

REPORT OF THE CCCC STANDING GROUP FOR BEST PRACTICE IN  
ONLINE WRITING INSTRUCTION (OWI)

THE 2021 STATE OF THE ART OF OWI REPORT

December 2021

Jessie Borgman  
(Chair of the CCCC OWI Standing Group)  
Cat Mahaffey  
(Associate Chair of the CCCC Standing Group)  
Jason Snart  
Jennifer M. Cunningham  
Natalie Stillman-Webb  
Lyra Hilliard  
Mary Stewart  
Casey McArdle  
Heidi Skurat Harris  
Scott Warnock  
Joanna Whetstone  
(Communications Chair of the CCCC OWI Standing Group)

## Report Notes

\*\*\*This report is titled 2021 because the research and report were written in 2021. Though revisions and edits happened in 2022 and the report was released in 2022, the report illustrates the decade between the initial report (2011) and this report (2021)

\*\*\*The original working group consisted of 16 people but the survey data and report was analyzed and written by the 11 people listed on the front of the report.

\*\*\*Special thanks to UNC Charlotte, which served as the IRB of record and hosted the 2021 survey, and to NCTE, which hosts the OWI Standing Group.

\*\*\*This report exists in three versions: a short executive summary version, a version with the executive summary and results reporting, and a full report including the executive summary, results reporting, and raw data. All three versions of the report can be found here:

<https://sites.google.com/view/owistandinggroup/state-of-the-art-of-owi-2021>

\*\*\*APA Citation for this report:

CCCC Online Writing Instruction Standing Group. (2021). *The 2021 state of the art of OWI report*. Conference on College Composition and Communication.

<https://sites.google.com/view/owistandinggroup/state-of-the-art-of-owi-2021>

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
The 2021 State of the Art Working Group	6
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>9</b>
The 2011 report outlined emergent themes related to each of its six major categories (we quote directly from the 2011 report.	9
The 2021 report identifies the following emergent themes:	10
<b>2021 Survey Methods</b>	<b>12</b>
Determining the Question Bank	12
Providing Key Terms to Respondents	14
Reporting the Results	15
<b>Limitations</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Results and Discussion</b>	<b>19</b>
Background/Institutional History	19
Course Activities and Elements	23
Pedagogy Influences	27
Tutoring	31
Student Experience	32
Instructor Experience	38
<b>Areas for Future Research</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Appendix A: 2021 Survey Questions</b>	<b>51</b>
Background	51
Institutional History	53
Course Activities and Elements	53
Pedagogy Influences	55
Tutoring	56
Student Experience	57
Instructor Experience	60
Continued Participation	63
<b>Appendix B: 2021 Survey Results</b>	<b>64</b>
2021 Survey Results	64

Background/Institutional History (Q1-9)	64
Course Activities and Elements (Q 10-14)	68
Pedagogy Influences (Q15 & 16)	74
Tutoring (Q17 & 18)	75
Student Experience (Q19-31)	77
Instructor Experience (Q32-42)	86
Continued Participation	94
<b>Appendix C: Responses to 2021 Survey Open-Ended Questions</b>	<b>95</b>
Open-Ended Q13 Responses	95
Open-Ended Q14 Responses	98
Open-Ended Q26 Responses	101
Open-Ended Q28 Responses	112
Open-Ended Q29 Responses	121
Open-Ended Q37 Responses	126
<b>Appendix D: Responses to 2021 Survey Questions with “Other” Option</b>	<b>130</b>
Responses to the questions that included an “Other” option.	130
Q4 “Other” Responses:	130
Q7 “Other” Responses:	130
Q8 “Other” Responses:	131
Q10 “Other” Responses:	133
Q15 “Other” Responses:	134
Q17 “Other” Responses:	137
Q18 “Other” Responses:	138
Q19 “Other” Responses:	139
Q20 “Other” Responses:	140
Q22 “Other” Responses:	143
Q23 “Other” Responses:	146
Q27 “Other” Responses:	148
Q30 “Other” Responses:	150
Q31 “Other” Responses:	152
Q32 “Other” Responses:	156
Q33 “Other” Responses:	158
Q34 “Other” Responses:	161
Q39 “Other” Responses:	164
Q40 “Other” Responses:	171
Q42 “Other” Responses:	179
Q43 “Other” Responses:	182

# Introduction

The initial 2011 State of the Art of OWI report was created by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Committee for Best Practice in Online Writing Instruction (OWI), formed in 2007. (The name of the committee subsequently changed to the “Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction.”) Originally a formal CCCC committee (now a standing group), the committee was initially charged by CCCC to complete the following tasks:

- Identify and examine best strategies for online writing instruction using various online media and pedagogies primarily used for the teaching of writing in blended, hybrid, and distance-based writing classrooms, specifically composition classrooms, but including other college writing courses.
- Identify best practices for using online instruction specifically for English language learners and individuals with disabilities in coordination with related CCCC committees.
- Create a Position Statement on the Principles and Standards for OWI Preparation and Instruction. In consultation with the Assessment Committee and the Task Force on Position Statements, review and update the 2004 Position Statement “Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments.”
- Share best practices in OWI with the CCCC membership in a variety of formats.
- Identify best practices for using various online media and pedagogies (e.g., networked classrooms, e-mail and Internet-based conferences, peer-reviewed papers) for the teaching of writing with both synchronous and asynchronous modalities while taking into consideration currently popular learning management environments;
- Identify best practices for training and professional development of online writing instructors.

Creating the 2011 State of the Art of OWI report was an integral part of these charges and the impetus for forming the 2013 Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for Online Writing Instruction (OWI), <https://ncte.org/statement/owiprinciples/>. The 2011 State of the Art of Online Writing Instruction project surveyed 297 fully online and hybrid writing instructors (using two separate surveys) to gather findings about instructor pedagogy, training, supplemental support, and satisfaction as well as experiences with multilingual students and students with disabilities.

A decade has passed since the initial report, and online writing instruction and research in online pedagogy has expanded. The CCCC sponsored [OWI Standing Group](#) still operates, and two OWI specific community groups have emerged, [The Online Writing Instruction Community](#) (2015) and [The Global Society of Online Literacy Educators](#) (2016). In addition, an entire annotated bibliography dedicated to OWI specific research exists, The Bedford Bibliography of Research in Online Writing Instruction (OWI) (updated last in 2019), which boasts over 500 citations (Harris et al., 2019). The field has also faced the effects of the 2020 COVID pandemic, which forced many instructors to participate in emergency remote instruction, including teaching and learning in digitally mediated spaces for the first time. While teaching and scholarship in OWI has expanded over the past decade, there remains a need for multi-institutional, longitudinal research into OWI practices as well as scholarship that is replicable, aggregable, and data-supported (RAD) (Haswell, 2005).

The 2021 State of the Art of OWI report seeks to meet this need and to facilitate the continued expansion of OWI scholarship by reporting on the experiences of online writing instructors. It also compares results reported ten years ago with results derived from our 2021 survey. The report offers an update on instructor experiences, attitudes, and concerns that emerged in a survey of 235 writing instructors/administrators/scholars with experience in digitally mediated teaching environments, including hybrid, online (synchronous or asynchronous), and any combination of modalities, including hyflex.

While the CCCC 2011 OWI survey was developed around the Sloan Consortium pillars, the field of writing studies now has the benefit of writing-specific frameworks, including the [2013 Position Statement](#) and the [2019 Global Society of Online Literacy Educators \(GSOLE\) Online Literacy Instruction Principles and Tenets](#). The 2021 survey was thus based on the 2011 survey but also informed by foundational principles, tenets, and best practices for OWI as they have emerged in recent years.

## The 2021 State of the Art Working Group

In 2016, the CCCC Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction was disbanded and formed into the official [CCCC OWI Standing Group](#), which continues the valuable work of the original OWI Committee (though, unlike the committee, the Standing Group has no task-oriented charges from CCCC and instead researches topics of interest to the working group).

The OWI Standing Group members include leading scholars in areas critical to OWI: accessibility, multimodal writing, hybrid writing instruction, multilingual writing instruction, user design, assessment, contingent labor equity, teacher preparation and mentoring, program development, and much more. The group's expertise attracts newcomers to our annual Cs workshops and panels. Since cultivating a sense of community is crucial to the mission of advising CCCC members on OWI research, effective practices, and emerging trends, committee members interact during the year through ongoing projects and active working groups.

At the 2021 CCCCs OWI Standing Group business meeting, a working group was formed to create a revised report of the [2011 State of the Art of Online Writing Instruction](#) survey and report, in order to create a 10-year picture of the developments in OWI, including the shift to emergency remote instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic beginning in 2020. The 2021 State-of-the-Art of OWI Working Group consisted of the following 15 scholars:

- Jessie Borgman, (Chair of the CCCC OWI Standing Group), Arizona State University
- Cat Mahaffey, (Associate Chair of the CCCC OWI Standing Group), University of North Carolina Charlotte
- Jason Snart, College of DuPage
- Jennifer M. Cunningham, Kent State University
- Natalie Stillman-Webb, University of Utah
- Lyra Hilliard, University of Maryland
- Mary Stewart, California State University, San Marcos
- Casey McArdle, Michigan State University
- Heidi Skurat Harris, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
- Scott Warnock, Drexel University
- Joanna Whetstone, (Communications Chair of the CCCC OWI Standing Group), Lakeland Community College
- Dan Seward, The Ohio State University
- Sushil Oswal, University of Washington
- Joanne Giordano, Salt Lake Community College
- Catrina Mitchum, University of Arizona
- Ashlyn Walden, UNC Charlotte

The members of this Working Group were a diverse collection of scholars who have extensive experience in OWI and Online Literacy Instruction (OLI).

Most of the Working Group members currently teach at public four-year colleges or universities (73%). Two members currently teach at two-year community colleges, and one teaches at a private, four-year university.

Within those institutions, our members bring a range of modality experience.

- All but one have taught **asynchronous courses** for at least six years, and over a third of the working group has 16 or more years of asynchronous teaching experience.
- 80% have taught **hybrid courses** for at least six years, and nearly 10% of the working group have more than 20 years of hybrid teaching experience.
- Ten working group members have up to five years of experience teaching **hyflex courses**.

Working Group members have taught a wide range of courses. Everyone has taught first-year composition, and the majority have also taught research composition or upper-level writing. Group members have also taught developmental writing, literature, creative writing, film, web authoring, technical writing, and several types of graduate-level courses including writing, education courses, and rhetoric courses focussed on OWI.

Working Group members have authored over a dozen books about OWI and more than 80 chapters and articles about OWI and related topics. Their review work spans the major journals in Writing Studies and many of the significant publishers of writing/rhetoric books. The authors of this report have won awards for their publications and work, both on campus and as part of the broader field. In addition, Working Group members have secured nearly \$100,000 in funding for various grant projects.

Members of the Working Group have facilitated dozens of faculty development activities nationally and internationally and have themselves engaged in many professional development workshops, courses, and seminars. A number of them created the first online writing courses at their institutions, often taking the lead in also teaching these courses and training the first cohorts of faculty to do so.

Members have served as key leaders in OWI, online literacy instruction (OLI), and online learning in organizations such as GSOLE, CCCCs OWI Standing Group, The Online Writing Instruction Community, CCCCs Committee for Best Practices in OWI, and Quality Matters (QM). Finally, the expertise of the group is augmented by its members' involvement with educational technology projects, ranging from authoring a webtext development project to creating a start-up for securing grants for campus technologies.

# Executive Summary

In this section, we begin by revisiting the 2011 report's emergent themes, and then we share the 2021 report's emergent themes. These themes are arranged by category, though readers will note that the two reports' categories differ somewhat. For a detailed discussion of these differences, please review the section below on [2021 Survey Methods](#).

The 2011 report outlined emergent themes related to each of its six major categories (we quote directly from the 2011 report).

1. **Pedagogy:** Teachers and administrators, to include those in writing centers, typically are simply migrating traditional face-to-face writing pedagogies to the online setting—both fully online and hybrid. Theory and practice specific to OWI has yet to be fully developed and engaged in postsecondary online settings across the United States.
2. **Training:** Training is needed in pedagogy-specific theory and practice in both fully online and hybrid settings, but particularly in fully online settings because of its unique complete mediation by computers. In most cases, it appears that “writing” and how to achieve strong writing and identifiable student results are left out of online writing instructional training.
3. **Supplemental Support:** Online writing centers are not developed by enough institutions to handle the needs of students in both fully online and hybrid online settings. To that end, training is insufficiently developed to the unique setting because it is, as mentioned above, migrated primarily from face-to-face settings.
4. **English Language (EL2) Users:** The needs of EL2 learners and users are vastly unknown and insufficiently addressed in the online setting—both fully online and hybrid.
5. **Students with Disabilities:** The needs of students with various kinds of disabilities have not received sufficient and appropriate consideration in light of writing courses in online settings, although the hybrid setting indicates somewhat of a beginning. Teachers and administrators do not know what they are responsible to do or how

to do it for any particular variation of learning or physical disabilities relative to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or to a particular student's specified needs.

6. **Satisfaction:** Instructors are dissatisfied with the levels of support they receive regarding technology, course caps, training, pay, and professional development/interactions relative to OWI in both the fully online and hybrid settings. Such dissatisfaction can lead to poor teaching, low expectations for students and for an online course, and insufficient retention of experienced instructors at a time when OWI continues to grow.

The 2021 report identifies the following emergent themes:

1. **Pedagogy:** Most survey respondents indicated that the course design process was collaborative, involving an instructional designer, faculty, and/or subject matter expert. More faculty seem to be involved in the design process than were involved in course design processes as reported in 2011. However, fewer than half of the 2021 survey respondents indicated consulting research on distance education and/or surveying students and incorporating their input into course design. These latter two areas could be better incorporated into the course development process; emphasis could be placed, for example, on studying/surveying students as web users in addition to incorporating existing effective distance learning practices as an intentional part of the design process.
2. **Training/Support:** Student resources including tutoring, library help, and writing center resources have increased significantly since 2011, as have modality options (more synchronous and asynchronous classes are now offered). Training and preparation continue to be a problem for instructors teaching online courses, however. Most training still focuses on using the learning management system. Fewer respondents (29%) indicated that they were offered online faculty development webinars or that training was mandatory, which is a departure from the 2011 study which reported that (48%) of respondents who taught fully online indicated some type of mandatory training. Twenty-seven percent of respondents indicated that they did not receive any training specific to OWI. A majority of respondents who did receive training did not receive any payment (59%), which is comparable to the 2011 Report which found that (63%) of respondents who taught fully online did not receive payment.

3. **Access:** More focus has been placed on student access, including access to technology (computer/internet) and access to content (help for students with learning challenges). When looking at other access elements, such as working with students who are non-native speakers of English and complying with ADA requirements for students with disabilities, many survey respondents seemed under prepared. Only (37%) of respondents offered more text-based communication for ESL students, and only (48%) viewed their courses as ADA compliant. These areas need improvement, and emphasis should be placed on training and aiding instructors in creating more accessible courses.
4. **Student Preparation/Appeal:** Only about half of the survey respondents indicated that they prepared students for the commitments of distance education by setting expectations for workload or time commitments. Fewer than a quarter of respondents noted that their institution prepared students to learn in digital environments by giving them any sort of formal training, such as how to use the learning management system. Survey respondents also indicated that they felt that the benefits or greatest opportunities for students who take online courses were location (93%) and flexibility with time (85%).
5. **Instructor Perceptions/Satisfaction:** Respondents indicated “flexibility in scheduling” (77%) and “no commute” (69%) as the top reasons they enjoyed teaching online, while they disliked “dealing with technical problems” (52%) and the added time it takes to prepare online courses. The majority of respondents indicated that they would be expected to provide reasonable support for teaching in online environments (93%), and that they would be expected to develop a sound online course (82%). Respondents also believed that they would be expected to interact with students (69%) and hold office hours (65%). Participants indicated the valued qualities for online writing instructors were:
  - “Willingness to follow-up with students promptly” (79%)
  - “Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines” (74%)
  - “Ability to establish a presence online” (65%)

The survey results indicate that training remains a significant issue, both for prospective online teachers and for students registering for online courses, making this topic a key area for future research. One related issue that stands out is the need for distinctions between designer and subject matter expert. The idea of “design” is often relegated to the domain of instructional designers, suggesting that online teachers aren’t able or aren’t willing to

claim and/or practice this skill set, despite the fact that (82%) of 2021 respondents identified themselves as adept in using classroom technologies. This likely complicates faculty views of training for OWI vs. training for technologies like learning management systems.

Some good news is evident in the growing prevalence of online access to tutoring and other support services for students. It seems that the call from researchers over the past decade to align access with course delivery has been influential. The bad news is that ADA compliance remains a major concern, and best practices for enhancing success for ESL students need continued attention. Furthermore, expanded definitions of access (learning preferences, content delivery in multiple modes, etc.) remain an area for further focus and research.

## 2021 Survey Methods

In the May 2021 State of the Art of OWI Working Group meeting, members decided to determine the current state of OWI by replicating the 2011 survey instrument. We were interested to discover if, or how, strategies and approaches to online writing instruction had changed over the last ten years, in addition to if, or how, perceptions of OWI have changed. Primary IRB approval was obtained through the University of North Carolina, Charlotte (IRB-22-0098). Once all of the questions on the survey were finalized, the survey was opened from September 7, 2021 to October 5, 2021. The survey was made available via several listservs in North America such as the Writing Program Administration listserv and TYCA (Two-Year College English Association) listserv, as well as being shared via social media from multiple accounts and organizations around OWI (The OWI Community, GSOLE, etc.). In addition, within the survey recruitment script, we invited amplification by asking respondents to forward the survey to “applicable colleagues, listservs, and social media groups.”

## Determining the Question Bank

To make the 2021 survey faster for participants to complete, we reduced the number of questions from the 2011 survey from 77 questions to 44 questions, which included the addition of 5 new questions. Due to more outlets to advertise the survey (social media sites, listservs, etc.), we decided to run the survey for a shorter time (one month vs. the four months that the original 2011 survey was open), distributing it from September 7, 2021 to October 5, 2021. The committee met several times synchronously via video conference to discuss questions from the initial survey; we also compiled notes asynchronously via Google Docs.

Questions were eliminated from the 2011 survey through three rounds of voting exercises using Google Forms. In order to account for changes within the last ten years since the initial survey, the group decided to add new questions to the 2021 survey. During the second round of 2011 survey question cuts, the members of this working group were given the opportunity to add three suggested questions for the 2021 survey. There were 14 new questions suggested from working group members during this round of voting. For round three, a new Google Form survey was created with the 10 questions from round two that scored too high to cut but not high enough to keep. Then team members were asked to select 6 questions to keep for the final survey. Thus, 38 questions remained from the original survey and 14 new questions were added.

Following the three rounds of voting and the dissemination of the new question suggestions, survey question wording was updated to account for developments in technology and changes in terminology over the last ten years. For example, question #20 of the 2011 survey asked respondents to “Please indicate the extent to which the following virtual tools and online teaching strategies are used in your writing course(s).” Option choices were updated with new tools: Zoom replaced Skype, and Twitter, TikTok, and Instagram replaced MySpace. Dated technologies, such as RSS feeds (a web feed format that publishes frequently updated works) were removed.

Then we refined the 14 new questions, allowing all working group members to comment and suggest edits. After that, similar questions were combined, resulting in five new questions on the 2021 survey (these five new questions are in bold on the 2021 survey which can be found in Appendix A).

Lastly, one of the original 2011 survey questions asked about online teaching experience: “How many total years have you been teaching online writing courses?” Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced numerous instructors to shift to emergency remote instruction, we decided to add the option: “I had not taught online prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.” This would allow researchers to sort survey responses by those who identified as having taught online prior to the pandemic versus those who had not, in order to report more nuanced survey findings. We surmised that those who had taught online only as part of the shift to remote instruction in Spring of 2020 would likely have different perceptions than those who had pre-COVID OWI experience.

The final survey contained 44 questions: 38 original 2011 survey questions, 5 new questions, and one follow-up question that allowed us to gather contact information of participants willing to participate in future interviews and/or

focus groups. In total, 285 participants consented to the survey, but not all who consented completed the survey. We used the data from respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, which left 235 respondents. There were 87 volunteers for future research (Appendix A).

## Providing Key Terms to Respondents

Due to the many terms used to describe online teaching and its various modalities, key terms and definitions were provided for respondents. Online instruction has always involved multiple modalities, and the delivery methods of online courses can look quite different and be called by different terms, based on the institution. The COVID-19 pandemic has also prompted a rethinking of how online modalities are defined. The pandemic even produced a new term, *hyflex*, which represents a modality in which some students and/or the instructor are onsite and other students are participating virtually (some synchronously and others asynchronously).

The group developed definitions for each modality, based on our experience and on how modalities were defined in various public-facing course catalogs at institutions across the country. The primary modalities below are the ones we developed and offered to our survey respondents: Face-to-Face/Onsite, Online Synchronous, Online Asynchronous, Hybrid/Blended, and Hyflex.

**Face-to-Face/Onsite:** Instruction is delivered through real-time interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus.

**Online Synchronous:** Instruction is delivered through real-time interaction with set meeting times via video conferencing software. There is no interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus.

**Online Asynchronous:** Instruction is delivered through a digitally-mediated platform (such as a learning management system) with no real-time interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus.

**Hybrid/Blended:** Instruction is delivered through both real-time interaction (with or without physical presence) and an asynchronous digitally-mediated platform environment (such as a learning management system).

**Hyflex:** Instruction is delivered in multiple modes and students and instructors can choose how they participate. Hyflex modes can include: face-to-face/onsite instruction, online synchronous instruction, online asynchronous instruction, and/or hybrid/blended instruction. The definition of *hyflex* varies by institution. This digitally-mediated instructional mode term originated during the COVID-19 pandemic.

While the 2011 survey was distributed to two separate populations—those who taught in fully online settings and those who taught hybrid courses—we determined that there were too many modalities to distribute separate surveys for each and that determining who to send the surveys to would prove too challenging. Instead we decided to identify and define key terms at the start of the survey and ask participants to identify their primary mode of instruction before taking the 2021 survey. These definitions were given in question #2 of the 2021 survey so that participants could identify their primary modality and keep that primary modality in mind when answering the questions.

## Reporting the Results

The tables in the executive summary below report the number of individuals out of the total number of respondents for each question who selected a specific response. For example, for some questions survey respondents were given the option to select “all that apply” from a set of choices, like Q15:

Q15: How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.

- Subject area expert
- Faculty collaboration
- Consulting research
- Student-needs surveys
- Other, please specify

There were 229 people who responded to this question. But because each respondent could select anywhere from 1 to 5 of the options, the total *responses*, not *respondents*, could be quite high. Thus, reporting the percentage of any given option against all the choices made could be misleading, whereas reporting the number of times each respondent selected a given option out of the total respondents, not responses, is, we feel, more accurate.

So, we report that 176 or 77% of respondents, out of the 229 who answered this question, selected “subject area expert,” for example. If we calculate the percentage based on how many times “subject matter expert” was selected relative to all the selections made, which is substantially higher than 229, that percentage drops considerably, and, we feel, underrepresents the role that subject area expertise plays in course development.

The 2021 results are categorized below based on the 2021 survey sections, which are comprised of the following (and loosely based on the 2011 survey sections):

- Background/Institutional History
- Course Activities and Elements
- Pedagogy Influences
- Tutoring
- Student Experience
- Instructor Experience
- Continued Participation

## Limitations

All research comes with limitations, and this survey and report are no exception. Survey research is often limited because respondents self-report their responses, and there is always the potential for confusion about question phrasing and/or terminology. Though we gave definitions about given modalities (face-to-face, online sync., online async., hybrid/blended, hyflex) in order to avoid confusion about delivery format, we understand that terms such as “student interaction” could take on different meanings.

For example, one possible wording confusion occurs in Q32 where we asked “What expectations are set with the faculty who teach online/hybrid/blended courses?” Respondents could check all that applied from a list. It surprised us to discover that one choice—“Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected”—was only selected by 69% of survey respondents. Does that mean that over 30% of respondents did not have “student interaction” as a perceived expectation for online writing instruction? Or does that mean that there is no expectation “set” in some very rigid or formal way at a departmental level with online writing instructors for interaction with students? Perhaps survey respondents interpreted “interaction” as something more like “synchronous class meetings” or even the general idea of students working in groups as might happen in a typical face-to-face class. Maybe student interaction actually *is* a clear expectation, but that expectation is not articulated in terms of “certain kinds” and/or a “certain amount.” It’s hard to know for sure, but the point is that we recognize, generally, that this is the kind of question (or response option) that might shape respondent survey data in unhelpful ways. In sum, we acknowledge that subtleties of survey question, and option response, wording are inevitably going to shape the data we gather.

Further, early in our survey we asked respondents to choose their “primary” delivery modality and to answer questions through that lens for the rest of the survey:

3. We understand that many people teach across many modalities but for the purposes of this survey specifically we are asking you to identify what you feel is your **primary** teaching modality from the options below based on the definitions above in question 2.

- Face-to-Face/Onsite
- Online Synchronous
- Online Asynchronous
- Hybrid/Blended
- Hyflex

It is possible that the narrower lens of answering questions with reference to a primary teaching modality shaped the way that respondents might otherwise have answered questions were they to think in terms of the breadth of their teaching across multiple delivery modes. There are a number of reasons we asked respondents to identify a primary teaching mode, however. First, we wanted to avoid the complicated logistics of having to send out multiple surveys, each tailored to a single delivery mode (the 2011 survey project involved one survey for “online” writing instructors and a separate one for “hybrid” writing instructors). Part of our concern, too, was that survey respondents might answer questions about “online” instruction in a particularly negative way if their only association with that delivery mode was the abrupt turn to remote learning that began in early 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic rather than other experiences they may have had with teaching in digital environments. Instead, we wanted survey respondents to answer questions based on their primary mode of delivery; this could also be useful for future research which might look to correlate survey responses based on what delivery mode respondents chose as primary.

The pandemic played a significant role in the limitations of our survey. In 2011, there was no pandemic, online instruction was tapering off from the boom experienced in the late 2000s, and not nearly as many instructors and administrators had online teaching experience. We knew the pandemic would have an impact, which is why we asked participants to indicate if they had taught online prior to the pandemic. Of the respondents, 53 (23%) had not taught online prior to the pandemic, so many of the perspectives expressed about online teaching may be through the lens of emergency remote instruction. Some respondents may have been jaded from ill-fated online teaching experiences of 2020. As an experienced group of online writing instructors, we know that lack of training, support, and experience

severely impacts one's experience teaching online, and we saw that manifested in some of our survey respondents' answers. Lack of OWI specific and course design specific training were clearly an influence in our survey respondents' answers, as many had experienced a year of online teaching thrown together at the last minute.

Another limitation of our study was something that happens with all survey research: incomplete surveys. We had 283 people consent and begin completing the survey, but 48 of those 283 responded to less than half the questions. We determined to report on the answers for only the respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, which left 235 responses that contributed to the data set.

Replicating the original 2011 survey also meant including open-ended questions as were used in the 2011 survey; however, the open-ended questions were more likely to be left incomplete by respondents.

- Q13=75
- Q14=78
- Q26=171
- Q28=151
- Q29=112
- Q37=85

The two other questions that were not open-ended but were also most skipped were:

- Q43=152: participation in OWI related communities/support groups
- Q36=173: ranking question on important elements of OWI training

It is not surprising that these two questions were skipped, as 23% of survey respondents had not taught online prior to 2020, had likely received very little training, and did not know of the OWI specific support groups and resources available. In the case of the other open-ended questions, participants likely sought to reduce time spent on the survey. A future survey might be even shorter or not include open-ended questions, or questions with "other" as an answer choice.

Additionally, Q36 asked respondents to rank a list of types of training as most (1) to least (8) helpful. Moving forward, if this question were included, it would need to be revised for simplicity and allow respondents to skip or not rank particular items. Several respondents indicated in Q37, the follow-up question for open-ended feedback to Q36, that Q36 was difficult to navigate and that

ranking training options that an institution does not offer is confusing and difficult.

Finally, although our intention was to replicate the 2011 survey, the 2021 survey included only half of the question bank of the original. Some questions were cut because they were not as relevant to contemporary online instruction. It was also hoped that reducing the survey length would increase response rate, although that did not occur: in 2011, there were 297 survey respondents and in 2021 there were 235 survey respondents. However, it is important to note that the 2011 survey was open for three months and the 2021 survey was open for only one month. Although in many ways the 2021 survey was more focused than the 2011 survey, not replicating the entire question bank may have prevented some potentially useful comparisons.

## Results and Discussion

The following text synthesizes the results in each section of the survey and provides an overview of the significant data points from each section. For a more detailed look at the data, please see the appendices.

### Background/Institutional History

In this first section, survey respondents were asked to consent to the survey and describe their institutional position, primary mode of teaching, rank, and courses most frequently taught. The questions in this section included:

Q1. Do you consent to this survey?

- Yes
- No

Q2. In online instruction, there are many definitions that describe how instructors teach in digital spaces. Please read the following definitions and consider them for your teaching situation and for the purposes of this survey. Indicate how often you teach in each of these modalities. (Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never).

A definition of each term was provided for the following delivery modes (see “Providing Key Terms” above).

- Face-to-Face/Onsite

- Online Synchronous
- Online Asynchronous
- Hybrid/Blended
- Hyflex

Q3. We understand that many people teach across many modalities but for the purposes of this survey specifically we are asking you to identify what you feel is your **primary** teaching modality from the options below based on the definitions above in question 2.

- Face-to-Face/Onsite
- Online Synchronous
- Online Asynchronous
- Hybrid/Blended
- Hyflex

Q4. Please check all that apply

- I am a graduate teaching assistant
- I am an adjunct instructor/professor
- I am a full-time non-tenure track instructor/professor
- I am a tenure-track professor
- I am a tenured professor
- I am an administrator
- Other (please specify)

Q5. How many total years have you been teaching (please include all teaching experience)?

- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7 or more years

Q6. How many total years have you been teaching online writing courses?

- I had not taught online prior to the COVID-19 pandemic
- 2-3 years
- 4-6 years

- 7 or more years

Q7. At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.

- 2-year community college
- 4-year college
- 4-year university
- 2- or 4-years graduate school
- Professional school
- For-profit institution
- Non-profit institution
- Completely online
- Traditional, brick & mortar with some online courses
- Other (please specify)

Q8. What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.

- Integrated reading and writing
- Basic writing
- Co-requisite writing
- First-year writing
- Professional/technical writing
- Advanced academic writing
- Creative writing
- Writing-intensive courses in other disciplines
- Writing courses for non-native speakers of English
- Other, please specify

Q9. How many students are enrolled in your online writing courses?

- 10 or fewer per course
- 11-20 per course
- 21-30 per course
- 31-40 per course
- 41-50 per course
- More than 50
- I don't know

When respondents were asked to declare their primary modality for teaching, 38% noted that they teach primarily face-to-face/onsite, 13% selected online synchronous, 34% selected online asynchronous, 13% selected hybrid/blended, and 2% selected hyflex. The original report did not ask about synchronous online, and it noted that “synchronous” was taken to mean “oral face-to-face methods rather than computer-mediated synchronous platforms” (SoA Report, 2011, p. 12). It has been 10 years since the initial survey, and given the advancement in video conferencing technologies, the use of online synchronous courses has grown extensively in undergraduate and graduate program course offerings. Therefore, synchronous can now mean synchronous time during a video conference without face-to-face time in a brick and mortar classroom.

The respondents held different positions: approximately 57% of respondents identified as student/adjunct/non-tenure/full-time faculty, while 42% identified as tenure track or tenured professors and 13% as administrators. These numbers are similar to the 2011 survey, with 57% non-tenure faculty and 46% tenured/tenure track faculty. Of the total respondents to the 2021 survey, 23% noted that they had not taught online before the COVID-19 pandemic. A majority of respondents, 54%, noted that they have been teaching online for six years or less. This is a bit of a shift as the original survey found that 74% of respondents had been teaching 6 years or less.

For the question regarding institutions, respondents who teach at two-year community colleges stayed around the same at 30%, but the large shift came from the four-year university. In the 2011 survey, 47% of respondents identified as being at a four-year university, but in the current 2021 survey, 64% identified as being at a four-year university. In the 2021 survey, respondents were able to also select non-profit spaces (26%) and traditional brick and mortar institutions with some online courses (31%), but in the original survey, such selections were in different questions, so respondents may have selected non-profit, four-year, traditional brick and mortar, and others as a few could overlap.

In the 2011 survey, 86% of respondents noted that they teach first-year writing, which was higher than the 79% of respondents to the 2021 survey. The largest jump occurred in those who noted they teach professional and technical writing online: in 2011, only 25% said they teach these courses online, but in the updated survey, 51% identified as teaching professional and technical writing courses online.

The biggest takeaways are that more OWI courses are being taught synchronously online, and more non-tenure-line faculty are teaching online classes.

## Course Activities and Elements

This section included four questions related to the course activities and elements instructors used in their online writing courses.

In the 2011 report, instructors were asked about their course design experience, their online training, and their methodology for developing online courses. The 2021 survey focused more on the tools that instructors implemented, the strategies or tools that they used in online courses, and the training they received to teach online.

The questions in this section included the following:

Q10. What elements do your online/hybrid/blended course(s) include? Please check all that apply.

- Announcements/email through the learning management system
- Synchronous meetings discussion
- Asynchronous meetings discussion
- Synchronous peer response workshops (discussion forums or individually assigned peer reviews)
- Asynchronous peer response workshops (breakout rooms, small group meetings, pairing off during class)
- External peer response spaces (Eli Review, Google Suite, etc.)
- Synchronous group work
- Asynchronous group work
- Reading response discussion (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Reading response short essays (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Student facilitation and/or presentation
- Synchronous student conferences
- Asynchronous student conferences
- Collaborative writing (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Other, please specify

Q11. Which of the following statements are true for you? Check all that apply.

- I was given a pre-designed course
- I was given a course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example, changed assignments)
- I worked alone to design the online components of my course
- I have participated in formal training for online teaching
- I have participated in formal training for online course design
- I am considered an expert in online course design
- I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course
- I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface
- I am considered an expert in the content of the course
- Course designs are unique to individual instructors
- Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tool generated by the instructor/course development team

Q12. Please indicate the extent to which the following virtual tools and online teaching strategies are used in your writing course(s). (Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)

- Online distribution of course materials, use of learning management system, or other online platform such Google Drive
- Learning modules designed by course instructor/department
- Learning modules designed for the campus (perhaps by Library, Honor System, or Center for Teaching and Learning)
- Video lectures
- Instructional videos
- Lectures via PowerPoint or MSWord documents
- Links to websites
- Audio modules
- Instructor-designed quizzes/exams
- Audio feedback
- Video feedback
- Multimodal student submissions (non-text based student responses to assignment prompts) (e.g., Voicethread, Kaltura, Images, Websites, etc.)
- Responses to student work using LMS feedback tools (commenting, highlighting, strikethrough, etc.)
- Course website outside of course management system (e.g. Wordpress, Weebly, Google Sites/Classroom)

- Wikis
- Blogs
- Social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, or Instagram
- AI - augmented reality
- Virtual reality
- Mobile devices/smartphones
- Synchronous video tools (Zoom, Google Meet, Webex, MS Teams)
- Interaction through third-party tools (i.e., Slack, Discord).
- Interaction through LMS tools (messaging, chat, etc.)

Q13. What other activities and/or elements, if any, do you use in your courses? (open ended see Appendix C for responses)

Q14. What other elements/tools, if any, do you use in your courses? (open ended see Appendix C for responses)

In Q10, respondents were asked about the elements they used in their courses. Elements were provided in a list and respondents could select multiple options. In addition, there was an open-ended “Other” category that a few respondents (4 %) used to share additional thoughts and to indicate other elements that were part of their course activities.

Respondents indicated that they used asynchronous tools more than synchronous ones, with “announcements and email through the campus learning management system (LMS)” being the most frequently used element (86%). Collaborative elements, including peer review and response, discussion, and workshops, were frequently used as well. However, “peer response groups” (80%), “Asynchronous peer response workshops (discussion forums or individually assigned peer reviews)” (79%) were at the top of the list followed by “Synchronous peer response workshops (breakout rooms, small group meetings, pairing off during class)” (44%). Synchronous (42%) and asynchronous group work (52%) was selected by roughly half of the respondents. The least selected were “external peer response spaces (Eli Review, Google Suite, etc.)” (24%) and “asynchronous student conferences” (26 %).

Q11 asked respondents to reflect on their course design experience. Answers ranged from “I was given a pre-designed course” to “I worked alone to design the online components of my course.” This question also asked how much formal online teacher training respondents received and whether or not the

course design process was collaborative. Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 responded to this question.

In the 2011 report, less than 50% of respondents had received formal online teacher training, with two-year community college respondents most often receiving formal training. Their online courses were developed through process-centered and social constructivist methods.

In the 2021 survey, 76% of respondents indicated that they participated in formal training for online teaching, with 69% indicating that they participated in formal training for online course design. Most respondents worked alone to design their online course (75%), with some reporting that they were given pre-designed courses (19%). Only a small percentage of people (18%) worked with an instructional designer on their campus and roughly a third (34%) worked collaboratively with their department colleagues to design their courses.

Question 12 asked respondents to discuss the tools and strategies they used in their courses using a four-point Likert scale (frequently, occasionally, rarely, never) to rate pre-listed selections. Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 231 people responded to this question.

The most frequently used tools and strategies were those inside the learning management system, such as online distribution of course materials through an LMS or other online platform (frequently = 94%), learning modules that were designed by the course instructor/department (frequently = 81%), links to websites (frequently = 78%), responses to student work using LMS feedback tools (frequently = 73%), synchronous video tools (frequently = 54%), and interaction through LMS tools (messaging, chat, etc.) (frequently = 52%).

The most infrequently used tools and strategies were those outside of the LMS, such as virtual and augmented reality (infrequently = 93% and 93% respectively), social networking sites (infrequently = 65%), and interaction through third party tools (i.e., Slack, Discord) (infrequently = 60%). These responses demonstrate that online writing instructors are comfortable using the tools provided by their institutions and are less likely to venture out to use third-party tools or social media and virtual reality in their online classes.

Some of the reasons that instructors stayed primarily within the confines of the LMS were included in responses to Q13 and Q14, both open-ended questions that asked participants about other activities, elements, and tools they use in their courses that were not previously listed in other questions. To view participant responses to this open-ended question in detail, please see Appendix C.

One respondent wrote of technological tools, “As few as possible. While tech is important, the PDC I was given is more like teaching tech than Eng/FYW. Basically, there's too much tech going on and it complicates the transition from high school to college, and for non-traditional adults returning to college.”

Other respondents, however, expressed clear displeasure with using tools within the LMS. One respondent wrote, “I primarily use an external website to host my courses. I use my LMS only for grades and mass emails/communication. Students are required to use many different kinds of digital media—infographics, website building, free video making/editing software etc.” Another respondent was unhappy with their LMS: “I wanted to explain that I feel some resentment to [sic] course management templates/tools because I've been augmenting my classes with email, class listservs, and social media for years. For me, some of the bells and whistles (required rubric, etc.) are just not what I want.”

Responses to questions about course activities and elements, including formal online training, show that few online instructors participate in formal training for online course design or teaching, although the majority of them are in charge of developing and teaching their own courses and content. Further study of demographic factors, particularly instructor rank and years of experience teaching online) might shed light on which populations are receiving online professional development and which are not. In addition, given the preferences for asynchronous tools native to the LMS work, correlating instructor rank and years experience with synchronous/asynchronous activities inside or outside the LMS might yield insight into which instructors feel comfortable across a range of tools and modalities and which prefer to use asynchronous LMS elements.

## Pedagogy Influences

In Q15 we asked about how online writing courses were developed. We wanted to know if courses were created with involvement from a subject area expert, or experts, most likely individual faculty who would be teaching the course. Was there any faculty-to-faculty collaboration? Did instructors conduct their own course design research as part of the process? Did student-needs surveys inform course design?

Q15. How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.

Subject area expert

- Faculty collaboration
- Consulting research
- Student-needs surveys
- Other, please specify

Survey respondents were able to choose any aspects of course development that applied. In addition, there was an open-ended “Other” category that a few respondents used to share additional thoughts and to indicate other elements that were part of course development.

Most respondents (77%) indicated that a subject area expert was part of the course development process; 67% of respondents indicated that faculty collaboration was part of the course development process; 40% of respondents indicated that consulting research was part of the process, and 34% of respondents indicated that student-needs surveys informed course development (14% of respondents offered additional input via our “Other” option).

In the 2011 OWI report, 81% of respondents to the question about course development indicated that fully online writing courses were developed by a “subject area expert.” In our survey, this percentage dropped slightly, to 77%. It is somewhat surprising to see a decline in course design input from a subject area expert; one might assume such input would become an ever greater part of OWI course design processes as online instruction itself becomes more commonplace in higher education.

Faculty collaboration seems to have increased as part of the course design process, based on comparison between the 2011 and 2021 OWI surveys: from 46% in 2011 to 67% in 2021. And faculty-to-faculty collaboration may include informal efforts, as one respondent comment suggests: “Most of our courses are developed by individual faculty and informal collaboration.” Faculty collaboration is likely a beneficial part of any course design process, not just online writing instruction, since it allows for multiple perspectives and it broadens the knowledge base. Some respondents may have also included “collaboration” as an aspect of course design even when that collaboration was not necessarily faculty to faculty. For example, one survey respondent indicates that a “faculty course developer collaborates with non-faculty instructional designer.”

“Consulting research” as part of the course development process also increased from the 2011 and 2021 OWI surveys, from 32% up to 40%. This again might reflect a decade’s worth of scholarship and online teaching materials now available that might not have been so ubiquitous before.

In qualitative comments we collected via the “Other” short answer option to Q15, a number of respondents addressed training. One notes, for example, that course development is the product of “Years of faculty development elsewhere.” Another respondent mentions “internal training,” while still another notes “Our institution also has training about on-line classes,” and yet another mentions “Institutional requirements and training.” However, there are also a number of qualitative comments indicating that training and support is less robust in some circumstances. One respondent noted, “I was told to develop the courses & then I created a course and revised it year after year until I got it to be an optimal learning space. I had to train myself with OWI books and webinars, etc.” Another wrote of the course development process simply: “trial and error.”

The next question, Q16, asked about the pedagogical and online writing instruction principles that respondents perceived to most influence their teaching of writing online.

Q16. Which of the following pedagogical or theoretical principles, if any, are most important in your online teaching of writing? Select no more than three (3).

- Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas
- Writing is a social process
- Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion
- Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response
- Writing is a process
- Writing and revising are recursive acts
- Writing and revising are generative acts
- Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement
- Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important

For this question, respondents were allowed to choose only three options from the nine options presented. Of the available choices, most individuals selected “Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion” as one of their important pedagogical or theoretical principles (78% of respondents). The next most important principle chosen was “Writing is a process” (53% of respondents). “Writing and revising are recursive acts” was the third most important principle chosen (47% of respondents).

Very few respondents indicated that face-to-face (f2f) interaction with students was important: only 22 respondents (9%) chose this option. Despite

being the least frequently chosen option for Q16, 10% of respondents indicated that f2f interaction with students was one of their top three pedagogical principles, which may have been because these 10% of participants taught hybrid courses where they had both f2f and online time. It is possible that some respondents were including synchronous video interaction as “f2f interaction.” Perhaps more likely, though, is that some respondents were thinking about online writing instruction through the lens of the recent, dramatic shift to “online” (or more correctly, “remote”) instruction that COVID-19 necessitated. Those respondents may have considered online instruction in terms of pivoting quickly from fully onsite, f2f teaching to remote teaching, and for many instructors and students alike, preserving (or recapturing) some element of “f2f interaction” seemed important.

Of interest in the results generated by Q16 holistically is that the principles informing online writing instruction were probably the same as those that inform writing instruction generally. Not surprisingly, for example, most of our survey respondents indicated, as most composition teachers probably would, that “Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion” is a core pedagogical principle (78%).

Perhaps fully onsite, f2f writing instruction would see “Writing is a “social process” as more important than our OWI survey indicated (that option was only chosen by 38% of respondents). But over half of our survey respondents still indicated that the “Writing is a process” principle is important (53%).

We should also keep in mind that because respondents could choose only three options, there might have been some choices that would have been a fourth for those taking the survey and could thus have seen a percentage uptick. Also, unlike with the 2011 survey, we did not offer an “Other” option for open-ended responses or an open-ended follow-up question. (The follow-up question in the 2011 report read: “Which one of the pedagogical principles in Q23 above is most central to your work in OWI? Why and how?”)

This “core principles” question is certainly worth additional research, including instructor interviews or focus groups, since it would be interesting to better understand how survey respondents made their three choices. For example, the principle that “Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement” was selected by only 22% of respondents as one of their top three choices. That might seem surprisingly low, for writing teachers, but perhaps when respondents opted for “Writing is a process” (which 53% selected) or even “Writing is a social process” (which 38% selected), they felt those options included peer feedback as part of a larger process.

To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "Other" option, please see Appendix D.

## Tutoring

In this section we asked survey participants about the availability of tutoring and other writing resources as part of their online courses. There were two questions in this section: one about what supplemental resources were available, and the other on what kinds of services were offered by writing centers and libraries.

Q17. What supplemental online writing instruction or online writing tutoring opportunities, if any, exist at your institution? Please check all that apply.

- Resources/guidelines available for students to consult (on citing sources, proofreading, etc.)
- Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting
- Writing center consultants available online in real-time
- Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies
- Turnitin or other plagiarism detection services
- Other, please specify

Q18. Please indicate which of the following resources are available on your campus. Please check all that apply.

- Writing Center: Online text-based resources
- Writing Center: Online video resources
- Writing Center: Online scheduling
- Writing Center: Face-to-face appointments
- Writing Center: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with tutor
- Writing Center: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with tutor
- Library: Online resources
- Library: Online text-based resources
- Library: Online audio resources
- Library: Online video resources
- Library: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with librarian
- Library: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with librarian
- Other, please specify

In the 2011 report, the survey participants reported a distinct lack of online support for hybrid and online students. Less than half (49%) of respondents indicated that their institutions had writing center consultants available for asynchronous support, and even fewer institutions (25%) offered real-time online writing center tutoring. Those numbers rose significantly in the 2021 data, with 81% of respondents reporting the availability of asynchronous tutors and 86% reporting real-time tutor availability.

This trend was also true for library consultations. In 2011, 38% of respondents reported the availability of synchronous appointments and 57% reported asynchronous consultations, compared with 81% for synchronous and 76% for asynchronous appointments among 2021 respondents.

A similar increase was observed in responses about specific writing center resources. In 2011, 50% of institutions offered online, text-based writing center resources, while 74% of institutions in 2021 did so. In both cases, text-based resources remained more prevalent than video resources: 15% of writing centers in 2011 offered video resources, compared with 50% of writing centers in 2021.

Interestingly, it seems that online library resources were more common than writing center resources: 87% of 2011 respondents reported having online, text-based library resources, which was remarkably similar to the 89% of respondents who reported online text-based library resources in 2021. In contrast, video resources have become much more common in libraries: only 37% of 2011 respondents reported library video resources, compared with 78% of 2021 respondents.

Finally, the use of TurnItIn or other plagiarism detection services increased. In 2011, 53% of respondents said their institutions used these services, and in 2021 that percentage rose to 66%. In contrast, the use of outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies remained static: 22% of respondents in 2011 said their institutions used these services, as did 20% of respondents in 2021.

To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.

## Student Experience

This section included 13 questions that captured perspectives on student experience related to five key areas: student preparedness, expectations of faculty support, access issues (ELL students, ADA compliance), and classroom technology and tools.

The first two questions in this section asked about student preparation for online learning:

Q19. What expectations are set with students about taking these online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

- Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, LMS technologies (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)
- Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions
- Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments
- Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)
- Completion of course requirements
- Peer review
- Informed participation in online discussions
- Productive facilitation of online discussion
- I don't know
- Other, please specify

Q20. In what delivery formats does your program/course offer a student orientation to online courses? Please check all that apply.

- Face-to-face
- Face-to-face and asynchronously
- Asynchronously
- Audio/video
- We/I don't offer it because another program on our campus handles it
- We/I don't offer it
- Other, please specify

When considering what expectations were set for online students, 97% of participants reported that regular access to technologies like broadband, the LMS, and word processing software were essential, followed by an expectation of completing course requirements (94%) and regular availability via email (91%). Roughly half (56%) set expectations of hours per week to complete course readings and assignments, and most expected students to

interact with classmates through peer review (78%) and online discussions (74%).

Access to online learning orientation through various formats seemed to be of issue, since 22% of respondents reported that neither they nor their institution offered any sort of orientation specific to online students. Even though asynchronous orientation opportunities was the most frequent choice, only 36% of respondents selected it.

The next two questions focused on classroom technology and tools.

Q21. Which of the following describe technology adoption and use in your classroom? Check all that apply.

- I consider myself adept with using learning technologies.
- I regularly test new technologies in my classroom.
- I avoid adding new technologies because I don't feel comfortable with them.
- I have the freedom to adopt new technologies as I deem appropriate.
- I must get approval from my administration before I adopt new technologies in my classroom.
- I enjoy adopting new technologies.
- My university limits the technologies we can use.
- I only use university-supported technologies.
- I choose technologies that enhance student engagement.
- I limit technologies to protect student online privacy.
- I limit technologies to protect instructor online privacy
- I limit technologies to enhance student accessibility.
- I limit technologies to enhance instructor accessibility.
- Cost

Q22. How, if in any way at all, are student course-related problems addressed in your online course? Please check all that apply.

- Community building activities early/across the semester
- Incorporating media that allow students to have some other encounters with each other (building personal web-pages so students can "see" what classmates look like, for example)
- Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong)
- Instructor office hours in chat room

- Informal portions of discussion board
- Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly
- Other, please specify

Based on the results, most instructors (82%) considered themselves adept with learning technologies and had the freedom to choose technologies (83%) they deemed appropriate for their classes. When asked about how they choose classroom technology, 70% said they aim to enhance student engagement; however, only 46% considered student accessibility issues related to classroom technologies, and only 35% considered student online privacy issues.

When asked about addressing course-related issues for students, the most frequent solution (70%) was to communicate a reasonable amount of flexibility and acknowledge that things can and do go wrong. Only 59% of respondents offered virtual office hours and less than half (47%) offered informal discussion forums to address student issues in an online course.

The next seven questions in this section focused on access as related to English as a second language and ADA compliance:

Q23. What strategies are used to accommodate students who are English language learners?

- More asynchronous delivery
- More text-based communication
- More audio-based communication
- Providing more instructions and/or feedback in more than one mode
- I do not have ELL students
- Other, please specify

Q24. To what extent are your online writing courses accessible to students with various disabilities (ADA compliant)?

- Highly Accessible
- Somewhat Accessible
- Minimally Accessible
- Not Accessible
- I don't know

Q25. Does your institution provide guidance on how to make online writing courses accessible to your disabled students (ADA compliant)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Q26. What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities? (open ended see Appendix C for responses)

Q27. What strategies do you use to ensure access for all types of learners in the online writing courses you teach? (ELL, students with physical challenges, students with learning challenges, etc.) Check all that apply.

- Providing content in multiple formats for multiple learning styles
- Video Captioning
- Transcripts
- Universal Design
- User-Centered Design
- Other, please specify

Q28. What are your major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities? (open ended see Appendix C for responses)

Q29. What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in online settings? (open ended see Appendix C for responses)

Regarding support that specifically considers the needs of ELL students, 60% reported providing additional support in the form of instructions and feedback in more than one mode, but only 37% offered more text-based communication, and only 14% offered more audio-based communication. Interestingly, 20% indicated that they do not have ELL students in their courses.

When considering ADA compliance of their courses and course materials, 48% viewed their courses as highly accessible, and 44% rated theirs as somewhat accessible. Only 2% believed their courses to be minimally

accessible, but 6% simply don't know how accessible their courses were. This large number of highly or somewhat accessible rankings aligns with the reported 73% who said their institution provided guidance on accomplishing ADA compliance.

Respondents reported a wide variety of strategies to accommodate students with disabilities, including providing transcripts and captions for course videos, using accessibility checkers, applying universal design methods, and offering content in multiple formats. Some major challenges included the labor involved in captioning videos, the inability to know which students need accommodation, and the understanding that many students do not report their disabilities. It was difficult to fully capture the myriad elements that respondents desire to know more about, but it was clear that many did not fully understand how screen readers work or how to design their courses for all learners, regardless of ability.

The two questions in the next section focused on expectations for faculty support in online courses.

Q30. In your experience, what are the greatest opportunities for students who are instructed in online settings? Please check all that apply.

- Opportunity to develop writing through writing
- Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time
- Participating in written discussions
- Flexibility in terms of time
- Flexibility in terms of location
- Student facilitation and/or presentation
- Recorded student conferences
- Collaborative writing
- Other, please specify

Q31. What measures has your institution, your department, and you as an instructor taken to address diversity, equity and inclusivity issues *specifically* in online writing classes?

- Training in accessible digital design
- Guest speakers who are / represent BIPOC populations
- Anti-racist statements
- Anti-racist workshops/training

Other, please specify

When asked about benefits or greatest opportunities for students who take online courses, 93% pointed to flexibility in location and 85% pointed to flexibility with time. Another highly ranked opportunity was allowing students to compose on their own time (84%), and half of the respondents saw value in having students participate in written discussions through online learning.

For this 2021 update of the 2011 report, we added a question about actions around inclusivity, diversity, equity and accessibility (IDEA). While 70% of respondents had taken workshops or training in IDEA, only 60% reported training in accessible digital design. Sixty-four percent reported that their institution or department had written anti-racist statements, and 48% had invited guest speakers who represent BIPOC populations.

## Instructor Experience

In this section we asked survey participants about their training and preferences in teaching online or hybrid writing classes.

The first question in this section asked about the departmental expectations of instructors who teach writing courses online.

Q32. What expectations are set with the faculty who teach online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.

- Teachers will develop a pedagogically sound online course
- Teachers will provide reasonable support to students for succeeding in the online environment
- Online office hours will be required
- On-campus responsibilities will exist
- Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected
- Faculty will be observed one or more times during a term
- Other, please specify

The majority of responses indicated that instructors believed they would be expected to provide reasonable support for teaching in online environments (93%) and that they would be expected to develop a sound online course (82%). Respondents also believed that they would be expected to interact with students (69%) and hold office hours (65%). Fewer respondents believed

that they were expected to have on-campus responsibilities (27%) or be observed at least once each term (25%).

The next question asked about the types of training, if any, instructors received before teaching online writing courses.

Q33. What types of orientation/training activities, if any, do faculty receive for these online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.

- Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)
- Online faculty development course(s) in OWI offered through your department
- Online faculty development webinar(s) in OWI offered through your department
- Ongoing workshops on various aspects of learning management systems (e.g., (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)
- Access to an instructional designer (at the department and/or college levels)
- Training on how to personalize a pre-designed course or master course (shared curriculum) at the department and/or college levels.
- Mandatory training
- Optional training
- Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members
- Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online
- Other, please specify

The most common type of training participants indicated receiving was ongoing workshops related to their learning management systems (77%), followed by access to an instructional designer (69%), optional training (64%), and online faculty development courses (38%). Fewer respondents (29%) indicated that they were offered online faculty development webinars (29%), training on personalizing pre-designed courses (28%), mentoring with experienced faculty (24%), or summer institutes for online teaching (24%).

In a departure from the 2011 study which reported that 48% of respondents who taught fully online experienced some type of mandatory training, only 29% of 2022 respondents indicated that training was mandatory. Only 3% of respondents indicated a reduced teaching load as an option.

The next two questions asked about time commitment and compensation related to instructor training.

Q34. How many hours of training in OWI did you receive as part of your formal faculty training?

- Between 1 and 5 hours
- Between 6 and 10 hours
- More than 10 hours
- I did not receive any OWI specific training
- Other, please specify

Q35. How much do you earn per hour for your faculty training?

- Under \$15/hr
- \$15-\$30/hr
- \$30-\$50/hr
- Over \$50/hr
- I do not receive payment for training
- I did not receive any OWI specific training

Twenty-seven percent of respondents indicated that they did not receive any training specific to OWI. About 20% of respondents received 6-10 hours of training and 19% indicated more than 10 hours. About 16% received 1-5 hours of OWI training. A majority of respondents who did receive training did not receive any payment (59%), which is comparable to the 2011 Report which found that 63% of respondents who taught fully online did not receive payment. In 2021, those who did receive payment included \$15-30 per hour (5%), \$30-50 per hour (4%), less than \$15 per hour (3%), and more than \$50 per hour (1%).

The next two questions asked about the types of training that writing instructors value for online writing instruction and course design.

Q36. Rank the parts of training that you find most and least helpful (most helpful being 1).

- Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)
- Ongoing workshops on various aspects of learning management system (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)

- Use of a dedicated instructional designer (at the department and college levels)
- Teachers developing an online course to be offered to students who are not already enrolled on campus also have a designer available to them via Extended Education and Outreach (another entity on campus)
- Mandatory training
- Optional training
- Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members
- Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online

Q37. What other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction? (open ended see Appendix C for responses)

For Q36, respondents were asked to rank a list of types of training as most (1) to least (8) helpful. For this question, items ranked 1, 2, or 3 were considered “most helpful,” and items ranked 6, 7, or 8 were considered “least helpful.” When asked to rank which resources were most and least helpful (Q36), most respondents (64%) ranked having a designer available to them and having access to optional training (49%) as most important. About 45% of respondents rated mandatory training as most important. Most respondents (62%) rated ongoing workshops as least important. Having the use of a dedicated instructional designer (47%) and a summer institute for online teaching (43%) were also ranked less important. Reduced teaching load during the first term teaching online and mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members were equally important. About 44% of respondents ranked having a reduced teaching load as most important, while about 43% ranked it as least important. About 37% of respondents ranked mentoring/shadowing as most important, while about 41% ranked it as least important.

Question 37 was an open-ended question, asking what other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction. About 80 respondents provided an answer, with many identifying collaboration and communication, such as the respondent who wrote, “Collaboration and communication. Develop communities of peers who you can turn to for ideas and support.” See Appendix C for more open-ended answers to this question.

The next question focused on the valued qualities of online instructors.

Q38. Rate what you perceive to be the importance of qualities below for an online writing instructor at your institution: [Very important, Important, Not Important, or Very Unimportant]

- Overall comfort with technology
- Technical proficiency with the interfaces available at our campus
- Advanced web design skills
- Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best ones for a pedagogical purpose
- Ability to establish a presence online
- Skills in designing “lecture” delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital video, learning module)
- Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines
- Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects
- Skills in teaching rhetorical principles
- Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection
- Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning
- Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles
- Willingness to follow-up with students promptly
- Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning
- Participation in an active community of online teachers

When asked about which qualities are important for an online writing instructor (Q38), the majority of respondents (79%) rated “Willingness to follow-up with students promptly” and “Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines” (74%) as very important. “Ability to establish a presence online” (65%) and “Skills in teaching rhetorical principles” (61%) were also rated as very important among the majority of respondents. Other items rated as very important by about half of respondents included: “Technical proficiency with interfaces” (57%); “Overall comfort with technology” (55%); “Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection” (54%); and “Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles” (50%).

Slightly more than half of respondents rated the following as important: “Skills in designing ‘lecture’ delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital, video, learning module)” (57%); “Participation in an active community of online teachers” (51%); and “Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best one for a pedagogical purpose” (51%). Slightly less than half of respondents rated

“Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning” (49%), “Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning”(48%), and “Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects” (47%) as important.

Much of what respondents rated as very important and important related to instructional design. Worth noting is that all items in Q38 but one were rated as very important or important. Alternatively, “Advanced web design skills” was the only item rated not important by 66% of respondents, which is consistent with results from the 2011 Report. We were unsure how to interpret this result and suspect that respondents interpreted “Advanced web design skills” as their ability to write code, rather than their ability to view themselves as an instructional designer. In the future, a more specific question about online instructors’ self-perceptions as instructional designers would be helpful.

The next two questions asked about instructor preferences related to teaching online writing courses.

Q39. What do you like about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

- Flexibility in scheduling
- No commute
- More focus on students’ writing and skills and less emphasis on students’ personalities in a way that can lead to favoritism in face-to-face classes
- Other, expand on your answer

Q40. What do you dislike about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

- Anticipating student problems
- Dealing with technical problems
- Managing large class size that is sometimes given to online teachers because physical space is not a limitation
- Other, expand on your answer

Question 39 asked what instructors like most about teaching online. The majority of respondents (77%) liked the “Flexibility in scheduling” afforded by online writing courses, followed by “No commute” (69%). Fewer respondents (40%) indicated that “More focus on students’ writing and skills and less emphasis on students’ personalities in a way that can lead to favoritism in

face-to-face classes.” Of the respondents who chose “Other,” many cited increased student access and accessibility: “I actually feel like I get to know my online students better because I interact with them more often as individuals. I also like that it's simpler to make the course accessible to disabled students and provide options for interaction, especially those (like me) who prefer written communication.”

When answering Q40 about what they disliked about teaching online, more than half of respondents indicated that they disliked “Dealing with technical problems” (52%). Fewer respondents disliked “Managing large class sizes” (31%) and “Anticipating student problems” (22%). Many respondents (46%) chose “Other” and provided qualitative feedback indicating that they least liked the lack of community/connection and student engagement. One respondent shared, “Less opportunities for connection and interaction with students. Students who stop communicating are harder to track down in an online space.” Another respondent, addressing difficulties exacerbated by the pandemic, wrote, “It's harder to build community. Online teaching also did not work for many students during the pandemic. It seems to work effectively when students have chosen it.” Increased time needed to build and deliver online courses was another common qualitative response. For example, one respondent included, “Extra cognitive load and time required to manage the course site,” and another simply wrote, “Time!”

The last two questions focused on context and modality for teaching writing and participant preference for modality.

Q41. In what context do you most prefer to teach writing?

- Asynchronous Online/Remote
- Synchronous Online/Remote
- Onsite
- Blended/hybrid (both synchronous and asynchronous components)
- I am open to any or all of these contexts

Q42. Based on your response to question 41, If you had a choice, would you continue teaching in the modality you preferred?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
- Other (open-ended)

When asked about their preferred context when teaching writing (Q41), 34% of respondents reported that they are open to any or all contexts. About 24% of respondents prefer teaching writing onsite, 21% prefer teaching asynchronously online or remotely, and 13% prefer teaching hybrid or blended courses with both synchronous and asynchronous components. Only about 9% of respondents prefer teaching writing synchronously online. When asked instructors if they would continue teaching in their preferred modality if they had a choice (Q42), the majority (80%) would continue teaching in their preferred modality; 7% were unsure, and 2% answered “No.”

Question 43 asked about participation in OWI-specific or distance education groups/organizations.

Q43. What communities do you participate in that are directly focused on developing your OWI pedagogy and/or practice? (check all that apply).

- The Cs OWI Standing Group
- The Online Writing Instruction Community
- The Global Society of Online Literacy Educators
- The Online Writing Centers Community
- The Online Learning Consortium
- Quality Matters
- Other\_\_\_\_(fill in)

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 152 people responded to this question. The top three were, [The Online Writing Instruction Community](#) (53%), followed by [The Global Society of Online Literacy Educators](#) (44%), and [Quality Matters](#) (33%). See Appendix B for the full list and respondent answers.

The last question, question 44 asked for willingness to participate in future research (either a focus group or interview). Of the 291 survey participants 87 people shared their names and contact information for a follow-up meeting or email exchange. Having this number of willing interview participants will allow us to conduct interviews and focus groups in phase two of this research project.

## Areas for Future Research

In the Executive Summary above, we provided general summaries of the data pertaining to these areas: Pedagogy, Training/Support, Access, Student Preparation/Appeal, and Instructor Perceptions/Satisfaction. We see all of these areas as providing great opportunities for future research. As noted, training and preparation for both students and faculty continues to be an issue as does the lack of consulting distance education and OWI specific research prior to designing online courses. More emphasis on the student user experience could be explored. Access is definitely an area that can continue to be researched, specifically given the results of the survey and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on online courses. For example, only (48%) of survey respondents indicated that their course was ADA compliant and only (22%) of respondents reported that neither they nor their institution offered any sort of orientation specific to online students. These are issues of access that need further research.

While we have offered some analysis of the survey data in this report, we are also aware that there is significant work still to be done. We decided that it was neither feasible for, nor entirely the purview of, this particular report-writing group to perform extensive analysis of survey data or speculate about what the data might indicate. Instead, we have provided what we hope is a useful summary above and will suggest a few areas for future research.

Our hope is that the field of online writing studies writ large can now use this data for more extensive and targeted analysis, including potential cross referencing and comparison. Scholars in the field might also use the survey data in conjunction with other data sources to further explore aspects of online writing instruction. We see this report as a valuable resource for the overview and analysis it does provide, but also—perhaps even primarily—it is a rich data source for the field to now explore in greater depth. All of the de-identified raw survey data can be found in Appendices B, C, & D, which will allow researchers to analyze and assess data points that are useful to their own OWI research.

Additionally, some of this raw data will be revisited, as we plan to conduct follow-up studies in the future. As part of our 2021 survey we asked if respondents would be interested in follow-up interviews or focus groups, and 37% of the respondents indicated such interest. Therefore, following the completion and publication of the current report, a set of the current survey researchers will begin what we envision to be a Phase II of this project, in which we will reach out to survey respondents to set up interview and/or focus group opportunities. Through these more in-depth, potentially less structured conversations, we hope to explore aspects of the survey in order to

gain a fuller picture of how instructors understand their work as online writing educators.

We will also investigate how respondents understood some of the survey questions in an effort to discover if what we *thought* we were asking was in fact what respondents interpreted us to be asking. This qualitative follow-up should be interesting for the insight it provides about how, or if, respondents understood our survey questions in unanticipated ways, a challenge of any survey research. As noted in the limitations section, questions 36 and 37 presented some confusion for our survey takers, so exploring useful training for online faculty remains another fruitful area of possible future research.

One example of this that we are interested in learning more about via focus groups and/or interviews relates to Q38 in our survey in which we asked respondents to rate the importance of certain qualities for an online writing instructor. Among the least important instructor capability as identified by survey respondents was “Advanced web design skills,” only 1% of respondents identified this as “very important” and (14%) identified this as “important”; fully (66%) identified “advanced web design skills” as unimportant and (19%) ranked it as “very unimportant.” However, over (50%) of respondents identified “Skills in designing ‘lecture’ delivered in a number of modes,” “Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments,” and “Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects” as important or very important, and (74%) identified “Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments” as “very important.” In the future, a more specific question about online instructors’ self-perceptions as web designers would be helpful.

All this is to say that while instructors may not perceive themselves as advanced web designers (or they at least do not rank that skill as very important to their teaching), there is clearly an element of design that *is* important for effective OWI. Of course, many survey respondents may not have ranked “Advanced web design skills” as important to their work simply because of the qualifier “advanced.” Were this option reworded just to “web design skills” perhaps more respondents might have ranked it as important or even very important. What we might tease out in conversation with survey respondents is what they perceive “web design” to entail. Did this particular term suggest to many respondents highly technical skills like coding, for example?

Additionally, we were unsure how to interpret the results for Q32, which asked about departmental expectations of instructors who teach writing courses online. In response, 69% of respondents indicated that “Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected.” We are unsure whether the 31% who did not select this option believed they would not be

expected to interact with students at all or if they were conflating “interaction” (e.g., any communication, including email) with “synchronous interaction” (e.g., real-time video sessions). Potential follow-up focus groups or interviews that investigate respondents’ understanding and interpretation of this question would be helpful.

Another area that is promising for future research derives from our questions about course development. In Q15, for example, we asked how online writing courses were developed, with the following options that respondents could choose (respondents could choose any/all that applied):

- Subject area expert
- Faculty collaboration
- Consulting research
- Student-needs surveys
- Other, please specify

Seventy-seven percent of respondents indicated that subject area experts were part of the course development process. But that leaves almost a quarter of courses being developed with *no* subject area expertise, at least according to the way that our survey respondents responded to our phrasing of this question: an alarmingly high number and certainly worth further investigation.

We wonder about how respondents understood the phrase “subject area expert,” because our question did not specify who the subject area expert could be. Did that imply to respondents that *they themselves* had to be directly involved in course development? For example, as one respondent even indicated in qualitative “other” feedback: “the expert [was] me.” Could there be a subject area expert who was not the person (or people) who ended up teaching the course?

Another aspect of course development alluded to in some of the qualitative data we gathered related to pre-made courses or what some respondents identified as “templates.” One respondent referred to teaching from a “Pre-made course by admins and experienced professors for FYW” and another mentioned “Top-down requirements from administration.”

Further research could be extremely valuable in the area of “template”-driven course design and/or instructors having to adopt pre-made materials. This might be usefully coordinated with questions about subject area expert involvement (or lack thereof) in the course development process.

We also wonder (as noted in the limitations) what the impact of the pandemic might have been on the data and how follow-up research would provide more information. For example, participants liked teaching online because of the “flexibility in scheduling” and “no commute” but surely there are other reasons, and it seems possible that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted those responses. Additionally, cross-tabulated data such as training and support in relation to instructor satisfaction or position/rank in relation to view of online courses would prove interesting. It would also be interesting to perhaps cross-tabulate this survey, which was taken by instructors and administrators, with previous surveys done on student satisfaction in online courses taken by students. We see this kind of cross tabulation as an area rich for future research.

In terms of this document’s structure and future research, some analysis has been included in the above sections to act as support for administrators seeking to use this data to make the case for more resources and greater investment in OWI at their institutions. So while the initial audience for this text may be those already associated with OWI, we are aware that as institutions examine their post-COVID-19 pandemic data concerning their online offerings, this document can confirm pain points when it comes to requesting future support. It is important to note that as OWI evolves, we can utilize the research and data collected in this survey, and other research around OWI, to make the case for more support and greater access when it comes to online offerings. A return to pre-COVID-19 pandemic thinking would undermine the knowledge gained over the past decade and significantly limit future OWI research.

## References

- CCCC Committee for Best Practices in Online Writing Instruction. (2011). Initial report of the CCCC committee for best practices in online writing instruction (OWI). [The State-of-the-Art of OWI Report](#).
- CCCC Committee for Best Practices in Online Writing Instruction. (2014). A position statement of principles and example effective practices for online writing instruction (OWI). Retrieved from Urbana, IL: <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples>
- Harris, et al. (Eds.) (2019). *Bedford Bibliography of Research in Online Writing Instruction*.
- Haswell, R.H. (2005). NCTE/CCCC's recent war on scholarship. *Written Communication*, 22(2), pp. 198-223. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088305275367>

# Appendix A: 2021 Survey Questions

## 2021 Survey Questions State of the Art of Online Writing Instruction

### Background

1. Do you consent to this survey?

- Yes
- No

2. In online instruction, there are many definitions that describe how instructors teach in digital spaces. Please read the following definitions and consider them for your teaching situation and for the purposes of this survey. Indicate how often you teach in each of these modalities. (Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)

**Face-to-Face/Onsite:** Instruction is delivered through real-time interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus.

**Online Synchronous:** Instruction is delivered through real-time interaction with set meeting times via video conferencing software. There is no interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus.

**Online Asynchronous:** Instruction is delivered through a digitally-mediated platform (such as a learning management system) with no real-time interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus.

**Hybrid/Blended:** Instruction is delivered through both real-time interaction (with or without physical presence) and an asynchronous digitally-mediated platform environment (such as a learning management system).

**Hyflex:** Instruction is delivered in multiple modes and students and instructors can choose how they participate. Hyflex modes can include: face-to-face/onsite instruction, online synchronous instruction, online asynchronous instruction, and/or hybrid/blended instruction. The definition of hyflex varies by institution. This digitally-mediated instructional mode term originated during the COVID-19 pandemic.

3. We understand that many people teach across many modalities but for the purposes of this survey specifically we are asking you to identify what you feel is your **primary** teaching modality from the options below based on the definitions above in question 2.

- Face-to-Face/Onsite
- Online Synchronous
- Online Asynchronous
- Hybrid/Blended
- Hyflex

4. Please check all that apply

- I am a graduate teaching assistant
- I am an adjunct instructor/professor
- I am a full-time non-tenure track instructor/professor
- I am a tenure-track professor
- I am a tenured professor
- I am an administrator
- Other (please specify)

5. How many total years have you been teaching (please include all teaching experience)?

- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7 or more years

6. How many total years have you been teaching online writing courses?

- I had not taught online prior to the COVID-19 pandemic
- 2-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7 or more years

7. At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.

- 2-year community college
- 4-year college
- 4-year university
- 2- or 4-years graduate school
- Professional school
- For-profit institution
- Non-profit institution
- Completely online
- Traditional, brick & mortar with some online courses
- Other (please specify)

## Institutional History

8. What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.

- Integrated reading and writing
- Basic writing
- Co-requisite writing
- First-year writing
- Professional/technical writing
- Advanced academic writing
- Creative writing
- Writing-intensive courses in other disciplines
- Writing courses for non-native speakers of English
- Other, please specify

9. How many students are enrolled in your online writing courses?

- 10 or fewer per course
- 11-20 per course
- 21-30 per course
- 31-40 per course
- 41-50 per course
- More than 50
- I don't know

## Course Activities and Elements

10. What elements do your online/hybrid/blended course(s) include? Please check all that apply.

- Announcements/email through the learning management system
- Synchronous meetings discussion
- Asynchronous meetings discussion
- Synchronous peer response workshops (discussion forums or individually assigned peer reviews)
- Asynchronous peer response workshops (breakout rooms, small group meetings, pairing off during class)
- External peer response spaces (Eli Review, Google Suite, etc.)

- Synchronous group work
- Asynchronous group work
- Reading response discussion (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Reading response short essays (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Student facilitation and/or presentation
- Synchronous student conferences
- Asynchronous student conferences
- Collaborative writing (synchronous or asynchronous)
- Other, please specify

11. Which of the following statements are true for you? Check all that apply.

- I was given a pre-designed course
- I was given a course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example, changed assignments)
- I worked alone to design the online components of my course
- I have participated in formal training for online teaching
- I have participated in formal training for online course design
- I am considered an expert in online course design
- I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course
- I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface
- I am considered an expert in the content of the course
- Course designs are unique to individual instructors
- Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tool generated by the instructor/course development team

12. Please indicate the extent to which the following virtual tools and online teaching strategies are used in your writing course(s). (Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)

- Online distribution of course materials, use of learning management system, or other online platform such Google Drive
- Learning modules designed by course instructor/department
- Learning modules designed for the campus (perhaps by Library, Honor System, or Center for Teaching and Learning)
- Video lectures
- Instructional videos
- Lectures via PowerPoint orf MSWord documents
- Links to websites

- Audio modules
- Instructor-designed quizzes/exams
- Audio feedback
- Video feedback
- Multimodal student submissions (non-text based student responses to assignment prompts) (e.g., Voicethread, Kaltura, Images, Websites, etc.)
- Responses to student work using LMS feedback tools (commenting, highlighting, strikethrough, etc.)
- Course website outside of course management system (e.g. Wordpress, Weebly, Google Sites/Classroom)
- Wikis
- Blogs
- Social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, or Instagram
- AI - augmented reality
- Virtual reality
- Mobile devices/smartphones
- Synchronous video tools (Zoom, Google Meet, Webex, MS Teams)
- Interaction through third-party tools (i.e., Slack, Discord).
- Interaction through LMS tools (messaging, chat, etc.)

13. What other activities and/or elements, if any, do you use in your courses?

14. What other elements/tools, if any, do you use in your courses?

## Pedagogy Influences

15. How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.

- Subject area expert
- Faculty collaboration
- Consulting research
- Student-needs surveys
- Other, please specify

16. Which of the following pedagogical or theoretical principles, if any, are most important in your online teaching of writing? Select no more than three (3).

- Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas
- Writing is a social process
- Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion
- Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response

- Writing is a process
- Writing and revising are recursive acts
- Writing and revising are generative acts
- Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement
- Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important

## Tutoring

17. What supplemental online writing instruction or online writing tutoring opportunities, if any, exist at your institution? Please check all that apply.

- Resources/guidelines available for students to consult (on citing sources, proofreading, etc.)
- Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting
- Writing center consultants available online in real-time
- Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies
- Turnitin or other plagiarism detection services
- Other, please specify

18. Please indicate which of the following resources are available on your campus. Please check all that apply.

- Writing Center: Online text-based resources
- Writing Center: Online video resources
- Writing Center: Online scheduling
- Writing Center: Face-to-face appointments
- Writing Center: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with tutor
- Writing Center: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with tutor
- Library: Online resources
- Library: Online text-based resources
- Library: Online audio resources
- Library: Online video resources
- Library: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with librarian
- Library: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with librarian
- Other, please specify

## Student Experience

19. What expectations are set with students about taking these online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

- Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, LMS technologies (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)
- Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions
- Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments
- Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)
- Completion of course requirements
- Peer review
- Informed participation in online discussions
- Productive facilitation of online discussion
- I don't know
- Other, please specify

20. In what delivery formats does your program/course offer a student orientation to online courses? Please check all that apply.

- Face-to-face
- Face-to-face and asynchronously
- Asynchronously
- Audio/video
- We/I don't offer it because another program on our campus handles it
- We/I don't offer it
- Other, please specify

21. Which of the following describe technology adoption and use in your classroom? Check all that apply.

- I consider myself adept with using learning technologies.
- I regularly test new technologies in my classroom.
- I avoid adding new technologies because I don't feel comfortable with them.
- I have the freedom to adopt new technologies as I deem appropriate.
- I must get approval from my administration before I adopt new technologies in my classroom.
- I enjoy adopting new technologies.

- My university limits the technologies we can use.
- I only use university-supported technologies.
- I choose technologies that enhance student engagement.
- I limit technologies to protect student online privacy.
- I limit technologies to protect instructor online privacy
- I limit technologies to enhance student accessibility.
- I limit technologies to enhance instructor accessibility.
- Cost

22. How, if in any way at all, are student course-related problems addressed in your online course? Please check all that apply.

- Community building activities early/across the semester
- Incorporating media that allow students to have some other encounters with each other (building personal web-pages so students can “see” what classmates look like, for example)
- Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong)
- Instructor office hours in chat room
- Informal portions of discussion board
- Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly
- Other, please specify

23. What strategies are used to accommodate students who are English language learners?

- More asynchronous delivery
- More text-based communication
- More audio-based communication
- Providing more instructions and/or feedback in more than one mode
- I do not have ELL students
- Other, please specify

24. To what extent are your online writing courses accessible to students with various disabilities (ADA compliant)?

- Highly Accessible
- Somewhat Accessible
- Minimally Accessible
- Not Accessible
- I don't know

25. Does your institution provide guidance on how to make online writing courses accessible to your disabled students (ADA compliant)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

26. What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities? (open-ended)

27. What strategies do you use to ensure access for all types of learners in the online writing courses you teach? (ELL, students with physical challenges, students with learning challenges, etc.) Check all that apply.

- Providing content in multiple formats for multiple learning styles
- Video Captioning
- Transcripts
- Universal Design
- User-Centered Design
- Other, please specify

28. What are your major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities?

29. What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in online settings?

30. In your experience, what are the greatest opportunities for students who are instructed in online settings? Please check all that apply.

- Opportunity to develop writing through writing
- Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time
- Participating in written discussions
- Flexibility in terms of time
- Flexibility in terms of location
- Student facilitation and/or presentation
- Recorded student conferences
- Collaborative writing
- Other, please specify

31. What measures has your institution, your department, and you as an instructor taken to address diversity, equity and inclusivity issues *specifically* in online writing classes?

- Training in accessible digital design
- Guest speakers who are / represent BIPOC populations
- Anti-racist statements
- Anti-racist workshops/training
- Other, please specify

## Instructor Experience

32. What expectations are set with the faculty who teach online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.

- Teachers will develop a pedagogically sound online course
- Teachers will provide reasonable support to students for succeeding in the online environment
- Online office hours will be required
- On-campus responsibilities will exist
- Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected
- Faculty will be observed one or more times during a term
- Other, please specify

33. What types of orientation/training activities, if any, do faculty receive for these online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.

- Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)
- Online faculty development course(s) in OWI offered through your department
- Online faculty development webinar(s) in OWI offered through your department
- On-going workshops on various aspects of learning management systems (e.g., (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)
- Access to an instructional designer (at the department and/or college levels)
- Training on how to personalize a pre-designed course or master course (shared curriculum) at the department and/or college levels.
- Mandatory training
- Optional training

- Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members
- Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online
- Other, please specify

34. How many hours of training in OWI did you receive as part of your formal faculty training?

- Between 1 and 5 hours
- Between 6 and 10 hours
- More than 10 hours
- I did not receive any OWI specific training
- Other, please specify

35. How much do you earn per hour for your faculty training?

- Under \$15/hr
- \$15-\$30/hr
- \$30-\$50/hr
- Over \$50/hr
- I do not receive payment for training
- I did not receive any OWI specific training

36. Rank the parts of training that you find most and least helpful (most helpful being 1).

- Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)
- On-going workshops on various aspects of learning management system (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)
- Use of a dedicated instructional designer (at the department and college levels)
- Teachers developing an online course to be offered to students who are not already enrolled on campus also have a designer available to them via Extended Education and Outreach (another entity on campus)
- Mandatory training
- Optional training
- Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members
- Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online

37. What other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction? (open-ended)

38. Rate what you perceive to be the importance of qualities below for an online writing instructor at your institution: [Very important, Important, Not Important, or Very Unimportant)

- Overall comfort with technology
- Technical proficiency with the interfaces available at our campus
- Advanced web design skills
- Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best ones for a pedagogical purpose
- Ability to establish a presence online
- Skills in designing “lecture” delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital video, learning module)
- Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines
- Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects
- Skills in teaching rhetorical principles
- Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection
- Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning
- Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles
- Willingness to follow-up with students promptly
- Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning
- Participation in an active community of online teachers

39. What do you like about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

- Flexibility in scheduling
- No commute
- More focus on students’ writing and skills and less emphasis on students’ personalities in a way that can lead to favoritism in face-to-face classes
- Other, expand on your answer

40. What do you dislike about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

- Anticipating student problems
- Dealing with technical problems
- Managing large class size that is sometimes given to online teachers because physical space is not a limitation
- Other, expand on your answer

41. In what context do you most prefer to teach writing?

- Asynchronous Online/Remote
- Synchronous Online/Remote
- Onsite
- Blended/hybrid (both synchronous and asynchronous components)
- I am open to any or all of these contexts

42. Based on your response to question 41, If you had a choice, would you continue teaching in the modality you preferred?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
- Other (open-ended)

## Continued Participation

43. What communities do you participate in that are directly focused on developing your OWI pedagogy and/or practice? (check all that apply).

- The Cs OWI Standing Group
- The Online Writing Instruction Community
- The Global Society of Online Literacy Educators
- The Online Writing Centers Community
- The Online Learning Consortium
- Quality Matters
- Other \_\_\_\_\_(fill in)

44. If you are willing to participate in a follow-up phone call or email exchange, please provide a phone number and/or email address. (takes participant to a new survey so that their survey responses remain anonymous)

# Appendix B: 2021 Survey Results

## 2021 Survey Results

Below are the results of the 2021 State of the Art of OWI survey. Responses for all open-ended questions can be found in Appendix C.

### Background/Institutional History (Q1-9)

<p><b>Q1: Do you consent to this survey?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>We had 285 participants consenting to the survey, but not all who consented actually completed the survey.</p>

<p><b>Q2: In online instruction, there are many definitions that describe how instructors teach in digital spaces. Please read the following definitions and consider them for your teaching situation and for the purposes of this survey. Indicate how often you teach in each of these modalities.</b></p>					
	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Occasionally</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Total</b>
Face-to-Face/On site	148 (63%)	46 (20%)	18 (8%)	22 (9%)	234 (100%)
Online Synchronous	55 (24%)	78 (34%)	47 (20%)	50 (22)	230 (100%)
Online Asynchronous	135 (58%)	57 (24%)	27 (12%)	14 (6%)	233 (100%)
Hybrid/Blended	55 (24%)	58 (25%)	54 (23%)	64 (28%)	231 (100%)
Hyflex	14 (6%)	21 (9%)	43 (19%)	144 (65%)	222 (100%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.</p>					

<b>Q3: We understand that many people teach across many modalities but for the purposes of this survey specifically we are asking you to identify what you feel is your primary teaching modality from the options below based on the definitions above in question 2.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Face-to-Face/Onsite	90 (38%)
Online Synchronous	30 (13%)
Online Asynchronous	80 (34%)
Hybrid/Blended	30 (13%)
Hyflex	5 (2%)
Total	235 (100%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q4: Please check all that apply</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Graduate Teaching Assistant	19 (8%)
Adjunct Instructor/Professor	38 (16%)
Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Instructor/Professor	79 (34%)
Tenure-Track Professor	39 (17%)
Tenured Professor	60 (26%)
Administrator	30 (13%)
Other	6 (3%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.	

To review survey responses for those who chose the “other” option, please see Appendix D.

<b>Q5: How many total years have you been teaching (please include all teaching experience)?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
1-3 years	14 (6%)
4-6 years	11 (5%)
7 or more years	210 (90%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q6: How many total years have you been teaching online writing courses?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
I had not taught online prior to the COVID-19 pandemic	53 (23%)
2-3 years	26 (11%)
4-6 years	47 (20%)
7 or more years	109 (47%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q7: At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.</b>	
2-year community college	71 (30%)
4-year college	22 (9%)
4-year university	148 (64%)

2- or 4-years graduate school	28 (12%)
Professional school	5 (2%)
For-profit institution	7 (3%)
Non-profit institution	60 (26%)
Completely online institution	9 (4%)
Traditional brick and mortar institution with some online courses	73 (31%)
Other (please list institution's name)	6 (3%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix I.</p>	

<b>Q8: What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Integrated reading and writing	32 (14%)
Basic Writing	40 (17%)
Co-requisite writing	38 (16%)
First-year writing	185 (79%)
Professional/technical writing	121 (51%)
Advanced academic writing	74 (31%)
Creative Writing	23 (10%)
Writing-intensive courses in other disciplines	34 (14%)
Writing courses for non-native speakers of English	10 (4%)
Other, please specify	37 (16%)

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.

To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.

<b>Q9: How many students are enrolled in your online writing courses?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
10 or fewer per course	2 (1%)
11-20 per course	81 (34%)
21-30 per course	141 (60%)
31-40 per course	4 (2%)
41-50 per course	0 (0%)
More than 50	6 (3%)
I don't know	1 (0.4%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.	

## Course Activities and Elements (Q 10-14)

<b>Q10: What elements do your online/hybrid/blended course(s) include? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Peer response groups	189 (80%)
Announcements/email through the learning management system	202 (86%)
Synchronous meetings discussion	143 (61%)
Asynchronous meetings discussion	168 (72%)

Synchronous peer response workshops (breakout rooms, small group meetings, pairing off during class)	103 (44%)
Asynchronous peer response workshops (discussion forums or individually assigned peer reviews)	186 (79%)
External peer response spaces (Eli Review, Google Suite, etc.)	56 (24%)
Synchronous group work	99 (42%)
Asynchronous group work	123 (52%)
Reading response discussion (synchronous or asynchronous)	189 (80%)
Reading response short essays (synchronous or asynchronous)	105 (44%)
Student facilitation and/or presentation	106 (45%)
Synchronous student conferences	154 (66%)
Asynchronous student conferences	62 (26%)
Collaborative writing (synchronous or asynchronous)	110 (47%)
Other, please specify	10 (4%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix I.</p>	

<b>Q11: Which of the following statements are true for you? Check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
I was given a pre-designed course	45 (19%)
I was given a course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example, changed assignments)	90 (38%)

I worked alone to design the online components of my course	175 (75%)
I have participated in formal training for online teaching	177 (76%)
I have participated in formal training for online course design	162 (69%)
I am considered an expert in online course design	69 (29%)
I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course	43 (18%)
I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface	80 (34%)
I am considered an expert in the content of the course	154 (66%)
Course designs are unique to individual instructors	132 (56%)
Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tool generated by the instructor/course development team	63 (27%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q12: Please indicate the extent to which the following virtual tools and online teaching strategies are used in your writing course(s). (Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)</b>					
	<b>Frequently</b>	<b>Occasionally</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Total</b>
Online distribution of course materials, use of learning management system, or other online platform such Google Drive	220 (94%)	11 (5%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	234

Learning modules designed by course instructor/department	190 (82%)	25 (11%)	7 (3%)	11 (5%)	233
Learning modules designed for the campus (perhaps by Library, Honor System, or Center for Teaching and Learning)	15 (7%)	52 (23%)	74 (33%)	83 (37%)	224
Video lectures	69 (30%)	83 (36%)	47 (21%)	30 (13%)	229
Instructional videos	76 (33%)	109 (47%)	39 (17%)	8 (3%)	232
Lectures via PowerPoint or MSWord documents	76 (33%)	69 (30%)	46 (20%)	36 (16%)	227
Links to websites	182 (78%)	45 (19%)	6 (3%)	0 (0%)	233
Audio modules	26 (12%)	38 (17%)	78 (35%)	80 (36%)	222
Instructor-designed quizzes/exams	55 (24%)	43 (19%)	59 (26%)	70 (31%)	227
Audio feedback	26 (12%)	33 (15%)	59 (27%)	104 (47%)	222
Video feedback	23 (10%)	40 (18%)	64 (29%)	95 (43%)	222
Multimodal student submissions (non-text based student responses to assignment prompts) (e.g., Voicethread, Kaltura, Images, Websites, etc.)	74 (32%)	77 (34%)	43 (19%)	35 (15%)	229

Responses to student work using LMS feedback tools (commenting, highlighting, strikethrough, etc.)	168 (73%)	30 (13%)	14 (6%)	19 (8%)	231
Course website outside of course management system (e.g. Wordpress, Weebly, Google Sites/Classroom)	30 (13%)	46 (20%)	47 (21%)	105 (46%)	228
Wikis	3 (1%)	25 (11%)	45 (20%)	151 (67%)	224
Blogs	13 (6%)	28 (12%)	60 (27%)	124 (55%)	225
Social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, or Instagram	7 (3%)	25 (11%)	47 (21%)	145 (65%)	224
AI - augmented reality	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	13 (6%)	208 (93%)	224
Virtual reality	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	11 (5%)	208 (93%)	222
Mobile devices/smartphones	41 (18%)	53 (24%)	65 (29%)	66 (30%)	225
Synchronous video tools (Zoom, Google Meet, Webex, MS Teams)	125 (54%)	69 (30%)	27 (12%)	12 (5%)	233
Interaction through third-party tools (i.e., Slack, Discord).	20 (9%)	25 (11%)	44 (20%)	135 (60%)	224
Interaction through LMS tools (messaging, chat, etc.)	119 (52%)	53 (23%)	27 (12%)	32 (14%)	232

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.

**Q13: What other activities and/or elements, if any, do you use in your courses?**

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 76 people responded to this question.

Representative quotes from respondent answers:

“As few as possible. While tech is important, the PDC I was given is more like teaching tech than Eng/FYW. Basically, there's too much tech going on and it complicated transition from high school to college, and for non-traditional adults returning to college.”

To view participant responses in detail to this open-ended question, please see Appendix C.

The following word cloud provides a brief overview of the most frequently used words in the responses.



**Q14: What other elements/tools, if any, do you use in your courses?**

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 78 people responded to this question.

To provide a brief overview of the most frequently used words in the responses, here is a representative word cloud.

To view participant responses in detail to this open-ended question, please see Appendix C.



## Pedagogy Influences (Q15 & 16)

<b>Q15: How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Subject area expert	176 (77%)
Faculty collaboration	153 (67%)
Consulting research	91 (40%)
Student-needs surveys	79 (34%)
Other, please specify	33 (14%)

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 229 people responded to this question.

To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.

<b>Q16: Which of the following pedagogical or theoretical principles, if any, are most important in your online teaching of writing? Select no more than 3.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas	45 (19%)
Writing is a social process	89 (38%)
Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion	183 (78%)
Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response	2 (1%)
Writing is a process	124 (53%)
Writing and revising are recursive acts	110 (47%)
Writing and revising are generative acts	71 (30%)
Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement	52 (22%)
Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important	22 (9%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.	

## Tutoring (Q17 & 18)

<b>Q17: What supplemental online writing instruction or online writing tutoring opportunities, if any, exist at your institution? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
--	---------------------------

Resources/guidelines available for students to consult (on citing sources, proofreading, etc.)	205 (88%)
Writing center consultants available online in real-time	199 (86%)
Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting	189 (81%)
Outsourced writing tutor with commercial companies	47 (20%)
Turnitin or other plagiarism detection services	153 (66%)
Other	11 (5%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 232 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix I.</p>	

<b>Q18: Please indicate which of the following writing center resources are available on your campus. Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Writing Center: Online text-based resources	172 (74%)
Writing Center: Online video resources	117 (50%)
Writing Center: Online scheduling	208 (90%)
Writing Center: Face-to-face appointments	203 (88%)
Writing Center: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with tutor	178 (77%)
Writing Center: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with tutor	158 (68%)
Library: Online resources	223 (96%)
Library: Online text-based resources	206 (89%)
Library: Online audio resources	119 (51%)
Library: Online video resources	180 (78%)

Library: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with librarian	188 (81%)
Library: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with librarian	177 (76%)
Other	9 (4%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 232 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

## Student Experience (Q19-31)

<b>Q19: What expectations are set with students about taking these online writing courses? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, Blackboard®, etc.)	228 (97%)
Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions	185 (78%)
Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments	132 (56%)
Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)	215 (91%)
Completion of course requirements	221 (94%)
Peer review	184 (78%)
Informed participation in online discussions	174 (74%)
Productive facilitation of online discussion	73 (31%)
I don't know	2 (1%)

Other, please specify	13 (6%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 235 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q20: In what delivery formats does your program/course offer a student orientation to online courses? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Face-to-face	18 (8%)
Face-to-face and asynchronously	30 (13%)
Asynchronously	83 (36%)
Audio/video	59 (26%)
We/I don't offer it because another program on our campus handles it	48 (21%)
We/I don't offer it	51 (22%)
Other, please specify	34 (15%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 230 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q21: Which of the following describe technology adoption and use in your classroom? Check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
I consider myself adept with using learning technologies.	192 (82%)
I regularly test new technologies in my classroom.	119 (51%)

I avoid adding new technologies because I don't feel comfortable with them.	14 (6%)
I have the freedom to adopt new technologies as I deem appropriate.	195 (83%)
I must get approval from my administration before I adopt new technologies in my classroom.	12 (6%)
I enjoy adopting new technologies.	109 (47%)
My university limits the technologies we can use.	24 (10%)
I only use university-supported technologies.	39 (17%)
I choose technologies that enhance student engagement.	163 (70%)
I limit technologies to protect student online privacy.	82 (35%)
I limit technologies to protect instructor online privacy	41 (18%)
I limit technologies to enhance student accessibility.	106 (46%)
I limit technologies to enhance instructor accessibility.	39 (17%)
Cost	85 (36%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q22: How, if in any way at all, are student course-related problems addressed in your online course? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Community building activities early/across the semester	144 (62%)
Incorporating media that allow students to have some other encounters with each other (building personal web-pages so students can “see” what classmates look like, for example)	87 (37%)
Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong)	164 (70%)

Instructor office hours in chat room	138 (59%)
Informal portions of discussion board	109 (47%)
Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly	93 (40%)
Other, please specify	33 (14%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q23: What strategies are used to accommodate students who are English language learners? Check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
More asynchronous delivery	54 (24%)
More text-based communication	84 (37%)
More audio-based communication	32 (14%)
Providing more instructions and/or feedback in more than one mode	136 (60%)
I do not have ELL students	46 (20%)
Other, please specify	36 (16%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 227 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q24: To what extent are your online writing courses accessible to students with various disabilities (ADA compliant)?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>

Highly Accessible	112 (48%)
Somewhat Accessible	103 (44%)
Minimally Accessible	4 (2%)
Not Accessible	0 (0%)
I don't know	15 (6%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q25: Does your institution provide guidance on how to make online writing courses accessible to your disabled students (ADA compliant)?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Yes	170 (73%)
No	34 (15%)
I don't know	28 (12%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 232 people responded to this question.	

**Q26: What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities?**

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 171 people responded to this question.

To provide a brief overview of the most frequently used words in the responses, here is a representative word cloud.

To view participant responses in detail to this open-ended question, please see Appendix D.







Flexibility in terms of time	200 (85%)
Flexibility in terms of location	218 (93%)
Student facilitation and/or presentation	39 (17%)
Recorded student conferences	27 (12%)
Collaborative writing	83 (35%)
Other, please specify	17 (7%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 234 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q31: What measures has your institution, your department, and you as an instructor taken to address diversity, equity and inclusivity issues specifically in online writing classes? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Training in accessible digital design	130 (60%)
Guest speakers who are / represent BIPOC populations	104 (48%)
Anti-racist statements	139 (64%)
Anti-racist workshops/training	152 (70%)
Other, please specify	37 (17%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 216 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

## Instructor Experience (Q32-42)

<b>Q32: What expectations are set with the faculty who teach these courses? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Teachers will develop a pedagogically sound online course	177 (82%)
Teachers will provide reasonable support to students for succeeding in the online environment	200 (93%)
Online office hours will be required	140 (65%)
On-campus responsibilities will exist	58 (27%)
Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected	148 (69%)
Faculty will be observed one or more times during a term	53 (25%)
Other, please specify	21 (10%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 215 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option (10%), please see Appendix I.</p>	

<b>Q33: What types of orientation/training activities, if any, do faculty receive for these online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)	52 (24%)
Online faculty development course(s) in OWI offered through your department	80 (38%)

Online faculty development webinar(s) in OWI offered through your department	62 (29%)
On-going workshops on various aspects of learning management systems (e.g., (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)	164 (77%)
Access to an instructional designer (at the department and/or college levels)	147 (69%)
Training on how to personalize a pre-designed course or master course (shared curriculum) at the department and/or college levels.	60 (28%)
Mandatory training	61 (29%)
Optional training	137 (64%)
Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members	52 (24%)
Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online	6 (3%)
Other, please specify	20 (9%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 213 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option (9%), please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q34: How many hours of training in OWI did you receive as part of your formal faculty training?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Between 1 and 5 hours	33 (16%)
Between 6 and 10 hours	42 (20%)
More than 10 hours	40 (19%)
I did not receive any OWI specific training	56 (27%)

Other, please specify	36 (17%)
To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option (17%), please see Appendix I.	

<b>Q35: How much do you earn per hour for your faculty training?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Under \$15/hr	7 (3%)
\$15-\$30/hr	11 (5%)
\$30-\$50/hr	9 (4%)
Over \$50/hr	1 (1%)
I do not receive payment for training	126 (59%)
I did not receive any OWI specific training	58 (27%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 212 people responded to this question.	

<b>Q36: Rank the parts of training that you find most (8) and least (1) helpful</b>								
	<b>1</b> Least helpful	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b> Most helpful
Summer institute for online teaching	29 (17%)	24 (14%)	20 (12%)	21 (12%)	22 (13%)	24 (14%)	21 (12%)	12 (7%)
On-going workshops	24 (14%)	42 (24%)	42 (24%)	32 (18%)	15 (9%)	11 (6%)	5 (3%)	2 (1%)
Use of a dedicated	20 (12%)	26 (15%)	34 (20%)	34 (20%)	32 (18%)	14 (8%)	9 (5%)	4 (2%)

instructional designer								
Teachers ... have a designer available to them	2 (1%)	3 (2%)	13 (8%)	17 (10%)	26 (15%)	32 (18%)	35 (20%)	45 (26%)
Mandatory training	30 (17%)	15 (9%)	6 (3%)	19 (11%)	24 (14%)	21 (12%)	33 (19%)	25 (14%)
Optional training	10 (6%)	13 (8%)	21 (12%)	18 (10%)	25 (14%)	32 (18%)	21 (12%)	33 (19%)
Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members	27 (16%)	26 (15%)	18 (10%)	22 (13%)	16 (9%)	24 (14%)	32 (18%)	8 (5%)
Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online	31 (18%)	24 (14%)	19 (11%)	10 (6%)	13 (8%)	15 (9%)	17 (10%)	44 (25%)

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 173 people responded to this question.

**Q37: What other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction?**

Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 85 people responded to this question.

To provide a brief overview of the most frequently used words in the responses, here is a representative word cloud.



pedagogical purpose (n=215)				
Ability to establish a presence online (n=215)	138 (65%)	64 (30%)	8 (4%)	2 (1%)
Skills in designing “lecture” delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital, video, learning module) (n=214)	62 (29%)	121 (57%)	27 (13%)	2 (1%)
Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines (n=216)	158 (74%)	50 (23%)	6 (3%)	0 (0%)
Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects (n=214)	59 (28%)	100 (47%)	47 (22%)	6 (3%)
Skills in teaching rhetorical principles (n=214)	129 (61%)	65 (31%)	17 (8%)	1 (1%)
Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection (n=216)	116 (54%)	83 (39%)	14 (7%)	1 (1%)
Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning (n=215)	46 (22%)	102 (48%)	59 (28%)	6 (3%)
Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles (n=216)	108 (50%)	87 (41%)	16 (7%)	3 (1%)
Willingness to follow-up with students promptly (n=215)	169 (79%)	43 (20%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)

Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning (n=215)	61 (29%)	104 (49%)	38 (18%)	10 (5%)
Participation in an active community of online teachers (n=216)	45 (21%)	110 (51%)	46 (21%)	13 (6%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 214 people responded to this question.				

<b>Q39: What do you like about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Flexibility in scheduling	165 (77%)
No commute	147 (69%)
More focus on students' writing and skills and less emphasis on students' personalities in a way that can lead to favoritism in face-to-face classes	85 (40%)
Other, expand your answer	63 (29%)
Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 214 people responded to this question.	
To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option (29%), please see Appendix D.	

<b>Q40: What do you dislike about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Anticipating student problems	45 (22%)
Dealing with technical problems	107 (52%)
Managing large class size that is sometimes given to online teachers because physical space is not a limitation	64 (31%)

Other, expand on your answer	96 (46%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 207 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option (46%), please see Appendix D.</p>	

<b>Q41: In what context do you most prefer to teach writing?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Asynchronous Online/Remote	45 (21%)
Synchronous Online/Remote	19 (9%)
Onsite (face-to-face)	51 (24%)
Blended/hybrid (both synchronous and asynchronous components)	29 (13%)
I am open to any or all of these contexts	73 (34%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 217 people responded to this question.</p>	

<b>Q42: Based on your response to question 41, if you had a choice, would you continue teaching in the modality you preferred?</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
Yes	174 (80%)
No	4 (2%)
I don't know	15 (7%)
Other, please specify	24 (11%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 217 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option (11%), please see Appendix I.</p>	

## Continued Participation

<b>Q43: What communities do you participate in that are directly focused on developing your OWI pedagogy and/or practice? (check all that apply)</b>	<b>Total (Percentage)</b>
The Cs OWI Standing Group	29 (19%)
The Online Writing Instruction Community	81 (53%)
The Global Society of Online Literacy Educators	67 (44%)
The Online Writing Centers Community	15 (10%)
The Online Learning Consortium	17 (11%)
Quality Matters	50 (33%)
Other____(fill in)	24 (16%)
<p>Of the 235 respondents who completed 50% or more of the survey, 152 people responded to this question.</p> <p>To review survey respondents' answers for those who chose the "other" option, please see Appendix D.</p>	

<p><b>Q44: If you are willing to participate in a follow-up phone call or email exchange, please provide a phone number and/or email address.</b></p> <p>This question took participants to a new survey using a Google Form so that their survey responses remained anonymous. This question was voluntary/optional if participants wanted to be a part of further research, including the possibility of interviews and focus groups.</p> <p>Of the 291 survey participants 87 people shared their names and contact information for a follow-up meeting or email exchange.</p>
---

# Appendix C: Responses to 2021 Survey

## Open-Ended Questions

Responses have been de-identified to protect respondent identity and fulfill our IRB requirements.

### Open-Ended Q13 Responses

Q13: What other activities and/or elements, if any, do you use in your courses?

- SCORM tutorials (library created) for information literacy
- Mixed modality compositions
- Google Hangouts
- Canva
- Online research tools and online tutoring
- Wikipedia Editing, Canva ePortfolios
- Calendar
- Client-based experiences (service-learning and community engaged learning)
- I primarily use an external website to host my courses. I use my LMS only for grades and mass emails/communication. Students are required to use many different kinds of digital media - infographics, website building, free video making/editing software etc.
- You've covered tons. I wanted to explain that I feel some resentment to course management templates/tools because I've been augmenting my classes with email, class listservs, and social media for years. For me, some of the bells and whistles (required rubric, etc.) are just not what I want. That said, I always learn from faculty workshops with our eLearning department. Just trying to offer context for some of my answers.
- Invention Materials are posted on weekly discussion boards where students interact and support one another's project development and process.
- Research assignments
- I use Google Docs to facilitate in-class writing.
- Asynchronous discussion response activities on Canvas and Blackboard.
- Weekly video course overviews
- I think you've covered all of them.
- A few resources and one module (on design accessibility) from Canvas Commons

- We frequently do group work in breakout rooms. In creative writing, we do Zoom writing workshops. In advanced composition, we use Canva to make infographics (multimodal composition).
- writing assignments
- It really depends on the course. One other thing I used recently is Perusall for collaborative annotation of readings.
- Google Drive like Docs and Slides are really important.
- students create accessible video and audio files; use Canva as a design tool
- Lots of email and messaging through the LMS!
- Lecture
- GroupMe, Remind
- Optional one-on-one video conferences; welcome videos that guide students through each week's coursework
- Synchronous breakout groups during video conferences; backchannel chats
- Interactive video and similar tools using Feedback Fruits, a learning tool available at one of the institutions where I teach. Online tools available through the textbook publisher, such as adaptive learning modules.
- Google Suite Applications primarily. Students submit all work through Google Docs and Google Drive.
- Social annotation (hypothesis)
- online reading apps
- Small group discussions
- Extensive feedback on written assignments
- Embedded tutors (synchronous and asynchronous options)
- self-evaluation through ppt and audio; Flipgrid for discussion responses
- Blackboard journal feature
- My students use discussion boards as a way to engage in and outside of class. They also do synchronous and asynchronous peer responses.
- Group work
- in person discussion--we actually talk
- Open source materials rather than having students purchase a textbook
- instructor created visual materials, collaborative documents actually used after creation
- document design
- Padlet, Kahoot
- FlipGrid; Zoom conferences (one-on-one with the student for feedback purposes); required writing center visits
- Perusall (annotation software) for readings
- padlet timeline, lumen videos that I create or the students create for presentations, flipgrid presentations on readings with student responses.

- pdf or word marking tools; the iPad for grading; online Zoom drop in hours; guest lectures (live and recorded)
- Discussion of readings using Google Docs comments
- Peer review and group work (scheduling student group meetings, sharing documents) through our LMS (Canvas), Students can choose whether to use Canvas for their group or use something like Discord. I use Zoom for virtual one-on-one meetings and virtual office hours.
- We rely heavily on LMS discussion boards during synch sessions and students work in breakout rooms in Zoom on a single post/response in the discussion board
- We use WhatsApp. We have a group chat for class
- I do a visual literacy activity using Padlet; I facilitate a lot of group work or collab writing via Google docs;
- Discussion forums
- Self-assessment quizzes
- graphic organizers, collaborative note taking in Google Docs
- Service learning with professionals in the field, discipline specific tools (Articulate, InDesign, etc)
- required meetings with college writing tutors; submission to online writing center integrated into Canvas
- Discussions are the most robust and prominent component of all my online courses
- This may have been covered above, but I ask students to check out my feedback and post a video "hot take" on what they learned. I also post assignments to discussion boards and ask students to post questions. Anyone in the class can answer.
- I use blogging, group-based peer-review via the blog, quizzes, assignments, instructional videos that I make on a just-in-time basis, links to externally-produced videos, external websites, external texts
- student-generated content for sharing
- google forms for post-class surveys,
- Guest speaker from inside and outside institution

## Open-Ended Q14 Responses

Q14: What other elements/tools, if any, do you use in your courses?

- Achieve
- Adobe Spark
- As few as possible. While tech is important, the PDC I was given is more like teaching tech than Eng/FYW. Basically, there's too much tech going on and it complicated transition from high school to college, and for non-traditional adults returning to college.
- Blackboard
- Blackboard journal feature
- Breakout rooms, screen sharing, recording for sick students
- Calendly for scheduling synchronous online individual meetings (though I stopped recently, too clunky)
- Discipline specific tools (tech comm)
- Discord for asynchronous discussion, Google Docs for file sharing, Eli Review for asynchronous workshopping, Hypothesis for asynchronous group annotation
- Email and reporting of student progress via an online platform
- Feedback Fruits for asynchronous peer review
- Flipgrid
- Flipgrid, Flipbooks, My poster
- Flipgrid, sometimes.
- Free infographic and document design tools like Piktochart and Canva, screenrecording software like Screencast-o-matic, online presentation software like Visme and Powtoon
- Google Chat, Google Docs, Google Meet, Google Slides (Google Workspace for Education)
- Google Drive Folders for sharing articles for the research project; Google Docs for synchronous small group work; Google Slides for mini-lectures
- Hypothesis for social annotation
- I LOVE Jamboards
- I use DVDs--either clips from movies or clips that I put on my own DVD.
- I use blogs, wikis, quizzes, and traditional formal writing assignments.
- I use sites that allow students to post questions or answers (depending on the prompt) anonymously. Sites like ideaboardz.
- Institutional email
- Integration with third-party textbook instructional platforms (McGraw-Hill's Connect)
- Jamboard
- Kami (social pdf editor)
- Lots of YouTube.
- Microsoft Word Track Changes

- Mostly I just use the elements/tools incorporated in our LMS (Canvas).
- My students use Feedback Fruits (a peer review interface) to participate in peer response workshops. They also use an online textbook and readings through Blackboard.
- OER materials
- OneDrive, Miro, Perusal, MS Teams
- Other interactive in-class writing and participation tools, like Padlet, Slido Polls, Kahoot. QR codes for easy viewing of documents, Remind text message system.
- Packback, Flipgrid
- Padlet
- Padlet = frequently for collaborative asynch and synch activities; video for student reflections; Discussion Board for peer review; I use Turnitin simply because the feedback studio is has so many ways to provide feedback;
- Padlet, TED Talks
- Polls, kahoots
- Polls, surveys
- Remind
- Social annotation (hypothesis)
- Teams or Zoom for office hours.
- Teams, Eli Review
- Tech comm-specific tools (i.e., Oxygen, UserTesting); visual design tools (i.e., InDesign, iStudio Publisher, Microsoft Publisher, Canva)
- Turnitin
- Twitch for live streaming video games and discussion
- Voicethread and Hypothesis
- We look at some of the citation generators, plagiarism detectors, and paraphrasing tools to figure out how we can help students engage with these tools as they teach students.
- We use bookcreator and Padlet, and Canva right now, but I change these up as I find out about new tools and spaces. Our university now has online access to Adobe suite tools, so we'll start using these this year.
- Website builders, sometimes.
- YouTube Studio-created videos.
- YouTube playlists for instructor-created videos
- a pdf annotation program; video recorder; clipping tool; pictures
- audacity, student-found tools for creating short video/audio
- collaborative annotation
- design tools: both free/open source (Canva, Piktochart, etc.) and industry-standard (Adobe Creative Suite)
- interactive games (Jeopardy PowerPoints, Fake News online game)
- links to certain sections of OER textbooks, including videos

- lots of free digital software including infographic makers, video makers, website makers etc.
- manual, exercises, rewriting existing technical reports
- open-access textbook
- padlet, mapping platforms (e.g., mindomo, bubbl), final portfolios composed and submitted in digication
- slack, Trello, Canva, OBS, Camtasia, mentimeter, audacity, HelpNDoc7, Project management tools

## Open-Ended Q26 Responses

Q26: What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities?

- Course is checked for compliance by university accessibility services
- Alt text, style headings, useful URL design, color contrast, timing flexibility
- Transcripts are provided for all videos, captions for pictures.
- I don't use any; I would like to learn more.
- Make sure all videos have captions, all text is presented in screen-readable format, tagging/using various "styles," avoiding red/green color combinations...
- Universal design for online learning
- I make accommodations to meet the needs of students who self-identify.
- documents (powerpoints, handouts) available through LMS both before and after class; recording of class with audio transcript/captioning; LMS analysis of accessibility for documents
- OCR-enabled PDFs, closed captioning/transcripts on videos, I ask them to let me know if something isn't accessible so I can fix it.
- I offer students more time to turn in work, make sure there are numerous ways to participate and don't require on the spot answers in Zoom chat for instance, I offer video, audio and text instructions when I can, as well as responses. My Canvas site is set up to easily access information and participate in multiple modes of composition.
- closed captions on all zoom meetings; uploading all slides/materials in advance to LMS; written instructions for all activities; ways to participate other than speaking (i.e. chat function; emoji reactions); greater time to complete assignments; intentional scaffolding of writing activities; attention to color/contrast in slide development; Alt-text of images
- Alt text for images, audio with assignment instructions. Accessible PDF, information on syllabus for Accessibility Office
- Universal design, multiple formats, accessible documents, use of captions when videos are required.
- multiple modes of accessing materials; invitation to submit in different modes/media
- I work closely with the disability office to meet students' needs
- Limit use of scanned documents (scan carefully so easier to read), use easy to access textbooks, provide feedback in typed rather than written forms
- I use the built-in LMS tools to check content availability and also use universal design principles when designing a course, curriculum, and specific materials.

- Tutor assist
- Connect with students via email to discuss accommodations and anything else that isn't a documented accommodation that would support their learning; upload documents as PDFs when possible; include links within documents and announcements embedded within the text of the sentence; post all class materials to weekly folders for students on LMS; post weekly overview for students within LMS that links to reading and assignments; make a weekly overview video each week; correct auto-generated captions before posting videos; provide content in multiple formats and reiterate instructions in several areas (within assignments, in announcements, in weekly overview video)
- I haven't received accommodation letters for students this semester! When I used to get accommodation letters for students, I follow accommodations in the letters.
- flexibility in all things
- I ask the student what their needs are first, then apply revisions to documentation and/or online delivery to accommodate those needs.
- overall flexibility
- alt tags, transcripts, make sure my curriculum is screen reader friendly
- Largely I work on a case-by-case basis with individual students, but typically students have required extensions, flexibility with deadlines; I ensure everything I publish online meets accessibility guidelines
- I make sure all videos have captions; I make sure all PDFs and websites are screen reader accessible. Asynchronous courses with flexible deadlines by nature are more accessible
- Ensure everything posted to the LMS is ADA compliant, per the trainings I have received and accessibility checker built into our LMS
- accessible documents, video materials, closed captioning of Zoom calls, and flexibility overall
- Accommodations rarely alter my strategies.
- Captioning PP and video, document design templates,
- Flexibility, in general. Captioning for video instruction, auto read-aloud option within Canvas for text-based instruction, larger font
- I encourage students to let me know about disabilities and will work with them even if they don't choose to register with the campus office. However, I also encourage students with disabilities to register with the campus Office for Students with Disabilities. Some students need more time, some students need a better understanding of JAWS or other text readers, some students need to not be in in-person groups, etc. I can convert texts, choose books that are available online, and encourage students to ask me questions.
- I ask the student what would help them most, and then try to provide it.

- Canvas accessibility features; accessible .pdf readings; course content available in multiple modes
- To the best of my ability, my course is accessibly formatted, but I make alterations as students raise accessibility concerns or I learn more about accessible practices from colleagues, professional development, and research.
- mix of text and graphics; use of college-wide tools for accessibility--I consult with our student learning specialist as needed for each one.
- Various modes, accessibility software, alt text, captions
- Flexible due dates; no tests or quizzes
- Enhanced outreach/one-on-one meetings and instruction.
- I work with students based on the accommodations that disability services itemizes.
- whatever is appropriate for the individual student
- I provide announcements and assignment instructions in both video and text formats. I vet technological tools to make sure that they will work for students with disabilities before I use them in class.
- Use text readers, captions, and image description tools when possible.
- I consult with our eLearning dept; I use whatever tools are built into technology; I collaborate with peers to determine accessibility; I follow up with students when I receive their accommodation letters to find out what instructors do that help them be successful in class to ensure I do that as well
- Post all materials to Blackboard in advance so that all materials are available in alternative formats.
- Video captioning; accessible PDFs and Word docs; sometimes transcripts
- Communication with the student directly and offering or using various formats as needed
- transcripts and closed captions
- These vary with the need/s of student/s
- ASL assistance / ODS accommodation
- Multiple modes for accessing information, encouragement of a variety of strategies, Blackboard Ally to improve accessibility, captioning/transcripts of all video content (no audio-only content)
- I handle these situations case-by-case; I've worked directly with the ADA department to work with deaf students, and I've ensured that text is easily adaptable and accessible in multiple forms for visually impaired students, etc.; I think this is hard to blanket answer, as disabilities comes in such a wide variety; handling this may be as simple as just offering extensions at times when students don't actually have ADA paperwork but demonstrate needing the assistance
- Multiple modes for accessing materials; high flexibility on due dates; infinite opportunities to revise work up until the last day of class.

- Some audio and video content, documents made accessible
- Use captioning for videos, alt tags for images, OCR for PDF documents
- I have posted class notes on LMS, I have recorded audio feedback.
- I don't honestly know that I do.
- Employing disability rhetorical theory and pedagogical practice strategies as described in a course I am taking along with information learned from CLCs and student-feedback.
- Built-in tools with LMS; took workshops outside of institution to learn
- UDOIT course review; testing accessibility of documents; communicating early in the semester my willingness to troubleshoot accessibility issues at any point
- Our LMS has an accessibility checker which evaluates each resource and provides a custom solution to make it accessible.
- Students may use screen readers, request additional time on assignments
- Closed captioning on videos, running instructions for assignments through a program that checks for accessibility, not having timed quizzes, ability to stop and start assignments as needed, all quizzes are open book...
- check accessibility through Word and make recommended adjustments like labeling tables and describing pictures, watching color choices and spacing, listening to audio dictates for confusion, closed-captioning
- All of my content meets ADA standards. I also work with individual students and the university's disability resource center to offer any additional accommodations.
- Students can seek an accommodation for any disability and then let me know so I can make accommodations. But everything we do is put online so students can access our content, our chats, our discussions, and videos.
- Make myself available to help them and all students. Regularly emphasize they should contact me with any problems.
- Alt text for images, Alternative formats for screen readers, Blackboard Ally tools, video captioning
- captioning all videos
- Captions, text + video modes for content, vary the type of activity and assignment, offering choices for assignment completion (e.g., write a paper or give a presentation)
- Multimodal approach to assignment deliverables; teach students how to make messages accessible across modes; collaborative note taking for class sessions; informal check ins with students throughout the class
- I provide transcripts of lectures, make sure that images have alt text, make sure that tables have headers that are tagged as headers and

that repeat across pages (if the table goes over a page break), provide instructor-generated captions for video lectures

- Formatting documents, using CC or a transcript on videos, limiting choices and # of clicks in the LMS.
- I assume all students need different ways to engage with the material, so I don't rely on letters from the ODS requesting accommodations for certain students.
- That depends on the student's needs.
- I offer instruction in multiple modes.
- Screen-reader friendly text; information repeated verbatim in many places in the LMS; carefully following disability serves accommodations guidelines
- Listen and ask
- I strive to follow UDL principles and WCAG. I strive to develop materials somewhat redundantly in different media and check for accessibility using various tools. Pedagogically, it's knowing that learners engage in a variety of ways, and I want them to have the best opportunities to learn and be able to apply what they have learned.
- Captioning of videos; recording of lessons
- We have students with so many different kinds of disabilities and try to adapt as needed with each student; we ask all students to tell us what kinds of accommodations would be helpful to them and thus do not make distinctions. That said, we are attentive to presenting material in different formats (written, video, audio; prose/powerpoint; graphic forms as well as prose forms, and so on). We also have structured our curricula to be scaffolded and we have \*all\* materials on our LMS so students with ADD/ADHD/short-term memory issues etc can find everything in one place.
- have not had students registered with disability services in recent courses
- Use of headings, image descriptions, and an LMS that has built-in accessibility tools. I also have alternative assignments prepared for students who cannot complete program-mandated multimodal assignments (i.e., a data narrative podcast instead of an infographic for students who have vision impairments).
- Universal design
- accommodations whenever required through student disability services
- Multimodal instruction, check websites for accessibility through WAVE, use style sheets, use embedded hyperlinks, include multiple forms of media (video, audio, transcript), design responsive classes for mobile devices
- Most formal approved disability requests ask for extra time on tests. I don't give tests, so don't make many actual accommodations.

- Ask what they need/prefer; check with Disability Services
- Courses have been evaluated by teaching excellence dept for Accessibility using QM model.
- Text-based, asynchronous materials, Quality Matters-influenced design elements, etc.
- I meet whatever their disability needs are. For example, the texts that were not available on audio, I recorded myself reading the texts for the student.
- a variety of accommodations managed by the disability office.
- Using the LMS compatibility checker, providing alternate text for images, captioning all videos, providing content in multiple formats
- Making sure that documents are accessible to e-readers and making sure that videos have closed captioning.
- We make accommodations
- See responses below
- Instructions/resources in multiple modalities
- I format documents in ADA-compliant ways, I provide flexible deadlines, I provide closed captions on videos and alternative descriptions on images, I do not engage in timed testing, I continue to learn about universal design and to try to implement it while also working to recognize the specificity of particular disabilities and the critiques of universal design offered by disability activists.
- engagement instead of participation, accessible course texts
- Multiple modes/formats, collaborative note taking, etc.
- alignments in Blackboard
- For accommodations our students are given, my course already accommodates students, so I can't think of anything that specifically targets these students.
- I teach to a variety of learning styles and do not deduct point for ELL grammar mistakes
- universal design
- Universal design is paramount.
- Meet the needs of the student and meet the required needs of accommodations
- I follow the nine guidelines for making web and course pages accessible offered by Educause at this link:  
<https://er.educause.edu/articles/2017/1/ada-compliance-for-online-courses-e-design>
- instructions and lectures in multiple modalities
- universal design
- as many universal design principles as I know about, primarily flexibility in attendance and deadlines, modes of communication, etc.
- Transparent assignment design (TILT), +1 choice on assignments, accessibility checker within LMS

- I leave room for disabilities, have notetakers, offer recordings as needed, and have flexible due dates
- I check each page for accessibility and use with screen readers. Videos include both closed captions and transcripts. ASL interpreters have access to the course site.
- Document design is essential. I also make an effort to differentiate instruction to allow for different modes of learning.
- I try to understand and respond to student needs.
- I follow Adam standards and am working on fully implementing.
- Universal design. flexible due dates for everyone. Checking all material for accessibility before the class begins. Clear communication and work to make students comfortable letting me know their needs. Close work with our disability center and specialists when new accommodations are needed.
- I limit the use of other websites and just use the LMS; it is hard enough just learning the LMS for many students.
- Adding headings in text, alt tags in images, captions, transcript, using accessibility check in pdf, LMS, Google's doc, more time for activities, frequent check ins
- Automatic double-time allotment on timed activities; some captioned audio lectures; files checked with Blackboard Ally
- Closed captioning of videos; work with Disabilities Resource Center when student self-identifies
- I build my courses to be accessible so I don't need many accommodations. All readings and course materials are accessible, all videos are captioned, and all technologies are supported by our disability services office.
- Subtitles, alt text, formatting instructions to help screen readers, personal meetings, optional timeouts, allow screens to be muted and darkened in conferences, limit abrupt changes in lighting, generally empathy and understanding at every opportunity
- allowing multiple modes for completion of assignments (e.g., video, audio, image, text, etc.); using OCR on all PDFs and including alt text on all images; creating course documents with embedded tags/metadata for screen readers; "chunking" content and defining unfamiliar terms wherever possible; giving context for cultural phenomena
- Youtube- closed captioning and recording of desktop (screencasting)
- Universal Design for Learning
- Pre-built accessible documents; various forms of communication
- labeling of photos used in course materials, multiple methods of explanation
- Refer them to the disability services office. Try to keep the LMS interface simple.
- Put closed captioning on videos.

- Every instruction that I share in class is also able to be found in writing on our course website. I try to organize the LMS with accessibility in mind.
- Patience, empathy, flexibility.
- I consult the Office of Access and Accommodations. I actually do this a lot, so I know that not everything is easily accessible all the time. We try our best.
- Almost all "lectures" are in Adobe pdf so that screen readers can access it, esp the Adobe screen reader. I can not find a video captioning program that works within my constraints; the search continues!
- Respond to their needs. Make lectures available by audio and print through detailed PowerPoints
- provide multiple document formats, pdf, word, etc.. record videos and include captions
- Closed captioning and options for adapted resources or feedback (such as providing audio/video feedback to student writing)
- SAS instructs us
- including captions on videos, formatting pdfs for screen readers, using bold typeface instead of colors
- I try to be as accessible as possible. Closed-captioning, transcripts, multiple modes.
- Depends on disability--I can address some, while the institution's SAS program addresses others.
- It depends--recently had student with visual impairment, worked with him (synchronously individually online) on trying out some screen-reader technologies to help him improve his writing
- I caption all of my lecture videos and turn on the captions by default. I follow university guidelines for accessibility in online courses. I don't use timed exams or online proctoring tools.
- I ask students for their preferences on feedback format (video or written), I make sure lecture and orientation videos have captions, I try to compose documents that a screen-reader friendly, I try to break up information and make the course easy to navigate. I use the LMS calendar feature, deadlines, and checklists to help students track their work. Students are allotted a maximum amount of time on quizzes, which are all open book. I also work with students individually as needed.
- I express interest and willingness to work with them more closely, but I realize this is unlikely to be enough as I rarely encounter students with disabilities in my classes. I don't know why.
- Alt-text in LMS on images; Captions on any/all video/audio; universal design across the board
- Providing materials in more than one modality. Video transcription, voice readers, flexible classroom policies for Neuro-diverse learners.

- No timed tests; LMS has system that alerts to non-accessible content; captioning on videos; work with SDS for individual needs
- Voice-to-text software, subtitles on videos, etc. I also encourage students to contact me and the student counselors if they have needs that aren't currently met.
- I use various practices to assist students with disabilities especially those who are neurodiverse
- Our college recently received a grant to promote UDL, so more faculty are being trained in accessibility and universal design. Prior to that, there were some statewide opportunities that a few instructors took part in, and we have an instructional designer who can assist, but those efforts were pretty scattershot. Our LMS includes "Ally" which communicates about document and image accessibility, but instructors do not necessarily attend to those alerts (or know how to attend to those alerts). For me personally, participation in the first cohort of TILT/UDL (through the aforementioned grant program) has been tremendously helpful, and I'm not working forward on designing documents and presentations with accessibility in mind. I have been in the habit of captioning video for years now, but some of the other strategies I've used only when an accommodation was required, which for visual impairment (compatibility with readers) has been exceedingly rare, but now that I know more about accessible document design, I can do better. Pedagogically, I've developed good habits from experience and from previous learning about teaching strategies, e.g. using multiple modalities for instruction, offering various ways of demonstrating learning, etc. (though written essays still predominate in my courses). The one blind student I taught helped me remember to verbalize what I show--a good habit for all teaching. Online, I offer any student who needs more time more time, and on the rare occasion I used some sort of timed activity, I can add in extended time for all who have documented disabilities and any who request additional time. I'm also generous with revisions and retakes.
- alt text, text styles, limit color for communication, WebAIM page checks, ADA office checks
- I try to consider UDL approaches and have been more invested in reading and learning from comp disability studies scholars. And very recently reading UNgrading.
- make sure that documents are accessible to screen readers, captions on all texts, try to to alt-text for images, use color contrasts that are better for people with visual impairments,
- I try to design a flexible course from the beginning so that students have a variety of ways to engage
- More test time and/or more time to complete any activity

- Accessibility is built into our LMS, and for students who have registered with CSD, instructors receive information about specific strategies to use in accommodating particular disabilities. Separately from institutional requirements, I include a collaboratively authored (with grad students teaching FYW) access and accommodation statement at the beginning of my syllabus letting students know that their learning and ability to effectively engage with course content is important to me and encouraging them to reach out at any point in the quarter, regardless of school disability processes. I offer a variety of modalities for participating in discussion and activities, and I survey students at the beginning of the term about their learning needs and preferences; I adapt aspects of the course as necessary to be responsive to their needs. I am flexible with deadlines and open to working with students to adapt major projects in ways that better support their needs and goals. I assign multimodal projects and readings (including videos, podcasts, etc.) and scaffold these with opportunities to analyze and experiment with technologies, modalities, and media.
- UDL
- close caption screen-cast videos; use Canvas' UDOIT to check accessibility
- We use a program called Ally which points out items that need to be captioned, etc.
- Test all web materials with WAVE accessibility checker and ensure it passes before I complete, write and edit transcripts for media, compose alt text for media, prefer text formats over pdf formats, flexible due dates and late work policies, and using multiple media to deliver feedback and instruction.
- Everything can be accessed by adaptability software for the visually impaired. All talks have CC or transcripts. All assignments have windows of submission to support students who may need extra time.
- follow the instructions in their faculty notification letter
- Meeting with them, using Zoom transcripts and captions, encouraging the use of screen readers and voice typing (I have links on my website), etc.
- Universal Design for Learning principles; using only approved technologies
- I present materials in word documents to make machine-reading easy. I am redundant in my presentation of information. All graded assignments are asynchronous. I record lectures so that students can use captioning software.
- I take courses about accessibility to try to improve my online teaching for all students
- Quality Matters training and making sure everything is accessible in multiple formats (visual, audio, and written)

- Accessibility statement in print and audio, encouragement to work with the office of accessibility services, openness and advocacy, frequent opportunities to make anonymous teaching requests, fast responses when students make requests, teaching of disabilities-aware writing strategies as part of audience awareness
- I consider font styles, color, and allowing for CC on videos.
- Flexibility: timing/pace, closed captioning, open platform assignments
- read to them

## Open-Ended Q28 Responses

Q28: What are your major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities?

- Being aware of it, I rarely have students with disabilities so I wonder about undocumented disabilities or students who don't want to disclose
- Transcripts for videos is challenging.
- In online courses, I often don't know if they have disabilities; they do not always self-identify. I am concerned I may be neglecting some student needs by assuming all are similarly abled.
- If they don't let me know if there is a problem with the current formats. When I integrate materials created by others that aren't accessible and don't have access to make them so.
- Canned courses are not always as accessible as they should be
- online courses can make it difficult to see if students are struggling, especially if they do not let me know (and students online are less likely to say something, I've found)
- I cannot always know if my materials are accessible.
- I am not able to use technologies such as Jamboard, or off technologies that take place in real time.
- if a student doesn't disclose their needs; sometimes there are conflicting needs with course goals (student struggles with socialization in a class with lots of group work, for instance); lack of integration of good technology (it took forever to get closed captions in zoom); balancing trying to provide class materials in advance with limited prep time/notice of teaching the class.
- Accommodations often only provide for more time. My students often need help with study skills or assistance navigating the course and taking notes
- UDL "providing multiple means of action & expression"
- Sending work to them in advance
- Not enough time to implement all the accessibility features I want to
- Providing appropriate accommodations, but not more than needed; understanding what accommodations are needed is sometimes a challenge as well
- not being given sufficient time for accessibility tasks, e.g., captioning videos (or correcting auto-captions) on top of the already expected tasks of teaching
- Strategies to help
- It takes so much time to correct the auto-generated transcripts in the weekly videos. It usually took me about 30 minutes to correct the captions for a 10-minute video. I spent about 2-3 hours each week doing

this. The assignment sheets I develop also do not use headers in a way that works well with screen readers, and this would take a lot of time for me to convert.

- Failing to receive accommodation letters from support staff to know what student accommodations are.
- tailoring as specifically as possible to their needs
- They have needs that are not addressed in typical accessibility. For example, PDFs require text that can a screen reader can read. However, I had a student with visual disability who told me black print on white background is really hard to read.
- I think I've been pretty successful; the vast majority of students who have reported a disability to me have been successful in my courses
- My institution offers no support and the tech I have on my end is limited.
- Getting students to get the appropriate accommodations letters so that I can provide adequate accommodations is usually the biggest hurdle
- late submission on writing assignments means students are constantly catching up
- Some materials take a significant amount of time to duplicate in officially accessible formats.
- Lack of university support and resources
- For me, the challenge is that our university has bled our disabilities services office dry. The office depends on education and social work scribes and drivers, who, unfortunately, can be unreliable. That office does not have teeth to make demands from uncooperative. If a blind student can't get resources until two weeks after we've covered the material, I sense a huge problem, especially when resources have been provided in a timely manner. We're down to an office of one professional and some administrative assistants pulling double duty.
- If a student were blind and taking my writing courses, they would be at an extreme disadvantage. I don't know how, and regularly would not have time, to create audio documents or fully accessible PDFs. The same is true for students who could not type or use a keyboard.
- Time and support; often it takes time to create materials in multiple modes and find workarounds for material that isn't accessible.
- Students are sometimes denied accommodations from our disabilities center and subsequently feel awkward asking for accommodations in my course, so I don't always know specific needs.
- Attention span in both F2F and online environments; frustration on both our parts if things do not go as planned.
- Time - students who need extra time for things have a difficult time because the course moves quickly and part of the assignments require feedback and peer response.

- Alignment with discussions and peer reviews when time is of the essence
- Ensuring that they feel comfortable interacting with me and expressing what they need.
- Students whose disabilities are not on record and who are reluctant to disclose them.
- I have a hard time knowing what their disabilities are and ensuring that all of my content is accessible to all students. I use a variety of modalities when teaching, but I'm never quite sure if everything is accessible to everyone.
- Not much. Between the technology and student support services, students are usually well accommodated.
- My own gaps in knowledge; having to collaborate with faculty who do not attend to that
- I don't have time to do all the tasks required for full accessibility, especially the first time I teach a course. I have to add accessibility features a little bit at a time each year.
- I cannot think of any major challenges.
- understanding students needs, esp students with cognitive limitations
- Adapting several different ways, but it is just another challenge - I'm up for it
- Having better support for students with reading disabilities in online only/asynchronous courses
- Not sure how to make everything ADA-compliant; overwhelming to get to compliance
- Ensuring that they take the initiative to access the resources available to them and letting them know it's totally okay to need those resources
- The time demands of manual labor of creating multiple access points, high-quality text-enhanced scans, etc.
- Making sure that classmate-generated communications are accessible to students
- In synchronous (Zoom) online courses, it is difficult for students who overpower the discussion. I find it more difficult to interrupt them. I believe it is easier in a physical space to cue them. I'm not sure how to appropriately address this in synchronous settings and have sought guidance from other faculty.
- Making sure PDFs are screen reader available
- Having them actually apply for accommodations
- Some of the "invisible disabilities" are even more invisible in online formats
- Not knowing about the challenges until it has already impacted the student's learning.
- Time management

- It is less clear what accessibility really looks like for students with cognitive, neurological, and psychological disabilities as opposed to physical disabilities. The accessibility checker can tell me if a document can be read by a screen reader, for example, but it can't tell me how to design something that works better for a student who has a traumatic brain injury or is on the autism spectrum.
- Not knowing student needs
- Making sure to cover all the possibilities. Everyone has things that they aren't aware of until it's explained.
- Making sure they are confident enough to share with me. I want them to feel welcomed and comfortable enough to let me know if there are issues. There are no challenges for me, only for the students and I want to do everything I can to alleviate those challenges.
- Students who do not communicate what they need (some do not know what they need).
- It is hard to know what students with disabilities need in an online setting and how to accommodate them, as the rules and remediations for differently abled students were developed with face-to-face interactions in mind. When a student reaches out, I work with them directly, but I don't have a clear sense of what the range of possibilities is overall.
- Not having the technological skill set to implement more accessibility
- Quite often, instructors don't know about the disability. That makes it difficult to determine what students need.
- The expectation that students should offer support when they are not legally required to do so.
- Lack of knowledge of how to connect with such students
- Getting feedback from them to make sure that what I am doing is best needing their needs.
- The time it takes to make materials accessible
- Can't think of any
- crimp time issues are by far the biggest challenge and are bound up with such disabilities as ADD/ADHD; OCD; dysgraphia and dyslexia, etc.
- Understanding all of the options that would benefit the largest number of students.
- Getting them to realize their disability is not an imposition for me.
- Anticipating struggles for neuro divergent students
- students who don't know they must go through student disabilities services to receive accommodations, despite this being outlined in the syllabus. need more points of contact that make students aware of this resource
- Teaching visual rhetoric classes. I can't find a way for our visually impaired students to participate in these classes (like graphic nonfiction).

- knowing what they need in terms of helpful accommodations
- Communication
- Making sure all materials are accessible for all disabilities since new accommodations seem to arise each semester.
- Lack of support in LMS (Blackboard)
- making sure certain readings are accessible
- I need the time to make the materials.
- resources
- Some accommodation plans ask for lectures/class discussions to be recorded, which can lead to privacy concerns (particularly in my life writing class, where we sometimes discuss sensitive topics)
- I don't encounter many. Most of my challenges come from the needlessly complex bureaucratic actions to protect my institution from being sued under the ADA.
- making sure everything is adaptable.
- Most challenging is when students are hesitant to ask for what they need (and for me to recognize needs when they haven't been explicated).
- Working with our disabilities services office is difficult; creating consistent, department- and institution-wide policies for students with disabilities, creating online spaces in which students can get to know me quickly enough to be comfortable communicating needs (many students do not have formal accommodations)
- Accommodating a variety of disabilities simultaneously.
- We should be able to do completely async courses that are student-paced with no deadlines. Most universities are not set up for that.
- Excessive paperwork required by my institution for remote courses limits time I can devote to students.
- resources and support for transcribing
- students who may have a disability but does not acquire accommodations through the Center of Accommodations.
- Students don't always tell me the need accommodation until late in the semester. Disability services office on my campus is overwhelmed and their requests for accommodations also come late.
- Lack of training in what their challenges could be in order to build in accommodations
- textbooks in alternative formats. Luckily that isn't something I have to do myself.
- Being given the time it takes to revise materials to be accessible to everyone, institutional awareness that disabled students (and faculty) exist and need support, having emotional energy and time to support them (namely those with PTSD and disabilities that affect cognitive

processing), not having training, etc. It's not the disabled students; it's the lack of institutional and social support.

- I often don't know what I'll be teaching and/or am assigned new courses that require a lot of planning. As a grad student I find I lack time to cover a diverse range of accessibility needs
- Getting students to use the accommodations that the institution provides for them. Helping students with mental illnesses stay on track to complete assignments and catch up with late work. Supporting students who have professors in other courses who are not providing them with adequate learning support for disabilities, especially mental health issues.
- As a TA, I haven't really gotten much information or guidance from my department or from the students about what would be helpful. I mostly go off what I know from my own experience and education with differentiation.
- I try to use my best knowledge of user-centered design, but it's hard to know what special needs there are in the class (e.g., I don't like sharing my own disability/needs).
- Video production is hard, especially with needs for captions/transcripts (so I usually avoid it and stick to text)
- Tech isn't always accessible so making sure that I'm finding/using accessible tech.
- I don't see any challenges related specifically to students with disabilities
- Helping students when they get frustrated at parts of the course I'm not authorized to change.
- Haven't received training, not sure if what I'm doing is enough
- Being asked to do too much as the instructor (by the administration)
- Unless students self-identify as having challenges, it can be difficult to know that is the reason they struggle. Typically a student will only identify through the disabilities office; if they don't and they are struggling, it becomes a guessing game to determine why as they may not want to acknowledge a problem in meetings
- I struggle to balance integrating multimodal content with accessibility.
- having to guess who they are, the accommodations sheets do not consider online classes nor do they understand accommodations that might actually help students in project based courses with few tests and quizzes.
- repeating instructions multiple times, in many forms, and across several avenues to ensure that they are read, understood, and retained
- Knowing how to support them and if I am complying
- I don't encounter this issue, but I am prepared to work with it should it arise

- make sure to provide an equitable learning situation (not just accessible)
- Do not know.
- Students often do not share with me or the appropriate campus organs that they have or are experiencing difficulties with the class until very late in the semester. This includes technical issues such as slow internet or webcam issues.
- Some lack confidence and do not give themselves enough credit.
- they don't discuss their specific needs clearly. They might have a card that says they need accommodations, but the students don't necessarily tell us what they need because sometimes they don't know or don't want to talk about it until it's very late in the term.
- I don't teach a huge number of disabled students. The student and I usually discuss what can be made more accessible or how I can change the course to better suit them.
- getting video sources captioned
- making sure they are comfortable to disclose
- Only students registered with the school receive official accommodations; otherwise, I'm dependent on the students themselves to disclose their special needs
- Addressing all of their needs.
- Not knowing what they're going through. I get the official letters of accommodation from the disability office, whose accommodations usually don't apply to an online course, but aside from that, I depend on the students to tell me what they need. It's harder to know what they need when you don't see them face to face.
- When I run into issues, it is sometimes because I suspect they may be having trouble in a course related to a disability (usually because I've gotten a notification from the disabilities services office, but sometimes not). However, without I don't know enough about the student's needs or diagnosis to know how to help. The student would need to initiate that conversation. (And rightly so! I shouldn't be asking them invasive questions or trying to diagnose!) Also, mental health issues can be tricky to navigate--again, because students need to initiate that conversation. They often don't treat their mental health in the same way they do their physical health (if they had the flu, they would ask for an extension; if anxiety or depression is interfering with their schoolwork, they don't always know what to do.) All I know is that they haven't turned something in.
- How to best reach them.
- Zoom functions have sometimes been difficult to manage; screen readers aren't great in Canvas discussion boards
- They don't always communicate whether accommodations are meeting their needs; university doesn't emphasize that they need to

start the conversation (we are not permitted to bring up their disability even if we know about it)

- Students rarely disclose disabilities, which makes it hard to check that our courses are supporting them adequately.
- Zero institutional support
- Honestly, it hasn't been that challenging; it just takes more time, forethought. That said, there have been some colleagues who had students with very challenging disabilities, e.g. students who are blind and deaf or students who can only communicate through an AAC or eye tracking device (these were students in f2f classes), and it was exceedingly difficult to navigate. It's hard to know what kind of workload is reasonable AND also sufficient to demonstrate student learning and achievement of course outcomes, especially in a written communications course.
- There are many types of disabilities.
- That some softwares don't make it easy to create accessible documents or presentations.
- Not enough education from the campus about how to adapt!
- Being aware of what would be most helpful for students
- the major challenge is that I can never fully anticipate student needs until the course is already under way
- Wondering if the LMS is accessible
- Primarily the challenges are institutional: at times, disabilities services reaches out to faculty with very specific directions for upcoming courses, but they don't reach out far enough in advance for faculty to take steps to achieve what disabilities services is asking. For instance, disabilities services emailed faculty with very specific requests just prior to winter break and requested action by an unreasonable deadline.
- Making sure I meet every student's needs
- Lack of time to prepare instruction materials in multiple formats
- I don't see them in person.
- Our systems don't support it and we are not trained to do it. Additional labor on those of us who care.
- I don't know that I'm doing enough. We have no feedback loop from Dis Services.
- matching the accommodation to the student's needs
- The biggest challenge is when the disability itself makes keeping up with things hard--if a student struggles with attention and also depression, they get behind and also go into hiding. No nudges, etc. seem to work.
- Not enough campus support, difficulty of getting students who need support registered

- I only find it challenging when I don't have adequate communication with the student. I am an instructor with a disability so I know that information and collaboration is key.
- Time is the biggest obstacle. We don't have release time to improve courses, only develop new ones and those are limited.
- Just having the time to make sure that I can add in as much support as possible into the class. I recently found out I was teaching a class the day before it started. I didn't have enough time to really prepare the class
- I'm sure there are folks who may not be explicitly asking for what they need. The disabilities services office documents are pretty vague.
- We sometimes don't know.
- Various needs require more accommodation or conflicting accommodations.
- knowledge
- resources

## Open-Ended Q29 Responses

Q29: What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in online settings?

- More of what they need
- How do disabilities affect online learning? What can I do to support online students with disabilities? How can I help them feel included, not tokenized?
- Student preferences
- identifying students having difficulties without requiring the students to self-report
- more support with synchronous activities in class
- How to design docs to be more accessible
- like to see how faculty offer variety of engagement and then how to still keep students engaging with one another and make "grading" manageable
- What other platforms/software are out there that are useful
- How is their experience different when navigating the platform I use for classes and how might I better accommodate a variety of needs in one class?
- Resources
- How to format headers in attached files to work well with screen readers
- How to make my online courses more accessible to students with disabilities. How to best serve and accommodate individual students with disabilities.
- I would like to know before the semester starts while I am preparing the course, not at the beginning and have to redo things
- I would like better guidelines from my institution; they have a webpage, but they don't really provide hands-on help; they also have some seriously mistaken notions about accessibility: some of the folks in charge of it believe that materials only have to be made accessible if they're public (on a course website) but NOT if they're in an LMS
- I would like to have an accessibility "checker" to review my materials and course to anticipate any neuro or physical diversities that I may have missed or don't know about.
- What are we missing?
- I always want to know what students with X disability needs and what can help them learn.
- I would like to know how to effectively and efficiently create accessible documents for the blind.
- How to adapt more of our course materials to their needs. We have an excellent staff member for the campus who helps with this, but I feel

more formal training for instructors is needed on disabilities, especially autism.

- If I'm missing something. It's hard to know.
- More on accessible materials for the visually impaired.
- Feedback from students on the efficacy of selected teaching measures.
- I want to know how to design my course so that I know what elements to include as a standard for helping students. I also would like to use more audio and video feedback, but the tools that I have so far are clunky and take too much time to use (Canvas, I'm looking at you).
- Any new technologies, especially those that simply captioning or transcript creation.
- Honestly, I already feel behind already so I don't know where to start. Mostly I would want practical guidance as a stop gap measure so that I reduce any harm would be my first request. Then having the practical measures pointing to or grounded it theory for me to explore helps me develop a pedagogical praxis.
- Student feedback regarding online courses--challenges, benefits, etc.
- I want to know more about their experiences -- and I want access to a paid assistant to help make my courses more accessible so I can stay focused on content and interaction.
- Are there other tools or practices that would make it easier for students with disabilities to learn?
- learning more about cognitive load theory
- I need to know what is needed and ways to help them up, not reducing the standards of the course
- Ways to develop multiple formats/modalities for course content & present in a way that doesn't overwhelm students (organization, etc.)
- What is one thing I can do at a time to help students in online settings so that all of the changes are not so overwhelming.
- What actually works for them. For example, I often wonder if multiple points of access for materials is more confusing than helpful.
- How to better help students with autism
- How to prevent the monopolization of discussion.
- I know there's a lot I don't know, so just general training would be useful
- Designing for ADD/ADHD
- I want to know how to more effecting engage with students with cognitive, neurological, and psychological disabilities.
- What more support do they need from the instructor and/or from Disability Services?
- How to make everything work for them in the least complicated way for them.
- That it is important for us as educators to listen.
- students who do not have official accommodations but need differentiated instruction to succeed

- What is the range of opportunities available? Several accommodations developed with face-to-face students in mind (longer testing times, sitting in a particular place in the class, etc.) are not applicable to writing classes or online classes, much less online writing classes.
- How to create more accessible documents, courses, etc.
- I feel confident teaching all students.
- Strategies for inclusive design; communication strategies for working with students with particular categories of disability
- I would prefer better and integrated tools that allow me to test/preview.
- What are the most common disabilities?
- I honestly don't know. We do a lot of work on writing and disabilities and have been finding that most students with disabilities do better in the online format than in our face-to-face classes.
- How students with disabilities that directly affect their writing (such as dyslexia) can learn better in asynchronous courses.
- What aspects of course design and instruction work best
- chance to use technologies, both adaptive and non, from POV of a student with hearing and sight impairments
- How to make more materials accessible
- I would really like to read more scholarly research and see practical solutions.
- everything
- Where the trade-offs can occur. At what point does satisfying the ADA requirements become so costly in terms of man hours that it is unfeasible?
- I would like to learn more about specific strategies for people with a wide range of disabilities.
- If they can access resources and what other resources are needed to support their learning
- Best practices
- I would like to know what their common problems and needs are, and what I could do to make my online course more beneficial for them.
- I would love more training in general
- How can I help the student succeed at his/her level? What can I do as an instructor to support all of the student's needs?
- I would like to see more concrete examples/modeling of what works for students.
- All of the various things to consider- for example, are there invisible disabilities I haven't accounted for because I'm not familiar with them?
- always want to learn more about Universal Design
- Since not all disabilities are known or disclosed, and not all students have access to diagnosis and the documentation required for accommodations, I'd like to know more about ways to make my course accessible to the most possible students as a default (UD), but also how

to not over-extend myself in a setting where I'm already very stretched. I'd also love to know general preferences from this population.

- I would like more training in supporting autistic students and other students who are neurologically atypical.
- Specific pedagogical strategies and standards, alternative perspectives on assignment structure from people with disabilities
- I'm comfortable teaching online, but it would be nice to have peer review opportunities. Few if any instructors at my institution prefer/opt for online teaching.
- Better understand the student experience (rather than regulations)
- What's working and not, creating accessible documents and other media, other relevant tools
- I've spent a lot of time researching this and feel knowledgeable.
- how to manage transforming all of my materials to ADA each time I update a class to avoid stagnation.
- how to better tailor online content to students with ADHD and other cognitive disabilities, to boost interaction, participation, and retention
- What are the ADA rules ? Why is this not gone over with us? (adjunct faculty here)
- Low- to no-cost tools and software
- How to make courses more accessible for hard of hearing students and students with visual impairment
- What are their challenges? How can I help?
- How I might avail myself of better technologies to help address accessibility concerns in the classroom. I confess myself ignorant of most options/technologies that I might use beyond organizing the course in an accessible way.
- can they get individualized assistance and tech help from the college?
- More ways to create accessibility
- What is best practice to make sure they get questions answered (besides email, etc.)
- How to address all their needs.
- How I can make the course more accessible, other than standard web design techniques and captioning videos.
- That they are there.
- What should I be doing that I'm not already doing?
- New technologies for working with different kinds of learners.
- How to streamline a course to help everyone without taking away important accessible learning features--instructors are expected to address the needs of so many different learners (yet may also have their own physical, emotional, cognitive limitations))
- Everything
- I've had very few students with disabilities in my fully online courses, at least few that I was alerted to. I \*think\* my classes work okay for

students with learning disabilities and hearing impairments. I can make my classes work for visually impaired students, though I can't say they're ready to go for students reliant on readers. I guess I don't know what I don't know, so I'd appreciate any information about how to make online, asynchronous learning work better for students with disabilities, beyond the accessibility of instructional materials. It would also be helpful to understand more about how to make collaborative activities work better for all students in an asynchronous environment. It's often harder to build community and trust and to catch potential (and actual) problems

- How to appeal to visual learners
- I would like to know where the secret captioning office is at my university's central office and I'd like more instruction on how to make pdfs accessible through Adobe cloud and Canva.
- I wish I were more proficient with making courses accessible--everything I know I've learned on my own, with no central guidance
- How to best support students with different disabilities
- How to make the LMS more accessible
- I've had limited experience working with students who are blind, have vision loss, or are deaf-blind; because I do incorporate visual activities like concept mapping and visual analysis, I would like to know more about how I can reconfigure visual work for students with these disabilities.
- There's always something to learn
- Tools available
- What they really need, not what we think they need.
- how to set up situations for full participation with minimal disruption for students and instructors
- How to get the administration to keep class sizes at 15 max. We need TIME. We teach 4/4 load with a lot of service expected.
- How we can make available licenses for software that supports student access needs
- I would like someone to tell me about ADA compliant materials and teaching. At my institution. Rather than using one-size-fits-all "reasonable accommodations.
- Support structures
- how to use programs

## Open-Ended Q37 Responses

Q37: What other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction?

- I will say that dedicated faculty is useful only if they truly know what they are doing. The most useful thing for me was access to online training outside of the institution, which was paid for by the college.
- Communication with other online writing instructors in other departments, on other campuses, and at other universities.
- Collaboration with other instructors using online instruction
- A community of instructors talking to each other about a shared course-- how to teach it and how to improve the "master" course site
- Quality Matters training
- awareness of good teaching practices, regardless of delivery format; awareness of how your course integrates with other courses students are taking (i.e. if students are mostly depending on Canvas calendar to track deadlines); greater time/compensation to plan for class \*before\* semester runs
- Theoretical training on how to balance tech with teaching
- Examples of activities that apply effective practices from the research in OWI and how they are implemented in the online writing classroom (with sample assignment sheets and unit plans)
- Offer optional training for online instructors at no cost to the instructor, and pay the instructor for the training.
- Eight choices are plenty. I ranked the final question at no. 8 because I cannot understand what it is saying.
- Training is really important, I think. My institution calls itself a "leader in distance education," yet they have no mandatory or intensive training opportunities in online teaching. Most of my colleagues in my department are extremely reticent to teach online and struggled heavily during the pandemic because of this.
- funding and time up front to develop the online course and modules.
- Active preservation of academic freedom.
- Not activities but online efforts are valued in our annual reports and tenure/promotion review. Almost everyone who has gotten tenure in the past 10 years developed online classes.
- Collaboration with other, more experienced faculty
- Design, set up, best practices
- You can't teach online interpersonal sensitivity.
- Learning how to use various tools--Teams/Zoom, online whiteboards, strategies for engaging discussions online as distinct from face-to-face
- Practice and experience to develop ideas for best practices and encounter multiple learning styles and scenarios.

- Joining orgs such as GSOLE; getting an OWI mentor
- collaboration with other instructors (but that rarely happens)
- We have regular workshops/discussions on norming, rubric use, etc.
- Collegial support from expert online colleagues.
- Training should attend to the isolation that instructors might feel when/if they move to entirely online instruction.
- Incentives
- I think you've got them all covered.
- Weekly meetups is of teachers working with Eli Review
- My training was for asynchronous instruction; training specific to synchronous instruction would be useful. They are very different.
- Practice!
- technology checks, organization, clear and consistent deadlines, communication
- Have Jessie and Casey come to your campus and give a workshop!
- (note: Q36 was difficult to respond to because the survey interface on my browser (chrome) was hard to interact with(not all were relevant to my training but couldn't unselect them); I discovered I could move the questions around after playing around with the question a little). Q37: A sandbox course where instructors can practice and experiment with different features during a training session (and later come back to as a resource when building course for students).
- I don't know
- OWI specific training, training in access/UCD for those designing courses
- Breakout rooms in zoom
- Training in OWI specifically rather than just online instruction
- Collaboration and communication. Develop communities of peers who you can turn to for ideas and support.
- discipline focused pedagogy information
- Keeping with professional readings
- Peer review of courses
- Information presented on OWI research/best practices, specifically.
- I just want to comment that we don't have a summer institute or reduced teaching load the first semester teaching online. Other activities essential to training: continuous improvement based on surveying students and teacher reflection.
- No more activities. Give us independence so we can focus on our students instead of institutionally-mandated paperwork.
- Ongoing professional development opportunities are essential.
- More training offered throughout the semester.
- Faculty should take online courses. The best part of my unpaid (but free to me) summer training was that it was online via the LMS my students use. I got a great feel for what it is like to be a student online.

- I'd love someone who specializes in both content and online presentation to support us
- actually making faculty take an online class on online teaching so that they can experience what students experience. I had an excellent online teaching class.
- Being current with research about online writing instruction, ongoing conversations with other online instructors
- Course development shells that reduce workload for adjunct instructors; discipline-specific support in OWI in addition to campus training for all online instructors
- Not sure
- Backwards planning
- Good trainers
- how to engage and manage student communication. giving effective and timely feedback to students. being present
- Being able to type or word process at a good clip is a wonderful asset
- I suggest being a TA in another Instructors class-- EVEN if the instructor has taught for many years FTF. I Posit that 2 courses as a TA should equal 1 standard course.
- tip guides or fact sheets on various elements of online course design and instruction (instructor presence, creating useful discussions, etc.); Purdue has a great set of these here:
- QM is really good for re-assessing own teaching in a general sense
- On smaller campuses, actually have pedagogical discussions (vs. just ones about how to use the technology)
- Question Q37 doesn't make sense. I can't rank what we don't have. Taking an online class taught me more about teaching an online class than anything else. I took an undergrad online course and saw the problems to avoid based on being a real student. Very eye-opening. Very confusing to use an online textbook and try to communicate with students with poor wifi connections. Lots of problems getting confusing messages from the instructor. Made me realize how bad a lot of online instruction really is even by teachers who are trying to do it well.
- taking a badly designed online course and a well-designed course.
- I am satisfied with the amount of training my institution provides.
- Presentation in online format training
- Collaboration with other writing instructors
- Course models/shells, experience BEING an online student
- Rhetorical strategies for interacting with and responding to students online
- We do not have any OWI-specific training, and I haven't received any OWI-specific training. I think we SHOULD have discipline-specific training! I think it would also be helpful to have regular sessions to talk

online teaching, so we can learn from each other! I've done that informally, and that's been far more helpful than any formal (general) online instruction training I've received. Reading about OWI and using available resources available through my disciplinary organization has also been helpful, but most of what I've learned has been through experience.

- Something our online cert course doesn't do is teach instructors about course design and how to use the LMS's course design tools.
- Time to develop materials
- ongoing support that provides just-in-time learning, like faculty learning communities
- For the previous question, options 7 and 8 do not exist at my institution. Two other activities that were helpful include a panel discussion by students about their online learning experiences, and university-wide survey results about student and faculty experiences with online instruction due to the pandemic.
- Are we talking legitimate, intentional OWI or the panicked switch many of us have had to do during the pandemic? Context matters.
- Maybe taking an online class and trying to navigate it.
- Community building - frank discussions of what works with our particular student population and our particular LMS. This doesn't happen, btw.
- Release time during the planning/building stage of course. Opportunities for help revising online course.
- There needs to be training!
- community of practice, field-specific knowledge of online pedagogies
- Training is great, but we have limited time and resources. I tend toward making it available and optional.

## Appendix D: Responses to 2021 Survey Questions with “Other” Option

Responses to the questions that included an “Other” option.

<p>Q4 “Other” Responses:</p> <p>Please check all that apply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am a graduate teaching assistant</li> <li>• I am an adjunct instructor/professor</li> <li>• I am a full-time non-tenure track instructor/professor</li> <li>• I am a tenure-track professor</li> <li>• I am a tenured professor</li> <li>• I am an administrator</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>	My WC directorship is a full-year staff position, and I teach various writing & education classes when departments are not able to staff a class with an appropriate instructor.
	I am an administrator with faculty status
	I am a full-time professor with a secure contract; my institution does not have tenure
	Graduate Instructor of Record
	Consultant to biopharma industry, retired prof
	I am a full-time lecturer (which offers similar job security to tenure)

<p>Q7 “Other” Responses:</p> <p>At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-year community college</li> <li>• 4-year college</li> <li>• 4-year university</li> </ul>	[a large, Episcopal] Seminary
	[a public, research] State University, which has 75,000 onground and 50,000 online students; we break categories
	Traditional Bricks and Mortar with about 50% of courses offered online
	Regional campus of a 4-year

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2- or 4-years graduate school</li> <li>• Professional school</li> <li>• For-profit institution</li> <li>• Non-profit institution</li> <li>• Completely online</li> <li>• Traditional, brick &amp; mortar with some online courses</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>	university
	consulting and training group
	MA-granting public university
	[a private, Catholic] University

<p>Q8 “Other” Responses:</p> <p>What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated reading and writing</li> <li>• Basic writing</li> <li>• Co-requisite writing</li> <li>• First-year writing</li> <li>• Professional/technical writing</li> <li>• Advanced academic writing</li> <li>• Creative writing</li> <li>• Writing-intensive courses in other disciplines</li> <li>• Writing courses for non-native speakers of English</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	sociolinguistics courses
	Medical School Writing Center
	Practicum
	For the adjunct position I checked on the previous page, I asynchronously teach a graduate course on OWI
	writing and rhetoric courses in the major
	rhet/comp graduate courses
	Individual tailored instruction
	Rhetorical theory
	Writing Consultant Training (Covid)
	Writing Center instruction
	Writing Center
	Upper level ENG course
	Studies in rhetorical theory
Graphic Novels	
graduate courses that train writing	

	teachers
	Composition Theory
	Document design, Rhetorical Theory
	rhetorical theory, methods
	Second-year WAC course
	Rhetorical Theory and Criticism courses
	First-Year Experience Seminar
	Writing for media / writing for education
	Theory and history of writing
	Literature
	life writing theory and practice (first year seminar); MA courses in writing pedagogy, rhet/comp theory, and World Englishes
	Graduate classes in pedagogy
	rhetorical theory
	Community engagement certificate program
	Non-credit writing course that is part of our certificates program (most students already have completed Bachelor's and are trying to add skills)
	Courses in academic writing for doctoral students in STEM
	speech / oral communication
	Scientific Writing

	professional writing
	Literature courses
	Editing, Grant Writing, Introduction to Editing
	Sophomore writing
	Writing about literature and the writing that is done in literary study.
	Graduate level theory courses, multimodal writing
	Research writing; writing about literature
	FYC linked with a course in another discipline
	graduate courses on teaching writing
	Teaching of Writing

<p><b>Q10 Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What elements do your online/hybrid/blended course(s) include? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Announcements/email through the learning management system</li> <li>• Synchronous meetings discussion</li> <li>• Asynchronous meetings discussion</li> </ul>	email and text questions from students that I answer
	Social annotation
	Social Annotation
	Audio-visual lectures
	service learning projects
	design activities
	flip grid, padlet
	audio feedback on first drafts

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Synchronous peer response workshops (discussion forums or individually assigned peer reviews)</li> <li>● Asynchronous peer response workshops (breakout rooms, small group meetings, pairing off during class)</li> <li>● External peer response spaces (Eli Review, Google Suite, etc.)</li> <li>● Synchronous group work</li> <li>● Asynchronous group work</li> <li>● Reading response discussion (synchronous or asynchronous)</li> <li>● Reading response short essays (synchronous or asynchronous)</li> <li>● Student facilitation and/or presentation</li> <li>● Synchronous student conferences</li> <li>● Asynchronous student conferences</li> <li>● Collaborative writing (synchronous or asynchronous)</li> <li>● Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>NOTE: My fully online courses include none of the synchronous elements I marked above. Synchronous activities are only in my hybrid or f2f courses. Also, not all courses may include all elements.</p>
	<p>Social annotation (via Hypothesis or Perusall; synchronous active reading and writing via padlet.</p>

<p>Q15 “Other” Responses:</p> <p>How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Subject area expert</li> <li>● Faculty collaboration</li> <li>● Consulting research</li> <li>● Student-needs surveys</li> <li>● Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>I developed my own courses over time, but am given a basic template within which to work.</p>
	<p>information adapted from in-person courses</p>
	<p>Years of faculty development elsewhere.</p>
	<p>internal training</p>
	<p>Our institution also has training about on-line classes.</p>

	34 years of experience
	Trial and error on my own part, essentially, combined with Blackboard training modules done independently through each campus
	Course design/development are typically left up to the instructors. I designed my courses based on a template and then made adjustments as necessary.
	the expert being me
	Working with online education office specialists (instructional designers; visual designers, instructional technology experts)
	Standardized with an assigned "instructional designer"
	Program needs - like program goals and outcomes.
	my own expertise in the subject, some consultation with colleagues
	faculty course developer collaborates with non-faculty instructional designer
	trial and error
	Independently using required textbooks for content support
	Template recommended by online Learning manager
	Institutional requirements and training
	Most of our courses are developed by

	individual faculty and informal collaboration.
	Instructional designed worked with me on the non-credit course (University requires this for courses in the certificates program)
	Top-down requirements from administration
	Pre-made course by admins and experienced professors for FYW
	past models in my own learning
	pandemic necessity
	discipline requirement
	Our college has online course handbook, plus opportunity for peer review of course (non-disciplinary peers)
	I've been doing industry training for 40 years
	In-person courses adapted into a course template from our university's Enhanced Teaching and Learning department
	me
	Building on previous courses from other institutions; informal collaboration with colleagues like sharing tips and tricks
	I was told to develop the courses & then I created a course and revised year after year until I got it to be an optimal learning space. I had to train myself with OWI books and webinars, etc.

	soliciting student input for specific course components that can be implemented within the term (in other words, student input and choice is built in by design)
	In response to student evaluations across courses/instructors

<p><b>Q17 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What supplemental online writing instruction or online writing tutoring opportunities, if any, exist at your institution? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources/guidelines available for students to consult (on citing sources, proofreading, etc.)</li> <li>• Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting</li> <li>• Writing center consultants available online in real-time</li> <li>• Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies</li> <li>• Turnitin or other plagiarism detection services</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	Grammarly has become a rage among instructors.
	Library Services staff for style formatting - chat feature
	embedded tutor whose hours with the course are paid for by tutoring services.
	Embedded tutors in some courses
	library resources; 24/7 availability of librarians for research assistance
	I also take time to teach the techne
	Our WC is temporarily online, asynchronous due to the pandemic
	review and comment on individual texts
	Our campus does offer f2f tutoring, but I don't think we offer online tutoring with campus ppl.
	supplemental instruction (e.g., subject matter tutoring), peer mentoring programs, identity and cultural offices offering mentorship to specific student populations (e.g., Black cultural center, Women's

	center, LGBTQIA2S center, first-gen student services, adult, commuter, and veteran services)etc.)
	Writing tutors but (sadly) no proper writing center

<p><b>Q18 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>Please indicate which of the following resources are available on your campus. Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing Center: Online text-based resources</li> <li>• Writing Center: Online video resources</li> <li>• Writing Center: Online scheduling</li> <li>• Writing Center: Face-to-face appointments</li> <li>• Writing Center: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with tutor</li> <li>• Writing Center: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with tutor</li> <li>• Library: Online resources</li> <li>• Library: Online text-based resources</li> <li>• Library: Online audio resources</li> <li>• Library: Online video resources</li> <li>• Library: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with librarian</li> </ul>	<p>We used to have a Writing Center. Then we had a tutoring service, now we have brought back writing tutors in a f2f tutoring center this year.</p>
	<p>Writing Center: Online synchronous video appointments</p>
	<p>Library: face-to-face appointments.</p>
	<p>With our budget, we just send students to Purdue OWL for many text and video resources.</p>
	<p>Classroom presentation</p>
	<p>Course-embedded librarian</p>
	<p>Libraries have online and in person courses for students.</p>
	<p>uncertain. We have a writing center, but I am not sure how their online tutoring works</p>
	<p>English Language Academy, International Student cohorts with supplemental support for FYW courses</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Library: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or web-based) with librarian</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	
---	--

<p><b>Q19 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What expectations are set with students about taking these online writing courses? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, LMS technologies (Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)</li> <li>• Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions</li> <li>• Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments</li> <li>• Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements &amp; correspondence from teacher/classmates)</li> <li>• Completion of course requirements</li> <li>• Peer review</li> <li>• Informed participation in online discussions</li> <li>• Productive facilitation of online discussion</li> </ul>	3 days per week deadlines
	Regular availability through LMS Discussion Forum
	respect for classmates
	Collaborative assignments
	Group work (outside of class)
	meeting deadlines; civil discourse with other students and one another
	in synchronous online courses, attendance in at least of 75% of class meetings throughout the semester
	I don't think we have any set standards. There are some tutorials students can take, but I'm not sure they are required and I question the quality of them.
	they will be expected to revise significantly
	Available for limited synchronous interactions
Passing a portfolio (cross grading); And labor based grading, minus the contract; and now moving toward engagement based grading	
I'm not sure how to answer this. Who is setting the expectations? Me or the school? I just selected what I	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't know</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>expect. I'm not sure that means they are prepared to meet those expectations.</p>
	<p>some instructors use labor-based grading contracts and negotiate the contract criteria with students early in the course; for "laptop required" courses, students must acknowledge that they have a laptop to use during face-to-face sessions</p>

<p><b>Q20 "Other" Responses:</b></p> <p>In what delivery formats does your program/course offer a student orientation to online courses? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Face-to-face</li> <li>• Face-to-face and asynchronously</li> <li>• Asynchronously</li> <li>• Audio/video</li> <li>• We/I don't offer it because another program on our campus handles it</li> <li>• We/I don't offer it</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>We don't really do this adequately, I think. Or at least it's available through our LMS point person, but I don't think students really take advantage of it.</p>
	<p>synchronous webinars</p>
	<p>I'm not sure</p>
	<p>Honestly, I don't know what is available university-wide for students, but I provide a video introduction through email before the class begins.</p>
	<p>I don't know what kind of orientation the University offers</p>
	<p>I don't know</p>
	<p>I'm actually not sure.</p>
	<p>Synchronous introduction after the enrollment, so that type of orientation may not count, depending on how strictly you're defining "orientation."</p>
<p>I am not sure. Students are not</p>	

	required to have an orientation, though.
	don't understand the question
	Unsure
	I don't know that students are required to participate in an online course orientation. If they are, it may be handled in a different department.
	There is a general "welcome to campus" gathering for freshmen, but any orientation for an online course would be conducted by the instructor of that course.
	I'm not sure
	I don't offer an orientation to online learning in general but I do go over how to get around the course and tips for succeeding in my course, if that's what you mean
	When I learn some students are new to Canvas or Google Docs, we meet to go over the interface. I've also created slides that share where to find deadlines on Canvas and info on how to interpret icons on Canvas.
	unsure
	not sure
	I don't know
	It is offered to a limited degree in general orientation and in freshmen experience courses
	There is no online-specific orientation I'm aware of, and

	definitely not for writing specifically.
	I'm not sure
	"Module Zero" (instructor made orientation)
	Unsure
	there are some "online class resources" that are automatically linked in Canvas, but that's it
	I think the online tutorials are not great. The last time IO did them they had dead links and seemed slightly outdated. Like the screenshots were no longer what the actual screens look like. Pretty disappointing.
	I don't understand this question. How are you defining "student orientation"? That could refer to several different things.
	I don't know
	I include an introductory module in the first week of class that introduces the course and the LMS.
	I don't have the sense that students always know what they signed up for, so I don't believe that the university offers any orientation to online courses (And after the pandemic, it's become a bit difficult to wrap one's head around all the different modalities!) I provide students with an orientation to my course in the opening video.
	Module within LMS
	I have a "Welcome-start here" page and I send out two videos in the first

	few days (1. Welcome video 2. navigating our course video)
	I don't know.
	Not sure what others offer, only what I make available for my students

<p><b>Q22 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>How, if in any way at all, are student course-related problems addressed in your online course? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community building activities early/across the semester</li> <li>• Incorporating media that allow students to have some other encounters with each other (building personal web-pages so students can “see” what classmates look like, for example)</li> <li>• Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong)</li> <li>• Instructor office hours in chat room</li> <li>• Informal portions of discussion board</li> <li>• Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	Break larger classes into smaller groups for continual discussion forums. Leads them to feeling as if course is small.
	Students have access to IT Help Desk
	InScribe Learning Community
	Instructor office hours with synchronous video (required for students at several points in semester)
	IT hasn't been supportive of faculty or students on my campus. When IT problems arise, IT support staff have little to no knowledge of the technology used in many cases--there is only one IT support staff member on my campus familiar with the technology used for the modality I teach in.
	I promise students that I won't look at their space if they want a channel or to make a close FB group (I'm a little old school!), but I ask them to elect a person or two who will realize when questions need to come to me, not because I'm in charge, but because I can help.
Maximum response time limits to	

	communication
	I do not have formal ways of addressing student course-related problems, they are dealt with ad hoc via email primarily
	Students are told to reach out to me if they experience problems.
	My students know that I will get back to them on an email or text within a business day. I provide links to common help sites for technology (such as with university IT, the LMS help desk, etc.). I send out announcements/updates at least once a week to check in, remind of short- and longer-term course goals, and always include the invitation to follow up with me (with email link).
	Regular communication with students.
	Flexibility built into assignment requirements (multiple options when possible) and deadlines
	Email/messaging
	office hours held by embedded tutors
	Students are encouraged to email both instructor AND each other. Also, all IT information is provided.
	Links to university tech support; explicit guidelines for whether instructor or university should be contacted for certain issues
	in grant writing, students are sorted into small groups for the semester as

	<p>a means of keeping them on-track and emotionally supported.</p>
	<p>Frequent reminders that their instructor is a real person and can be reached through email, office hours chat, and office hours Zoom meetings.</p>
	<p>Individual Online F2F or phone meetings.</p>
	<p>Encouraging students to use technologies outside of classroom to connect with each other (GroupMe), video introductions assignment</p>
	<p>Mainly I incorporate media that allows students to have some other encounters with one another, communicate a reasonable amount of flexibility, offer instructor office hours. I also try to do community building, but that has varied greatly in its success.</p>
	<p>I often make short personalized tutorial videos or quick video responses when students cannot meet with me or if their question needs visuals to easily answer; students text me too when they need immediate responses</p>
	<p>My students created a group WhatsApp chat. And they email me so I can troubleshoot.</p>

<p>Q23 “Other” Responses:</p> <p>What strategies are used to accommodate students who are English language learners?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More asynchronous delivery</li> <li>• More text-based communication</li> <li>• More audio-based communication</li> <li>• Providing more instructions and/or feedback in more than one mode</li> <li>• I do not have ELL students</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>I do have ELL students, but normally not online unless they are advanced enough to do an online course.</p>
	<p>Individual attention in office hours and encouragement to use the writing center</p>
	<p>Offering of office hours to chat about questions and concerns or to go over assignments</p>
	<p>My courses are designed to be accessible to ELL students</p>
	<p>Synchronous video chat. Extra revision opportunities.</p>
	<p>Assessment leniency for correctness.</p>
	<p>There are no specific accommodations for ELL</p>
	<p>Flexibility to needs as they arise</p>
	<p>More instructor availability 1:1; weekly standing appts with writing tutor</p>
	<p>We do not have ELL-specific resources provided by our college. These students are referred to tutoring.</p>
	<p>Constant referrals/reminders about the resources available on campus to assist with assignments (i.e, tutoring, writing center, accommodations, etc.) addressed case-by-case</p>
	<p>I have not been aware of specific students in courses who are ELL.</p>
	<p>Generally not accommodated</p>
<p>Providing feedback in multiple</p>	

	modalities; providing transcripts and subtitles for instructional videos; tailoring feedback to their needs; including texts from authors from diverse backgrounds
	One-on-one discussions followed by more text or audio resources as needed by the individual student.
	caption everything; offer additional conferences
	We do not do a very good job accommodating our very large population of ELL students
	offer a writing coach
	Use of live closed captioning can help with live discussions.
	University provides additional assistance
	I rarely have ELL students in online courses. They typically take in-person courses at my institution.
	Embedded tutors with ELL training
	Individual instructor conferences
	Face to face offerings when possible.
	Direct address of linguistic diversity. Work early in semester to make sure all students feel comfortable reaching out to me with questions.
	I make a point to connect with them early
	I try to make courses as accessible to as many students as possible,

	including ELL students.
	counselors and tutors are encouraged. but these students often fall through the cracks online.
	ELL students are expected to have passed ELL coursework before taking my classes
	Almost all are second language, widely dispersed globally
	Video conferencing because ELLs can sometimes feel more comfortable recognizing spoken language is they can see the speaker.
	Writing Center for ELL students
	A lot of ELL students are in my ALP group, so they receive an additional 1-2 hours a week with me and about 8 classmates to get more support.
	more synchronous interaction through individual conferences or office hour check-ins

<p><b>Q27 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What strategies do you use to ensure access for all types of learners in the online writing courses you teach? (ELL, students with physical challenges, students with learning challenges, etc.) Check all that apply.</p>	<p>inpost all class materials to weekly folders for students on LMS; post weekly overview for students within LMS that links to reading and assignments; make a weekly overview video each week; correct auto-generated captions before posting videos; provide content in multiple formats and reiterate instructions in several areas (within assignments, in announcements, in weekly overview videos)</p>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Providing content in multiple formats for multiple learning styles</li> <li>● Video Captioning</li> <li>● Transcripts</li> <li>● Universal Design</li> <li>● User-Centered Design</li> <li>● Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>Keep in mind that some accommodations I want are not allowed by the university because of costs, which makes my blood boil, given that I'm not asking for highly expensive assistance.</p>
	<p>I'm not sure how universal design and user-centered design, but I do attempt to use design elements such as coding for headers, white space, and color to guide students through important information.</p>
	<p>I provide content in multiple formats, but don't want to check that box b/c the idea of multiple learning styles has been refuted. It's actually a myth that has material consequences for student learning.</p>
	<p>Following the recommendations of our accessibility office</p>
	<p>One challenge that some of my students face is tied to technology access, so I do multiple formats not only for learning styles, but mobile devices, bandwidth, and data caps</p>
	<p>We will also give extra time to students who ask for it; we are especially flexible with our online courses, though this is becoming a bit intense in terms of workload, so we are exploring how to find a good balance between teacher labor and student need.</p>
	<p>I'm still learning how to do this</p>
	<p>We use the Ally tool in Blackboard.</p>
	<p>I would love to do more universal design, but I am limited by the LMS</p>

	that I am required to use.
	We try to provide captioning but it falls on us 100% and therefore doesn't always happen as we're usually making our own content.
	Transparent assignment design; readability checks
	open Praxis and flexibility to augment deliverables if warranted
	Flexible, asynchronous due dates for all assignments, even exams.
	Consideration of time zones for synchronous interactions
	I am dabbling in a hyflex world. I meet with students synchronously once a week. The work we do in the synch session can be completed asynch by a deadline.
	re: first option--learning styles are NOT A THING! But I do provide content in multiple formats.
	I do provide content in multiple formats but not for multiple learning styles because learning styles are bunk

<p>Q30 "Other" Responses:</p> <p>In your experience, what are the greatest opportunities for students</p>	More opportunities to engage with others.
	I think online spaces can be more inviting to students who are more shy to share verbally.

<p>who are instructed in online settings? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to develop writing through writing</li> <li>• Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time</li> <li>• Participating in written discussions</li> <li>• Flexibility in terms of time</li> <li>• Flexibility in terms of location</li> <li>• Student facilitation and/or presentation</li> <li>• Recorded student conferences</li> <li>• Collaborative writing</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	<p>synchronous conferences (Zoom) allow students to share screen--conferences in this setting generate more participation than in F2F classes.</p>
	<p>students end up writing more</p>
	<p>might be more comfortable for some students with social anxiety or other difficulty posed by meeting in person</p>
	<p>They are also building professional and skills for working/living in virtual contexts.</p>
	<p>These are all opportunities, but they aren't always capitalized on, by students, me, or the institution</p>
	<p>Greater preparation for a global workplace in which communication is often written and asynchronous.</p>
	<p>Having the time to read and re-read, and to be less exposed to normate pressures from neurotypicals in the class</p>
	<p>The ability to access higher education without having to drop everything in their life for four+ years (I'm thinking mainly of students with full-time jobs, families, overseas, etc.)</p>
	<p>Students who would otherwise not be able to access higher education are able to attend college online.</p>
	<p>access--students who might feel judged or uncomfortable in classroom setting are able to control what is known about them and not have assumptions and identity</p>

	imposed on them. Material is more likely to be accessible.
	each and every one of these affordances also bears a limitation to accompany it.
	Ability (over time) to develop Hyflex learning settings where interactions can match up with student needs.
	I would only add just like OWI give students an opportunity to develop writing through writing, but they also it also teaches reading through reading.
	Recorded class sessions
	individual student conferences scheduled flexibly in response to student availability

<p><b>Q31 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What measures has your institution, your department, and you as an instructor taken to address diversity, equity and inclusivity issues <i>specifically</i> in online writing classes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training in accessible digital design</li> <li>• Guest speakers who are / represent BIPOC populations</li> <li>• Anti-racist statements</li> <li>• Anti-racist workshops/training</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	readings addressing CRT and other DEI topics
	this is mostly all at department level; not institutional level
	Title IX training
	Anti-racist readings
	Money designated to bring on diverse scholars as professors and to provide for students who are underrepresented. Of course, that \$500,000 starts in January 2022.
	None.
	none. It's disappointing.

	Reading assignments that discuss the experiences of different ethnic groups
	None to my knowledge/awareness.
	anti-racist book discussion groups
	Anti-racists components built into lecture.
	None specifically for OWI. Honestly, WPA attempts at facilitating such discussions and training have been met with ample resistance from OWI instructors.
	Writing Projects focused on DEI and Antiracism
	The institution treats online courses as easy cash, so if you want anything more substantive than some basic training, you have to turn to people in the department, and they're essentially all overworked contingent faculty.
	not sure
	We've currently formed a committee to study inclusion efforts. They began meeting and researching this semester.
	You only have "Anti-Racist" as options, but the question addresses diversity and inclusivity. There is more to this than just your "race."
	We have revised our course objectives to better address DEI
	inclusivity training and professional development

	My university supports sabbaticals to re-design a course with respect to this issue. I am in the middle of that approval process right now and am hopeful.
	We've had anti-racist discussions and outcomes revision to address DEI, but nothing is specific to online instruction. Almost all of us teach in multiple modalities and our department doesn't have the bandwidth or specialists to address online courses specifically.
	Inclusive teaching practices course
	What about anti-racist content? I don't want to put extra work on BIPOC folks to be a lecturer for a white dude's class. I try to do the anti-racist work (e.g., assignments and day-to-day content) myself.
	Inclusion of course resources created by diverse authors; extra credit options that encourage engagement and reflection related to DEIA issues
	hiring that prioritizes BIPOC faculty
	none
	Every student is treated fairly and with respect.
	a lot of lip service. not a lot that is meaningful, in my opinion.
	none that I know of
	Our Writing Program has begun discussing the option of using labor-based grading. We also have a page on the Writing Program

	<p>website dedicated to anti-racist pedagogy and recommended readings.</p>
	<p>I have attended workshops about diversity and equity, but these were not sponsored by my department or specific to writing courses.</p>
	<p>My department has done more than my institution, and I personally have done more than most folks in my department.</p>
	<p>My comp program has been spending the last year revising our comp curriculum specifically to dismantle and undo lots of racist practices and traditions. The curriculum revision process included 25 faculty who teach comp and our coordinator, so it's not a top down approach at all, though the coordinator does choose the readings, and direction of our work. .</p>
	<p>Content &amp; OER textbook with mostly non-white voices</p>
	<p>I've collaborated with the Assistant Director of FYW to compose an anti-racist statement committing the program to particular actions, including the development of a mission statement centering social and linguistic justice, the creation of an anti-racist library with digital and print resources that are built upon through reading groups, workshops, and collaborative assignment design. We created a shared calendar that includes relevant events at the program, department, college, university, and professional</p>

	organization levels, such as the many webinars on anti-racist writing instruction that have proliferated especially over the past year and a half. I'm leading the collaborative design of a custom, student-facing program handbook that operationalizes our mission statement. I've pushed for the creation of a department-level standing committee on equity and currently chair the committee.
	They had me lead a bunch of workshops and then they ignored most of what I shared during those workshops.
	Ha. Nothing.

<p><b>Q32 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What expectations are set with the faculty who teach online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will develop a pedagogically sound online course</li> <li>• Teachers will provide reasonable support to students for succeeding in the online environment</li> <li>• Online office hours will be required</li> <li>• On-campus responsibilities will exist</li> </ul>	I'm the guinea pig remote faculty member, so several expectations are either unknown yet or likely to evolve
	none
	My campus provided a training opportunity for universal design, but the training required a payment/had a cost, so I declined to participate.
	Graduate students will be required to develop assignments with little to no guidance or models to follow. We have to request them, but they are not made available.
	Faculty will be observed once every 3 years.
Faculty observation is annual.	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected</li> <li>• Faculty will be observed one or more times during a term</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	Requirements differ for adjuncts vs full time
	Required in-house certification course for online teaching.
	Faculty will be observed once per year.
	Pre-set "canned" course with little deviations possible
	Faculty will be observed two times during the year
	Meeting federal guidelines for interactions.
	Required use of Quality Matters assessments of online courses
	Not sure
	Complete online training course
	Instructors will actively work to discourage and catch cheating
	Until the pandemic, online instructors were expected to maintain on-site office hours and had on-campus responsibilities (except adjunct faculty), but I think that will be more flexible after the pandemic. We've all been teaching fully online for 1.5 years now.
	Faculty who want to teach online will all eventually have to go through online certification. But for the most part, faculty see their course design and approach as part of their academic freedom, so we have quite a lot of autonomy.
	depends on the type of faculty

	member (tenured, TT, NTTF, etc.)
	Observations required of probationary faculty (first 5 years). Encouraged periodically for those of us, like me, with more experience, esp. when going up for promotion or during periodic review.
	New instructors will be observed; others may request observations/feedback

<p><b>Q33 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What types of orientation/training activities, if any, do faculty receive for these online/hybrid/blended courses? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)</li> <li>• Online faculty development course(s) in OWI offered through your department</li> <li>• Online faculty development webinar(s) in OWI offered through your department</li> <li>• On-going workshops on various aspects of learning management systems (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, D2L, Moodle, etc.)</li> <li>• Access to an instructional designer (at the department and/or college levels)</li> </ul>	Short online course in online teaching, not through the institution but nonetheless paid for by the institution
	We don't have a lot of resources. We're given a template and expectations. There's a committee that tries to mitigate the worst of online teaching mandates. We've had occasional training sessions on the LMS, maybe an hour per year.
	Help through office of AI (Academic Innovation) and CTE (Center of Teaching Excellence) rather than through college or department
	The only training I am aware of is PDFs of how to use one of the 5,854,908,000 features in Blackboard. Some of the PDFs are over 50 pages long. Other training might be 30-minute professional development workshops or workshops that pop up in response to a specific need.
	Annual meetings to discuss new

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Training on how to personalize a pre-designed course or master course (shared curriculum) at the department and/or college levels.</li> <li>● Mandatory training</li> <li>● Optional training</li> <li>● Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members</li> <li>● Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online</li> <li>● Other, please specify</li> </ul>	needs
	none
	When we transitioned to fully online instruction there was mandatory BlendFlex training, aside from that particular instance, training for online course design is not required.
	Required in-house certification course for online teaching.
	I was originally trained at another institution and pursued further training on my own
	Our CTL provides on-demand trainings that can be taken at any time. The English department has online course shells that instructors are able to copy all or part of.
	We don't have access to an instructional designer, but we do have COLT which the Center for Online Learning and Teaching where we can consult/ get help with technology.
	Any training for online-specific teaching is conducted at the institution level through the Center for Teaching and Learning. Our institution does not have any mandatory or optional writing-specific training.
additional stipend/funding for participating in a short course on online course design and our LMS (Canvas) -- this was not OWI specific, but was online learning specific. I received \$300 for a week-ish long course that took me probably about	

	10 hours to complete.
	It depends on whether the faculty member is full-time or part-time. Full-time faculty develop most of the course setup -- part-time faculty teach the courses that have been set up and have some flexibility in making small changes.
	Reduced teaching load! hahahaha!
	None
	Many of these opportunities are available to faculty, but are not required, so I do not know how to answer this question
	Our OWI training has all been in response to the pandemic and I don't know if that sort of thing (like summer workshops and on-going AY workshops) will continue.
	bi-annual faculty meetings that include some training and discussion of online instruction, asynchronous resources provided by our center for teaching and learning, asynchronous resources gathered from professional organizations in comp/rhet and other institutions' webpages, program-level workshops throughout the year
	casual department tools (e.g., weekly pedagogy meetings)

<p><b>Q34 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>How many hours of training in OWI did you receive as part of your formal faculty training?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Between 1 and 5 hours</li> <li>• Between 6 and 10 hours</li> <li>• More than 10 hours</li> <li>• I did not receive any OWI specific training</li> <li>• Other, please specify</li> </ul>	I took the training years ago, I don't remember.
	Last year we had one hour of a session on using the LMS.
	Optional seminars or workshops provided across multiple semesters
	I received ~4 hours of training in my graduate program.
	Not sure.
	I did a summer institute course design program in the summer of 2020. The director could sense that we would be online in the fall, so she built in training for OWI. It was not in the original design of the SI.
	We have Blackboard training only but it is not OWI specific
	Whenever there is a meeting assigned. Also, instructional videos are always available to graduate assistants
	The mandatory BlendFlex training was approximately 2 hours.
	Uncertain about current
	We do not have any OWI specific mandatory training
	As much or as little as you seek out.
	They implemented the program after I had already been teaching online here, so I did not take it.
personally I have done more than 10 hours of optional training, but it is not required for all OWI teachers.	

	I can't remember.
	not sure
	We have a range of programs at the departmental and university level, from 1 hour workshops, to a 1 week summer institute, to graduate programs in online instruction
	Training is outsourced and optional, can be between 1-more than 10 hours
	It's been so long since I've taken it that I do not know what the current course looks like.
	I did not receive OWI specific training but did attend a free summer workshop that I was not paid to attend.
	We have mandatory training for faculty new to online teaching generally, but nothing specifically for writing instruction online.
	Not sure
	since training is optional, it varies based on what the individual faculty member want to engage it.
	Started online 20+ years ago--few opportunities to train
	QM training from a previous institution
	optional training was an online class of maybe 6 hours
	All my training has been piecemeal.
	The amount of hours varies widely

	<p>since practically all of our training is optional (and that's a good thing!). So it really is left up to the individual instructor (which, again, is a good thing!)</p>
	<p>I don't know specifics.</p>
	<p>I opted for training, which was a 10-week course (took it 2x for two different courses)</p>
	<p>We had a short presentation we had to watch</p>
	<p>I don't recall. I completed mine years ago. It seems like it was at least 10 hours. This training is not OWI training, but LMS/online course design training for all faculty in general. The training is not paid, but was required (until the pandemic) of all instructors who wished to teach online. This training is unpaid, though could be completed during work hours.</p>
	<p>As many as faculty want</p>
	<p>The pandemic-motivated training was 10 hours in the summer and three one-hour workshops during the semester.</p>
	<p>There are two versions: one for developing *new* courses for online offerings that includes 40-hours of coursework and structured follow up with an assigned instructional designer, and another for teaching *already developed* courses online that is comprised of asynchronous sessions amounting to ~20 hrs.</p>
	<p>not sure</p>

<p><b>Q39 “Other” Responses:</b></p> <p>What do you like about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Flexibility in scheduling</li> <li>● No commute</li> <li>● More focus on students’ writing and skills and less emphasis on students’ personalities in a way that can lead to favoritism in face-to-face classes</li> <li>● Other, expand on your answer</li> </ul>	Shy students open up more
	Students must take on a more active learning mindset with online classes.
	more options for students to complete required courses
	Students read and write more than in F2F courses, just to participate in the course.
	greater opportunity to teach adult learners/other learners who may not attend face to face
	forced to think about course/curriculum design more carefully & critically
	When I taught synchronously, I asked students to type their responses to various questions in the whole group chat and sometimes in private chat to me. A wider range of students participated, and some of the shyer students typed a lot and shared much more privately to me than they would have in a face-to-face classroom.
	More writing overall
	the fact that students write more than in other settings
	More room to innovate.
	I see more diverse student populations online.
	Zero classroom management. There are also possibilities for MORE

	interaction online that I am exploring and developing.
	No COVID exposure!
	Because everyone has to write to participate, I get some feedback from almost every student in almost every discussion. It's much easier to see what they are learning from week to week, what interests them most, etc.
	ability to design my own courses
	geographical flexibility
	I love that you can teach students about writing while they are writing. Often times, we know, students do not view discussion boards, text messaging, course messaging, emails, etc. as writing. I also enjoy watching students come out of their shells in an online course. I feel as though I have a better understanding of students as writers when they are engaging with writing at a high level in an OWC.
	Having time to consider students' discussion responses before responding myself
	Ability to meet the needs of a more diverse student population.
	Promoting student access.
	more time for one-on-one interaction with students and their writing
	More opportunity to prepare in advance, I feel more comfortable

	with that compared to the more "on the fly" teaching that happens in person
	Because I'm doing a hyflex model, I can take the best of online and f2f teaching.
	I don't love teaching online writing courses, in large part because my institution's very tight control on course design. What I do like is the focus on students' writing -- every interaction has to be in writing. But I am also ALWAYS looking for student personalities and how to relate to students as people, not just collections of writing abilities.
	Flexibility and accommodating students with jobs/family obligations
	Not receiving negative feedback because of disability and identity
	working from home to manage my own ability needs, balancing online instruction with face to face instruction
	enhancing students' 21st century digital skills
	When students only have the materials that I have prepared for them, they seem to read them more carefully. When I distribute instructions in class, they often ignore them in favor of my in-class remarks.
	I enjoy the interaction in an online setting
	Working with student populations

	<p>who otherwise would find it difficult or impossible to achieve their degree f2f. Students often follow directions better in online courses (more careful readers of directions and assignment sheets and more self-sufficient). I teach at least 15 credits a semester at a community college and like the variety to my schedule--mixture of online and f2f classes.</p>
	<p>providing greater access for students</p>
	<p>I have heart failure and teaching online is part of my disability accommodation. It allows me to work without taxing my heart, and it keeps me away from large groups. All infections are now dangerous for me -- not just COVID. Limiting contact with lots of people helps me stay well and manage my condition better.</p>
	<p>They are practicing writing constantly in every assignment.</p>
	<p>I actually feel like I get to know my online students better because I interact with them more often as individuals. I also like that it's simpler to make the course accessible to disabled students and provide options for interaction, especially those (like me) who prefer written communication.</p>
	<p>I teach nontraditional and place bound students who would not be able to attend college in person.</p>
	<p>I have a chronic mental health condition that is easier to manage</p>

	when I get to teach OWCs at home.
	We have students with really complicated lives, especially right now. I like providing a quality experience for our students who need the flexibility online classes provide. This is an opportunity to really help with access issues and DEI issues and not consign students who don't have the freedom to be in class at traditional class times to predatory for-profit schools or schools where the bottom line is the driving factor.
	Students can see the structure of the course rather than wonder where we are and where we are going.
	Using different pedagogical tools
	I hate it. Artificial and surreal. The students suffer and are not learning what they need to know.
	there is a difference in the relationship students have with a teacher in online courses when compared to FTF.
	challenging me to
	More flexibility for students.
	Good access for our students.
	different pedagogical environment--to me, it feels easier to build a course
	As the instructor, I can share information, provide feedback, and communicate with students without being performative.

	<p>Hearing from students who would not otherwise "speak up" in F2F class</p>
	<p>More efficient use of my time: I can focus on giving feedback, which I view as the most important part of teaching writing.</p>
	<p>It's the only way to reach a global audience</p>
	<p>The idea of "contact hours" is very silly to me. Online courses allows demonstrate that much of what happens in the classroom (lectures, quizzes, even some groupwork) can be more effective when moved online. It allows you to be more mindful about what modes are most effective for each activity.</p>
	<p>Working from home is important to me, but I also think that giving students the option to be more flexible, in terms of how they interact, as well as making use of the technologies available to enhance learning.</p>
	<p>I readily admit I miss teaching f2f. Hybrid is my ideal because it combines the community and energy of the f2f synchronous experience with the benefits (flexibility, especially) of teaching online. However, in some ways, I've gotten to know (fewer) students better and make a more direct impact on them because of the individualized attention I can provide them. I also appreciate the depth and thoughtfulness I often see in discussions--I think it allows for broader participation. BUT there's a</p>

	<p>loss there, too, because students really don't (or rarely) build relationships with one another.</p>
	<p>I was a skeptic, but when I taught an online course in fall 2020m which I had designed really carefully, and where I had a lot of motivated students enrolled, I saw the best writing I had ever seen in 10 years of comp teaching.</p>
	<p>I like the flexibility overall--I like putting a unit or module up and letting people work at their own pace within a structure,</p>
	<p>I disagree that online learning erases personalities. The potential for favoritism is just as likely online. And the reason I like teaching online is because of the flexibility and accessibility it affords to students. And the online space lends itself to frequent writing.</p>
	<p>There's so much innovation that can take place asynchronously to improve student learning; it's the optimal in student flexibility.</p>
	<p>opening up opportunities for students to take courses that they may not have been able to take if it were only f2f, more individualized attention to individual student learning and progress</p>
	<p>Accommodates physical disabilities I have.</p>
	<p>Not having to go to a campus during a pandemic</p>
	<p>Teaching OL writing courses</p>

	definitely help me focus on usable, informative feedback and improves my teaching in that way.
	More time to focus on class needs and adapt to what students can/cannot do. More quick assessments of student demonstrations of knowledge and skills
	unexpectedly effective

<p><b>Q40 "Other" Responses:</b></p> <p>What do you dislike about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipating student problems</li> <li>• Dealing with technical problems</li> <li>• Managing large class size that is sometimes given to online teachers because physical space is not a limitation</li> <li>• Other, expand on your answer</li> </ul>	Extra cognitive load and time required to manage the course site
	It's harder to build community. Online teaching also did not work for many students during the pandemic. It seems to work effectively when students have chosen it.
	White supremacist and/or "bullying" student not being held accountable
	Students who refuse to participate and ghost everyone.
	forming a connection with students
	Use of "master" courses is needed due to time involved in building good courses, but you miss out on spontaneity to some degree; F2F teaching can be really fun; students may be less likely to seek help if they're not in a room with you.
	Students who don't participate
	constant expectation of availability

	<p>Online grading takes so much more time</p>
	<p>I dislike that individuals who don't teach online think anyone can do it.</p>
	<p>self-discipline as a teacher to get work done</p>
	<p>Less opportunities for connection and interaction with students. Students who stop communicating are harder to track down in an online space. Students who don't understand are less likely to reveal that they don't understand in an online space. Teaching to students who don't have their video on (a bunch of gray boxes with names). Not being able to judge student comprehension as I'm lecturing. Not being able to overhear student problems and issues as they are working in groups unless I interrupt their conversations by joining each breakout room. Having to cut down content because everything takes much longer online.</p>
	<p>Fully online classes are easier for students to ignore/forget about. My students tend to not allocate enough time for online classes (thinking they can slip work into tiny cracks in their overly-booked schedules)</p>
	<p>The personal interaction from a face-to-face classroom goes away in an online writing course.</p>
	<p>the lack of learning opportunities from problem-solving as a class (i.e. if a student raises an issue in class we</p>

	<p>have the opportunity to discuss it all together). That and the lack of organic discussion about difficult topics.</p>
	<p>Lack of communication with students</p>
	<p>Class size is #1. GOOD Online work takes longer, but it's treated as if it takes less time.</p>
	<p>Time!</p>
	<p>Not interacting with students in person, talking to blank/black screens</p>
	<p>Some students do not engage well online, especially if it is a "learn at your own pace" course. The class is out of their sight, so it is out of their mind. Sometimes.</p>
	<p>Lack of as much serendipitous individual interaction with students. Everything is a bit stilted through online synchronous work. Also, I let students turn off their cameras in part due to bandwidth issues on their end and privacy concerns. No one likes to see young students in their bedrooms. And some have home environments they may not want to share.</p>
	<p>Expectation by students that instructors are available 24/7</p>
	<p>pedagogically inferior method of teaching</p>
	<p>The lack of interaction with students concerns me. I feel like I don't get to know students individually as well.</p>

	<p>I miss the embodied interaction, but that's a particularity of my personality. Though, I think that valuable information is exchanged in embodied spaces (changing classes, meeting in the campus coffee house) that gets lost in the online space. Some of us thrive in those spaces.</p>
	<p>Student distraction and lack of participation</p>
	<p>The technical and legal requirements generate large amounts of extra work.</p>
	<p>I miss seeing students face to face in online classes. I also miss the spontaneity of synchronous learning.</p>
	<p>Not being present with students</p>
	<p>Feeling especially disconnected from students who "disappear" from class &amp; difficulty in following up/tracking them</p>
	<p>student expectations that online is easier; more structure (less organic facilitation); can be harder to get to know students/read body lang/context clues</p>
	<p>It's more work/grading. (e.g. normal f2f classroom discussions become a graded event)</p>
	<p>Not knowing whether the student is present or engaged in synchronous settings where camera use is restricted; trying to find ways to ensure student presence and participation in these circumstances</p>

	Asynchronous discussion tools. They're a poor substitute for in-person discussion and they create repetitive instructional work for the instructor.
	screen fatigue
	Students who disappear / stop participating without a trace or explanation
	Losing students because they weren't ready for the responsibility of such a flexible course
	Our institution puts far too many students in online writing courses.
	As much as I tried to emulate the classroom environment and increase comradery in my students, they did their work an that was all.
	more reading, more time consuming, more grading
	The lack of connection to students.
	easier for students to blow off = more more time spent following up
	Anticipating/responding to needs of students unfamiliar with online learning and perhaps unable to articulate even this
	Opportunities for one-on-one conversations in the asynchronous classes.
	I find that accommodating the increased literacy load of OWI makes it difficult to go into much depth with course concepts in asynchronous courses.

	easier for students to avoid accountability conversations or avoid conversations about why they are struggling
	Poor reading skills/behaviors of students
	Students being hesitant about asking questions when they get stuck
	Never really getting to know my students. It can seem very lonely.
	Student attitudes towards online classes (when they didn't choose them).
	Many elements such as guest speakers are not as available as they were in the classroom.
	It's much easier for students to disappear from class than f2f. Much harder to get students back on track because it's so "easy" for them to just stop completing work and not check their student email.
	Excessive paperwork required by my college for remote learning. My college cares more about showing over-compliance with remote learning quality standards from Congress than it does about its students.
	teaching online generally takes more time than teaching in person. It increases my overall workload.
	Helping students make the most of the opportunity when they are uncomfortable with technology.

	It's online
	facilitating engagement as an introvert
	Managing the workload of designing a course and being responsible for keeping it up-to-date without time allotted to do so.
	extra time requirements
	The time that it takes to provide individualized support to students in contrast to the time required for similar support in face-to-face teaching
	Students who are in an online class but who won't/don't check email.
	Workload doubles for OWCs
	Responding to student problems online
	Harder to build community
	Teaching course shells that we are not allowed to alter.
	Lack of personal interactions with students
	Student engagement challenges
	Administrative expectations that online delivery means that students can be assessed through quizzes or exams or that teaching/learning can be automated
	The entire concept. It is dehumanizing us.
	Seems more time-intensive than

	face-to-face instruction.
	None
	I do miss the energy of a face-to-face classroom
	administration does not recognize the increased labor that is involved in preparing and teaching online ---- and the porous boundaries of the online paradigm.
	having to be very repetitive
	connecting with students
	Student perceptions that online courses will be easier than face-to-face ones.
	Lacking that in-person interaction
	Lack of making a real, human connection.
	students don't pay attention and get left behind, then drop out or fail.
	super needy students OR students that flicker in and out of the course.
	lack of direct in person contact
	Interpersonal interaction is limited
	We don't have good tech support
	Feeling detached from students
	It is a LOT of work. Even when I've taught a course many, many times before updating it for a new term--even making minor tweaks--involves a lot of moving pieces.

	<p>Problems in establishing rapport with some students in the class. Because I do one-on-one meetings with students, I think I set expectations for these interactions at a higher bar for myself.</p>
	<p>Online courses are clearly offered for financial reasons (during intersessions), not because institution particularly values online pedagogy (as evidenced by refusal to allow instructors to teach online, as campus returns to face-to-face classrooms during regular semester). Administration also makes statements about "full campus experience," to now indicate the lesser value of online courses.</p>
	<p>Difficulty connecting with the students, establishing rapport, etc.</p>
	<p>The other side of the coin is that when students aren't as motivated, or who do not have time as a resource, it is very hard to get them to keep up with the work and/or complete the work. At the end of the semester, there are always a hand full of students who want to make up 6 weeks worth of work in 5 days. Also, at my school online attrition is really high, which has just totally bummed us out.</p>

<p>Q42 "Other" Responses:</p>	<p>I'm content to remain online (whether synchronous or a-), though I'd like to try hybrid, and I'd be in the classroom again at some point. I want it all</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>Based on your response to question 41, If you had a choice, would you continue teaching in the modality you preferred?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> <li>● No</li> <li>● I don't know</li> <li>● Other (open-ended)</li> </ul>	<p>I actually like a mix of both. I enjoy teaching online, but f2f is my favorite modality.</p>
	<p>I prefer to teach different writing classes in different modes. For instance, I enjoy teaching Technical and Professional Writing online, but I'd prefer to teach Freshman Composition in person</p>
	<p>I really prefer F2F, but I am getting better at online synchronous and see the real benefits (no commute, no childcare issues) for many students.</p>
	<p>COVID is the conditioning factor for these responses.</p>
	<p>I have not taught in any kind of online asynchronous modality. I've either taught face-to-face, online synchronous, or hybrid. I feel like I need some kind of real-time interaction with my students, so I have avoided a fully asynchronous environment.</p>
	<p>depends on life circumstances</p>
	<p>I like F2F and asynchronous online, but I'm interested in trying different modalities as well.</p>
	<p>All modalities offer benefits and disadvantages</p>
	<p>I am open to any option, but focusing on one would make me better able to direct my energies.</p>
	<p>I am happy with both onsite and asynchronous.</p>
<p>While I am open to all, I teach</p>	

	<p>completely online in both asynchronous and synchronous formats. I would like to maintain this format to provide flexibility for other aspects of my life.</p>
	<p>Yes, pandemic willing.</p>
	<p>I will teach in whatever modality because I love teaching, but I definitely prefer asynchronously, online teaching.</p>
	<p>It is situational--some semesters I am more needed face to face and others online. Online synchronous is the only modality I really don't like.</p>
	<p>Would prefer either onsite or synchronous online</p>
	<p>Maybe</p>
	<p>Yes, but I also wish that our university provided an option to add a synchronous class session or two to fully online classes. I am back on campus for the first time this fall. If given the option, I would prefer to remain remote. But that is more for pandemic and commuting reasons than pedagogical ones.</p>
	<p>I prefer seeing students face-to- on occasion; however, my long commute factors into my preferences for at least a hybrid experience.</p>
	<p>Yes. I also wanted to clarify that by "blended/hybrid" I mean synchronous VIDEO + asynchronous. I do not want a f2f component in my writing courses.</p>

	Again, what's the context? In a pandemic, yes. With no pandemic, maybe,
	If it's safe... we're f2f now, and I wish we were hybrid again.
	I am glad I can now comfortably manage any mode

Q43 "Other" Responses:	none
	none
	I'm reading posts from the Global Society, but I mainly work with local folks.
	Technical Writers Association
	Campus-specific communities
	NCTE
	organic conversations with colleagues
	None
	Canvas group
	Eli Review Teaching & Learning Community
	I have checked out these communities at various times, but I don't have the time to participate. I'm teaching six classes in two subjects. Four sections are asynchronous, two went to hyflex because of COVID concerns.
I guess I really don't right now.	

	none
	Online teachers & experts on my campus
	Computers and Writing conference/outlets
	An online instructor community set up by my university.
	Writing Analytics
	WAW, Canvas Communities
	None
	[Name] is my colleague club. :)
	Educause
	I have engaged with resources from CCCC OWI SG, the Online Writing Instruction Community, GSOLE, and QM, but I'm not really an active participant in any of those space.
	I read items from various groups, including those above, but I am not a member of any of them.