



Report on First Virtual Institute

Antonio Byrd and Timothy Oleksiak

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	3
Background and Purpose	3
Thematic Takeaways	6
Pedagogy	6
Assessment	8
Administration	8
Theory	10
Survey Results	12
Suggestions and Considerations Moving Forward	16
Conclusion	17
2024 CCC Virtual Institute Roundtable Speakers	19
2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Attendees	20
Call for Proposals - 2024 Fall Virtual Institute on Machine Writing and the Work of Rhetoric and Composition	23
Institute Format	23
July Informational Meetings	23
Need-Based Waivers for Accepted Presenters	23
Background	23
Call for Roundtable Proposals	24
Form, Style, and Content of Roundtables	24
Expectations for Roundtables	25
Roundtable Participant Commitments	26
Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria for Proposals	26
Proposal Deadline (Please place the following dates and times on your calendar.)	27

	2
Decisions to Proposers with Rationale	27
Tentative Schedule at a Glance	27
Concurrent Session Breakdown	27
Rationale	27
Works Cited	28
Fall 2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Program	29
Fall 2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Announcement	34
Registration	34
Interpreting Services	34
Tentative Schedule	35
Concurrent Session Breakdown	35
References	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Acknowledgments

We want to thank the following folks who took time to offer feedback on the draft of this report and offer insights during CCCC 2025 in Baltimore, Maryland: Jason Tham, Charles Grimm, Michelle Taransky, Jennifer Mitchell, Stephanie Kerschbaum, Jack Kenigsberg, Analeigh Horton, AM, Virginia Costello, Genie Giaimo, and Mya Poe. Any errors or omissions are our responsibility. We thank the CCCC Officers for entrusting us with this undertaking and the CCCC Executive Committee for their good-faith engagement with us as we put forth our ideas. Insights offered by these groups significantly transformed the Virtual Institute and this report for the better. The National Council of Teachers of Education staff, led and coordinated by Kristen Ritchie, were invaluable to the success of this day. We are grateful for their efforts and technical skills and assistance.

Background and Purpose

The purpose of this report is threefold: 1) to story a partial history of the Fall 2024 CCCC Virtual Institute from the co-chairs' perspectives, 2) to archive documents we created for the successful implementation of the Virtual Institute, and 3) to offer recommendations to CCCC leaders and future Virtual Institute chairs. While some reviewers of this report requested citations, we see this as an artifact in an archive that need not function as, perhaps, something akin to a bibliography. We understand our primary audience as folks who have been called to and have accepted chairship of the Virtual Institute and those who want to understand the thought processes animating our approach.

In October 2023, the Conference on College Composition and Communication announced plans to host a one-day virtual institute in Fall 2024. The goal was to expand programming beyond the CCCC Annual Convention and create additional opportunities for building community among members. The one-day virtual institute would focus on a topic of broad significance to CCCC members and the field. Through surveys distributed via email, CCCC leaders sought input from its members on a range of pressing issues in the discipline, such anti-DEI legislation, alternative writing assessments, and generative artificial intelligence. The majority of members believed the virtual institute should address generative artificial intelligence.

At the 2024 CCCC Annual Convention in Spokane, Washington, CCCC Chair Frankie Condon announced the first Virtual Institute on Machine Learning and Writing, co-chaired by us—Timothy Olesiak, associate professor of English at the University of Massachusetts Boston and Antonio Byrd, assistant professor of English at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Between that time and the circulation of our call for proposals, we designed the one-day virtual institute as a community-focused gathering grounded in **five key values or drives**:

First, we wanted to **resist replicating the annual convention**. What structures could we create when we weren't focused on creating a "mini-CCCC"?

Second, we wanted to **be as inclusive in our invitations as possible**. Being solely responsible for inviting speakers for the institute, how could we do so in ways that included a broad range of members from the pool of submitted proposals?

Third, we wanted to **build interaction and dynamism** into the structure. How could we create a dynamic and interactive experience for members?

Fourth, we wanted to **honor the most capacious sense of processing information** possible within the structure of a one-day institute. How could we build in solo time for quiet reflection and processing?

Fifth, we wanted to **create a space for action and agenda setting**. What was our role in helping attendees to think of themselves as agenda setters?

Value/Drive: Create an academic space that did not replicate the annual convention.

We wanted the presenters to unlearn existing approaches to conference presentations. To meet this value, we framed the call for proposal roundtables as conversations among panelists and asked each member to address generative artificial intelligence and writing from one of a few roles: Listener/Synthesizer/Opener; Empiricist/Researcher; Curious Nonexpert; Rhetorical Gadfly; Knowing Scholar/Theorist; and Other, Named Role. We selected these roles in order to honor the broad practices of knowledge-making in our discipline.

Value/Drive: Build a program that was inclusive and represented as much as possible CCCC membership given the proposals we received.

We wanted to capture an inclusive view of generative artificial intelligence and writing. To achieve this value, we created two types of panels: proposed panels and chair-created panels. Our intention here was to represent as much as possible community colleges, historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), tribal colleges, colleagues from institutions outside the United States, teaching colleges, Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs), and/or Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving Institutions (AANAPISIs). We were asking for something different, and so to support accepted speakers we required all speakers or representatives from each panel to participate in an information session, and we required consultation meetings with accepted roundtables to help panelists brainstorm ideas and clarify expectations.

Value/Drive: Structure dynamic interaction as a goal as frequently as possible.

As we encouraged panelists to offer something more creative but no less intellectually rigorous, we also hoped that our many breakout sessions would give attendees the chance to have smaller spaces of interaction. To meet this value, we created smaller and larger breakout sessions to facilitate this experience. We also gave attendees free reign to use the full range of Zoom features, which encouraged folks to use real-time reactions and the side chat for public and private messaging.

While conventional conferences feature panelists presenting their research followed by question-and-answer phases, the virtual institute would be a space for provocative presentations of ideas, focused writing, and small-group interactions. Each roundtable session worked as a foundation of provocation to inspire attendees to write, compose, reflect, and move new or existing projects forward.

Value/Drive: Create space to process before moving onto the next session.

It was important for us to give space for individual reflection so that attendees could process roundtables and gather their thoughts before the first small breakout session. To meet this value, we integrated individual writing/reflection time within sessions. We encouraged folks to free-write, revise their own research agenda, find sources that panelists mentioned, or to develop “clapbacks” as needed.

Value/Drive: Build agenda setting into the structure of the institute.

Finally, we wanted folks not just to enjoy their time during the Institute. We also wanted work to get done. We had hoped that as folks moved throughout the day learning from each other and reflecting, that they would bring big ideas to the town hall meeting or at least consider what was important for them moving forward. We wanted to give focus and purpose to the day without being controlling or stating what experiences attendees should be having. To meet this value, we created a call to action in our opening session and during the final town hall meeting.

During a meeting of the CCCC Executive Committee on May 20, 2024, we presented our vision for the structure and layout of the institute. This structure and other concerns such as compensation for co-chairs and financial support for invited speakers was discussed and approved by its members. The Executive Committee and staff from NCTE were highly receptive to our inclusive vision and offered suggestions for how to draw on the greatest number of people possible, such as offering a full-day event rather than smaller events distributed across three afternoons in the same week or three Friday afternoons in a row. Approval was unanimous and NCTE staff offered just about everything we had requested, making the planning process direct and unencumbered.

What follows is a distillation of key challenges and considerations based on the conversations we heard, the notes taken, and the resources shared throughout the day. This report suggests directions for future research and teaching in generative artificial intelligence and writing. It offers pathways for how CCCC itself may take official positions on the place of GenAI and writing. Importantly, it was written in collaboration with attendees of the institute, if not directly then surely with their input and suggestions based on what they wrote in response to our survey about the institute and how they responded to a draft of this report that we circulated prior to and during CCCC25.

Thematic Takeaways

We clustered the Virtual Institute around four key themes: pedagogy, assessment, administration, and theory. We recognize that other themes exist. For example, we can imagine a future institute focusing on various stakeholders—teachers, students, administrators, communities—or on wicked problems, or on genres, methods, or on galvanizing our knowledge for political action, etc. Our rationale for such themes was based on the broad outputs that are common in rhetoric and composition. These themes also represented areas of our profession that we believed are most impacted by the advancement of GenAI.

No single event can reasonably cover all there is to say about machine writing and we admit that between the Virtual Institute and now, the state of machine writing has altered dramatically. However, as we processed the day's events and considered the post-institute survey distributed to members, we noticed some of the larger takeaways that might support an active research agenda by those who wish to take it up. We, Antonio and Timothy, offer broad statements in **bold** followed by a list of positions and questions that cluster around each statement. Our thinking here is to offer action paired with generative research-focused questions that suggest no easy answers. We hope that these takeaways and themes might be incorporated into writing courses as topics for student research. With this in mind, we review the ideas that emerged from each cluster: pedagogy, assessment, administration, and theory.

Pedagogy

Rhetoric and composition has taken the teaching and theorizing of writing instruction as part of its identity. And yet, the presence of GenAI creates real and imagined pressures for fast and uncritical production or reduces writing, too often, to prompt generation. GenAI requires a reconsideration or reframing of our disciplinary values and curricula, while rethinking cultures of learning to make writing feel less task-based and more critically engaged with meaningful writing and the study of writing's impact on social reality.

Lead with social justice.

Engaging GenAI is a matter of social justice. That is, thinking about how privilege, inequity, entitlement, and access in regard to GenAI reveals students' varying ability to apply critical digital literacy to GenAI. What kinds of support do writing teachers across institutional types need to move beyond surveillance pedagogy? In what ways might GenAI support students with specific writing or educational needs? How can writing teachers balance their values regarding GenAI with complex student need? In addition, understanding the negative impacts of GenAI on creativity, labor, and the environment seems like an important and meaningful research agenda. Finally, it will be increasingly important to consider carefully what GenAI ed tech companies are offering teachers of writing. Making sure theory and practice, not market-based solutions, drive the teaching of writing is something worth insisting upon. How do we rewrite the script on writing technologies and capitalism?

Analyze and critique GenAI.

Not all writing courses require direct hands-on practice with GenAI. Instructors may help students launch critiques of GenAI tools themselves without using such tools. Such an approach might focus on students having knowledge of GenAI capabilities, how they are designed, who they serve, and to what ends they support students' critical digital literacies. What might GenAI

literacy mean? What are its contours? How might we recognize this literacy in the work of our students?

Advocate for the teaching of writing process/workflow over text generation.

One concern of GenAI is the quick production of text. Students may present all or significant portions of the synthetic text as their own authentic human-generated writing to writing instructors. Writing mediates thinking and reflection, which in turn shapes how we perceive and engage our social realities. Extensive reliance on GenAI for writing and research reduces independent problem-solving. Developing active learning pedagogy and teaching metacognition with writing technologies emphasizes and teaches human cognitive processes and critical thinking about GenAI. Given the rapid output of GenAI products, what pedagogies are necessary to persuade students of the value of process?

Study when and how students deploy GenAI in their writing process/workflow.

There are a number of theoretical and empirical studies that focus on consciously deploying GenAI in writing classrooms; however, research about how students use GenAI on their own without direct instruction from writing instructors would provide a wealth of knowledge about GenAI in students' writing processes. Increased knowledge of non-classroom use of GenAI might offer more precise ways to accept or reject such technologies in our classrooms. Such research would be a reboot of foundational scholarship in composition pedagogy on writing process going back to the 1960s and 1970s. What empirical studies and pedagogical explorations are necessary for understanding how writers work with and take up GenAI outputs?

Add reading instruction as a key priority in composition.

While GenAI may summarize difficult texts, it's important that writing instructors teach students that reading is more than "getting the gist" of the author's argument. One approach is clarifying that there are multiple purposes for reading and each purpose has a different strategy. This demonstrates reading as a complex activity beyond merely reading to pass a quiz or test. How does GenAI influence reading and retention of information? How might GenAI aid with reading and comprehension development?

Protect the labor of writing instructors from encroaching ed tech companies.

We need to organize ourselves in response to the corporatist ways GenAI is being imposed on instructors' labor across campuses (along with so many other profound impositions taking place concurrently). CCCC leadership must collaborate with members to imagine systemic ways of responding concretely in real-time. What collaborative partnerships might CCCC as an organization form to make its knowledge and advocacy more widely available to non-rhetoric and composition stakeholders? What labor practices and unionizing efforts are necessary to resist the rapid automation of teaching and learning?

Develop policies that respond to the rapidly advancing capabilities of GenAI.

Syllabus policies shape the pedagogical constraints and affordances of teaching GenAI. (A policy that prohibits GenAI is a pedagogical lesson.) Policies and their justification may become outdated as GenAI develops. For example, discouraging GenAI use for research because it hallucinates sources applies to many conversational AI; however, Perplexity challenges this notion as it often cites the links. Research Rabbit is another AI-powered website, which creates a web of sources associated with or cited by a given core text. What resources do teachers need to create policies that students adhere to? How do we move from policies of surveillance to policies grounded in critical engagement with how learning communities are structured?

Adapt existing guidelines to assignments that consider GenAI.

Writing program administrators and instructors may work together to determine how assignments can be revised in light of AI's capabilities. How might we move from developing "AI-proof" writing assignments to developing meaningful writing experiences for students that support their learning?

Assessment

Surveillance pedagogy disrupts relationships in learning environments among faculty, students, and university administrators. The ongoing use of GenAI detection tools continues to disproportionately accuse multilingual students and international students of using GenAI in their writing and creates an environment in which students actively reshape their writing—not to learn how to write or to learn about themselves as writers, but to "pass" the detection software. With the possibility of AI being used, how are assessments created that still demonstrate competency in spite of its use? If we add an outcome for using LLMs, what are we putting down?

Assess for process.

For better or for worse, GenAI has capabilities that apply to the writing process. Writing instructors should de-emphasize the final essay as the end goal and focus on writing experiences and what students learn from those experiences. If a writing program (see Administration section) or individual instructor allows GenAI use, students should reflect on the experience of using GenAI and what it does and does not add to their writing. How might portfolios help writing instructors understand students' writing processes?

Alternative grading models.

While much of first year composition may use rubrics for pragmatic purposes (setting clear expectations for students, supporting writing program assessment, and reducing the labor and time of grading essays across multiple sections of composition), instructors may consider other forms of grading that bring process and reflection to the forefront of learning outcomes. Writing program administrators (WPAs) may consider programmatic requirements, such as allowing instructors to use whatever assessment model they wish with a separate rubric for programmatic assessment of students' writing. How might our various methods of assessment change in a cultural moment dominated by rapidly developing GenAI?

Develop strategies for addressing inappropriate/unethical use of GenAI.

Writing classrooms inherently create close relationships among students and teachers. Instead of relying on surveillance pedagogy or immediately reporting students for academic integrity violations, how might instructors give students due process and use rhetorical listening to address inappropriate/unethical use of GenAI?

Administration

Whereas individual faculty might have their own approach to machine writing, WPA policy and support casts a much wider net and has a greater variety of stakeholder needs. What is right for a single teacher of writing is not always appropriate at the programmatic level. How might WPA work reach those writing teachers laboring at institutions without formal programmatic structures, especially those at the two-year college level? Administrators who direct first-year composition programs, writing centers, and academic majors or minors often struggle with AI at

the programmatic level, but also with how to create the best, most-informed policy language for faculty, students, and staff within their programs.

Situate AI policy within the local needs of your program.

There are multiple first-year writing curricula to consider: teaching for transfer, writing about writing, academic writing, argumentative writing, writing in the disciplines, community-engaged writing, etc. Writing program administrators that lead academic majors or minors or who direct Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs must frequently consider vertical programming beyond the first-year experience. How might WPAs across these program foci come together to think through AI policy? How do we maintain programmatic autonomy and agency as WPAs in the presence of pressure to integrate machine learning into our first-year writing curriculum? When we are ready, how do we get seats at institution-level committees on machine writing and learning? How do we create AI policies that honor various resistances and acceptances of machine writing and GenAI?

Review AI policy language with various stakeholders.

It is necessary but insufficient to create AI policy without gathering input from the folks impacted by that policy. What does AI policy that is built not just *for* student writers but *with* student writers look like? How do we help faculty understand that timed-writing and writing by hand often conflict with the learning outcomes and values of the discipline?

Coordinate AI policy efforts across writing programs and scholarly groups.

When students are left to navigate policy, they often turn to writing centers for support and guidance. How can writing centers and composition or writing-enriched curriculum programs build networks of communication for students who make use of campus writing support? First-year composition programs and writing centers have valuable opportunities to coordinate AI policy efforts. If coordination is not desirable or possible, how then can WPAs communicate their programmatic policies appropriately to writing center leaders and staff? How might writing center directors initiate such conversations? Members could, for example, begin this work by looking to the International Writing Centers Association for any statements supporting such collaborations.

Determine and accept what is beyond WPAs' reach.

What does it mean for WPAs who cannot outpace the advance in machine writing and learning or GenAI technologies? What forms of resistance are possible for WPAs facing pressures from higher administration to integrate machine writing and learning in the classroom?

Work with faculty to develop systematic and critical approaches to machine writing.

WPAs need to develop training practices that help faculty systematically approach their own reactions and understandings of machine writing. How might WPAs effectively support faculty who experience challenges or heightened emotional responses in light of GenAI? How can WPAs create spaces of communal knowledge for their faculty without taking on the emotional weight of faculty's responses to it? How do we present a capacious understanding of machine writing, its environmental degradation, its product-focused outputs, its training on white linguistic norms, and its use-value for disabled students to inform the policies we might create?

WPAs should build articulation networks with area secondary education teachers to collaborate on age-appropriate, context-specific AI policy.

What coordination beyond our institutions might help us understand more deeply what kinds of writers are entering our programs? How does a deeper understanding of secondary education policy support the difficult transition into college-level writing development? How might we have

these articulation conversations in the spirit of mutual reciprocity and critical generosity rather than epistemic arrogance?

CCCC can support networked opportunities for collaborative research.

For those of us interested in grant-funded research, a concern that has taken on greater consequence since January 20, 2025, how can CCCC use its resources to support members with grant applications, processes, and administering of monies? What networking possibilities are available for large, multi-year, and multi-institutional research—and how can CCCC begin to support these opportunities beyond what is initiated by already well-supported research scholars?

Theory

For those of us who consider using and making rhetorical and composition theory part of the work we do, a host of questions and concerns emerged from the discussions in this cluster. Generally, rhetoric and composition is well-positioned to consider machine writing, what it is, what it means, what its impacts might be, and why it matters for the things we hold valuable in the profession. Many questions and concerns emerge as we think about the work we do as knowledge-makers.

Rhetoric and composition is positioned well to speak on this matter.

We have knowledge that can and does speak to this moment. While we can take heart knowing that we have created consequential knowledge about writing and technology, digital communication, social media, machine learning, etc., we have not yet done sufficient cross-disciplinary and political work that allows others to see our field as having anything to say about the issues surrounding the development of GenAI. How can we position ourselves in spaces where this knowledge is sought and heard well by those in power? How might the micro-interactions we have with students function as a counternarrative to other normative narratives surrounding machine writing?

Rhetorical theorists have insights and answers to many questions about machine writing.

What empirical research can help us see the effects of AI on student learning, writing, and the complexities of global Englishes? How do student writers use AI in their writing processes? What assessments are possible for detecting AI use ethically? What pedagogical approaches need to be developed and circulated to help us support students on the uptake, or not, of machine writing? What can we learn from our histories so that our responses to machine writing is neither inappropriately alarmist nor laudatory? How does machine writing shift the way we think about and with disability, and how does disability thinking shape our approaches to machine writing?

Machine writing is creating new research agendas in the discipline's major areas of concern.

How is GenAI transforming the way we, as professionals, think about our own work? Is any advancement in GenAI and machine writing saving us labor?

Editorial work requires a deep engagement with and response to machine writing.

One roundtable focused on the matter of academic publishing and it is therefore unsurprising to see that editors across journals within our fields need to have responsive policies to GenAI and machine generated content. What, if any, appropriate use policies can be created? How can

editorial boards support editors in this work? Having editorial policies can support authors as they make choices about where to publish and how their work might be used or taken up to train AI models.

More and better modes of resistance are necessary.

In an institute decidedly focused on how to use and think with/about machine writing, many folks wanted space and time away from the matter. The volume of discourse surrounding machine writing makes “just don’t respond” an unsupportive response. It is unsupportive precisely because it does not respond to the affective pull that overwhelming discourses have on our scholarly communities. How can we support folks whose positions on machine writing insist that we not support it?

Conclusion

As we conclude this section, we wanted to point to a particular absence from the CCCC Virtual Institute. For many roundtable presenters and attendees the focus was largely on accepting machine writing within the discipline. A small but patient number of attendees rightly pointed out that resistance to machine writing is real and reasonable. While we gave space for panelists on roundtables to speak as “rhetorical gadflies,” this disposition was not the norm nor was it given much space during the structure of the day. Additionally, some attendees did not consider the role of “gadfly” as sufficient for creating a space for counterargument or resistance. We recognize a chilling effect this might have on folks who have good reasons for being critical of machine writing.

Survey Results

In this section we share with you the results of the post-institute survey that was distributed to all speakers and attendees, and our cursory understanding of what these results suggest for future Virtual Institutes. We offer this information about the thematic takeaways and various responses to our survey items to deepen thinking. The responses to the survey suggest ways for future institute leaders, invited speakers, and attendees to consider as they plan. We include the raw survey data in this report should others wish to spend more time with it.

Our intention was to assess what participants thought of the institute and what, if any, suggestions they might have. We received 49 responses (out of 411 registered attendees for an 8.38% response rate). All Likert-scale responses were based on a 1–5 scale, with 5 being the highest positive rating and 1 being the lowest.

Q1 - Overall, how would you rate the event?

Respondents rated the event overwhelmingly positively, with 98% of respondents ranking the VI a 4 or 5 out of 5. We believe that such positive results encourage CCCC to continue to develop and refine the structure and culture of the VI.

Q2 - Please indicate which session(s) you attended (check all that apply).

Roundtable Session A – Administration #1 (16.67%)
 Roundtable Session A – Theory #1 (6.25%)
 Roundtable Session B – Pedagogy #1 (20.83%)
 Roundtable Session B – Assessment #1 (9.72%)
 Roundtable Session C – Theory #2 (4.17%)
 Roundtable Session C – Pedagogy #2 (22.22%)
 Roundtable Session D – Assessment #2 (11.11%)
 Roundtable Session D – Administration #2 (9.03%)

As we look at the distribution of what sessions were attended by respondents this seems to track with the kinds of scholarship and work that is popularly valued in rhetoric and composition: pedagogy and support for the teaching of writing. During our CCCC 2025 open session allowing members to comment more freely on this report, one attendee suggested that conference organizers might think more broadly about session types. For example, rather than “theory” and “administration,” future VI chairs might think about “students, administrators, teachers, and community.”

Q3 - What drove your decision to attend the sessions you selected?

33.33% of respondents had a particular session fit within their available time.
 39.78% of respondents had the description of the roundtable session pique their interest
 15.05% of respondents selected their session because it aligned with their research interests.

We gesture hesitantly that folks make decisions about which session to attend because they are curious and interested, not for support on their own research agenda. It might be that the format of the VI was an influential factor on how attendees spent their time. Future VI chairs might want to refine the survey to see how the structure of the VI shapes decision-making. While it is beyond the scope of this report to follow this insight further, we do believe that this result holds potential for how sessions are written and shaped, and will help conference planners think through what drives people to particular sessions.

Q4 - Should CCCC leadership invest resources in future Fall Virtual Institutes?

93.88% of the respondents said “yes,” which encourages CCCC leadership to continue with this community experience for our members.

Q5 - What did you like most about the event?

Q6 - How do you think this event could have been improved?

We combine questions 5 and 6 since they describe both sides of the VI coin.

A key highlight from the 49 responses on question 5 was that participants enjoyed the opportunity to connect with others, learn what their colleagues were thinking about generative artificial intelligence, and share information/resources. This theme aligns with the goal of the VI: to create space for community-learning and information-sharing. “Participant-centered” should typify all future VI events, and future VI chairs should use any available technologies to strategically provide lots of opportunities for audiences to engage with each other. This theme also means using the roundtables as jumping-off points for conversations, and not as the center of the event.

For question 6, format and engagement was one area for improvement. For example, participants believed a day-long event was too long. One participant felt “attention-fatigue” and was exhausted by the end of the day. Another had suggested more breaks, which conflicts with a suggestion to have more breakout session time and less writing time (writing time functioned as both rest time and writing time). Some expressed interest in making the institution a multi-day event, an idea we had considered in the initial planning stages and would strongly suggest for future chairs. Again, future VI chairs might want to refine the survey item to invite respondents to offer a rationale for their suggestions.

While having conversations in the chat and later in breakout rooms was a good idea, it felt overwhelming with the number of participants. Relatedly, participants wished they were better prepared or had aligned themselves to their roles. While some roundtables did better than others, one felt more like a conference presentation. We believe the new format challenged presenters to unlearn typical approaches to presenting, even with careful coaching from the co-chairs. The more that members participate in and observe these formats the easier members will adapt to writing in this new genre. Future chairs should plan to create a digital space where participants can share resources seamlessly and have the opportunity to pay for others’ registration or donate a registration.

Some respondents wished there was language that suggested openness to refusal and reported that during the sessions refusal was dismissed. One thing we noticed as co-chairs was a remarkable absence of proposals that took a refusal stance. The call for proposals (CFP) may not have been explicit in its openness to these and all other views. This may also be a result of timing: requests for proposals went out in the summer of 2024 when refusal did not seem to be a visible and heard perspective. However, in early fall these voices became more prominent, especially in response to the MLA-CCCC Task Force on AI’s Working Paper 3.

Each VI takes on a different theme, such anti-DEI legislations and policies and alternative assessment. As such, future institutes should clearly indicate that all perspectives are welcome and encourage proposals from those stances.

Q7 - Reflect on the cost of the Fall Virtual Institute by rating the following prompts from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Participants in the VI believed that the experience was worth the cost. While surely not universal, we believe that the lowest possible cost to members is a value that future chairs should maintain. Over 65% of participants agree that if CCCC made registration donations possible, they would donate. We find this a truly generous intention and it will be important for CCCC to recognize this generosity by allowing members to make such donations in the future.

Q8 - Consider that the Fall Virtual Institute was a one-day event. Based on your experience this year, what is the ideal number of days for a Fall Virtual Institute?

One full day – 55.10%

Three half-days over three weeks – 32.65%

While the results suggest a modest preference for one full day, nearly half the respondents mentioned a preference for something different. We must admit that a 10-hour, consistently “on” day for us as co-chairs was exhausting, even with breaks. What these results suggest to us is that future chairs should continue to play with the structure of the VI, not so that we can “get it right for every participant,” but because we hope that the spirit of the VI—to play with what is possible for a scholarly community—continues to be the driving force of it.

Q9 - Reflect on the organization (multiple Zoom links for sessions; breakout rooms; general format of the day) of the Fall Virtual Institute by rating the following prompts from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Over 80% of respondents believed that the communication about the institute was helpful for planning the day. Respondents also believed that it was easy to navigate in and out of the various sessions. A similar number of respondents believed that the breakout sessions were well-managed. We were pleased, also, to note that a high percentage of respondents also believed that their access needs were met (84%).

While the response rate on this item is high, it is important that future chairs consider those who were dissatisfied with communications or did not have their access needs met in order to make adjustments that result in more robust involvement of attendees. We hope changes to format and technology are explained and framed in a way that is responsive to member needs and are educational for members who need demonstrations of what disability advocacy looks like at an institutional level.

Q10 - Do you have any other comments that you’d like to share with CCCC leadership and the co-chairs?

While the overwhelming majority of comments indicated that the institute should continue next year, there were some criticisms about the structure and organization of the day. For example, there was some dissatisfaction with the length of the day and the need for longer breaks. Some respondents had concerns about registration fees being prohibitive to graduate students, which suggests to us a need for a tiered fee structure. The most frequent comment among these respondents was a consternation with a lack of resistance in both the original call we created and the content throughout the day. No panels nor speakers during the institute made the case for full-throated AI resistance in our field, though these voices do exist. Considering oppositional stances, especially when the institute is themed, might be time well-spent.

To this last point, it is important for members to understand that the content of the VI was largely in the hands of roundtable discussion leaders. We note this not to place responsibility for dissatisfaction on proposers but rather to note that CCCC members need to feel like their

perspectives can be proposed and taken seriously. A review of calls for proposals to the next VI should, we believe, have a revision that considers the ways that the CFP might disincentivize oppositional perspectives.

Because we were asking panelists to take risks and to resist the typical modes of presenting scholarly information, we created two required information sessions to communicate our intentions and to field questions. After the VI, we wanted to see if the support we offered was sufficient for our panelists. We do not include Q11 because that item simply directed respondents to either the end of the survey or to items specific to roundtable speakers. As such, the following items were responded to by roundtable speakers only.

Q12 - Reflect on the support offered prior to the day's events and rate the following prompts from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The majority of roundtable leaders felt supported before the day's events. However, we recommend more time between proposal acceptances and the VI so leaders are better prepared, especially if future VI organizers take on a non-traditional format. This aligns with participants' requests for better preparation from their leaders.

Q13 - What other things do you believe the co-chairs should know about regarding the selection, construction, and support for roundtable leaders?

While two of the four respondents suggested that there was not much more we could have done, this was not universal. Worth paying attention to was a response from an organizer-led roundtable that voiced that it was a significant workload to—rather than present on their original, proposed idea—try to mesh their new panel together. We value combining proposals and believe that it speaks to the good faith attempts to honor our vision. But this combining is labor intensive. Future chairs of the VI should keep this insight into the kinds of support they offer presenters top of mind. As a balance to this feedback, another organizer-led roundtable presenter noted that the opportunity to work with colleagues they did not know was a net-positive experience. Future chairs can surely take these insights into future communications should the “organizer-led” panel be repeated.

Readers may [access the complete data](#) here.

Suggestions and Considerations Moving Forward

In our capacity as CCCC Virtual Institute co-chairs, we wanted to offer a final word on what future chairs or co-chairs might consider as they take up the exciting challenge of serving the field in this way.

First, more work is needed to help colleagues habituated to the “park and bark” of an academic conference to unlearn these dispositions for a virtual environment.

We take “park and bark” from stage performance lingo that has a singer simply standing in one spot on the stage and performing. It takes a very accomplished and careful performer to make “park and bark” engaging for audiences even as it is the most common presentation experience at CCCC. We do not use “park and bark” as a pejorative for academic speakers. Those who use this approach to presenting their knowledge and expertise are in good company. The goal here, however, is to sensitize ourselves to this default approach and to think deliberately about what is needed to support scholars when asking them to take different approaches.

Speakers need time and support to align with institute chairs’ visions for non-conventional ways of presenting academic knowledge. Behaviors and expectations for breakout sessions that include “mindful interruptions” of those who dominate should be communicated with attendees and speakers. But more than just communication, attendees and speakers need to make such practices a deliberate choice in real time.

The further away from standard practice we get, ultimately, the more support our colleagues need. Asking for risk-taking must be balanced with trust-building. Attendees and conference designers must not hold this risk-taking against our colleagues. Risk-takers shoulder some responsibility for taking care of attendees. Mutual generosity of spirit can take us very far in this matter. How to develop it, foster it, and request it is work worth doing.

Second, the pace of the day should be given deliberate attention.

The chair or co-chairs of the next CCCC Virtual Institute should maintain a focus on the various bodyminds that attend the next institute. We considered a 3-day event spread out over 3 weeks and our survey suggested that 32.65% of respondents would support this structure. CCCC leadership and institute chairs should consider both financial possibilities of new structures and needs of members.

Third, there will continue to be a difficult balance between greater inclusion on the official program for invited speakers and space and time for attendees to have rich and rewarding experiences.

We offer the following questions to think through as you develop the next iteration of the institute:

1. How can you work with CCCC Caucus leaders to encourage proposal submissions?
2. How can the various institute documents that chairs/co-chairs must create (CFP, calls to participate, video support, workshops, etc.) help members see themselves as capable of proposing their ideas as *discussion leaders*?
3. How can you balance the desire for more speakers with the need for rest and with attending to access or disability needs during the day?

Fourth, there is work to be done to make the CCCC Virtual Institute a regular benefit for members.

Subsequent leaders of the institute will want to work with CCCC Officers and the Executive Committee to institutionalize the structure while remaining open to the creative spirit that drove us.

Do we, for example, vote to elect institute chairs or co-chairs or do we trust CCCC leadership to select members with the demonstrated commitment to serve the organization, as Frankie Condon has done with us? How do we build trust in this process knowing full well that whatever we choose from one year to the next has its affordances and limitations?

Fifth, members deserve to know via official CCCC communications how decisions about the CCCC Virtual Institute are made with respect to theme and institute leadership.

CCCC leadership has a right to choose what it believes benefits its members, but a clear explanation of how things came to be this way and why would build trust among leadership and members. Members would do well to understand that selecting institute chairs comes from the deep knowledge pool of elected leaders and isn't done capriciously. We believe these things are necessary for enacting CCCC's mission to function as an anti-ableist, antiracist organization.

Sixth, be direct in the kinds of support you need to enact the vision you have and be nimble when CCCC leaders (officers and Executive Committee members) reasonably insist upon alternatives.

What are your non-negotiables? Have a very small number of these. For example, do you need additional reviewers for proposals? At what point would you need additional reviewers (50 proposals? 25? 100?)? We were able to review and establish a program with 125 proposals. Knowing your limit can help leadership call in additional support for you.

Seventh, continue to work for the kinds of compensation that make sense to you as chair of this major service commitment.

We agreed to serve CCCC as co-chairs of this experiment we call the Virtual Institute. It is not, in other words, a chance to line our pockets. But we were able to advocate for our registration to be covered at the annual conference in Baltimore, Maryland. We also advocated for support for invited speakers. That support looked like a limited number of registration waivers for speakers. The CCCC Executive Committee made this optional as many of our speakers were established in their careers and might want to support CCCC with their registration fee.

Eighth, use the publicly-accessible survey data from the Fall 2024 Virtual Institute as a basis for rationales and decisions to the extent that it is reasonable to do so.

The post-institute survey included the following item: "How do you think this event could have been improved?" While we have not shared a deep analysis and complete summary of these results, it will be incumbent upon future chairs to retain this question and consider it as they plan each Institute.

Conclusion

It is our hope that this is the first of many such reports that are created as part of the work of chairing this event. Such continued reporting not only creates an interesting archive of how the organization has changed but ensures a kind of continuity that prevents a "starting from zero" approach to the institute.

To our mind, the first CCCC Virtual Institute was a resounding success. We have succeeded in remaining true to our values and desires and have seen how the day proved rich and rewarding.

We are proud of the work that we have done for our members and believe that the institute is worth replicating, developing, and stabilizing as a regular feature of CCCC. Not as a replacement for our annual conference, which cannot be replicated, but as an added benefit of membership. We are grateful for the trust CCCC leadership has placed in us and the freedom they gave us to create our vision.

With respect,

Antonio Byrd and Timothy Oleksiak, 2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Co-Chairs

2024 CCC Virtual Institute Roundtable Speakers

Ira Allen
Virginia Costello
Rebecca Hallman Martini
Matt Davis
Dylan Dryer
Mya Poe
Lainie Pomerleau
Jason Tham
Franziska Tsufim
Casey Boyle
Ali Gunnells
Maddie Bruegger
Carlee Baker
Samantha Turner
Salena Anderson
Xiao Tan
Rodrigo Gomez
Lynn Briggs
Kate Crane

Eugenia Novokshanova
Michelle Kassorla
Jennifer Duncan
Jennifer Hall
Marsha W. Rhee
Stephen Kim
Quang Ly
Jessica Mattox
Lydia Wilkes
John Gallagher
Anuj Gupta
Shiva Mainaly
Fatima Zohra
Sherry Rankins-Robertson
Aurora Matzke
Angela Clark-Oates
Kyle Jensen
Priscila Santa Rosa
Anastasia Salter

2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Attendees

Alaa Abdelghaffar
 Anoud Abusalim
 Heather Adamson
 Jun Akiyoshi
 Sam Alexander
 Christine Alfano
 Ira Allen
 Abram Anders
 David Anderson
 Salena Anderson
 Tracey Anderson
 Jennifer Arena
 Jean Arthur
 Michael Avery
 Adrianna Aviles
 Maggie Ayala
 Raegan Babb
 Lana Baeumlisberger
 Austin Bailey
 Carlee Baker
 Paige Banaji
 Sarah Banting
 Layla Barati
 Benjamin Barckholtz
 David Barndollar
 Rodolfo Barrett
 Mary Barry
 Aryn Bartley
 Nathan Bauer
 Aaron Beasley
 Stacey Beauregard
 Erin Beaver
 Estee Beck
 Marne Benson
 Sherrin Berezowsky
 Catherine Berkenfield
 Siddharth Bhogra
 Michael Black
 Kelly Blewett
 Ann Bomberger
 Melissa Borgia-Askey
 Casey Boyle
 Kate Bradley
 Kirsten Bradley
 Alicia Brienza
 Lynn Briggs
 Marilee Brooks-Gillies
 Mary Brower
 Maddie Bruegger

Beverly Burch
 Melanie Burdick
 Dolphia Butler
 Antonio Byrd
 Megan Callow
 Adam Camarena
 Kyndra Campbell
 Lillian Campbell
 Ellen Carillo
 Brooke Carnwath
 Maria Carvajal Regidor
 Ruiming Cash
 Christopher Castillo
 Geneve Champoux
 Erin Chandler
 Laura Clapper
 Angela Clark-Oates
 Catherine Clifford
 Rachel Cofield
 DeSilver Cohen
 Sarah Coletta-Flynn
 Joanna Collins
 Denise Comer
 Frankie Condon
 Katherine Condra
 Thais Cons
 Ana Contreras Charmelo
 Janice Cool Stephens
 Kris Cory
 Virginia Costello
 Katheryn Crane
 Jamie Crosswhite
 Christopher Davidson
 Laura Davies
 Matthew Davis
 Jennifer Dawes
 Ann Dean
 Thomas Deans
 Rachel Del Signore
 Renee DeLong
 Michael-John DePalma
 Lorise Diamond
 Lorrie DiGiampietro
 Amy Dohm
 Jayne Doneskey
 Michael Donnelly
 Dylan Dryer
 Michael Dufresne
 Jennifer Duncan

Michelle Eble
 Michael Edwards
 Nicole Emmelhainz
 Diana Epelbaum
 Jason Evans
 Adam Fajardo
 Robert Faunce
 Maggie Fernandes
 Jake Ferrington
 Ann Fetterman
 Jenn Fishman
 Maureen Fitzpatrick
 Laura Flint
 Christopher Foree
 Ashley Fortner
 Jen Foster
 Elle Fournier
 Monica Fox
 Kimberly Freeman
 Susie Fries
 Bridget Fullerton
 John Gallagher
 Jeff Gard
 Sarah Garelik
 Lindsey Gendke
 Barbara George
 Carolyn Geraci
 Catherine Gillespie
 Brian Gogan
 Emma Gomez
 Joanne Gonzalez
 Michelle Graber
 Valerie Gramling
 Leslie Grant
 Jillian Grauman
 Meredith Gravett
 Kindall Gray
 Angela Green
 Nicole Green
 Brent Griffin
 Charles Grimm
 Rachael Groner
 Allison Gross
 Elliott Gruner
 Eric Grunwald
 Elisabeth Gumnior
 Alexandra Gunnells
 Anuj Gupta
 Emiliano Gutierrez-Popoca

Pamela Haji
 Jennifer Hall
 Susanne Hall
 LewEllyn Hallett
 Rebecca Hallman Martini
 Talisha Haltiwanger
 Morrison
 J W Hammond
 Cheryl Hampton
 Barbara Handt
 Susanmarie Harrington
 Holly Hassel
 Wendy Hayden
 Ling He
 Edwina Helton
 Jill Heney
 Joel Heng Hartse
 Brandon Herring
 Susan Hesemeier
 Heather Hill
 Matt Hill
 Wendy Hinshaw
 Corrine Hinton
 Kelsey Hixson-Bowles
 Titcha Ho
 Deborah Hodgkins
 Mara Holt
 Lauren Hornberger
 Analeigh Horton
 Andrew Hudgins
 Paul Huey-Burns
 Rik Hunter
 Zita Hüsing
 Rossitza Ivanova
 Lindsey Ives
 Krista Jackman
 Lubna Javeed
 Kyle Jensen
 Helen Jeoung
 Chelsea Johnson
 Maureen Johnson
 Emily Johnston
 Leigh Jones
 Mikala Jones-Wall
 Jay Jordan
 Linda Jordan
 Tyler Julian
 Sean Kamperman
 Martha Karnes
 Adrienne Kaufmann
 Tara Kazmark

Megan Keaton
 Erin Kelly
 Sara Kelm
 Jack Kenigsberg
 Stephanie Kerschbaum
 Jessica Kester
 Stephen Kim
 Elizabeth Kimball
 Ana King
 Carie King
 Kristen Kirkman
 Amanda Knopf
 Laura Kovick
 Denise Krane
 Maureen Kravec
 Sarah Kruse
 Joy Kwon
 Sarah Lacy
 Marisa Lamb
 Brenda Lanphear
 Ethna Lay
 Lisa Lebduska
 Meredith Lee
 Soyeon Lee
 Erica Leigh
 Barbara Leplattenier
 Ruth Li
 Sasha Litzenberger
 Andy Jiahao Liu
 Janet Lively
 Maria Perpetua Liwanag
 Nick LoLordo
 Nattaporn Luangpipat
 Amy Lueck
 Jennifer Lutman
 Breanna Lutterbie
 Quang Ly
 Christina Lynch
 Kathleen Lyons
 Sasha Maceira
 Yogita Maharaj
 Shiva Mainaly
 Shirley Manigault
 Christina Mar
 Holly Marich
 Farah Marklevits
 Bruce Martin
 Londie Martin
 Cynthia Martinez
 Christine Martorana
 Carrie Matthews

Jessica Mattox
 Tina Matuchniak
 Aurora Matzke
 Gabriella Mazal
 William McCarter
 Megan McIntyre
 Adam McKee
 Beatrice McKinsey
 Cruz Medina
 Kristi Melancon
 Cynthia Miecznikowski
 Benjamin Miller
 Daisy Miller
 Lynn Miller
 Sandra Mills
 Lilian Mina
 Cynthia Mishlove
 Jennifer Mitchell
 Kendra Mitchell
 Tiffany Mitchell
 Jackie Mohan
 Kathleen Mollick
 Stephen Monroe
 Jenna Morton-Aiken
 Paul Muhlhauser
 Colette Murphy
 Brigitte Mussack
 Melinda Myers
 Nimmy Nair
 Siskanna Naynaha
 Heather Nelson
 Alissa Nephew
 lisa nienkark
 Trishena Nieveen-Phegley
 Matt Noonan
 Krystia Nora
 Eugenia Novokshanova
 Ildi Olasz
 Timothy Oleksiak
 Adrienne Oliver
 Matthew Osborn
 Amanda Oswalt
 Lana Oweidat
 Grant Palmer
 Donna Paparella
 Courtney Parker
 Jessica Parker
 Joy Pasini
 Kalani Pattison
 Matthew Pavesich
 Shanna Peeples

Vanessa Petroj
 Kelly Peugh-Forte
 Danielle Pieratti
 Emily Plummer Catena
 Mya Poe
 Lainie Pomerleau
 Kate Pond
 Phatik Poudyal
 Steven Price
 Melody Pugh
 Jill Quandt
 Jill Quinn
 Juval Racelis
 Alma Ramirez
 Sherry Rankins-Robertson
 Diane Ransdell
 Kyle Ratsch
 Lynn Reid
 Rhonda Reid
 Brandi Reyes
 Marsha Rhee
 Tonya Rickman
 Tanya Robertson
 Glendal Robinson
 Shelley Rodrigo
 Christine Ross
 Kacey Ross
 Deborah Rossen-Knill
 Jonathan Rovner
 Kezia Ruiz
 Larissa Runyan
 Kate Ryan
 Heidi Saenz
 Consuelo Salas
 Anastasia Salter
 Catherine Savini
 Sherri Sawicki
 Martha Schaffer
 Erika Scheurer

Priscila Schilaro Santa
 Rosa
 Anne Schnarr
 Amata Schneider-Ludorff
 Jennifer Scott
 Amanda Scukanec
 John Seabloom-Dunne
 Emily Sendin
 Inês Signorini
 Jillian Skeffington
 Heidi Skurat Harris
 Jenn Sloggie
 Alexander Slotkin
 Elizabeth Smith
 Jason Snart
 Lingshan Song
 Lauren Springer
 Jess Stallings
 Jadwiga Staniszevska-
 De Mott
 Jessica Steele
 Jennifer Stewart
 Stephanie Stewart
 Wendy Stewart
 Jennifer Stumphy
 Billie Tadros
 Xiao Tan
 Michelle Taransky
 Kathleen Tarr
 Gina Terry
 Jason Tham
 HoaiAnh Thanh
 Jenny Thomas
 Julie Thompson
 Lizbett Tinoco
 Tamara Toomey
 Rachel Trnka
 Mika Troutman
 Mariya Tseptsura

Franziska Tsufim
 Samantha Turner
 Kimberly Turner-Shukis
 David Tver
 Onur Ural
 Melissa Valerie
 Marisol Varela
 Molly Vasich
 Elizabeth Vincelette
 Beth Virtanen
 Nicole Vogler
 Jori Waldron
 Dana Walker
 Amy Wan
 Tiffany Wang
 Christine Watson
 Daniel Weinstein
 Rebecca West
 Grace Wetzel
 Sarah White
 Kinlee Whitney
 Lydia Wilkes
 Mary Williams
 Kelly Wilson
 Natalie Wilson
 Katie Winkelstein-
 Duveneck
 Erica Wnek
 Tara Wood
 Allison Wright
 Allison Wynhoff Olsen
 Wei Xu
 Ashley Yuckenberg
 Grace Zanotti
 James Matthew
 Zarnowiecki
 Robert Zawatski
 Jesseka Zeleike
 Havva Zorluel Ozer
 Damian Zurr

Call for Proposals - 2024 Fall Virtual Institute on Machine Writing and the Work of Rhetoric and Composition

Institute Format

The one-day event will feature eight roundtable sessions on machine writing, two on each of the four larger areas of interest that machine learning challenges: theory, pedagogy, assessment, and administration. The day will include four participant-created roundtables and four chair-created roundtables with no special distinction made between them. Each panel, whether participant-created or chair-created, will have opportunities to collaborate with each other and the co-chairs before the event. Those submitting proposals for individual roles will be placed in a chair-created roundtable.

The roundtables will activate further ideation among participants. After each roundtable, participants will have thirty minutes to process what they've heard by writing notes or fully thought-out responses. Then everyone will return for small breakout conversations, each led by at least one roundtable participant. Each small group will be assigned one prompt: From your thirty-minute processing, create a shared list of concerns, values, resources and tools, and/or future projects that should be explored as teaching, research, or service activities, either collaborative or individual.

July Informational Meetings

Given the newness of the format for this institute, the co-chairs, Antonio Byrd, University of Missouri-Kansas City, and Timothy Oleksiak, University of Massachusetts Boston, held two informational meetings in July to clarify any expectations and confusions members might have. Please visit the [Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQ\)](#) page resulting from the informational meetings.

Email cccc@ncte.org with questions.

Need-Based Waivers for Accepted Presenters

CCCC will offer up to 20 need-based registration waivers (valued at \$60 each) for accepted presenters to the [2024 CCCC Fall Virtual Institute](#). Priority will be given to graduate students and contingent faculty accepted to the institute program.

Proposal submitters should complete the [application form](#) by the deadline for institute proposals, which is August 9, 2024, at 10:00 a.m. ET.

Background

In the fall of 2023, the Conference on College Composition and Communication asked members to pick a topic of broad significance to them and the field for a CCCC one-day institute. An overwhelming majority of members selected machine learning and writing, which should not come as a surprise, given that generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) seems to represent a paradigm shift in composition and rhetoric. The discipline had generative AI on its radar before these tools came onto the scene of our social literacy histories (Burns; Hart-Davidson; McKee and Porter). However, the widespread availability of AI platforms to individual students and

teachers, their adoption in the workplace and higher education, and their swift development in the last eighteen months, poses important questions about the impact these tools have on the teaching of writing, on writing research, and on the social activity of writing itself.

For example, how do we meet the expectations that we teach ethical use of AI (Flaherty), when we know that even one output activates environmental degradation (Luccioni et al.; Crawford)? Or that the development of these tools relies on raw materials mined from the Earth by modern enslaved Black Congolese women and children (Noble; Sovacool)? When we move away from what's behind the design of GenAI, we find our labor transformed as private industry sells affordable versions of GenAI to our universities under the auspices of "efficient" writing processes and grading ("Introducing ChatGPT Edu"; "HAI at Five")? In that light, what responsibilities do humans and GenAI share in writing, research, and administration; what tasks might be off-loaded to GenAI; and what might that mean for teaching and learning AI? Finally, how might our commitment to rhetorical truth (Roberts-Miller; Mercieca; McComiskey) address bad actors' deployment of GenAI for misinformation and troubling varieties of deepfakes, most recently middle school and high school students creating deepfake nudes of classmates (Singer)?

However, recent scholarship on the latest GenAI tools have shown neither hype, dismissing these technologies, nor total disdain, but rather nuanced arguments on composing and GenAI using our existing research methods and rhetorical theories (Ranade and Eyman) and careful use case scenarios for our writing classrooms (Vee et al.). Another unsurprise, then, is that we are equipped to interrogate utopian discourse about AI and how dominant groups may use these tools to perpetuate existing inequality to show up power and capital for themselves (Crawford; Preston).

Call for Roundtable Proposals

We wish to continue this dynamic conversation and state at the top that we discourage uncritical championing of machine-writing technologies or simple demonstrations of a particular technology. We're excited to invite group (4–5 speakers) and individual roundtable proposals for the first-ever one-day CCCC Fall Virtual Institute, devoted to critical conversations on wicked problems challenging rhetoric and composition. This year, we seek roundtable discussions that build on current conversations about machine learning and writing.

We imagine this event differently than a virtual conference that replicates in-person CCCC. Rather, the CCCC Fall Virtual Institute is a space for provocative presentations of ideas, focused writing, and small-group interactions. Each roundtable session will work as a foundation of provocation that will inspire attendees to write, compose, reflect, and move new or existing projects forward. By the end of the conference, the results of the conversation will be distributed to CCCC members.

We consider this institute an opportunity to learn in the community. Thus, both roundtable participants *and* attendees will be listed in the final program. If you are included as a roundtable participant, you may place this item on your CV under national, peer-reviewed conference presentations as a roundtable speaker or discussant.

Form, Style, and Content of Roundtables

We imagine each roundtable as playing with creating a style and tone that is at once engaging, informative, and generous to the multiple values and member needs on the broad matter of machine writing. Roundtables might offer staged dialogues with archetypes such as European

Medieval morality plays or Platonic dialogues. Perhaps participants are inspired by myths and stories from Indigenous peoples or shaped by their unique geo-cultural locations. A mock trial or curriculum meeting at a community college could offer structure. Participants might use these roles to provoke creative tensions that inspire those witnessing the roundtable discussions into new ideas.

Expectations for Roundtables

Each participant selected will be responsible for offering cohesive roundtable experience. Rather than seeking atomized presentations, we ask that each member collaborate with each other well in advance of the day's events and consider taking one of the following roles:

- Listener/Synthesizer/Opener – In this role, you are processing information that is shared by others and contributing when you have a question, concern, or idea.
 - How will you bring ideas together during the roundtable? How will you prepare attendees for what they are about to experience with your roundtable?
- Empiricist/Researcher – You have come with a project in mind and are looking for development and refinement.
 - What kinds of empirical projects are important for the rhetoric and composition specialists to undertake in this larger area of interest? How might you use your individual empirical project as a way to broaden what can be possible for empirical, data-driven researchers?
- Curious Nonexpert – You are coming with an active interest in machine writing but have not had time to immerse yourself in the literature.
 - What curiosities do you bring to the area of interest that other, more knowing colleagues might respond to? What do you want to know? Why is learning important for you and your movement through the profession?
- Rhetorical Gadfly – You are incredulous and are eager to share your contrary and informed opinions.
 - What objections, frustrations, or killjoy experiences can you offer to productively engage the roundtable and create meaningful dissonances for attendees to consider?
- Knowing Scholar/Theorist – You have studied this stuff and have citations and scholarly conversations that you believe are important to share with our community. Rather than general gestures to the literature, you are able to recall the scholarly positions within the conversation.
 - What learned experience, critical conversations, or scholarly expertise can you offer during the roundtable discussion, either in support of colleagues' ideas or as critical responses to what is being offered?
- Other, Named Role – If there is a role you imagine playing that is not included among the roles listed here, you are welcome to name it, describe its character, and list one or two questions this role is animated by in your proposal(s).

We encourage roundtable participants to identify speaking roles to encourage richer dialogues and to highlight the critical nature of these rhetorical dispositions in the creation of knowledge. We think the notion of taking a role rather than simply presenting your own research for others to listen to can bring us closer to collective learning experiences that have guided the format of this event.

Finally, feel free to use the questions associated with each role as a guide to developing your proposal.

Roundtable Participant Commitments

Should you be selected as a roundtable participant, we ask you to join the co-chairs, Antonio Byrd, University of Missouri-Kansas City, and Timothy Oleksiak, University of Massachusetts Boston, for a short informational session on Zoom to ground expectations for roles, possible structure, and brief suggestions on leading breakout discussions so that “What do you think?” is not the first and only question used to generate discussion.

We strongly encourage invited roundtable speakers to attend one of two optional virtual sessions to share any issues or concerns about their roundtable with co-chairs before the CCCC Fall Virtual Institute.

These sessions will occur via Zoom on

- September 18, 2024, 11:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. ET
- September 19, 2024, 10:00–11:00 a.m. ET

Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria for Proposals

For Group (4–5 speakers) Roundtable Proposals

- Proposals should be no more than one thousand (1,000) words long.
- Proposal speaks directly to the area of interest—theory, pedagogy, assessment, or administration.
- Your proposal is grounded in a concept or series of concepts related to machine writing and your area of interest.
- Your proposal includes representatives from more than two of the following categories: community colleges, HBCUs, tribal colleges, colleagues from institutions outside the United States, teaching colleges, HSIs, and/or institutions that are part of the AANAPISI program.
 - While this is not a deal-breaker for program acceptance, those with two or more of the aforementioned representatives will take priority.
- Proposal identifies the role each speaker is interested in playing in the roundtable.
- If applicable, name and description of a role not listed in this call.

For Individual Roundtable Proposals

- Proposal should be no more than one thousand (1,000) words long.
- Proposal speaks directly to the area of interest—theory, pedagogy, assessment, or administration.
- Proposal is grounded in a concept or series of concepts related to machine writing and your area of interest.
- Proposal identifies the role you are interested in playing in the roundtable.
- If applicable, name and description of a role not listed in this call.

In order to ensure maximum participation in the roundtables, individuals will be limited to one speaking role.

Proposal Deadline (Please place the following dates and times on your calendar.)

Proposals must be submitted by August 9, 2024, at 10:00 a.m. ET. We selected 10:00 a.m. ET to ensure that there are support staff available to assist with any submission problems. Email cccc@ncte.org with questions.

Decisions to Proposers with Rationale

All proposers can expect brief feedback about our decisions by 5:00 p.m. ET on August 16, 2024. If you are not selected as a featured roundtable speaker that does not mean you are excluded from participating during the many institute open town hall sessions. Bring all of your ideas to share in our learning community.

Tentative Schedule at a Glance

10:45–11:00 a.m. ET – All Attendees: Brief opening remarks as people connect to Zoom

11:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Administration Roundtable or Theory Roundtable

1:00–3:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Pedagogy Roundtable or Assessment Roundtable

3:00–5:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Theory Roundtable or Pedagogy Roundtable

5:00–7:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Assessment Roundtable or Administration Roundtable

7:00–8:00 p.m. ET – All Attendees: Open Townhall and Moving Forward for Our Members

Concurrent Session Breakdown

The roundtable dialogues will break down into the following schedule:

1. 45-minute roundtable dialogues relating to the area of interest
2. 30-minute individual writing or reflection period
3. 20-minute breakout session
 - Five or six different randomly assigned breakout rooms with a roundtable participant as leader
4. 10-minute report-back, speak-out session
5. 15-minute break between sessions

Rationale

We use four participant-created roundtables and four chair-created roundtables as an inclusive practice. In this model, we do not favor full group roundtable discussions over individual proposals. Some CCCC members may be better connected than others and more able to bring together colleagues to participate in a roundtable, while others may not. Not having access to networks, we believe, should not prevent individuals who wish to present as selected roundtable members. Thus, we encourage CCCC members across professional status and institutional type to submit a proposal: undergraduates with faculty mentors, graduate students, tenured and non-tenure-track faculty, adjunct instructors, independent scholars, writing program and writing center administrators, and writing center tutors.

Works Cited

- Burns, Hugh. "A Note on Composition and Artificial Intelligence." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 1, no.1, 1983, pp. 3–4.
- Crawford, Kate. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven, Yale UP, 2021.
- Flaherty, Colleen. "Survey: How AI Is Impacting Students' Career Choices." *Inside Higher Ed*, 10 Jan. 2024, www.insidehighered.com/news/student-success/life-after-college/2024/01/10/survey-college-students-thoughts-ai-and-careers. Accessed 9 June 2024.
- "HAI at Five: Celebrating 5 Years of Impact." *YouTube*, uploaded by Stanford HAI, 5 June 2024, www.youtube.com/live/wVqNLaN7cJQ?si=GjzRD6qTSmuAp-mQ&t=23124.
- Hart-Davidson, William. "Writing with Robots and Other Curiosities of the Age of Machine Rhetorics." *The Routledge Handbook of Digital Writing and Rhetoric*, edited by Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes, Routledge, 2018, pp. 248–55.
- "Introducing ChatGPT Edu." *OpenAI*, 30 May 2024, openai.com/index/introducing-chatgpt-edu/. Accessed 9 June 2024.
- Luccioni, Sasha, et al. "Power Hungry Processing: Watts Driving the Cost of AI Deployment?" *FAccT '24: Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, Association for Computing Machinery, 2024.
- McComiskey, Bruce. *Post-Truth Rhetoric and Composition*. UP of Colorado, 2017.
- Mercieca, Jennifer R. "Dangerous Demagogues and Weaponized Communication." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 264–79.
- McKee, Heidi A., and James E. Porter. *Professional Communication and Network Interaction: A Rhetorical and Ethical Approach*. Routledge, 2017.
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. "A Future for Intersectional Black Feminist Technology Studies." *Transversing Technologies*, special issue of *S&F Online*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2016. *Barnard Center for Research on Women*, sfoonline.barnard.edu/safiya-umoja-noble-a-future-for-intersectional-black-feminist-technology-studies/.
- Preston, John. *Artificial Intelligence in the Capitalist University: Academic Labour, Commodification, and Value*. Routledge, 2022.
- Ranade, Nupoor, and Douglas Eyman. "Introduction: Composing with Generative AI." *Computers and Composition*, Vol. 71, 2024, 102834, doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102834.
- Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Rhetoric and Demagoguery*. Southern Illinois UP, 2019.
- Singer, Natasha. "Teen Girls Confront an Epidemic of Deepfake Nudes in Schools." *New York Times*, 8 Apr. 2024, www.nytimes.com/2024/04/08/technology/deepfake-ai-nudes-westfield-high-school.html.

Sovacool, Benjamin K. "When Subterranean Slavery Supports Sustainability Transitions? Power, Patriarchy, and Child Labor in Artisanal Congolese Cobalt Mining." *The Extractive Industries and Society*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2021, pp. 271–93.

Vee, Annette, Laquintano, Timothy, and Schnitzler, Carly. (Eds.) (2023). *TextGenEd: Teaching with Text Generation Technologies*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2023. doi.org/10.37514/TWR-J.2023.1.1.02.

Fall 2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Program

ALL-ATTENDEE OPENING — 10:45–11:00 a.m. ET

Institute Co-Chairs:

- Antonio Byrd, University of Missouri–Kansas City
- Timothy Oleksiak, University of Massachusetts Boston

CONCURRENT ROUNDTABLE SESSION A — 11:00 A.M.– 1:00 p.m. ET

Option 1 — Administration

This roundtable will invite users to play an interactive adventure game in order to consider how writing program administrators facilitate real, low-stakes, complex conversations with layered audiences around AI. This gaming experience, directed and facilitated by the roundtable panelists, will ask participants to employ a concept-tactic approach of rhetorical listening. The virtual session aspires to disrupt the narrative(s) that generative AI has wreaked havoc on operations. Step outside of (or at least next to) the milieu, for a few minutes, in order to examine the roles, responsibilities, challenges, and opportunities in ways that open dialogue and sustain interest. In short, we will play and in doing so discover ways to engage with what may seem almost insurmountable.

11:00–11:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- Sherry Rankins-Robertson, University of Central Florida
- Aurora Matzke, Chapman University
- Angela Clark-Oates, California State University, Sacramento
- Kyle Jensen, Arizona State University
- Priscila Santa Rosa, University of Central Florida
- Anastasia Salter, University of Central Florida

11:45–12:15 — Focused Writing

12:15–12:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

12:35–12:45 — Large-Session Report Back

12:45–1:00 — Personal Break

Option 2 — Theory

This panel positions AI hype as an opportunity to develop grant proposals in writing studies with reproducible, aggregable, data-driven (RAD) designs. Panelists will share examples from their own research, such as corpus-driven analysis of AI prompts, and discuss how these projects can be adapted to collaborative RAD frameworks. The session will provide a collaborative space for participants to theorize and develop study designs aimed at fostering cross-institutional collaborations in the field while enabling researchers to evaluate those designs, thereby preventing confirmation bias.

11:00–11:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- John Gallagher, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
- Anuj Gupta, University of Arizona
- Shiva Mainali, University of Memphis
- Fatima Zohra, University of Waterloo

11:45–12:15 — Focused Writing

12:15–12:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

12:35–12:45 — Large-Session Report Back

12:45–1:00 — Personal Break

CONCURRENT ROUNDTABLE SESSION B — 1:00–3:00 p.m. ET

Option 1 — Pedagogy

Our pedagogy roundtable will encourage discussions about the affective and emotional responses we have had to generative AI in university writing classrooms. Both undergraduate and graduate writing instructors alike must respond to the affordances and pitfalls of generative AI by first considering the various rhetorical situations and individual student challenges already present in their classrooms. Our roundtable will allow participants to take stock of their existing pedagogy and grapple with the need for critical AI literacy while examining its place alongside our time-tested pedagogical strategies like critical genre awareness, reflective writing, and experiential learning opportunities.

1:00–1:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- Marsha W. Rhee, Johnson C. Smith University
- Stephen Kim, Cornell University
- Quang Ly, University of Miami
- Jessica Mattox, Radford University
- Lydia Wilkes, Auburn University

1:45–2:15 — Focused Writing

2:15–2:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

2:35–2:45 — Large-Session Report Back

2:45–3:00 — Personal Break

Option 2 — Assessment

Join us in a Composition II Course Committee meeting where diverse views on AI in assessment are discussed with the goal of creating a program assessment rubric for the age of machine writing. Together, we'll explore innovative ways to integrate AI into meaningful evaluation of student writing. #EdTech #AlinEducation

1:00–1:45 — Roundtable facilitators

- Eugenia Novokshanova, Georgia State University
- Michelle Kassorla, Georgia State University
- Jennifer Duncan, Georgia State University
- Jennifer Hall, Georgia State University

1:45–2:15 — Focused Writing

2:15–2:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

2:35–2:45 — Large-Session Report Back

2:45–3:00 — Personal Break

CONCURRENT ROUNDTABLE SESSION C — 3:00–5:00 p.m. ET

Option 1 — Theory

This roundtable will feature the editors of *College Composition & Communication*, *Computers & Composition*, and *Written Communication* who will consider several “live questions,” created by moderator Ira Allen, about the role that AI plays or might play in academic publishing. These editors will discuss how generative text technologies are and will inflect the processes and policies of their respective journals. The roundtable will also reserve time for attendees to consider those same questions, thus allowing editors and participants to collaborate on the future of academic journal publishing in rhetoric and composition.

3:00–3:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- Matthew Davis, University of Massachusetts Boston
- Ira Allen, Northern Arizona University
- Jason Tham, Texas Tech University
- Mya Poe, Northeastern University
- Dylan Dryer, University of Maine
- Kara Taczak, University of Central Florida

3:45–4:15 — Focused Writing

4:15–4:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

4:35–4:45 — Large-Session Report Back

4:45–5:00 — Personal Break

Option 2 — Pedagogy

As college students' reading abilities decline (allegedly), educators face new challenges in teaching effective reading and composition skills. While much attention has been given to AI writing tools like ChatGPT, other emerging technologies are also transforming how students read and research, such as AI-powered PDF readers and advanced research applications. A working group from the University of Texas at Austin's Digital Writing & Research Lab explores how these machine reading and research technologies reshape composition pedagogy and impact student learning. By combining established reading theories with a survey of new technologies, the group aims to provide insights into how machine reading may impact composition pedagogy, considering both its potential benefits and challenges.

3:00–3:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- Casey Boyle, The University of Texas at Austin
- Ali Gunnells, The University of Texas at Austin
- Maddie Bruegger, The University of Texas at Austin
- Carlee Baker, The University of Texas at Austin
- Samantha Turner, The University of Texas at Austin

3:45–4:15 — Focused Writing

4:15–4:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

4:35–4:45 — Large-Session Report Back

4:45–5:00 — Personal Break

CONCURRENT ROUNDTABLE SESSION D — 5:00–7:00 P.M. ET

Option 1 — Assessment

What do equitable and effective assessment practices look like in an era of artificial intelligence? This roundtable focuses on designing and revising writing assessments to integrate AI and learning objectives related to critical AI literacy. Exploring assessment in a variety of classroom and institutional contexts, we consider equitable assessments, ecological models, new rhetorics and rhetorical theories of assessment, and resistance of assessment-as-surveillance. Participants are invited to create or revise their own writing assessments informed by reflection on the roundtable discussion.

5:00–5:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- Salena Anderson, Georgia Southern University
- Xiao Tan, Utah State University

- Rodrigo Gomez, San Diego Miramar College
- Lynn Briggs, Eastern Washington University
- Kate Crane, Eastern Washington University

5:45–6:15 — Focused Writing

6:15–6:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

6:35–6:45 — Large-Session Report Back

6:45–7:00 — Personal Break

Option 2 — Administration

How does AI challenge what we do in the classroom, department, and institution? Why do we need AI policies and statements? Our roundtable invites participants to join us in a charette-style experience, in which organizers and stakeholders work together to create solutions, and to collectively work through the thornier issues involved in creating, administering, and enforcing equitable and just AI policies. We will take participants through three scenarios that embrace the complications that AI administrative genres—which include but are not limited to policy—create for students, staff, faculty, and other campus community stakeholders. Participants will draft actionable policy artifacts in real time to effectively respond to generative AI policy decisions across learning and administrative contexts.

5:00–5:45 — Roundtable Facilitators

- Rebecca Hallman Martini, University of Georgia
- Virginia Costello, University of Illinois Chicago
- Lainie Pomerleau, College of Coastal Georgia
- Franziska Tsufim, Wake Forest University

5:45–6:15 — Focused Writing

6:15–6:35 — Small-Group Breakouts

6:35–6:45 — Large-Session Report Back

6:45–7:00 — Personal Break

ALL-ATTENDEE OPEN TOWN HALL AND MOVING FORWARD FOR OUR MEMBERS —
7:00–8:00 p.m. ET

Institute Co-Chairs:

- Antonio Byrd, University of Missouri–Kansas City
- Timothy Oleksiak, University of Massachusetts Boston

Fall 2024 CCCC Virtual Institute Announcement

The first-ever one-day CCCC Fall Virtual Institute is devoted to critical conversations on wicked problems challenging rhetoric and composition. This year's event will host roundtable discussions that build on current conversations about machine learning and writing. The one-day event will feature eight roundtable sessions on machine writing, two on each of the four larger areas of interest that machine learning challenges: theory, pedagogy, assessment, and administration.

We imagine this event differently than a virtual conference that replicates in-person CCCC. Rather, the CCCC Fall Virtual Institute is a space for provocative presentations of ideas, focused writing, and small-group interactions. Each roundtable session will work as a foundation of provocation that will inspire attendees to write, compose, reflect, and move new or existing projects forward. The roundtables will activate further ideation among participants. After each roundtable, participants will have thirty minutes to process what they've heard by writing notes or fully thought-out responses. Then everyone will return for small breakout conversations, each led by at least one roundtable participant. Each small group will be assigned one prompt: from your thirty-minute processing, create a shared list of concerns, values, resources and tools, and/or future projects that should be explored as teaching, research, or service activities, either collaborative or individual. By the end of the conference, the results of the conversation will be distributed to CCCC members.

We consider this institute an opportunity to learn in the community. Thus, both roundtable participants and attendees will be listed in the final program.

Registration

Not a CCCC member yet? Save \$80 on your registration by becoming a member today! Take advantage of this special opportunity to experience the value of CCCC and NCTE membership all year long. To join CCCC and receive the discounted rate on your CCCC 2024 registration, [join NCTE](#) and select the Conference on College Composition and Communication constituent group.

Rates: \$60 for CCCC members and \$140 for nonmembers

[REGISTER HERE](#)

All registrants must agree to the [NCTE Event Policies](#). All presenters must register for the Institute.

Please Note: Refunds will not be given after October 16, 2024.

Interpreting Services

The 2024 CCCC Fall Virtual Institute sessions will have Zoom captioning enabled for all attendees. If you require ASL interpreting or CART services, requests can be made by emailing cccc@ncte.org or through the institute registration process. All requests need to be made by September 15, 2024, to ensure scheduling availability. After an attendee indicates that they are in need of additional interpreting services, NCTE will confirm receipt of the request within 10 business days and will provide information on the next steps.

Tentative Schedule

10:45–11:00 a.m. ET – All Attendees: Brief opening remarks as people connect to Zoom

11:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Administration Roundtable or Theory Roundtable

1:00–3:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Pedagogy Roundtable or Assessment Roundtable

3:00–5:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Theory Roundtable or Pedagogy Roundtable

5:00–7:00 p.m. ET – Two session choices: Assessment Roundtable or Administration Roundtable

7:00–8:00 p.m. ET – All Attendees: Open Townhall and Moving Forward for Our Members

Concurrent Session Breakdown

The roundtable dialogues will break down into the following schedule:

1. 45-minute roundtable dialogues relating to the area of interest
2. 30-minute individual writing or reflection period
3. 20-minute breakout session
 - Five or six different randomly assigned breakout rooms with a roundtable participant as leader
4. 10-minute report-back, speak-out session
5. 15-minute break between sessions