**INITIAL REPORT OF
THE CCCC COMMITTEE FOR BEST PRACTICE IN
ONLINE WRITING INSTRUCTION (OWI)**

THE STATE-OF-THE-ART OF OWI

APRIL 12, 2011

BETH L. HEWETT, CHAIR
DEBORAH MINTER
KEITH GIBSON
LISA MELONCON
SUSHIL OSWAL
LESLIE OLSEN
SCOTT WARNOCK
CHRISTA EHMANN POWERS
W. WEBSTER NEWBOLD
JULIE DREW
KEVIN ERIC DE PEW

INTRODUCTION

The Committee for Best Practices in Online Writing Instruction (OWI) has been working for four years toward a best practices statement regarding the teaching and learning of OWI. Its current charges are:

1. 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.

2. Identify best practices for using online instruction specifically for English language learners and individuals with disabilities in coordination with related CCCC committees.

3. 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."

4. Share best practices in OWI with the CCCC membership in a variety of formats.

The Committee's original charges also included the following two charges:

1. 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;

2. Identify best practices for training and professional development of online writing instructors.

To the end of achieving these goals, the Committee has developed an annotated bibliography of OWI published to the general NCTE membership. It also has participated in and analyzed field visits to various institutions that practice OWI as well as other interviews of online writing instructors. These research opportunities were undertaken to create a series of action-targeted research questions, outlined below. The research questions were formulated with a series of initial assumptions about OWI and the Sloan Consortium's qualities of best practices in mind.

The Committee's initial assumptions began with the idea that OWI comprises writing instruction that occurs—at least partially if not fully—in a computer-based, Internet, or intranet instructional setting. It uses online/digital media to provide instruction; to talk about writing; or to distribute, share, and/or collect writing-related materials. OWI can occur in either the synchronous or asynchronous modality using a variety of electronic media, platforms, and technologies. OWI potentially is applicable to all learners of English language writing skills to include native English speakers, English language learners, and those with physical and/or learning challenges.

The CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI recognizes a difference in a (currently) primarily text-based online instructional environment from one that traditionally occurs face-to-face. The Committee takes no position on the oft-asked question of whether OWI *should be* used and practiced in postsecondary settings because it accepts the reality that currently OWI *is* used and practiced in such settings. The Committee therefore believes that OWI needs its own study, theories, and practices. The Committee fundamentally believes that OWI has the potential to be an efficacious activity for postsecondary students and faculty. It recognizes, however, that some students and faculty will be better suited to the online educational environment than others. Further, it seems that there are certain conditions under which OWI can be implemented more effectively than others. Discerning and describing such conditions are part of this committee's charges.

Specific to the postsecondary educational level, the major purposes of this committee's work are to identify, analyze, and synthesize some of these conditions, which will be called "best practices." We define best practices as programs, initiatives, or activities that are considered leading edge, or exceptional models for others to follow, or—even more generally—as processes and activities that have been shown in practice to be the most effective from postsecondary student, faculty, administrator perspectives.

The Sloan Consortium (2005)[1] identified the criteria of effective, or best, practices in online education, which are considered related and interdependent in that "practices in one area affect quality in another." To varying degrees, the Committee agreed that elements of the following are useful in discussing best practices: innovation, the ability of the program to be repeated in other settings, potential impact on the field, supporting documentation of effectiveness, and scope in that "the practice explains its relationship with other quality elements."

The Sloan Consortium identified the elements of "quality pillars," or best practices, in online learning as:
- Learning Effectiveness: The provider demonstrates that the quality of learning online is comparable to the quality of its traditional programs.
- Cost Effectiveness and Institutional Commitment: Institutions continuously improve services while reducing cost.
- Access: All learners who wish to learn online have the opportunity and can achieve success.
- Faculty Satisfaction: Faculty achieve success with teaching online, citing appreciation and happiness.
- Student Satisfaction: Students are successful in learning online and are pleased with their experience.

Using these criteria and elements of best practices as initial tenets, the committee formulated the following research questions on which all of our activities have been based thus far:

Questions based on elements of Best Practices
Learning effectiveness
- What are the principles that ground effective student learning in an OWI environment?
- What conditions foster such learning?

Cost effectiveness and institutional commitment
- What are quality benchmarks for OWI?
- Costs
    - What are the financial costs of OWI?
    - What are the hidden costs of OWI?
    - How are these costs comparable to traditional writing instruction?
    - How should institutions/administrators address these costs?
- What are the features of institutional support for an effective/successful OWI program?

Access
- What conditions foster student access to OWI?
- In what ways do administrators and faculty have similar and different responsibilities for fostering such access?
- Along these lines, what conditions foster faculty access to OWI?

Student satisfaction
- What are characteristics of student satisfaction in an OWI environment?
- What conditions foster student satisfaction?

Faculty satisfaction
- What are the characteristics of faculty satisfaction with OWI?

---

[1] http://www.aln.org/publications/books/v9n3_moore.pdf; see also http://www.sloan-c.org/effective/

- What conditions foster faculty satisfaction with OWI?
- How should online instructors be evaluated, especially in comparison to existing evaluation structures used in tenure and promotion?

Questions based on modalities, etc. list
Modality-specific questions
- What are the characteristics of synchronous technologies in an OWI program?
- What conditions foster successful synchronous OWI?
- What are the characteristics of asynchronous technologies in an OWI program?
- What conditions foster successful asynchronous OWI?
- How should faculty choose between these modalities when using these technologies to achieve writing course objectives?

Environment-specific questions
- What are the characteristics of hybrid learning environments for OWI?
- What conditions foster successful hybrid OWI?
- What are the characteristics of distance learning environments for OWI?
- What conditions foster successful distance OWI?
- How can content management systems be leveraged for OWI?
  - What are the differences in using large-scale, standardized content management systems (Blackboard, WebCT, etc.) vs. smaller, open-source systems (Moodle, etc.) for the delivery of OWI?
- How can gaming simulations and other non-text-based environments be leveraged for OWI?
- How can collaborative environments like wikis be leveraged for OWI?

Pedagogy-specific questions
- What traditional learning strategies, if any, are appropriate for OWI? [example strategies: collaborative learning, co-teaching]
- How can we apply those strategies, if any, to an OWI environment?
- What learning strategies are distinctive to an OWI environment?
- How do we encourage and improve collaboration among students in online writing instruction in distance-based classrooms?
- How do faculties stimulate student participation in OWI?
- What conditions foster student motivation in OWI environments?
- What are appropriate uses of new technologies in OWI? What conditions foster the funding and employment of such technologies?

Population-specific questions
- To what extent and in what ways can OWI accommodate certain learner groups other than native English speakers?
  - English language learners
  - Students with physical challenges
  - Students with learning challenges

Professional development-specific questions
- To what extent and in what ways should administrators [and, subsequently, faculty trainers] encourage new instructors to elect an OWI environment?
- How can instructors new to content management systems be supported to use those systems for OWI?
- What professional qualities and skills need to be emphasized in new instructor training and on-going professional development relative to OWI?
- To what extent and in what ways do course material ownership issues discourage professors from developing online courses? How are these ownership issues best addressed?

Future Research
- What areas of OWI need to be addressed in future research?
- What are necessary "next steps" for CCCC's continued approach to OWI and its investigation?

The Committee's research led it to write, pilot, review, and field two nationwide surveys, one focused on fully online and the other on hybrid OWI.[2] The surveys contained both quantitatively focused questions and various opportunities for open-ended responses that comprised our qualitative data. Some questions asked for additional "other" type of information to contextualize quantitative selections, while other questions were entirely open-ended to prompt respondents to articulate less quantifiable thinking.

Except for the contextual focus of fully online or hybrid OWI, the questions in the surveys were identical. The separate focus was deemed necessary to account for both acute and subtle differences between a fully online environment and one where some traditional classroom meetings and activities are retained. The two surveys also are reported in full within separate sections of this report to assist those readers who are interested in one OWI environment more than the other. Although particular parts of each report read similarly, they are not identical; findings are relative to the different surveys and the explanations are tailored to those surveys overall. However, where comparisons can be made, those are made in the Hybrid Survey Findings and in the Executive Summary.

It should be noted that the surveys were particularly long given the amount of information they sought. The Committee deliberated about the length and, with the final advice of the NCTE Executive Director Kent Williamson, decided that rather than break the survey into component parts and field additional instruments, it would be more advantageous strategically to field the longer surveys with a notice to participants that responding would require at least 30 minutes. To reduce potential frustration with a long survey, responses were not forced by the survey software or through any other kind of intervention, so for some questions and respondents, responses may be missing. Additionally, many questions asked participants to check "all that apply," sometimes increasing the aggregated results beyond a mere 100%.

The OWI surveys were open from January 2010 to April 2010. They were made available through email from CCCC to its members and on particular targeted listservs such as those with members of Writing Program Association (WPA) and various writing center and so-called "techo-rhetoricians." Those participants who engaged and completed either survey should be considered highly interested in OWI overall, suggesting a likely respondent bias. The findings from these surveys should be considered in light of the self-selection of respondents. As responses to FO-Q2 and H-Q2 revealed (see Appendixes A and B),[3] participants were from a wide variety of academic institutions across the United States, representing a breadth, if not a depth, of North American postsecondary OWI practices.

Although the surveys originally were intended to support a sense of best practices in OWI, the Committee realized that a picture of the *state-of-the-art* was necessary before best practices could be articulated. Therefore, this report should be read as an initial articulation of the state-of-the-art of OWI and not as a set of best practices.

Researchers who may want to build upon this study by conducting their own investigations should bear in mind that the Committee's goals were to establish broad trend lines. For others' purposes, statistical analysis might be achieved more efficiently through numbered surveys correlated to individual respondents. Similarly, computer-forced responses might allow for more even data. Shorter, more targeted surveys also might work well for addressing localized issues and concerns. Future studies might adapt and revise the questions presented from these surveys to strengthen potentially ambiguous meanings.

---

[2] There does not seem to be a uniform definition of "hybrid" or "blended" OWI courses, so we have come to define "hybrid" as any OWI-based setting that is not fully online. Although we used the term "blended" in the survey, we will not use this term anywhere in the report.

[3] Appendixes A and B contain both the quantitative and qualitative data from the surveys.

This report generally follows the sections of the surveys. It is organized as follows:

1. Executive Summary (directly following this introduction)
    a. State of the Art Indications
    b. Next Steps toward Best Practices
2. Fully Online Survey Findings
    a. Characteristics of Respondents
    b. Pedogocial choices and influences
    c. Online Tutoring and training
    d. Student experiences
    e. Instructor experiences
    f. CCCC Practices
3. Hybrid Survey Findings
    a. Characteristics of Respondents
    b. Pedogocial choices and influences
    c. Online Tutoring and training
    d. Student experiences
    e. Instructor experiences
    f. CCCC Practices
4. Appendix A: Fully Online Survey Aggregated Quantitative and Qualitative Data
5. Appendix B: Hybrid Survey Aggregated Quantitative and Qualitative Data

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary of the Initial Report of the State-of-the-Art of OWI is intended as a précis of the most significant findings of the Fully Online and Hybrid surveys as developed in the two-part report provided in this document. It is roughly organized according to the questions that the Committee developed based on elements of best practices as indicated by the Sloan Consortium.

Emergent Themes
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 as it is, re above, migrated primarily from the face-to-face setting.
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.

Characteristics of the Survey Respondents
The respondents for both surveys most often claimed more than seven years teaching experience although most reported fewer than seven years of *online* teaching experience. These numbers reflect the relative newness of the online setting for most educators. Most of the respondents in both surveys taught at 2-year community colleges and 4-year universities. Therefore, the findings more often represent these contexts than those of the 4-year college, graduate school (either 2- or 4-year), or professional schools although these were represented in the data.

In the fully online setting, respondents who self-identified as tenured professors reported the highest number of "first-year writing" online courses (and fewer "developmental writing" online courses, similar to the numbers reported by assistant professors). In the hybrid setting, those who self-identified as tenured professors and full-time non-tenure track were more likely to report teaching both "first year writing" and "developmental writing" online courses than others.

While most respondents in both online settings reported enrollments in their courses of 11-30 students, those in the hybrid setting more often reported higher enrollments in their courses than those in the fully online setting. It seems possible that administrators saw hybrid courses as capable of addressing more students per course than those in the fully online setting. This belief might seem reasonable given the face-to-face nature of most hybrid courses; it may also reflect the seating arrangements in various types of classrooms and computer labs. Nonetheless, the vast majority of respondents in both settings

indicated a strong preference for course caps of 20 students, which was a recurring theme throughout both surveys in both qualitative and quantitative data.

In support of their requests for lower student enrollments, respondents in both settings generally saw the online course as demanding a great deal of time on theirs and students' parts. They also indicated that the online setting required more reading and written communication on their parts, which increased the time required for course interaction. Although they reported that their need to grade, respond to students, and provide writing feedback did not change, the written nature of all of those activities added to their work. Additionally, they cited such activities as commenting on discussion posts, crafting class announcements, and responding to emails and other written questions as increasing their workload.

Respondents for the fully online survey reported that student attrition, or "drop rates," occurred most often in the 1-10-% range. Attrition rates were highest among community college and university participants in all ranges. In the hybrid setting, respondents from community colleges again reported the highest drop rates, while the 4-year college and university respondents as well as the graduate and professional school respondents all reported lower drop rates overall (except for within the 1-10% range, as stated earlier). Fifty-seven percent of the hybrid responses indicated course drop rates in the 1-10% while only 31.8% of the fully-online responses indicated drop rates in this range. Reported attrition rates for both the smallest of classes and the largest ones suggests a data-linked reason for an "ideal" sized online course of between 11-20 students, as indicated in the report proper. Although more research is necessary, it appears that a substantial portion of this hybrid attrition rate is reported by 4-year universities that may be working with a different population and teaching in contexts where students persist rather than drop courses. The high community college drop rates, as other data support, may stem contextually from the nature of the 2-year community college as one with open enrollment, a particular educational mission, and a different set of economics and student population from the other types of schools. In other words, these attrition rates reveal little about the quality of the courses and potentially more about the contexts in which these different kinds of attrition rates are reported

Pedagogical Choices and Influences
Course Design
The data reveal that both fully online and hybrid online courses were developed primarily using process-centered and social constructivist writing activities. The fully online respondents reported higher uses of the asynchronous modality, while the hybrid respondents indicated they were as likely to use synchronous as asynchronous modalities. Given the nature of a hybrid course to use face-to-face interaction, it seems likely that "synchronous" in this case was taken to mean traditionally oral face-to-face methods rather than computer-mediated synchronous platforms.

Respondents in both settings indicated that they inherited the interface for their courses and that they were considered experts in course content. In the fully online setting, only the 2-year community college respondents indicated, however, that a majority of them had received training for online teaching and for online course design. In the hybrid setting, on the other hand, those in both the 2-year community college and the 4-year university received the most formal training in online teaching and online course design. Fewer than 50% had indicated receiving such training. The importance of training in these areas and in online writing instruction particularly was strongly suggested in these surveys as revealed through the cited pedagogical theories and practices and regarding the particular needs of EL2 users and disabled students.

Theory and Practice
In the fully online setting, participants reported using a wide variety of technological tools to support their classroom practices; they particularly made full use of Internet-based resources as might be reasonable in a fully online setting. In the hybrid setting, participants made much less use of the Internet and its varied resources and higher use of the CMS-based affordances for peer response, distributing quizzes and exams, and for collecting/distributing graded essays. These higher uses seem natural in a setting where computer-mediated communication (CMC)-based peer response long has been touted as a bonus in classrooms. Similarly, hybrid respondents more valued face-to-face interaction than did fully online respondents.

In terms of preferences for theoretical principles or tenets, those in the fully online setting most often selected writing as a process, writing as rhetorical (attendance to audience, purpose, and occasion), and writing as a social process. The high valuation of social process seems natural given that using CMC to share writing and receive responses is more or less the only way to achieve such response in a fully online environment. Those in the hybrid setting most often selected writing as rhetorical (attendance to audience, purpose, and occasion), writing as a process, and writing instruction that values face-to-face interactions. The principles to which respondents most often held appear to be natural to the preference for or attention to the technological environment. For example, those in the hybrid setting who are comfortable teaching in that setting would naturally appreciate the face-to-face interaction it affords while those in the fully online setting would not be looking for that interaction if they are making sufficient uses of the affordances available in that environment. A complete breakdown of all theoretical principles and their differences are available in the survey findings of this report. There were few open-ended comments that indicated any recognition that pedagogical principles, theories, or strategies might differ in the online setting, which suggests a simple migration of face-to-face approaches to OWI

Tutoring and Tutor Training
Online Tutoring
The survey assumed that online tutoring would be available to students in both fully online and hybrid settings given that their instruction was occurring at least part time in an online setting. In the fully online setting, barely 50% of the respondents reported such availability; asynchronous tutoring was more often available to these students than synchronous. The vast majority of supplemental support was available through static online materials with a text-based nature. The results for the hybrid setting were remarkably similar with the exception that outsourced online tutoring was made available to 2-year community college students more often than for other fully online students. Quite a few respondents in both settings indicated either no access to online writing center assistance or a need for students to come in to a traditional brick-and-mortar writing center *if* one was available. The possibility that some students, particularly those in fully online settings, could not access the campus-based writing center did not emerge in open-ended "other" responses. The lack of supplemental support for students in online settings is worrisome.

Additionally, among those respondents who indicated that online tutoring was available as many as 30% (fully online) and 47% (hybrid) reported that students did not receive any instruction for using those tutoring services. Although many did report that teachers instructed students or that there were text-based materials that oriented students, the general lack of orientation to such available resources seems irresponsible at best in that it assumes a familiarity and comfort level with technology that may not exist and/or a sense of agency that students may not possess. It also assumes a level of reading ability regarding instructional texts that some contemporary postsecondary students may lack.

Tutors most often were undergraduate peers (especially in the hybrid setting) and second most often were professional tutors (experienced educators). Many respondents did not know the makeup of the available tutoring pool.

Online Tutor Training
The survey findings indicated that most often, when tutors were trained for online environments, their training was the same as that provided for traditional face-to-face training. Far fewer tutors received any training in the more distinct text-based asynchronous response or the synchronous chat. The responses indicated a strong training bias toward traditional tutoring that does not account for the differences in face-to-face and online tutoring styles and environments. It suggests that mainstream tutoring practices merely have been migrated to the online setting without sufficient consideration for the interaction needs of online students and the practicalities of online tutoring.

Student Experience
Orientation Experiences
The surveys indicate that students in both settings understand that certain expectations must be met in the online setting. The two most frequently set expectations for either group were that students must

regularly access their CMS or other crucial technologies to complete the course and that they must complete the course requirements. Other expectations varied by setting. For example, in the fully online setting, students were expected to be available for online discussion contributions, be available by email, and to participate in an informed manner in online discussions—in that order. In the hybrid setting, students were expected to be available by email, to participant in an informed manner in online discussions, and to be available for online discussion contributions—in that order. These differences and others may be accounted for by the availability of face-to-face interactions in the hybrid group versus the fully online group.

When asked whether their students were aware that they were entering a writing course in an online setting, 95% of the fully online respondents agreed while only 56% of the hybrid respondents agreed. Most respondents in both groups indicated that their students received email prior to the first day of classes to orient them to the course and its online nature. Many fewer respondents indicated their belief that any kind of counselor had interviewed, oriented, or otherwise prepared students for the online setting of the writing course. For students who had received some kind of orientation, most respondents in both groups indicated that such orientation primarily was text-based although some orientation was provided face-to-face (especially in the hybrid setting) and audio/visual means were used only rarely.

The most important issues that respondents indicated students needed to be adequately oriented for OWI courses were technology orientation, time management skills, and the "ability to be successful." Admitting to the importance of all of these issues for success in any online course, none of these indicate successful indicators for an online *writing* course. Indeed, students' needs to be able to read or write well to succeed in these courses fell at or below 6% response in both surveys. The differences between online courses and online writing courses, between online training and online writing instruction training, and online teaching and online writing teaching blur throughout this report, indicating that traditional ideas and strategies simply have migrated to the online setting without sufficient consideration of what the specific media mean for learning in a particular disciplinary area like writing. In other words, environment-based concerns seem to take priority over the academic nuts and bolts that must be considered in light of the environment.

Students' Reported Experiences
According to respondents, students most often reported that they liked logistical elements of OWI opportunities: reduced or no need to commute to campus, and the longer timeframe between classes or the need to not meet within specific 50- or 75-minute class times. Another common benefit to students was the opportunity to rethink a thought before "posting" it to the class or group. Also cited was the ability for shyer students to speak up. Interestingly, particularly in the hybrid survey group, respondents reported that over the course of a semester, students seemed less willing or happy to attend the face-to-face portion of class. Students appear to have reported least liking the need to remain motivated, keeping up with the class, and technological problems (especially in the hybrid setting where a technology glitch could offset an entire class session's work). Many indicated that online class discussions, while interesting, are inefficient and take longer because of typing the remarks and its typically asynchronous nature.

Respondents indicated that they tried to allay these issues by using early semester community-building activities and communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility with the acknowledgement that things sometimes do go wrong. In keeping with the higher drop rates for fully online students, the fully online respondents reported that some students simply disappeared and failed to respond to any email or attempts at communication.

English Language User Experience
Although no respondents in either survey reported teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, a few—particularly in the hybrid group—did acknowledge that they had EL2 users in their online writing courses. Most respondents indicated that there were no EL2-specific online writing courses (or *any* EL2-specific writing courses) available to their students. When asked whether there should be such courses available in the online setting for EL2 users, responses were mixed, but leaned more toward not having any special-population specific courses. While some saw a need for English Language Learner

(ELL) specialists to take on these students in all cases, others believed that if students were going to take online courses, they should be mainstreamed. A few indicated that EL2 learners had no place in an online setting. Positions were strongly stated in these responses, which suggest significant experiential or anecdotal biases that may not be supported yet by research. When asked how they would accommodate such students in their online writing courses, respondents in both groups agreed that they would try to include more than one delivery modality, but that they would also include more text-based communication.

Students with Disabilities Experiences
The simplest way to summarize the responses to all questions about the disabled student population is to say that exceptionally few respondents indicated through any substantial response that they understood the concept of the ADA and how to comply with it. The lack of understanding was underscored by a number of remarks that indicated amazing ignorance of student needs and instructor/institutional responsibilities. The hybrid survey respondents overall seemed to have a clearer sense that some of their students had disabilities of various kinds (learning-oriented as well as physical) and that it was their responsibility to find out how to accommodate the student's success. This group also indicated an acceptance of disabled students that did not come through in the fully online survey respondents' comments. It is possible that the face-to-face nature of many hybrid courses encouraged students to have introduced themselves to their instructors or to have met in such a way as to recognize and openly address such needs. Similarly, more of these students and their instructors may have received assistance from their campus-based disabilities services office.

Themes that emerged from both surveys include the following: (1) instructors lacked knowledge about how to deal with the many types and kinds of disabilities and the technologies that may be necessary to address their needs in an online setting (and, possibly, in a traditional face-to-face setting as well); (2) many instructors indicated a limited understanding of disabilities and accommodation overall; (3) respondents were concerned with and challenged by the students themselves, especially where students did not self-disclose their disabilities; (4) the time needed to address special accommodations affected instructors and caused concern that any added time, for example, for the disabled students must also be applied to able-bodied students for fairness to occur; and (5) some respondents admitted concern that disabled students use their challenges as a crutch or a way to play the system. All of these concerns indicate a significant need for research and best practices for special populations who take online writing courses.

Students Ratings and Benefits in Online Writing Courses
Respondents most often indicated that their students rated their courses highly, with an average rating coming next. Fully online participants indicated that they experienced a relatively high attrition rate while hybrid participants indicated that some students gave poor ratings. We might speculate that the fully online students dropped the course more often than the hybrid students who persisted and completed final course evaluations, possibly because of the traditional face-to-face component.

As indicated earlier in this section, students most often reported liking the flexibility of such courses in terms of location and (for fully online students especially) of time. The ability to write and compose on their own time was highly rated as well. The participants indicated that students in online writing courses gained some kind of advantage in terms of logistical flexibility, development of self-directedness and self-discipline, adeptness at using the computer, and development of personal accountability among other skills that enable success in college. Surprisingly, none of the higher rated skills addressed writing instruction for the fully online students, while the final two items listed for hybrid students did indicate some writing progress: development of writing skills and benefits from receiving asynchronous feedback. Validating these responses, respondents reported that students were more disadvantaged by their OWI in such areas as support to make the transition to college, improvement of critical thinking skills, recognition of the need for details in writing, sensitivity to audience, and development of stronger reading and writing skills. These perceptions of student experiences—especially regarding progress in writing itself—are extremely worrisome and need to be addressed by the Committee's next steps in seeking out best practices in OWI.

Instructor Experience

Expectations and Training

When asked about the expectations set for them as online writing instructors, respondents most often stated that they were expected to provide reasonable support for students to succeed in the course, with the requirement to have a pedagogically sound course stated second most frequently. For both the fully online and hybrid survey groups, it was both interesting and concerning that having on-campus office hours (rather than online office hours) were important given that online office hours were less often selected as important as a set expectation. The observation of their courses to ensure sound teaching and pedagogical strategies was rated low in both settings despite the fact that for hybrid instructors, at least, some of the meetings were to be held in the campus facilities where observation might be logistically simpler. Open-ended responses from both groups indicated a need and desire for more training.

When asked what kind/s of training they received, 48% of the fully online respondents indicated that they had some kind of mandatory training and 58% indicated that training was optional (respondents could check more than one option, which appears to be why these numbers do not equal 100%). Of the hybrid respondents, 32% indicated they had some kind of training and 53% indicated that training was optional. Types of preparation that participants indicated to be most helpful were peer mentoring and the time-based support of a reduced teaching load—despite having received these least frequently. Many respondents indicated having had no training, preparation, or orientation before being expected to teach in the online setting. Recalling that earlier in the survey respondents had indicated that many did not have course-design training, the requirement that they design online writing courses without preparation seems unreasonable. In both quantitative and qualitative responses, participants regularly indicated a need for more training in the online setting but particularly for more training in the online writing teaching experience and setting.

Those who did receive training were afforded anywhere from 1-5 hours and more than 10 hours or a series of weeks. The types and length of training revealed in the survey were uneven. In terms of payment for training, this also was uneven. Participants cited receiving anywhere from $2.00 per hour, a $50.00 one-time stipend, and the equivalent of a single 3-credit course stipend. While participants generally were vocal about wanting to be paid for their training time, they claimed that they wanted also to be valued for their OWI work.

Instructor Qualities, Likes, and Dislikes

When asked what qualities they most valued in an online writing instructor, both the fully online and hybrid respondents most often indicated a willingness to follow up with students promptly. They differed only slightly in the perceived most important order of overall technology comfort level, ability to establish an online presence, and technical proficiency with campus-based technologies. Skills in developing clear assignment sequences, in moderating online discussion boards, and in teaching rhetorical principles were also highly valued. Such skills as advanced web design, designing multi-modal projects, and the participation in an active community of online teachers were rated lower. The lower ratings of multi-modal projects and advanced web design—while not as important to teaching writing in traditional settings—may need attention in training in order to address the needs of students with particular learning styles and needs, to include the EL2 user and the disabled. Such modalities also may encourage less text-based instruction where text can challenge some students.

Respondents indicated that they most liked the ability to be flexible logistically when asked what they liked most about teaching online. Their responses mirror those of their students in this area. The hybrid group slightly more often that the fully online group indicated that they liked the ability to focus more on student writing than on personalities; this finding is interesting given that hybrid instructors meet their students face-to-face more often than do fully online instructors. When asked what they least liked about online instruction, participants most often cited technical problems, large classes, and lack of interaction among students and themselves. Technical issues rated higher for the hybrid group, which may be due in part to the occasional use of real-time computer lab meetings.

Ways that problems were resolved or mitigated included particular kinds of administrative support, technical support, addressing emotional and psychological issues, considering programmatic/structural issues like course caps, and looking to student success issues. Up to one quarter of all respondents indicated a sense of being totally on their own with no mitigation activities provided to or for them or their students. A remarkably deep sense of isolation was expressed at times.

When asked whether they would continue to teach online, 89% of the fully online group and 75% of the hybrid group indicated that they would teach in their respective environments. They listed a variety of reasons—some with near-audible ambiguity—most of which are enumerated in this Executive Summary and in the reports found below. When asked in which contexts they preferred to teach, 19% of the fully online respondents indicated FO, while 38% of the hybrid respondents indicated hybrid. Up to 50% indicated they would teach in any or all contexts to include face-to-face.

This air of ambiguity emerged most tellingly when the respondents were asked whether they would recommend their online setting to other writing instructors, only 58% of the fully online respondents and 46% hybrid respondents said they would. Most often, their reasons for not recommending their teaching environments to others regarded the areas in which they had expressed dissatisfaction or the need for an individual to be particularly interested in or of a personality type who would be successful in OWI.

CCCC Practices
At the end of the survey, respondents were given opportunities to indicate what kinds of assistance they most would like from CCCC in terms of their online writing instructional needs. Their responses indicated that they most wanted a statement of best practices and instructional workshops at annual conference of the CCCC. They also indicated that online teaching needed CCCC support to be legitimized, that CCCC might identify or create instructional materials, and that their needs for training should be publicized by the professional association.

Open-ended responses fell into four themes: (1) legitimizing OWI so that it would be compared favorably to and valued equally with face-to-face teaching; (2) setting out guidelines for best practices that would enable instructors to have manageable time to spend in their courses; (3) receiving standards of instructor-led activities, feedback, and how to engage students and meet their particular learning needs; and (4) having a need for a pedagogical framework and understanding of OWI that would inform instructor strategies and skills for yielding student success and beneficial outcomes.

Conclusion
A recurring theme in these data is that students must access much of their interactions, instruction, orientation, supplemental assistance, and so on in text-based manners. Although intuitively this reading/writing nature of the online setting would not appear to be a problem, we think that many students are not necessarily good readers of instructional texts, which means that communicating with them textually may require different kinds of strategies than those provided by simply migrating face-to-face techniques and strategies to an online setting. Particularly for students in developmental writing and EL2 writing courses, text-based instruction may prove challenging and may require different textual strategies and technological strategies to include audio/visual interactions and instructional delivery. Even these changes may be insufficient for students with various kinds of language backgrounds and disabilities from learning issues to physical challenges; if little is known about how to provide efficacious and satisfying OWI for mainstream students, far, far less is known about providing an excellent learning opportunity for EL2 users and disabled students.

Readers may recognize that the data provided in the fully online and hybrid survey findings support an understanding of OWI that has been largely anecdotal until now. The findings outlined above are deeply considered within this report about the state-of-the-art of OWI, and they indicate a certain level of preparedness to begin to make claims about best practices in OWI. The questions that emerge from these findings will enable a fruitful discussion with OWI professionals, particularly those who may be identified as leaders or experts in the field by virtue of their published literature and apparently successful practices. Such discussion is the next step of this Committee toward fulfilling its charges.

FULLY ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS

Characteristics of the Survey Respondents

Demographics

The total number of respondents for the CCCC-OWI Survey: Fully Online Classes was 158.

Those responding to this survey were asked to provide some information about themselves and their institutions (see Appendix A, FO-Q1-17 for the questions and aggregated responses). Cross-tabulations were run to determine associations among some of these variables and other key questions (e.g., respondent's rank, total number of years teaching, type of institution(s) at which the respondent taught). As aggregated responses to the survey questions show, a majority of the fully online survey respondents were CCCC members (see FO-Q1). Many identified themselves as tenured professors (FO-Q5).

Table FO-1 compares respondents' general and online teaching experience (FO-Q7 and FO-Q8 respectively) with the rank(s) at which they claimed to teach (FO-Q5); respondents were asked to check all applicable choices; therefore, a respondent could self-identify as both "tenure track" and "assistant professor" (although the frequency suggests that very few respondents identified within more than one category).The first line of data represents the number of people who answered "yes" to FO-Q6 and who identified as currently teaching online (100% of respondents). The second line of data (re FO-Q7) shows by rank those who identified themselves as having taught 7 or more years (89%). The third line of data shows by rank those who responded to FO-Q8 as having taught online for 7 or more years; only 34% claimed this amount of *online* teaching experience. Although a majority of the survey respondents reported fewer than 7 years of specifically online teaching experience, this report may reflect the relative youth of OWI as a practice and field. The most experienced instructors can claim only about 20 years total in the various available iterations of the online environment.

Table FO-1: Teaching Experience by Reported Rank(s)

	Tenured Professor	Tenure-track Prof.	Assistant Professor	Full-time non-tt instructor/prof./ admin	Adjunct	Grad TA
Currently teaching online (answered "yes" to FO-Q6)	41 (26.3%)	18 (11.5%)	13 (8.3%)	35 (22.4%)	25 (16%)	3 (1.9%)
Total teaching experience 7 or more years (FO-Q7)	50 (32.3%)	18 (11.6%)	16 (10.3%)	35 (22.6%)	17 (11%)	2 (1.3%)
Teaching online 7 or more years (FO-Q8)	25 (16.2%)	6 (3.9%)	4 (2.6%)	11 (7.1%)	6 (3.9%)	0

Percentages shown are taken from the total number of responses to the indicated question (i.e., those answering "yes" to FO-Q6 in the first row; those identifying as having taught 7+ years in FO-Q7 in the second row; and, those identifying as having taught writing online for 7+ years in FO-Q8 in the third row.

FO-Q9 asked respondents to indicate the type(s) of institution(s) at which they worked. Respondents had the option of choosing more than one. In Table FO-2 below, respondents' self-reported years of teaching experience are cross-tabulated with the type of institution(s) at which they worked (FO-Q9). The data reveal that most respondents were working at 2-year community colleges and four-year universities.

Table FO-2: Respondents' Teaching Experience by Type of Institution

Years of Teaching Experience	2-yr Community College	4-year College	4-year University	2- or 4-year Grad School	Professional School
1-3 years | Count teaching exp | (% Total*)	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
4-6 years | Count teaching exp | (% Total*)	6 (3.9%)	1 (0.7%)	6 (3.9%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)

7 or more yrs | Count	64	12	45	14	0
teaching exp | (% Total*)	(41.8%)	(7.8%)	(29.4%)	(9.2%)	(0%)

*Percent of total responses to Q7.

Thus, of the 3 respondents in FO-Q7 who reported 1-3 years of teaching experience, one taught at a 4-year college and two taught at a 4-year university, representing 0.7% and 1.3% (respectively) of the total responses to this question. Note that of the large number of survey respondents reporting 7 or more years of teaching experience, 64 were affiliated with 2-year community colleges and 45 with 4-year universities, representing (collectively) 71% of the total responses to FO-Q7.

Online Courses
FO-Q12 and 13 were designed to elicit a picture of the online course types that respondents were teaching and the enrollments in those courses. Respondents were asked "*What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach*" (and were allowed to choose more than one). FO-Q13 asked "*How many students are enrolled in your online writing course?*" Cross-tabulating these questions with rank (Table FO-3) revealed the distribution of writing courses across rank—with the exception of ESL writing courses (which no respondents reported teaching). Respondents who self-identified as "tenured professors" (5) and "assistant professors" (1) were less likely to also report teaching "developmental writing" than respondents at other ranks although tenured professors reported the highest number of "first-year writing" courses (33).

Table FO-3: Types of Online Writing Courses by Rank

Type of course	Tenured Professor	Tenure-track Prof.	Assistant Professor	Full-time non-tt instructor/prof./admin	Adjunct	Grad TA	Total
First-year writing | Count	33	17	11	30	23	2	116
(Percent*)	(28.4%)	(14.7%)	(9.5%)	(25.9%)	(19.8%)	(1.7%)	(100%)
Prof/Tech writing | Count	12	2	5	9	3	3	33
(Percent*)	(36.4%)	(6.1%)	(15.2%)	(27.3%)	(9.1%)	(6.1%)	(100%)
Developmental | Count Writing | (Percent*)	5 (17.2%)	6 (20.7%)	1 (3.4%)	10 (34.5%)	7 (24.1%)	0 (0%)	29 (100%)
Advanced Academic | Count Writing | (Percent*)	15 (36.6%)	6 (14.6%)	5 (12.2%)	13 (31.7%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	41 (100%)
Creative writing | Count (Percent*)	11 (40.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	11 (40.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	14 (100%)
Writing-intensive courses | Count in other disciplines | (Percent*)	7 (63.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)	0 (0%)	14 (100%)
Writing Courses | Count for ESL | (Percent*)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (100%)

Enrollment and Attrition
As shown in Table FO-4, most respondents (regardless of rank) reported enrollments in the range of 11-30 students with 11-20 students enrolled in a class only a little less frequently (63) than 20-30 students (68).

Table FO-4: Student Enrollment by Rank(s)

Student Enrollment	Tenured Professor	Tenure-track Prof	Assistant Professor	Fulltime non-tt instructor/prof./admin	Adjunct	Grad TA
10 or less	3	0	1	0	1	0
	1.9%	0%	0.6%	0%	0.6%	0%
11-20	20	7	6	22	9	1
	13.0%	4.5%	3.9%	14.3%	5.8%	0.6%
21-30	18	12	10	15	12	1
	11.7%	7.8%	6.5%	9.7%	7.8%	0.6%
31-40	4	1	0	0	2	1
	2.6%	0.6%	0	0%	1.3%	0.6%
41-50	1	0	0	0	0	0
	0.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
More than 50	2	0	1	0	1	0
	1.3%	0%	0.6%	0%	0.6%%	0%
I don't know	1	0	0	1	0	1
	0.6%	0%	0%	0.6%	0%	0.6%

Percentages are based on total number of respondents answering Q 16.

The issue of course caps in fully online writing courses was raised by the survey and also addressed by respondent open-ended replies. Table FO-5 provides the aggregated data for FO-Q14, which asked respondents to indicate at which number they preferred enrollment to be capped in their online writing courses. Respondents overwhelmingly preferred to have a course cap of between 11-20 students. One respondent commented that 10 or fewer students created a poor environment for online discussion.

Table FO-5: Preferred Student Enrollment Caps

10 or fewer per course	9	6%
11-20 per course	110	71%
21-30 per course	28	18%
31-40 per course	4	3%
41-50 per course	0	0
More than 50	2	1%
I don't know	3	2%

FO-Q15 requested reasons for the responses in FO-Q14. These responses were analyzed qualitatively for the context they could provide. The results were classified into time factors and grading/response/feedback.

Time factors included the perception from faculty that their chosen class size enabled them to be more effective teachers in terms of faculty workload and the effect on teaching effectiveness. The responses support a general perception often argued anecdotally that teaching writing online is more labor intensive than in face-to-face settings. Since writing courses already are labor intensive, the addition of the writing necessary for all teaching and communication within the medium appears to mean, from a faculty perspective, that fewer students in a class creates a more ideal environment. Typical responses included:[4]

- "A good sized class has 12-14 students, especially if it is less than 6 weeks. When you start having classes with 20 or more people, there is a lot of responding involved because you want to provide the same amount of time and attention to each of your students. When the class sizes are larger, it is hard to provide the necessary time and input for the students."
- "The grading/feedback time commitment is so heavy for fully online courses that the cap should be limited to no more than 20."

One aspect of time that emerged is the extra written communication that is necessary when teaching online. Many responses pointed to this writing as a quantifiable measure for justifying smaller class sizes. Typical responses included:

- "Our face-to-face cap is 23 for first-year writing, so we cap at 20 for online first-year writing because it takes the instructor more time for responding in the online environment"
- "Online teaching requires a lot of intense email communication in the evenings — the more students I have, the longer this takes each night."

Regarding *grading/response/feedback*, respondents generally indicated that responding to student writing does not change to become easier or more expedient when moved to an online environment. The same grading and feedback demands exist. Thus, teaching writing online would be equivalent to teaching face-to-face in that increases in student numbers would decrease feedback and ultimately effectiveness. A typical response was "Twenty students seem like the maximum number per class that I can handle while giving continual feedback on their writing all semester." However, other than grading-related feedback, many respondents also indicated that additional communications increased their workloads (e.g., commenting on discussion posts, crafting class announcements, responding to emails and questions). The open-ended comments did not reveal much information on how faculty found themselves to be more effective with lower student enrollment beyond the consistent and overwhelming number of responses that pointed to their needs to provide sufficient feedback/grading/responding to all students and their writing.

Table FO-6: Attrition by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

Attrition Rates	2-yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
1-10%	11	5	25	7	0	48
	7.3%	3.3%	16.6%	4.6%	0	31.8%
11-20%	23	4	16	5	0	48
	15.2%	2.6%	10.6%	3.3%	0	31.8%
21-30%	14	1	5	0	1	21
	9.3%	.7%	3.3%	0	.7%	13.9%
31-40%	10	1	4	1	0	16
	6.6%	.7%	2.6%	.7%	0	10.6%

---

[4] All comments are quoted directly from the survey although misspellings have been corrected for greater readability.

41% or higher	11	1	0	1	0	13
	21%	12%	12%	21%	12%	12%

*5 (3.3% of those responding to this question) answered "I don't know."

As indicated in Table FO-6, an interesting final data point regarding the institutional contexts for online teaching concerned retention. When cross-tabulated by rank, little in the way of trend-lines emerged. However, when the data were cross-tabulated by institution type, it appeared that respondents working in community colleges reported experiencing higher drop rates. There are numerous plausible explanations for this phenomenon. Further research to confirm and (if confirmed) explain this phenomenon would be valuable.

Pedagogical Choices and Influences
Course Design
While the first section of this report sought to establish some sense of the respondents' characteristics and institutional contexts for the work of teaching online (including enrollment caps and perceived attrition rates as reported by survey respondents), this section takes up respondents' pedagogical choices and influences.

Table FO-7 cross-tabulates respondents' answers to FO-Q18 (regarding the kinds of activities included in their online courses) with the institutions at which they were employed. The data suggest that teachers employed a predictable range of process-centered and social constructivist writing activities (including revision activities and peer response groups), regardless of the type of institution in which they were working. The data also suggest that teachers were far more likely to employ asynchronous discussion than synchronous discussion. Student facilitation and/or class presentations, student conferences, and collaborative writing were reported to be much less frequently assigned. Interestingly, the data indicate that the reported pedagogies among all faculty were similar despite the type of school setting.

Table FO-7: Course Activities by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

What activities do your online course(s) include? Please check all that apply.	2 yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
Peer response groups	58	11	46	13	0	128
	45.3%	8.6%	35.9%	10.2%	0	100%
Synchronous discussion	18	6	20	6	0	50
	36.0%	12.0%	40.0%	12%	0	100%
Asynchronous discussion	65	13	49	14	1	142
	45.8%	9.2%	34.5%	9.9%	.7%	100%
Small group discussion	35	9	24	11	0	79
	44.3%	11.4%	30.4%	13.9%		100%
Whole class discussion	54	11	32	7	0	104
	51.9%	10.6%	30.8%	6.7%		100%
Rhetorical analysis	54	10	34	13	0	111
	48.6%	9.0%	30.6%	11.7%	0	100%

Reading responses	63	11	46	13	0	133
	47.4%	8.3%	34.6%	9.8%	0	100%
Invention activities	43	8	34	10	1	96
	44..8%	8.3%	35.4%	10.4%	1.0%	100%
Revision activities	66	13	46	14	1	140
	47.1%	9.3%	32.9%	10.0%	.7%	100%
Student facilitation and/or presentation	16	2	11	7	0	36
	44.4%	5.6%	30.6%	19.4%	0	100%
Student conferences	20	7	17	6	0	50
	40.0%	14.0%	34.0%	12.0%	0	100%
Collaborative Writing	19	4	16	9	0	48
	39.6%	8.3%	33.3%	18.8%	0	100%

*29 respondents or 18% of those responding to this question also selected "Other"—indicating a course practice not represented in this list.

It is possible that pedagogical practices in online writing courses could be determined by a course design that was inherited by the respondent (so that the responses in FO-Q18 above were a function of having inherited elements of the online course that are not reflective of the respondents' own pedagogical commitments). To help understand that possibility, FO-Q19 asked respondents a number of questions related to online course design. Responses are cross-tabulated by institution type in Table FO-8. The two statements most frequently indicated as true for respondents were: "I inherited the interface" and "I am considered an expert in the content of the course."

An interesting data point about the responses to these questions deals with the frequency by which respondents indicated they had received training in either online teaching or online course design. For both statements, a majority percentage of 2-year community college participants reported having received such training (respectively 58 of 77 or 75% and 48 of 77 or 62%). In the 4-year college setting only 6 of 16 (37%) and 8 of 16 (50%) indicated they had received this training. In the 4-year university, 35 of 60 (58%) and 25 of 60 (41%) reported having received this type of training. Of the 2- or 4-year graduate school setting, only 6 of 15 (40%) and 8 of 15 (53%) claimed this kind of training. It is clear that the community college faculty reported training support as preparation for fully online course teaching and course design more often than other respondents.

Table FO-8: Course Design by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

Which of the following statements are true for you?	2 yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
I inherited a course design.	5	3	17	3	1	29
	17.2%*	10.3%	58.6%	10.3%	3.4%	100%
I inherited the interface.	46	11	47	11	1	116
	39.7%	9.5%	40.5%	9.5%	.9%	100%
I inherited the course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example,	6	2	20	2	0	30

changed assignments).	20.0%	6.7%	66.7%	6.7%	0	100%
I worked alone to design the online components of my course.	57	10	32	6	0	105
	54.3%	9.5%	30.5%	5.7%	0	100%
I have participated in formal training for online teaching.	58	6	35	8	1	108
	53.7%	5.6%	32.4%	7.4%	.9%	100%
I have participated in formal training for online course design.	48	8	25	8	0	89
	53.9%	9.0%	28.1%	9.0%	0	100%
I am considered an expert in online course design.	23	5	19	7	0	54
	42.6%	9.3%	35.2%	13.0%	0	100%
I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course.	17	4	17	2	0	40
	42.5%	10%	42.5%	5.0%	0	100%
I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface.	17	2	15	5	0	39
	43.6%	5.1%	38.5%	12.8%	0	100%
I am considered an expert in the content of the course.	55	11	47	15	0	128
	43.0%	8.6%	36.7%	11.7%	0	100%
Course design is unique to individual instructors.	58	7	32	7	0	104
	55.8%	6.7%	30.8%	6.7%	0	100%
Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tools generated by the instructor/course development team.	18	9	29		8	1	65
	27.7%	13.8%	44.6%	12.3%	1.5%	100%

*Percent of those who answered "yes" (rather than "no" or "I don't know") to this particular statement within Q 18.

Assuming that training is critical to high quality online education, the aggregated responses to FO-Q19 (see Appendix A) will give pause. Only 73% of all survey respondents teaching fully online courses reported having received any training in online education in response to FO-Q19. The survey does not ask at that point for further clarification as to the nature of the training received by the 73%, but it does do so using FO-Q59, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64. Further investigation would be useful to distinguish between training in *online writing instruction* versus training in *site-specific or interface-specific technology*. Similarly, while (only) 59% reported having participated in formal training for online course design, a full 79% of respondents answered "no" to the question of having inherited a course design. In other words, the data suggest that respondents may be expected to develop their online courses rather than to inherit them, yet only 59% of the respondents indicated that they received preparatory formal training to enable strong course design. If this information is accurate, it is an issue that best practices should address.

It seems worthwhile to note at this juncture that, given the higher reported attrition rates among the community college students, the community college faculty seemed to be at least as well prepared—and possibly better prepared—via training than the other faculty participants in this survey. Additionally, there did not seem to be any appreciable difference among the selected pedagogies for all participants. That being the case, it seems possible that the lower reported community college retention rates may be due to other factors such as an increased at-risk student population, the economics of a community college

education, or other explanations. The complete data made available through this survey are knotty in this area and bear further scrutiny.

Theory and Practice
FO-Q20 offered interesting information as well (See Appendix A for aggregated numbers). This question asked participants to indicate both virtual tools and teaching strategies used in fully online courses; they could select as many as desired. The most frequently selected tools were primarily text-based, asynchronous media like course management systems (CMS); strategically, these were used for such practices as the online distribution of course materials; PowerPoint and Word document lectures; quizzes and exams; draft exchange for peer response; asynchronous discussion; submission of assignments in which text is the primary mode; and return of graded assignments. These participants reported linking to websites (81% over 71%) and to course-based websites outside the prescribed CMS more often than did the hybrid survey participants (24% over 16%), which seems reasonable given the fully online nature of the course where an instructor may need more control over the specified environment/s and may wish to avail him or herself of particular online resources. Surprisingly, participants reported rare uses of the tools for one-to-one student/teacher conferences. Of the least used tools were wikis, RSS feeds, and blogs, while the least used teaching strategies were video lectures, audio modules, synchronous discussions, audio file exchange, and multi-modal assignments. These types of strategies may prove important, as this report suggests later regarding the needs of English Language (EL2) users and disabled students.

Table FO-9 presents aggregated data from FO-Q23 of the fully-online survey, in which respondents were asked "*Which of the following pedagogical or theoretical principles, if any, are most important in your online teaching of writing?*" Respondents were asked to check no more than three items. These statements of belief and value were provided based on results of the pilot survey, which indicated that using more theoretical language may have prevented some participants from responding. The pedagogical principles frequently selected here correlate with the frequency of process-centered course practices identified by respondents in FO-Q19 (Table FO-7). "Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion" and "Writing is a process" were most frequently selected. The two least frequently selected responses were that "Writing cannot be taught" (3%) and that "Face-to-face interaction with students is important" (8%). These are not surprising findings from respondents who were sufficiently interested in fully online OWI to take the survey.

Table FO-9: Aggregated Response to Influential Pedagogical or Theoretical Principles (Q 23)

Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas	60	38%
Writing is a social process	67	42%
Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion	123	78%
Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response	4	3%
Writing is a process	119	75%
Writing and revising are recursive acts	88	56%
Writing and revising are generative acts	53	34%
Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement	62	39%
Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important	12	8%

An opportunity to contextualize the responses was provided in FO-Q24, an open-ended question regarding which one of the three selected principles was most central in one's OWI practices and why that was so. The qualitative analysis revealed that the respondents made frequent reference to the interrelated nature of writing instruction where many of the targeted principles are at work simultaneously.

However, only 16 out of the 154 responses specifically mentioned OWI's relationship with the principles and their practices, leaving open the possibility that their statements could be related to writing instruction in general, as opposed to OWI in particular. One reason for this response might be that the length of the survey may have discouraged respondents from reflecting deeply on and articulating how OWI affected their teaching as a discrete factor. Another reason might have been that what respondents said was implicitly in reference to OWI environments given the rhetorical context of the survey. A third possibility could be that the instructional environment may be perceived as less noticeable or crucial than it used to be, with students and teachers functioning increasingly in a technological world and passing from one modality to another without much reflection (i.e., using Web displays and students' own laptop connectivity in traditional classrooms, and conversing online in real time or asynchronously in online-only classes). Of the 16 who did mention OWI specifically in the online survey, the large majority were positive and quite thoughtful about its involvement in their teaching.

Example substantive responses included the following, provided in the order of most-to-least frequently cited in the open-ended responses. The ranking differed slightly from the order selected for FO-Q23, which may be accounted for by the request that participants select only one principle about which to respond:

- **Writing is a process. (38)** For many respondents, "process" meant getting students to see the necessity of going through a defined series of steps, thinking critically about them, getting feedback from readers, and trying again. Process was seen to help with overcoming past negative writing experiences and habits. One respondent thought these steps are made more evident and visible in an OWI environment. Since "process" is an umbrella concept in our field, respondents frequently connected this choice with others listed, and often indicated "it encompasses all the other aspects." Six participants specifically mentioned traditional course environments in relation to OWI and four mentioned that the concepts and practices of "process" were operable in both.
  - o "The courses are designed to require each major essay to go through a proposal, first draft, peer review, second draft w/ conference, and final draft. This allows students to take their ideas through to polished essays."
  - o "This manifests itself in the use of several stages students go through to create their main research paper. Students also generally draft and then revise short papers with feedback from all members of the class (including me). My students, who are almost entirely first-year students, are often intimidated by writing and need to be shows the steps to go through to create successful writing and given a chance to revise. Revision is central to our departmental focus in the teaching of writing, hence the focus on it in our online offerings."
- **Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion. (23)**. This rhetorical principle focuses on getting students to recognize and respond to all rhetorical situations (make writing choices) with varied styles for different audiences and genres. Three respondents mentioned that this principle holds regardless of the environment writing takes place in—online or traditional.
  - o "Our courses are founded on teaching students to recognize and adjust to rhetorical situation."
  - o "This is the central goal of my first-year writing course, regardless of whether it's taught online or face-to-face. My first-year comp. class is meant to teach students to understand how to write for many different purposes and in many different disciplines."
- **Writing is a social process. (14)** The theoretical support for this principle directly comes from social constructivism; two respondents cited this basis. Most mentioned the value of peer review, feedback, and collaboration as their reason for putting this principle first; and again it functioned as an umbrella term like "process" in general. One mentioned that networked connectivity of OWI suited his method of peer review better than a traditional format.
  - o "We can only understand the meaning of the writing by seeing it in context. Students discover themselves as writers by interacting with those who respond to their writing."
  - o "My online writing courses are intensely social and collaborative—much more so than my face-to-face writing courses. Students collaborate to produce texts."

- **Writing and revising are generative acts. (11)** Respondents seemed to see generation as a natural process of writing out one's ideas. The notion that the process of writing leads to a clearer sense of one's message is one outgrowth of writing as generative.
    - ○ "My teaching philosophy is heavily influenced by the philosophical hermeneutics of Gadamer—thus, writing is a process (both personal and social) that constantly links and reorders knowledge. Online work, I feel, allows students to rework the issues and ideas of writings from the past into matrices that make new sense in their web-enhanced world. When I read Anzaldua, I am amazed at the languages and rhetorical forms she employs—students can learn to do similarly amazing things in their own formal writing by connecting it to the much broader world of the web."
    - ○ "Writing and revising are generative acts—this notion recognizes that the use of language is an action that is meaning-making so that the act of writing becomes a powerful act that illustrates the centrality of language for not only communicating but knowing, as well. I encourage students to examine the ways in which they think about language and knowledge, especially in the face of "virtual" classrooms, which seem to evidence the social nature of language and learning."
- **Writing and revising are recursive acts. (10)** Respondents seemed to see recursion as an opportunity to improve and recognize that improvement. Feedback, peer and otherwise, attention to audience, and the umbrella concept "process" are the major crossover principles. Multiple drafts with feedback in between seemed to be the main overall approach. One thought that OWI encouraged rewriting and recursion by making the steps more intentional overall, three respondents connected OWI with recursive writing, all seeing it as encouraging that process.
    - ○ "I am with Donald Murray, who said that writing is rewriting,' and thus I teach revision and provide many opportunities for feedback and revision. It does not have to be peer feedback, however."
    - ○ "Because the online environment does not allow for those 'I have a quick question' moments before and after class that can sometimes guide or help shape a student's writing or revision strategies, the notion of writing being a recursive act becomes important in the online writing course. A student in this case particularly needs the ability to write and revise with multiple levels of feedback (friend, peer, family member, instructor, Writing Center)."
- **Other. (8)** A number of respondents provided comments that were somewhat outside of the nine possibilities provided.
    - ○ "In order to learn to write, one must write often because one discovers what one thinks through writing it. Learning writing and one's own ideas requires revision to sort out organization, to abide by the law of noncontradiction, and to avoid logical fallacies. There is no critical self-reflection without writing and critical thinking skills are what we are really teaching underneath writing skills or at least along side of them."
    - ○ "Students benefit from detailed feedback on their writing. That is different to me than the fourth statement, "writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response." I do indeed believe that writing can be taught. I also believe that an important mode of teaching is to give detailed feedback (more than just reader response)."
- **Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement. (4)** This principle also is related to social constructivist writing theory, but it focuses on peers rather than any reader response.
    - ○ "I believe that while students believe the teacher has the answers, often the peers have better or clearer answers because often students are better able to communicate with each other than the instructor. There is something less intimidating about peer-to-peer revision. Also, I think peer work is necessary to encourage working together and respecting the knowledge of those who are not teaching."
    - ○ "Peer feedback is more approachable to students, even though they may fight that notion at first. They discover what they really need and can use when they see a peer's work, better than when they read only my comments."
- **Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response. (2)** This principle is connected to post-process theory, which holds that writing is an unteachable skill, but it is one that can be learned through sharing writing and receiving response.
    - ○ "I have held to this principle in 25 years of teaching—face to face as well as online."

- o "I do not agree entirely with the first clause, but I have discovered in my 30 years as a writing teacher that I cannot use packaged instruction to teach writing. Student needs are so unique that teaching them to write may as well be a knack."
- **Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas. (1)** Only one respondent simply repeated this principle as the response.
- **Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important. (1)**
  - o "I am skeptical about my effectiveness as a teacher in OWI. Therefore, I think face-to-face instruction, or some semblance thereof, is most central to my OWI work."

As far as these specific principles go, it seems that the online teachers had many tenets of faith in writing instruction and used them simultaneously. Those who gave primacy to rhetoric, revising, and feedback as social process were fairly evenly divided, and those who chose "process" as an umbrella concept also divided their understanding of general and social process among these same principles. The data suggest that these online writing instructors did not perceive teaching online as a separate entity from traditional writing instruction. We may speculate that a convergence between teaching and technology (as well as media convergence in the culture generally) is occurring, making such boundary lines fainter. If so, it may become more important to understand the nature of best teaching practice for OWI so that students receive more than simply cross-over traditional setting practices.

Online Tutoring and Tutor Training
Online Tutoring
With an online writing instructional setting, it would seem appropriate to have available environment-specific supplemental support like that which exists in face-to-face settings; therefore, the survey asked respondents about the online tutoring opportunities available to their students. The survey indicated that supplemental online tutoring was relatively uncommon. FO-Q25 revealed that just over half the respondents (50.3%) indicated writing center consultants were available for asynchronous online consulting, and 25.8% reported tutors available for synchronous online consulting, while 22% indicated that they outsourced online tutoring. Given that respondents were asked to check all applicable options, it is clear that the vast majority, 82%, made static resources available to their students as a primary supplemental intervention. Some indicated that those resources were developed by themselves, by the English department, by their libraries, or by outside online writing labs like the Purdue OWL.

When the results of FO-Q25 were cross-tabulated with the type of institution (Table FO-10), they revealed that a higher percentage of asynchronous tutorials were claimed by 4-year university participants and then by 2-year community colleges. The synchronous tutorial opportunities appear to be nearly equally distributed given the number of participants from each type of institution. The 2-year community colleges accounted for most of the outsourcing of supplemental instruction, which may be a factor of economics or of particular attention to their students' needs. The uses of static resources were high among all types of institutions.

Table FO-10: Supplemental Online Writing Instruction
by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

What supplemental online writing instruction or online writing tutoring opportunities, if any, exist at your institution? Please check all that apply.	2 yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
Resources/guidelines available for students to consult (on citing sources, proofreading, etc.)	57	10	47	11	1	126
	45.2%	7.9%	37.3%	8.7%	.8%	100%
Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting.	25	5	34	12	1	77
	32.5%	6.5%	44.2%	15.6%	1.3%	100%
Writing center consultants available	15	2	16	6	0	39

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

online in real-time	38.5%	5.1%	41.0%	15.4%	0%	100%
Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies	23	7	0	4	0	34
	67.6%	20.6%	0	11.8%	0	100%
Turnitin® or other plagiarism detection services	35	6	32	9	1	83
	42.2%	7.2%	38.6%	10.8%	1.2%	100%

Given the overlap in some of these responses, it is interesting that of the between 36-37% who reported that there is no access to an online writing center at their institution and of the 18 "other" responses, 6 reported that they do not know whether access is available or how the online function works where it is available. In the open-ended "other" responses, 8 clearly indicated that online students needed to go to their campus writing centers for support or that they could use other institutions' online writing centers.

Regarding how such tutoring occurred technologically (FO-Q28), email was listed the most frequently (45%) with static webpages (23%), synchronous chat (21%), and some sort of file sharing that may or may not be Web-based (18%) also indicated. In the "other" category, telephone conferences were listed. As with the other questions, 36% chose the "no access" response, validating the data from previous questions. What this means is that students in online writing environments appear to be receiving more asynchronous than synchronous tutoring time, but that many students had no apparent access at the time of the survey.

For those instructors whose students have access to an online writing center (FO-Q29), 30% of the respondents reported that students did not receive any instruction for using those tutoring services. Another 44% indicated that the teacher instructed students in how to access tutors. With such a high number reporting this lack of preview or instruction, the assumption appears to be that students know how to use and navigate any online resource, which may not be true given that platforms and site design may differ significantly from those provided in online classrooms. Additionally, many students, while "digital natives," are not necessarily skilled in instructional technology applications; and in high-stakes settings like writing classes, their technological skills and anxiety levels may join to frustrate their attempts to locate and use well the support systems provided to them. Finally, it seems worth noting that 44% of respondents indicated students were given static text-based materials for instruction, which by nature requires that students read and apply such instructional text in order to understand how and why to access the online tutoring available to them. These findings are supported by FO-Q30, which clearly shows a significant amount of text-based resources and face-to-face tutors (79%), but far less by way of person-to-person online tutoring support (45% asynchronous and 20% synchronous).

Responses to FO-Q31, 32, and 33 indicate that for these respondents the tutor pool was comprised of more undergraduate peer and professional tutors (experienced educators) than of graduate peer tutors. The tutors appeared most often to have background in English literature (59%), composition (52%), and a variety of disciplines (51%). Interestingly, however, many of the respondents (28% to 35%) reported they did not know who the online tutors were in terms of their levels of expertise, nor did they know how the individuals were chosen to be online tutors. These data suggest that some writing centers may be separate entities from English and/or Composition departments, which also may explain why so many respondents did not know about the function of the writing center in relation to the courses they were teaching or the writing programs they were in.

Online Tutor Training
Finally, for online tutoring to be successful, presumably tutors need some kind of training in the highly text-based asynchronous response and/or synchronous chat practices used in many fully online settings. FO-Q36 asked participants to check all applicable responses to a question about how tutors were trained for online writing center work. Up to 47% indicated that the tutors received the same training as face-to-face tutors, while 31% indicated that their tutors received non-credit bearing training dedicated to online tutoring. Only 1% indicated that their tutors had some kind of credit-bearing online-specific tutor training,

while 7% reported that tutors received credit-bearing training in non-online specific processes and 9% reported that their tutors received credit-bearing training on technology and online pedagogies. These responses indicate that the online tutoring may not be considered much different from face-to-face tutoring despite the differences in delivery style and environments.

Student Experience
A series of questions were asked of respondents regarding student experiences in fully online OWI. It is important to take into account that these data are representative of understanding and perceptions only and that they are not to be construed as indicative of actual student experiences, which we should ascertain via such means as student interviews and interactions.

Orientation Experiences
FO-Q37 asked respondents which kinds of expectations they believed were set with students regarding their fully online writing courses. Setting expectations appeared to be an important part of preparing students adequately for the online setting:
- Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, Blackboard®, etc.)—95%
- Completion of course requirements—92%
- Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions—82%
- Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)—82%
- Informed participation in online discussions—80%
- Peer review—72%
- Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments—58%
- Productive facilitation of online discussion—35%

Of these expectations, only the productive facilitation of online discussion fell below the 50% mark, which suggests that such facilitation may be considered a teacher-leadership role rather than a student role.

To the end of understanding how students are prepared for enrollment, participants were asked in FO-Q38 to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements about whether the student or someone else had set expectations and to what degree the student had the opportunity to understand the responsibilities of a fully online writing course. Using primarily the "agree" response, 34% agreed that students were "well aware" that the course was held online (and 61% strongly agreed with this statement). A 30% group agreed that students had read the program's documentation on the course's expectations and that the instructor had greeted the student by email prior to the first day of class (19%, with 66% strongly agreeing). Because this Committee's field interviewees had recommended that students needed outside counseling to make their best choices about fully online writing instruction, two survey questions probed this concern. Interestingly, only 19% of respondents agreed that their students had been advised by a counselor—an outside person—about the course's expectation. Similarly, only 12% agreed that students had completed an instrument that indicated that their learning preferences were conducive to success in an online environment. If such outside-the-course communications about OWI course expectations are important, they were not perceived by respondents to be occurring.

FO-Q39 and 40 addressed the orientation delivery formats and subject matter of student preparatory experiences for fully online writing courses. Asynchronous formats were indicated the most frequently (41%), while audio/video (19%), face-to-face (13%), and a combination of asynchronous and face-to-face followed (10%). Precisely what was meant by "asynchronous" was not indicated in this question, but the additional choices of audio/visual seem to indicate that some kind of text-based orientation was the interpreted meaning. Twenty percent and 17% respectively indicated that some other educational unit provided such orientation or that not orientation was provided. Other respondents indicated that they "did not know" in their responses to the "other" category. The subject matter of orientation was addressed in the following order of frequency (H-Q40; see Appendix B for specific frequencies): how to use the interfaces and contact the instructor, to how to access online resources, how to be "successful" in the

class, how to manage time appropriately for an online course, netiquette, and plagiarism and cheating. Of these, only the last item might be considered not particular to an online course.

FO-Q41 was an open-ended question that asked respondents to indicate what they believed was the single most important issue to address in an orientation to a fully online writing course. Even though the question requested the "single most important issue," a number of respondents wrote more than one item. These were separated into 153 individual responses, which were categorized into 13 total categories.

Most respondents were concerned with the students' need to be oriented to the technology (22%).This concern seemed only peripherally related to the idea of accessibility to the technology, which only 1% of respondents indicated as most important, suggesting that people may not be as worried about universal accessibility as published literature has indicted we should be. The next two most frequently mentioned concerns—using these words almost exactly—were for students to have "time management skills" (19%) and the ability to "be successful" in the environment (19%). Time management connects to the idea that students also need to make a time commitment (7%) to the course and to have the self motivational ability to log in regularly and to meet their classes and do their work in this setting (4%). The ability to be successful, which was not provided in detail in 11 of the 29 responses, included success tips like understanding the details of the syllabus, logging in frequently, and having strong organizational skills. Such success connects to the need for a situational knowledge (5%) about the differences between a traditional and an online classroom in that—many respondents indicated—being online is "more difficult."

Interestingly, given the critical nature of strong reading and writing skills in a fully online setting, few respondents indicated the need for students to have sufficient reading ability (5%) to understand their materials and assignments. Indeed, the ability to write to communicate was mentioned the least often by only one person (0.6%). The notion that students need the self knowledge to make a good choice to be in such a setting was mentioned twice (1%). Finally, given the relative importance that social constructive and collaborative pedagogies place on interaction among peers and with the instructor in the online setting, it is interesting to note that only 6 participants (3%) indicated orientation to this kind of communication and interaction was a necessary orientation in the fully online setting for a writing class.

Students' Reported Experiences
FO-Q42, 43, and 44 addressed the kinds of experiences that students had reported to respondents. Although it also is important to get the students' views from their own stated experiences, it is useful to understand what the respondents believe students experience in their courses.

FO-Q42 asked what students reported they most liked about fully online writing courses; respondents were asked to check all that applied. As can be seen in Appendix A, the most frequently cited benefit was that there was no need to commute to campus (84%), more of a logistical convenience than a pedagogical or learning-based benefit. The second most frequently cited was that an online course enabled students to participate across a longer timeframe and to not have to meet within the confines of a 50 – 75 minute class during particular days/times of the week (81%). This second benefit also is logistical, but it may be a feature that enables the third most often cited benefit: the opportunity to rethink and/or revise a discussion post or answer prior to posting to the group (39%), which may lead to some affective benefits enumerated in some of the open-ended "other" responses like "They feel less self-conscious in discussion" and "Shy students report feeling empowered to freely voice their ideas." Other benefits that students reported having liked included personal attention from the teacher (28%), the opportunity to revisit saved/archived peer discussions or reviews (27%), the "strong" organization of such courses (26%)—by which we believe the survey intended to convey a sense of clear direction and tight arrangement of activities—and the ease of collaborating with peers (13%). It is interesting that the logistics of writing course experiences were most often reported as being liked by students. Other open-ended responses included "Students mostly complained about my course. I do not think the 8-week format is appropriate for learning writing, but everything in the online program is 8 weeks" and "Students are often amazed that they get to know their peers in online courses BETTER (because of all the writing and discussion board interaction) than they do in face-to-face classes. They also often reported less

inhibition about sharing their work because nobody can 'see' them." Again, affective issues rose to the top of stated benefits.

FO-Q43 asked what students reported they least liked about fully online writing courses. Not surprisingly, given the participants' open-ended responses to FO-Q41, participants claimed that students most often reported difficulties with keeping up with class (75%), remaining motivated (50%), and "getting started" in the course (39%). To some degree, these concerns are based in the need for time management and "success" skills for fully online environments. Technical problems with the interface also scored high (58%), with concerns about poor help desk assistance (28%) and experiencing constructing more technologically sophisticated projects like electronic portfolios as more difficult at a distance (27%). In terms of affective concerns, students reported feeling "weird" about not meeting people face-to-face (30%), lacking interaction with the teacher (23%), lacking interaction with peers (18%), and missing social aspects of the class (17%). Students more rarely reported an inability to ask questions of the teacher (6%). Open-ended responses to "other" included higher workloads than expected (which speaks to respondents' concerns about orientation to the courses), keeping up with classes, finding time to do the work in an already full life, taking too many classes, and that "Class discussions, while engaging, are less efficient and cover less ground than an in-person group conversation." It seems reasonable that all of these issues are mirror concerns of those that some students reported liking about fully online writing courses, and to some degree, these concerns speak to the need for appropriate orientation for selecting oneself into such a course.

In FO-Q44, respondents were given an opportunity to indicate how, if at all, they attempted to mitigate the problems they encountered in their fully online writing courses. These activities were selected with the following frequency:

- Community building activities early/across the semester (66%)
- Informal portions (e.g., speaking opportunities) on discussion boards (60%)
- Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong) (54%)
- Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly (52%)
- Instructor office hours in chat room (43%)
- 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) (26%)

This final item regarding using other media seems to correlate to respondents indicating they used primarily asynchronous materials for orientations and other activities. Fully text-based materials may be difficult for some students with different learning/thinking styles to relate to, however. The most frequent "other" responses related to rapid and regular communications with students, primarily through email, as represented by this response:

> I try to communicate promptly and often with the students about anything that isn't working well. If they have individual problems with the course, that is another matter. Some will come to me directly, some go behind my back (I think the non-face-to-face aspect makes that easier for them), and sometimes they just disappear and answer no email, etc.

The disappearance in this particular response relates to the relatively high reported drop rates discussed earlier in this report.

English Language User Experiences
FO-Q45, 46, 47, 48, and 49 were specific to the experiences of English Language (EL2) users in the fully online writing course. FO-Q45 was an open-ended question that asked for rough percentages of such students in respondents' courses. The reported frequency was most often between 0 – 10%, with a few responses in the 25% and 50% occurrence. Overall, the impression given is that few EL2 users were known to the respondents; in other words, there might have been EL2 users in their courses, but the students were not identified as such. Recall that none of the participants claimed to teach EL2/ESL-specific courses. It is in this context that we think these next survey responses should be considered.

In FO-Q46, 91% of respondents reported that there were no special fully online writing courses for EL2 users, with 9% reporting that such courses were available. In that some responded that no separate sections were provided to EL2 users, respondents were asked in FO-Q47 whether participants thought

there should be. These responses were split at 66% not favoring such specialized courses and 34% favoring them. In open-ended responses, 116 participants gave these types of reasons for not favoring the fully online EL2-based writing courses:

- "Every student begins and ends on a different level of writing ability. It's just a different level. There is no need for a separate class unless the ELL knows almost zero English."
- "Not enough resources to offer; resources better spent elsewhere."
- "I think the non-native speakers benefit from interactions with native speakers. They are able to interact with those students and probably gain more knowledge than if they were in a class with only non-native speakers. I think online classes might be easier for them as well because they can think about what they are trying to say before they post it."
- "Immersion is the best way to learn."
- "The teachers are specially trained to work with non-native speakers and they care about non-native speakers."
- "Benefits provided by interacting with native speakers are too important; ESOL students would feel ghettoized if we did this."
- "The courses have objectives and any person taking the course should have the language skills to complete it, so why have a separate course for ELL or ESL students?"
- "The courses I teach are mainstreamed in the face to face versions (post ESL/ELL course sequence)."
- "I think that most of those issues should be ironed out in ESL courses before the student gets to ENGL 1301 and 1302."
- "Research in mixed ELL and non-ELL classrooms has shown that students who are beyond college-prep (or "developmental") level writing classes benefit from a mixed classroom environment. We can all learn and be sensitive to each other's learning process, and it benefits us socially to interact with one another. The online writing classroom is a great place to support each other."

On the other hand, participants who favored fully online EL2-based writing courses said:

- "I teach in Texas, and it seems like a crime not to serve the Hispanic student population."
- "It depends on their level of literacy. If they cannot read and write at the college level, they will not do well in an Advanced Business Writing course."
- "There are issues specific to ESL students that we don't cover in "regular" classes"
- "If our numbers increased, those students could truly benefit from a teacher whose knowledge learns more toward ESL learning."
- "When in an online environment and without the traditional face-to-face attention, I think it could be beneficial to at least have corresponding group tutorials to address the specific, unique needs of English language learners."
- "ESL issues could be handled better"
- "Because most of us aren't trained to work with ELL students, and their needs would be met more effectively by someone with training."

Although these are only a few of the many interesting responses that emerged for this questions, it seems clear that agreement about what might be best for EL2 students has not yet been explored sufficiently to reach consensus regarding fully online writing courses. It also seems clear that such exploration will require navigating such hot-topic issues as "ghettoization" and the notion of readiness for particular levels of writing courses and whether and how such readiness might play out in a fully online setting.

Finally, when asked in FO-Q48 regarding the kinds of strategies that are employed to accommodate such students, participants responded that they provide more instructions and/or feedback in more than one modality (42%), provide more text-based communication (30%), and provide asynchronous delivery (10%) or audio-based communications (10%). Many of the "other" responses were used to indicate that the respondents simply did not know enough to respond to this question.

Students with Disabilities Experiences
FO-Q49, 50, and 51 gathered quantitative data about disability and accommodations in terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. In FO-Q49, 69% of participants indicated that their fully online courses were able to accommodate students with various disabilities, while 5% said they were not

and 26% indicated that they did not know. Interestingly, in FO-Q50, 56% indicated that their institutions provided guidance on how to make their fully online writing courses accessible, while 16% said it did not do so and 28% percent admitted to not knowing the answer. The additional 19% of respondents added from FO-Q49 among the 69% of instructors in this latter data seem either to be guessing that their courses were ADA-compliant, or they may have been uncertain about the definition of "ADA compliance." In short, there is disconnect among the number of participants who reported that their courses were accessible with the range of responses received in the open-ended questions. We base this conjecture on the responses received to FO-Q50, where it is uncertain whether 16% of these 69% instructors were working on disability access issues on their own or whether they were defining accessibility much more restrictively.

In FO-Q51, 50% of respondents indicated that they had taught students with either disclosed or obvious disabilities in their fully online courses, while 23% said they had not taught such students and 28% did not know. The number of negative responses to earlier FO-Q 49, 50 and 51 also raises some red flags about the lack of preparation for delivering accessible online writing instruction. Out of overall 158 respondents, 8 did not respond to FO-Q49, 7 did not provide an ADA-compliant course, and 39 did not know whether or not their courses were ADA compliant. Likewise, responses to FO-Q50 about the availability of ADA training at their institution indicates that out of 152 respondents, 43 did not even know whether or not their institution provided this training. In another 24 cases, the institution lacked arrangements for educating its instructors in ADA and disability issues. In FO-Q51, the ratio of instructors who did teach disabled students—85 as compared the 41 who did not know whether they did or did not—is worrisome. If the instructors are not familiar with the availability of resources and training for educating the disabled at their institutions, it is unclear how they could meet their students' needs. A question asking participants to define what they mean by "ADA compliance" in future field research may provide a clearer picture.

Potentially more reliable data about what instructors know and do not know about meeting the needs of disabled students can be gleaned from the responses to the open-ended question (FO-Q54) regarding what they wanted to know about teaching students with disabilities. Many respondents asked for basic information about what the student's disability was and what they needed for learning. Roughly, an equal number of participants raised preliminary questions about what the disabled students' challenges were and how they could make course content accessible, suggesting that they lacked any experience teaching disabled students and that they were only now beginning to think about the issue. Some of these respondents frankly admitted that "They had not thought about such students"; others indicated that "support services at the university should be responsible" for them [the disabled students]; and yet others qualified their responses with such statements as, "that they didn't mind doing some things, but as long as it wasn't overwhelming or too much work on their part they wouldn't mind making modifications." Nevertheless, the data from closely related questions FO-Q53 and FO-Q54 about what participants know and what they want to know suggest that instructors require much training and education in disability-specific OWI pedagogy for fully online courses.

FO-Q52 asked, "*What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities?*" The aim was to capture the true and tried pedagogical strategies from instructors in the writing classroom for incorporating the needs of disabled students. There were 109 responses with the most dominant theme being "Give students more time to complete course work"; the second most common response was, "Follow guidelines from the disability services office or work with the students"; and a third common theme, albeit from a limited number of respondents was, "make technological/design changes such as multiple delivery formats—text script of the podcast for hearing impaired students, or other minor changes in design to accommodate student needs." The number of responses that said none, not applicable, or otherwise stated nothing was being done to accommodate students with disabilities was surprising. At times, these non-responses were followed up with the justification that if instructors are not told about a disability, then there is nothing they can or should do. Among the respondents who made changes in the way they delivered their courses to accommodate needs of their disabled students, only one was familiar with the concept of Universal Design and another one referred to her training in Special Education. It is less than clear whether most respondents understood what their obligations are in terms of adapting their courses to meet the needs of the disabled. For instance, one respondent wrote, "Not

enough help in this area; I would counsel students with some types of disabilities not to take an online class because they need more 1:1 and face-to-face instruction."

FO-Q53 was designed as a catch-all question so as to record the concerns and needs of the survey participants who might have taught disabled students and wished that they knew more about teaching the disabled. It directly solicited information about the instructors' knowledge and skill gaps experience when teaching the disabled. The goal was to create an aggregate picture of the online writing faculty's educational and training needs. It was a more direct question as it pinpointed to the problematic aspect of their experience from the point of view of their major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities. FO-Q54, as mentioned above, raised the same question from another angle: "*What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in online settings?*" We discuss the data from these questions together since these were interrelated. FO-Q53 garnered a total of 95 responses, while FO-Q54 drew a total of 83 responses. About one third of the responses from each of these questions are not applicable to this analysis because even though respondents entered information into the open ended question textbox, their responses were that they had no challenges with disabled students.

Combined from FO-Q53 and 54, these themes emerged:
1. Lack of knowledge by the instructor on how to deal with the many different types and kinds of disabilities and the technologies that may be necessary to meet their needs. This was the most common response and one that probably needs the most attention. Most of the responses to FO-Q54 expand this idea of needing more information on methods to reach students with disabilities, about technological solutions, about how the setting changes the pedagogy, and on best practices for different disability types. Both of these questions attracted a small number of focused comments about the problems pertaining to course management systems (CMS) such as, Blackboard, Web CT and Angel; however, we are not sure whether other instructors are unaware of these issues for their disabled students or whether they have a found fixes—such as text-to-voice readers—around the problem.

2. In line with the findings of FO-Q52, many of the responses (especially to FO-Q54) indicated that faculty generally had a limited understanding of disabilities and accommodations. Many responses to question FO-Q54 indicated that faculty need basic information such as the numbers of students with disabilities and how fully OWI may change pedagogies. Several responses simply stated "anything and everything." One of the most named disabilities was blindness or visual impairment with hearing impairment named second most often. Here also, many participants reported that the office of disability services is the entity that holds most of the responsibility.

3. Respondents also were concerned and challenged by the students themselves. Most notably, they expressed frustration when students did not disclose their disabilities until too late or were not taking on the responsibility of wanting to work with the faculty. Closely related to this concern was the idea that faculty expressed belief that unless students disclose their disabilities then they need not do anything differently. For example, one respondent wrote: "If they have a disability it is good to know, but, really, legally I don't think we are to make accommodations." Another respondent did not think that s/he needed to make the class materials screen reader accessible for a blind student, finding instead a helper to deal with the screen navigation issues.

4. A minor theme that consistently emerged was the time needed to carry out special accommodations and how added time for students might affect fairness among all students.

5. While not a major theme, there were about ten responses where faculty were concerned that students were using their disabilities as a crutch or a way to play the system. Even though this information may be disturbing, the very mention of it means that future research should consider such thinking.

In sum, although many of the responses suggested that the instructors were not fully-prepared to handle the needs of their disabled students and these instructors often passed on the responsibility of helping the

disabled student to the Disability Services on their campus, no one linked the needs of the disabled to the orientation in answer to FO-Q41: "*What is the single most important issue to cover in student orientation for online writing?*" courses. Likewise, the respondents did not make any connection among the needs of the disabled students and their college's writing center facilities while answering open-ended questions—specifically FO-Q26, 27, 28 and 29, which addressed the issues of "access" to an online writing center for the general (presumably able-bodied) student population. Likewise, when respondents stated that their students had access to asynchronous or synchronous tutoring, we cannot be certain whether or not the technology used for such access would be accessible to all the disabled students.

Students' Ratings and Benefits in Fully Online Writing Courses
Finally, for this section about student experiences of fully online writing courses, the last three questions addressed students' ratings, instructors' views of what such courses provide to students, and the relative advantages of fully online writing instruction versus face-to-face instruction.

FO-Q55 asked how most students rated their fully online writing courses. Forty-six percent indicated that their students rated such courses "high[ly]", while 21% said that students gave it an "average" rating. Eleven percent stated that their students rated the course "very high" and 2% indicated a "low" rating with no one indicating a "very low" rating. However, in open-ended responses, 3 of 13 respondents indicated that they receive few ratings, sometimes due to a high drop rate, while another 3 indicated that they had difficulty actually accessing their course ratings. An example response was: "Those who actually COMPLETE the courses tend to give them high ratings. I would guess that the 50% (in introductory comp courses) who drop would not give a high rating, but we rarely hear from those students."

Respondents indicated a number of benefits for students in their fully online writing courses (FO-Q56). Among these were:
- Flexibility in terms of time (91%)
- Flexibility in terms of location (90%)
- Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time (82%)
- Opportunity to develop writing through writing (76%)
- Participating in written discussions (65%)
- Collaborative writing (21%)
- Student facilitation and/or presentation (14%)
- Recorded student conferences (7%)

In sum, the major benefits seemed to be viewed in terms of course logistics of time and location although participants did see potential benefits in terms of actual writing opportunities for students. This perception might be connected to the general sense revealed earlier that OWI pedagogy does not differ significantly from that of the traditional face-to-face pedagogy. Indeed, this impression is supported by responses to FO-Q57, which asked "*Regardless of instructor efficacy, rate whether you believe that students in online courses have an advantage in the areas below compared to students in face-to-face courses.*" The areas that respondents seemed to most believe students had a "clear advantage" or "somewhat of an advantage" over face-to-face courses were:
- Flexibility in time-of-day for attending class (98%)
- Development of self-directedness (91%)
- Development of self-discipline (91%)
- Adeptness at using the computer for their academic work (87%)
- Development of student accountability (75%)
- Ability to troubleshoot personal technology failures (76%)
- Benefits from an accessible archive of course materials (72%)
- Development of problem-solving skills as they negotiate course expectations and troubleshoot their own computing issues (67%)
- Attentiveness to instructions (61%)

These skills and benefits—while important to navigating college in general given their focus on time management, general success with technology, and problem ownership/maturity—do not address writing and writing instruction at all.

The areas in FO-Q57 that respondents seemed more often to believe students were at a "clear" or "somewhat of a disadvantage," or in which there was no perceived advantage at all, on the other hand, tended to be ones where writing instruction was—or should be—intimately concerned:
- Support to make the transition to college (85%)
- Enjoyment interacting with classmates (74%)
- Greater insight about own writing process and style (74%)
- Improvement of critical thinking skills (70%)
- Difficulty with the instructional technology and/or technology support infrastructure (61%)
- Recognition of the need for details when writing (63%)
- Sensitivity to audience (58%)
- Written commentary on peer drafts (57%)
- Benefits from receiving asynchronous feedback (57%)
- Development of stronger reading skills (48%; 51% found advantages)
- Development of stronger writing skills (48%; 52% found advantages)

Although the frequencies presented here do not indicate an overwhelmingly negative picture of how students are perceived to benefit in their writing skills from fully online writing courses, they are at best lukewarm. Given the increasing number of opportunities that students have for taking fully online writing courses, these perceptions bear additional scrutiny for how to improve OWI before best practices are articulated.

Instructor Experience
The next major subject explored in this survey concerned the experiences of instructors. Instructor perceptions are critical to understanding how practices are put into place for fully online writing courses.

Expectations and Training
The first question, FO-Q58, asked participants to check all of the applicable options regarding the expectations that were set for them as teachers by administrators. The most frequently selected expectation was that teachers would provide reasonable support to their students for succeeding in the online setting (88%). The second most frequently selected expectation addressed developing a pedagogically sound course (86%). The other expectations were the requirement to provide certain kinds and/or amounts of interaction with students (68%), that teachers still would have on-campus responsibilities (53%), that online office hours would be required (35%), and that faculty would be observed one or more times during a semester (20%). These frequencies indicate that assisting students in succeeding in an online course is important, as is the general notion of sound pedagogy. However, the specific types of activities that might create success may not have been the ones that administrators had in mind for their faculty. For example, it would seem to be important to reach out to students with interaction, but providing regular online office hours was not often selected as an expectation. Similarly, providing "sound" pedagogy was considered an expectation, but the follow-up of observations to ensure such pedagogy (especially for inexperienced online instructors) was not indicated as a strong expectation. Open-ended "other" responses included the need for training/certification and the expectation that courses would follow similar requirements despite delivery methods or media. Other examples follow:
- "Teachers must pass a certification course before teaching online."
- "Instructors will follow the approved course design, holding students to the same performance and work requirements as face to face students according to the department standards and Alabama Articulation Agreement."
- "A quick response time to student questions and assignments is required. All student work must receive feedback within 48 hours of the due date, and grades for the week's assignments must be posted within 3 days of the end of the week."
- "There are few real expectations."
- "Campus office hours are required."

FO-Q59 asked respondents what kinds of training they received as preparation for their fully online writing courses and it requested that they check all that applied. While 48% indicated that they had some kind of mandatory training, 58% indicated that training was optional.[5] The most frequently selected type of training was "on-going workshops on various aspects of a Content Management System (e.g., Blackboard®)" (79%). This frequency is not surprising given that a CMS typically is chosen by an institution and its use or any updates change at the will of the institution or the software provider—it would seem to be a critical need for instructors to be able to operate within the assigned CMS. The more interesting responses emerged as respondents selected such training types as that coming from faculty peer mentoring programs (41%), dedicated instructional designers (35%), some kind of campus outreach to faculty (14%), summer institutes (13%), and support from a reduced first-online term teaching load (12%). In open-ended "other" responses, participants indicated a range of responses from there being no training available, receiving training that was "not helpful," not being aware of any training offered, and working at an institution that only hires people with previous online instructional experience. These responses support those provided earlier in this report that indicate training is inadequately developed at the level of online writing pedagogy and somewhat unevenly applied.

These frequencies listed above generally corresponded in FO-Q63, where participants were asked to rate the helpfulness of the different types of training named. Peer mentoring garnered 70% of the responses in terms of being most helpful and reduced teaching load garnered 65%,[6] which suggests that even though few respondents received that type of assistance, they valued it the most highly. A sampling of the open-ended responses from FO-Q64 provides additional context for the types of training individuals preferred:
- "Any that develop thick skin, patience, and tolerance. Drinking...heavy drinking."
- "I really didn't have much. But, one semester of teaching online was the most beneficial training I received, by far!"
- "Experience being a student in an online classroom"
- "Training in how to use non-text content delivery. I have no idea how to create a video or audio file, but to be honest, I don't have the time to learn either."
- "We need to be able to see and explore examples of successful online courses."
- "ongoing interaction with other OWI faculty"
- "Ours is so weak that I have no scale for comparison. I have learned most of what I know from trial and error, speaking with other faculty members whom I respect, & additional research. For my university, folks are thrown online because they think it will be easier. There is almost no quality control at this point."
- "Regular reflection and response during at least the first term teaching 100% on line. A group of peers/mentors to build a teaching community for online teachers."
- "Regular group discussion for those teaching and those who want to teach online. Paid time to learn, develop, and teach for the first year teaching online."
- "Our online teacher training actually deals with all online teaching. I am personally working to develop OWI training specifically for our English department."
- "Instruction on how to achieve the same pedagogical outcomes in new/different modalities—and on how the modality differences affect and affect the learning."

For those participants who had training (FO-Q60), the amount was spread fairly evenly over a series of hours: 1-5 hours (22%), 6-10 hours (14%), more than 10 hours (25%); 23% again indicated that they had no training provided. Those who checked "other" provided a range of responses from "I don't know," to several weeks of training, to self-direction. One respondent indicated that there was an 8-week course intended to have the rigor of a 3-credit graduate course.

FO-Q61 asked whether participants received payment for their training time and efforts; only 17% indicated that they did so. Of those who indicated that they received payment, the payment ranged from a

---

[5] We have no explanation for why these numbers do not agree except that participants were able to check all responses that apply, which means that some responses might have been read differently by individuals and checked for non-obvious reasons.
[6] These frequencies are the result of adding the first three rating choices (1-3) on a scaled of 1-7, where 1 is considered the "most helpful."

dollar amount per hour ($2.00 - $25.00), a $50.00 one-time stipend, $2000 for developing a course, the dollar equivalent of a 3-credit overload, and the possibility of advancement in lieu of training pay. One participant noted that while full-time faculty received payment for training, part-time faculty did not. Several participants stated that they did not remember what they might have been paid for training. These responses go to the heart of valuation of faculty member's time for preparing to teach fully online writing courses, which is an area that any statement of best practices should address.

Instructor Qualities, Likes, and Dislikes
This next section discusses the instructors' experiences in terms of their beliefs in the qualities of a good OWI instructor and their preferences regarding teaching fully online writing courses.

Table FO-11 is a modified presentation of the FO-Q65 table available in Appendix A. It is presented here in terms of how participants valued particular instructor qualities with the most important ones to respondents presented at the top and the least important shown at the bottom of the table. Percentages shown indicate only the frequencies with which the participants rated the item as either "very important" or "important." An attempt to find a pattern in these responses suggests that certain kinds of general teaching skills, such as the ability to teach rhetorical principles, were reasonably valued for online (or any) writing instruction courses. Many technology-based qualities also were valued highly, but one some of these would have been addressed in the training that participants indicated they had received. It seems possible that the less often an item was presented in training, the less it was valued as a teaching quality. For example, the first two items considered of utmost importance are interpersonal skills necessary for connecting with students in a fully online setting. The next two items were both technology-based, with technical proficiency with institution-based interfaces being one of the few items most commonly addressed in training per FO-Q59 (79% of trained participants listed this item). Other items that require some kind of technological proficiency are the uses of discussion boards, understanding online theoretical rationale, and critical analysis of available technologies. The least valued of the technological skills also were those that were least often addressed in formal training opportunities: lecture design in a variety of modes, multi-modal project design and grading, and advanced web design skills. These data offer a picture of what most may need to be provided in faculty training, while at the same time suggesting what types of training, such as in multi-modal technologies, may need to be developed to better suit the learning styles of particular students and to better address the needs of learning and physically disabled students, as well as EL2 users.

Table FO-11: Rated Importance of Instructor Qualities for Fully Online Writing Courses (Q65)

Willingness to follow-up with students promptly	100%
Ability to establish a presence online	99%
Overall comfort with technology	98%
Technical proficiency with the interfaces available at our campus	98%
Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines	98%
Skills in teaching rhetorical principles	97%
Skills in moderating online discussion boards	96%
Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection	95%
Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning	89%
Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles	88%
Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning	85%
Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best ones for a pedagogical purpose	83%

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Skills in designing "lectures" delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital video, learning module)	78%
Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects	70%
Participation in an active community of online teachers	67%
Advanced web design skills	20%

When asked about what they liked most about online writing teaching (FO-Q66), participants responded similarly to their students: logistical preferences emerged. They most frequently preferred flexibility in scheduling (79%) with another high rating for not having to commute (46%)—recalling that some instructors were expected to attend campus office hours anyway, per FO-Q58. Nonetheless, 50% of the participants responded that they most liked the opportunity that fully online classes provided to focus more on student writing and less on student personalities. Among the open-ended "other" responses were the challenges of a new environment and the needs to rethink old approaches, the general motivation of online students, increased abilities to interact with students, a sense of "discovery" and letting "creativity flourish," and the increased emphasis on and amount of writing.

When asked what they least liked about online writing teaching (FO-Q67), participants responded that they most disliked dealing with technical problems (59%), managing occasionally over-large class sizes given to virtual courses (31%), and anticipating student problems (23%). Among the open-ended "other" responses were the oft-mentioned "Relative anonymity of students—'disembodied' teaching environment," lack of response from students (sometimes leading to failure or indicative of impending student failure), amount of writing involved (noted by one respondent as "Tendonitis!"), and students who do not read the provided materials and/or who desire more one-to-one instruction.

In an attempt to learn what participants' institutions were doing to mitigate the problems noted in FO-Q67, FO-Q68 asked an open-ended question regarding how they or their institutions were addressing the problems they had noted in previous questions. While one respondent found this to be a "lame question," most of the 89 responses were substantive and sorted out to the following categories:

Administrative Support
- class size (respondents appreciated smaller class sizes or lamented larger class sizes; respondents were unanimous in declaring smaller class sizes necessary for teaching and learning success)
- online teaching perceived as "easier" or "less than" (respondents lamented this attitude among administrators, some at the college and even department levels; others saw this perception as support of OWI instruction in theory, but not in practice)
- possibility of teaching duties 24/7 (this concern was generally expressed as managing student expectations, although some saw it as an administrative/workload issue)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers (some are getting this support, many are not in their views)
- course and instructional design training and support needed (some saw course/instructional design support as part of technical support, but most saw it as a different issue)

Technical Support
- server capabilities (since this is primarily a cost/budget issue, most respondents saw this issue as inseparable from Administrative Support)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers (since this is primarily a cost/budget issue, most respondents saw this issue as inseparable from Administrative Support)
- course and instructional design training and support (some saw course/instructional design support as a technical issue)

Emotional/Psychological Issues
- teacher independence (those teaching fully-online courses tended to experience this as a positive)
- teacher isolation

- teacher autonomy (interestingly, those who tended to see their teaching as isolated [negative] also tended to see their academic freedom as more limited)
- course and instructional design training and support needed (those who felt a lack of training and support seemed to also feel less comfortable and confident in their teaching and students' experiences of the course)

Programmatic/Structural Issues
- class size (unanimously agreed class sizes should be smaller, or at least not larger than face-to-face)
- possibility of teaching duties 24/7 (mostly about managing student expectations, but also about administrative/workload concerns)
- consistency/inconsistency among sections (this concern seems to contradict concerns about academic freedom, which tended to suggest a common syllabus and rigid course structure)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers
- development of evaluation guides/rubrics needed
- course and instructional design training and support needed

Student Success Issues
- class size (many expressed that classes were too large for student success)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers (needed for student success)
- underprepared dual-enrollment students (increased numbers of dual-enrollment students is understood as one of the administrative goals of online writing instruction; respondents are concerned that those students are often under-prepared for online writing instruction)
- fewer means to identify at-risk/high-risk students (one of the few issues identified as decidedly less problematic in face-to-face courses)
- less opportunity for spontaneous, rapport-building interactions (face-to-face social interactions are absent)
- ability to assess students' skills before drop/add period ends (concerns about underprepared students, as well as students without hardware or software capabilities who register for the course)
- course and instructional design training and support needed

We found it striking that 25 of 89 respondents stated that there is no effort of which they were aware being made to mitigate problems (3 more respondents offered "N/A" as a response). One respondent's comment was telling in terms of how isolated some of the instructors appeared to feel: "The college provides us with the opportunity to learn more, but sometimes we cannot afford the technologies, or we are on our own as to how to make things work. Not that I mind the independence, but sometimes I feel alone."

With concerns in mind that may make teaching fully online writing courses challenging, FO-Q69 was asked to help understand the factors that contribute to instructors' willingness to teach online. Table FO-12 only addresses the frequencies selected for increasing willingness to teach online "significantly" or "very significantly." Interestingly, both logistics and intrinsic rewards seemed to be more important for respondents than financial remuneration, which suggests that achieving satisfaction for many instructors might be accomplished by increasing rewards in those two areas. However, given the training issues and other realities of teaching writing online enumerated in previous questions from this survey, the relatively low valuation of students' learning relative to instructors' willingness to teach online deserves further scrutiny.

**Table FO-12: Rated Importance of Factors Contributing to Willingness
to Teach Fully Online Courses (Q65)**

Flexibility in teaching schedule	95%
Finding satisfaction in the online interactions with students	82%
Reduced commuting	79%
Learning new pedagogical strategies	73%

Using new technologies	73%
Input and support of campus technology	67%
Time/money compensation for development of course	62%
Establishing an online presence as an instructor	62%
Linking course materials to other Web resources	56%
Time/money compensation for learning a sophisticated set of skills, theories, and technologies	55%
Reliability of campus technology	55%
Students' learning	46%
Level of appreciation/respect from colleagues	39%
The organization and planning involved in teaching online	38%
Use of common syllabus/curriculum	28%

Responses to FO-Q70 indicated that, if given a choice, 89% of respondents would continue to teach writing in a fully online course; 5% would not and 5% did not know. For a variety of reasons, most of which previously outlined in this report (with "flexibility" being especially favored), respondents indicated their reasons for those preferences in response to FO-Q71. Perhaps the most telling response was a decided "maybe" that seemed to outline succinctly both the benefits and challenges of such online courses:

> My answer to 70 is "maybe," a choice not offered. I could answer yes because my university pays well for teaching online in summer and also pays our department in addition. I have some satisfactions, like finally getting all my online students to create a university tagged portfolio last summer, with real reflections. "No" accounts for many things about teaching online: Because the same policy makes it the _only_ option for summer teaching. Teaching writing online is a massive amount of work, exhausting. It's lonely. It's difficult, like having a conversation underwater. It's not well supported by a network of faculty. Absolutely no one in my department has ever recognized that good teaching online by a tenured faculty member merits the slightest compliment. Students (those who heed the FAQs about the workload) are pleasantly surprised, but their good will lasts exactly the 5 weeks of the general education course. They're gen ed and off campus, so they don't stop by the office in the fall or talk to my colleagues, either. Online in a compressed format seriously limits the types of projects we can do, and over the 6 years of doing online I have cut out collaborative work almost entirely. I think student learning is very much affected by the compressed format coupled with online. Changing the course to incorporate new technology and pedagogical ideas is attractive and responsible but seriously daunting. And I'd have to undertake it pretty much alone.

FO-Q72 asked respondents to select the contexts they most preferred to teach in. While 19% selected fully online, 16% selected face-to-face, 15% selected hybrid online, and another 50% indicated that they were open to any and all of the choices. These selections suggest that many of the respondents are well placed in their fully online settings, but that some may not be in the best teaching setting for them, which raises questions about whether an instructor does or should have the right to select the teaching environment.

The ambiguity of the respondent cited above is echoed in the responses to FO-Q73 that asked whether participants would recommend teaching fully online writing courses to their colleagues. Only 58% said that they would, while 12% said they would not. Fully 30% indicated that they did not know whether they would make such a recommendation or not. FO-Q74 asked respondents to comment on their yes/no choices. The question failed, however, to request a response to those who did not know. In this analysis, it seems that the ambiguity cited above suggests a more interesting gap in our knowledge as it

underscores the challenges of fully online writing instruction in ways that a pure affirmative or negative response cannot. The ambiguity seemed to emerge most clearly in open-ended responses in awareness that online teaching, just as with online learning, is not for everyone and should be an individual preference. This awareness often was stated quite strongly:

- "Several of my colleagues refuse to teach online because they absolutely do not have the necessary skills to adapt to it. If all they want to do is stand up and lecture, I don't think anyone should "rattle their cages" because the outcome for students might be disastrous."
- "If you don't seek it out, you are probably not a good fit for this specialized mode of teaching. Too many on our campus seek it out simply to make more money and end up using completely bankrupt pedagogical practices they would never get away with on campus."
- "Actually, I would like to have answered "it depends" . . .on the colleague's willingness to spend the extra time it takes to create a good, coherent, comprehensive course on line."
- "Yes, but only to those whom I know have a positive attitude toward it. Unfortunately, there are many faculty members at my institution who have a negative view of online learning and no inclination to change that view or educate themselves about the principles of e-learning. I actually had one colleague say that "times have changed, students want more online courses, so I guess we'd better phone it in, too." They are disappointing because such a quagmire should not exist in academia."
- "Well, I would recommend it with the caveat that it's not what most instructors expect. It's neither the cake walk nor the technological nightmare. But I would say that if a colleague has an interest in online teaching, s/he should jump in and give it a try."

One final comment, cited below, appears to capture the fullness of the challenges involved in fully online writing courses that most respondents seemed to be conveying at one level or another:

Teaching online requires even more organization and transparency with students about course goals. You have to make the unspoken spoken—no more reading between the lines with what you want students to achieve. We don't have that luxury in online or distance learning. You have to know and say your course goals out loud and clearly so all students have a chance to succeed as writers and thinkers. Online teaching requires professors and educators to constantly think about tone and the importance of follow-up. You also have an intimate chance of getting to know your students through their ideas and not just who raises their hand or speaks first. Everyone has to put ideas into discussion boards. Everyone's ideas are what we see first and foremost—not where you grew up or what you're wearing. Maybe I'm romanticizing online teaching a bit, but I don't think so. As a reluctant online teacher, I have been immensely gratified by my involvement with a broader (students are from all over the nation and the world) learning community.

CCCC Practices
At the end of the survey, participants were asked two questions relative to the CCCC. FO-Q75 asked what the CCCC could do for the respondent (see FO-Q75 table in Appendix A). The purpose of this question was to give respondents the opportunity to express their needs with regard to OWI. They were invited to check as many responses as they chose. An overwhelming number of participants indicated that they wanted a statement of best practices (81%), while instructional workshops at CCCC conferences and events followed fairly closely (70%). Other pre-written responses included legitimizing online teaching (66%), identifying and/or creating instructional materials for faculty (65%), and publicizing the need for training (59%)—presumably a concern among respondents who wanted CCCC to use its authoritative position to help them receive training.

Among the 23 open-ended responses, as indicated in the "other, please specify" choice, respondents appeared to use this option as a final opportunity to express their needs:

- "Suggest faculty be paid for course development—one feels one's intellectual property may be filched!"
- "More articles/presentations dealing with online writing pedagogy"
- "Emphasize the need for CONTENT specialists at the department level to lead instructional development for online courses."

- "A Cs generated tool we could use at our institution to help students learn how to take an online writing course (emphasizing the unique learning efforts needed, for example) and perhaps a self-screening tool would be really helpful."
- "Create or publicize networking opportunities for online faculty and those interested in online"
- "I cannot tell you how many times I've heard colleagues from other universities and colleges say that where I teach and tutor is a "degree mill," only for those people to come back to me and say, "Hey, I guess your pedagogy and commitment to students is sound." There should be greater respect for what online teachers are doing (and for online learning and learners). There are bad online teachers who don't monitor student learning aggressively or with compassion, but there are many of us who really do want to see this form of education work, and work well, so students receive an outstanding education, especially those who do not have access or time for face-to-face learning institutions."
- "Continue to discuss the realities of online instruction to dispel the myths that it is easier or less time consuming."

A final open-ended question asked of the respondents was: "*What do you think is most needed in a statement of best practices for online writing instruction? Why?"* Of the 158 respondents who participated in the fully online survey, 113 chose to respond in this question. Of the 113 who responded, two indicated they did not know and provided no further elaboration. The main findings of data of this question can be organized under four thematic headings:

1. The first theme centered on the overall legitimization of OWI that, if conducted effectively, would be viewed as an equally valuable means of teaching writing compared to traditional, face-to-face means. Within this thematic category, respondents reported a need for the legitimization of OWI to be expressed in terms of the distinctive benefits that faculty and students can yield from engaging in OWI and the skills/understanding that students could uniquely gain from OWI. Legitimization of OWI also was expressed in terms of an articulation of an institution's pedagogical motivation behind its implementation of OWI rather than merely a mechanism for institutional cost savings. Respondents expressed the need to view OWI as means of quality writing instruction, not "just" a way to teach with technology. To that end, faculty training also was advocated and considered of utmost importance before engaging in OWI.

2. A second theme emerging from the data concerned the importance of instructor time management. Specifically, respondents' reported that engaging in OWI is far more time consuming than face-to-face courses. There were a number of statements, therefore, about the need for a best practices statement to include guidelines for class sizes that take account of overall instructor workload, number of courses taught, and other duties.

3. Along these lines, a third theme of student-centeredness also permeated the responses. Participants also reported on the need for standards of instructor-led interactivity and feedback and the need to engage students and meet their specific learning needs as well as actual technology support for participants.

4. The fourth primary theme evident in the responses related to the need for a pedagogical framework and understanding of OWI that informs recommendations on particular instructor strategies and skills that yield student success and beneficial outcomes.

HYBRID SURVEY FINDINGS

Characteristics of the Survey Respondents
Demographics
The total number of respondents for the CCCC-OWI Survey: Hybrid Classes was 139.

"Hybrid," in this study, means any online course that is not conducted in a fully online setting. It can be a course where the instructor meets students full time in a computer lab, for example, and the interactions take place both face-to-face and through computer-mediated communication. The course could take place part time in a traditional classroom and part time in a computer lab where all students are expected to meet at the same time; or the course could meet part time in a traditional classroom and part time over the Internet, where students can use any computer in any location to meet at the same time with classmates and teacher or at varied times. The meetings could use the asynchronous or synchronous modality. Because these varied conditions all fall under the term "hybrid" for the Committee's purposes, they should be taken into account when reading the survey findings.

As with the fully online survey, those responding to this survey were asked to provide some information about themselves and their institutions (see Appendix B, H-Q1-17 for the questions and aggregated responses). Cross-tabulations were run to determine associations among some of these variables and other key questions (e.g., respondent's rank, total number of years teaching, type of institution(s) at which the respondent taught). As aggregated responses to the survey questions show, a majority of the fully online survey respondents were CCCC members (see H-Q1). Many identified themselves as tenured professors (H-Q5).

Table H-1 compares respondents' general and online teaching experience (H-Q7 and H -Q8 respectively) with the rank(s) at which they claimed to teach (H -Q5); respondents were asked to check all applicable choices; therefore, a respondent could self-identify as both "tenure track" and "assistant professor" (although the frequency suggests that very few respondents identified within more than one category).The first line of data represents the number of people who answered "yes" to H-Q6 and who identified as currently teaching online (100% of respondents). The second line of data (re H-Q7) shows by rank those who identified themselves as having taught 7 or more years (84% of those answering H-Q7). The third line of data shows by rank those who responded to H-Q8 as having taught online for 7 or more years; only 26% claimed this amount of *online* teaching experience. Although a majority of the survey respondents reported fewer than 7 years of specifically *online* teaching experience, this report may reflect the relative youth of OWI as a practice and field. The most experienced instructors can claim only about 20 years total in the various available iterations of the online environment. 84% of those who responded to survey in particular rank responded yes to question 6.

Table H-1: Teaching Experience by Reported Rank(s)

	Tenured Professor	Tenure-track Prof.	Assistant Professor	Full-time non-tt instructor/prof./ admin	Adjunct	Grad TA
Currently teaching online (answered "yes" to H-Q6)	38 (33.9%)	13 (11.6%)	9 (8.0%)	31 (27.6%)	15 (13.4%)	6 (5.4%)
Total teaching experience 7 or more years (H-Q7)	43 (37.4%)	16 (13.9%)	9 (5.2%)	32 (27.8%)	14 (12.2%)	1 (.8%)
Teaching online 7 or more years (H-Q8)	15 (46.8%)	3 (9.4%)	4 (12.5%)	9 (28.1%)	1 (3.1%)	0 (%)

Percentages shown in row 1 represent percent of those who answered "yes" to question H-Q6 (111). Percentages in rows 2 & 3 are percentages of total responses to questions H-Q7 (136) and H-Q8 (131).

Question H-Q9 asked respondents to indicate the type(s) of institution(s) at which they worked. Respondents had the option of choosing more than one. In Table H-2 below, respondents' self-reported years of teaching experience are cross-tabulated with the type of institution(s) at which they worked (H-Q9). The data reveal that the largest number of respondents was working at 2-year community colleges and four-year universities.

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Table H-2: Respondents' Teaching Experience by Type of Institution

Years of Teaching Experience		2-yr Community College	4-year College	4-year University	2- or 4-year Grad School	Professional School
1-3 years teaching exp	Count (% Total*)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
4-6 years teaching exp	Count (% Total*)	2 (1.5%)	1 (0.7%)	7 (5.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
7 or more yrs teaching exp	Count (% Total*)	40 (29.4%)	14 (10.3%)	52 (38.2%)	10 (7.3%)	3 (2.2%)

* Percent of total responses to H-Q7.

Thus, of the 4 respondents in H-Q7 who reported 1-3 years of teaching experience, one taught at a 2-year community college, one taught at a 4-year college and two taught at a 4-year university, representing 0.7%, 7%, and 1.5% (respectively) of the total responses to this question. Note that of the large number of survey respondents reporting 7 or more years of teaching experience, 40 were affiliated with 2-year community colleges and 52 with 4-year universities, representing (collectively) approximately 67.6% of the total responses to H-Q7. Although the data are insufficient for anything beyond mere speculation, that these frequencies differ from those of the fully online survey group may have to do with the institutional missions and student populations that they serve in that more 4-year institutions may have embraced hybrid online instruction over fully online instruction given a higher population of live-in students.

Online Courses
H-Q12 and 13 were designed to elicit a picture of the online course types that respondents were teaching and the enrollments in those courses. Respondents were asked "*What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach*" (and were allowed to choose more than one). H-Q13 asked "*How many students are enrolled in your online writing course?*" Cross-tabulating these questions with rank (shown in Table H-3) revealed the distribution of writing courses across rank—with the exception of ESL writing courses (which no respondents reported teaching).[7] Respondents who self-identified as "tenured professors" and "full-time non-tenure track" were more likely to also report teaching "first-year writing" and "developmental writing" than respondents at other ranks, which differed from fully online survey respondents.

Table H-3: Types of Online Writing Courses by Rank

Type of course		Tenured Professor	Tenure-track Prof.	Assistant Professor	Full-time non-tt instructor/prof./admin	Adjunct	Grad TA	Total
First-year writing	Count (Percent*)	39 (34.5%)	11 (9.7%)	11 (9.7%)	32 (28.3%)	15 (13.3%)	5 (4.4%)	113 (100%)
Prof/Tech writing	Count (Percent*)	12 (35.3%)	6 (17.6%)	4 (11.7%)	9 (26.5%)	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.9%)	34 (100%)
Developmental Writing	Count (Percent*)	13 (36.1%)	3 (8.3%)	2 (5.5%)	12 (33.3%)	6 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	36 (100%)
Advanced Academic Writing	Count (Percent*)	20 (50.0%)	6 (15.0%)	4 (10%)	6 (15%)	4 (10%)	0 (0%)	40 (100%)
Creative writing	Count	6	0	0	5	0	0	11

---

[7] The hybrid data are questionable on this point. In the aggregated hybrid survey results, the ESL designation received 6 responses (0 in the fully online). In the cross-tabulated data, no data were run on these responses. One possibility is that the data are sorted here by rank, so if those "6" responses came from participants who identified their rank as "other," they would not show up here.

(Percent*)	(54.5%)			(45.5%)		(100%)
Writing-intensive courses | Count in other disciplines | (Percent*)	10 (43.5%)	2 (6.6%)	0	9 (39.1%)	2 (8.7%)	0	23 (100%)
Writing Courses | Count for ESL | (Percent*)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (100%)

Enrollment and Attrition

As shown in Table H-4, most respondents (regardless of rank) reported enrollments in the range of 11-30 students, with 21-30 students reported more often (71) than 11-20 students (48). These data suggest that hybrid courses may be seen by administrators as capable of addressing more students per course than those for fully-online courses.

Table H-4: Student Enrollment by Rank(s)

Student Enrollment	Tenured Professor	Tenure-track Prof	Assistant Professor	Fulltime non-tt instructor/prof./ admin	Adjunct	Grad TA
10 or less	1	1	0	1	1	0
	(.7%)	(.7%)	0	(.7%)	(.7%)	0%
11-20	15	5	4	18	3	1
	(11%)	(3.6%)	(2.9%)	(13.2%)	(2.2%)	(.7%)
21-30	27	10	7	14	11	2
	(19.8%)	(7.3%)	(5.1%)	(10.3%)	(8.1%)	(1.5%)
31-40	1	1	0	1	1	0
	(.7%)	(.7%)	0	(.7%)	(.7%)	0
41-50	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
More than 50	2	0	0	1	0	0
	(1.5%)	0%	0	(.7%)	0	0%
I don't know	1	1	0	1	1	0
	(.7%)	(.7%)%	0	(.7%)	(.7%)	0%

Percentages are based on total number of respondents answering Q 16.

The issue of course caps in fully online writing courses was raised by the survey and also addressed by respondent open-ended replies. Table H-5 provides the aggregated data for H-Q14, which asked respondents to indicate at which number they preferred enrollment to be capped in their online writing courses. Respondents overwhelmingly preferred to have a course cap of between 11-20 students.

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Table H-5: Preferred Student Enrollment Caps

10 or fewer per course	11	8%
11-20 per course	106	77%
21-30 per course	19	14%
31-40 per course	0	0%
41-50 per course	0	0
More than 50	0	0%
I don't know	2	1%

H-Q15 requested reasons for the responses in H-Q14. These responses were analyzed qualitatively for the context they could provide. The results were classified into time factors and grading/response/feedback, as they were in the fully online survey findings.

Time factors included the perception from faculty that their chosen class size enabled them to be more effective teachers in terms of faculty workload and the effect on teaching effectiveness. The responses support a general perception often argued anecdotally that teaching writing online is more labor intensive than in face-to-face settings. Since writing courses already are labor intensive, the addition of the writing necessary for all teaching and communication within the electronic medium appears to mean, from a faculty perspective, that fewer students in a class creates a more ideal environment. Typical responses included:

- "Students in the blended environment need smaller class size because you're not only teaching writing, you're teaching the technology as well, so it slows down the amount of material you can get to if you have large class sizes."
- "I think 15 is really the optimum number that allows the instructor to interact online sufficiently with each student. Online instruction is more intensive, in my opinion than the face-to-face class. It is really close to individualized instruction response to student needs is done properly."

One aspect of time that emerged is the extra written communication that occurs alongside the need to teach or engage technology that is necessary when teaching online. Many responses pointed to this writing as a quantifiable measure for justifying smaller class sizes. Typical responses included:

- "So that I have time to give each student's writing careful feedback. So that I have time to meet individually with students for writing conferences and to help them navigate the technology side of class."
- "In my experience, the time spent teaching an online course far exceeds the time spent in a traditional classroom. That time translates into different (not necessarily better or worse, but certainly different) kinds of necessary feedback and interaction strategies, which are inevitably more time consuming. I think a smaller class is better for an online writing course."

Regarding *grading/response/feedback*, participants generally indicated that responding to student writing does not change when moved to an online environment. The same grading and feedback demands exist. Thus, teaching writing online would be equivalent to teaching face-to-face in that increases in student numbers would decrease feedback and ultimately effectiveness. A typical response was "Frankly, online teaching should be called online writing. The sheer volume of interactive discussion posts and emails makes for a more labor intensive class than a face-to-face class. In addition, you can't simply speak to clarify a point. You must write and think even more carefully about how that writing will come across." However, other than grading-related feedback, many respondents also indicated that additional communications increased their workloads (e.g., commenting on discussion posts, crafting class announcements, responding to emails and questions):

Our bin counts (course caps) are 24 for first year and 22 for second year. Our students could not and do not survive in a fully online environment. Too many students, too little time for "how to." Since we are hybrid/blended, we have time to teach our students how to negotiate the network/online environment while we teach them to think and communicate. Ideal classes would be 15-18. Our face-to-face attrition rate is 2-4% in writing courses. Our State's online attrition rate is 50% in writing courses.

The open-ended comments did not reveal much information on how faculty found themselves to be more effective with lower student enrollment beyond the consistent and overwhelming number of responses that pointed to their needs to provide sufficient feedback/grading/responding to all students and their writing:

There is a pretty standard equation for all writing instruction—if you have a smaller number of students you can increase your activity and engagement as a teacher exponentially. I have 22 per class right now, which is certainly on the nicer end of the scale, but I could be infinitely more productive with a smaller class. There is simply more time to respond more thoroughly to the writing, both in formal projects and in on line posts.

Table H-6: Attrition by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

Attrition Rates	2-yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
1-10%	13	14	41	7	2	77
	(9.7%*)	(10.4%)	(30%)	(5.2%)	(1.5%)	(57%)
11-20%	8	2	12	2	0	24
	(5.9%)	(1.5%)	(8.9%)	(1.5%)	0	(18%)
21-30%	10	1	3	0	1	15
	(7.4%)	(.7%)	(2.2%)	0	(.7%)	(11%)
31-40%	3	0	2	0	0	5
	(2.2%)		(1.5%)		0	(3.7%)
41% or higher	7	0	0	1	0	8
	(5.2%)			(.7%)		(6%)

Percent is relative to those reporting on drop rates within the same rank. (4% of responses to this question [5] were "I don't know.")

As indicated in Table H-6, an interesting final data point regarding the institutional contexts for online teaching concerned retention. When cross-tabulated by rank, little in the way of trend-lines emerged. However, when the data were cross-tabulated by institution type, it appeared that respondents working in community colleges reported experiencing higher drop rates, whereas the 4-year colleges and university faculty, as well as the 2-4 year graduate schools and professional schools reported lowest drop rates. These numbers differ substantially from those reported by the fully online survey group; there, the only high attrition rates were those for community colleges (all ranges) and for 4-year universities (in the 1-10% range). Fifty-seven percent of the hybrid responses indicate course drop rates in the 1-10% while only 31.8% of the fully-online responses indicate drop rates in this range. Although more research is necessary, it appears that a substantial portion of this hybrid attrition rate is reported by 4-year universities who may be working with a different population and teaching in contexts where students persist rather than drop courses. These attrition rates may tell us little about the quality of the courses and more about the contexts in which these different kinds of attrition rates are reported.

Pedagogical Choices and Influences
Course Design
While the first section of this report sought to establish some sense of the respondents' characteristics and institutional contexts for the work of teaching online (including enrollment caps and perceived attrition rates as reported by survey respondents), this section takes up respondents' pedagogical choices and influences.

Table H-7 cross-tabulates respondents' answers to H-Q18 (regarding the kinds of activities included in their online courses) with the institutions at which they were employed. The data suggest that teachers employed a predictable range of process-centered and social constructivist writing activities (including revision activities and peer response groups), regardless of the type of institution in which they were working. Given the hybrid nature of the online environment, the data also suggest that teachers were as likely to employ synchronous discussion as asynchronous discussion, contrary to the fully online survey findings; this difference seems quite natural because of the differences in response modalities. Student facilitation and/or class presentations, student conferences and collaborative writing were reported to be much less frequently assigned. Interestingly, the data indicate that the reported pedagogies among all faculty were similar despite the type of school setting.

Table H-7: Course Activities by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

What activities do your online course(s) include? Please check all that apply.	2 yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
Peer response groups	36	14	54	8	2	114
	31.6%	12.3%	47.4%	7%	1.8%	100%
Synchronous discussion	16	6	13	2	2	39
	41%	15.4%	33.3%	5.1%	5.1%	100%
Asynchronous discussion	34	12	49	7	2	104
	32.7%	11.5%	47.1%	6.7%	1.9%	100%
Small group discussion	28	6	37	8	1	80
	35%	7.5%	46.2%	10%	1.2%	100%
Whole class discussion	32	10	42	8	2	94
	34%	10.6%	44.7%	8.5%	2.1%	100%
Rhetorical analysis	26	8	38	8	3	83
	31.3%	9.6%	45.8%	9.6%	3.6%	100%
Reading responses	40	16	54	11	2	123
	32.5%	13%	43.9%	8.9%	1.6%	100%
Invention activities	23	7	35	6	2	73
	31.5%	9.6%	47.9%	8.2%	2.7%	100%
Revision activities						
	0	0	0	0	0	
Student facilitation and/or presentation	14	5	34	5	1	59

	23.7%	8.5%	57.6%	8.5%	1.7%	100%
Student conferences	17	4	25	4	3	53
	32%	7.5%	47.2%	7.5%	5.7%	100%
Collaborative Writing	13	5	30	5	0	53
	24.5%	9.4%	56.6%	9.4%	0	100%

*4 respondents or 3% of those responding to this question selected "Other"—indicating a course practice not represented in this list.
**Revision Activities—as a data line—was missing from the initial data run, which will need to be corrected for any final report.

It is possible that pedagogical practices in online writing courses could be determined by a course design that was inherited by the respondent, so that the responses in H-Q18 above were a function of having inherited elements of the online course that are not reflective of the respondents' own pedagogical commitments. To help understand that possibility, H-Q19 asked respondents a number of questions related to online course design. Responses are cross-tabulated by institution type in Table H-8. The two statements most frequently indicated as true for respondents were: "I inherited the interface" and "I am considered an expert in the content of the course." Interestingly, in the hybrid online survey group, only 72 participants indicted that they were considered to be experts in the course content; in the fully online survey group, 128 responses were "yes" to this statement. We have difficulty making sense of these data given that so many of the hybrid respondents self-identified as teaching at a 4-year university where such expertise presumably would be required.

An interesting data point about the responses to these questions deals with the frequency by which respondents indicated they had received training in either online teaching or course design. For both statements, a majority percentage of 2-year community college participants reported having received such training (respectively 38 of 46 or 82% and 31 of 77 or 67%). In the 4-year college setting only 12 of 20 (60%) and 9 of 20 (45%) indicated they had received this training. In the 4-year university, 39 of 65 (60%) and 35 of 65 (53%) reported having received this type of training. Of the 2- or 4-year graduate school setting, only 6 of 12 (50%) and 6 of 12 (50%) claimed this kind of training. It is clear that the community college faculty reported training support as preparation for hybrid online course teaching and course design more often than other respondents.

Table H-8: Course Design by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

Which of the following statements are true for you?	2 yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
I inherited a course design.	4	6	12	1	0	23
	17.4%*	26%	52.1%	4.3%	0%	100%
I inherited the interface.	31	14	43	7	1	96
	32.3%	14.6%	44.8%	7.3%	1%	100%
I inherited the course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example, changed assignments).	9	6	16	4	1	36
	25%	16.7%	44.4%	11.1%	2.8%	100%
I worked alone to design the online components of my course.	29	6	41	6	3	85
	34.1%	7%	48.2%	7%	3.5%	100%
I have participated in formal training for online teaching.	38	12	39	6	1	85
	44.7%	14.1%	45.9%	7%	1.2%	100%

I have participated in formal training for online course design.	31	9	35	6	1	82
	37.8%	10.9%	42.7%	7.3%	1.2%	100%
I am considered an expert in online course design.	10	1	17	4	0	32
	31.2%	3.1%	53.1%	12.5%	0	100%
I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course.	14	3	17	5	1	40
	35%	7.5%	42.5%	12.5%	2.5%	100%
I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface.	16	6	24	5	3	54
	29.6%	11.1%	44.4%	9.3%	5.6%	100%
I am considered an expert in the content of the course.	43	7	16	5	1	72
	59.7%	9.7%	22.2%	6.9%	1.4%	100%
Course design is unique to individual instructors.	36	11	42	10	2	101
	35.6%	10.9%	41.6%	9.9%	1.9%	100%
Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tools generated by the instructor/course development team.	13	8	24	8	2	55
	23.6%	14.5%	43.6%	14.5%	3.6%	100%

*Percent of those who answered "yes" (rather than "no" or "I don't know") to this particular statement within Q 18.

Assuming that training is critical to high quality online education, the aggregated responses to H-Q19 (see Appendix B) will give pause. Only 73% of all survey respondents teaching hybrid online courses reported having received any training in online education in response to H-Q19 (equal to those in the fully online survey group). The survey does not ask at that point for further clarification as to the nature of the training received by the 73%, but it does do so using H-Q59, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64. Further investigation would be useful to distinguish between training in *online writing instruction* versus training in *site-specific or interface-specific technology*. Similarly, while (only) 61% reported having participated in formal training for online course design, a full 81% of respondents answered "no" to the question of having inherited a course design. In other words, the data suggest that respondents may be expected to develop their online courses rather than to inherit them, yet only 61% of the respondents indicated that they received preparatory formal training to enable strong course design.

It seems worthwhile to note at this juncture that, given the higher reported attrition rates among the community college students for larger hybrid writing courses as reported by respondents, the community college faculty seem to be at least as well prepared—and possibly better prepared—via training than the other faculty participants in this survey. Additionally, there did not seem to be any appreciable difference among the selected pedagogies for all participants. That being the case, it seems possible that the lower reported community college retention rates for their larger courses may be due to other factors such as an increased at-risk student population, the economics of a community college education, or other explanations. The complete data made available through this survey require further scrutiny.

Theory and Practice
H-Q20 offered interesting information as well (See Appendix B for aggregated numbers). This question asked participants to indicate both virtual tools and teaching strategies used in hybrid online courses; they could select as many as desired. These respondents reported a higher frequency of online course modules designed by the instructor or department than did the fully online survey participants (73% over 57%). The most frequently selected tools were primarily text-based, asynchronous media like course management systems; strategically, these were used for such practices as the online distribution of

course materials, PowerPoint and Word document lectures, quizzes and exams, draft exchange for peer response, asynchronous discussion, submission of assignments in which text is the primary mode, and return of graded assignments. Indeed, the uses of the technology for peer response, quizzes and exams, and the submission and return of graded assignments surpassed the uses indicated by fully online survey participants. The hybrid survey participants reported having asynchronous discussion more often than the fully online participants (84% over 64%), which may be due to attention to the focus that hybrid course software and pedagogy places on peer response to writing and the ease of electronic exchange of papers. Hybrid survey participants also reported rare uses of the tools for one-to-one student/teacher conferences. Of the least used tools were wikis, RSS feeds, and blogs, while the least used teaching strategies were video lectures, audio modules, synchronous discussions, audio file exchange, multi-modal assignments. These types of strategies may prove important as this report suggests later regarding the needs of English Language (EL2) users and disabled students.

Table H-9 presents aggregated data from H-Q23 of the hybrid-online survey, in which respondents were asked "*Which of the following pedagogical or theoretical principles, if any, are most important in your online teaching of writing?*" Respondents were asked to check no more than three items. These statements of belief and value were provided based on results of the pilot survey, which indicated that using more theoretical language may have prevented some participants from responding. The pedagogical principles frequently selected here correlate with the frequency of process-centered course practices identified by respondents in H-Q19 (Table H-7). "Writing is a process" and "Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion" were most frequently selected. The least frequent response was that "Writing cannot be taught" (4%). Interestingly, the principle "Face-to-face interaction with students is important," which was selected by only 8% of the fully online participants was selected by 44% of the hybrid survey participants. This choice is not surprising, however, because their very classroom setting involves the combination of face-to-face with online interactions. One interesting open-ended response to this question was:

> I don't see a difference in the principles that guide online from F2F pedagogy, really. The principles that guide online pedagogy for me are the need to supplement or to provide extra avenues of communication for my students, or to meet student demand for online courses. My personal principle is to create a course online that doesn't lack integrity.

Overall, the findings were not surprising from respondents who were sufficiently interested in OWI to complete the survey.

Table H-9: Aggregated Response to Influential Pedagogical or Theoretical Principles (Q 23)

Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas	56	40%
Writing is a social process	66	47%
Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion	106	76%
Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response	5	4%
Writing is a process	97	70%
Writing and revising are recursive acts	83	60%
Writing and revising are generative acts	50	36%
Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement	53	38%
Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important	61	44%

An opportunity to contextualize the responses was provided in H-Q24, an open-ended question regarding which one of the three selected principles was most central in one's OWI practices and why that was so. The qualitative analysis revealed that the respondents made frequent reference to the interrelated nature

of writing instruction where many of the targeted principles are at work at the same time. However, only 36 out of 131 responses specifically mentioned OWI's relationship with the principles and their practices, leaving open the possibility that their statements could be related to writing instruction as a whole, as opposed to OWI in particular. As with the fully online survey findings, reasons for this response might be the length of the survey, that respondents' comments were said implicitly in reference to OWI environments given the rhetorical context of the survey, and that the instructional environment may be perceived as less noticeable or crucial than it used to be. Of the 36 who did mention OWI in the online survey, the large majority were positive and thoughtful about its involvement in their teaching.

Example substantive responses included the following, provided in the order of most-to-least frequently cited in the open-ended responses. The ranking differed somewhat from the order selected for H-Q23, which may be accounted for by the request that participants select only one principle about which to respond.

- **Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion. (26)**. This rhetorical principle focuses on getting students to recognize and respond to all rhetorical situations (make writing choices) with varied styles for different audiences and genres. Three respondents mentioned that this principle holds regardless of the environment writing takes place in—online or traditional.
  - "Ultimately, I believe writing is a public act (to varying degrees, depending upon purpose and audience)—and rooted in the human desire to express, articulate, reflect, connect to what's "out there" beyond the self, and thus is also a social process, a dialogical process between self and other. The new computer technologies have made this process more transparent—especially as we move into the genres of blog writing, web pages and the like—and the online writing experience invites a fruitful exploration of the intersection of public and private realms. The writing act is both private and public, in a sense. And the work we do in OWI requires even greater sensitivity to audience awareness, and greater sophistication towards reaching that wider audience. There are a lot of rhetorical assumptions to explore and to question, and rhetorical gestures to transmit and translate in these newly available modes. Pretty exciting stuff!"
  - "Emphasis on rhetorical situation drives all the writing classes I teach as I believe that learning to attend careful[ly] to one's rhetorical skill is a piece of learning that students will most likely apply after leaving the course."
- **Writing is a process. (20)** In this question, respondents were most eager to define "process" in terms of the other pedagogical principles—so "crossovers" outweigh the whys and hows presented in these responses. The most clearly indicated crossover principles include audience, purpose, occasion; revising; and peer collaboration in review and feedback. There were not a lot of specific references to actual techniques used (there were a number of general ones) in comparison with other principles discussed in H-Q34. Clearly, this group of respondents was invested heavily in the concept of "process."
  - "Students need to use brainstorming techniques, first drafts and revision after revision."
  - "Writing is a process unique to each writer, requiring BOTH social interaction and solitary, generative acts."
  - "Writing is a process (with substantial elements of generative acts embedded within), which distributes the writing "acts" through different elements of generation, including brainstorm, research questions, proposal, drafting, revision."
- **Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important. (14)** Most comments tended to justify the choice of face-to-face instruction in the context of an OWI survey, albeit hybrid. Reasons for insisting on a face-to-face component included the need to develop connectedness and trust; the frequent lack of reading skills in online students; and the need for basic writers, often returning adults, to feel a face-to-face connection with the instructor. Interestingly, only one respondent answered with awareness that this survey was designed with a hybrid context. The issues and concerns of most of those here could be met with the face-to-face component in a hybrid course.
  - "Probably the face-to-face part; I work with adult basic writers who aren't comfortable with technology and who need to see each other and the teacher frequently to feel that they are connected."

- o "Rhetoric and process are central to my work in ANY writing course—online, hybrid, or f2f. To me, those are essential to teaching writing. That, said, the one central to my OWI views are that human contact is important to effective instruction and important to my own sense of fulfillment in this career, so that is why, when I do offer courses online, which is infrequent, I try to offer them as hybrid, so I can get to know the students and give them some personal attention. And, while there are many positive aspects to online instruction, there is something magical about the space we have together that just cannot be replicated online."

- **Other. (10)** A number of respondents provided comments that were somewhat outside of the nine possibilities provided.
  - o "My "other" response—with hybrid and online courses, students can only be "present" in class by being actively engaged, to whatever degree, with assignments and texts and one another (via text). Thus, in hybrid and online environments, we don't "talk about" or even "teach" discourse principles without simultaneously enacting them."
  - o "Honestly, I think it is that, for some students, writing in a classroom doesn't work. Writing on their own time and at their own pace, however, does work. Hybrid seemed a good way to serve those students."

- **Writing is a social process. (9)** "Writing as a social process" was seen largely as a commitment to writing for audiences and learning in a social context. The online environment expands opportunities beyond traditional community; activities exploiting online affordances include collaboration in drafting, collaborative assignments and responses, peer review, online discussions and conferences, group projects, and making writing available beyond the class. This principle was specifically linked with others: general process, recursiveness, writing as generative, peer feedback, and audience/purpose/occasion.
  - o "Writing is a social process (which then makes room for me to include things like "writing is a generative act" and "peer feedback is necessary." I believe students have something to contribute to course instruction & discussions, I believe they need strategies for learning how to create meaning in communities, I drive them crazy with collaborative assignments and responses, but the theory that informs my F2F classes is social constructivist theory, so that informs my online work with students as well."
  - o "Online site allows students to engage beyond the classroom, to see each others' writing and how others are approaching topics and tasks, to give and get thoughtful responses."

- **Writing and revising are recursive acts. (9)** Respondents seemed to see recursion as an opportunity to improve and recognize that improvement. They evinced strong interest in a writing → feedback → rewriting loop as the concrete pattern of "recursiveness."
  - o "I use the online system (Moodle) to make sure students are doing peer review and to enable me to make electronic comments on their papers. I believe revision opportunities are the non-negotiable foundation of my courses, and I find having an electronic record of where we've been and where we are going is essential."
  - o "OWI makes it easier for me and students' peers to respond to drafts and for writers to revise them."

- **Students need to write to express themselves and their ideas. (4)**
  - o "All writing is expressive in nature. If we didn't have something to say and share, then what would be the point of writing?"
  - o "For developmental students who have had little practice or success in writing, it's essential to gain confidence and fluency."

- **Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement. (3)** Peer feedback was indicated as very important throughout the answer set, notably in crossover references. It may have been selected by few as the major principle because it was seen by these respondents as integral in other principles as a supporting, ongoing activity.
  - o "It is more important to students in online courses because otherwise they have no real opportunity to interact with peers."
  - o "Peer feedback - so that students learn about their own work and the work of others, which helps them recognize new techniques, and that revision is fundamental to writing."

- **Writing and revising are generative acts. (2)** Respondents seemed to see generation as a natural process of writing out one's ideas. The notion that the process of writing leads to a clearer sense of one's message is one outgrowth of writing as generative.
    - "Writing & revising are generative acts because this generation is central to improved writing."
    - "Writing and revising are generative acts that encourage writing as process and allows for the generating of ideas and their expression."
- **Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response. (1)** This principle is connected to post-process theory, which holds that writing is an unteachable skill, but it is one that can be learned through sharing writing and receiving response.
    - "I do not agree entirely with the first clause; however, my experience has been that student needs vary to such a great extent that most writing instruction needs to be greatly individualized. I find the discussion forums allow students to work with other students' texts and to develop a sense of what their writing practices are and how their practices affect the response to and perceived quality of their work. I have taught in this medium exclusively for at least 10 years and at least 50% of the time for 25 years. I cannot easily remember what it was like before we could share our work so readily."

As far as these specific principles go, it seems that the online teachers had many tenets of faith in writing instruction and used them simultaneously. However, the ranking of these tenets or principles differed considerably between these respondents and those in the fully-online survey. While the first two ranks of audience/purpose/occasion and writing as a process merely exchanged places, the importance of face-to-face teaching was ranked much more highly here, which would seem natural for respondents who were speaking to the importance of a hybrid setting as opposed to a fully online setting. The shifting of the other ranking of principles seems less transparent and may suggest an area for future research.

Online Tutoring and Tutor Training
Online Tutoring
With an online writing instructional setting, it would seem appropriate to have available environment-specific supplemental support like that which exists in face-to-face settings; therefore, the survey asked respondents about online tutoring opportunities available to their students. The survey indicated that supplemental online tutoring was relatively uncommon. H-Q25 revealed that just over half the respondents (51%) indicated writing center consultants were available for asynchronous online consulting, and 23% reported tutors available for synchronous online consulting, while 8% indicated that they outsourced online tutoring. Given that respondents were asked to check all applicable options, it is clear that the vast majority, 79%, made static resources available to their students as a primary intervention. These results differ only slightly from those in the fully online survey. In that survey, it was clear that outsourcing of online tutoring occurred more often than in the hybrid online setting. It seems likely that the difference may reside in the nature of hybrid settings with classes occurring at least part time on campus, where a traditional brick-and-mortar writing center would be expected to handle student writing concerns.

When the results of H-Q25 were cross-tabulated with the type of institution (Table H-10), they revealed that asynchronous tutorials were claimed almost equally by respondents identifying as 4-year university employees and 2-year community college employees. More synchronous tutorial opportunities were claimed by 2-year community college respondents (although the actual number of responses was low overall). The 2-year community colleges accounted for most of the outsourcing of supplemental instruction, which may be a factor of economics or of particular attention to their students' needs. The uses of static resources were high among all types of institutions.

Table H-10: Supplemental Online Writing Instruction
by Respondents' Institution Type(s)

What supplemental online writing instruction or online writing tutoring opportunities, if any, exist at your institution? Please check all that apply.	2 yr comm college	4-yr college	4-yr university	2- or 4-yr grad school	Prof school	Total
Resources/guidelines available for students to consult (on citing sources, proofreading, etc.)	38	14	40	7	3	102
	37%	13.7%	39.2%	6.8%	2.9%	100%
Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting.	26	7	25	5	2	65
	40%	10.7%	38.5%	7.7%	3%	100%
Writing center consultants available online in real-time	10	3	3	0	0	16
	62.5%	18.7%	18.7%	0%	0%	100%
Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies	8	0	3	0	0	11
	73%	0%	27.2%	0%	0	100%
Turnitin® or other plagiarism detection services	18	10	29	5	0	62
	29%	16%	46.8%	8%	0%	100%

Regarding how such tutoring occurred technologically (H-Q28), email was listed the most frequently (42%) with static webpages (18%), synchronous chat (15%), and some sort of file sharing that may or may not be Web-based (18%) also indicated. In the "other" category, telephone conferences were listed. As with the other questions, 47% chose the "no access" response, validating that data. Students in hybrid online writing environments appear to be receiving more asynchronous than synchronous tutoring time, but many students had no apparent access to such assistance at the time of the survey. In the open-ended "other" responses, many participants indicated that hybrid online students needed to go to their campus writing centers for support or that they could use other institutions' online writing centers and, in fact, were referred to them. Three respondents reported "robust" online library assistance with synchronous abilities to speak with librarians.

For those instructors whose students have access to an online writing center (H-Q29), 47% of the respondents reported that students did not receive any instruction for using those tutoring services. Only 34% indicated that the teacher instructed students in how to access tutors. With such a high number reporting this lack of preview or instruction, the assumption appears to be that students know how to use and navigate any online resource, which may not be true given that platforms and site design may differ significantly from those provided in online classrooms. Additionally, many students, while "digital natives," are not necessarily skilled in instructional technology applications; and in high-stakes settings like writing classes, their technological skills and anxiety levels may join to frustrate their attempts to locate and use well the support systems provided to them. Finally, it seems worth noting that 31% of respondents indicated that students were given static text-based materials for instruction, which by nature requires that students read and apply such instructional text in order to understand how and why to access the online tutoring available to them. These findings are supported by H-Q30, which clearly shows a significant amount of text-based resources and face-to-face tutors (85%), but little person-to-person online tutoring support (36% asynchronous and 14% synchronous).

Responses to H-Q31, 32, and 33 indicate that for these respondents the tutor pool was comprised of more undergraduate peer than any other type, with more professional tutors (experienced educators) than graduate peer tutors. The increased frequency of undergraduate tutors as indicated by the hybrid survey participants over those indicated by the fully online survey participants is interesting, and it may reflect a stronger familiarity with the make-up of the campus on-the-ground writing center. The tutors

appeared most often to have background in a variety of disciplines (66%), in English literature (47%), composition (38%), and creative writing (28%). Many of the respondents (19% to 24%) reported they did not know who the online tutors were in terms of their levels of expertise, nor did they know how the individuals were chosen to be online tutors.

Online Tutor Training
Finally, for online tutoring to be successful, presumably tutors need some kind of training in the highly text-based asynchronous response and/or synchronous chat practices. H-Q36 asked participants to check all applicable responses to a question about how tutors were trained for online writing center work. Up to 60% indicated that the tutors received the same training as face-to-face tutors, while 25% indicated that their tutors received non-credit bearing training dedicated to online tutoring. Zero percent indicated that their tutors had some kind of credit-bearing online-specific tutor training, while 8% reported that tutors received credit-bearing training in non-online specific processes and 8% reported that their tutors received credit-bearing training on technology and online pedagogies. These responses indicate that the online tutoring may not be considered much different from face-to-face tutoring despite the differences in delivery style and environments. The "same training" as face-to-face tutors may account for some common tutoring principles, but not the particular strategies and/or principles necessary for a text-based tutoring asynchronous or synchronous (chat) setting, nor for the faceless telephone synchronous setting.

Student Experience
A series of questions were asked of respondents regarding student experiences in hybrid online OWI. It is important to take into account that these data are representative of understanding and perceptions only and that they are not to be construed as indicative of actual student experiences, which we should ascertain via such means as student interviews and interactions.

Orientation Experiences
H-Q37 asked respondents which kinds of expectations they believed were set with students regarding their hybrid online writing courses. Setting expectations appeared to be an important part of preparing students adequately for the online setting:
- Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, Blackboard®, etc.)—95%
- Completion of course requirements—90%
- Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)—81%
- Informed participation in online discussions—80%
- Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions—73%
- Peer review—73%
- Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments—69%
- Productive facilitation of online discussion—32%

Of these expectations, only the productive facilitation of online discussion fell below the 50% mark, which suggests that such facilitation may be considered a teacher-leadership role rather than a student role. In contrast to the expectations set for the fully online writing course students, these expectations indicate a higher valuation of regular availability via email over the availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions. It is possible that the idea of being "available" is more critical in the fully online setting given that students meet totally asynchronously for most such courses.

To the end of understanding how students are prepared for enrollment, participants were asked in H-Q38 to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements about whether the student or someone else had set expectations and to what degree the student had the opportunity to understand the responsibilities of a hybrid online writing course. Using primarily the "agree" response, 42% agreed that students were "well aware" that the course was held online (and 14% strongly agreed with this statement). A 28% group agreed that students had read the program's documentation on the course's expectations and that the instructor had greeted the student by email prior to the first day of class (28%,

with 37% strongly agreeing). Because field interviewees had recommended that students needed outside counseling to make their best choices about any online writing instruction, two questions probed this concern for the hybrid setting. Interestingly, only 24% of respondents agreed that their students had been advised by a counselor—an outside person—about the course's expectation. Similarly, only 8% agreed that students had completed an instrument that indicated that their learning preferences were conducive to success in an online environment. If such outside-the-course communications about OWI course expectations are important, they were not perceived by respondents to be occurring.

H-Q39 and 40 addressed the orientation delivery formats and subject matter of student preparatory experiences for hybrid online writing courses. Face-to-face (47%) formats were indicated the most frequently (47%), while a combination of asynchronous and face-to-face followed (17%), while asynchronous (14%) and audio/video (8%) were the least frequently used. These findings are interestingly different from those for the fully online survey group where asynchronous formats were most often used, but these differences make sense in light of the opportunity for face-to-face instruction of any sort in a hybrid online setting. Precisely what was meant by "asynchronous" was not indicated in this question, but the additional choices of audio/visual seem to indicate that some kind of text-based orientation was the interpreted meaning. Eight percent and 23% respectively indicated that some other educational unit provided such orientation or that not orientation was provided. Other respondents indicated that they "did not know" in their responses to the "other" category. The subject matter of orientation was addressed in the following order of frequency (H-Q40; see Appendix B for specific frequencies): how to use the interface, how to contact the instructor, how to access resources other than course materials how to be successful in the class, plagiarism and cheating, how to manage time appropriately for an online course, and netiquette. Of these, only the issues of plagiarism and cheating might be considered not particular to an online course.

H-Q41 was an open-ended question that asked respondents to indicate what they believed was the single most important issue to address in an orientation to a hybrid online writing course. Even though the question requested the "single most important issue," a number of respondents wrote more than one item. These were separated into 121 individual responses, which were categorized into 13 total categories.

Most respondents were concerned with the students' need to "be successful" in the environment (33%), which contrasted with those respondents to the fully online survey, where orientation to the technology was most often cited. The ability to be successful, which was not fully developed in terms of success tips in 12 of the 41 responses, included tips like the need for critical thinking, self pacing, and understanding course expectations. Such success connects to the need for a situational knowledge (10%) about the differences between a hybrid and any other classroom setting. Specifically, participants indicated that the hybrid format is not "easier" than a face-to-face setting and that students need to understand how the online portion supports the rest of the course. The second most frequent concern regarded students' needs to be oriented to the technology (19%).This concern seems somewhat related to the idea of accessibility to the technology, which only 0.8% of respondents indicated as most important, again calling into question participants' understanding of access and universal design. The next two most frequently mentioned concerns were for students to have time management skills (13%) and a time commitment (4%) to the course.

The category of self motivation (which included 4% of the fully online survey respondents) had no input from this survey. Respondents also seemed fairly uninterested in the need for students to have sufficient reading ability (0.8%) to understand their materials and assignments. The ability to write to communicate was mentioned equally infrequently (0.8%). The notion that students need the self knowledge to make a good choice to be in such a setting was mentioned three times (2%). Given the relative importance that social constructive and collaborative pedagogies place on interaction among peers and with the instructor in the online setting, it is interesting to note that only 1 participant (0.8%) indicated orientation to this kind of communication and interaction as being a necessary orientation in the fully online setting for a writing class. Finally, there were 8 miscellaneous "I don't know" type of remarks (6%).

Students' Reported Experiences

H-Q42, 43, and 44 addressed the kinds of experiences that students had reported to respondents. Although it also is important to get the students' views from their own stated experiences, it is useful to understand what the respondents believed students experience in their courses.

H-Q42 asked what students reported they most liked about hybrid online writing courses; respondents were asked to check all that applied. As can be seen in Appendix B, the most frequently cited was that an online course enabled students to participate across a longer timeframe and to not have to meet within the confines of a 50 – 75 minute class during particular days/times of the week (70%). The second most frequently cited benefit was that there was no need to commute to campus (55%), which most likely only occurred part of the time given the typical uses of some face-to-face meetings in hybrid online setting. Both the first and second items were logistically based. The third most often cited benefit was the opportunity to rethink and/or revise a discussion post or answer prior to posting to the group (41%), which may lead to some affective benefits enumerated in some of the open-ended "other" responses like "They feel less self-conscious in discussion" and "Shy students report feeling empowered to freely voice their ideas." Other benefits that students reported having liked included the opportunity to revisit saved/archived peer discussions or reviews (33%), personal attention from the teacher (25%), the ease of collaborating with peers (20%), and the "strong" organization of such courses (15%)—by which we believe the survey intended to convey a sense of clear direction and tight arrangement of activities. It is interesting that the logistics of writing course experiences were most often reported as being liked by students: "They like the flexibility of working asynchronously at the times they have available" and "saves travel money," as expressed in open-ended comments. Other open-ended responses included a somewhat surprising dislike about attending the face-to-face portions of the course: "Mine do not seem too happy," "The students demonstrate an increasing antipathy toward attending class," and "They prefer mediated interaction." Students also reported they liked: "Opportunity to hear their peers' writing read aloud and to ask the writer questions about the piece," which indicates a preference toward the traditional course setting, and "Students repeatedly tell us how much it has helped them to read the posted writing of many other students—all of their classmates, and to have it available throughout the semester."

H-Q43 asked what students reported they least liked about hybrid online writing courses. Not surprisingly, given the participants' open-ended responses to H-Q41, students most often reported difficulties with keeping up with class (62%), remaining motivated (45%), and "getting started" in the course (34%). To some degree, these concerns are based in the need for time management and "success" skills for hybrid online environments. Technical problems with the interface also scored high (58%), experiencing constructing more technologically sophisticated projects like electronic portfolios as more difficult at a distance (41%), and concerns about poor help desk assistance (32%). In terms of affective concerns, students reported lacking interaction with the teacher (30%), lacking interaction with peers (23%), and missing social aspects of the class (20%), as well as feeling "weird" about not meeting people face-to-face (18%). These affective issues, however, were reported in lower frequencies for the hybrid online students than for the fully online ones, as might be considered reasonable given the difference in environments. Students more rarely reported an inability to ask questions of the teacher (7%).

Open-ended responses to "other" included higher workloads than expected (which speaks to respondents' concerns about orientation to the courses):

> My students complain the workload is too great, even though I make it clear their online course work should represent only the equivalent of one class (etc.) I think it seems like more work since that's time they have to be actively engaged in the course material rather than sharing responsibility for keeping a discussion going with me & their peers.

Another stated: "Everything takes longer to complete online. Providing asynchronous flexibility is a double-edge sword. Students have to wait on their peers for a response." They also referenced difficulties with keeping up with classes, forgetting to attend classes on "online" days, and having the wrong expectations: "Think they can do all the work in one sitting—better yet just a few times a semester." It seems reasonable that all of these issues are mirror concerns of those that some students reported liking about hybrid online writing courses, and to some degree, these concerns speak to the need for appropriate orientation for selecting oneself into such a course.

In H-Q44, respondents were given an opportunity to indicate how, if at all, they attempted to mitigate the problems they encountered in their hybrid online writing courses. These activities were selected with the following frequency:

- Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong) (65%)
- Community building activities early/across the semester (54%)
- Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly (54%)
- Informal portions (e.g., speaking opportunities) on discussion boards (42%)
- Instructor office hours in chat room (25%)
- 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) (23%)

The first item seems responsible given that in many cases a hybrid course takes place in a computer lab or using software that is insufficiently supported throughout the institution; teachers may indicate that there is flexibility when things go wrong in order to keep the course on track and to maintain credibility. The final item regarding using other media seems to correlate to respondents indicating they used primarily asynchronous materials for orientations and other activities. Fully text-based materials may be difficult for some students with different learning/thinking styles to relate to, however. The most frequent "other" responses related to face-to-face connections between students and instructor where optional, additional face-to-face sessions, conferences, and office hours were scheduled. Additionally, electronic communications were mentioned such as rapid and regular communications with students through email and chat.

English Language User Experiences
H-Q45, 46, 47, 48, and 49 were specific to the experiences of English Language (EL2) users in the hybrid online writing course. H-Q45 was an open-ended question that asked for rough percentages of such students in respondents' courses. The reported frequency was most often between 0 – 10%, with approximately one fifth of the responses ranging between 25% and 60%, and another five responses indicating that the course primarily taught EL2 students. Overall, many more EL2 users were known to the hybrid survey respondents than to those in the fully online course survey. It is in this context that we think these next survey responses should be considered.

In H-Q46, 83% of respondents reported that there were no special hybrid online writing courses for EL2 users, with 17% reporting that such courses were available. In that some responded that no separate sections were provided to EL2 users, respondents were asked in H-Q47 whether participants thought there should be. These responses were split at 60% not favoring such specialized courses and 40% favoring them. In open-ended responses, 93 participants gave these types of reasons for not favoring the hybrid online EL2-based writing courses:

- "The reading intensive nature of the course has been a big problem in online environments in the past. Our ESL program does not allow any online or hybrid courses."
- "All writers should be mainstreamed. This mania for separating out some writers with problems or deficiencies disadvantages all writers: the weaker writers lack strong writers to learn from, and the stronger writers lose the opportunity to learn by helping others. Writing is learned from one's peers, not from teachers, so separating weak writers condemns them to remain disadvantaged."
- "English language learners need to get into mainstream classes sooner or later. I think ENGL 101 is the place where that should happen."
- "Our campus blends these populations in all their coursework—we have a very large bilingual and/or L2 writer population."
- "We couldn't staff it, quite honestly."
- "Non-native speakers should not be ghettoized; they will never learn English well unless they are in class with native English speakers."
- "I don't think the need is high enough at our institution."
- "Integration is good. We learn from each other. And make a point of that."
- "If students are able to take the class per cut scores on COMPASS, they should have enough mastery of the language to perform in the class without special treatment."

On the other hand, participants who favored hybrid online EL2-based writing courses said:

- "Our department has specialists in TESL who are better equipped to teach ESL students well."
- "Course readings are too difficult for non-native speakers."
- "The ELL needs are different from the ones the course is designed to meet."
- "I don't think it should be a rule that ESL students should be in separate sections, but I definitely think a department should offer a few exclusively to them so they perhaps feel less self-conscious about their English. In the past, I've had non-native speakers in my classroom and they have told me they like to listen/watch discussions for speaking and writing skills."
- "Backgrounds and needs of ELLs differ significantly from those of native speakers. Also standard composition courses are based on assumptions about English-language learning, abilities, and backgrounds for native speakers that make these classes especially difficult and foreign to ELLs."
- "Pedagogically speaking, an instructor must modify his/her practice with ESL/EFL/ELL students. The materials are the same, along with expectations, but the method of delivery is different."
- "I feel that I have to compromise my standards for non-native English speakers in order for them to pass my courses."
- "Because someone else would be better qualified to teach them."

Although these are only a few of the many interesting responses that emerged for this questions, it seems clear that agreement about what might be best for EL2 students has not yet been explored sufficiently to reach consensus regarding hybrid online writing courses. It does seem clear that such exploration will require navigating such hot-topic issues as "ghettoization" and the notion of readiness for particular levels of writing courses and whether and how such readiness might play out in a hybrid online setting. To be fair, many of these respondents did not seem to be thinking in terms of the hybrid online nature of the course but rather whether any composition or writing course should be EL2 tracked. The following is an example of one respondent who did consider the online nature of the course in the comments: "I think online writing instruction is a poor choice to ELL students. They need immersion in language (speaking and listening, too!) and a good support system."

Finally, when asked in H-Q48 regarding the kinds of strategies that are employed to accommodate such students, participants responded that they provide more instructions or feedback and/or in more than one modality (59%), provide more text-based communication (23%), and provide more asynchronous delivery (19%) or audio-based communications (5%). Many of the "other" responses were used to indicate that the respondents simply did not know enough to respond to this question.

Students with Disabilities Experiences
As with the fully online survey, H-Q49, 50, and 51 gathered quantitative data about disability and accommodations in terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. In similar frequencies as the fully online survey participants, H-Q49 revealed that 68% of participants indicated that their hybrid online courses were able to accommodate students with various disabilities, while 5% said they were not and 26% indicated that they did not know. Interestingly, in H-Q50, 48% indicated that their institutions provided guidance on how to make their hybrid online writing courses accessible, while 20% said it did not do so, and 31% percent admitted to not knowing the answer. The additional 20% of respondents among the 68% of instructors in this latter data again seemed either to be guessing that their courses were ADA-compliant, or they may have been uncertain about the definition of "ADA compliance." In short, there is a similar disconnect among the number of hybrid writing course faculty who reported that their courses were accessible with the range of open-ended responses as there was for the fully online survey respondents. We base this conjecture on the responses received to H-Q50, where it is uncertain whether 20% of these 68% instructors were working on disability access issues on their own or whether they were defining accessibility much more restrictively.

In H-Q51, 57% of respondents indicated that they had taught students with either disclosed or obvious disabilities in their hybrid online courses, while 31% said they had not taught such students and 12% did not know. The number of negative responses to earlier H-Q49, 50 and 51 also raises some red flags about the lack of preparation for delivering accessible hybrid online writing instruction. Out of overall 139 respondents, 10 did not respond to H-Q49, 11 did not have ADA compliant courses, and 10 did not know whether or not their courses were ADA compliant. Likewise, responses to H-Q50 about the availability of

ADA training at their institution indicates that out of 139 respondents, 40 did not even know whether or not their institution provided this training. In another 26 cases, the institution lacked arrangements for educating its instructors in ADA and disability issues. In H-Q51, the ratio of instructors who did teach disabled students—73 as compared the 15 who did not know whether they did or did not—is worrisome. If the instructors were not familiar with the availability of resources and training for educating the disabled at their institutions, it is unclear how they could meet their students' needs. A question asking participants to define what they mean by "ADA compliance" in future field research may provide a clearer picture.

Potentially more reliable data about what instructors know and do not know about meeting the needs of disabled students can be gleaned from the responses to the open-ended question (H-Q54) regarding what they wanted to know about teaching students with disabilities. Many respondents asked for basic information about what the student's disability was and what they needed for learning. Roughly, an equal number of instructors raised preliminary questions about what the disabled students' challenges were and how they could make course content accessible, suggesting that they lacked any experience teaching disabled students and that they were only now beginning to think about the issue. Some of these respondents frankly wondered "If special accommodations are necessary in an online environment"; others indicated that they needed to learn "How to get compliant. How to go beyond compliant!"; and yet others indicated that "I'd appreciate knowing fully what the college offers these students." Overall, the hybrid participants' open-ended responses revealed a more thoughtful approach to disabilities accommodations than did the fully online survey participants. We speculate that this different approach to the question of disabilities may emerge from the hybrid context where instructors meet students at least part time in the traditional classroom; these encounters may enable both a visual sighting and experience-based understanding of particular students' disabilities and a different type of openness between some students and their teachers about their disabilities. However, the data from closely related questions H-Q53 and H-Q54 about what participants know and what they want to know suggest that instructors require much training and education in disability-specific OWI pedagogy for hybrid online courses.

H-Q52 asked, "*What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities?*" The aim was to capture the true and tried pedagogical strategies from instructors in the writing classroom for incorporating the needs of disabled students. There were 99 responses with the most dominant theme being "all of my courses are 100% compatible with the accommodations needed...often these students need extra time/attention via e-mail correspondence "; the second most common response was, "I ask them what they need and then implement it"; and a third common theme, albeit from a limited number of respondents was, " Actually, the reason I put everything online was FOR the students with disabilities: this way they had the information without it being obvious that they were getting extra information." The number of responses that said "none," "not applicable," or otherwise stated nothing was being done to accommodate students with disabilities was surprising. One respondent indicated that "the disabilities have not affected use of online resources," but s/he did not indicate how he or she knew that to be the case. Among the respondents who made changes in the way they delivered their courses to accommodate needs of their disabled students, no one mentioned the concept of Universal Design, but a number of them offered specific types of accommodations appropriate to a variety of disabilities. More so than in the fully online survey group, it seems that this hybrid survey group had some understanding of what it means to comply with the ADA. Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether most respondents understood what their obligations are in terms of adapting their courses to meet the needs of the disabled.

H-Q53 was designed as a catch-all question so as to record the concerns and needs of the survey participants who might have taught disabled students and wished that they knew more about teaching the disabled. It directly solicited information about the instructors' knowledge and skill gaps experience when teaching the disabled. The goal was to create an aggregate picture of the online writing faculty's educational and training needs. It was a more direct question as it pinpointed to the problematic aspect of their experience from the point of view of their major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities. H-Q54, as mentioned above, raised the same question from another angle: "*What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in online settings?*" We discuss the data from these questions together since these were interrelated. H-Q53 garnered a total of 89 responses, while H-Q54

drew a total of 70 responses. About one third of the responses from each of these questions are not applicable to this analysis because even though respondents entered information into the open ended question textbox, their responses were that they had no challenges with disabled students.

Combined from H-Q53 and 54, the following themes emerged. It seems useful to note that while the themes from the hybrid survey participants were similar to those from the fully online participants, the responses from the hybrid group indicated a somewhat more sophisticated understanding and/or more frequent experiences with students they knew to have some kind of disability.

1. Lack of knowledge by the instructor on how to deal with the many different types and kinds of disabilities and the technologies that may be necessary to meet their needs. This was the most common response and one that probably needs the most attention. Most of the responses to H-Q54 expand this idea of needing more information on methods to reach students with disabilities, about technological solutions, about how the setting changes the pedagogy, and on best practices for different disability types. Both of these questions attracted a small number of focused comments about the problems pertaining to CMSs:

   > I am comfortable helping students with disabilities in person. However, the distance education model can, at times, make it almost impossible to give the student what she needs, if the disability has to do with information processing. Many of our students with disabilities have difficulty managing Blackboard and Adobe Connect (over which we teach our courses). Explaining how these programs work without being able to sit next to the student and show her is very challenging.

2. In line with the findings of H-Q52, many of the responses (especially to H-Q54) indicated that faculty generally had a limited understanding of disabilities and accommodations. Many responses to question H-Q54 indicated that faculty need basic information such as the numbers of students with disabilities and how hybrid OWI may change pedagogies. Contrary to the fully online survey responses, where the most named disability was blindness or visual impairment, as well as occasional hearing impairment, this hybrid survey group also mentioned learning disabilities like reading and writing challenges, ADHD, autism, Tourette's Syndrome, visual processing disorders, wheelchair accessibility, and others. Here also, many participants reported that the office of disability services is the entity that holds most of the responsibility, but that this responsibility was for teaching the instructors how to help the students as well as for guiding the students into appropriate classroom settings.

3. Respondents also were concerned and challenged by the students themselves. Most notably, they expressed frustration when students did not disclose their disabilities until too late or were not taking on the responsibility of wanting to work with the faculty: "How to motivate every student to make more use of the technology in the hybrid classroom. Just like other students, students with disabilities are trained in HS to do the least for the best possible GPA." Closely related to this concern was the idea that faculty expressed belief that unless students disclose their disabilities, then they need not do anything differently.

4. A minor theme that consistently emerged was the time needed to carry out special accommodations and how added time for students might affect fairness among all students:

   > Time. On the few occasions when I've had a student in my class who had a serious disability, the time required to adequately accommodating him or her was immense. And with little support from our Disabled Student Services (not because they are not willing, but because their budget has been cut to the bone and beyond), I failed miserably in my accommodation attempts.

   More than one respondent indicated that being fair to all students was critical when making accommodations for one: "Being fair to all—both the disabled students and the non-disabled. Juggling the needs of one sometimes creates issues with the other, so fairness and flexibility are critical."

5. While not a major theme, there were some responses where participants expressed concern that students were using their disabilities as a crutch or a way to play the system: "An expectation that

I should be continuously accommodating their needs—including giving them an extra eight weeks to complete their work. This is o.k. in some instances, but not all. In other words, students who use their disability as a crutch rather than as a service for accommodation." Even though this information may be disturbing, the very mention of it means that future research should consider such thinking.

In sum, similar to the fully online survey participants, although many of the responses suggested that the instructors were not fully-prepared to handle the needs of their disabled students and these instructors often passed on the responsibility of helping the disabled student to the Disability Services on their campus, no one linked the needs of the disabled to the orientation in answer to H-Q41: "*What is the single most important issue to cover in student orientation for online writing?*" courses. Likewise, the respondents did not make any connection among the needs of the disabled students and their college's writing center facilities while answering open-ended questions, specifically, H-Q26, 27, 28 and 29, which addressed the issues of "access" to an online writing center for the general (presumably able-bodied) student population. Likewise, when respondents stated that their students had access to asynchronous or synchronous tutoring, we cannot be certain whether or not the technology used for such access would be accessible to all the disabled students.

Students' Ratings and Benefits in Hybrid Online Writing Courses
In this section about student experiences of hybrid online writing courses, the final three questions addressed students' ratings, instructors' views of what such courses provide to students, and the relative advantages of hybrid online writing instruction versus face-to-face instruction.

H-Q55 asked how most students rated their hybrid online writing courses. Forty-six percent indicated that their students rated such courses "high[ly]", while 24% said that students gave it an "average" rating. Thirteen percent stated that their students rated the course "very high" and 5% indicated a "low" rating with 1% indicating a "very low" rating. However, in open-ended responses, 4 of 10 respondents indicated that there was no comparison data due to the newness of these hybrid courses at their institutions, while another 3 indicated that their students either rated the course low because of the workload or simply that students had indicated mixed feelings: "I've gotten nice evaluations from my classes; but I've also heard quite a bit of student dissatisfaction."

Respondents indicated a number of benefits for students in their hybrid online writing courses (H-Q56). Among these were:
- Flexibility in terms of location (80%)
- Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time (78%)
- Flexibility in terms of time (77%)
- Opportunity to develop writing through writing (72%)
- Participating in written discussions (59%)
- Collaborative writing (21%)
- Student facilitation and/or presentation (19%)
- Recorded student conferences (11%)

In sum, as with the fully online survey findings, the major benefits seemed to be viewed in terms of course logistics of time and location although participants did see potential benefits in terms of actual writing opportunities for students. This perception might be connected to the general sense revealed earlier that OWI pedagogy does not differ significantly from that of the traditional face-to-face pedagogy. Indeed, this impression is supported by responses to H-Q57, which asked "*Regardless of instructor efficacy, rate whether you believe that students in online courses have an advantage in the areas below compared to students in face-to-face courses.*" The areas that respondents seemed to most believe students had a "clear advantage" or "somewhat of an advantage" over face-to-face courses were:
- Flexibility in time-of-day for attending class (84%)
- Development of self-directedness (81%)
- Development of self-discipline (78%)
- Adeptness at using the computer for their academic work (84%)

- Development of student accountability (70%)
- Ability to troubleshoot personal technology failures (66%)
- Benefits from an accessible archive of course materials (74%)
- Development of problem-solving skills as they negotiate course expectations and troubleshoot their own computing issues (66%)
- Development of stronger writing skills (54%)
- Benefits from receiving asynchronous feedback (54%)

These skills—with the exception of the last two—are important to navigating college in general given their focus on time management, general success with technology, and problem ownership/maturity. Yet, they tend not to address writing and writing instruction, which calls into question whether the students actually do not perceive advances or advance in their writing in a hybrid online course or whether these simply are instructors' perceptions of student gains.

The areas in H-Q57 that respondents seemed more often to believe students were at a "clear" or "somewhat of a disadvantage," or in which there was no perceived advantage at all, on the other hand, tended to be ones where writing instruction was—or should be—intimately concerned:
- Support to make the transition to college (71%)
- Improvement of critical thinking skills (68%)
- Recognition of the need for details when writing (61%)
- Difficulty with the instructional technology and/or technology support infrastructure (61%)
- Greater insight about own writing process and style (60%)
- Written commentary on peer drafts (57%)
- Attentiveness to instructions (53%)
- Sensitivity to audience (52%)
- Development of stronger reading skills (51%)

Although the frequencies presented here do not indicate an overwhelmingly negative picture of how students are perceived to benefit in their writing skills from hybrid online writing courses, at best they are lukewarm, just as the fully online survey frequencies were. Given the increasing number of opportunities that students have for taking hybrid online writing courses, these perceptions bear additional scrutiny for how to improve OWI before best practices are articulated.

Instructor Experience
The next major subject explored in this survey concerned the experiences of instructors. Instructor perceptions are critical to understanding how practices are put into place for hybrid online writing courses.

Expectations and Training
The first question, H-Q58, asked participants to check all of the applicable options regarding the expectations that we set for them as teachers by administrators. The most frequently selected expectation was that teachers would provide reasonable support to their students for succeeding in the online setting (85%). The second most frequently selected expectation addressed developing a pedagogically sound course (81%). The other expectations were that teachers still would have on-campus responsibilities (66%), the requirement to provide certain kinds and/or amounts of interaction with students (61%), that online office hours would be required (29%), and that faculty would be observed one or more times during a semester (22%). As with the fully online survey group, these frequencies indicate that assisting students in succeeding in an online course is important, as is the general notion of sound pedagogy. However, the specific types of activities that might create success may not have been the ones that administrators had in mind for their faculty. For example, it would seem to be important to reach out to students with interaction, but providing regular online office hours was not often selected as an expectation—perhaps because administrators believe that on-the-ground office hours would suffice for hybrid online writing courses. Similarly, providing "sound" pedagogy was considered an expectation, but the follow-up of observations to ensure such pedagogy (especially for inexperienced online instructors) was not indicated as a strong expectation; given the typical face-to-face component of a hybrid course, it would seem that some kind of observation in the classroom would be possible if not online. Open-ended "other" responses included that there was no training and/or certification and the expectation that

instructors would be observed only on the regular institutionally required schedule. Other examples follow:

- "The new technologies are tools to promote more effective critical thinking and writing."
- "Contributing to an archive of hybrid "best practices" for teaching this course."
- "Contributing to an archive of hybrid "best practices" for teaching this course."
- "Faculty have to publish a policy for turnaround time in responding to student queries."
- "Most of the department is technologically illiterate, so the only expectation is that faculty should know how to use the smart podium to turn on the projector, computer, doc cam, etc."
- "We insist that all faculty be local so that f2f guidance can be provided."

H-Q59 asked respondents what kinds of training they received as preparation for their hybrid online writing courses and it requested that they check all that applied. While 32% indicated that they had some kind of mandatory training, 53% indicated that training was optional.[8] The most frequently selected type of training was "on-going workshops on various aspects of a Content Management System (e.g., Blackboard®)" (76%). This frequency is not surprising given that a CMS often is chosen by an institution and its use or any updates change at the will of the institution or the software provider—it would seem to be a critical need for instructors to be able to operate within the assigned CMS. The more interesting responses emerged as respondents selected such training types as that coming from faculty peer mentoring programs (32%), dedicated instructional designers (29%), summer institutes (15%), some kind of campus outreach to faculty (11%), and support from a reduced first-online term teaching load (4%). In open-ended "other" responses, participants indicated a range of responses from there being no training available, receiving training that was technology but not pedagogy based, handbook/online support, and some mentoring. One response suggested a feeling of having been dumped into the course unprepared and unwillingly: "Except for Blackboard training, we had no preparation for teaching hybrid courses. None. We were forced into hybrids by our campus dean." These responses support those provided earlier in this report that indicate training is inadequately developed at the level of online writing pedagogy and somewhat unevenly applied.

The frequencies listed above generally corresponded in H-Q63, where participants were asked to rate the helpfulness of the different types of training named. The reduced teaching load garnered 62%, and the peer mentoring garnered 59% of the responses in terms of being most helpful,[9] which suggests that even though few respondents received that type of assistance, they valued it the most highly. A sampling of the open-ended responses from H-Q64 provides additional context for the types of training individuals preferred:

- "Patience!"
- "I wish I had something to compare it against. Up to this point, I've read as many books and articles on it as possible."
- "Access to successful online activities and assignments."
- "Pedagogical discussions group — or a focus group that meets regularly to discuss, share notes and observations."
- "Attendance at conferences; journals, monographs."
- "Take a class in this mode." and "Let us take a mini course to see what it is like."
- "Our college/campus introduced hybrids in the worst possible way—forced to offer hybrids this fall (50% of our comp courses were hybrids). I have no idea what is ideal, but we should have had a year to prepare."
- "Faculty need to want to teach online and to believe students can succeed online. We do not offer our composition courses online because we feel that the skills necessary for student success online come as a result of successful completion of the composition sequence. Students who

---

[8] We have no explanation for why these numbers do not agree except that participants were able to check all responses that apply, which means that some responses might have been read differently by individuals and checked or not checked for non-obvious reasons.

[9] These frequencies are the result of adding the first three rating choices (1-3) on a scaled of 1-8, where 1 is considered the "most helpful."

have not completed the sequence seldom if ever have the skills to learn well in an online environment."

- "An understanding of technology as a social product—one that reflects our (well, the dominant) values in society."
- "It would be very helpful to have some more work on developing effective online or blended pedagogy, particularly with mentorships from experiences instructors in one's own dept. So many of the examples offered in our campus's "mentorships" are irrelevant to OWI because they are outside of our discipline. (Thus, no peer review, more focus on test development, etc.) Having time and/or compensation for course development would be another great plus, because it is very time consuming to develop an online or blended course, especially one that is as rigorous and pedagogically sound as a face-to-face course, and we don't have that, and, to be honest, I don't think our online courses are, in general, nearly as high of quality as our face-to-face courses. Often times, adjunct faculty teach the online courses, and while I am sure they are qualified and dedicated teachers, I know they have had the most minimal of training and many are teaching sections for a variety of campuses, so they have to keep things as simple as possible to manage the awful workload they carry."
- "Evaluation of materials developed."

For those participants who had training (H-Q60), the amount was spread fairly evenly over a series of hours: 1-5 hours (27%), 6-10 hours (14%), and more than 10 hours (20%); 29% again indicated that they had no training provided. Those who checked "other" provided a range of responses from "I don't know," to several weeks of training, to self-direction. One respondent indicated that there was an 8-week hybrid course while another indicated that the instructors for hybrid courses received less training (in terms of hours) than those who taught in fully online courses.

H-Q61 asked whether participants received payment for their training time and efforts; only 11% indicated that they did so. Of those who indicated that they received payment, the payment ranged from a dollar amount per hour ($2.00 - $25.00), a $50.00 and a $500 one-time stipend, $1000 – 3000 for developing a course or as a one-time payment, a laptop computer, and the statement that attending training was part of the job description. These responses go to the heart of valuation of faculty member's time for preparing to teach hybrid online writing courses, which is an area that any statement of best practices should address.

Instructor Qualities, Likes, and Dislikes
This next section discusses the instructors' experiences in terms of their beliefs in the qualities of a good OWI instructor and their preferences regarding teaching hybrid online writing courses.

Table H-11 is a modified presentation of the H-Q65 table available in Appendix B. It is presented here in terms of how participants valued particular instructor qualities with the most important ones to respondents presented at the top and the least important shown at the bottom of the table. Percentages shown indicate only the frequencies with which the participants rated the item as either "very important" or "important." An attempt to find a pattern in these responses suggests that certain kinds of general teaching skills, such as the ability to teach rhetorical principles, were reasonably valued for online (or any) writing instruction courses. Many technology-based qualities also were valued highly, but one some of these would have been addressed in the training that participants indicated they had received. As with the fully online survey group, it seems possible that the less often an item was presented in training, the less it was valued as a teaching quality. For example, the first item considered of utmost importance was an interpersonal skill necessary for connecting with students in a hybrid online setting. The next two items were both technology-based, with technical proficiency with institution-based interfaces being one of the few items most commonly addressed in training per H-Q59 (76% of trained participants listed this item). Other items that require some kind of technological proficiency were the uses of discussion boards, understanding online theoretical rationale, and critical analysis of available technologies. The least valued of the technological skills also were those that were least often addressed in formal training opportunities: lecture design in a variety of modes, multi-modal project design and grading, and advanced web design skills. These data offer a picture of what most may need to be provided in faculty training, while at the same time suggesting what types of training, such as in multi-modal technologies, may need to be

developed to better suit the learning styles of particular students and to better address the needs of learning and physically disabled students, as well as EL2 users.

**Table H-11: Rated Importance of Instructor Qualities
for Hybrid Online Writing Courses (Q65)**

Willingness to follow-up with students promptly	100%
Overall comfort with technology	99%
Technical proficiency with the interfaces available at our campus	97%
Ability to establish a presence online	96%
Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines	95%
Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection	94%
Skills in teaching rhetorical principles	93%
Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning	91%
Skills in moderating online discussion boards	90%
Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles	90%
Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning	88%
Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best ones for a pedagogical purpose	86%
Skills in designing "lectures" delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital video, learning module)	78%
Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects	66%
Participation in an active community of online teachers	65%
Advanced web design skills	22%

When asked about what they liked most about online writing teaching (H-Q66), participants responded similarly to their students: logistical preferences emerged. They most frequently preferred flexibility in scheduling (60%), but gave a low rating for not having to commute (21%), not surprising given that hybrid online instructors need to meet at least part of their course on some kind of campus setting. Even more participants (56%) than for the fully online survey group (50%) responded that they most liked the opportunity that hybrid online classes provided to focus more on student writing and less on student personalities. Although the difference is small, it is a little surprising given that hybrid instructors tend to meet their students face-to-face as well as online. Among the open-ended "other" responses were the challenges of a new environment and the needs to rethink old approaches, the increased opportunities to use rhetoric and to engage in writing, increased abilities to interact with students both face-to-face as a group and one-to-one online, a sense of flexibility, and an enjoyment of the way writing and discussions could be archived.

When asked what they least liked about online writing teaching (H-Q67), participants responded that they most disliked dealing with technical problems (67%), managing occasionally over-large class sizes given to online courses (27%), and anticipating student problems (22%). These dislikes fell into the same order as those in the fully online survey, but the frequency of those who most disliked technical problems is higher for the hybrid survey group—possibly because many technical glitches need to be addressed immediately in such settings or a class opportunity to work a lesson plan may be lost. In fully online settings, technological glitches tend to be system-wide rather than particular to a classroom or set of classes. Among the open-ended "other" responses were a lack of flexibility, lack of time to accomplish all

that is asked along with the need to repeat instructions to those who do not read them, attendance issues, and software updates or new versions. One respondent provided a full picture of the frustrations that s/he experienced:

> Not enough time with students in a group setting and the spontaneity and relevance of a group discussion; less personal interaction with/relationships with students; for me, peer review is harder to manage/less effective (so I usually do that in-class); less time for one-to-one personalized help/instruction; too much time repeating things to individuals vs. telling the whole class once; harder time getting information across clearly (in class I can answer questions immediately or adjust explanation, add more explanation immediately) and/or highlighting what's important and/or getting the word out—students ignore, miss, misread, etc. lots of the written communication; more attrition—students feel (and are) less connected and supported than they would be in a f2f class.

It seems clear that in terms of teacher-dissatisfaction, most online writing instructors (fully-online and hybrid) disliked dealing with technical problems associated with their courses, but it seems likely that this dissatisfaction is connected to the perception among respondents that administrative and technical training and support were lacking to varying degrees. Class size appears to be a problem for them as well, but no more so than respondents' decreased ability to anticipate student problems. These concerns among respondents would seem to be connected directly to perceived lack of administrative and technical support, as well as desires for ongoing training in terms of both technology and course design.

In an attempt to learn what participants' institutions were doing to mitigate the problems noted in H-Q67, H-Q68 asked an open-ended question regarding how they or their institutions were addressing the problems they had noted in previous questions. While one respondent expressed frustration by writing "Not much! You are on your own," most of the 64 responses were relatively substantive and sorted out to the following categories:

Administrative Support
- class size (respondents appreciated smaller class sizes or lamented larger class sizes; respondents were unanimous in declaring smaller class sizes necessary for teaching and learning success)
- online teaching perceived as "easier" or "less than" (respondents lamented this attitude among administrators, some at the college and even department levels; others saw this perception as support of OWI instruction in theory, but not in practice)
- possibility of teaching duties 24/7 (this concern was generally expressed as managing student expectations, although some saw it as an administrative/workload issue)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers (some are getting this support, many are not in their views)
- course and instructional design training and support needed (some saw course/instructional design support as part of technical support, but most saw it as a different issue)

Technical Support
- server capabilities (since this is primarily a cost/budget issue, most respondents saw this issue as inseparable from Administrative Support)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers (since this is primarily a cost/budget issue, most respondents saw this issue as inseparable from Administrative Support)
- course and instructional design training and support (some saw course/instructional design support as a technical issue)

Emotional/Psychological Issues
- teacher independence (those teaching fully-online courses tended to experience this as a positive)
- teacher isolation (those teaching hybrid courses were more inclined to experience this as a negative)
- teacher autonomy (interestingly, those who tended to see their teaching as isolated [negative] also tended to see their academic freedom as more limited)
- course and instructional design training and support needed (those who felt a lack of training and support seemed to also feel less comfortable and confident in their teaching and students' experiences of the course)

Programmatic/Structural Issues
- class size (unanimously agreed class sizes should be smaller, or at least not larger than face-to-face)
- possibility of teaching duties 24/7 (mostly about managing student expectations, but also about administrative/workload concerns)
- consistency/inconsistency among sections (this concern seems to contradict concerns about academic freedom, which tended to suggest a common syllabus and rigid course structure)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers
- development of evaluation guides/rubrics needed
- course and instructional design training and support needed

Student Success Issues
- class size (many expressed that classes were too large for student success)
- technical training/continuing education for teachers (needed for student success)
- underprepared dual-enrollment students (increased numbers of dual-enrollment students is understood as one of the administrative goals of online writing instruction; respondents are concerned that those students are often under-prepared for online writing instruction)
- fewer means to identify at-risk/high-risk students (one of the few issues identified as decidedly less problematic in face-to-face courses)
- less opportunity for spontaneous, rapport-building interactions (face-to-face social interactions are absent)
- ability to assess students' skills before drop/add period ends (concerns about underprepared students, as well as students without hardware or software capabilities who register for the course)
- course and instructional design training and support needed

About 10 of 68 respondents stated that there is no effort of which they were aware being made to mitigate problems (1 more respondent offered "N/A" as a response and another simply left the response field blank). One respondent's comment expressed a sense of despair: "It hasn't. We have presented data on the high failure/low success rates to our deans to no avail. Our institutional nightmare is just what Catherine Gouge predicted in her CE article." Another indicated that assistance with hybrid writing course attrition was not forthcoming locally and could only come from beyond the campus:

> The Vice President of Academic Affairs ignores the requests of the faculty to have smaller class sizes, yet he claims to be supportive of retention. The only way to improve retention is to have smaller class sizes. NCTE and the CCCC need to have a national mandate for smaller class sizes so that faculty may use this mandate to make administrators comply.

With concerns in mind that may make teaching hybrid online writing courses challenging, H-Q69 was asked to help understand the factors that contribute to instructors' willingness to teach online. Table H-12 only addresses the frequencies selected for increasing willingness to teach online "significantly" or "very significantly." Interestingly, both logistics and intrinsic rewards seemed to be more important for respondents than financial remuneration, which suggests that achieving satisfaction for many instructors might be accomplished by increasing rewards in those two areas. Nonetheless, it seems odd that finding satisfaction with students in the online setting received a fifth place rating with the hybrid online group versus a second place rating with the fully online group. Some differences in the ratings make sense given the different environments. For example, the hybrid group rated establishing an online presence as an instructor as the twelfth priority over the eighth priority that the fully online group rated it; this ranking may be sensible given that hybrid instructors already have an opportunity to establish presence with students in the face-to-face setting, making the online presence an augmentation rather than a strict requirement for interaction success. However, given the training issues and other realities of teaching writing online enumerated in previous questions from this survey, the relatively low valuation of students' learning relative to instructors' willingness to teach online deserves further scrutiny.

**Table H-12: Rated Importance of Factors Contributing to Willingness
to Teach Hybrid Online Courses (Q65)**

Flexibility in teaching schedule	92%
Reduced commuting	74%
Learning new pedagogical strategies	73%
Input and support of campus technology	59%
Finding satisfaction in the online interactions with students	58%
Time/money compensation for development of course	57%
Using new technologies	56%
Reliability of campus technology	53%
Linking course materials to other Web resources	50%
Students' learning	49%
Time/money compensation for learning a sophisticated set of skills, theories, and technologies	48%
Establishing an online presence as an instructor	47%
Level of appreciation/respect from colleagues	46%
The organization and planning involved in teaching online	34%
Use of common syllabus/curriculum	27%

Responses to H-Q70 indicated that, if given a choice, 75% of respondents would continue to teach writing in a hybrid online course; 10% would not and 15% did not know. For a variety of reasons, most of which previously outlined in this report, respondents indicated their reasons for those preferences in response to H-Q71: they enjoyed the interactions, they liked experimenting with technology, flexibility of combining home and campus life, and were willing to meet the students at their own levels and interests/needs for technology. The following are two telling responses that suggest reasons for and against such hybrid teaching:

- "I love what I can supply my students, but I think a hybrid instructor needs to be both transparent and ethical in terms of clearly identifying to students what the benefits and problems with a course like this can be. I talk to each one of my students about who they are and how they learn, so we can decide together if this is a successful mechanism for them. This level of interaction and empowerment is what makes hybrid instruction so appealing. Furthermore, I love that students are unable to "zone out" in the online section of the hybrid. If they have questions, they need to be pro-active and ask me for clarification or help. They have to do the reading and consult the course documents. Accountability actually increases the amount of student participation and growth from the course."
- "This survey confuses the issues. Teaching a web-only comp course is fun. It's the blended/hybrid paradigm that is the nightmare. This model simply does not work at our college. We've lost a good chunk of our incoming students this year because of an administrative decision to offer 50% or more of our comp classes as hybrids."

H-Q72 asked respondents to select the contexts they most preferred to teach in. While 38% selected hybrid online, 22% selected face-to-face, 2% selected fully online, and another 38% indicated that they were open to any and all of the choices. These selections suggest that many of the respondents are well placed in their hybrid settings, but that some may not be in the best teaching setting for them, which

raises questions about whether an instructor does or should have the right to select the teaching environment.

In H-Q73, participants were asked whether they would recommend teaching hybrid online writing courses to their colleagues. Only 46% said that they would, while 17% said they would not. Fully 37% indicated that they did not know whether they would make such a recommendation or not. H-Q74 asked respondents to comment on their yes/no choices. The question failed, however, to request a response to those who did not know. Not everyone was certain because, the responses suggest, the choice to teach in particular settings is a personal one. Although one respondent believed the question to be unnecessary ("This is a rather silly question. Why wouldn't a teacher want to expand her/his repertoire?"), many gave substantive responses, some of which are cited below:

- "So that teachers who are uncomfortable with technology became more comfortable with it, and to be able to relate to the variety of student writing experiences beyond the classroom."
- "I believe that this is education for the future -instructors need to stay marketable."
- Actually, I would like to have answered "it depends" . . .on the colleague's willingness to spend the extra time it takes to create a good, coherent, comprehensive course on line.
- "I would only recommend it to those with a strong interest in technology and its possibilities. Some individuals do not work well with technology and would not be someone I would recommend for online classes."
- "Question 69 gets at most of the problems associated with online instruction. Many of my peers are simply unwilling to expend the necessary time to acquire the range of technological skills necessary to manage this environment effectively; coupled with a varied resistance to exploring MORE pedagogical issues particularly associated with online instruction, many instructors consistently choose f-2-f instruction (in my department of 42 f/t instructors only 3 provide online instruction)."
- "I think it depends on the teacher. Some folks would fit admirably into this kind of pedagogy—others wouldn't. Part of what I want faculty to consider though, is that five years ago I never thought I could teach anything online. *whistles* *humms*"
- "I like the way you can organize materials, keep track of assignments, upload materials (instead of mindless photocopying), respond to student journals and discussion boards. Some of the best writing I have gotten from students has come from discussion boards and reading journals (writing by writing, not necessarily multi-drafted papers. I also enjoy giving online feedback and using footnotes, highlights, bold to mark problem areas in writing. I like to give online feedback because I think students take it more seriously."

One final comment, cited below, appears to capture the fullness of the challenges involved in hybrid online writing courses that most respondents seemed to be conveying at one level or another:

> I recommend online teaching, but I fully emphasize all the pitfalls, the time involved, the frustration with technical problems, and the need to work with a majority of students who have the wrong idea in the beginning about online classes. They start out thinking online is easy, can be taken at the student's own pace and leisure, and then they have to be motivated to keep up, and read, and read, and read.

CCCC Practices
At the end of the survey, participants were asked two questions relative to the CCCC. H-Q75 asked what the CCCC could do for the respondent (see H-Q75 table in Appendix B). The purpose of this question was to give respondents the opportunity to express their needs with regard to OWI. They were invited to check as many responses as they chose. An overwhelming number of participants indicated that they wanted a statement of best practices (83%), while instructional workshops at CCCC conferences and events followed fairly closely (66%). Other pre-written responses included identifying and/or creating instructional materials for faculty (64%), publicizing the need for training (57%), and legitimizing online teaching (56%)—all of which may have emerged among respondents who wanted CCCC to use its authoritative position to help them receive training.

Among the 18 open-ended responses, as indicated in the "other, please specify" choice, respondents appeared to use this option as a final opportunity to express their needs:

- "Promulgate the serious questions raised about online and distance learning writing classes. Make everyone, especially non-writing faculty and administrators, aware that research suggests there are serious drawbacks to distance and online writing courses."
- "Special issue of CCC on online teaching? So few articles in that journal are relevant to me."
- "Alert administrations to the need of adequate workload compensation for the difficulty of digitizing a course and a curriculum."
- "Free online trainings on how to teach effectively online."
- "The CCCC must create a national mandate for class sizes to be 20 students or under."
- "Involve ESL writing faculty more in these discussions."
- "Create ways for faculty to share modules, learning objects or best practices. Why are we all reinventing the wheel?"

A final open-ended question asked of the respondents was: "*What do you think is most needed in a statement of best practices for online writing instruction? Why?"* Of the 139 respondents who participated in the hybrid course survey, 85 chose to respond to this question. Of the 85, five indicated they did not know. In conducting the subsequent analysis of the data, it was found that the same thematic categories can be used across both the hybrid and fully online datasets. The main findings of data of this question, therefore, can be organized under four thematic headings:

1. The first theme centered on the overall legitimization of OWI that, if conducted effectively, would be viewed as an equally valuable means of teaching writing compared to traditional, face-to-face means. Within this thematic category, respondents reported a need for the legitimization of OWI to be expressed in terms of the distinctive benefits that faculty and students can yield from engaging in OWI and the skills/understanding that students could uniquely gain from OWI. Legitimization of OWI also was expressed in terms of an articulation of an institution's pedagogical motivation behind its implementation of OWI rather than merely a mechanism for institutional cost savings. Respondents expressed the need to view OWI as means of quality writing instruction, not "just" a way to teach with technology. To that end, faculty training also was advocated and considered of utmost importance before engaging in OWI.

2. A second theme emerging from the data concerned the importance of instructor time management. Specifically, respondents' reported that engaging in OWI is far more time consuming than face-to-face courses. There were a number of statements, therefore, about the need for a best practices statement to include guidelines for class sizes that take account of overall instructor workload, number of courses taught, and other duties.

3. Along these lines, a third theme of student-centeredness also permeated the responses. Participants also reported on the need for standards of instructor-led interactivity and feedback and the need to engage students and meet their specific learning needs as well as actual technology support for participants.

4. The fourth primary theme evident in the responses related to the need for a pedagogical framework and understanding of OWI that informs recommendations on particular instructor strategies and skills that yield student success and beneficial outcomes.

This concludes the survey findings portion of the Report. Following are Appendixes A and B, representing the aggregated data for first the fully online and then the hybrid surveys.

Appendix A: CCCC-OWI Survey: Fully Online OWI

BACKGROUND

FO-Q1 Are you a CCCC member?

Yes	114	71.7%
No	44	27.7%
Total	158	99.4

FO-Q2 Please note the name of your institution.
Weatherford C; Henderson CC; Clarkson C; Southern Polytechnic State U; Midland Lutheran C; Boston U; U of Wisconsin-Stout; Nova Southeastern U; Boise State U; Sacramento State U; Montgomery C; U of Rhode Island; South U; UC Irvine; U of Arkansas at Little Rock; U of Saint Francis, Fort Wayne, IN; Tarleton State U; U of Maryland U C; Fashion Institute of Technology; Ivy Tech CC; Grand Valley State U; San Joaquin Delta C; Arizona State U; Century C; Chadron State C; Harrisburg Area CC; Alpena CC; C of the Sequoias; City C of San Francisco; Minnesota State U; Mankato; Southern Adventist U; U of Central Oklahoma; Inver Hills CC; Ivy Tech CC; Ohlone C; St Clair C & U of Windsor; San Antonio C; North Dakota State U; Brigham Young U; C of Lake County; New England Institute of Technology; C of the Siskiyous/ Mendocino C/ Santa Rosa Junior C; SUNY Westchester CC; Hawkeye CC; Midland C; C of Lake County; Tennessee State U; Raritan Valley CC; Odessa C; U of Alabama; Ouachita Technical C; The C of St. Elizabeth; Towson U; Cascadia CC and Edmonds CC; South U Online; Chattanooga State CC; South Seattle CC; Grand Valley State U; Joliet Junior C; C of the Sequoias; Western Nebraska CC; American River C; Los Angeles Valley C; Northwestern State U of Louisiana; Wayne State U; San Diego City C; UMUC/ Kaplan University/ CTUO; Kennesaw State U; Middlesex County C; Moorpark C; Martin Luther C; Marist; Harvard U; West Virginia U; Kirkwood CC; Art Institute of Pittsburgh; Online; Owens CC; Cuyahoga CC; Tri-County Technical C; Collin C; Morehead State U (KY); San Antonio C; Creighton U; U of Houston-Downtown; Suffolk County CC (State U of New York); Kent State U at Salem; Johnson County CC; Alpena CC; NAU; West Virginia U; St. Louis CC—Florissant Valley; Antelope Valley C; Idaho State U; Southeastern Oklahoma State U; J. Sargeant Reynolds CC; Midland Lutheran C; San Diego Mesa C; UMUC/ Kaplan University/ CTUO; Reynolds CC, Richmond, VA; Eastern Oregon U; Clemson U; Baker C Online; Lindsey Wilson C; Louisiana State U; Duke U; Tarrant County C; Marist; Ferris State U; Arizona State U; Northampton CC; Indiana University-Purdue U Indianapolis; Joliet Junior C; Kishwaukee C; Texas A & M U; UMass Boston; West Valley C; Northeastern U; Central Arizona C; Boise State U; UTPB; Kishwaukee C; U of Minnesota/ MN State C and Universities; West Georgia Technical C; New England Institute of Technology; Onondaga CC; Onondaga CC; Mesa CC; Kaplan U; Harrisburg Area CC; Hartnell C; Boise State U and C of Western Idaho; U of Calgary; Lord Fairfax CC; Lake Michigan C; U of Minnesota; U of Washington Tacoma; U of Houston-Clear Lake; Charter Oak State U; Lone Star C-Montgomery; U of Colorado; Boulder; San Antonio C; Macomb CC; Ivy Tech CC; Indiana University-Purdue U Fort Wayne; Boise State U; Spokane Falls CC; Bryan C; Harrisburg Area CC; HACC; Texas A&M U; Harrisburg Area CC; Spring Arbor U; Kaplan U; St. Cloud Technical and CC; Kishwaukee CC/U of Phoenix; Indiana U Purdue U Fort Wayne

FO-Q3 How did you hear about this survey?

CCCC email	109	68.6%
Tech Rhet Listserv	6	3.8%
WPA Listserv	12	7.5%
Writing Center Listserv	7	4.4%
Other	31	19%

FO-Q4 Are you or have you ever been a Writing Program Administrator (WPA) either in actual title or in terms of job responsibilities?

Yes	55	35%
No	102	65%

FO-Q5 Please check all that apply:

I am an adjunct instructor/professor	28	18%
I am a full-time non-tenure track instructor/professor/administrator	43	27%
I am an assistant professor	22	14%

I am a tenure-track professor	20	13%
I am a tenured professor	50	31%
I am a graduate teaching assistant	5	3%
Other (Please Specify)	10	6%

FO-Q6 Are you currently teaching writing using any kind of computer-mediated or distance-facilitated technology?

Yes	114	71.7%
No	44	27.7%
Total	158	99.4

FO-Q7 How many total years have you been teaching (please include all teaching experience)?

1-3 Years	3	2%
4-6 Years	15	9%
7 or more years	140	89%

FO-Q8 How many total years have you been teaching online writing courses?

1-3 Years	56	36%
4-6 Years	48	31%
7 or more years	53	34%

FO-Q9 At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.

2-year community college	77	49%
4-year college	16	10%
4-year university	60	38%
2- or 4-year graduate school	15	9%
Professional school	1	1%
Other (please list institution's name)	8	5%

FO-Q10 At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.

For-profit institution	15	9%
Non-profit institution	70	44%
Completely online	11	7%
Traditional, brick & mortar with some online courses	124	78%
Other (please specify)	7	4%

FO-Q11 At how many institutions do you work?

1	129	82%

2	22	14%
3	6	4%
If more than 3, how many?	1	1%

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

FO-Q12 What type(s) of online writing course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.

First-year writing	118	75%
Professional/Technical writing	33	21%
Developmental writing	30	19%
Advanced academic writing	42	27%
Creative writing	11	7%
Writing-intensive courses in other disciplines	11	7%
Writing courses for non-native speakers of English	0	0
Other, please specify	21	13%

FO-Q13 How many students are enrolled in your online writing courses?

10 or fewer per course	5	3%
11-20 per course	67	43%
21-30 per course	69	44%
31-40 per course	8	5%
41-50 per course	1	1%
More than 50	4	3%
I don't know	3	2%

FO-Q14 At what number do you think student enrollment should be capped for your online writing course?

10 or fewer per course	9	6%
11-20 per course	110	71%
21-30 per course	28	18%
31-40 per course	4	3%
41-50 per course	0	0
More than 50	2	1%
I don't know	3	2%

FO-Q15 Please explain the reasons for your responses to question 14.

FO-Q16 In your course experience, approximately what is the student drop-out rate per course?

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Between 1% and 10%	48	31%
Between 11% and 20%	50	32%
Between 21% and 30%	24	15%
Between 31% and 40%	16	10%
More than 41%	13	8%
I don't know	5	3%

FO-Q17 Who led the efforts toward online/blended/hybrid courses in your department? Please check all that apply.

College administrators	79	50%
Departmental administrators	53	34%
Colleagues in my department	56	35%
Graduate students	2	1%
Me	48	30%
Instructional technology staff	20	13%
No one, but as opportunities arose, some have elected to use these tools.	11	7%
I don't know	20	13%
Other, please specify	12	8%

COURSE ACTIVITIES AND ELEMENTS

FO-Q18 What activities do your online course(s) include? Please check all that apply.

Peer response groups	132	84%
Synchronous discussion	52	33%
Asynchronous discussion	147	94%
Small group discussion	80	51%
Whole class discussion	105	67%
Rhetorical analysis	114	73%
Reading responses	136	87%
Invention activities	97	62%
Revision activities	145	92%
Student facilitation and/or presentation	37	24%
Student conferences	51	32%
Collaborative Writing	50	32%

Other, please specify	29	18%

FO-Q19 Which of the following statements are true for you:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Yes	No	I don't know
I inherited a course design.	31	124	1
	20%	79%	1%
I inherited the interface.	120	31	4
	77%	20%	3%
I inherited the course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example, changed assignments).	31	122	1
	20%	79%	1%
I worked alone to design the online components of my course.	107	48	0
	69%	31%	0%
I have participated in formal training for online teaching.	113	42	0
	73%	27%	0%
I have participated in formal training for online course design.	92	63	1
	59%	40%	1%
I am considered an expert in online course design.	54	79	22
	35%	51%	14%
I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course.	42	110	1
	27%	72%	1%
I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface.	40	115	1
	26%	74%	1%
I am considered an expert in the content of the course.	132	18	7
	84%	11%	4%
Course design is unique to individual instructors.	107	40	6
	70%	26%	4%
Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tools generated by the instructor/course development team.	70	67	17
	45%	44%	11%

FO-Q20 Please indicate the extent to which the following virtual tools and online teaching strategies are used in your writing course(s).

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never

Course Management System (e.g., Blackboard® or SAKAI®)	143	3	4	5
	92%	2%	3%	3%
Online distribution of course materials	145	7	2	3
	92%	4%	1%	2%
Learning modules designed by course instructor/department	113	17	7	17
	73%	11%	5%	11%
Learning modules designed for the campus (perhaps by Library, Honor System, or Center for Teaching & Learning)	18	35	40	60
	12%	22%	26%	38%
Video lectures	8	30	40	75
	5%	19%	26%	48%
Lectures via PowerPoint® or MSWord® documents	57	51	23	24
	37%	33%	15%	15%
Links to Websites	111	41	4	1
	71%	26%	3%	1%
Audio modules	28	45	29	51
	18%	29%	19%	33%
Instructor-designed quizzes/exams	68	32	22	33
	43%	20%	14%	21%
Exchange of drafts (peer review, commenting)	115	24	14	4
	73%	15%	9%	3%
Synchronous peer-to-peer discussion	27	24	27	73
	18%	16%	18%	47%
Asynchronous peer-to-peer discussion	131	16	5	4
	84%	10%	3%	3%
Online instructor conferences	42	43	37	33
	27%	28%	24%	21%
Audio file exchange peer-to-peer or instructor conference	4	10	33	103
	3%	6%	21%	66%
Submission of assignments in which text is the primary mode	151	4	0	1
	96%	3%	0%	1%
Submission of multimodal assignments	16	43	38	56
	10%	28%	25%	36%

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Return of graded assignments	147	3	1	6
	94%	2%	1%	4%
Course Website outside of Course Management System	25	21	23	85
	16%	14%	15%	55%
Wiki	12	15	31	96
	8%	10%	20%	62%
RSS feeds (web feed format that publishes frequently updated works)	4	5	23	120
	3%	3%	15%	77%
Blogs	15	27	30	81
	10%	17%	19%	52%
Social networking sites such as Facebook® or MySpace®	8	7	24	116
	5%	5%	15%	75%
Social bookmarking such as Delicious®	2	7	17	129
	1%	4%	11%	83%
Audio/Video conferencing (through applications such as Skype®)	6	16	28	97
	4%	10%	18%	63%

FO-Q21. What other activities and/or elements, if any, do you use in your courses?

PEDAGOGY INFLUENCES

FO-Q22. How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.

Subject area expert	127	81%
Faculty collaboration	71	46%
Consulting research	50	32%
Student-needs surveys	33	21%
Other, please specify	33	21%

FO-Q23. 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	60	38%
Writing is a social process	67	42%
Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion	123	78%
Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response	4	3%

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Writing is a process	119	75%
Writing and revising are recursive acts	88	56%
Writing and revising are generative acts	53	34%
Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement	62	39%
Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important	12	8%

FO-Q24. Which one of the pedagogical principles in question 23 above is most central to your work in OWI? Why and how?

TUTORING

FO-Q25. 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.)	130	82%
Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting	81	51%
Writing center consultants available online in real-time	42	27%
Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies	34	22%
Turnitin® or other plagiarism detection services	84	53%
Other, please specify	30	19%

FO-Q26. If there is access to an online writing center, how does the online component of the writing center (e.g., online supplemental and tutoring opportunities) function in relation to the traditional writing center? Please check all that apply.

Same tutors, different format	49	34%
Specialized tutors that only work online	32	22%
Specialized training for online tutors	33	23%
There is no access	53	37%
Other, please specify	18	12%

FO-Q27. If there is access to an online writing center, how does the online component of the writing center (e.g., online supplemental and tutoring opportunities) function in relation to the traditional and/or online writing program? Please check all that apply.

No connection	20	14%
An option	71	49%
A requirement	4	3%

There is no access	52	36%
Other, please specify	12	8%

FO-Q28. If there is access to an online writing center, what technology is used to implement these online tutoring programs? Please check all that apply.

Email	65	45%
Static webpages	34	23%
Synchronous online chat	31	21%
File sharing	26	18%
Facebook® or other social networks	3	2%
In-house software	17	12%
There is no access	53	36%
Other, please specify	24	16%

FO-Q29. How, if in any way at all, are students given preparation/direction for using online tutoring services? Please check all that apply.

Instruction from teacher	64	44%
Instruction from static online materials	64	44%
Instruction from tutor	37	25%
No instruction is offered	44	30%
Other, please specify	18	12%

FO-Q30. Please indicate which of the following resources are available on your campus. Please check all that apply.

Writing Center: Online text-based resources	78	50%
Writing Center: Online audio resources	16	10%
Writing Center: Online video resources	23	15%
Writing Center: Online scheduling	48	31%
Writing Center: Face-to-face appointments	124	79%
Writing Center: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with tutor	31	20%
Writing Center: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or Web-based) with tutor	70	45%
Library: Online resources	142	91%
Library: Online text-based resources	136	87%
Library: Online audio resources	47	30%
Library: Online video resources	58	37%

Library: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with librarian	59	38%
Library: Online Asynchronous exchanges (email or Web-based) with librarian	89	57%
Other, please specify	19	12%

TUTOR TRAINING: Please complete this section if an online writing center is available at or to your institution. If not, please move ahead to question 37.

FO-Q31. Approximately what percentage of your online writing tutors are undergraduate student peers?

Less than 10%	28	38%
Between 11% and 25%	3	4%
Between 26% and 50%	4	5%
Between 51% and 75%	4	5%
Between 76% and 100%	12	16%
I don't know	22	30%
Total	73	100%

FO-Q32. Approximately what percentage of your online writing tutors are graduate student peers?

Less than 10%	31	43%
Between 11% and 25%	5	7%
Between 26% and 50%	4	6%
Between 51% and 75%	6	8%
Between 76% and 100%	1	1%
I don't know	25	35%
Total	72	100%

FO-Q33. Approximately what percentage of your online writing tutors are professional/experienced educators?

Less than 10%	20	28%
Between 11% and 25%	3	4%
Between 26% and 50%	2	3%
Between 51% and 75%	4	6%
Between 76% and 100%	23	32%
I don't know	20	28%
Total	72	100%

FO-Q34. How are online tutors selected? Please check all that apply.

Faculty from across university nominate	6	9%

Director reviews applications from a general posting	33	47%
WC administrators and tutors review applicants and make final selection	23	33%
Students who successfully complete a tutoring course automatically get the position	6	9%
Other, please specify	22	31%

FO-Q35. From what academic backgrounds do your tutors generally come? Check all that apply.

English Literature	41	59%
Composition Studies	36	52%
Professional and Technical Writing	21	30%
Creative Writing	17	25%
Linguistics	9	13%
Foreign Languages and Literatures	6	9%
From a range of disciplines	35	51%

FO-Q36. How are tutors trained for the online writing center? Please check all that apply.

Same as face-to-face tutors	32	47%
Accredited class dedicated to online tutoring	1	1%
For-credit course that does not fully address online tutoring	5	7%
For-credit course and additional training sessions on technology and online pedagogy	6	9%
No-credit training sessions dedicated to online tutoring	21	31%
Other, please specify	30	44%

STUDENT EXPERIENCE

FO-Q37. 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®, Blackboard®, etc.)	145	95%
Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions	126	82%
Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments	89	58%
Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)	126	82%
Completion of course requirements	141	92%
Peer review	110	72%
Informed participation in online discussions	123	80%
Productive facilitation of online discussion	53	35%
I don't know	4	3%
Other, please specify	10	7%

FO-Q38. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about how students enroll in an online course:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I don't know
An advisor has counseled students about the expectations for the course.	9	29	45	45	24
	6%	19%	30%	30%	16%
Students are well aware that it is an online course.	93	51	6	1	1
	61%	34%	4%	1%	1%
Students have read the program's documentation on the expectations of online courses.	21	46	42	21	21
	14%	30%	28%	14%	14%
Students have completed an instrument, which has indicated that their learning preferences are conducive to success in an online environment.	10	19	36	60	27
	7%	12%	24%	39%	18%
The instructor sends students a welcome email prior to the first day of class.	101	29	11	8	3
	66%	19%	7%	5%	2%

FO-Q39. In what delivery formats does your program/course offer a student orientation to online courses? Please check all that apply.

Face-to-face	20	13%
Face-to-face and asynchronously	15	10%
Asynchronously	61	41%
Audio/video	29	19%
We/I don't offer it because another program on our campus handles it	30	20%
We/I don't offer it	26	17%
Other, please specify	27	18%

FO-Q40. What topics are typically covered by the student orientation? Please check all that apply.

How to use the interface(s)	94	64%
How to manage your time in an online class	62	42%
How to be successful in an online class	71	49%
How to contact the instructor	85	58%
How to access resources (i.e., tutoring, technology assistance) beyond the course materials	81	55%
Netiquette	52	36%
Plagiarism and cheating	50	34%
We do not offer an orientation	23	16%
Other, please specify	26	18%

FO-Q41. What is the single most important issue to cover in student orientation for online writing courses?

FO-Q42. What do students' report they like the most about these courses? Please check all that apply.

Flexibility to post/join/participate in class discussion across a longer timeframe than the 50 or 75 minute-class meeting and not necessarily within the time frame of the face-to-face class meeting time each week	120	81%
Opportunity to think/revise idea before making it public by posting (rather than the quicker real-time delivery of the classroom)	58	39%
Opportunity to revisit class discussions or peer reviews (as opposed to the oral counterparts in face-to-face classroom)	40	27%
No commute to campus	125	84%

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Personal attention	41	28%
Strong organization	38	26%
Ease of collaboration with peers	20	13%
Other, please specify	23	15%

FO-Q43. What do students' report are the most problematic aspects of the courses? Please check all that apply.

More technologically sophisticated class activities (like building eportfolios) are difficult to manage at a distance.	40	27%
Computer Help desk not always helpful	42	28%
Feels "weird" to only meet people online relative to face-to-face classrooms with physical presence	45	30%
Lack of interaction with teacher	35	23%
Lack of interaction with peers	27	18%
Getting started in the course	58	39%
No social aspect of class	25	17%
Difficult to ask questions	9	6%
Lack of motivation	74	50%
Keeping up with class	112	75%
Technical problems with student interface	86	58%
Other, please specify	29	19%

FO-Q44. 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	99	66%
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)	38	26%
Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong)	81	54%
Instructor office hours in chat room	64	43%
Informal portions of discussion board	90	60%
Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly	77	52%
Other, please specify	26	17%

FO-Q45. Approximately what percentage of student enrollment in your online classes consists of non-native speakers of English or English language learners?

FO-Q46. Are there separate sections of your courses for non-native speakers of English or English language learners?

Yes	14	9%
No	134	91%
Total	148	100%

FO-Q47. Whether there are or aren't separate sections, do you think there should be separate sections for non-native speakers of English or English language learners?

Yes	48	34%
No	93	66%
Total	141	100%

FO-Q48. What strategies are used to accommodate students who are English language learners?

More asynchronous delivery	12	10%
More text-based communication	36	30%
More audio-based communication	12	10%
Providing more instructions and/or feedback in more than one mode	50	42%
Other, please specify	59	50%

FO-Q49. To your knowledge, is your online writing course accessible to students with various disabilities (ADA compliant)?

Yes	104	69%
No	7	5%
I don't know	39	26%
Total	150	100%

FO-Q50. Does your institution provide guidance on how to make online writing courses accessible to your disabled students (ADA compliant)?

Yes	85	56%
No	24	16%
I don't know	43	28%
Total	152	100%

FO-Q51. Have you ever taught students with disclosed or obvious disabilities in an online course?

Yes	77	50%
No	35	23%
I don't know	41	27%
Total	153	100%

FO-Q52. What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities?

FO-Q53. What are your major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities?

FO-Q54. What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in online settings?

FO-Q55. Overall, how do most students rate these online courses?

Very high rating	16	11%
High rating	70	46%
Average rating	32	21%
Low rating	3	2%
Very low rating	0	0%
I don't know	15	10%
I'm not free to divulge this information	2	1%
Other, please specify	13	9%
Total	151	100%

FO-Q56. 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	115	76%
Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time	124	82%
Participating in written discussions	99	65%
Flexibility in terms of time	138	91%
Flexibility in terms of location	137	90%
Student facilitation and/or presentation	21	14%
Recorded student conferences	11	7%
Collaborative writing	32	21%
Other, please specify	18	12%

FO-Q57. Regardless of instructor efficacy, rate whether you believe that students in online courses have an advantage in the areas below compared to students in face-to-face courses.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Clear advantage	Somewhat of an advantage	No advantage or disadvantage	Somewhat of a disadvantage	Clear disadvantage
Flexibility in time-of-day for attending class	141	10	3	0	0
	92%	6%	2%	0%	0%
Benefits from an accessible archive of course materials	60	48	41	2	0
	40%	32%	27%	1%	0%
Development of stronger reading skills	29	49	67	5	1
	19%	32%	44%	3%	1%

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Development of stronger writing skills	27	53	69	5	0
	18%	34%	45%	3%	0%
Development of self-directedness	64	75	13	0	0
	42%	49%	9%	0%	0%
Development of self-discipline	67	73	14	0	0
	44%	47%	9%	0%	0%
Development of student accountability	53	63	37	1	0
	34%	41%	24%	1%	0%
Attentiveness to instructions	35	57	52	8	0
	23%	38%	34%	5%	0%
Written commentary on peer drafts	24	43	77	7	1
	16%	28%	51%	5%	1%
Enjoyment interacting with classmates	15	24	69	37	8
	10%	16%	45%	24%	5%
Benefits from receiving asynchronous feedback	22	42	78	6	2
	15%	28%	52%	4%	1%
Greater insight about own writing process and style	15	24	102	7	2
	10%	16%	68%	5%	1%
Improvement of critical thinking skills	14	32	102	3	1
	9%	21%	67%	2%	1%
Sensitivity to audience	16	49	73	13	1
	11%	32%	48%	9%	1%
Recognition of the need for details when writing	12	43	90	5	0
	8%	29%	60%	3%	0%
Development of problem-solving skills as they negotiate course expectations and troubleshoot their own computing issues	28	75	47	1	1
	18%	49%	31%	1%	1%
Adeptness at using the computer for their academic work	49	84	19	0	0
	32%	55%	12%	0%	0%
Ability to troubleshoot personal technology failures	31	85	32	2	2
	20%	56%	21%	1%	1%
Difficulty with the institution's technology and/or technology	15	33	63	32	9

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

support infrastructure.	10%	22%	41%	21%	6%
Support to make the transition to college	6	16	80	33	15
	4%	11%	53%	22%	10%

INSTRUCTOR EXPERIENCE

FO-Q58. What expectations are set with the faculty who teach these courses? Please check all that apply.

Teachers will develop a pedagogically sound online course	130	84%
Teachers will provide reasonable support to students for succeeding in the online environment	136	88%
Online office hours will be required	54	35%
On-campus responsibilities will exist	81	53%
Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected	104	68%
Faculty will be observed one or more times during a term	31	20%
Other, please specify	21	14%

FO-Q59. What types of orientation/training activities, if any, do faculty receive for these courses? Please check all that apply.

Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)	19	13%
On-going workshops on various aspects of a Content Management System (e.g., Blackboard®)	118	79%
Use of a dedicated instructional designer (at the department and college levels)	52	35%
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)	21	14%
Mandatory training	72	48%
Optional training	87	58%
Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members	61	41%
Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online	18	12%
Other, please specify	16	11%

FO-Q60. How many hours is your training program, if you have one?

Between 1 and 5 hours	33	22%
Between 6 and 10 hours	20	14%
More than 10 hours	37	25%
We don't have a training program	34	23%
Other, please specify	24	16%
Total	148	100%

FO-Q61. Do you receive payment for training?

Yes	25	17%
No	95	63%
We don't have a training program	30	20%
Total	150	100%

FO-Q62. If you answered yes to question 61, approximately how much do you earn per hour?

FO-Q63. Rank the parts of training that you find most and least helpful (most helpful being 1)?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)	2	2	3	12	4	4	5	10
	5%	5%	7%	29%	10%	10%	12%	24%
On-going workshops on various aspects of a Content Management System (e.g., Blackboard®)	9	11	11	11	9	6	1	0
	16%	19%	19%	19%	16%	10%	2%	0%
Use of a dedicated instructional designer (at the department and college levels)	8	7	11	12	8	3	2	5
	14%	12%	20%	21%	14%	5%	4%	9%
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)	2	2	6	8	7	8	9	8
	4%	4%	12%	16%	14%	16%	18%	16%
Mandatory training	12	11	9	7	3	4	4	12
	19%	18%	15%	11%	5%	6%	6%	19%
Optional training	8	14	15	15	5	11	3	3
	11%	19%	20%	20%	7%	15%	4%	4%
Mentoring/shadowing with	28	19	16	10	8	4	1	4

experienced faculty members	31%	21%	18%	11%	9%	4%	1%	4%
Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online	23	16	16	7	4	3	5	12
	27%	19%	19%	8%	5%	3%	6%	14%

FO-Q64. What other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction?

FO-Q65. Rate what you perceive to be the importance of the qualities below for an online writing instructor at your institution:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Very important	Important	Not important	Very unimportant
Overall comfort with technology	110	36	3	0
	74%	24%	2%	0%
Technical proficiency with the interfaces available at our campus	90	55	3	0
	61%	37%	2%	0%
Advanced web design skills	4	25	101	19
	3%	17%	68%	13%
Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best ones for a pedagogical purpose	59	66	17	8
	39%	44%	11%	5%
Ability to establish a presence online	114	35	1	0
	76%	23%	1%	0%
Skills in designing "lectures" delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital video, learning module)	43	73	30	4
	29%	49%	20%	3%
Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines	119	27	2	2
	79%	18%	1%	1%
Skills in moderating online discussion boards	89	53	5	2
	60%	36%	3%	1%
Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects	37	67	37	9
	25%	45%	25%	6%
Skills in teaching rhetorical principles	102	39	2	2
	70%	27%	1%	1%
Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection	82	60	7	0
	55%	40%	5%	0%

Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning	58	68	18	4
	39%	46%	12%	3%
Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles	59	71	14	5
	40%	48%	9%	3%
Willingness to follow-up with students promptly	129	21	0	0
	86%	14%	0%	0%
Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning	61	73	15	1
	41%	49%	10%	1%
Participation in an active community of online teachers	39	61	32	17
	26%	41%	21%	11%

FO-Q66. What do you like the most about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

Flexibility in scheduling	119	79%
No commute	69	46%
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	75	50%
Other, please specify	45	30%

FO-Q67. What do you like the least about teaching online writing courses? Please check all that apply.

Anticipating student problems	34	23%
Dealing with technical problems	88	59%
Managing large class size that is sometimes given to online teachers because physical space is not a limitation	46	31%
Other, please specify	58	39%

FO-Q68. How, if in any way at all, do you (or your institution) address any of the issues highlighted in previous questions?

FO-Q69. Rate the degree to which you believe that each of the following factors contributes or detracts from instructors' willingness to teach online courses:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Increases willingness to teach online very significantly	Increases willingness to teach online significantly	Does not increase willingness to teach online	Decreases willingness to teach online significantly	Decreases willingness to teach online very significantly
Flexibility in teaching schedule	98	45	6	1	0
	65%	30%	4%	1%	0%
Reduced commuting	82	40	27	0	0
	55%	27%	18%	0%	0%

Students' learning	12	34	91	10	3
	8%	23%	61%	7%	2%
Learning new pedagogical strategies	16	57	52	19	6
	11%	38%	35%	13%	4%
Using new technologies	15	58	42	21	14
	10%	39%	28%	14%	9%
Linking course materials to other Web resources	8	46	75	17	3
	5%	31%	50%	11%	2%
Time/money compensation for learning a sophisticated set of skills, theories, and technologies	23	32	53	18	21
	16%	22%	36%	12%	14%
Time/money compensation for development of course	31	31	46	19	21
	21%	21%	31%	13%	14%
Reliability of campus technology	21	34	51	33	10
	14%	23%	34%	22%	7%
Input and support of campus technology	21	46	50	22	10
	14%	31%	34%	15%	7%
Level of appreciation/respect from colleagues	15	24	67	31	13
	10%	16%	45%	21%	9%
Establishing an online presence as an instructor	24	38	67	18	2
	16%	26%	45%	12%	1%
The organization and planning involved in teaching online	12	26	36	54	21
	8%	17%	24%	36%	14%
Finding satisfaction in the online interactions with students	32	50	44	20	4
	21%	33%	29%	13%	3%
Use of common syllabus/curriculum	9	19	62	32	23
	6%	13%	43%	22%	16%

FO-Q70. If you had a choice, would you continue teaching online?

Yes	135	89%
No	8	5%
I don't know	8	5%
Total	151	100%

FO-Q71. If you answered yes or no to question 70, please explain why.

FO-Q72. In what context do you most prefer to teach writing?

Totally online	29	19%
Face-to-face	24	16%
Blended/hybrid	22	15%
I am open to any or all of these contexts	76	50%
Total	151	100%

FO-Q73. Would you recommend teaching online to colleagues who do not teach online?

Yes	88	58%
No	18	12%
I don't know	45	30%
Total	151	100%

FO-Q74. If you answered yes or no to question 73, please explain why.

CCCC's PRACTICE

FO-Q75. What can CCCC do for you/your institution? Please check all that apply.

Create statement of best practices	118	81%
Indentify and/or create instructional materials for faculty	94	65%
Publicize need for training	86	59%
Legitimize online teaching	95	66%
Create instructional workshops at CCCC conferences and events	101	70%
Other, please specify	23	16%

FO-Q76. What do you think is most needed in a statement of best practices for online writing instruction? Why?

FO-Q77. If you are willing to participate in a follow-up phone call or email exchange, please provide your phone number and/or email address.

Appendix B CCCC-OWI Survey: Hybrid OWI

BACKGROUND

H-Q1 Are you a CCCC member?

Yes	116	83%
No	23	17%
Total	139	100%

H-Q2 Please note the name of your institution.
Truckee Meadows CC; Western Kentucky U; U of Education Freiburg/Germany; Taylor U; U of Washington Tacoma; Georgia Southern U; U of Hawaii system; Lancaster Bible C; CREIGHTON U; tidewater community college; Eagle Gate C; Iowa State U; C of Southern Nevada; Wilbur Wright C; California State U Channel Islands; U of Michigan; Tennessee State U; Illinois Central C; Palm Beach Atlantic U; Stockton college (NJ); St. John's U; Purdue U; Limestone C; Oakland U; not teaching this year; North Carolina State U; Heartland CC; LaGuardia CC; DeVry U; South Dakota State U; Texas A&M International U; Murray State U; Houston CC; Whatcom CC; DeVry U Chicago Campus; North Carolina State U; NCSU; C of the Sequoias; Graceland U; Augsburg C; Northern Virginia CC; UTEP; Stetson U; Mt. San Antonio C; U of the Virgin Islands; Lincoln U; Penn State U; Bridgewater State C; Missouri State University-WP; USC Aiken; Salt Lake CC; The C of St. Elizabeth; Kennesaw State U; Memphis C of Art; Indiana U Kokomo; UNC-Chapel Hill; North Carolina State U; Ramapo C of NJ; Cuyahoga CC; Kennesaw State U; Wenatchee Valley C; C of Saint Elizabeth; Our Lady of the Lake C; Diablo Valley C; Longview CC (Metropolitan CC system); The U of Alabama; BARUCH C; Northeastern U; Southwest Minnesota State U; Bloomfield. C; San Francisco State U; Missouri U of Science and Technology; Grand Valley State U; Saint Joseph C; Weber State U; Morehead State U (KY); Eastern Oregon U; CSU LA; Hofstra U; Morehead State U; Century C; Indiana U Kokomo; Cecil C; Walsh U; U of Nebraska-Lincoln; J Sargeant Reynolds CC; The U of Findlay; U of North Carolina at Charlotte; Lee C; U of Arizona; Mesa CC; Bristol CC; State Fair CC; DePaul U; St. Ambrose U; Kishwaukee C; San Francisco State U; Gavilan C/ Evergreen Valley C/ Tacoma CC; U of Louisville; New Mexico State U ; Western Carolina U; Jackson CC; Gillette C; Reading Area CC; Texas A&M International U; Sandersville Technical C; Ferris State U; Greensboro C; MCC-Longview; UCLA; Ozarks Technical CC; Norwalk CC; U of Minnesota Duluth; UMass Boston; Iowa State U; De La Salle U-Manila; DeVry U; Drexel U; Rutgers Writing Program; Colorado Mountain C; CSUSB; Tidewater CC; Yakima Valley CC; Fullerton C; Felician C; IUPUI; Northern Virginia CC; Northern Virginia CC; Coahoma CC; U of Washington Tacoma; Butler CC (KS); Albuquerque Public Schools/U of New Mexico; Middle Tennessee State U; William Penn U; DeVry U; Arizona State U; Washtenaw CC

H Q3 How did you hear about this survey?

CCCC email	101	73%
Tech Rhet Listserv	6	4%
WPA Listserv	14	10%
Writing Center Listserv	11	8%
Other	13	9%

H Q4 Are you or have you ever been a Writing Program Administrator (WPA) either in actual title or in terms of job responsibilities?

Yes	59	44%
No	75	56%

H Q5 Please check all that apply:

I am an adjunct instructor/professor	17	12%
I am a full-time non-tenure track instructor/professor/administrator	39	28%
I am an assistant professor	17	12%
I am a tenure-track professor	16	12%
I am a tenured professor	47	34%

I am a graduate teaching assistant	7	5%
Other (Please Specify)	15	11%

H Q6 Are you currently teaching writing using any kind of computer-mediated or distance-facilitated technology?

Yes	117	85%
No	21	15%
Total	138	100%

H Q7 How many total years have you been teaching (please include all teaching experience)?

1-3 Years	4	3%
4-6 Years	11	8%
7 or more years	121	89%

H Q8 How many total years have you been teaching online writing courses?

1-3 Years	50	38%
4-6 Years	47	36%
7 or more years	34	26%

H Q9 At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.

2-year community college	46	33%
4-year college	20	14%
4-year university	65	47%
2- or 4-year graduate school	12	9%
Professional school	3	2%
Other (please list institution's name)	4	3%

H Q10 At what type of institution do you work? Please check all that apply.

For-profit institution	9	6%
Non-profit institution	58	42%
Completely online	1	1%
Traditional, brick & mortar with some online courses	110	79%
Other (please specify)	2	1%

H Q11 At how many institutions do you work?

1	127	92%
2	9	7%
3	0	0%

If more than 3, how many?	2	1%

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

H Q12 What type(s) of blended/hybrid writing course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.

First-year writing	118	86%
Professional/Technical writing	34	25%
Developmental writing	37	27%
Advanced academic writing	44	32%
Creative writing	11	8%
Writing-intensive courses in other disciplines	25	18%
Writing courses for non-native speakers of English	6	4%
Other, please specify	19	14%

H Q13 How many students are enrolled in your blended/hybrid writing courses?

10 or fewer per course	5	4%
11-20 per course	49	37%
21-30 per course	76	57%
31-40 per course	1	1%
41-50 per course	0	0%
More than 50	3	2%
I don't know	0	0%

H Q14 At what number do you think student enrollment should be capped for your blended/hybrid writing courses?

10 or fewer per course	11	8%
11-20 per course	106	77%
21-30 per course	19	14%
31-40 per course	0	0%
41-50 per course	0	0%
More than 50	0	0%
I don't know	2	1%

H Q15 Please explain the reasons for your responses to question 14.

H Q16 In your course experience, approximately what is the student drop-out rate per course?

Between 1% and 10%	78	57%
Between 11% and 20%	25	18%

Between 21% and 30%	15	11%
Between 31% and 40%	5	4%
More than 41%	8	6%
I don't know	5	4%

H Q17 Who led the efforts toward online/blended/hybrid courses in your department? Please check all that apply.

College administrators	69	50%
Departmental administrators	41	29%
Colleagues in my department	63	45%
Graduate students	5	4%
Me	52	37%
Instructional technology staff	27	19%
No one, but as opportunities arose, some have elected to use these tools.	11	8%
I don't know	16	12%
Other, please specify	13	9%

COURSE ACTIVITIES AND ELEMENTS

H Q18 What activities do your blended/hybrid course(s) include? Please check all that apply.

Peer response groups	115	83%
Synchronous discussion	40	29%
Asynchronous discussion	107	78%
Small group discussion	81	59%
Whole class discussion	97	70%
Rhetorical analysis	85	62%
Reading responses	126	91%
Invention activities	74	54%
Revision activities	112	81%
Student facilitation and/or presentation	59	43%
Student conferences	53	38%
Collaborative Writing	58	42%
Other, please specify	21	15%

H Q19 Which of the following statements are true for you:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Yes	No	I don't know
I inherited a course design.	24	110	2
	18%	81%	1%
I inherited the interface.	97	36	3
	71%	26%	2%
I inherited the course template, but have made adaptations to it (for example, changed assignments).	37	95	3
	27%	70%	2%
I worked alone to design the online components of my course.	85	52	0
	62%	38%	0%
I have participated in formal training for online teaching.	99	35	1
	73%	26%	1%
I have participated in formal training for online course design.	83	50	3
	61%	37%	2%
I am considered an expert in online course design.	32	82	22
	24%	60%	16%
I worked with one or more instructional technology specialists who share responsibility for the design of the course.	41	87	8
	30%	64%	6%
I collaborated with colleagues in the department to design the course and its interface.	56	76	2
	42%	57%	1%
I am considered an expert in the content of the course.	43	82	10
	32%	61%	7%
Course design is unique to individual instructors.	103	26	6
	76%	19%	4%
Course designs are intended to be replicable such that future instructors use significant parts of the course materials/tools generated by the instructor/course development team.	57	70	8
	42%	52%	6%

H Q20 Please indicate the extent to which the following virtual tools and online teaching strategies are used in your writing course(s).

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Course Management System (e.g., Blackboard® or SAKAI®)	119	7	3	119
	88%	5%	2%	88%

Online distribution of course materials	125	9	2	125
	92%	7%	1%	92%
Learning modules designed by course instructor/department	77	24	18	77
	57%	18%	13%	57%
Learning modules designed for the campus (perhaps by Library, Honor System, or Center for Teaching & Learning)	19	33	30	19
	14%	24%	22%	14%
Video lectures	10	24	28	10
	7%	18%	21%	7%
Lectures via PowerPoint® or MSWord® documents	44	40	29	44
	33%	30%	21%	33%
Links to Websites	111	22	3	111
	81%	16%	2%	81%
Audio modules	21	39	37	21
	16%	29%	27%	16%
Instructor-designed quizzes/exams	44	36	30	44
	32%	26%	22%	32%
Exchange of drafts (peer review, commenting)	90	27	12	90
	66%	20%	9%	66%
Synchronous peer-to-peer discussion	25	23	39	25
	19%	17%	29%	19%
Asynchronous peer-to-peer discussion	86	26	13	86
	64%	19%	10%	64%
Online instructor conferences	28	38	35	28
	21%	28%	26%	21%
Audio file exchange peer-to-peer or instructor conference	7	8	30	7
	5%	6%	23%	5%
Submission of assignments in which text is the primary mode	109	18	6	109
	80%	13%	4%	80%
Submission of multimodal assignments	23	40	30	23
	17%	29%	22%	17%
Return of graded assignments	100	12	8	100
	73%	9%	6%	73%

Report of the State of the Art of OWI (CCCC Committee for Best Practices in OWI, March 2011)

Course Website outside of Course Management System	32	8	21	32
	24%	6%	16%	24%
Wiki	14	10	25	14
	10%	7%	18%	10%
RSS feeds (web feed format that publishes frequently updated works)	8	7	20	8
	6%	5%	15%	6%
Blogs	17	22	29	17
	12%	16%	21%	12%
Social networking sites such as Facebook® or MySpace®	5	9	24	5
	4%	7%	18%	4%
Social bookmarking such as Delicious®	4	8	22	4
	3%	6%	16%	3%
Audio/Video conferencing (through applications such as Skype®)	3	4	24	3
	2%	3%	18%	2%

H-Q21. What other activities and/or elements, if any, do you use in your courses?

PEDAGOGY INFLUENCES

H-Q22. How were these courses developed? Please check all that apply.

Subject area expert	94	69%
Faculty collaboration	69	51%
Consulting research	34	25%
Student-needs surveys	22	16%
Other, please specify	26	19%

H-Q23. 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	56	40%
Writing is a social process	66	47%
Writing should attend to audience, purpose, and occasion	106	76%
Writing cannot be taught; it can only receive reader response	5	4%
Writing is a process	97	70%
Writing and revising are	83	60%

recursive acts		
Writing and revising are generative acts	50	36%
Peer feedback is necessary for writing improvement	53	38%
Even with OWI, face-to-face interaction with students is important	61	44%

H-Q24. Which one of the pedagogical principles in question 23 above is most central to your work in OWI? Why and how?

TUTORING

H-Q25. 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.)	104	79%
Writing center consultants available for asynchronous consulting	67	51%
Writing center consultants available online in real-time	31	23%
Outsourced writing tutoring with commercial companies	10	8%
Turnitin® or other plagiarism detection services	62	47%
Other, please specify	22	17%

H-Q26. If there is access to an online writing center, how does the online component of the writing center (e.g., online supplemental and tutoring opportunities) function in relation to the traditional writing center? Please check all that apply.

Same tutors, different format	50	41%
Specialized tutors that only work online	10	8%
Specialized training for online tutors	22	18%
There is no access	58	47%
Other, please specify	11	9%

H-Q27. If there is access to an online writing center, how does the online component of the writing center (e.g., online supplemental and tutoring opportunities) function in relation to the traditional and/or online writing program? Please check all that apply.

No connection	12	10%
An option	55	46%
A requirement	4	3%
There is no access	52	43%

Other, please specify	5	4%

H-Q28. If there is access to an online writing center, what technology is used to implement these online tutoring programs? Please check all that apply.

Email	50	42%
Static webpages	21	18%
Synchronous online chat	18	15%
File sharing	21	18%
Facebook® or other social networks	2	2%
In-house software	7	6%
There is no access	56	47%
Other, please specify	15	13%

H-Q29. How, if in any way at all, are students given preparation/direction for using online tutoring services? Please check all that apply.

Instruction from teacher	41	34%
Instruction from static online materials	37	31%
Instruction from tutor	23	19%
No instruction is offered	56	47%
Other, please specify	12	10%

H-Q30. Please indicate which of the following resources are available on your campus. Please check all that apply.

Writing Center: Online text-based resources	69	50%
Writing Center: Online audio resources	13	9%
Writing Center: Online video resources	14	10%
Writing Center: Online scheduling	54	39%
Writing Center: Face-to-face appointments	116	85%
Writing Center: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with tutor	19	14%
Writing Center: Online asynchronous exchanges (email or Web-based) with tutor	49	36%
Library: Online resources	123	90%
Library: Online text-based resources	108	79%
Library: Online audio resources	40	29%
Library: Online video resources	56	41%
Library: Online synchronous appointments (chat) with librarian	56	41%

Library: Online Asynchronous exchanges (email or Web-based) with librarian	74	54%
Other, please specify	7	5%

TUTOR TRAINING: Please complete this section if an online writing center is available at or to your institution. If not, please move ahead to question 37.

H-Q31. Approximately what percentage of your online writing tutors are undergraduate student peers?

Less than 10%	15	28%
Between 11% and 25%	0	0%
Between 26% and 50%	3	6%
Between 51% and 75%	6	11%
Between 76% and 100%	18	33%
I don't know	12	22%
Total	54	100%

H-Q32. Approximately what percentage of your online writing tutors are graduate student peers?

Less than 10%	28	52%
Between 11% and 25%	5	9%
Between 26% and 50%	3	6%
Between 51% and 75%	1	2%
Between 76% and 100%	4	7%
I don't know	13	24%
Total	54	100%

H-Q33. Approximately what percentage of your online writing tutors are professional/experienced educators?

Less than 10%	26	49%
Between 11% and 25%	5	9%
Between 26% and 50%	4	8%
Between 51% and 75%	0	0%
Between 76% and 100%	8	15%
I don't know	10	19%
Total	53	100%

H-Q34. How are online tutors selected? Please check all that apply.

Faculty from across university nominate	11	22%
Director reviews applications from a general	23	45%

posting		
WC administrators and tutors review applicants and make final selection	13	25%
Students who successfully complete a tutoring course automatically get the position	7	14%
Other, please specify	17	33%

H-Q35. From what academic backgrounds do your tutors generally come? Check all that apply.

English Literature	25	47%
Composition Studies	20	38%
Professional and Technical Writing	10	19%
Creative Writing	15	28%
Linguistics	5	9%
Foreign Languages and Literatures	3	6%
From a range of disciplines	35	66%

H-Q36. How are tutors trained for the online writing center? Please check all that apply.

Same as face-to-face tutors	31	60%
Accredited class dedicated to online tutoring	0	0%
For-credit course that does not fully address online tutoring	4	8%
For-credit course and additional training sessions on technology and online pedagogy	4	8%
No-credit training sessions dedicated to online tutoring	13	25%
Other, please specify	16	31%

STUDENT EXPERIENCE

H-Q37. What expectations are set with students about taking these blended/hybrid writing courses? Please check all that apply.

Regular access to technologies required to complete the course (broadband Internet connection, MSWord®, Blackboard®, etc.)	127	95%

Availability for frequent, regular, and informed contributions to online discussions	98	73%
Specific number of hours per week to complete reading, writing, response/research assignments	66	49%
Regular availability via email (to receive class announcements & correspondence from teacher/classmates)	109	81%
Completion of course requirements	120	90%
Peer review	98	73%
Informed participation in online discussions	92	69%
Productive facilitation of online discussion	43	32%
I don't know	3	2%
Other, please specify	6	4%

H-Q38. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about how students enroll in a blended/hybrid course:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I don't know
An advisor has counseled students about the expectations for the course.	4	32	41	44	4
	3%	24%	31%	33%	3%
Students are well aware that it is an online course.	18	56	32	19	18
	14%	42%	24%	14%	14%
Students have read the program's documentation on the expectations of online courses.	8	37	37	32	8
	6%	28%	28%	24%	6%
Students have completed an instrument, which has indicated that their learning preferences are conducive to success in an online environment.	6	10	34	69	6
	5%	8%	26%	52%	5%
The instructor sends students a welcome email prior to the first day of class.	49	37	23	17	49
	37%	28%	17%	13%	37%

H-Q39. In what delivery formats does your program/course offer a student orientation to blended/hybrid courses? Please check all that apply.

Face-to-face	62	47%
Face-to-face and asynchronously	22	17%
Asynchronously	19	14%
Audio/video	10	8%
We/I don't offer it because another program on our campus handles it	11	8%

We/I don't offer it	31	23%
Other, please specify	16	12%

H-Q40. What topics are typically covered by the student orientation? Please check all that apply.

How to use the interface(s)	72	56%
How to manage your time in an online class	41	32%
How to be successful in an online class	54	42%
How to contact the instructor	68	53%
How to access resources (i.e., tutoring, technology assistance) beyond the course materials	65	50%
Netiquette	38	29%
Plagiarism and cheating	46	36%
We do not offer an orientation	39	30%
Other, please specify	14	11%

H-Q41. What is the single most important issue to cover in student orientation for blended/hybrid writing courses?

H-Q42. What do students' report they like the most about these courses? Please check all that apply.

Flexibility to post/join/participate in class discussion across a longer timeframe than the 50 or 75 minute-class meeting and not necessarily within the time frame of the face-to-face class meeting time each week	87	70%
Opportunity to think/revise idea before making it public by posting (rather than the quicker real-time delivery of the classroom)	51	41%
Opportunity to revisit class discussions or peer reviews (as opposed to the oral counterparts in face-to-face classroom)	41	33%
No commute to campus	68	55%
Personal attention	31	25%
Strong organization	19	15%
Ease of collaboration with peers	25	20%
Other, please specify	28	23%

H-Q43. What do students' report are the most problematic aspects of the courses? Please check all that apply.

More technologically sophisticated class activities (like building eportfolios) are difficult to manage at a distance.	51	41%

Computer Help desk not always helpful	40	32%
Feels "weird" to only meet people online relative to face-to-face classrooms with physical presence	22	18%
Lack of interaction with teacher	38	30%
Lack of interaction with peers	29	23%
Getting started in the course	43	34%
No social aspect of class	25	20%
Difficult to ask questions	9	7%
Lack of motivation	56	45%
Keeping up with class	78	62%
Technical problems with student interface	73	58%
Other, please specify	26	21%

H-Q44. How, if in any way at all, are student course-related problems addressed in your blended/hybrid course? Please check all that apply.

Community building activities early/across the semester	67	54%
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)	29	23%
Communicating a reasonable amount of flexibility for the larger more sophisticated projects (acknowledging that things do/can go wrong)	81	65%
Instructor office hours in chat room	36	29%
Informal portions of discussion board	52	42%
Work closely with IT department to correct technical problems quickly	67	54%
Other, please specify	16	13%

H-Q45. Approximately what percentage of student enrollment in your blended/hybrid classes consists of non-native speakers of English or English language learners?

H-Q46. Are there separate sections of your courses for non-native speakers of English or English language learners?

Yes	21	17%
No	105	83%
Total	126	100%

H-Q47. Whether there are or aren't separate sections, do you think there should be separate sections for non-native speakers of English or English language learners?

Yes	48	40%
No	72	60%

Total	120	100%

H-Q48. What strategies are used to accommodate students who are English language learners?

More asynchronous delivery	21	19%
More text-based communication	26	23%
More audio-based communication	6	5%
Providing more instructions and/or feedback in more than one mode	66	59%
Other, please specify	43	39%

H-Q49. To your knowledge, is your blended/hybrid writing course accessible to students with various disabilities (ADA compliant)?

Yes	88	68%
No	7	5%
I don't know	34	26%
Total	129	100%

H-Q50. Does your institution provide guidance on how to make online writing courses accessible to your disabled students (ADA compliant)?

Yes	62	48%
No	26	20%
I don't know	40	31%
Total	128	100%

H-Q51. Have you ever taught students with disclosed or obvious disabilities in a blended/hybrid course?

Yes	73	57%
No	40	31%
I don't know	15	12%
Total	128	100%

H-Q52. What pedagogical and/or practical strategies do you use to accommodate students with disabilities?

H-Q53. What are your major challenges in teaching students with various disabilities?

H-Q54. What would you like to know about teaching students with disabilities in blended/hybrid settings?

H-Q55. Overall, how do most students rate these blended/hybrid courses?

Very high rating	17	13%
High rating	46	35%
Average rating	31	24%
Low rating	6	5%
Very low rating	1	1%

I don't know	16	12%
I'm not free to divulge this information	3	2%
Other, please specify	10	8%
Total	130	100%

H-Q56. In your experience, what are the greatest opportunities for students who are instructed in blended/hybrid settings? Please check all that apply.

Opportunity to develop writing through writing	92	72%
Convenience allows students to compose writing and response on their own time	100	78%
Participating in written discussions	75	59%
Flexibility in terms of time	98	77%
Flexibility in terms of location	102	80%
Student facilitation and/or presentation	24	19%
Recorded student conferences	14	11%
Collaborative writing	27	21%
Other, please specify	17	13%

H-Q57. Regardless of instructor efficacy, rate whether you believe that students in blended/hybrid courses have an advantage in the areas below compared to students in face-to-face courses.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Clear advantage	Somewhat of an advantage	No advantage or disadvantage	Somewhat of a disadvantage	Clear disadvantage
Flexibility in time-of-day for attending class	82	24	18	2	0
	65%	19%	14%	2%	0%
Benefits from an accessible archive of course materials	59	36	30	2	0
	46%	28%	24%	2%	0%
Development of stronger reading skills	20	42	57	5	2
	16%	33%	45%	4%	2%
Development of stronger writing skills	24	45	53	3	2
	19%	35%	42%	2%	2%
Development of self-directedness	41	62	19	4	1
	32%	49%	15%	3%	1%
Development of self-discipline	46	52	23	4	1

	37%	41%	18%	3%	1%
Development of student accountability	42	47	34	3	2
	33%	37%	27%	2%	2%
Attentiveness to instructions	25	35	57	6	2
	20%	28%	46%	5%	2%
Written commentary on peer drafts	19	36	65	6	1
	15%	28%	51%	5%	1%
Benefits from receiving asynchronous feedback	23	46	55	1	2
	18%	36%	43%	1%	2%
Greater insight about own writing process and style	13	37	69	8	0
	10%	29%	54%	6%	0%
Improvement of critical thinking skills	14	28	78	6	2
	11%	22%	61%	5%	2%
Sensitivity to audience	23	38	52	13	1
	18%	30%	41%	10%	1%
Recognition of the need for details when writing	15	33	72	3	1
	12%	27%	58%	2%	1%
Development of problem-solving skills as they negotiate course expectations and troubleshoot their own computing issues	25	58	41	3	0
	20%	46%	32%	2%	0%
Adeptness at using the computer for their academic work	44	62	17	2	2
	35%	49%	13%	2%	2%
Ability to troubleshoot personal technology failures	31	53	38	3	2
	24%	42%	30%	2%	2%
Difficulty with the institution's technology and/or technology support infrastructure.	10	38	47	21	7
	8%	31%	38%	17%	6%
Support to make the transition to college	10	26	62	21	5
	8%	21%	50%	17%	4%

INSTRUCTOR EXPERIENCE

H-Q58. What expectations are set with the faculty who teach these courses? Please check all that apply.

Teachers will develop a pedagogically sound online course	102	81%

Teachers will provide reasonable support to students for succeeding in the online environment	107	85%
Online office hours will be required	36	29%
On-campus responsibilities will exist	83	66%
Certain kinds of/a certain amount of interaction with students are expected	77	61%
Faculty will be observed one or more times during a term	28	22%
Other, please specify	18	14%

H-Q59. What types of orientation/training activities, if any, do faculty receive for these courses? Please check all that apply.

Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)	19	15%
On-going workshops on various aspects of a Content Management System (e.g., Blackboard®)	93	76%
Use of a dedicated instructional designer (at the department and college levels)	36	29%
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)	13	11%
Mandatory training	39	32%
Optional training	65	53%
Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members	39	32%
Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online	5	4%
Other, please specify	18	15%

H-Q60. How many hours is your training program, if you have one?

Between 1 and 5 hours	33	27%
Between 6 and 10 hours	17	14%
More than 10 hours	24	20%
We don't have a training program	35	29%
Other, please specify	13	11%
Total	122	100%

H-Q61. Do you receive payment for training?

Yes	14	11%
No	85	69%
We don't have a training program	25	20%
Total	124	100%

H-Q62. If you answered yes to question 61, approximately how much do you earn per hour?

H-Q63. Rank the parts of training that you find most and least helpful (most helpful being 1)?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Summer institute for online teaching (run each summer and open to teachers across the campus)	9	4	0	9	4	0	9	4
	23%	10%	0%	23%	10%	0%	23%	10%
On-going workshops on various aspects of a Content Management System (e.g., Blackboard®)	7	14	10	7	14	10	7	14
	13%	26%	19%	13%	26%	19%	13%	26%
Use of a dedicated instructional designer (at the department and college levels)	8	7	8	8	7	8	8	7
	15%	13%	15%	15%	13%	15%	15%	13%
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)	0	1	3	0	1	3	0	1
	0%	2%	7%	0%	2%	7%	0%	2%
Mandatory training	12	7	7	12	7	7	12	7
	21%	12%	12%	21%	12%	12%	21%	12%
Optional training	10	7	13	10	7	13	10	7
	16%	11%	21%	16%	11%	21%	16%	11%
Mentoring/shadowing with experienced faculty members	10	19	12	10	19	12	10	19
	14%	28%	17%	14%	28%	17%	14%	28%
Reduced teaching load during first term teaching online	20	16	8	20	16	8	20	16
	28%	23%	11%	28%	23%	11%	28%	23%

H-Q64. What other activities, if any, are essential for faculty training for online writing instruction?

H-Q65. Rate what you perceive to be the importance of the qualities below for an online writing instructor at your institution:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting	Very important	Important	Not important	Very unimportant

the option.				
Overall comfort with technology	92	29	2	0
	75%	24%	2%	0%
Technical proficiency with the interfaces available at our campus	74	45	4	0
	60%	37%	3%	0%
Advanced web design skills	1	26	77	18
	1%	21%	63%	15%
Ability to critically analyze available technologies and select the best ones for a pedagogical purpose	47	59	13	4
	38%	48%	11%	3%
Ability to establish a presence online	69	49	4	1
	56%	40%	3%	1%
Skills in designing "lectures" delivered in a number of modes (aural, visual, textual) and media (PowerPoint, digital video, learning module)	32	60	27	3
	26%	49%	22%	2%
Skills in developing clear sequences of assignments well in advance of deadlines	93	23	6	0
	76%	19%	5%	0%
Skills in moderating online discussion boards	49	61	12	1
	40%	50%	10%	1%
Skills in designing and grading multimodal projects	39	42	35	6
	32%	34%	29%	5%
Skills in teaching rhetorical principles	80	34	8	1
	65%	28%	7%	1%
Skills in teaching meta-cognition or reflection	69	45	8	0
	57%	37%	7%	0%
Skills in using an archive of course materials effectively to promote learning	51	60	10	1
	42%	49%	8%	1%
Ability to adapt course plan to different learning styles	60	50	9	3
	49%	41%	7%	2%
Willingness to follow-up with students promptly	102	19	1	0
	84%	16%	1%	0%

Familiarity with theoretical rationale for online learning	51	58	12	2
	41%	47%	10%	2%
Participation in an active community of online teachers	26	52	36	6
	22%	43%	30%	5%

H-Q66. What do you like the most about teaching blended/hybrid writing courses? Please check all that apply.

Flexibility in scheduling	71	60%
No commute	25	21%
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	66	56%
Other, please specify	44	37%

H-Q67. What do you like the least about teaching blended/hybrid writing courses? Please check all that apply.

Anticipating student problems	27	22%
Dealing with technical problems	81	67%
Managing large class size that is sometimes given to online teachers because physical space is not a limitation	33	27%
Other, please specify	33	27%

H-Q68. How, if in any way at all, do you (or your institution) address any of the issues highlighted in previous questions?

H-Q69. Rate the degree to which you believe that each of the following factors contributes or detracts from instructors' willingness to teach blended/hybrid courses:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Increases willingness to teach online very significantly	Increases willingness to teach online significantly	Does not increase willingness to teach online	Decreases willingness to teach online significantly	Decreases willingness to teach online very significantly
Flexibility in teaching schedule	45	55	20	0	2
	37%	45%	16%	0%	2%
Reduced commuting	34	53	30	0	2
	29%	45%	25%	0%	2%
Students' learning	21	39	51	10	1
	17%	32%	42%	8%	1%
Learning new pedagogical strategies	16	57	35	9	6
	13%	46%	28%	7%	5%
Using new technologies	19	49	25	16	12
	16%	40%	21%	13%	10%

Linking course materials to other Web resources	16	45	48	9	5
	13%	37%	39%	7%	4%
Time/money compensation for learning a sophisticated set of skills, theories, and technologies	17	40	44	7	10
	14%	34%	37%	6%	8%
Time/money compensation for development of course	25	42	32	10	9
	21%	36%	27%	8%	8%
Reliability of campus technology	31	34	28	24	6
	25%	28%	23%	20%	5%
Input and support of campus technology	34	38	31	16	4
	28%	31%	25%	13%	3%
Level of appreciation/respect from colleagues	16	39	50	8	6
	13%	33%	42%	7%	5%
Establishing an online presence as an instructor	19	37	54	8	3
	16%	31%	45%	7%	2%
The organization and planning involved in teaching online	16	26	24	39	17
	13%	21%	20%	32%	14%
Finding satisfaction in the online interactions with students	23	47	33	9	8
	19%	39%	28%	8%	7%
Use of common syllabus/curriculum	11	22	51	14	22
	9%	18%	42%	12%	18%

H-Q70. If you had a choice, would you continue teaching online?

Yes	93	75%
No	12	10%
I don't know	19	15%
Total	124	100%

H-Q71. If you answered yes or no to question 70, please explain why.

H-Q72. In what context do you most prefer to teach writing?

Totally online	2	2%
Face-to-face	28	22%
Blended/hybrid	48	38%
I am open to any or all of these contexts	47	38%

Total	125	100%

H-Q73. Would you recommend teaching online to colleagues who do not teach online?

Yes	57	46%
No	21	17%
I don't know	45	37%
Total	123	100%

H-Q74. If you answered yes or no to question 73, please explain why.

CCCC's PRACTICE

H-Q75. What can CCCC do for you/your institution? Please check all that apply.

Create statement of best practices	100	83%
Indentify and/or create instructional materials for faculty	77	64%
Publicize need for training	68	57%
Legitimize online teaching	67	56%
Create instructional workshops at CCCC conferences and events	79	66%
Other, please specify	18	15%

H-Q76. What do you think is most needed in a statement of best practices for online writing instruction? Why?

H-Q77. If you are willing to participate in a follow-up phone call or email exchange, please provide your phone number and/or email address.