

Spring 2016

# Faculty Seminar On Collaboration Syllabus

Rachel Sagner Burma  
*Swarthmore College*, [rburma1@swarthmore.edu](mailto:rburma1@swarthmore.edu)

Lynne Steuerle Schofield  
*Swarthmore College*, [lschofi1@swarthmore.edu](mailto:lschofi1@swarthmore.edu)

Let us know how access to these works benefits you

Follow this and additional works at: <http://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-english-lit>

---

## Recommended Citation

Rachel Sagner Burma and Lynne Steuerle Schofield. (2016). "Faculty Seminar On Collaboration Syllabus". *Swarthmore Collaboration Seminar*.  
<http://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-english-lit/291>

This Syllabus is brought to you for free and open access by the English Literature at Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Literature Faculty Works by an authorized administrator of Works. For more information, please contact [myworks@swarthmore.edu](mailto:myworks@swarthmore.edu).

## **Faculty Seminar on Collaboration Syllabus Swarthmore College, Spring 2016**

This is a collectively-built, in-progress syllabus for a faculty seminar on the topic of collaboration at Swarthmore College, Spring 2016. Topics include competing definitions of collaboration across disciplines, formal and informal collaboration, rich descriptions of collaboration, metrics and measures of collaborations, digital and analog tools for collaboration, literary and historical forms of collaboration, cost/benefit analyses of collaboration, cross-institutional collaborations, institutional versus individual collaborations, collaboration narratives, failed or tragic collaborations, and teaching collaborations. Seminar members include statisticians, historians, psychologists, visual artists, literary critics, physicists, philosophers, engineers, education studies researchers, linguists, art historians, and computer scientists. Our format will accommodate both discussions of readings based on the syllabus as well as small experiments, and planning for possible future related projects.

Dates: Friday, January 29th; Friday, February 12th; Friday, February 26th; Friday, March 18th; Friday, April 1st; Friday April 15th  
Location: Science Center 102

Zotero bibliography: [https://www.zotero.org/groups/collaboration\\_seminar/items](https://www.zotero.org/groups/collaboration_seminar/items)  
Informal blog: <https://collaboration.withknown.com/>

Conveners:

Rachel Sagner Buurma  
rbuurma1@swarthmore.edu  
Department of English Literature  
LPAC 302 610-328-8666

Lynne Steuerle Schofield  
lschofi1@swarthmore.edu  
Department of Mathematics and Statistics  
SC 148 610-328-7896

Acknowledgements: Thanks to the Aydelotte Foundation for financial and administrative support for the seminar. Specific thanks to Pam Shropshire, Eric Jensen, Tim Burke, and Grace Ledbetter, Mike Kappeler, the Department of English Literature, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Ayse Kaya, Philip Jefferson, Sunka Simon, Mike Reay, Allen Kuharski, Barbara Milewski, Jim Lovelace, and the members of the seminar.

## Week 1: Introduction

### Topics

Definitions and types; tools and practices (writing, materiality); description and narratives, intra-, extra-, and inter-disciplinarity; what is non-collaboration?

### Required Reading

- Black Mountain Research. “Collaboration.” Black Mountain Research. Accessed January 5, 2016. <http://black-mountain-research.com/2015/06/15/collaboration/>.  
*Short blog post on “former art school Black Mountain College as an example of collaborative academic practice” indebted to the ideas of John Dewey.*
- Bozeman, Barry, Daniel Fay, and Catherine P. Slade. “Research Collaboration in Universities and Academic Entrepreneurship: The-State-of-the-Art.” *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 38, no. 1 (November 28, 2012): 1–67. doi:10.1007/s10961-012-9281-8.  
*Lit review of recent work on academic research collaborations in the sciences. Written from a public funding perspective, but useful to us generally as an overview of existing work on this subject. Long but skim-able, with useful chart of work on research collaboration. Attached.*
- Inge, M. Thomas. “Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship.” *PMLA* 116, no. 3 (May 1, 2001): 623–30.  
*A brief overview history of literary collaborations and how we think about them. Attached.*
- Wilkins, Jon. “E. O. Wilson is Wrong Again - Not About Math, but About Collaboration.” <http://jonfwilkins.com/2013/04/e-o-wilson-is-wrong-again-not-about-math-but-about-collaboration>  
*Short blog post describing the necessity of a common language when a biologist and a mathematician collaborate, drawing an example from the collaborative translation of poetry.*
- Wuchty, Stefan, Benjamin F. Jones, and Brian Uzzi. “The Increasing Dominance of Teams in Production of Knowledge.” *Science* 316, no. 5827 (May 18, 2007): 1036–39.  
*Bibliometric analysis of collaboration and coauthorship comparing differences across the disciplines. Attached.*

As you read these pieces, keep in mind the following questions that we will use (and modify, and rewrite) to guide our discussions over the course of the semester. You may find it useful to jot down notes about the readings that you might share with the group.

1. How might what you've read for this week help you think about how you might collaborate differently - or reaffirm one of your existing practices - in your research and/or in your teaching?
2. What further questions about collaboration did this reading open up?
3. Thought experiment: what next steps you might you take to try to answer these questions?
4. What does this reading cite that you to want track down and read? (Add those readings to our Zotero library!)
5. What doesn't this reading cite that you think it should have?
6. How did you take notes on this reading when you read it yourself? How did you share your notes and thoughts with the group?
7. Imagine you are teaching this reading(s) in your own class, what discussion questions would you pose to your students about this work?

**Researcher Profile Assignment:**

Bring a short (100-200 words) written description of a (failed)(successful)(moonshot?) collaboration to share with the group.

## Week 2: Histories

### Topics

Epistemology, teaching, history of technology, digital vs analog, artists' workshops, co-creation

### Required Reading

- “Humanities Collaboration in 2013: Eduardo Cadava Interview.” *Humanities / Work*. Accessed March 30, 2015.  
<https://humanitieswork.wordpress.com/2014/08/07/humanities-collaboration-in-2013-cadava/>.  
*Summary of an interview discussing the history of and current state of collaboration in the humanities, the role of the institution in promoting or demoting collaboration, and the role of language in collaboration.*
- “Can Architecture Make Us More Creative?” *ArchDaily*. Accessed January 14, 2016.  
<http://www.archdaily.com/353496/can-architecture-make-us-more-creative/>.  
*Article discussing the role of space(s) in promoting collaboration. There is a specific focus on describing the history of MIT’s Building 20.*
- Cranshaw, Justin, and Aniket Kittur. “The Polymath Project: Lessons from a Successful Online Collaboration in Mathematics.” In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1865–74. ACM, 2011.  
<http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1979213>.  
*Descriptive history of an online mathematics collaboration, along with discussion of the successes and difficulties. Design suggestions are also given.*
- Cronin, Blaise, Debora Shaw, and Kathryn La Barre. “A Cast of Thousands: Coauthorship and Subauthorship Collaboration in the 20th Century as Manifested in the Scholarly Journal Literature of Psychology and Philosophy.” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 54, no. 9 (July 2003): 855–71.  
*Examines acknowledgements, subauthorship, and coauthorship in academic scholarship over the past 100 years and finds that the amount of varies by disciplines.*

### **Bibliography Building**

Find and engage with two or three additional pieces (other than the required reading) of scholarship on the topics listed above. Add them to the seminar's collective Zotero library[link]. Come prepared to describe and discuss them with your group members.

### **Discussion Questions**

1. How might what you've read for this week help you think about how you might collaborate differently - or reaffirm one of your existing practices - in your research and/or in your teaching?
2. What further questions about collaboration did this reading open up?
3. Do a thought experiment about what next steps you might do to further research your questions.
4. What does this reading cite that you want to track down and read?
5. What doesn't this reading cite that you think it should have?
6. How did you take notes on this reading when you read it yourself? How did you share your notes and thoughts with the group?
7. Imagine you are teaching this reading(s) in your own class, what discussion questions would you pose to your students about this work?

### **Tagging Assignment:**

As a group, discuss what tags are appropriate for each reading. Once you've agreed (or disagreed!) on a set of tags, add them to the seminar's collective Zotero library for the entire seminar to see based on the instructions given during the Week 1 meeting.

### **Researcher Profile Assignment:**

Research your partner and engage with their scholarship in some way (e.g., read an article or two that they've written, examine some of their artwork, read some reviews of their book). Write a few paragraphs or a set of notes on their research and the questions their work raises for you.

## **Week 3: Measurement, Value, and Representation**

### **Topics**

Authorship, subauthorship, hierarchies, bibliometrics, tenure, responsibility, formal vs. informal, ethics, lone genius and other creator/authorship myths, myths, materiality, intellectual property, assessment, dyadic + triadic

### **Required Reading**

- Bonilla, Jesús Zamora. “The Nature of Co-Authorship: A Note on Recognition Sharing and Scientific Argumentation.” *Synthese* 191, no. 1 (December 20, 2012): 97–108. doi:10.1007/s11229-012-0238-0.
- Wolfers, Justin. “When Teamwork Doesn’t Work for Women.” *The New York Times*, January 8, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/upshot/when-teamwork-doesnt-work-for-women.html>.
- Cronin, Blaise. “Collaboration in Art and in Science: Approaches to Attribution, Authorship, and Acknowledgment.” *Information & Culture: A Journal of History* 47, no. 1 (2012): 18–37. doi:10.1353/lac.2012.0005.
- Lander, Eric. “The Miracle Machine.” Transcript of talk at the National Math Festival. 4/16/2015

### **Recommended**

- National Research Council (US) Committee on the Assessment of 21st Century. “Assessing Interpersonal Skills,” 2011. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK84226/>.

### **Bibliography Building**

Find and engage with two or three additional pieces (other than the required reading) of scholarship on the topics listed above. Add them the seminar’s collective Zotero library. Come prepared to describe and discuss them with your group members.

### **Discussion Questions**

1. How might what you’ve read for this week help you think about how you might collaborate differently - or reaffirm one of your existing practices - in your research and/or in your teaching?
2. What further questions about collaboration did this reading open up?
3. Do a thought experiment about what next steps you might do to further research your questions.
4. What does this reading cite that you to want track down and read?

5. What doesn't this reading cite that you think it should have?
6. How did you take notes on this reading when you read it yourself? How did you share your notes and thoughts with the group?
7. Imagine you are teaching this reading(s) in your own class, what discussion questions would you pose to your students about this work?

**Tagging Assignment:**

As a group, discuss what tags are appropriate for each reading. Once you've agreed (or disagreed!) on a set of tags, add them to the seminar's collective Zotero library [link] for the entire seminar to see based on the instructions given during the Week 1 meeting.

**Researcher Profile Assignment:**

Give and record a 20-minute interview with your partner to learn about their work (teaching, research, career). Write a 100-200 word profile possibly including links to their work and teaching. Share it with your partner and other group members.

## Week 4: Expertise and its opposites

### Topics

Teaching, epistemology, crowdsourcing vs. expertise, interdisciplinarity, interspecies, posthumanist, unintentional, w/o shared goals

### Required Reading

- Brabham, Daren. Introduction and Chapter 1, *Crowdsourcing*. MIT Press, 2013.
- Galison, Peter. “The Collective Author” in *Scientific Authorship: Credit and Intellectual Property in Science*. Edited by Mario Biagioli and Peter Galison, 325-353. New York and Oxford: Routledge, 2003.
- Shulist, Sarah. “Collaborating on Language: Contrasting the Theory and Practice of Collaboration in Linguistics and Anthropology.” *Collaborative Anthropologies* 6, no. 1 (2013): 1–29. doi:10.1353/cla.2013.0006.
- Donna Haraway, “*Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Chthulucene: Staying with the Trouble*”, 5/9/14. Accessed December 17, 2015. <https://vimeo.com/97663518>.
- Kelly J. Baker and Miya Tokumitsu, “A Q&A with Miya Tokumitsu.” *Vitae, the Online Career Hub for Higher Ed*. Accessed December 17, 2015. <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1141-a-q-a-with-miya-tokumitsu>

### Recommended

- Haley Di Pressi, Stephanie Gorman, Miriam Posner, Raphael Sasayama, and Tori Schmitt. A Student Collaborator’s Bill of Rights. <http://www.cdh.ucla.edu/news-events/a-student-collaborators-bill-of-rights/>
- Collaborator’s Bill of Rights. <http://mcpres.media-commons.org/offthetracks/part-one-models-for-collaboration-career-paths-acquiring-institutional-support-and-transformation-in-the-field/a-collaboration/collaborators%E2%80%99bill-of-rights/>

### Bibliography Building

Find and engage with two or three additional pieces (other than the required reading) of scholarship on the topics listed above. Come prepared to describe and discuss them with your group members.

### **Discussion Questions**

1. How might what you've read for this week help you think about how you might collaborate differently - or reaffirm one of your existing practices - in your research and/or in your teaching?
2. What further questions about collaboration did this reading open up?
3. Do a thought experiment about what next steps you might do to further research your questions.
4. What does this reading cite that you want to track down and read?
5. What doesn't this reading cite that you think it should have?
6. How did you take notes on this reading when you read it yourself? How did you share your notes and thoughts with the group?
7. Imagine you are teaching this reading(s) in your own class, what discussion questions would you pose to your students about this work?

### **Tagging Assignment:**

As a group, discuss what tags are appropriate for each reading. Once you've agreed (or disagreed!) on a set of tags, add them to the seminar's collective Zotero library [\[link\]](#) for the entire seminar to see based on the instructions given during the Week 1 meeting.

### **Researcher Profile Assignment:**

1. Ten-second research videos! [\[Link\]](#) Working with your partner and drawing on what you have learned about each other's research, prepare scripts for a ten-second research video (to be filmed next time you meet.)
2. Finalize 100-200 word profile in collaboration with profilee and other group members.

## **Week 5: Institutions**

### **Topics**

Cross-institutional, within-institutional, trans-disciplinary. SLAC collaboration, community college collaborations, teaching collaborations.

### **Required Reading**

- Baba, Yasunori, Naohiro Shichijo, and Silvia Rita Sedita. "How Do Collaborations with Universities Affect Firms' Innovative Performance? The Role of 'Pasteur Scientists' in the Advanced Materials Field." *Research Policy* 38, no. 5 (June 2009): 756–64. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2009.01.006.

### **Bibliography Building**

Find and engage with two or three additional pieces (other than the required reading) of scholarship on the topics listed above. Come prepared to describe and discuss them with your group members.

### **Discussion Questions**

1. How might what you've read for this week help you think about how you might collaborate differently - or reaffirm one of your existing practices - in your research and/or in your teaching?
2. What further questions about collaboration did this reading open up?
3. Do a thought experiment about what next steps you might do to further research your questions.
4. What does this reading cite that you want to track down and read?
5. What doesn't this reading cite that you think it should have?
6. How did you take notes on this reading when you read it yourself? How did you share your notes and thoughts with the group?
7. Imagine you are teaching this reading(s) in your own class, what discussion questions would you pose to your students about this work?

### **Tagging Assignment:**

As a group, discuss what tags are appropriate for each reading. Once you've agreed (or disagreed!) on a set of tags, add them to the seminar's collective Zotero library [link] for the entire seminar to see based on the instructions given during the Week 1 meeting.

### **Researcher Profile Assignment:**

Ten-second research videos! [\[Link\]](#) Grab a camera and film your 10-second research video. Do at least three takes each - possibly in different locations or with different props or different styles?

## **Week 6: Facilitating Collaboration**

### **Topics**

Tools reprised, teaching, guidelines, productive vs. unproductive practices, value, DH, Peripeteia, student, faculty

### **Required Reading**

- none!

### **Bibliography Building**

As a whole group, discuss the bibliography and its tags. Discuss process of tagging and taking notes. What worked? What didn't work? How was your group's collaboration helped or hindered by the tools each of you individually used? What's your favorite article? What (if any) article did you hate? What article did you find useful that you never would have found on your own? Tweet our bibliography. Drink wine.

### **Researcher Profile Assignment:**

Read profiles. View 10-second research videos.