

CBI: A CATALYST NOT A PANACEA

内容重視：万能薬でなく、触媒である

Phyllis Larson, St. Olaf College

Introduction: Toward CBI

I had just completed a Ph.D. in Japanese literature at the University of Minnesota and was teaching in a term position at Macalester College in 1989, when I was invited to participate in an Oral Proficiency (OPI) workshop led by Professor Makino at the University. It was my introduction to the ACTFL Standards. In that workshop, we moved from a general description of the Standards themselves, which had been developed largely in connection with European languages, to a particular discussion of what they meant for Japanese. What I found inspiring was the underlying belief that Japanese could be treated in the same way as other languages, that it was just a language like any other, or perhaps just a language like any other, but with special characteristics. In any case, it could be described in the same terms as other languages. Of course, standards which had been developed with European languages in mind needed to be adapted to non-European languages; but the point remained: Japanese should be considered right alongside Spanish or French or German. It should not exist in a separate universe. The oral proficiency inventory (OPI) was enormously helpful in defining global oral skills we wanted our students to acquire. Even though it may have focused too much attention on speaking, it nevertheless helped us in the profession clarify our goals and standards for assessment.

The ACTFL standards movement allowed all the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) to join the commonly taught ones in a common enterprise. The LCTLs were increasingly visible at the Modern language Association conferences and representative faculty were gradually included on the executive committee of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL). LCTLs were no longer treated by other languages as “too different” for comparison or common cause, although they might still have been viewed as languages too difficult for American students to learn. I have sometimes heard echoes of these early attitudes in the comments by faculty in Asian languages when they say that CBI may work for European languages but not for “our” languages.

Following on the pioneering work of ACTFL, the *National Standards Framework* was developed. This work fleshed out the minimalist emphasis of the OPI by devoting attention to a much richer context for learning and assessing language proficiency, the now familiar 5 Cs:

1) Communication

This was a corrective of not only the emphasis on OPI but also the reigning emphasis on communicative competence, both of which privileged oral production skills. The *Standards* continued the emphasis on effective communication with people in the contemporary moment, but it reached more broadly to include “communication” with texts, written and visual, over time.

2) Cultures

The *Standards* claimed that cultural proficiency is as important as linguistic proficiency. In fact, since a minority of our students will actually achieve a professional level of competence in their languages, it is important that they understand the rich cultural context for the language they do learn. I will refer to this later in my comments about our program at St. Olaf.

2) Comparisons

We want our students to learn that there are multiple ways of “being” in the world. We want to avoid their developing a sense of the monolithic nature of culture. We want to deepen their understanding of their second culture by complexifying their understanding of their culture of origin. This is particularly important for our students in the Midwest who have just completed high school and have limited experience with second cultures, even though they may have brushed shoulders with several cultures while growing up.

3) Communities

Even a basic language proficiency gives our students the chance to participate in another language community. This is a desire that brings a number of students to our language programs. They have participated in an exchange program, hosted someone from Japan—maybe a colleague of a parent—in their homes, played Japanese video games or seen a “cool” anime or listened to J-pop, and they want to be able to participate more fully in that culture. They understand almost unconsciously that there is so much they cannot access unless they have some language proficiency.

4) Connections

This is the standard that is immensely important to the work of content-based instruction. The *Standards* just states: “connections to additional bodies of knowledge that may be unavailable to the monolithic English speaker.” More specifically, the *Standards* identify access to the knowledge of other disciplines and to distinctive viewpoints available only through language. It is here, in this emphasis on connections that CBI has become so important to us in our work in Asian Studies at St. Olaf. It has acted as a catalyst for significant changes in the way we as a department go about our work and in the common conversation we have about our curriculum.

Previously, the language and non-language courses ran on perfectly parallel tracks, with occasional points of intersection in order to conduct department business such as certifying majors, dealing with budget, adjunct or tenure-track hiring, and so forth. But some of us felt dissatisfied with this state of affairs. On the language side, a few of us realized the thinness of our primary concern with communicative competence, especially since, in pre-Skype and pre-Google chat days, it was difficult to arrange communication opportunities with native speakers in Japan. (We have very few native speakers of Japanese on our campus.) All of us in languages teach at least one non-language course in our specialty, usually literature or linguistics. And in those courses, we realized we set language aside. At the same time, our colleagues in religious studies, history and political science, all of whom do research in Japanese or Chinese, also felt the strangeness or

“thinness” of such a separation between language and non-language content in these courses. We began a casual and intermittent conversation with colleagues in Romance languages, who had been developing a CBI approach to language teaching and learning over a period of ten years. These conversations resulted in a successful grant proposal, a Title VI Undergraduate International Studies and Languages (UISFL) Program grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

We had two goals for the grant: one was to integrate language and culture in both language and non-language courses through CBI approaches. In the language courses we wished to develop CBI approaches for the beginning levels as well as advanced; in the non-language courses, we decided to concentrate on our Asian Conversations program, which I will describe in some detail shortly. Our second goal was to develop internships for our students in Taiwan and Japan. But before I get into the details of our CBI project, I need to give you some information about the context in which our Asian Studies Department exists.

Context for CBI at St. Olaf College

St. Olaf College, with its 3000-plus students is located in Northfield, Minnesota. Although it still draws more than half its student population from the Midwest region, it values a global perspective and welcomes a growing number of degree-seeking international students attracted to the college, more than 125 currently. More than two-thirds of each graduating class has studied abroad, and the college is one of the top producers of volunteers for the Peace Corps. While Asian Studies has enjoyed steady success in producing Fulbrighters, this year is a particularly good one: we have 4 altogether, 2 to China and 2 to Japan. We are an interdisciplinary department of 12 faculty, not all of them full-time in the department; several have joint appointments with another department. At the core are the faculty in Chinese and Japanese; right now we have 2+ in Japanese and 3 in Chinese. The college language requirement in our languages is three semesters; the requirement for the Asian Studies major is four semesters; and the requirement for the China Studies or Japan Studies concentration is four courses above the first year level. This is the context in which we have built our Asian languages and area studies program. This year we will graduate 27 Asian Studies majors, 14 China Studies concentrators, and 9 Japan Studies concentrators. We enrolled 91 students in all levels of Chinese in the fall semester 2010, and 71 students in Japanese. The total number of students in our Chinese and Japanese programs has grown from 90 in the fall semester of 2001 to more than 160 in 2011.

In this paper I will concentrate on our Asian Conversations program, which is an attempt to integrate language and culture in a very intentional way. Please see Appendix A, where there is a diagram and brief explanation. We began the program as an experiment in 1999 as a three-semester learning community that began with first-year students, but we became dissatisfied with the program because we had trouble attracting students to it before they arrived on campus. We also had retention problems in the third semester, which extended into the students’ sophomore year. With the aid of a grant, we completely rethought our program and instituted its new version in fall 2008. It is now a sophomore or junior year Asian humanities sequence that is linked with simultaneous language study. We describe it to students as 3 plus 2: three terms of humanities (fall, January term, and spring) plus 2 terms of language (one course each semester). The

sequence is organized around the metaphor of “journey,” and we use this in a variety of ways—the journey through space and time (geography and chronology), the journey of ideas and peoples across East Asia (including globalization now), the encounter of East Asia with Europe and America in the 19th and 20th centuries, and our students’ own journeys to China and Japan during the January term. Reflections on journeys undertaken by Chinese and Japanese historically, as well as our students’ reflections on their own journeys, both physical and intellectual, are embedded in the program. We entice students not only with a curriculum that includes a month of study abroad but also with the fact that this sequence provides an efficient way of fulfilling numerous general education requirements (6 of them). In this way, we can appeal to more casual students of Asia who do not plan a major in Asian Studies but are intrigued by a curriculum that provides unique opportunities, while allowing them to move efficiently toward graduation. We began with 21 students in 2008, and we have enrolled 29 for 2011-12. Most of the students are sophomores, and most are in their second year of Chinese or Japanese language study.

We are exploring various ways of infusing and integrating language into the Asian Conversations curriculum, but I will focus on one aspect that illustrates how we are thinking about this task. We decided early on that it was important to take our students to China and Japan during the January term. The third semester of Chinese or Japanese is often a point of discouragement for many students. In the first year they have gone from zero to minimal competence, and they can see their progress from semester to semester. In the third semester they begin to understand how much more time and study will be required for them to achieve the kind of proficiency their peers in European languages do. At the same time, their proficiency gains seem to plateau. This was the point at which we wanted to give them the chance to interact with peers in China or Japan. We worked out a plan whereby those studying Japanese would spend one week in Beijing, and then three weeks in the Tokyo area; Chinese students would do the reverse. In each country we arranged for lectures to supplement those offered by the accompanying faculty member.

In addition to that classroom-based study, students would spend most of their time in various kinds of activities.

- **Ethnographic observations.** Students are required to go to a public space—a park, train station, a street or market, a playground, and so on—at least three times at different times of the day and record what they observed. They are given training ahead of time in the technique of observing without making judgments. These are subsequently shared with the group and discussed.
- **Planning day trips.** Pairs of students choose a culturally significant site during the fall semester that they want to study and visit. They prepare materials introducing the site to their peers, including language notes that would help them. They visit the site on their own in preparation for a second visit, on which they bring members of the class and act as “expert” guides to the site. They need to figure out transportation to the site, cost of tickets, hours open, and any other relevant information. If their language skills are strong enough, they are to compare the description of the site in an English-language guidebook with that in a Japanese guidebook.
- **Keeping a language journal.** On a daily basis, they note words and characters new to them and find explanations. They are encouraged to practice tasks they

need to perform ahead of time, note their success or try to understand their failure, and then repeat the task. These tasks might be as simple as buying something at a store or something more complicated, such as requesting information or explaining a change in plans or telephoning friends in Japanese.

- **Interviewing peers.** This is their largest task and the one they found most daunting. In pairs they conduct two interviews with peers, each to last about a half hour and recorded. Students prepare for these interviews by writing questions during the fall semester, based on what they wanted to know about their peers' lives and course content about the interactions of peoples and ideas. For example, they wanted to know how their peers viewed the United States or China/Japan, how they saw their place in the world, how much they had traveled or wished to travel, and so on. Their work is checked for accuracy and appropriateness by language faculty. Students were extremely nervous about this part of the January term course. They put a great deal of effort into preparing their questions. They practiced with native speakers on campus before they left. They realized they needed to practice some strategies—how to ask someone to repeat what they said or to speak more slowly. They also began to realize that while they could prepare to ask the questions proficiently, they would have more trouble following up on the responses they received.

These interviews proved to be the highlight of the month for all the students. They realized the limits of their language proficiency, but they were thrilled by the fact that they could communicate and even carry on a rudimentary conversation. Further, since they had recorded their interviews, they were able to listen to them again and glean what they missed during the live interview.

Our goal was to have students supplement the curriculum on the journey of peoples and ideas with these interviews of their contemporaries. This has worked to some extent. We are now encouraging students to build in questions that get at topics in greater depth. In the first year, the interviews tended to be somewhat superficial; each year, students have been able to elicit responses that truly supplement our classroom work. But even in the cases where the material elicited tends toward the superficial, students were thrilled by the interaction with peers. They felt their proficiency was better than they had judged, and they returned to campus feeling more confident, more eager to continue in their study.

After students returned from the January term abroad, during the third and last term of Asian Conversations, we have been asking students to reflect on their own journey to Asia and to think about where they place themselves in relation to the cultures they are studying. We ask them to think about the extent to which they feel they have been able to place themselves in the position of the peers they interviewed and to “see” the world from that point of vision. As part of this process, we had them transcribe a portion of one of the interviews they conducted and to provide a summary of the parts of the interviews they did not transcribe.

We began to realize that we could make much more of this curricular opportunity. This was an insight we received from Professor Makino. Why not make use of this material in our language classes, as a way to infuse content? We asked our students to select a portion of their interviews that provided an interesting insight into the life of a

peer in China or Japan, transcribe it precisely, and identify which level of language class it would suit. They were then to provide an introduction in language, as well as language notes. Last, they were to design an exercise or some activity based on the transcription that would encourage students to expand on the topic covered in the transcription. These instructional modules will be used in language classes in the fall. As we refine this interview project, we could choose our topics carefully so that the content of interviews would fit with topics in our non-language classes as well.

International Internships

For a long time our Asian Studies Department had hoped that we would be able to supplement off-campus study opportunities with internships in China and Japan. The funding we received through the UISFL Grant allowed us to realize this hope. We needed funds in order to send faculty to make contacts, identify potential sites, visit partners, cultivate relationships, and explore the internship possibilities for our students. We sent two faculty members in January, 2010; one is an economist specializing in Japan who had completed a research Fulbright grant some years ago and now is the director of our Center for Experiential Learning that oversees internships, and the other is a Chinese language and literature faculty member who has ties in Taiwan.

I will briefly describe the opportunities just in Japan:

JAPAN

- Education First in Shibuya, Tokyo. This international company arranges study abroad programs for high school students, college students, and young adults. The intern plans and implements events for Japanese students to promote study/travel abroad. Interns must be extremely creative, outgoing, and have excellent interpersonal skills. Summer 4-6 weeks.
- Japanime in Nishi-Kawaguchi, Tokyo. This is a small-scale development, design, production and marketing firm that creates manga and anime-related education materials. The intern is involved with book/video projects utilizing manga as a medium, which eventually will be published. The intern must be interested in manga or creative use of manga for educational purpose. If desired, the intern can take manga drawing lessons. There are opportunities for interaction with artists, designers and technology specialists. The intern may live with the owner's family on site. Experience in video- editing software (for instance, iMovie or Final Cut on the Macintosh) will be useful for those who are interested in video projects. Mid-July to early August, with a duration of about 4 weeks.
- Joy English Academy and Otofuke Board of Education in Obihiro and Otofuke, Hokkaido. This is a two-part internship. At Joy English Academy the intern teaches English to children and young adults-both assisting their instructors as well as teaching alone on various occasions. At Otofuke Board of Education, the intern assists a local English teacher at a local middle school--a week with their ALT (sent by the JET program), another week without the ALT. The intern lives on-site at the Joy English Academy and has a home stay while teaching at the middle school. 4-5 weeks at the beginning of the summer (June to mid July).

- Asian Rural Institute (ARI) in Utsunomiya. Non-profit dedicated to sustainable agriculture, community development and leadership, with most participants coming from Southeast Asia and Africa. Length of internship varies.

The requirements are that the internship must be taken for academic credit; students should have junior standing; a minimum GPA of 2.5 but 3.0 preferred; language competency demonstrated by completion of 4th semester of Japanese with grade of B or higher; and a commitment to continue in the language. Students are required to serve at least 100 hours over a minimum of 4 weeks. Upon their return to campus, students must submit a reflection essay and commit to sharing their experience and expertise with other Asian Studies students at various department functions. Because of the grant funding we are able to provide scholarships that cover in-country expenses, and with a second application, students can request supplemental funds for air travel.

Our faculty members returned from Asia at the end of January and began negotiated details with interested parties in country. We had thought it would take a year to set things up, so we were surprised when all the partners we had contacted expressed the wish to begin the internships right away in summer 2010. We sent 7 students—4 to Taiwan and 3 to Japan. This year we had more than twice the number of applicants as we had in the previous year. Despite the recent disasters in Japan in the Fukushima area, we are sending four students to the various sites in Japan this year.

Because these are academic internships, students are given the following instructions:

A. You must keep a **journal** during your internship period, and submit it or send it to your adviser within a month of your return. The journal should include:

- 1) **Entries in the target language** (Chinese or Japanese). Make 4 entries per week, dating each one. The entries do not need to be long or perfectly grammatically correct, but they should represent an attempt to express your experiences in the target language.
- 2) **Cultural observations.** These should include observations about language, nonverbal aspects of communication (gestures, body language, use of space, use of time, and so on) and social hierarchy and relationships (in the workplace, informal relationships). Make 4 entries per week.
- 3) **List of words and phrases you hear and learn each day.** You should make 5 entries per day.
- 4) **Brief summary of the week's activities.** This is for you to use when you write your reflection paper on the internship.

B. Reflection paper

This paper should be 3-5 pages and describe the extent to which you accomplished your learning goals, what you learned about your target country and the workplace, and how you reflect upon yourself in relation to that workplace. This should not be a summary of your journal. It should be submitted with the

journal, within a month of your return from the internship. When you return to campus, you will meet with your adviser and other Asian Studies faculty to discuss your experiences.

C. Contribution to the Asian Studies community at St. Olaf

In the academic year after you return to campus, you will be asked from time to time to participate in department activities or in language classes to share your experiences and inspire others to apply for an internship.

It is also the hope of the department that you will continue to study your target language.

As with the interviews from the Asian Conversations, we are beginning to view these internships as valuable sources for curricular materials. We have perhaps been slow to realize all the ways in which we could use them to supplement our curriculum, to involve our students collaboratively in developing our curriculum in new ways. We plan to build on this program.

So far, with our grant, we have been focused on inputs for our CBI project. We have read papers, talked extensively with our colleagues in Romance languages and benefited from the advice of our external consultants. We have worked as a group, across languages and disciplines, to develop a sense of the whole, pay attention to the integration of all the separate parts, but we have not paid as much attention to the outputs, to student gains in a concrete, measurable way. We intend to collect evidence of the proficiencies we value in multiple ways, including class conversations, eportfolios, oral presentations, papers and journals of various kinds, and oral proficiency interviews.

CBI as a Catalyst

A catalyst is, according to Merriam-Webster, “an agent that provokes or speeds significant change or action.” When we began we were not sure what we meant by CBI. We had students, about half of the students in the Japanese program, who studied Japanese to fulfill the language requirement or the requirement for the Asian Studies major (2 years) and then moved on to other majors. The other half took more language and more cultural studies courses. Our concern was that the half that did not continue, whose knowledge of Japan was confined to brief “cultural notes” in the text or “tourist” level content enabled by study of linguistic forms or vocabulary. What knowledge of Japan would these students take away with them? What framework were we providing in the language curriculum for students to use in understanding specific cultural phenomena? For the other half, the students who would go on to a third year of language study and go abroad for a term, and the fraction of that group that would continue to fourth year—we needed to find ways to encourage them in their study, to give them a sense of proficiency or competence to *do* things in the language. Most students did not want *to know about the language*; they wanted to see what their knowledge would allow them *to do or perform*. Most did not just want to practice forms, they wanted to relate their language study to their other academic or personal interests.

CBI became the catalyst that allowed us to address our concerns for both kinds of language students. We could not have addressed these concerns had we in the Japanese language program not worked collaboratively. CBI also fostered collaborative work

between Japanese and Chinese language faculty, and between them and faculty outside the languages—in history, art history, political science, economics and religion.

We had an obvious opportunity in the Asian Conversations program. Although students simultaneously studied Japanese or Chinese with the humanities sequence, they really originally studied the two on parallel tracks. CBI became the catalyst that led us to create points of intersection between the two. Soon it led us to think about Asian Conversations and the language program as a single whole. We have found ourselves pushed to think about the curriculum—language and non-language—as a single whole, a single system. That has had profound implications for the way we think about teaching and learning.

Student Work Fostered by CBI

Our students' work will give the reader a sense of what some students have *done through language*, or alternatively, how they have done “language through culture.” An example is this student who created an oral presentation based on her research on Japanese women in politics (<http://www.stolaf.edu/depts/japanese/courses/232sample2.html>). She completed this work at the end of her second year of Japanese; subsequently she studied for a semester at Waseda University, and has just been awarded a Fulbright grant to continue her study of Japanese politics after graduation.

This is another student's eportfolio, submitted after his participation in the Asian Conversations program (<https://sites.google.com/a/stolaf.edu/asianconversations0910/home/joshu-jakuso>).

As I mentioned in my title, CBI is not a panacea, however useful it has been. We face some challenges of the kind that Katra Byram and Claire Kramersch speak about in their article entitled, “Why is it so difficult to teach a language as culture?”¹ In that article they begin by saying: “...realia and personal testimonies bring the culture to life in a way that literary or cultural analysis do not.” But that does not necessarily solve the problem of cultural translation, the attempt to understand another culture on its own terms. Byram and Kramersch mention three difficulties that affect the work of CBI, or what they call “language as culture”:

- The communicative imperative. What are the appropriate proportions in a CBI class? How much linguistic activity? How much metacognitive reflection?
- The teacher's lack of cultural knowledge.
- Concern about stereotypes. Students are not aware of the “categories” in which they view the world. They overgeneralize. They tend to essentialize.

We can see this latter difficulty in the comments students have made in their reflections on the interview project in country:

Student A: “Having the opportunity to discuss Japan, America and life with students soon to be entering the work force of Japan helped to show us even more about the culture here since we were at the same junction in life. We could see through our

¹ Byram, Katra and Claire Kramersch. “Why Is It so Difficult to Teach Language as Culture?” *The German Quarterly* 81:1 (Winter 2008): 21. Print.

answers that they were going through a lot of the same struggles surrounding careers, parents, desire, and purpose but in a way that is markedly Japanese.”

Student B: “Finally, an incredibly important concept I’ve learned is that Japanese often don’t consider themselves an individual. As my interview questions went into comparisons of Japanese people with others, such as Americans or Chinese, the major aspect they pointed out is that Japanese people often think of themselves as part of a group or community. I’ve realized that this mindset creates a lot of the cultural values in the Japanese. Rather than doing what’s best for oneself, a Japanese salaryman considers his company before himself. This is quite a powerful mindset. Often selfishness and greed come out of individuality which may end up hurting the community as a whole. I feel a good mix of independence and detachment of self is necessary for a truly enlightening life.”

These are responses from sophomores, both of them traveling to Japan for the first time. The distinction eportfolio submitted by a senior shows how much students’ reflections can deepen with two additional years of study and experience. You can access his portfolio here: <http://www.stolaf.edu/depts/asian-studies/braunsg>. He writes:

“...my experiences on the Asian Conversations interim trip to Beijing and Tokyo had a profound impact on my perspectives on cultural relativity. The course’s emphasis on the contrast between *self* and *other* was fascinating; it opened my eyes to a new way of thinking about personal identity as a construct of the world around us. There, I experienced briefly some of the challenges of bridging cultural differences and discarding normative beliefs about proper social conduct, and I reveled in them. I loved the challenge of being put outside my comfort zone and forced to accept that what I had taken for granted in American culture was in no way guaranteed in Chinese and Japanese culture.”

Toward the end of his reflection he states:

“In a sense, this deconstruction of myth is a multifaceted journey we are constantly undertaking ourselves. As individuals, we travel along a perpetual pilgrimage inwards through life, constantly trying to figure out who we are and what our purpose might be. Indeed, just as Matsuo Basho writes in *The Narrow Road to Oku*, “The months and days are the travelers of eternity,” and perhaps in this same way we ourselves are bound upon an eternal sojourn that has no absolute destination but that invites us to explore who we are. Through awareness of how we define ourselves and the world around us, it is possible to see how perceptions of the self and other are not mutually exclusive or independent of one another. Rather, they are fundamentally interdependent functions of identity, both intrinsic constructs of each other.”

This student exemplifies what we hope to accomplish through our work with CBI. We began CBI in a piecemeal fashion with him, not completely aware of our direction. The question we see for us at St. Olaf now is, How can we think holistically to provide the environment and guidance that will nurture more students like him?

CBI as a Catalyst

We have been involved in thinking about CBI for less than two years, and we have not made as much progress as many of you here today. Nevertheless, allow me to share some of the most valuable lessons our work with CBI has made clear to us:

- 1) Our best language students tend to be those who make connections between language and their other academic interests. *Students grow because they go beyond language.* In one of our 4th year Japanese language classes, the topic for the semester has been the homeless in Japan. For their projects, students linked the topic with their own intellectual interests. One student, for example, examined the laws Japan has regarding the definition and treatment of the homeless. Another student became interested in the term ホームレス and wondered how long that term had been used and looked into its etymology. Both students delved into Japanese language materials they had to find on their own and had to figure out the words and forms they didn't understand; but they were deeply motivated to do so because they wanted to know. *Students grow because they go beyond language as an end in itself.*
- 2) *Collaborative work by faculty pays huge dividends, for the faculty and for the curriculum.* As is true in every institution, we are busy people, and most of the time, we try to stay ahead of all the tasks we have to perform—in the classroom, in our departments, in our research, and in professional responsibilities outside the institution. All the energy tends to be concentrated in individual silos of frenetic energy. Even at a liberal arts college such as mine, faculty do not take much time for leisurely conversation together. We are all frighteningly absorbed in our individual workloads.

Our work with CBI has led to many, many conversations; it has definitely interrupted our usual schedules as we have struggled to develop a much more holistic view of our curriculum. Not only have the faculty in Japanese or Chinese met together for discussions, non-language and language faculty have joined together to plan. We have become aware of each other's projects and ideas, we have found common ground in pedagogy. Most of all, we have worked together to create a curriculum, an effort that has all of us thinking about what is most fundamental to it. This has given us renewed energy and enthusiasm for our work that has erased the initial worries about the time commitment. Thus, CBI has helped us create a community that bridges various potential divides—between China and Japan specialists; between language and non-language faculty; even within a language faculty. There is enormous strength and potential for continued innovation in such a community.

- 3) As I have suggested earlier in this talk, we have discovered, too, the potential for collaboration with our students in developing our curriculum. It is not just that we need to listen to our students and observe how they learn best. We need to involve them in the learning. *We need to see our students as collaborative partners who help us develop a curriculum richer than we could imagine on our own.* They can help us deliver vibrant curriculum materials to other students in our programs. In the old way of doing things, students, too, worked in isolation, in their own silos.

They might write papers or journals or respond to an oral interview, but the product was usually shared just with the instructor, or a small group of peers. Now we are thinking much more about a larger audience, about the importance of public performance and response to student work. This, we are already seeing inspires a higher level of production from students; it also motivates those students who see the work of others and are inspired to do as well or better.

- 4) *CBI has helped us “see” curricular opportunities we hadn’t noticed before.* I have already described the ways in we find students can help us build the curriculum. But it is only when all the faculty in a program talk and think together that we are able to see the curriculum in a complete and singular way. We have found that we don’t always need to create new materials; sometimes we need to make more use of the most effective materials we already have. We need to scaffold and recycle. We need to get the maximum use of all our resources.

As you can see, at St. Olaf, we have just begun to work with the insights CBI has afforded us. Although we do not know what the definitive results of our work with CBI will be, we do know this: it has changed the way we think and work as a faculty, language and non-language alike; it has led to curricular innovations that promise to yield our students’ best efforts; and it has inspired us to continue to collaborate, explore and improve our teaching and learning.

Appendix A.

ASIAN CONVERSATIONS

Discussion based. Interim in China or Japan. Linked Classes.

Asian Conversations offers students a sophomore-year option that includes language study, a January interim in China or Japan, and dynamic classes on the movement of people and ideas throughout Asia. Students begin their study of Chinese or Japanese language in their first year on campus, and then apply for the three-course sequence in the spring. Those accepted into the program will embark on a series of linked courses that explore “*Journeys through Asia.*” While continuing language studies, Asian Conversations students will investigate:

- ♦ tales told and experiences had by Asian travelers, pilgrims, and migrants, historically and today;
- ♦ the range of communities and boundaries that have shaped Asia: political, economic, cultural, linguistic, and environmental communities will all be included; and
- ♦ Asian interpretations of the human condition, from religious, philosophical and literary perspectives.

Your schedule during a year in Asian Conversations:

<u>Fall semester</u>	<u>Interim</u>	<u>Spring semester</u>
<p><i>Chinese 231 or Japanese 231</i> AS210: Mapping Journeys How do pilgrims, travelers and migrants make sense of their journeys in Asia? We will explore maps, histories, tales and guides that define Asia today and in years past, including at least one of the classic Asian texts. We will study how cultural, linguistic, economic, religious, social and political connections and divisions create and sustain communities in Asia. Students will spend the last few weeks of the term planning related projects for their Interim course.</p>	<p>AS215: Exploring Asia Students pursue guided fieldwork experience in the United States. Activities and readings in this course build on the topics from Asian Studies 210 and three semesters of language study. Students reflect on the experience of Asians in America through readings, site visits, and local interviews. Students develop projects and follow a process of inquiry that will help them understand how ordinary people construct "Asian" culture and society today. Prerequisite: Asian Studies 210. Offered during interim.</p> <p><i>*MN-based option available upon petition.</i></p>	<p><i>Chinese 232 or Japanese 232</i> AS220 Interpreting Journeys Having looked at how people journey through Asia, this final semester in Asian Conversations considers how ideas journey over time and space. We will examine a range of interpretations of Asia, including spiritual, literary, philosophical and linguistic ideas. Students will present the ideas gathered from contacts made during Interim at the beginning of the semester. Additional materials include memoirs, novels, films that share individualized interpretations of Asian journeys.</p>

GE Credits (awarded at end of sequence) ALS-A ALS-L HBS MSG ORC WRI