardless of the specific settings in which GNLEs are to be designed, developing a vision for globally networked learning is only one step, which raises new questions—most importantly of what it takes to realize and sustain visionary GNLEs. As we discuss below, GNLEs are not simply a matter of connecting students via the Internet or in some other way. Rather, to be sustainable, these learning environments rest on three pillars: visionary partnerships, policies, and pedagogies.

#### THE PILLARS OF GLOBALLY NETWORKED LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS: PARTNERSHIPS, POLICIES AND PEDAGOGIES

To play a vital role in the shaping of higher education's global dimension and to be sustainable in the long term, GNLEs must rest on robust partnerships, be supported

by innovative institutional policies designed to facilitate globally networked learning, and enable visionary pedagogies that facilitate knowledge making across diverse ways of knowing. Although often underestimated, perhaps the two most vital considerations in enabling and sustaining GNLEs are their reliance on robust partnerships as a defining characteristic and their status as an innovation that introduces alternative practices for learning in a globally networked world and hence calls for innovative institutional policies.

Robust partnerships are a vital pillar of GNLEs for a number of reasons. Most importantly, to build shared learning and knowledge cultures across traditional boundaries, partnerships for GNLEs must be designed in such a way that they enable participants to tap into and mobilize different ways of knowing emanating from diverse locations and positions. For this purpose, they require equal leadership and equal contributions from partners and must address potential power imbalances that might stifle the sharing of knowledge and the inquiry into diverse ways of knowing in order to challenge locally situated, habitualized, and normalized ways of knowledge making. Furthermore, the strong relationships enabled by robust partnerships are vital for building the trust needed to help participants work through the myriad of often incompatible local institutional and national practices and policies. For educators, key questions that arise for partnerships include what kinds of partnerships best facilitate and sustain GNLEs, what characteristics such partnerships have, and how one goes about negotiating such a partnership or partnership network.

At the same time, GNLEs also depend on visionary institutional policies because they represent alternative practices for learning in a globally networked world. As innovations, they typically come up against institutional policies that reflect established practices focused on locally confined classrooms and the regularized, habitual, and normalized practices that support them, including the ways in which resources are allocated and processes are regulated according to assumptions about traditional classroom-confined learning. GNLEs thus call for all those involved in supporting GNLEs at an institution to work together and to reconsider local institutional policies. For educators, key questions to be addressed include what challenges those pursuing GNLEs encounter, what kinds of policies need reconsideration, and how these can be redesigned to support globally networked learning.

With strong foundations in robust partnerships and vital support by innovative institutional policies, GNLEs enable visionary pedagogies. Simply reproducing and repackaging traditional classroom-confined courses for online delivery will not suffice to realize the potential of GNLEs for new ways of knowledge making. For faculty, key questions here include: what pedagogies facilitate the kind of knowledge making enabled by GNLEs? How do faculty theorize and conceptualize their pedagogies? How do learners experience their interaction in these GNLEs? What new questions about pedagogies do GNLEs raise?

Because GNLEs rest on these pillars, they serve as the organizing principle for the book, with section one focused on the partnerships and policies needed to facilitate GNLEs, and section two focused on the visionary pedagogies they enable. Practically, however, these pillars are not clearly separable, nor should they be. As soon as one starts thinking about pedagogies, for example, questions arise about

what kind of partnerships and policies are needed to sustain these pedagogies. Vice versa, as soon as one considers partnerships, questions arise about the kinds the pedagogies that are to be facilitated, and what policies enable these partnerships and pedagogies. Nevertheless, our hope is that this organization will help readers consider the need for all three elements because the most significant distinguishing characteristic of GNLEs compared to more traditional classrooms is that GNLEs require robust partnerships and innovative policies to enable visionary pedagogies.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Much is at stake in the way the emerging global horizon of higher education is being shaped, and the particular shape it will take will depend on the visions educators develop for learning in a globally networked world, the partnerships they develop to realize them, and the institutional policies they shape to facilitate their visions for globally networked learning. Such visions can range from dominant approaches of reproducing and repackaging traditional industrial-model courses for delivery over the Internet to diverse visions for new ways of learning and knowledge making in a globally networked world. The kinds of visions that will shape the global horizon of higher education will have wide ranging consequences for the extent to which learners will be able to challenge traditional habitual ways of knowledge making, negotiate diverse knowledges across traditional boundaries, build shared learning and knowledge cultures, and ultimately assume active roles as professionals and citizens shaping an emerging global social and economic order.

To provide educators with one possible starting point for shaping their own visions, we offer the case studies described in this book by early innovators as opportunities for faculty, administrators, international program experts, faculty development experts, instructional technology experts, and others in higher education to work together to deliberate, shape, and realize inspiring visions for globally networked learning. We offer them as opportunities for inquiry, deliberation, collaboration, and participation in the shaping of an emerging global horizon in higher education.

#### REFERENCES

- Altbach, P.G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Altbach, P. G., & McGill Peterson, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Higher education in the new century: Global challenges and innovative ideas*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- American Council on Education (2004). GATS-General Agreement on Trade in Services. U.S. update on GATS. Retrieved May 23, 2005 from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Topics&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=9162>.
- Apple M., Kenway, J., & Singh, M. (Eds.) (2005). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Barrow, C. W., Didou-Aupetit, & J. Mallea. (2003). *Globalisation, trade liberalisation, and higher education in North America: The emergence of a new market under NAFTA?* NY: Springer.
- Bassett, R. M. (2006). *The WTO and the university: Globalization, GATS, and American higher education*. New York: Routledge.

- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Breton, G., & Lambert, M. (Eds.) (2004). *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust*. Paris: Economica.
- Brown, L. (2005). Virtual spaces for innovative pedagogical actions: Education, technology, and globalization. In M. Apple, J. Kenway, & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics* (pp. 171-189). New York: Peter Lang.
- Burbules, N., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.) (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Carr-Chellman, A. A. (Ed.) (2004). *Global perspectives on e-learning: Rhetoric and reality*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coatsworth, J. H. (2004). Globalization, growth, and welfare in history. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization, culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 38-55). Berkeley, CA: U of California Press.
- Currie, J., et al. (Eds.) (2003). *Globalizing practices and university responses: European and Anglo-American Differences*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Dewey, J. (1961). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: MacMillan.
- Herrington, T. & Tretyakov, Y. (2005). The Global Classroom Project: Troublemaking and Troubleshooting. In K. Cargile Cook, & K. Grant-Davie (Eds.), *Online education: Global questions, local answers* (pp. 267-283). Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Jameson, F., & Miyoshi, M. (Eds.) (1998). *The cultures of globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke UP.
- Jenson, J. & Papillon, M. (2001). The changing boundaries of citizenship: A review and research agenda. *Canadian Policy Research Networks*. Retrieved January 25, 2005 from <http://www.cprn.com/en/doc.cfm?doc=182>.
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2006). On globalisation and diversity. *Computers and Composition*, 23, 402-411.
- Kapitzke, C., & Peters, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Global knowledge cultures*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kapitzke, C. (2007). Intellectual property rights: Governing cultural and educational futures. In C. Kapitzke and M. Peters (Eds.), *Global knowledge cultures* (pp. 99-118). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Knight, J. (2000). Progress and promise: The AUCC report on internationalization at Canadian Universities. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Marginson, S. (2004). Don't leave me hanging on the Anglophone: The potential for online distance higher education in the Asia-Pacific region. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(2/3), 74-113.
- Marginson, S. (2007). The open horizon. In S. Marginson (Ed.), *Prospects of higher education: Globalization, market competition, public goods and the future of the university* (pp. xi-xv). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Muetzelfeldt, M., & Smith, G. (2002). Civil society and global governance: The possibilities for global citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(1), 55-75.
- Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The future of higher education: Rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Odin, J. K., & Manicas, P. T. (Eds.). (2004). *Globalization and higher education*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Palvetzian, T. (2005). Integrating international academic partnerships into institutional contexts: Faculty perspectives. Unpublished MA Thesis. McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Peters, M. (2007a). Higher education, globalization, and the knowledge economy: Reclaiming the cultural mission. *Ubiquity*, 8(18), 1-27.
- Peters, M. (2007b). *Knowledge economy, development and the future of higher education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Peters, M., & Besley, T. (2006). *Building knowledge cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham & Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

#### LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS: EMERGING VISIONS

- Sapp, D. (2004). Global partnerships in business communication. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67, 267-280.
- Scholte, J. (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sidhu, R. K. (2005). *Universities and globalization: To market, to market*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Starke-Meyerring, D. (2004). The rhetoric of the Internet in higher education policy: A cross-cultural study. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67, 238-244.
- Starke-Meyerring, D. (2005). Meeting the challenges of globalization: A framework for global literacies in professional communication programs. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 19, 468-499.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., & Andrews, D. (2006). Developing a shared virtual learning culture: An international classroom partnership. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69, 25-49.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., Duin, A. H., & Palvetzian, T. (2007). Global partnerships: Positioning technical communication programs in the context of globalization. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(2), 139-174.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: Norton.
- Stiglitz, J. (2006). *Making globalization work*. New York: Norton.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of power, technology, and knowledge*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (2004). Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 1-37). Berkeley, CA: U of California Press.
- Tapscott, D., & Ticoll, D. (2003). *The naked corporation*. New York: Free Press.
- U.S. Department of State. (2000). *Higher (tertiary) education, adult education, and training*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May, 20, 2003, from <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/econ/wto/education1214.htm>.
- U.S. Department of Commerce (2002). *Services exports and the U.S. economy*. Retrieved May20, 2003, from <http://www.ita.doc.gov/td/sif/Charts102002/Cover.htm>.
- Ziguras, C. (2005). International trade in education services: Governing the liberalization and regulation of private enterprise. In M. Apple, J. Kenway, & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics* (pp. 93-112). New York: Peter Lang.

#### AFFILIATIONS

*Doreen Starke-Meyerring*  
*Department of Integrated Studies in Education*  
*McGill University, Canada*

*Melanie Wilson*  
*Department of Integrated Studies in Education*  
*McGill University, Canada*

**PART I**  
**VISIONARY PARTNERSHIPS AND POLICIES**

DOREEN STARKE-MEYERRING, ANN HILL DUIN, TALENE  
PALVETZIAN, AND MELANIE WILSON

## **2. ENABLING AND SUSTAINING GLOBALLY NETWORKED LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS**

### *Visionary Partnerships and Policies*

#### INTRODUCTION

The visions for globally networked learning discussed in chapter one beg the question of what it takes to realize and—most importantly—sustain GNLEs. Depending on the vision, there are naturally diverse approaches to developing GNLEs; however, as we describe them here, GNLEs differ from traditional classrooms in two critical ways, which also call for two vital elements, or pillars, needed to realize and sustain them: visionary partnerships and policies.

First, visionary partnerships are vital because GNLEs are not the domain of individual faculty, but depend on partnerships to engage learners, faculty, programs, institutions, companies, civil society organizations, community organizations, and other individuals or entities outside of a program in a shared networked learning and knowledge culture. By definition, GNLEs cannot exist without partnerships. Indeed, we consider partnerships a defining characteristic of GNLEs that distinguishes them from many traditional classrooms and plays a vital role in ensuring the sustainability and growth of GNLEs.

Without thoughtful attention to the long-term relationships enabled by partnerships, GNLEs can be fleeting and difficult to sustain. They can be quickly abandoned as partners encounter the many challenges of working across often conflicting local institutional policies, needs, pressures, levels of institutional support and infrastructure, and constraints; diverging visions and approaches; and tacit power imbalances. To be sustainable, these partnerships require thoughtful attention, especially if they are to activate the richly diverse ways of knowing enabled by the local situatedness of participants in diverse local political, cultural, social, and economic environments for new ways of knowledge making. As we discuss below, sustainable GNLEs for shared knowledge and learning cultures require robust partnerships with distinct characteristics: shared leadership and attention to power imbalances between partners; initiation by faculty from the grassroots or with faculty as a critical driving force; attention to relationship building and trust; and skillful negotiation of a shared vision, approaches, and practices.

Second, visionary policies are vital to realizing and sustaining GNLEs because these learning environments and the partnerships that enable them operate across policy environments. Most importantly, GNLEs offer alternative pedagogical

visions and practices of integrating local and global learning; they break with the traditional confines of local classrooms and with the siloed approach to global learning as an add-on study-abroad program with traditionally limited student participation (Altbach, 2004). In representing alternative visions and practices of learning, they constitute a technological and pedagogical innovation. As an innovation, they face numerous challenges and require thoughtful attention to local institutional policies as these policies have traditionally designed without globally networked learning in mind. Nor have local policies traditionally been designed with a conscious focus on fostering pedagogical innovation.

Surprisingly, although partnership development is a new task for many faculty and other educators on campus, the ability to develop such partnerships across complex local environments is often simply assumed, with little explicit attention paid to partnership development for sustainable GNLEs. Likewise, their nature as an innovation that requires thoughtful reconsideration of local policies is often overlooked, although attention to local policies is vital given that established local policies have been designed to facilitate traditional local practices without attention to learning in global networks. Accordingly, the purpose of this chapter is to highlight some of the most vital considerations in the development of partnerships and policies needed to realize and sustain visionary GNLEs. Naturally, partnership and policy issues for GNLEs are complex and extend far beyond what can be discussed within the framework of this chapter; our purpose here, therefore, is limited to providing conceptual guidance to the development of visionary partnerships and policies and to offering a backdrop of partnership development in higher education and some of the institutional struggles and challenges involved in fostering innovation that help to contextualize the chapters in this book, specifically those in this section on partnerships and policies. We begin with a discussion of partnerships as they set some of the context for policy considerations.

#### PARTNERSHIPS

Much research on partnerships in higher education, especially at the institutional level, has noted that the role of robust partnerships and the need for their thoughtful development is often underestimated (Beerkens, 2002; Baer & Duin, 2005; Duin, Baer, & Starke-Meyerring, 2001; Marginson, 2004; Moxley & Maes, 2003). As Marginson (2004) notes, without visionary partnerships, early large-scale institution-level efforts at globalizing learning in higher education failed. In an effort to tap into global higher education markets, hundreds of millions of public and private dollars have been invested in large e-learning initiatives such as the UK e-university (62 million pounds), Fathom (\$25 million initial investment), Cardean University (Carnegie Mellon, Stanford, Columbia, London School of Economics and Political Science, and University of Chicago business schools with \$100 million initial investment), and others. A large number of them have since been closed down or are struggling to survive. The reasons for these failures, Marginson suggests, are complex, but they likely include the foregrounding of economic factors rather than visions of globally networked knowledge and learning cultures, a lack of attention to power imbalances, and a lack of pedagogical innovation.

These early initiatives thus largely reproduced and repackaged traditional courses for delivery in global markets via the Internet. In Benkler's (2006) terms, these initiatives disregarded the networked nature and the peer production potential of emerging institutional digital ecologies. Reflecting early visions of the Internet in higher education as facilitating global trade, these early efforts focused on the sale of pre-designed, traditional courses and programs in global markets with little cultural sensitivity and little intent of building shared collaborative learning environments (Brown, 2005; Hamilton & Feenberg, 2005; Marginson, 2004). In other words, existing pedagogy was packaged in the form of what Herrington (this volume) describes as "course in a box" for delivery in global markets.

As Marginson (2004) observes, perhaps the most important reason why these initiatives lacked innovative pedagogies is that they lacked visionary partnerships built around cultural respect, mutual benefit, and shared leadership. In other words, ignoring the peer production potential of networked technologies, they reproduced industrial models of education, simply attempting to spread them into new markets, without considering the paradigm shift towards a globally networked knowledge society, which called for innovative ways of networked learning and knowledge making across traditional boundaries. Without partnerships rooted in equality and reciprocity, Marginson asserts, curricula remained monocultural and monolingual, lacked sensitivity to local contexts and needs, and overlooked power imbalances between rich and less well resourced institutions, countries, and regions. Most importantly, without such partnerships, it is impossible to mobilize the richness of different ways of knowing, acting, and thinking that emerge from diverse social cultural, and economic locations and positions and to achieve the kind of transformative learning that results from inquiring into, questioning, and negotiating these diverse ways of knowing and from building shared learning and knowledge cultures across traditional boundaries.

Robust partnerships are vital, then, because GNLEs are not simply about facilitating the sale of courses globally via the Internet or even about simply connecting students via the Internet or other means. Instead, they are about developing strong relationships and networks that can enable and sustain the visions of GNLEs. And while much research has examined partnerships in higher education, especially those formed at the institutional level, here we focus on the partnership considerations that are most vital for GNLEs, which as we discuss below, include thoughtful attention to power imbalances to ensure shared leadership; a grassroots origin with faculty as a driving force to ensure innovative pedagogies; attention to relationship building to ensure trust between partners; and skillful negotiation of a shared vision, approaches, and practices to sustain the partnership.

#### *Shared Leadership and Attention to Power Imbalances*

Attention to power imbalances and the need for shared leadership and equal participation have been key concerns for faculty who have built sustainable partnerships for their GNLEs. Herrington (this volume), for example, is very aware of this need, which for her also includes attention to power imbalances and

dominance. Thus, she begins her chapter by acknowledging that “online educational programs that originate from the United States too often reflect the worst characteristics of globalization, usually more markedly a kind of pedagogical colonization” (p. 37) and stressing that the Global Classroom project she co-developed was designed to counter this kind of dominance. Crabtree, Sapp, Malespín, and Norori address similar concerns over power imbalances when they emphasize the need to develop partnerships with colleagues in countries that have been the most marginalized. As the authors note, “the colonial history, market bias, and corporate monopolistic character of contemporary structures of globalization have produced gross asymmetries in the experience and distribution of the benefits of globalization” (p. 88). The authors show how in designing their partnership for globally networked learning, they address the power imbalances between the U.S. and Nicaragua that partially motivate and also influence their partnership.

For GNLEs, this attention to shared leadership and mutual learning is particularly important if the GNLE is indeed to benefit from the wealth of different ways of knowing that emanate from each location as well as from the transformation that results from inquiring into and negotiating these diverse ways of knowing in a shared learning culture. Without partnerships characterized by mutual respect, equal contribution, and cultural sensitivity, faculty will also find it difficult to develop a shared instructional culture. A shared instructional culture, however, is necessary not only to facilitate learning in a GNLE, but also to model and facilitate ways in which students can learn how to build such a shared learning culture themselves (Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006; forthcoming). Without mutual respect and equal contributions, one partner may dominate the GNLE, rendering it little more than a mere copy of that partner’s existing course and ways of knowing, thus foregoing opportunities for the transformative potential of negotiating multiple ways of knowing.

Yet, as several of the contributors to this volume acknowledge, questioning and stepping out of one’s habitual ways of thinking, addressing power imbalances, and overcoming culturally and ideologically sedimented practices are not easy tasks—neither for students nor for faculty. It is instead one that requires substantial reflection. Crabtree, Sapp, Malespín, and Norori (this volume), for example, very openly acknowledge the ways in which habitual stereotypical perceptions surfaced in the process of collaboratively authoring their chapter. Collaborative writing about the partnership can thus serve as a vital forum for reflection on questions of power and culturally and ideologically sedimented stereotypes as they may affect the partnership. However, as the chapter authors recognize, such co-authorship and joint reflection may well be institutionally constrained, for example, by resource imbalances, when some co-authors are constrained by heavy teaching loads in less well-resourced institutions, or by institutional publishing pressures that can make accommodating joint authoring across differently resourced institutional contexts challenging. Moreover, given the dominance of English as the preferred language in the publishing industry, co-authors whose native language is not English find themselves at another disadvantage.

*The Grassroots Nature of Partnerships for GNLEs*

Given the concern of this book with positioning faculty, learners, administrators, and others in higher education as active participants in the globalization of higher education, the partnerships that sustain the GNLEs described in this book arise predominantly from faculty networks and emerge largely at the grassroots level or substantially involve faculty as driving their design. As Benkler (2006) notes, at some level, digital network technologies introduce new opportunities for individual decision making and action. In the case of faculty, digital technologies enable new opportunities for making connections with other colleagues, learners, professionals, or activists to extend their learning environments across national, cultural, institutional, and other boundaries, enabling the development of partnerships for GNLEs from the grassroots.

This grassroots nature of GNLEs is important because GNLEs require intensive collaboration and commitment among partnering faculty to negotiate a shared learning culture and to facilitate the daily work across institutional, national, and other boundaries. Such partnerships, therefore, cannot be imposed top down, but must be developed by faculty themselves or at the very least with faculty as a critical driving force in developing the partnership. As Herrington and Tretyakov (2005) infer from their work with their Global Classroom Project, “recognizing that the budding project began at a grassroots level is essential to understanding its nature and its development. Many international or inter-institutional projects begin with a cooperation agreement signed by the heads of two institutions and slowly wither for lack of enthusiasts willing to work along lines directed by others” (p. 268).

This grassroots theme surfaces in one way or another in all of the chapters in the partnerships and policies section, with the chapters illustrating a range of approaches, often influenced by the local institutional contexts in which partners work. For Herrington as well as for Maylath, Vandepitte, and Mousten, the grassroots origin of their partnership networks is a defining characteristic of their GNLEs. Both chapters describe a partnership network consisting of faculty located in multiple institutions in various national contexts. While Herrington illustrates the kinds of relationship building that are needed at various levels to establish and maintain such a faculty-based partnership network, Maylath and his colleagues illustrate how 12 faculty located in seven nations have developed and maintained such a partnership network from the grassroots with minimal cost, technology, and bureaucracy—a network from which over the course of seven years more than 1000 students have benefited. As the authors emphasize, it is the flexibility of this kind of grassroots network that allows them to design their GNLEs specifically around their pedagogical vision and also to enable not only the growth of their network, but also their development as faculty.

Illustrating a similar point from a somewhat different perspective, Rainey, Smith, and Barnum reflect on a program partnership with a Chinese university, which was originally developed at the administrative level, with little faculty involvement in the early stages. As the authors discuss, this original lack of faculty involvement led to numerous challenges that needed to be overcome, such as challenges for curriculum integration, especially in the case of a discipline, here

technical communication, that is new in China, and concomitant faculty anxieties about the ways in which the partnerships would affect their work. While early faculty involvement may have allowed the partnership to benefit more fully from faculty visions for innovative pedagogies, the authors note, their involvement only at a later stage required considerable work to address faculty concerns.

In some contexts, partnerships for globally networked learning environments may originate in an integrated fashion involving faculty, administrators, and others on a campus in a collaborative effort. Crabtree, Sapp, Malespín, and Norori (this volume) emphasize this integrated origin of their partnership as vital to its sustainability and widespread integration across the campuses of their private universities. As the authors explain, the partnership initiative emerged both from faculty interests and initiatives across disciplines in working with their Nicaraguan colleagues and from initiatives for a university-wide partnership sponsored by the President's office. Together, they worked to develop and shape the partnership in ways that reflected the research and teaching interests of faculty, the shared goal of providing opportunities for civic engagement in a global context to their students, and their universities' shared missions of social justice. In all of the GNLEs described in this book, then, faculty played vital leadership roles in initiating and developing the partnerships needed to sustain their GNLEs.

#### *Attention to Relationship Building and Trust*

Regardless of the specific local conditions and the concomitant approach to a partnership, the grassroots nature or substantial grassroots element at the faculty level is critical for the success and sustainability of a GNLE because partnerships for GNLEs require trust to facilitate the building of shared learning cultures across diverse institutional and national contexts with different policies, practices, expectations, laws, and infrastructures. Negotiating and bridging such differences across these boundaries is not only a time-consuming task, but also one that requires trust, patience, openness, commitment, and mutual inquiry into the practices, resources, assumptions, values, and beliefs of all partners.

It is not surprising, therefore, that all of the chapters in this Partnership and Policies section (section 1) emphasize relationship building, long-term commitment, and the need for considerable face-to-face interaction. Herrington stresses, for example, that the Global Classroom Project she describes resulted from extensive face-to-face visits facilitated through a Fulbright grant and from earlier partnership initiatives between the departments of the participants. Without these extensive opportunities for face-to-face negotiations, the partnership, she insists, would have been difficult to establish. Similarly, Maylath, Vandepitte, and Mousten emphasize the role of relationships. The origins of their Transatlantic Project go back to a long-term friendship between Maylath and Vandepitte from a student exchange experience. Rainey, Smith, and Barnum as well as Crabtree, Sapp, Malespín, and Norori in this section report on extensive face-to-face visits to each other's campuses, faculty exchanges, and more to build trust in order to make their partnership sustainable.

Clearly, a partnership for sustainable globally networked learning is not something that participants simply jump into, especially not if the partnership is to mobilize the wealth of different ways of knowing for globally networked learning that result from the local political, cultural, social, and economic situatedness of participants. Instead, sustainable partnerships require relationship building, thoughtful inquiry into each partner's local context, and careful negotiation of a shared vision for how the partnership and the resulting pedagogies are to be shaped and sustained. While these considerations may seem daunting, thoughtful attention to these aspects of partnership development saves much time in the long term as it provides a robust foundation for the GNLEs the partnership is designed to enable.

### *Negotiating a Shared Vision, Approaches, and Practices*

This attention to trust and relationship building is vital for sustainable partnerships for globally networked learning because they require thoughtful mutual engagement, discussion, and respectful negotiation of a shared vision, approaches, and practices, as well as a deep understanding of institutional, political, economic, and technological constraints and conditions under which all partners work. Building on an earlier framework for partnerships developed by Duin, Baer, and Starke-Meyerring (2001), table 1 provides a heuristic of the kinds of questions partners might address to develop a sustainable GNLE.

*Table 1. Heuristic for Partnership Development*

Considerations	Possible Questions to Address
1. <i>Description</i>	How do partners describe the partnership(s)?
2. <i>Vision and Mission</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– What is the greater vision or greater social good of the partnerships?</li> <li>– How does the partnership reflect the mission/vision of local programs/institutions, faculty, courses?</li> </ul>
3. <i>Benefits</i>	What specific benefits are partners pursuing for different participants (e.g., students, faculty, etc.)?
4. <i>Leadership and Practices</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– How is shared leadership ensured?</li> <li>– What structure does the partnership use to provide direction?</li> <li>– What will each partner contribute and be responsible for?</li> <li>– In what areas will different participants (faculty, administrators, international program directors, faculty development experts, educational technology experts) provide leadership?</li> <li>– What initiatives/activities will constitute the partnership (e.g. team teaching, team learning, student or faculty exchanges, joint course development, joint degrees, joint services)?</li> <li>– What are the guiding principles of the partnership?</li> <li>– On what sort of agreement (e.g. formal or informal) is the partnership based?</li> <li>– What role do technologies play in the partnership?</li> </ul>
5. <i>Commitment</i>	<p>What is the commitment of the partners to the partnership?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– What levels are committed to it? (i.e., deans, presidents, department heads/faculty, others at each institution?)</li> <li>– Who is committed to the partnership within local programs?</li> </ul>

	How?
	– What are the resources partners can or need to commit to the partnership? For what purposes (e.g. faculty development)? How may these be secured?
6. <i>Communication, Collaboration</i>	What communication and collaboration processes will enable the partnership? – How do the partners communicate? – How do the partners collaborate (structures, technologies, meetings, logistics)? – What is needed to develop relationships and trust? – How will power imbalances be addressed?
7. <i>Adaptation</i>	What adaptations might partners make to their local programs and institutional environments? – To what extent may partners need to alter the direction, structure, and operations of their programs to support the partnership? – How do partners adapt in order to accept and operate in a blended environment of values, purposes, missions, practices, conventions, outcomes, and policies?
8. <i>Risks</i>	What financial, legal, academic, or experimentation risks may be involved in the partnership? How might they be addressed?
9. <i>Sustainability</i>	How is the partnership sustained? – What factors are most associated with its sustainability? Agreements? Structures? Integration into local institutional support infrastructures? – What challenges in building and maintaining the partnership may need to be addressed?
10. <i>Outcomes</i>	What outcomes do partners envision for their GNLE? – How do the partners define the success of the partnership? – What objectives will partners pursue with the partnership? – How may the partnership affect local programs? – How will students, faculty, and other participants be affected by the partnership? – What may be some unintended outcomes? – How will students, faculty, and other participants be affected by unintended outcomes?

---

Surely, depending on the vision that drives a partnership initiative for globally networked learning, partners will find some aspects of this heuristic more applicable than others; different initiatives will also likely address these questions differently as the chapters in this section demonstrate. Nevertheless, the heuristic indicates that to be sustainable, partnerships for globally networked learning require thoughtful attention both to the partnership—its vision, direction, and shape—and to the local institutional contexts in which each partner works. As the partnership heuristic suggests, attention to these local contexts is vital as the partnerships are negotiated across these local contexts and require local support and integration for their sustainability, thus raising critical questions about local institutional policies.

## POLICIES

Naturally, educators designing GNLEs face numerous challenges that stem from both external and internal university environments. External challenges result most notably from incompatible or conflicting national as well as global policies, such as intellectual property, privacy, censorship, and visa or immigration policies, or from foreign politics and diplomatic international relations. In this book, Herrington, for example, describes a diplomatic incident in which the U.S. government suddenly decided to return a number of Russian diplomats to Russia and to bar them from re-entry to the U.S. while Herrington and her Russian GNLE partner were on their way to give a presentation to Russian scientists at Herrington's university, which they suddenly had to give under conditions strained by this diplomatic incident. These national, international, and global policy influences are certainly not to be overlooked; indeed, GNLEs can provide unique learning opportunities for participants to study such policy discourses and conflicts, to interrogate them from multiple local perspectives, and thus to make multiperspectival knowledge that may be difficult to achieve without participation in a GNLE.

However, unless interactions between citizens of particular nations are outlawed by a national government (e.g., as in the case of the U.S. government preventing its citizens from interacting with Cuban citizens), educators have indicated that such external constraints and influences can be addressed if their GNLE is well sustained through robust partnerships and through integration into a supportive local university environment (Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). Herrington (this volume), for example, attributes the ability of the partners to weather international diplomatic incidents to the strength of the partnership rooted in its equitable development.

In addition to partnerships, local institutional policy environments can play a vital role in the sustainability of GNLEs. And conversely, local institutional policy environments can be the main stumbling block for faculty wishing to develop GNLEs. In a survey of faculty in technical communication programs in the United States, for example, local institutional culture was identified as the main challenge by those who were interested in pursuing GNLEs, but had not yet done so (Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). This finding also suggests that the more GNLEs can rely on local institutional support and the better GNLEs are integrated into their local institutional environments, the more sustainable they are. In our discussion of policies for the development of GNLES, therefore, we focus on these local institutional policy environments.

The need for the integration of GNLEs into their local institutional policy environments is perhaps not surprising. After all, any initiative in an organization is most sustainable if it is a vital part of daily institutional practices, if it enjoys broad-based local participation, if it is closely aligned with the institutional mission, if policies have been purposefully designed to facilitate the initiative, and if it can rely on an institutional support infrastructure designed with the particular initiative in mind. GNLEs, however, represent an innovation that proposes alternative practices and as such rarely fits into established practices and policies. Like any such innovation in an organization, GNLEs face established, habitual, and regularized institutional practices, and processes that reproduce established

interests, values, and assumptions around pedagogy, which also guide policies and support infrastructures (Brown, 2005; Christensen, 1997; Christensen, Anthony, & Roth, 2004; Gaynor, 2004; Lewis, Marginson, & Snyder, 2005; Zuboff, 1988).

As innovations, GNLEs question these established institutional practices and share a number of characteristics that raise important local policy questions. To be sure, these policy questions are complex, diverse, and far more numerous than could be addressed here. Most notably, however, GNLEs raise institutional policy issues because they question traditional assumptions, practices, and processes that have privileged a split between local and global learning, and because as innovations, they come up against the traditional, regularized, habitual practices of institutions and against policies that can stifle innovation. To enable and sustain GNLEs, institutional policy considerations must, therefore, focus on integrating local and global learning and on fostering and supporting innovation.

#### *Institutional Policy Considerations for Integrating Local and Global Learning*

To build shared knowledge and learning cultures across institutional and national contexts and to address issues of globalization, GNLEs must by nature overcome the current split between local classroom learning and what has traditionally been called international learning in the form of study-abroad programs as this split has its origin in pre-globalization paradigms. Instead of treating international learning as an add-on experience for very few students, GNLEs integrate these experiences to facilitate their vision for globally networked learning, sometimes building on long-term study-abroad partnership programs to build GNLEs and sometimes working from an emerging GNLE to extend the learning experience to exchange programs.

This integration of local and global learning is significant because it means that GNLEs are situated in blended policy environments. In inquiring into each other's policy environments and the ways in which they enable or constrain teaching as well as in explaining these policy environments to each other, partners become aware of the local assumptions and values on which local policies rest, the local practices these policies facilitate, the ways in which they may contradict policies at partnering institutions, and the ways in which these diverging local policies—focused as they are on local practices and assumptions—may therefore constrain globally networked learning. Local institutional policies therefore require careful attention to the ways in which they enable or constrain globally networked learning.

Focused as they are on facilitating local institutional practices, current institutional policies perhaps not surprisingly have acted mostly to constrain globally networked learning and to maintain the traditional local-global split (Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). These constraints are perhaps most visible in the form of traditionally siloed support infrastructures, learning technologies that are confined to local institutions, and budget lines that reflect the traditional siloed understanding of local and global learning.

*Support infrastructure.* GNLEs present numerous challenges to faculty working to implement them amidst established practices, processes, and structures (Palvetzian, 2005; Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). For example, working across institutional, national, and other boundaries, faculty must work through often contradictory national policies, such as privacy, copyright, and censorship policies and laws, thus needing a kind of legal advice that may not be common in traditional local classrooms. Moreover, because GNLEs often extend across national boundaries, faculty would benefit from the advice and support of international program experts as well from support by the international student office, or by foreign-language and ESL programs. Given the need for face-to-face meetings to build the necessary trust for robust partnerships, faculty ideally also need to be able to tap into opportunities to build on existing partnerships for traditional add-on student exchange programs, which, however, are typically separate from local classrooms. Or in addressing globalization issues through civic engagement pedagogies in their local communities, faculty need the support of the office that facilitates community-university partnerships for learning. Furthermore, since GNLEs facilitate and require innovative pedagogies, faculty would also benefit greatly from the expertise of specialists in faculty development and higher education pedagogy. Finally, since most GNLEs rely heavily on digital communication technologies, faculty would need strong support from instructional design and educational technology experts who can help them design a cross-institutional partnered online learning environments to realize their vision for globally networked learning.

As these examples of challenges and need for support show, GNLEs require not only robust partnerships for collaboration across institutional and national boundaries, but also integrated local support networks for collaboration to enable and integrate GNLEs into local university policy environments. Currently, however, all of these vital areas of expertise tend to be arranged in silos, shaped around the traditional local-global split in learning. Integrated support infrastructures that bring together international program experts, learning technology experts, instructional designers, lawyers, faculty development experts, and others rarely exist (Palvetzian, 2005; Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). Not only do these units tend to be separated, but their policies tend to be designed around traditional assumptions of local classroom learning. These local policy constraints are perhaps most visible in the ways in which learning technologies are designed, used, and regulated within institutions.

*Technologies.* Technology theorists have long stressed that technologies are never neutral; they are instead highly political artifacts that enable, facilitate, or privilege some practices while undermining, questioning, or constraining others, with different practices reflecting different interests (Bazerman, 2007; Benkler, 2006; Feenberg, 2002; Longford, 2005; Winner, 1986; Starke-Meyerring, forthcoming). As Bazerman (2007) maintains, for example, “the large economic stakes along with the complexity, stability and power of ... [existing] social systems mean that the technology gets designed to facilitate the existing work and arrangements, making it cheaper and quicker, but not disrupting it.”

Predominantly, therefore, technologies are designed and regulated around local institutional practice and status quo, defying international or inter-institutional collaboration. For example, learning management systems are often highly standardized, require local institutional IDs for access, are closely aligned with local institutional structures (e.g., such as internal portals), and are often built with proprietary software, precluding opportunities for shaping technologies around diverse and emerging needs.

These technology designs and regulations have a number of constraining consequences for globally networked learning. First, they can make the building of a shared learning environment that reflects the partnership identity across institutions challenging, instead requiring the participants from one partner institution to simply join the learning environment of the other. Accordingly, faculty and students forego the opportunity of building a shared learning environment, and since the technology is likely designed to facilitate practices at one local institution and to be most integrated into that one local institution, it will likely disadvantage the participants from the partner institution. Moreover, such locally confined learning management systems are designed around assumptions of traditional classroom learning (on campus or reproduced as such online), but less to enable the kind of learning and shared knowledge making that facilitates faculty visions for globally networked learning (Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006).

Furthermore, because such learning management systems are often proprietary, unlike open-source technologies, they provide only limited opportunities to bend and shape their code according to the emerging learning needs of a GNLE. As Lewis, Marginson, and Snyder (2005) found in their study of digital technologies and change in Australian universities, “a number of lecturers complained about the privatization of electronic space that often accompanied the move to networked teaching and learning software, noting the difficulty of sharing material placed in these spaces with people outside the university” (p. 67). The researchers also learned that many faculty experienced institutional learning management systems as “centralized systems of control” that facilitated mostly “uniform administrative and evaluative systems” (pp. 72-73), with less attention devoted to the collaborative possibilities for learning valued by faculty. Accordingly, as the authors report, faculty tended to find ways to circumvent these technologies or to resort to alternatives.

Similarly, interested in digital technologies that allow them to build shared learning cultures, but constrained by technologies designed around traditional institutional classroom assumptions and administrative needs, faculty designing GNLEs often create their own digital environments or resort to open-source technologies (Starke-Meyerring & Andrews, 2006) as well, often requiring considerable additional time commitments. Many of the GNLEs described in this book likewise exist in digital spaces created outside of traditional learning management systems to facilitate their visions for globally networked learning. Rarely, however, do faculty have access to experimental labs equipped with servers to experiment with and shape emerging digital spaces or technologies, such as open-source technologies, to meet the needs of their partnered learning environment.

*Budget lines.* These examples of the kinds of integrated support and technology innovation infrastructure that would be needed to design sustainable GNLEs and overcome the traditional local-global split in learning also illustrate some of the reasons why GNLEs are sometimes perceived to be an extra expense. Given the recent decrease in public funding for public higher education in many countries around the world (Peters & Besley, 2006; Peters, 2007; Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004; Brown, 2005), any initiative that seemingly involves extra cost understandably raises budget concerns. Indeed, budget concerns or “lack of resources” have been identified as the most important stumbling block by faculty wishing to pursue GNLEs (Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). However, if GNLEs are understood as innovations—initiatives that present new practices amidst established, habitual, and regularized practices, then the question becomes less one of extra cost, but rather one of re-envisioning established practices and budget lines to foster innovation.

#### *Institutional Policy Considerations for Fostering GNLEs as Innovation*

As much research on technology and organizational innovation shows, absent an organizational commitment to innovation, technologies tend to be designed, used, and regulated to reproduce established practices—to make them cheaper, faster, and more efficient (Bazerman, 2007; Feenberg, 2002; Zuboff, 1988). In her seminal study of digital technology implementation in the workplace, Zuboff (1988), for example, observes that “technological developments, in the absence of organizational innovation, will be assimilated into the status quo” (p. 392). According to organizational innovation theory, fostering innovation requires attention to the ways in which the organization’s resources (the available means in an organization), processes (the habitual practices, policies, and procedures involved in getting the daily work of the organization done), and values (the criteria according to which resources and processes are regulated) are organized around established practices (Christensen, 1997; Christensen, Anthony, & Roth, 2004). Innovations that sustain or reproduce these established practices, such as for example, the posting of lecture notes or lecture recordings in learning management systems, tend to be easily supported, while innovations that represent alternative practices tend to require the re-envisioning of established practices, such as the rethinking of resources or budget lines to support the innovation.

GNLEs represent such alternative innovations because they do not just simply repackaging existing courses or lectures for online delivery, but rather represent new visions, reach out to new student populations in new ways, build new networks, and as such represent new opportunities for both intellectual and institutional growth and change. In Benkler’s (2006) words, they represent new opportunities for new institutional ecologies—shared knowledge and learning cultures across multiple boundaries that integrate local with global learning. As alternative practices, they question established practices and are, therefore, highly contested. To continue the example of budget lines, in many higher education institutions, these have traditionally been organized around the local-global split in learning and the concomitant siloed infrastructure practices. Rarely are GNLEs, as efforts to

integrate local and global learning, assigned hard funding. Instead, GNLEs tend to be considered a special effort that may be supported by occasional soft money, such as teaching enhancement grants (as in Herrington's case in this volume) or persistent funding requests by faculty and department chairs (as discussed by Rainey and his colleagues in this volume). Unlike established practices, GNLEs are rarely seen as a mission-critical innovation in the context of globalization, although it is these learning environments that present new opportunities for growth, that enable institutions to bridge multiple and conflicting motivations and pressures, and that allow institutions to position their members as active participants in global and technological change and to reshape learning in the context of globalization.

Partially, this lack of understanding GNLEs as innovations results from their status as an alternative practice as well as from their grassroots nature, which characterizes many innovations. This grassroots nature of innovation has been noted as a critical characteristic of innovations in organizational innovation theory as well. Drawing on his more than 40 years of experience in technology and innovation management, including more than 20 years at 3M, Gus Gaynor (2004), for example, notes that most innovation happens at the grassroots level or at the fringes of organizations, where established, habitual, and regularized practices have the least hold on innovators and are the least likely to bend innovations into established practices. One of the challenges for organizations is to identify, support, and systematically encourage these innovations by providing sufficient flexibility for innovation, developing faculty leadership capacity, and ensuring the retention of innovating faculty.

*Policies for flexibility.* Invested in reproducing established practices, institutional policies tend to work to stifle innovation that represents alternative practices. For example, as they develop and implement their innovative shared pedagogies, partnering faculty face local institutional performance evaluations that reflect the status quo and discourage risk taking and innovation. Questions on teaching evaluation forms, for example, reflect performance indicators rooted in the values and assumptions of traditional classroom-based teaching and may not be very relevant to capturing the innovative learning, new ways of knowledge making, and intercultural understanding aimed for in GNLEs. Because such learning environments are new and by nature much more complex than traditional classrooms, students, who themselves face performance evaluation, may be more unsettled about the new learning experience as well, rendering standardized teaching evaluation forms of little use at best.

By nature, performance standardization, indicators, standardized testing, and adherence to so-called "best practices" rest on traditional, established, habitual practices. In short, they reflect the past and thus work to reproduce past assumptions, expectations, and practices, limiting what Feenberg (2002) calls the "margin of maneuver" faculty have available for innovation. As Singh, Kenway, and Apple (2005) put it, such constraining policies in effect work as "cultural technologies of compliance" (p. 14); they tend to foster conformity and compliance with established practices and as such limit educators in "imagining and enacting transformative projects required to engage the risks of globalization" (p. 15). As

Lewis, Marginson, and Snyder (2005) point out, while the role of standardized performance indicators in stifling innovation is well understood in business contexts, they are rarely questioned in higher education settings. As the authors note, in their study of network technologies and globalization in Australian higher education, academics have experienced such compliance policies as “an increase in both bureaucratic processes and top-down corporate managerial techniques, and a concomitant loss of flexibility and autonomy” (p. 63). Although such compliance policies may not prevent innovation by those driven by vision, they make innovations difficult to pursue and therefore need to be balanced with policies that specifically foster innovation, especially policies that support and retain innovators and provide opportunities for leadership capacity development among faculty.

*Policies for faculty support and retention.* Any innovation that involves the pursuit of alternative practices amidst established practices, processes, and structures involves unusual challenges and unusually high time commitment. This is true for faculty pursuing GNLEs as well (Palvetzian, 2005; Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007). For example, working across institutional, national, and other boundaries, faculty deal with frequently contradictory national policies in addition to a myriad of different institutional practices and policies, such as institutional learning assessment policies and evaluation procedures. At the same time, faculty are working with a support infrastructure that was designed to facilitate established pedagogical practices, and they face learning technologies that defy international and inter-institutional collaboration, let alone the building of a shared learning environment. Furthermore, they spend considerable time designing their shared learning environment because this shared design experience involves an intensive faculty development process as they explain and negotiate each other’s pedagogical approaches to shape and facilitate their pedagogical visions and implement their pedagogy on a daily basis. By explaining their own pedagogical approaches, learning about those used by their partners, negotiating them into a shared instructional culture, and then facilitating students in a much more complex environment, faculty easily reach a time commitment that equals that of two courses. All of these challenges, thus, add up to large time investments on the part of faculty.

For institutions, these challenges involved in innovation raise another critical question—that of retention. Faculty who develop GNLEs are often some of the most innovative faculty on their campuses and are driven by pedagogical visions rather than by comfort or compliance requirements. As the need for pedagogical innovation in the context of global and technological change becomes more pressing, they will likely be attracted to institutional environments that support their innovation.

*Policies for faculty leadership development.* Because GNLEs tend to emerge from the grassroots, take advantage of new opportunities enabled by digital technologies for faculty to connect with others, and require faculty leadership for pedagogical innovation, they also depend on policies that facilitate shared leadership within the institution and specifically leadership development among

faculty. With the emergence of digital technologies, models of shared leadership have emerged that view leadership not as invested in one particular individual, but rather as distributed across an organization. These new models “conceptualize leadership as a more relational process, a shared or distributed phenomenon occurring at different levels and dependent on social interactions and networks of influence” (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003, p. 21). Simply put, “shared leadership is a process through which individual team members share in performing the behaviors and roles of a traditional, hierarchical team leader” (Houghton, Neck, & Manz, 2003, p. 124).

Models of shared leadership focus on the need to distribute the tasks and responsibilities of leadership up, down, and across the hierarchy present in any institution. They clearly articulate leadership as a social process that occurs in and through social interactions, and they focus on the skills and ability required to create conditions in which collective learning can occur. Shared leadership has many names including partnership-as-leadership, distributed leadership, and community of leaders. For shared leadership to be successful, however, there needs to be balance of power, shared purpose and goals, shared responsibility for the work, respect for each person, and a willingness to work together on the complex environments surrounding global partnerships. For example, while partnerships in universities have traditionally been initiated by designated individuals, for GNLEs to emerge and succeed, this leadership role and responsibility must be distributed across the institution, supported by a leadership process designed to facilitate integrated visions for globally networked learning.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Perhaps the two most vital considerations in enabling and sustaining GNLEs are their reliance on robust partnerships as a defining characteristic and their status as an innovation that introduces alternative practices for learning in a globally networked world. Robust partnerships are a vital pillar of GNLEs if these learning environments are to mobilize the wealth of different ways of knowing emanating from diverse locations and positions; to allow for the questioning of regularized and habitual ways of knowing; to allow for the kind of transformative learning that results from inquiring into, questioning, and negotiating these diverse ways of knowing; and to enable students to learn how to build shared learning and knowledge cultures across traditional boundaries. For these purposes, GNLEs require partnerships with distinct characteristics: shared leadership and attention to power imbalances between partners; initiation by faculty from the grassroots or with faculty as a critical driving force; attention to relationship building and trust; and skillful negotiation of a shared vision, approaches, and practices.

At the same time, GNLEs also depend on visionary policies that support them as mission-critical innovations within and across their institutions. Such policies foster the systematic integration of local and global learning by facilitating an integrated support infrastructure focused on innovation, a support infrastructure that integrates the expertise of faculty, administrators, international program experts, learning technology experts, instructional designers, legal services, faculty

development experts, and others. In many ways, visionary policies for GNLEs are those that build cross-functional local infrastructure networks to overcome the silo effects that often characterize infrastructure designed around the separation of local and global learning. Moreover, visionary policies provide faculty with safe spaces and opportunities as well as sufficient flexibility for negotiating traditional local practices and constraints with those of partners situated in diverse national and institutional contexts. Perhaps most importantly, these policies provide spaces and flexibility for pedagogical innovation and experimentation beyond the status quo. Such policies also facilitate faculty support and retention as well as leadership and partnership capacity development in order to integrate GNLEs into local institutional environments and to allow them to realize their visions for globally networked learning.

## REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Baer, L. L., & Duin, A. H. (2005). *LAAP summary report: Exploring success indicators for partnerships*. FIPSE commissioned report. Washington, D.C.
- Bazerman, C. (2007). Electrons are cheap, society is dear. Keynote address delivered at the Conference of the Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing. Saskatoon, SK, May 27-29.
- Beerens, E. (2002). International inter-organizational arrangements in higher education: Towards a typology. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(4), 297-314.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Brown, L. (2005). Virtual spaces for innovative pedagogical actions: Education, technology, and globalization. In M. Apple, J. Kenway, & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics* (pp. 171-189). New York: Peter Lang.
- Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Christensen, C. M., Anthony, S. D., & Roth, E. A. (2004). *Seeing what's next: Using the theories of innovation to predict industry change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Duin, A. H., Baer, L. L., & Starke-Meyerring, D. (2001). *Partnering in the Learning Marketplace*. Jossey-Bass: EDUCAUSE Leadership Strategies Series, Volume 4.
- Feenberg, A. (2002). *Transforming technology: A critical theory revised*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP.
- Gaynor, G. H. (2002). *Innovation by design*. New York: Amacom, American Management Association.
- Hamilton, E., & Feenberg, A. (2005). The technical codes of online education. *Techné* 9 (1), 97-123. Retrieved November 30, 2006, from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/SPT/v9n1/pdf/hamilton.pdf>.
- Herrington, T. & Tretyakov, Y. (2005). The Global Classroom Project: Troublemaking and troubleshooting. In K. Cargile Cook, & K. Grant-Davie (Eds.), *Online education: Global questions, local answers* (pp. 267-283). Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Lewis, Marginson, & Snyder (2005). The network university? Technology, culture and organizational complexity in contemporary higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 59, 56-75.
- Longford, G. (2005). Pedagogies of digital citizenship and the politics of code. *Techné*, 9(1), 68-96. Retrieved November 30, from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/SPT/v9n1/pdf/longford.pdf>.
- Marginson, S. (2004). Don't leave me hanging on the Anglophone: The potential for online distance higher education in the Asia-Pacific region. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(2/3), 74-113.
- Marginson, S. (2007). The open horizon. In S. Marginson (Ed.), *Prospects of higher education: Globalization, market competition, public goods and the future of the university* (pp. xi-xv). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

STARKE-MEYERRING, DUIN, PALVETZIAN, AND WILSON

- Moxley, V. M., & Maes, S. C. (2003). The Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 67, 1-10.
- Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The future of higher education: Rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Palvetzian (2005). Integrating international academic partnerships into institutional contexts: Faculty perspectives. Unpublished MA Thesis. McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Peters, M. (2007). *Knowledge economy, development and the future of higher education*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Peters, M., & Besley, T. (2006). *Building knowledge cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham & Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Starke-Meyerring, D. (forthcoming): Genre, knowledge, and digital code in web-based communities: An integrated theoretical framework for shaping digital discursive spaces. *International Journal of Web-based Communities*.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., & Andrews, D. (2006). Developing a shared virtual learning culture: An international classroom partnership. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69, 25-49.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., & Andrews, D. (forthcoming). Building a culture of intercultural learning: Assessment in a virtual team project. In Hundleby, M., & J. Allen (Eds.), *Assessment in Technical and Professional Communication*. Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., Duin, A. H., & Palvetzian, T. (2007). Global partnerships: Positioning technical communication programs in the context of globalization. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(2), 139-174.
- Winner, L. (1986). *The whale and the reactor: A search for Limits in an age of high technology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the age of the smart machine*. New York: Basic.

#### AFFILIATIONS

*Doreen Starke-Meyerring*  
*Department of Integrated Studies in Education*  
*McGill University, Canada*

*Ann Hill Duin*  
*University of Minnesota, USA*

*Talene Palvetzian*  
*Ministry of Education and Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities*  
*Ontario, Canada*

*Melanie Wilson*  
*Department of Integrated Studies in Education*  
*McGill University, Canada*