



Reset, Refocus, Recharge!

Almost all professional golfers have a coach who works with them to improve their swing, short game, or even mental game. As good as you might be, there is always room for improvement. There are different golf courses—some with lots of water, some with lots of bunkers, some built for the long game, and some that are all about the short game. The point is, you have to tailor your game to each golf course, and you need help with that. Even when you know the course and have played it a bunch of times, you can always have surprises pop up. We see this with online course design too. You can have the best online course design and students can still get tripped up locating something they need.

What we like about this chapter is that Joseph Bartolotta, Anthony Yarbrough, and Tiffany Bourelle discuss instructional design theory that is centered via five steps: analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluate. The authors give administrators and faculty a chance to engage in more conversations about how the changing educational landscape (student population, technology, program goals, etc.) can be met with a more agile framework of iteration.

We like the focus on design in this chapter because it's not something that gets discussed often and many writing program leaders with little to no experience in OWI are often faced with designing online courses. Bartolotta et al.'s chapter gives program leaders a clear framework to use when thinking about design.

Chapter 12. Professional Development for Online Writing Instruction: The Place of Instructional Design

Joseph Bartolotta
HOFTSTRA UNIVERSITY

Anthony Yarbrough
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Tiffany Bouelle
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Abstract: This chapter describes ways to incorporate theories of instructional design into online writing practica and other professional development for online writing instruction. Specifically, we discuss creating an online training practicum (or professional development workshop) structured in a way that mimics the Collaborative Mapping Model (CMM) of instructional design, combined with Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, and Evaluate (AD-DIE) and Backward Design principles, where the teacher-trainer works with online writing instructors to create effective online writing instruction environments. In this model, trainees are immersed in a course guided by these methods while learning how to structure their own online courses using similar design approaches. This immersive model also suggests a constructivist approach to learning, guiding trainees to better understand how to facilitate a collaborative, active learning atmosphere for online student success.

Keywords: instructional design, training, Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, and Evaluate (ADDIE), Collaborative Mapping Model (CMM), backward design, program administration

Training writing instructors used to be a straightforward affair. In a time before learning management systems (LMSs) and online tools, administrators could get by with training instructors in creating assignments, scaffolding activities, and implementing best pedagogical practices in the writing classroom. As classrooms moved online, the work of designing the classroom environment fell more upon teachers themselves, many of whom had not been trained in delivering writing instruction online. It is no longer enough to simply be an instructor of writing; we must also curate digital classroom spaces for instruction within the parameters set by higher education institutions and online learning service providers. In other words, online writing instructors must be at once teachers and instructional

designers (Blythe, 2001). Without training, they were sent into design roles. We want to refocus on what training in instructional design for online writing instructors could look like and provide a framework that builds a training structure that gives instructors an eye for instructional design.

Scholars have long been calling for training in online writing instruction (OWI) pedagogy (Bourelle & Hewett, 2017; Cargile Cook, 2007; Hewett & Ehmann, 2004; Hewett & Powers, 2007), and the COVID-19 pandemic has made clear that training in online writing instruction will become an important part of professional development for *all* writing instructors. Indeed, in *Teaching Writing in the Twenty-First Century*, Beth Hewett, Tiffany Bourelle, and Scott Warnock (2022) argue that composition in the digital era means that all communication is multimodal and all teaching is online in some capacity, with instructors using an LMS and various media to teach within onsite, hybrid, remote, and fully asynchronous classrooms. This shift means administrators must balance theories and pedagogies of teaching writing with the newly essential tool of acuity toward digital instructional design. Many interwoven theories including content strategy (Borgman, 2019, 2020; Borgman & McArdle, 2019), web design (Spart, 2021), course mapping (Ambrose et al., 2010), backward design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), and the analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluate (ADDIE) model of instructional design (Morrison, 2010), as well as tools such as usability testing and user-centered design more broadly (Bartolotta et al., 2017; Bartolotta, 2021) offer useful ways to develop online writing classes. With all this in mind, how do writing administrators wade through theories of online pedagogy and course design to create a compact and trainable approach to preparing the next generation of online writing instructors?

Hewett et al.'s (2022) observation about the changing nature of online writing instruction indicates a clear need to reconceptualize training to include pairing instructional design methods with the best practices of online writing instruction. The PARS approach offers a workable framework to imagine what this sort of training can look like. This chapter discusses the “Strategic” element of PARS by offering a theoretical background for such training, as well as a “how-to” guide for administrators and instructors alike to follow when structuring similar training for online writing instructors based on their institutional context.

Theory and Practice

Online writing instruction scholarship varies in terms of approaches to creating curriculum, with Warnock (2009) suggesting instructors can migrate what they do in the onsite classroom to the online environment and Beth Hewett and Christa Ehmann Powers (2004) arguing that instructors need training in reconsidering their curricula for the online environment. However, scholars do agree that instructors must consider the needs of their students and what might work best for the context of their institutions before building their courses. In *Writing Together: Ten*

Weeks Teaching and Studenting in an Online Writing Course, Scott Warnock and Diana Gasiewski (2018) discuss the online writing class from both the instructor and student point of view. As Warnock's student, Gasiewski gives insight into the material, prompting Warnock to consider how his students interact with the course material; such insight provided in their collaborative book offers instructors a starting point for creating and potentially revising their online curriculum accordingly.

Curriculum design that considers the students' impressions and experiences is also in line with more recent scholarship on user-centered design in teaching, which calls for the need to consider all students and their access needs and challenges in the online space (Borgman, 2019; Borgman & Dockter, 2018). Another approach to student-centered design includes usability testing of online courses, where the instructor asks a student a series of questions regarding what they like in the course, what they don't like, what was useful, what wasn't—all to better understand how students are interacting with the material (Bartolotta et al., 2017). Similarly, Joseph Bartolotta (2021) offers a way for instructors to conduct their own usability testing with their own students using PARS as a lens to ground that approach.

In *Writing Together*, Warnock and Gasiewski (2018) posit that the approaches and suggestions they provide are “platform-neutral” (p. xix), arguing for an instructor's focus to remain on pedagogy, including the curriculum they build and the ways in which they interact with the students on a daily basis. We agree that developing one's pedagogy is perhaps the most important aspect of teaching, but we do want to extend the conversation to include the LMS, as we believe such platforms are never as neutral as we hope. For instance, in “Preparing for the Rhetoricity of OWI,” Kevin DePew (2015) argues for the rhetoricity of online education, asserting that instructors should never just use technology for technology's sake. We take this to mean that instructors need to carefully consider their courses and how they approach the curriculum, offering a variety of content that includes text, sound, video, animation, and so on (McClure & Mahaffey, 2021). The LMS inherently will impact how the course is delivered and how students interact with the material, depending on what resources or technologies are available through that platform. In what follows, we discuss how teacher-trainers can work with trainees to consider their pedagogies, how these pedagogies will translate to the online classroom, and further, how they can work within the constraints of the LMS to deliver the best possible content for student success.

Success can only be achieved when students have opportunities to interact with the curriculum, which can be affected by the constraints and affordances of the LMS. To build a successful online writing course, we suggest using instructional design approaches that allow for the consideration of the curriculum and how it works in conjunction with the LMS. Specifically, we discuss the instructional models of analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluate (ADDIE); the Collaborative Mapping Model (CMM); and backward design, combining the three to provide instructors with a comprehensive guide for considering course design. In “The Collaborative Mapping Model: Relationship Centered Instructional Design

for Higher Education,” Jason Drysdale (2019) notes that the ADDIE model has become “widely characterized as the traditional industry-standard model of instructional design” (p. 58). Since then, other instructional design methods have been developed, including CMM and backward design, focusing on the process of course design based on student achievement of course outcomes. In this text, we use ADDIE as the overarching structure of how we shape instructional design training, but we find CMM and backward design to be important concepts that add nuance to how we operationalize ADDIE in practice. When process and student learning outcomes are the focal points of composition, these methods are useful for online writing course development in that the collaborative, outcome-focused process aligns with what instructors will ask of their students in a typical composition course.

Table 12.1 Critical Concepts of Backwards Design, CMM, and ADDIE

Critical Concepts	
Backward Design	An approach to designing instruction where the designers start with the results they'd like to see (i.e., achieving student learning outcomes) and then work backward to find methods, activities, and resources that help achieve those results (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).
Collaborative Mapping Model (CMM)	An approach to instruction design where instructional designers work with instructors who are experts in their field to develop high-quality learning experiences for students (Drysdale, 2019). In this chapter, we recognize that not all institutions have the resources to make instructional designers available to instructors, so as we imagine it here, the teacher-trainer fills the role of instructional designer.
ADDIE	Standing for “analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluate,” ADDIE is a systematic approach to course design that allows administrators and instructors alike to strategize, assess, and revise instructional design (Morrison, 2010).

How-To: Structuring Professional Development

In this section, we offer ways that teacher-trainers—often writing program administrators or faculty who are well versed in online education principles—can create online teaching professional development opportunities that could be delivered through practicum courses or a series of workshops. We see the practicum class being a semester-long training endeavor; however, an intensive week-long workshop can also be structured if a practicum is not possible (we recommend compensating faculty for their time spent in the training workshops). Regardless of format, we suggest that the training is structured in such a way that mimics the CMM of instructional design. However, we know that many schools do not have instructional designers who are available for guidance in course design. In these cases, teacher-trainers must assume the mantle of instructional designers. In such training, the teacher-trainer works from the CMM to collaborate with instructors (the trainees)

to learn of their pedagogical goals and to use the LMS to facilitate learning. Trainees are essentially immersed in the CMM while building their own course maps and content, with immersion being an established effective practice for online training (Grover et al., 2017; Hewett & Ehmann, 2004). In other words, the trainees are immersed in an online course guided by these methods while learning how to structure their own online courses using similar design approaches. Through such hands-on experiences, trainees learn which instructional design strategies align best with their pedagogical goals, which strategies facilitate and hinder learning for their own students, and which strategies they can implement appropriately into their course design. This immersive model also suggests a constructivist approach to learning, guiding trainees to better understand how to facilitate a collaborative, active learning atmosphere for online student success.

During the practicum or workshops, trainees first develop their teaching pedagogies through readings and discussions of multimodal composition (Cui, 2019; DePalma & Alexander, 2015; Lauer, 2009; Palmeri, 2012; Shipka, 2011); multiliteracies (Khadka, 2019; New London Group, 1996; Serafini & Gee, 2017), including critical, functional, and rhetorical (Selber, 2004); and online writing pedagogies (Borgman & McArdle, 2019; DePew & Hewett, 2015). The training is practical as well, as the trainees also develop their online courses using their institutional LMS, aligning their course with their teaching pedagogies.

The first major project asks trainees to develop a multimodal assignment prompt they would teach in their online course, using the principles they learned through the readings and discussions. They are then asked to swap with a peer and complete each other's assignments as if they were students in the course. After completion of the project, they leave their peer feedback using screen capture technology (such as Camtasia), and both trainees then revise their assignment prompt and reflect on why they made the changes. The peer review, including all communication between trainees, is conducted in asynchronous formats. The entire project from start to finish gives the trainees not only insight into what students might experience when creating the project, but it also gives them experience creating video feedback, which scholars have suggested is important to establish teaching presence in the online classroom (Harris & Greer, 2021). Lastly, because the peer review is conducted through asynchronous formats, the trainees gain a greater sense of how peer review will work from a student perspective in their own online courses.

The final major project is the creation of an online course the trainees can teach from in subsequent semesters. Combining CMM with ADDIE and backward design principles, the teacher-trainer works with trainees to create a map of the course, starting with identifying the course outcomes and then imagining assignments that allow students to experience those outcomes. Through backward design, the trainees take their multimodal assignment prompt and draft out a map that outlines activities, quizzes, small writing assignments, and other exercises that support the assignment. The map links each activity to the institution's student learning outcomes for first-year writing. After outlining their

course map, trainees are then prompted to think through the specifics of their curriculum and how the LMS can best support these activities. In the following list, we provide an example of what the final project looks like through the AD-DIE model of instructional design. Although we are presenting this sequencing in a linear fashion, in reality, much of what the trainees are learning about comes throughout the course and is reiterated in the final project.

Analyze

Trainees should refer to evaluative data from previous and current iterations of the course; they should also research the students as the audience for their curriculum. Trainees consider their course prerequisites and, using available educational and demographic data, ascertain students' learning needs or technological challenges. This phase is arguably the most important, as trainees will be conducting analysis of their students before starting the course design, throughout their teaching of their course, and after the course is complete. We suggest trainees first research and understand the students at their institution and gather whatever data is available. For example, the University of New Mexico (where all of the authors of this text have taught) is a Hispanic-serving institution. Indeed, our outcomes for first-year writing reflect the need for students to understand and value languages, dialects, and registers beyond standardized English. Further, the university is experiencing high growth of students from across different backgrounds and cultures, with the university reporting in 2021 “a 26 percent increase in [Native American] students, a 65 percent increase in African American students, and a 7.5 percent increase in Hispanic students in the freshman class compared with last year. International student enrollment increased by 74 percent” (Jones, n.p.). Trainees are encouraged to choose readings from authors with diverse, intersectional backgrounds and interweave the readings throughout the course, not just in one unit, to illustrate that diversity, inclusion, and access are integral and valued aspects of the course (Diab et al., 2016).

Analysis should look not just at demographics but access as well. From the latest study of internet access in New Mexico, we know that at least 26 percent of residents throughout the state do not have access to broadband internet, and 15 percent do not have access to a computer (Duran, 2019). Aligning with our institutional and state data, trainees read Rochelle Rodrigo's (2015) “OWI on the Go” and Michael Gos' (2015) “Nontraditional Student Access to OWI” to learn how students access the course from their cell phones and how internet access might affect students' participation and overall success in the course. Trainees also read Daniel Anderson's (2008) “The Low-Bridge to High Benefits” and Joy Robinson et al.'s (2019) “State of the Field: Teaching with Digital Tools in the Writing and Communication Classroom,” where they learn to include low-bridge software as options for multimodal composition, as requiring high-bridge technology such as web design software can potentially marginalize students who have limited resources or internet bandwidth concerns.

In his article “A Broad-Based Multiliteracies Theory and Praxis for a Diverse Writing Classroom,” Santosh Khadka (2018) suggests that “[a] course or a course sequence crafted around such a framework i.e. around an array of literacies such as essayist, rhetorical, multimodal, visual, and intercultural, can encourage students to use their native cultural, linguistic and media resources in the class while preparing them for complex composition and communication challenges of the globalized world” (p. 96). While the practicum readings are structured around teaching first-year students the literacies Khadka includes, learning to integrate these into an online curriculum is often a tall order for trainees, especially when many of them are first-time instructors who have limited experience in onsite teaching let alone in online environments. Thus, it is imperative that the teacher-trainer works with the trainees to guide them in deconstructing readings, formulating their pedagogical goals, and connecting them to the course outcomes or objectives. Trainees must *analyze* why they are including certain readings and activities by considering their connection to course outcomes; we discuss fostering this connection in the next element of design.

Design

Trainees should plan their courses for optimal student engagement by creating opportunities for higher-order thinking strategies, peer-to-peer interaction, and variety in activities. The key word in the previous sentence is *plan*: In the design phase, trainees simply map their course through a bare-bones outline, aligning the course activities with their pedagogical goals, the course outcomes, and the students’ needs and challenges that were researched in the analyze phase. Using backward design principles, trainees create assignments that best assess evidence of understanding for outcomes on unit and course levels, and they consider the resources that may be required to complete each assignment. Trainees are encouraged to use the course calendar as the “map” that allows them to create a basic outline of the course. The calendar is constructed like a table, with columns for activities, outcomes, and points that can be attained for completion of each activity.

Trainees also learn the instructional design method of “chunking,” which is based on the idea that similar content should be grouped together in an online course (Schuessler, 2017). Trainees learn to chunk their courses into units that correspond to the major writing assignments; they also learn to break down each week in the unit into small, manageable tasks that work toward scaffolding the major writing assignments. This sketching also considers repetition and redundancy (Warnock, 2009), where trainees create units that look similar and follow the same format for each week (i.e., the first week in each unit asks students to take a short quiz on the assignment and corresponding readings; the second week in each unit asks students to participate in two discussion boards, and so on, where every unit follows this structure). Trainees can think of designing or chunking the content in the LMS to mimic what is found in the calendar map. In other words, each unit in the LMS should be clear, with the same number of weeks, aligning

with the calendar structure. Trainees will then take their outline and fully develop the activities in the next phase before adding the content to the LMS.

Develop

Trainees now create course materials using the insights generated in the previous steps, considering how the learning outcomes align with course material on semester, project, and weekly levels. At the develop phase, trainees are encouraged to create their content through word processing software for easy copy into the LMS. They draft out the wording for discussion boards, journals, small writing assignments, and quizzes—anything they sketched out in the previous phase. The teacher-trainer must encourage trainees to think from the student seat again and anticipate questions they might receive:

- Have they thought about how students will respond, including word count and number of times to peers in the course?
- Have they asked students to use a variety of multimedia throughout the course to establish student presence?
- Have they offered low-bridge options at all levels, not only at the small and major writing assignment level but also at the discussion board post level?

Trainees can work together to review each other's scaffolding, but the teacher-trainers, who are likely experienced online instructors, should guide trainees to reconsider their content before the next phase of implementation.

Implement

Trainees take what they drafted in the develop phase and build these activities in various ways. Teacher-trainers should give feedback on the course scaffolding during the develop phase so that during the *implement* phase, trainees are now reviewing the LMS and searching for effective tools to teach the course content. The current LMS at UNM is Canvas, and trainees are provided several workshops to help them learn the features before they start building (teacher-trainers should research their own institutions to learn of LMS training opportunities or find tutorials on their LMS to guide trainees). At the same time, trainees are also encouraged to find and create various media to teach course concepts. Trainees build their own tools, such as a video that goes along with an assignment prompt or a short screen capture that shows students how to use the library databases; they are also encouraged to find and utilize prebuilt tools such as videos on YouTube, podcasts, sound bites, and other media. Lastly, trainees listen to webinars such as “Equity-Minded and Culturally Affirming Teaching and Learning Practices in Virtual Learning Communities” by Frank Harris III and J. Luke Wood (2020), who posit that the online course should be a mirror for students to see themselves represented. At the implement phase, trainees find media that represents *themselves and their students*, based on the analyze phase that asked them to research the students at their institution.

Evaluate

Trainees should review the course curriculum and structure to ensure the connection of their course design to established best practices of online writing pedagogy. The data gathered in the *evaluation* phase can be used to inform both the current and subsequent iteration of the ADDIE cycle. At the end of the training workshop or practicum, trainees should evaluate the actuality of the online curriculum they developed with their initial analysis and course vision, making adjustments if necessary. At the end of the training course, trainees are encouraged to use whatever institutional accessibility and assessment protocols are appropriate, such as the newest rubric from the Online Learning Consortium (OLC) or Quality Matters (QM), to review their courses. If their courses do not meet the QM standards, they can develop an action plan for meeting the criteria and make changes before the semester begins. They are also encouraged to use the OLC's rubric, which discusses design with more depth than the QM rubric, focusing on use of white space, font size and color, flashiness of media used, and other design elements that must be considered when using various LMS templates.

While the teacher-trainer should guide trainees to review their own courses, they should also provide overall feedback on the course to ensure that the course meets the programmatic goals. They should observe the course during the semester in which it is taught. They can screencapture their "observation," noting what they see and where the instructor can make improvements. Teacher-trainers should share the screencapture observation with the instructor (no longer a trainee) and open up a conversation, allowing the instructor to respond and share their own impressions of the course (Bouelle et al., 2022; Mechenbier & Warnock, 2019). At this point, the instructor can develop an action plan for revising the course based on the teacher-trainer's feedback and whatever feedback they have received from students at the midway point. This plan can be expanded upon the conclusion of the semester. Collaboration should not stop when the training course is over; the teacher-trainer should continue mentoring the instructors, offering feedback and future training as program outcomes and the field of composition change and evolve. In actuality, evaluation should occur throughout the teaching of a course and not just at the end. Instructors can use surveys, real-time student feedback, course evaluations, and feedback from colleagues and administrators to determine whether the course is effectively meeting student learning needs, making course revisions as necessary.

Conclusion and Takeaways

Not all teacher-trainers will be well versed in instructional design theory, and they do not have to be. However, we hope that our chapter has provided a starting point for more discussions regarding integrating instructional design with online writing pedagogy, and we also hope that our chapter offers avenues for more scholarship

on the subject for readers who are interested in understanding how instructional design functions and how the LMS can work in conjunction to enhance, not hinder, online writing instruction. Finally, we hope our readers can take our model and reconsider their teacher-training practices; we also hope that instructors without access to similar training methods can utilize some of what we've provided to create their own curriculum with an eye toward designing their courses, using the LMS to its fullest digital capacity. As we noted at the beginning of this chapter, the pandemic made it so that all instructors have taught online in some fashion; therefore, it is now more important than ever to return to teacher training with, as we have argued, an eye toward instructional design theory to guide us to better understand how course design within an LMS works to facilitate learning.

References

- Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. Wiley & Sons.
- Anderson, D. (2008). The low bridge to high benefits: Entry-level multimedia, literacies, and motivation. *Computers and Composition*, 25(1), 40-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2007.09.006>
- Bartolotta, J. (2021). Usability testing for OWI instructors. In J. Borgman & C. McArdle (Eds.), *PARS in practice: More resources and strategies for online writing instructors* (pp. 305-315). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2021.1145.2.18>
- Bartolotta, J., Bourelle, T., & Newmark, J. (2017). Revising the online classroom: Usability testing for training online technical communication instructors. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 26(3), 287-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2017.1339495>
- Blythe, S. (2001). Designing online courses: User-centered practices. *Computers and Composition*, 18(4), 329-346. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S8755-4615\(01\)00066-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S8755-4615(01)00066-4)
- Borgman, J. (2019). Creating a user-centered experience in online courses through content strategy. In G. Getto, J. Labriolola, & S. Ruskiewicz (Eds.), *Content strategy in technical communication* (pp. 154-170). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429201141>
- Borgman, J. (2020). *An investigation of the content practices of online writing instructors and administrators* [Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University]. TTU DSpace Repository. <https://ttu-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2346/86509/BORGMAN-DISSERTATION-2020.pdf?sequence=1>
- Borgman, J., & Dockter, J. (2018). Considerations of access and design in the online writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 49, 94-105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2018.05.001>
- Borgman, J., & McArdle, C. (2019). *Personal, accessible, responsive, strategic: Resources and strategies for online writing instructors*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2019.0322>

- Bouelle, T., & Hewett, B. (2017). Training instructors to teach multimodal composition in online courses. In E. A. Monske & K. L. Blair (Eds.), *Handbook of research on writing and composing in the age of MOOCs* (pp. 348-369). IGI Global.
- Bouelle, T., Hewett, B. L., & Warnock, S. (2022). *Administering writing programs in the twenty-first century*. Modern Language Association of America.
- Boyd, D. (2016). What would Paulo Freire think of Blackboard: Critical pedagogy in an age of online learning. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 7(1), 165-185. <https://libjournal.uncg.edu/ijcp/article/view/1055>
- Cargile Cook, K. (2007). Immersion in a digital pool: Training prospective online instructors in online environments. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(1), 55-82. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1601_4
- Cui, W. (2019). Rhetorical listening pedagogy: Promoting communication across cultural and societal groups with video narrative. *Computers and Composition*, 54, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.102517>
- DePalma, M. J., & Alexander, K. P. (2015). A bag full of snakes: Negotiating the challenges of multimodal composition. *Computers and Composition*, 37, 182-200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2015.06.008>
- DePew, K. E. (2015). Preparing for the rhetoricity of OWI. In B. L. Hewett & K. E. DePew (Eds.), *Foundational practices of online writing instruction* (pp. 439-467). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0650.2.14>
- Diab, R., Godbee, B., Ferrel, T., & Simpkins, N. (2016). Making commitments to racial justice actionable. In F. Condon & V. A. Young (Eds.), *Performing antiracist pedagogy in rhetoric, writing, and communication* (pp. 19-39). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2016.0933.2.01>
- Drysdale, J. (2019). The Collaborative Mapping Model: Relationship-centered instructional design for higher education. *Online Learning*, 23(3), 56-71. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i3.2058>
- Duran, J. A. (2019). Bringing broadband to the desert: Rural New Mexico, fiberoptic cable, and electric utility cooperatives. *New Mexico Law Review*, 49(2), 384-401. <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmlr/vol49/iss2/9/>
- Gos, M. W. (2015). Nontraditional student access to OWI. In B. L. Hewett & K. E. DePew (Eds.), *Foundational practices of online writing instruction* (pp. 309-346). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0650.2.10>
- Grover, S. D., Cook, K. C., Harris, H. S., & DePew, K. E. (2017). Immersion, reflection, failure: Teaching graduate students to teach writing online. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 26(3), 242-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2017.1339524>
- Harris, F., & Woods, J. L. (2020). *Equity-minded and culturally affirming teaching and learning practices in virtual learning communities*. Center for Organizational Responsibility and Advancement (CORA), Northern Illinois University. <https://www.niu.edu/flexteaching/workshops/equity-in-virtual-learning.shtml>
- Harris, H. S., & Greer, M. (2021). Using multimedia for instructor presence in purposeful pedagogy-driven online technical writing courses. *Journal*

- of *Technical Writing and Communication*, 51(1), 31-52. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0047281620977162>
- Hewett, B. L., & Ehmann, C. (2004). *Preparing educators for online writing instruction: Principles and processes*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Hewett, B. L., & Ehmann, C. (2007). Guest editors' introduction: Online teaching and learning: Preparation, development, and organizational communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250709336574>
- Hewett, B., Bourelle, T., & Warnock, S. (2022). *Teaching writing in the twenty-first century*. Modern Language Association of America.
- Jones, B. (2021). *UNM new student numbers increase substantially*. The University of New Mexico. <https://news.unm.edu/news/unm-new-student-numbers-increase-substantially>
- Khadka, S. (2018). A broad-based multiliteracies theory and praxis for a diverse writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 47, 93-110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2017.12.002>
- Khadka, S. (2019). *Multiliteracies, emerging media, and college writing instruction*. Routledge.
- Lauer, C. (2009). Contending with terms: "Multimodal" and "multimedia" in the academic and public spheres. *Computers and Composition*, 26(4), 225-239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2009.09.001>
- McClure, C. I., & Mahaffey, C. (2021) Finding the sweet spot: Strategic course design using videos. In J. Borgman & C. McArdle (Eds.), *PARS in practice: More resources and strategies for online writing instructors* (pp. 101-117). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2021.1145.2.06>
- Mechenbier, M., & Warnock, S. (2019). A collaborative method for observing/evaluating online writing courses. *College Composition and Communication*, 71(1), A8-A16.
- Morrison, G. R. (2010). *Designing effective instruction* (6th ed.). Wiley & Sons.
- New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Palmeri, J. (2012). *Remixing composition: A history of multimodal writing pedagogy*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Robinson, J., Dusenberry, L., Hutter, L., Lawrence, H., Frazee, A., & Burnett, R. E. (2019). State of the field: Teaching with digital tools in the writing and communication classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.102511>
- Rodrigo, R. (2015). OWI on the go. In B. L. Hewett & K. E. DePew (Eds.), *Foundational practices of online writing instruction* (pp. 493-516). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0650.2.16>
- Schuessler, J. H. (2017). "Chunking" semester projects: Does it enhance student learning? *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 17(7), 115-120.
- Selber, S. A. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age*. Southern Illinois University Press.

- Serafini, F., & Gee, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Remixing multiliteracies: Theory and practice from New London to new times*. Teachers College Press.
- Shipka, J. (2011). *Toward a composition made whole*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Snart, J. (2021). Online writing instructors as web designers: Tapping into existing expertise. In J. Borgman & C. McArdle (Eds.), *PARS in practice: More resources and strategies for online writing instructors* (pp. 243-254). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2021.1145.2.14>
- Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How and why*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Warnock, S., & Gasiewski, D. (2018). *Writing together: Ten weeks teaching and studenting in an online writing course*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.