

# Instructional (Re)design Portfolio

**Newly designed course:** The Monstrous in Japanese Culture (Autumn 2019), offered under East Asian Languages and Literatures (EALL) 4200: Topics in East Asian Culture

Instructor: Naomi Fukumori, Associate Professor, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures

Field: Premodern Japanese Literature and Culture

E-mail: [fukumori.1@osu.edu](mailto:fukumori.1@osu.edu)

## Section I: INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT AND PEDAGOGICAL APPROACH

This was **an instructional design of a new course**. The course was taught in Mendenhall Laboratory 175, a classroom with a maximum seating of 42 people. The course met twice a week, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 3:55pm-5:15pm (80 minutes) as a face-to-face course. The final enrollment for the course was **25 students**, which is considered a mid-sized group by both the university and my department. The breakdown of the levels of the students was as follows: 14 seniors, 10 juniors, and 1 sophomore. I was the sole instructor. The course is an undergraduate course that was **taught for the first time in Autumn 2019** under a general "topics" course number. I proposed the topics course, East Asian Languages and Literatures (EALL) 4200, in January 2018, and the Arts and Sciences curriculum committee approved it within two weeks (which I've been told is a record swift turnover for my department). The course that is the subject of this Instructional Design Portfolio, "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture," was the first course taught under the EALL 4200 number. I will propose "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture" as an independent course under the subject "Japanese" based on my initial experience of teaching it under the EALL 4200 number, pending clearer definition of the new General Education course approval process. Please note that I first applied for a redesign of Japanese 5454: Japanese Literature, Classical Period, but reapplied for a design of "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture"—the focus of the redesign/design remains the same: enhanced/increased student participation.

I identified "**enhanced/increased student participation**" as the focus of my course design. Since the start of my teaching career at OSU in fall 1999, I've been reticent to implement student-centered activities in courses, because I'm more comfortable with lecture-style presentation that includes encouraging dialogue between me and the students in Socratic fashion. I identified **enhanced student participation** as a significant issue through:

- 1) review of SEIs and departmental evaluations;

- 2) review of peer evaluations of teaching;
- 3) readings I completed through the UTL reading list reflection exercise and other articles and books on teaching and course design I selected through the course design process; and
- 4) my own discovery in the classroom that students learn more through:
  - a. active learning that takes place in interactions with other students and the instructor
  - b. activities that provide immediate feedback to students.

The **learning outcomes** I connect with enhance/increased student participation are:

- 1) student-generated learning through ownership and application of knowledge; and
- 2) each individual student's investment in the outcome of specific student-centered activities, which contributes to greater investment in the course as a whole.

I typically have **evaluated** student participation:

- 1) by the evidence of each student having completed the activity;
- 2) by the feedback I receive on SEIs and departmental evaluations;
- 3) through emails received from students about specific activities or assignments;
- 4) through anecdotal evidence in the form of verbal feedback from students and reaction to the activity; and
- 5) the effect of the activity on the learning of specific material as reflected in assignments.

**Strategies:** The one activity I've consistently employed to elicit student participation is 1) **a discussion board in Carmen Canvas**, where I present a general question on each session's subject and readings and require the students to post responses before the session. I choose this activity for a number of reasons: a) each student is required to participate; b) each student participates at a time and a place convenient for them (albeit requiring access to Carmen); c) not all students are comfortable speaking up in class, so the discussion board provides a venue where all students can voice their opinions and share their knowledge. While I encourage students to respond to each other's posts, most students have posted independent responses without engagement with others' ideas. Another problem with this activity is that a majority of students completed it at the last minute, as evidenced by time stamps on Carmen and the quality and length of the responses. At regular intervals, I also have students: 2) **discuss issues in small groups of 2 or 3 students and report back to the entire class**—this takes place every fourth session, for a total of approximately 7 times per semester. This activity provides opportunity for students to: a) learn from each other; b) to confirm and test ideas; and c) to take ownership of the learning that takes place—all of which I've found to be extremely valuable in elevating the quality of classroom time. **In my course design, I wanted to enhance further the number and types of student participation,**

including: 1) the employment of new technologies that would provide innovative visual presentations of student participation, such as word clouds and charts of responses; 2) concrete exchange of feedback among students through peer review; and 3) involvement of other experts to broaden the method and content of the course and to connect students with additional resources.

## Section II: DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

**Pathway:** I chose the **Individual pathway** in my course design, but after having taught the course and reflecting on the results, I participated in the **Digital Humanities (DH) Pedagogy Endorsement** program from February-April 2020, led by Dr. Leigh Bonds, for which I've submitted materials for the May 1 review deadline and am awaiting formal endorsement.

I selected the individual pathway to best accommodate my work schedule in summer 2019 and autumn 2019—a time when I was preparing to teach and actively teaching “The Monstrous in Japanese Culture,” making headway on the completion of a book manuscript, and organizing my department's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration (among other things). In preparation for the course, I pursued pedagogical readings and I researched digital pedagogical technologies. This was an effective pathway, given my time constraints. As mentioned above, I participated in the DH Pedagogies endorsement program in spring 2020, after the initial offering of the course, as a means of further reflection and development of pedagogical skills for the next offering of the course.

### Resources:

- 1) Personnel
  - a. Dr. Ann Marie Davis, Japanese Studies Librarian, University Libraries : collaboration on students' final class projects and hosting of external speaker (Dr. William Tsutsui, Hendrix College; expert on Godzilla)
  - b. Dr. Hajime Miyazaki, Director, Institute for Japanese Studies (IJS): sponsorship of external speaker on Godzilla—Dr. William Tsutsui— for the IJS lecture series
  - c. Dr. Leigh Bonds, Digital Humanities Librarian, University Libraries: DH Pedagogy Endorsement program instructor
  - d. Dr. Mark Bender, Chair, Department of East Asian Languages and Literature: co-sponsorship of Godzilla lecture and consultation on course offering
  
- 2) Readings
  - a. Dean, Kathy Lund and Charles J. Fornaciari. “The 21<sup>st</sup>-century Syllabus: Tips for Putting Andragogy into Practice.” *Journal of Management Education* 38.5 (October 2014): 724-32.

- b. Fink, L. Dee. "A Self-Directed Guide to Designing Courses for Significant Learning."  
<https://www.deefinkandassociates.com/GuidetoCourseDesignAug05.pdf>
- c. McGuire, Sandra Yancy. *Teach Students How to Learn: Strategies You Can Incorporate into Any Course to Improve Student Metacognition, Study Skills, and Motivation*.
- d. Trammell, Beth and Rosalie S. Aldrich. "Undergraduate Students' Perspectives of Essential Instructor Qualities." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 16.1 (February 2016): 15-30.
- e. Wiggins, Grant and Jay McTighe. *Understanding by Design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ and Columbus, OH: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall, 2006.

### Section III: IR IMPLEMENTATION

**Implemented Methods and Activities: a) strategies taken; b) when implemented; c) reception by students; d) pre-session preparation; e) educational technology; f) teaching assistance**

- 1) See Appendices item #4.
  - a. **Top Hat attendance and questions at every session.** The students accessed Top Hat through their smart devices and registered their attendance at the start of each session. The students also responded to at least one Top Hat question per session.
  - b. This was implemented from the first session of the course.
  - c. Some students complained that they weren't able to register their attendance, due to glitches in their wifi connection or lack of battery power on their smart device. I received positive feedback on the Top Hat questions in course evaluations and in the students' reactions to the data visualizations (word clouds and charts) produced from their responses to the questions.
  - d. I prepared questions to insert into the PowerPoint presentations for each session. The process involved uploading the session's PowerPoint slides into Top Hat and then inserting questions into the appropriate place within the slide presentation.
  - e. The technology used was **electronic attendance taking** and **electronic question responses/data visualization**.
  - f. No teaching assistance was required.
  
- 2) See Appendices item #6
  - a. **Invitation of external speaker:** I invited Dr. William M. Tsutsui, president and professor of history at Hendrix College, to be a speaker for the Institute for Japanese Studies (IJS) lecture series on Nov. 19, 2019. The title of his talk was "Beyond the Man in the Rubber Suit: Godzilla, Postwar Japan, and

the Global Imagination." I wanted to give the students an opportunity to learn directly from an expert on monster studies by not just reading articles by him but by also attending a lecture by him, participating in a formal Q & A at the lecture, and continuing conversations with him and with other attendees post-lecture.

- b. The talk took place on Nov. 19, during the 26<sup>th</sup> session of the class, and attending it was a requirement for the course.
  - c. 22 of 25 students attended the lecture; there were 82 attendees in total. A number of students asked questions during the post-lecture Q & A and several pursued conversations with the guest lecturer as well.
  - d. I invited Dr. Tsutsui to OSU and served as his host during his stay. I worked out the logistics of his stay and of the day of his visit with the staff of the IJS and Dr. Ann Marie Davis (Japanese Studies librarian). I also secured a co-sponsorship with my department, the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures.
  - e. Educational technology: audiovisual set-up for the lecture, held in Thompson Library 165
  - f. Teaching assistance: IJS and University Libraries logistical support.
- 3) See Appendices items #5 and #7
- a. Public presentation of final project/paper**
  - b. Nov. 19, Nov. 26, and Dec. 3.
  - c. Each student took ownership of her/his/their final projects/papers by making presentations to the rest of the class, engaging in Q & A, and honing their communication/teaching skills. All but 2 students made final presentations of their final project/paper. One student presented a pop-up exhibition of his curated personal collection of Godzilla paraphernalia and materials from the University Libraries at the site of Dr. Tsutsui's public lecture (#2 above and Appendices item #7) on Nov. 19. All students were required to make 5- minute presentations at the end of the semester.
  - d. Preparation consisted of providing feedback to students before their class presentations. Final projects/papers had several deadlines and students received feedback on: 1) project/paper description and annotated bibliography (Oct. 14); 2) the rough draft (Nov. 8); and 3) the final submission (Nov. 22) prior to making their in-class presentations.
  - e. Educational technology: conventional classroom computer technology for students' PowerPoint presentations, blackboard.
  - f. Teaching assistance: participation by all students.
- 4) See Appendices item #5
- a. Peer review of presentations on final project/paper**
  - b. Nov. 26 and Dec. 3
  - c. All students provided peer-review of others' final paper/project presentations.

- d. Preparation involved drafting a template of evaluative items and questions for the peer reviews and creating packets of these evaluations for each student to fill out in response to the presentations.
- e. Educational technology: N/A.
- f. Teaching assistance: participation by all students.

## Section IV: ASSESSMENT

### 1) Direct and indirect methods used:

#### a. Direct

- i. Student participation in methods
- ii. Evaluations of student-participation activities in SEIs and departmental teaching evaluations
- iii. Impact of activities on graded assignments (2 quizzes, 2 short papers, final project/papers)

#### b. Indirect

- i. Student engagement in methods
- ii. Cohort cohesion

### 2) Data summary

#### a. Direct

- i. Student participation in methods: high participation rates
  - 1. Top Hat attendance and questions: 100% participation
  - 2. Lecture by external speaker: attendance by 22 out of 25 students
  - 3. Public presentation of final project/paper: 23 out of 25 students
  - 4. Peer-review of final project/paper presentations: 24 out of 25 students

- ii. Evaluations of student participation/student-centered activities in SEIs (21 students out of 25 participating) and departmental teaching evaluations (8 out of 25 students, using a Qualtrics survey) (See Appendices item #2): improvement in evaluation of student participation/student-centered learning aspects of course

#### 1. SEI questions related to student participation

- a. Question 4 "Instructor encouraged students to think for themselves": 4.86/5 (for Japanese 5454: Japanese Literature, Classical Period, which is the comparison course: 4.36/5; 11/19 students; Autumn 2018)
- b. Question 8 "Instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning": 4.9/5 (for Japanese 5454: Japanese Literature, Classical Period, which is the

comparison course: 4.36/5; 11/19 students responding;  
Autumn 2018)

2. SEI student comment
  - a. "...I really liked her way of having everyone participate in class with her anonymous questions."
3. Departmental course evaluation form (through Qualtrics)
  - a. Question 16: General effectiveness of the instructor:  
ability to involve students in discussions: 7 out of 8  
students gave a grade of "A," 1 student gave a "C"
- iii. Direct communications from student: student contribution to developing the course
  1. One student sent me 2 emails about the course, one during the semester and one after the conclusion of the course, and provided suggestions for materials/subjects I might add to the next offering of the course. (See Appendices item #3)
- iv. Impact of activities on graded assignments (2 quizzes, 2 short papers, final project/papers): very high scores
  1. Quiz #1: average 104/100; low score 95/100, high score 110/100 (allowance of 10 points in bonus questions)
  2. Quiz #2: average 92.2; low score 0/100, high score 110/100 (allowance of 10 point in bonus questions)
  3. First short paper: average 94.8/100; low score 86.4/100, high score 99/100
  4. Second paper: average 96.2; low score 86/100, high score 100/100
  5. Final project/paper: average 95/100; low score 84.7/100, high score 100/100
- b. Indirect: observed evidence of effectiveness
  - i. Student engagement in methods: All students participated in the Top Hat activities; 2 students failed to show up for their final presentations
  - ii. Cohort cohesion: There was evidence of support among students in class discussion and in the comments given in peer-reviews of the students' presentations of final projects/papers.

### 3) Conclusions based on assessment:

I feel quite confident that positive impacts of the student participation and student-centered activities I implemented in "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture" bear out in my direct assessment data and in my indirect assessments. All the methods of enhancing student participation increased student learning by creating opportunities for generating and assessing knowledge to a greater extent than the largely one-way (teacher→student), primarily lecture format that I'd been using formerly in my teaching. Socratic class discussion, which I've always implemented in

my class, was noticeably more effective in this course—something that I attribute to the greater engagement with class materials encouraged and produced by the implemented student participation methods.

While I'm satisfied with the results of this IR, I plan to implement a digital database project of Japanese monsters for this class in the next offering to augment work that is done collaboratively by members of the course. Ideas for this digital humanities project were generated in the DH Pedagogies Endorsement program, in which I participated in Spring 2020. (See Appendices item #9.)

## Section V: REFLECTION

### 1) Changes in view of teaching question/issue after IR work:

I've always known that active student participation in class was paramount to my sense of a course's success. If students actively participate, it's observable evidence that they're enjoying the class. But, what is of greater import is the experiential learning that a course and instructor can facilitate, and I focused my IR efforts in creating, implementing, and assessing student activities that would produce evidence of effectiveness for student learning.

The methods I used gave me a chance to see how creative, curious, and motivated students can be when given the proper contexts, guidance, and trust. Most of them enrolled in the course because they already were aficionados of Japanese monsters or of monsters generally. They had much they wanted to share and discuss. The activities I implemented as part of the IR gave students chances to test out ideas without the risks of the more conventional graded assignments, and this ultimately resulted in the students doing better on the graded assignments.

In the future, I will continue to place emphasis on student-participation activities in my courses and will implement them to enhance students' learning of class materials.

### 2) Reflections on role and function as teacher after IR work:

I love to teach. Of the three aspects of faculty work—teaching, research, and service—I've always put the most effort and time into teaching. I am by nature introverted, though, so I've preferred to control the classroom by lecturing and by Socratic discussion methods. In implementing the student-centered, participation activities in "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture," I now know that students can be trusted to remain engaged and respectful in class when I: 1) construct and prepare activities properly; 2) give proper guidance on how to participate in the activities; and 3) elicit reflection on the activity to encourage students' confirmation of knowledge.

The greatest joy I experience in teaching is when I see that a student has made the material meaningful to herself/himself/themselves. The student input facilitated

by the implemented activities resulted in a greater number of submitted assignments in which students not just regurgitated information, but, rather, carefully analyzed and digested the materials meaningfully for themselves.

The East Asian Studies Center's most recent newsletter (academic year 2019-2020) featured my experience teaching "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture" as an interview-based article. The interview gave me a wonderful opportunity to reflect on this course and the impacts of its enhanced student participation. (See Appendices item #8.)

3) Future teaching questions raised after IR work:

In my assessment, the students conducted peer reviews of others' final presentations sensitively, thoughtfully, and constructively. Each student received all of the reviews on his/her/their presentation by the other students, but I didn't give the students an opportunity to learn from the content of the peer reviews. I would in the future: 1) set aside in-class time for discussion of the reviews; or 2) create a structured reflection exercise in which the students could respond to the reviews. After the IR work, I see that peer review combined with regular instructor feedback on concrete assignments can provide different types of useful feedback for students.

4) Most useful/least useful aspects of IR process for development as a teacher:

I found the IR process immensely helpful for my development as a teacher. With the aim of enhancing students' learning experiences, the IR process encouraged me to be creative about activities and resources for the students. Clearly articulating learning objectives and learning goals and devising class activities to facilitate these objectives/goals are perhaps basic to the development and teaching of a class, but they're matters I hadn't been doing mindfully or strategically until I undertook this IR.

Implementing Top Hat in this class produced delightful results. The attendance taking and anonymous answering of questions took place by interactive participation using smooth-operating technology. The immediate presentation of visual data through Top Hat effectively captured students' attentions and facilitated probing discussions based on students' responses. OSU provides excellent learning-technology support and I'm encouraged to continue to explore other technologies to enhance student learning.

In an effort to enhance students' participation and their learning experiences, I called upon the resources of the University Library, the Institute for Japanese Studies, and my home department (East Asian Languages and Literatures) to bring an external, renowned speaker to campus. The students enjoyed meeting Dr. William Tsutsui, aka Dr. Godzilla, and were exposed to active scholarship through participation at Dr. Tsutsui's lecture. They also were introduced to the riches of the resources in the University Library system through the Godzilla-related materials

displayed at Dr. Tsutui's lecture. Bringing in these outside resources into my course curriculum broadened the scope of coverage considerably and I think it helped to foster students' sense of themselves as active participants in scholarship/knowledge-making.

I'm glad to have participated in the IR process. To make the process even better, UITL might consider making interim consultation with UITL staff a mandatory part of the IR process. While I intentionally chose the individual pathway based on my time constraints, several periodic "check-ins" and review-of-progress discussions would have given my IR experience more structure and greater procedural clarity.

5) Thoughts on continuing IR in future courses and curricula:

As I mentioned above, I participated in the DH Pedagogies Endorsement program after I taught "The Monstrous in Japanese Culture." The IR process inspired me to continue to investigate ways to increase and enhance student participation in their learning and I'm interested in the ways digital technology can facilitate collaborative learning and the sharing of knowledge. In participating in the DH Pedagogies Endorsement program, I identified ways to develop a collaborative Japanese monsters database for the next time I teach the course (see Appendices item #9).

## APPENDICES

All of the below are placed in BuckeyeBox:

<https://osu.box.com/s/rn6tab9c0wd0eej4na2ro68wmhadk6im>

1. Course syllabus
  - a. Initial syllabus
  - b. Final syllabus
2. Course evaluations for EALL 4200: The Monstrous in Japanese Culture and the comparison course (for assessment) Japanese 5454: Japanese Literature, the Classical Period (Autumn 2018)
3. Emails from student regarding class content
4. Top Hat Questions: List of Questions, Sample Word Clouds and Charts
5. Final project/paper presentations: rubrics for final paper/project, template for peer evaluation, copies of completed peer evaluations
6. Information on Dr. William Tsutui's lecture, held in conjunction with the course
7. *Lantern* feature on student Nathan Stover's Godzilla pop-up exhibition, held in conjunction with Dr. William Tsutui's lecture
8. Feature on EALL 4200: The Monstrous in Japanese Culture in the Summer 2020 edition of *ExpOSUre*, the newsletter of the East Asian Studies Center
9. Digital Humanities Pedagogy Endorsement Program: assignments and endorsement application