

CHAPTER 6

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS FOR OWI

Deborah Minter

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Moving writing instruction online returns WPAs to many of the same questions they have faced historically, such as class size, appropriate support for teaching and learning, and equitable compensation. This chapter proposes that students and teachers are best served by informed WPAs who have developed an awareness of the challenges and opportunities unique to OWI. *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* (CCCC OWI Committee, 2013) and its OWI principles and example effective practices can help WPAs to conceptualize the work and resources required to mount effective online writing courses.

Keywords: budget, class size, compensation, literacy load, material conditions of teaching, resources, student preparation, writing program administration/administrator (WPA)

For WPAs, *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* (CCCC OWI Committee, 2013) will feel familiar in its call for attention to class size, equitable compensation, support for teacher development, and the availability of services that support developing writers such as OWLs and on-call reference librarians. These are not new concerns. Neither are attending to and advocating for writing teacher development, equitable compensation, fair and meaningful assessments of teaching effectiveness, and attending to and advocating for the kinds of broader institutional resources necessary for students' development as writers and learners, especially those resources that support contingent faculty (see Chapter 7). Still, as writing programs choose (or, in some cases, feel pressure) to move writing instruction online, *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* can help WPAs to conceptualize the work and resources required to mount the kind of OWCs that support teachers and students in doing their best work.

Arguably, the responsibility to make OWI an accessible and inclusive experience for both faculty and students rests with the institutions' WPAs, as OWI

Principle 1 advocated (p. 7). Although WPAs often have little direct access to necessary purse strings, they are positioned to make arguments to upper administrators (e.g., deans, division heads, and provosts) for resources that can increase access points of access for students and faculty. With these resources, WPAs have the power to engage in such activities as buying hardware and software for faculty to use to teach OWCs from their campus offices and potentially for teaching from remote locations, hiring Work Study students to compose documentation specific to OWI courses, and conducting research about the issues that faculty and students—especially because of disability, learning, linguistic, or socio-economic issues—have accessing OWI equipment. Similarly, WPAs or those administrators in charge of distance education need to conduct assessment of the program’s writing courses; this assessment should help the administrator understand who is being well served by the program, which populations want to participate in OWCs but struggle to access them, and what issues prevent student access. Then, WPAs need to work with those involved with online education at their respective institutions to determine how best to address these issues. WPAs, as this chapter details, can proactively respond to OWI Principle 1 by addressing other principles in *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* (CCCC OWI Committee, 2013).

THE CRITICAL CONCERN OF CLASS SIZE

Among the 15 OWI principles for OWI, class size—maintaining an enrollment cap of 15-20—is identified as “the most effective practice the Committee can imagine.” With OWI Principle 9 (pp. 20-21), this effective practices document takes its place among a number of position statements from professional organizations affiliated with the teaching of college-level English, all of which call for writing course caps in this range (see, for example, the CCCC’s *Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing*, originally issued in 1966, updated in 1989, & revised in 2013; also see the Association of Departments of English’s “ADE Guidelines for Class Size and Workload,” first issued in 1974 and updated in 1992).

Alice Horning’s (2007) “The Definitive Article on Class Size” is particularly useful for its overview of extant research to support the value of low student-faculty ratios in writing classes. Horning cited, for example, Richard Light’s (2001) finding that the amount of writing required for a course is the best predictor of students’ level of engagement with the course and argues that extensive writing “cannot reasonably be assigned, read, and responded to in large sections” (p. 12). She juxtaposed Light’s study with Alexander W. Astin’s (1993) *What Matters in College*, which reported that a low student-faculty ratio positively

impacts student satisfaction and degree completion (p. 12). In addition to this sweeping look at contemporary qualitative accounts of practices that contribute to college student success, Horning (2007) provided a review of research focused specifically on class size in college writing courses. Perhaps the most provocative piece of evidence she provided was a brief overview of an institutional study conducted at Arizona State University (ASU), where they analyzed the impact of a reduced writing course cap of 19. In short, lowered class-sizes correlated with improved pass rates for ASU's FYW courses (i.e., English 101 and English 102), improved retention, reduced numbers of student withdrawals or failures from the courses, and "improved student evaluations for all ranks of faculty teaching ASU's 100-level courses" (Glau as cited in Horning, 2007). Thus, synthesizing extant research that demonstrates relationships among smaller class-size, college student success, and teaching effectiveness, Horning provided several lines of argument for the benefits of smaller class-sizes.

At a recent meeting of the CCCC, June Griffin and I (2012; see also 2013) offered an additional argument for the benefit of lower course caps in OWCs particularly. Reporting on our study of the sheer quantity of reading and writing required in a set of comparable FYW courses, we compared the quantity required in fully online versions of the course with the amount required in face-to-face versions of the course. We called this aspect of the writing course the "literacy load"—suggesting its relationship to other kinds of loads associated with the intellectual and material work of learning and teaching, such as "cognitive load" and "work load." Comparing the amount of reading required of students in four FYW courses—all governed by the same course guidelines with the same enrollments (although with different instructors and syllabi), we found that the reading load of the fully online classes was nearly triple that of the on-site, face-to-face classes. This finding is all the more remarkable considering that enrollment in the two OWCs averaged only 15 students while enrollment in the onsite courses averaged 21.

Although preliminary, this research underscores the need for careful attention not only to the amount of assigned reading (and writing, to the degree that it, too, must be read and addressed) in an OWC, but also to the amount of reading required to participate in class activities and embedded in the way the course is conducted online. Indeed, Scott Warnock (2009) estimated that he routinely writes more than 30,000 words per class (p. 6); he and the students are responsible for reading these words and many more. As we (Griffin & Minter, 2013) have written elsewhere: "These initial findings lead us to worry that the literacy load of online classes as they are often configured can overtax students, particularly academically underserved and ELL students" (p. 153). More specific to the concerns raised in this chapter, each additional student in an OWC functions

like a multiplier in terms of other students' reading loads; and, when a majority of the course is conducted via text, an increase of only a few students can mean substantially more reading for both students and teachers. WPAs charged with overseeing OWCs as well as teachers interested in designing effective OWCs will want to attend to the literacy demands inherent in OWC design. As Beth L. Hewett (2015a) suggested in *Reading to Learn and Writing to Teach: Literacy Strategies for Online Writing Instruction*, strategic ways to address such literacy demands are through writing assignments that also address reading-to-learn skills, careful teacher-writing practices that attend to semantic integrity, and thoughtfully considered overall reading loads. Hence, OWI Principle 9 is worth serious discussion at any institution where OWI is used for teaching writing (pp. 20-21).

NEGOTIATING STUDENT PREPARATION

Reporting on the results of the Babson group's tenth annual survey of on-line learning for *Inside Higher Ed*, Doug Lederman (2013) noted that while enrollment in college-level online courses seemed to be slowing, growth in that segment of postsecondary education still outpaced growth in higher education more generally across the same period of time. In fact, the survey suggested that more than 6.7 million students (or nearly a third of all students enrolled in postsecondary education) in fall 2011 were enrolled in at least one online course for college credit. All of this comes as welcome news to those who see promise in online learning's potential to improve educational access for groups who have been traditionally underrepresented in college classrooms (see Chapter 10, for example).

If online instruction can alleviate a few of the practical challenges (e.g., lack of childcare and unreliable transportation) that interfere with some students' completion of face-to-face college courses, recent research suggests that online courses do not yet serve all populations of students equally well. Researchers Di Xu and Shanna Smith Jaggars (Community College Research Center, 2013) recently mined a dataset of more than 40,000 community and technical college students enrolled across 500,000 courses in the state of Washington. Analyzing correlations between student attributes such as gender, age, ethnicity, previous academic performance and students' ability to adapt to online classes, the researchers found that while students generally struggle in their efforts to adapt to online classes, "males, younger students, students with lower levels of academic skill, and Black students were likely to perform particularly poorly in online courses relative to their performance in face-to-face courses" (p. 19). In addition, analysis of student adaptability by discipline revealed the greatest negative effect

for persistence and course grade in English classes (p. 20), the area in which OWI seeks to excel. The stakes of failing to deliver on the apparent promise of online learning only increase as post-secondary institutions come under increasing public scrutiny for disappointing retention and graduation rates.

Although poor retention and graduation rates can be trailing indicators—an aggregate after-the-fact indication that students were struggling academically—my own institution (University of Nebraska-Lincoln) along with many others attend to “D, F, W rates,” a term that refers to the percentage of students who withdraw from a course or earn grades below a C in a given semester (see Lang & Baehr, 2012, whose essay detailed an administratively-mandated study of D, F, W rates in writing courses at their institution). A survey of online writing teachers conducted by the CCCC OWI Committee (2011a & 2011b) found 40 of 156 respondents reporting drop-out rates in their OWCs of between 21% and 40%—a finding that should concern any WPA or higher level-administrator poised to begin or expand offerings of OWCs. The percentages reported in these surveys were anecdotal and may have been made off the cuff, thus not reflecting the actual percentages, which easily could be higher for some institutions and student populations. Clearly, then, administrators need to give serious attention to the support required to ensure that teachers and learners are empowered to build successful OWCs to which students can commit and in which they can thrive.

OWI Principles 10 and 11 (pp. 21-24) addressed two important and often overlooked elements of support that are necessary as institutions press to capitalize on the prevalence and potential of online learning. Specifically, OWI Principle 10 advocates that Institutions (and the English or writing programs housed within them) should prepare students and teachers for the technological and pedagogical components that are unique to OWI (pp. 21-23). For example, while time management is a skill that many students have not yet mastered by the time they enter college, the particular challenges of time-management in online courses might surprise and disadvantage some students. As Warnock (2009) observed: “The lack of f2f time in an online class can be a danger for some students. They don’t have to go to class several times a week, so they may allow course work to slide away ... and then find themselves in trouble” (p. 143). Careful course design can address this kind of challenge. Yet, if instructors—especially the ubiquitous contingent faculty (see Chapter 7) often charged with teaching FYW—are not included in professionalization opportunities, this careful design may not always occur. For example, teachers can learn how to space their major and minor assignments in ways that maintain a scaffold while engaging students with interesting, connected weekly or ongoing assignments (see Chapter 2). They also can build redundancy into the OWC that helps to keep

students on track and teaches them ways of managing their time (see Chapter 4).

Many course developers opt for a general orientation to online learning, typically with the institution's LMS in mind. Online instructional design consultants at my own institution have developed an orientation to online learning that easily is customized at the program, course, or instructor levels. Such an orientation is designed to prepare students for online learning and to show them how to succeed with routine aspects of the course (e.g., accessing course assignments on the LMS, submitting formal writing to the instructor for response, communicating publicly with the class and privately with the instructor or individual class-members, and accessing technical support); this preparation acclimates students to the particular online environment they will be using. It clearly is important to have this orientation available in advance of the start of the semester because it can function to alert students who may have under-conceptualized the work of learning online or misunderstood the challenges of accessing the course through the computers or mobile devices available to them. It provides students with some information about potential access challenges, as detailed in OWI Principle 1 (p. 7; see also Chapters 1, 8, 9, 10, & 16), and (hopefully) it offers them hands-on education-based practice with the needed digital tools. With such an orientation, students can seek help, adjust schedules to give themselves sufficient time to do their online course work, or withdraw before such challenges negatively impact their finances or academic record.

Certainly, the orientation as a means of supporting students' success in OWCs is not the only available mechanism, but it provides a compelling example of how one practice—rarely a significant aspect of onsite, face-to-face writing classrooms—can have important implications as the course moves online. Second, it suggests how a WPA might leverage support for something the program needs by demonstrating its importance to student success and (depending on design) its capacity to be customized for other units across campus. Third, preparedness for full participation—and an opportunity for follow-up prior to the start of the course if a student identifies a barrier—is crucial to developing an online learning environment in which all students can participate fully. In that way, a general orientation to online learning also can support the development of a vibrant and participatory online community, as argued with OWI Principle 10 (pp. 21-23). To take an example from my own teaching, I prepared an online graduate course in the university's LMS, a central feature of which was going to be threaded discussion. Because the number of students was relatively small and I had worked with all of them in earlier onsite courses or professional development offerings, I did not think to include an orientation to the course. Early in the first week of the semester, one student with a visual impairment alerted me to the fact that her screen-reader was unable to accurately translate the threaded

discussion as housed in the LMS. Working with the Services for Students with Disabilities Office on solving this problem was going to take some time—now, almost a week into the semester—and more time would impact her ability to join and shape the class’ online community. We were able, as a class, to switch quickly to a social media tool that was accessible for this student and would allow most of the same work, but I could have eliminated what was a stressful experience for the student—a fundamental concern represented in OWI Principle 1— simply by adapting the online orientation and posting it in advance of the course (p. 7).

OWI Principle 10 asked for more than a general introduction to online learning for students however. It stated that OWI students should receive adequate preparation by both the institution and their teachers for the “unique technological and pedagogical components of OWI” (p. 21). To this end, it is the responsibility of WPAs to assist teachers in developing assignments or other orientation methods that help students see how to use the LMS, for example, in the OWC as opposed to in an online math or history course. The OWC often makes use of designated sites for placing course content, as would other disciplinary courses. It goes beyond posting content, however, by asking students to create content through their writing. Hence, the OWC might use such LMS sites as whole-class discussion areas that are public to the class and the teacher, private student-to-teacher writing spaces for such writing as journals or questions about an assignment or writing strategy, private/public spaces for peer response where both teacher and a small group might write and read, email for redundancy or class reminders, synchronous chat for time-sensitive consultations, and the like. Indeed, an OWC likely will more fully and possibly more creatively use the LMS than other disciplinary courses. With attention to access and inclusivity per OWI Principle 1 (p. 7), OWI teachers may even engage other software, as Chapter 14 argues, if the LMS simply cannot respond to a pedagogical/rhetorical need. For these reasons, students need to understand the online components of the OWC as writing course spaces and communicative venues beyond general online learning and time management strategies.

Outside of inadequate student preparation, an impediment to developing robust online classroom community that nourishes students’ growth as writers is lack of access to the resources frequently available to on-campus students. According to the same CCCC OWI Committee surveys (2011a & 2011b), only 45% of the respondents indicated that online students at their institution had access to online, asynchronous appointments with a writing center or OWL tutor. The figure dropped to 20% for respondents whose institutions offered students the opportunity for an OWL appointment in real-time. OWLs provide support on multiple levels, as Chapter 5 discusses, and their presence is crucial

to students in OWCs, particularly those in fully online settings.

In the same CCCC OWI Committee surveys, availability of librarians for students in OWCs was somewhat better but still troubling: 57% of respondents reported that online writing students at their institutions had access to asynchronous exchanges with a librarian—a figure that dropped to 38% for those offering access to libraries for real-time appointments. As OWI Principle 13 suggested, online writing students should have access to the same support resources as onsite students in the same program; and, they should have access to those resources through online/digital media as consistent with the online learning environment of the class (pp. 26-28). This means that WPAs need to allocate funds and other resources toward helping their online students achieve parity with their onsite peers. Certainly, as OWI Principle 13 stated, online students also should be eligible to use any of the on-campus or face-to-face support (just as onsite students should be allowed to access online support)—but resources that are only accessible for those who can physically walk into an onsite center disadvantages students who chose an online course precisely because of the challenges posed by a requirement to be physically present onsite.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR OWI

Concerns for access to the kinds of resources that support developing writers and for the structures that sponsor productive writing communities and literacy education—these are not simply abstract questions for WPAs. Indeed, WPAs routinely map new developments in research on writing and literacy learning onto the specific features of their individual writing programs as housed within the specific institutional contexts of their colleges and universities. In considering a move to (or expansion of) OWI, WPAs might pose the following questions for programmatic or departmental discussion and resolution:

- What do we want to accomplish by moving writing courses from onsite to online settings? Would hybrid or fully online OWCs—or both—work best to meet such goals?
- What goals are specific to the writing curriculum at this institution and how might we move that work online effectively?
- What opportunities become available for students and teachers if the courses move online?
- What access and inclusivity concerns do our particular student populations bring to learning to write using digital technologies?
- What abilities and prior knowledge do students at this institution typically bring to the writing classroom? Conversely, what will they need to learn to succeed and thrive in online settings for writing instruction?

- What pedagogical challenges do teachers face as the writing course moves online? How will the WPAs learn what these specific challenges are?
- What support for online learning is this institution already prepared (or willing to commit) to offer students and teachers?

These questions connect intimately to the questions of OWI program development and faculty professionalization discussed in Chapter 12. As such, before moving to OWI or as a mid-course assessment or corrective, these two chapters can be read together.

While WPAs engage the kinds of questions posed above, focused predominantly on student learning, they necessarily are concerned with the material conditions of teaching—with the extent to which the institution supports and rewards teaching, writing teacher development, the issues of full-time versus part-time instructors, and the kind of sustainable and meaningful assessment practices that ensure quality instruction. This focus drives such related questions as:

- Does this institution provide reasonable compensation for the teaching of writing such that it is likely to provide reasonable compensation to teachers as they build-out online offerings for the institution?
- What challenges might teachers face as the writing classroom moves online?
- What support for online teaching does this institution offer? How would that support need to be modified to develop a strong OWI program?
- What is the ratio of full-time to part-time writing teachers, and how would that ratio be represented in a movement to OWI?
- What strategies are best suited to helping this program collect data on how readily students are reaching the learning goals of our program and/or campus as instruction moves online?
- What assessment focus can provide meaningful insight on students' learning experience, bring the teachers in this program together and be cycled back on OWI in ways that will improve the experience and/or render visible the kinds of pedagogical support that would advance the goals of the program?

A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI (CCCC OWI Committee, 2013) called for equitable compensation spelled out by OWI Principle 8 (pp. 19-20), as well as appropriate professional development to grow pedagogies best suited for the online environment and teaching evaluation practices for the purposes of determining and rewarding high quality teaching as explained by OWI Principle 7 (pp. 17-19). To these ends, *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* took its place

among a number of professional statements that have sought to articulate the intellectual and ethical principles at stake in compensating writing teachers for their labor, even as shifting technological landscapes have brought new possibilities and demands.

For WPAs, initiating or expanding OWI likely means revisiting and potentially re-evaluating the matter of workload and compensation. OWI Principle 8 urged that teachers should be compensated for time spent developing courses and for recognition that teaching writing online is initially time-consuming (pp. 19-20). One example of an effective practice, then, is to compensate first-time teachers with some form of additional pay or reduced teaching load. Equally important in minimizing the overload associated with starting up an online course is to be certain, as an administrator, that policies and support networks are in place to minimize additional and unhelpful pressures. For example, policies and practices that ensure the timely assignment of online courses to instructors and a clear articulation of how online courses count in the instructor's overall teaching load are critical to teachers' professional well-being. It is important to ensure that a network of support structures exists: IT, library, and OWL support should be available 24/7 for students and teachers while the class is underway. Such a network should be established in advance—versus identified on-the-fly using the code-and-fix approach identified and problematized in Chapter 12—allowing teachers to focus on conducting the course. In addition, writing programs should have clearly understood intellectual property policies governing ownership of the course site and teaching materials that individual instructors develop. Such consideration is especially important for part-time faculty, many of whom teach multiple online courses while seeking to establish themselves as marketable scholars (see Chapter 7). Although not always possible practically, a program's intellectual property policy ideally will have the collective agreement of the program's teachers.

Online writing teachers also should have opportunities for formative and summative assessment comparable to what onsite classroom teachers enjoy. So, for example, if onsite teachers can assume that their course materials are being read and assessed by experienced onsite classroom teachers, then online teachers also should have the opportunity to have their teaching materials and OWI interactions reviewed by experienced online writing teachers. However, while the archival nature of OWI interactions may make it seem like a good idea to review an OWC several times during a full semester, in reality such intense scrutiny—unless applied also to onsite writing courses or codified as the most effective strategy for assessing OWCs—can be intimidating to OWI teachers and onerous for the few people in the writing program considered experienced enough to do the evaluations (also see Chapter 4). The goal is to provide support

for OWI teachers fully, equitably, but not punitively. To this end, course evaluations should be reviewed, if necessary, to ensure that the questions posed there provide insight into crucial elements of the OWC (e.g., disabled-accessible and effective course site design) as well as broader questions about pedagogical effectiveness. Processes for collecting student evaluations should not disadvantage online teachers. So, for example, if a WPA discovers differential rates of response in students' evaluations of onsite and online courses, efforts should be made to mitigate that difference as much as possible.

ADVOCATING FOR RESOURCES

One of the vexing truths of online courses at my own institution and others is that developing and offering them is incentivized financially. Thus, in addition to pedagogical or philosophical motivations to develop online courses, my institution has created a small financial incentive to do so. While course development grants (paid to faculty who are willing to develop and teach an online course) are no longer centrally funded, a small portion of the tuition generated by the course each time it is taught is returned to both the unit providing instruction and the college in which that unit is housed. Reporting on a study conducted by the Council of Colleges of Arts & Sciences (CCAS), Paul McCord (2013) suggested that some form of revenue-sharing on distance courses is fairly common. With 100 of its more than 700 member institutions responding to a survey on "Distributed Education: Status, Concerns and Consequences," roughly 40% reported a significant or critical concern with units' growing reliance on the money earned through distance course revenue (McCord, 2013, p. 19). This example of revenue-sharing illustrates, again, the ways in which issues that have historically concerned WPAs can take new forms as writing instruction moves online. In my home department, while onsite writing courses are budget-neutral, online courses generate revenue for the department. Moreover, at many institutions, revenue-sharing is only profitable if contingent faculty teach the course and/or it enrolls at least several dozen students. These ideal conditions can be difficult to achieve when most writing programs try to follow best practices and keep their class caps on their writing courses below 30 students, or ideally closer to 20 students, and when the most qualified faculty to teach OWCs are full-time and tenure-track faculty.

Questions of compensation, stipend-bound professional development, or paid programmatic assessment work quickly lead to questions of budget. How might WPAs, as a practical matter, prepare to seek additional funds from upper administration to support the cost of initiating or expanding online course offerings? The following are questions that I have used in preparing additional

budget requests:

- What aspect of the college's mission is served by this work? How highly valued—in this moment—is this part of the mission?
- What strategic priorities are addressed by this work? Are those priorities of primary or secondary importance at this institutional moment?
- If successful, what noticeable impact will this work have?
- What is the potential for success? (Is there evidence of buy-in from those who are immediately involved in the work? Is there evidence of a sound, executable plan? Is there evidence of broad support from those inside and outside the program?)
- What will this initiative cost? What kind of money (i.e., one-time, short-term, or—the most difficult to commit—permanent money)? What is getting leveraged?
- What is the return on investment and what form will that return take (e.g., increased revenue, increased research opportunity, increased visibility within the institution, public recognition for progress toward its mission, and the like)? How long will it take to see that return?
- How is this responsibility substantially new—for teachers or for the program—not already accounted for in the unit's current budget?
- If this is a new responsibility, then given the budget model at this institution, how does one find money for new initiatives?

A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI (CCCC OWI Committee, 2013) carefully articulated with OWI Principle 3 the ways in which OWI represents substantially new work for writing programs, requiring developing some new pedagogies and theories and with OWI Principle 4 how to migrate and adapt existing pedagogies in significant ways to the OWC (pp. 12-15). It also addressed new forms of attention to learning in online environments and awareness of potential barriers to participation in online educational settings.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Larry Johnson, Samantha Adams Becker, V. N. Estrada Cummins, A. Freeman, and Holly Ludgate (2013), in *The NMC Horizon Report: 2013 Higher Education Edition*, identified six emerging technologies or practices with the greatest potential for impact and uptake in the contexts of higher education. This report is the result of research jointly conducted by the New Media Consortium (NMC) and the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative (ELI). The “six technologies to watch” are massive open online courses (MOOCs), tablet computing, games

and gamification, learning analytics, and—on what the report terms “the far-term horizon ... four to five years away from widespread adoption”—3D printing and wearable technology (Johnson et al., 2013, pp. 4-5). Among the key trends identified in the report is the rise of “openness” (i.e., open content, open resources; easy access) as a value: “As authoritative sources lose their importance, there is need for more curation and other forms of validation to generate meaning in information and media” (p. 7). Additional key trends included increasing interest in “new sources of data for personalizing the learning experience and for performance measurement”; and, it included the authors’ observation that “the role of educators continues to change”: “Educators are providing mentorship and connecting students with the most effective forums and tools to navigate their areas of study” (p. 8). When these new and experimental forms of online instruction are extended directly to OWI, they require a WPA’s attention. OWI Principle 6 addressed to this issue by placing them within the guidance of *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* regardless of their newness and lack of familiarity as writing pedagogies (pp. 16-17).

The NMC Horizon Report: 2013 Higher Education Edition (Johnson et al., 2013) report with its rhetoric of radical transformation returns us to the question at the opening of this chapter: Tasked with responsibility for developing effective and sustainable writing programs that are responsive to the needs of particular student-writers who are seeking educational opportunities from particular institutions, how might WPAs negotiate the needs of the program and the institution while navigating some of the heightened rhetoric surrounding online learning and the technologies that make it possible? Certainly *A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for OWI* (CCCC OWI Committee, 2013) has been developed with a view toward supporting WPAs in this work. The following list of recommendations, summarized from this chapter, is provided to offer additional support for WPAs as they work to build and advocate for OWCs that are accessible and effective:

- Class-size remains a critical concern for OWI (as it has been for onsite, face-to-face classes). If instructors choose to move routine elements of a writing course such as explanations of assignments, class discussions and informal “in-class” activities online *as text*, the sheer quantity of required reading increases dramatically. And the workload for students (not just teachers) increases with each additional student. Navigating large amounts of text in a course-site can undermine students’ chances of success, and some populations of students (those with less fluency in academic English; students with particular disabilities) are likely at higher risk.

- Student-writers need more than effective writing pedagogy to be successful in an online course. They require support for writing and research in the form of access to OWL tutors and librarians. They require support for navigating the technologies of writing and learning. They require guidance—in advance of the start of the course—regarding what technologies, capacities and time the course will demand.
- Student-writers have the greatest opportunity for success in online classes when teachers are well-supported—well trained, fairly compensated, and secure in the value of their intellectual work to the institution as demonstrated through fair and reasonable policies.
- In considering the move to OWI, WPAs should assess the educational and pedagogical value—for *their specific population of students and teachers*—of moving writing courses online. WPAs also should frankly assess the current level of support for online instruction on their campus and how that might need to be adjusted to address OWI on any scale.
- In advocating for the value of moving writing instruction online and for the resources necessary to do that work effectively, WPAs are well-served by the ability to explain how effective OWI contributes significantly to their institution's particular mission.

REFERENCES

- Association of Departments of English. (1992). *ADE guidelines for class size and workload for college and university teachers of English: A statement of policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.ade.org/policy/index.htm>
- Astin, Alexander W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2013). *Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting>
- CCCC OWI Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction. (2011a). *Fully online distance-based courses survey results*. Retrieved from <http://s.zoomerang.com/sr.aspx?sm=EAUpi15gkwWur6G7egRSXUw8kpNMu1f5gjUp01aogtY%3d>
- CCCC OWI Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction. (2011b). *Hybrid/blended course survey results*. Retrieved from <http://s.zoomerang.com/sr.aspx?sm=%2fPsFeeRDwfnalyyz4sV0qxkhh5Ry7O1NdnGH-CxIBD4%3d>
- CCCC OWI Committee for Effective Practices in Online Writing Instruction. (2013). *A position statement of principles and effective practices for online writ-*

- ing instruction (OWI)*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples>
- Community College Research Center. (2013, February). *Adaptability to online learning: Differences across types of students and academic subject areas*. (CCRC Working Paper No. 54). New York: Xu, Di & Jaggars, Shanna Smith.
- Griffin, June & Minter, Deborah. (2012, March). Expert views from student voices regarding fully online and hybrid OWI. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, MO.
- Griffin, June & Minter, Deborah. (2013). The rise of the online writing classroom: Reflecting on the material conditions of college composition teaching. *College Composition and Communication*, 65(1), pp. 140-161.
- Horning, Alice. (2007). The definitive article on class size. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 31(1/2), 11-34.
- Hewett, Beth L. (2015a). *Reading to learn and writing to teach: Literacy strategies for online writing instruction*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.
- Johnson, Larry, Adams Becker, Samantha, Cummins, N. Estrada, V., Freeman, A. & Ludgate, Holly. (2013). *NMC horizons report: 2013 higher education edition*. *The New Media Consortium*. Retrieved from <http://www.nmc.org/publications/2013-horizon-report-higher-ed>
- Lang, Susan & Baehr, Craig. (2012). Data mining: A hybrid methodology for complex and dynamic research. *College Composition and Communication*, 64(1), 172-194.
- Lederman, Doug. (2013). Growth for online learning. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/01/08/survey-finds-online-enrollments-slow-continue-grow#ixzz2cBTTcmFD
- Light, Richard J. (2001). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McCord, Paul. (2013). *Distributed education: Status, concerns and consequences*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccas.net/i4a/doclibrary/index.cfm?pageid=3667&showTitle=1>
- Warnock, Scott. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How and why*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.