

TIEF Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) Grant Application

Identification

1. Name of University:
2. First Name:
3. Last Name:
4. University Email:
5. Title:
6. College:
7. Department:
8. Please Upload a Brief CV (2-3 pages Word or PDF):

Course and Course Approval

9. By typing the name of your chair/dean, you certify his/her/their approval of your proposal:
10. Course Name:
11. Course Number:
12. To split an award for a co-taught course, provide the other faculty member's name and institution:
13. Briefly describe the course and course objectives (100 words max).
14. If your course already contains global elements or content, please describe the content, and explain how incorporating COIL activities will introduce or reinforce global content in the course (150 words max):
15. Select Term Course Will be Taught: (Spring 2023/Summer 2023/Fall 2024)
16. Course is intended for: Undergraduates/Graduates/Both
17. Estimated number of students enrolled (no range). If you have taught this course before, please list the average number of students enrolled in past course offerings:
18. Estimated number of students in the partner course (no range).
19. Have you taught this COIL course before? (Yes/No)

Partner Information

20. Partner Institution
21. Partner Country
22. Partner Faculty Member (Name and Title)
23. Partner Faculty Member Email
24. Briefly describe any previous engagement with the partner institution or faculty member (100 words max):

COIL Description

The COIL component may be incorporated throughout the entire course or over some weeks within the course. Effective COIL collaborations have four primary components. Please describe

the planned COIL activities to take place during the course. We understand that your course is in development and that details and plans may shift, but please be as specific as possible at this stage.

25. Team building: Through introductory activities and icebreakers, students across courses build a foundation for personal connections. Describe what kinds of team building you plan (150 words max):

26. Shared activities: Students get to know each other and learn through shared assignments, readings, lectures, and discussions. Describe what kinds of shared activities you plan (150 words max):

27. Collaborative project: Students apply knowledge and work together to produce a shared project. Describe the collaborative project(s) you plan (150 words max):

28. Reflection: Students reflect on their experiences, creating new knowledge about themselves, others, and the world. Describe what kinds of reflection components you plan (150 words max):

29. Please provide an estimate on how many contact hours students will have with students at the partner institution. This includes synchronous and asynchronous activities, inside and outside of the classroom (i.e., group discussions in class, interacting via message boards or blog posts, and working together on group projects):

30. Please provide any additional clarification (250 words max). For example:

- If there is a language difference with students at the partner institution, how will this be managed to ensure cross-cultural student engagement?

- If there is a large difference in the number of students enrolled at your course compared to the partner course, how will this be mitigated?

-If there is a large time or scheduling difference, how will this be managed to still allow for student engagement with peers and instructors at the partner institution?

-Do you anticipate any other cultural differences that may cause difficulty? If so, how do you plan to address these additional changes?

Thank you for your application! If we have any questions during the review process, we will contact you directly.

TIEF Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) Grant Evaluation Rubric

The following rubric is intended to provide a continuum of ratings that will guide the evaluation of TIEF Grant proposals. The rubric is intended as a guide for the assignment of a composite rating to each proposal on a scale of 0-10.

COIL Course and Course Approval:

10 - Compelling and convincing articulation of the COIL course. The course is clearly described, the course objectives are realistic, and the course contains a variety of creative global elements that connect back to the objectives of the COIL.

5 - Acceptable articulation of COIL course. The course objectives are feasible but the description lacks details. There is a lack of global elements in the curriculum.

0 – Poor articulation of COIL course. The course description is not clear, the objectives are unattainable, there are no global elements connected to the objectives of the COIL.

Team Building:

10 – The team-building activities are clearly described, innovative, and well thought out. The activities described account for the language, cultural, and time differences, allow space for students to develop personal connections, and incorporate multiple technology platforms and tools.

5 – The team-building activities are clearly described but lack innovation. Description of the activities lacks details on how it will address language, cultural, and time differences.

0 – Poor explanation of team-building activities. There are no details on how they will address language, cultural, and time differences. Not well thought out.

Shared Activities:

10 – The activities are clearly described, innovative, and well thought out. The activities described account for the language, cultural, and time differences, allow space for students to develop personal connections, and incorporate multiple technology platforms and tools.

5 – The activities are clearly described but lack innovation. The activities lack details on how it will address language, cultural, and time differences.

0 – Poor explanation of activities. There are no details on how they will address language, cultural, and time differences.

Reflection:

10 – The reflection components are clearly described, research based, and well thought out.

5 – The reflection components are clearly described, well thought out, but are not rooted in research.

0 – The reflection components are poorly explained and not well thought out.

Contact Hours:

10 – The contact hours are clearly described and have a mix of synchronous and asynchronous components. The activities are innovative, collaborative, and include a variety of methods for student interaction.

5 – The contact hours are described but lack a good mix of synchronous and asynchronous components. The activities lack details and methods are not innovative.

0 – The contact hours are poorly described and have no details.