Stay Out of the Bunkers!

Often you can capitalMarize on how you have played courses in the past and use that knowledge when playing a new course that is similar. For example, if you play a course that is filled with bunkers one week, you can use that game plan to build a strategy for the next course that is swarming with bunkers. Why replicate work when you have already done the labor? Save that energy for the course . . . and maybe those bunkers!

We like this chapter because Catrina Mitchum takes a user-centered approach to pre-designed courses that allows faculty to put students first when it comes to designing and deploying content. Using Kenneth Burke's (1969) idea of rhetorical agency, Mitchum provides a framework to support faculty who might be used to just plugging and playing with whatever content they are forced to use. Mitchum reminds readers that pre-designed courses can be structures used to engage students with content rather than exclude and that they can aid instructors in powerful choices that promote agency and ownership.

Chapter 14. Promoting Instructor Agency and Autonomy with Pre-Designed Courses

Catrina Mitchum

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GLOBAL CAMPUS

Abstract: This chapter focuses on creating an online writing program ecology that uses pre-designed courses (PDCs) as a starting point. In order to be personal, accessible, responsive, and strategic (Borgman & McArdle, 2019), an online writing program that utilizes PDCs in an effort to reduce instructor labor needs to also consider instructor agency and autonomy. This chapter articulates instructor agency in terms of Kenneth Burke's (1969) rhetorical agency, with a specific focus on asking questions and acting on answers as a framework for creating an online writing program that uses PDCs as a space for instructor autonomy based on instructor choice (which can vary from one instructor to the next). We know that instructor autonomy is important in online writing instruction (OWI) because it creates a sense of ownership over course curriculum and connection to students and the larger program (Penrose, 2012). This chapter provides examples and samples to show and tell how that balance has been created in one particular context.

Keywords: Pre-designed courses, PDCs, shared curriculum, online writing program administrator, OWPA, instructor agency

Pre-designed courses (PDCs) have a bad reputation. This is largely due to their top-down nature. While they do have the potential to be a hindrance to instructors, students, and learning in general, if an ecology is built around them, there is a lot of potential for them to be a space of shared curriculum that is responsive to the needs of various stakeholders (mainly, students and instructors). Ideally, these PDCs would have a subject matter expert (SME) that is also the instructional designer (or at least works closely with one) because these particular courses require an approach different from a traditional asynchronous online course.

Over the last 14 years, I've taught online with various institutions that gave me varying levels of "control" over the course shell, what was taught, how it was taught, and how I delivered it. For example, at some institutions, I designed and taught my own courses; at some institutions, I designed for others; some institutions didn't allow me to do anything but grade and make announcements; others tracked how many days I logged in and how many discussions I posted; still others started to require that I use their slide deck and stick to their script when leaving feedback and leading synchronous sessions. This chapter comes out of my shift from this type

of teaching experience to being an administrator, or OWPA, of an online writing program (OWP) over the last three years as well as multiple conversations with my friend and colleague, Chvonne Parker, who had similar teaching experiences.

The online writing program that I administered at University of Arizona has used pre-designed courses (PDCs) since shortly before I started as an non-tenure track (NTT) lecturer in 2017. There is value in having an online course built for you; the number of hours that goes into designing and maintaining an online course is overwhelming as a contingent faculty member. Previous scholarship has argued for utilizing PDCs in an effort to mitigate that labor (Rodrigo & Ramírez, 2017) and give instructors a starting point as they professionalize as online teachers (Mitchum & Rodrigo, 2021). However, creating an online writing ecology doesn't stop at designing a course and offering professional development. These things have to be done with specific considerations in mind, and the PARS framework, with its focus on personal, accessible, responsive, and strategic teaching and administrative approaches (Borgman & McArdle, 2019), can help us consider instructor users as we try to strike a balance between support of labor, instructor agency, and work-life for the administrator.

We know that instructor autonomy is important in online writing instruction (OWI) because it creates a sense of ownership over course curriculum and connection to students and the larger program (Penrose, 2012). To promote instructor agency and autonomy, online writing programs that utilize PDCs need to be personal, accessible, responsive, and strategic. Kenneth Burke's (1969) pentad, a framework for understanding motivation developed by the rhetorical theorist, can help us understand how to define agency and make considerations for increasing it in an effort to increase instructor motivation when teaching a PDC. Burke's work is particularly useful in the case of instructor agency in PDCs because it's about motives. What motivates a program to use PDCs and what motivates instructors to be invested in using and adapting them? In his introduction to a *Grammar of Motives*, Burke (1969) says, "any complete statement about motives will offer some kind of answers to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose)" (p. xv). This chapter will answer and complicate some of these questions because the focus of an online writing program that uses PDCs is about the balance of motives between co-agents (Burke uses "co-agent" to define friends who help the "agent" or "hero" on the journey [p. 229]; here, "co-agents" is reciprocal as responsibility shifts between designer and deliverer of the course).

Theory and Practice

PARS and Burke for Negotiating Co-Agency

For our purposes here, we're assuming PDCs are being used in asynchronous online courses, and so we have the act and the scene: the act for the instructor of the

course is delivery (for the admin it's the design), and the scene is asynchronous online writing courses. The agent, agency, and purpose can help us take the next steps to find the places in our programs where PARS—Jessie Borgman and Casey McArdle's (2019) personal, accessible, responsive, and strategic framework for teaching and administrating online—can be applicable as administrators using PDCs.

Specifically, asking questions and acting on answers provides us with a method for enacting a PARS approach in creating an online writing program that uses PDCs as a space for instructor autonomy based on instructor choice (which can vary from one instructor to the next). I was an interim administrator of the online writing program at University of Arizona from January 2020 until January 2023. The program has approximately 50 sections a semester of first-year and professional technical writing (PTW) courses that fall under the purview of the online writing program, and the online campus grew at a rate of approximately 20 percent each year during that time. Supporting that many faculty teaching from the same PDC is no small feat. In answering the larger PARS (personal, accessible, responsive, strategic) questions below, in terms of Burke's Pentad, I'm pulling from both experiences as an instructor and as an administrator in order to help find a balance between support and agency for instructors without drowning in the labor yourself.

How do you make a PDC program personal to instructors?

You leave space and guidance for personalization. We know that students online are retained and more successful when they connect with their instructors (Boston et al., 2009). We know this can be done through instructor delivery of the course by creating an authentic persona (Garrison et al., 1999; Meyer et al., 2009), but we also know that in each course we teach (regardless of modality) we have different students in front of us (Powell, 2013). Borgman and McArdle (2019) say "Personal administration begins with treating your faculty with respect and acknowledging that they are contributors to the larger field of writing studies even if they are just instructors and not producing scholarship or presenting at conferences" (p. 27). Instructors need to have space and know-how to personalize a curriculum they didn't design. This is about finding balance. A pre-designed course is a tool; there needs to be enough structure that instructors don't need to build but not so much restriction that there's no space to own it.

This requires both giving choice to instructors and giving guidance and suggestions for where, how, and why to both add their personalization as well as be personal in their courses as they deliver them. As the administrator of an online program that utilizes PDCs, that space needs to be created in the design and instructors need to understand the design to deliver it well. Leaving the space isn't quite enough; the space needs to be identified. The flex points, the choices, and the spaces need to be articulated through the strategy of instructor guides. Personalizing comes from a smooth transition between agents: The agent shifts from designer (or admin in my case) to instructor. Without transitions, the new agent

isn't aware of the agency they have or the purpose behind what's been designed. This can result in getting lost on the ride.

How do you make a PDC program accessible for instructors?

The PDCs themselves should of course be accessible to students, but also to instructors; jumping into a curriculum that's not yours can be overwhelming (especially in an accelerated online format). It's important to remember that instructors might have disabilities, neurodiversities, or mental health conditions just like students. Instructors who teach from these courses might also be teaching a split prep, at multiple institutions, or all of the above. The content and its support need to be accessible and easy to navigate. Iterative user-experience design is necessary.

When we start to give students choices, which we should be doing (Cavanagh, 2016), we start to run the risk of overwhelming instructors. To help find balance between student need and instructor need for accessibility and motivation, we, as co-agents, need to provide student choices in ways that the delivering instructor can guide. This, again, involves designing an instructor guide that articulates the how and the why behind the choices but also provides reasonable choices with sufficient support built in.

Personally, I give my students open reign on the technology they use. However, in the PDC I managed for the program, the final ePortfolio currently has two options built in. Normally, I try not to put my literal voice into the courses, but to provide support, there are four videos (two for each technology option) that walk students through setting up and adding materials to the portfolio. I selected two programs that are also supported by the institution, so that if the materials I provide aren't enough, instructors have additional support. This is key: I'm one person; the more I can pull from the support that already exists at the institutional level, the more feasible giving choice becomes. So, in this case, I've given students the choice between two programs that are turned in the same way without putting additional burden on the instructor for supporting the technology beyond knowing where the resources are located. This example, however, wouldn't go smoothly without providing an instructor guide that explains this and being available for support. These support mechanisms are crucial to shifting agency to your co-agent in a way that makes the content easy for instructors to understand. Opening up a fully designed course can be overwhelming, and so articulating the how (not necessarily the how for instructors but the how for students) and the why can help instructors own the curriculum.

How do you make a PDC program responsive to instructors and students?

The interesting thing about Burke and his pentad is that it's not just about each of the terms (act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose) but also about the interactions

between these elements. PARS is similar in that there is a lot of "speaking" between the pieces of the framework. Administrators in an online writing program need to design PDCs that leave space for instructors to be responsive but also need to be responsive to instructors' needs and experiences. As Borgman and McArdle (2019) have noted, the PARS elements work together and are interconnected, so any online program ecology that is personal and accessible *has* to be responsive. If it's not, then it's not personal or accessible. Online PDCs are responsive by creating feedback mechanisms, including forms for minor errors (broken links are the worst), forms for larger suggestions, and frequent spaces for real-time feedback (Mitchum & Rodrigo, 2021). Don't ask for feedback if you're not going to do anything with it. As an instructor using the materials as a requirement or voluntarily, feeling like you're not heard can lead to not bothering to give feedback. This is also the point at which shared curricula truly become shared. Instructors should be encouraged to garner feedback from students and share it along with their own experiences so that the courses can be improved for everyone. Managing multiple online courses that you're not teaching *has* to be a team effort or the courses stagnate. Responsiveness is crucial. Being responsive in a program that uses a shared PDC can also look like, as Borgman and McArdle suggest, providing professional development that can give instructors ideas for how to fix what isn't working in the courses and that they're interested in. To be responsive, you need to make communication a two-way street.

Finally, as an administrator in an online writing program that uses PDCs, it's important to provide both support you anticipate (like getting-started materials) as well as just-in-time support. For example, I had built the onboarding website, but I also offered open labs for course preparation. If enough instructors are asking for the same type of help, then it becomes a help video on the website (because there's clearly a gap). Something that's important to remember when being a responsive administrator is to find your own responsive support. For example, knowing when and where the campus resources are for some of the tech concerns that are more general.

How do you act strategically when creating a PDC online writing program?

I'd argue this is the lynchpin. If you don't have a strategy that comes from a place of collaborative inclusion, then we become everything that makes us balk at the idea of a PDC. Borgman and McArdle (2019) remind us that it all comes down to strategy and that everyone needs to make strategic moves when designing, instructing, or administrating online courses. Understanding the why (purpose) of the design (agency) can provide the instructor (our co-agent) space to articulate the why (purpose) through delivery (agency). You can't just give a PDC to instructors and assume that all will be well; instructors need guides. Guides for getting started, guides for transparency that articulate why certain choices were

made, and support for professionalization. Without these guides, instructors, no matter how experienced they are, can't make informed choices. They also can't explain the breadcrumbs of the scaffolding to the students the first time around if we don't provide a map and a compass. This is where framing administrators and instructors as co-agents, per Burke, is useful. As co-agents, we should be helping each other in the scene of online teaching and learning. We can't ethically ask instructors to teach a course they didn't design (even if it helps reduce labor) if we don't explain to them the pedagogical undercurrents of what they're teaching. Therefore, without guides, it is impossible for instructors to develop knowledgeable personas or actually take autonomous ownership of the course.

Practical Application

Up until January of 2023, I worked, both as an NTT faculty member and then as an administrator, to create these necessary elements of an online writing instruction ecology. When I started at the institution, we had a Google doc that had some explanation for a few of the deadlines. However, it was largely about places that needed to be updated (like inserting links, adding instructor bios, etc.). In fall 2019, without an administrator title, I created, with the administrator's approval, a series of instructor guides directly within the LMS. Those guides started as a series of reminders (like putting students into groups) as well as a "heads up" to instructors for places students struggle. Over the last few years, as I shifted into administration and became a different agent in the same co-agent relationship, both the structure and the content have better adapted to instructor needs by using feedback mechanisms as usability tests.

Turning a course over to be used is the space where Burke's agent shifts from being the course designer to the course instructor and that handoff needs transition the same way a play or writing does. In the program, I built that transition in three places:

1. A course map
2. A shared curriculum website that focuses on onboarding and support
3. An instructor guide that is built into the LMS at each deadline

The Course Map

The course map is part and parcel of designing an online course. As a designer, it gives you a bird's-eye view or outline of the activities and the outcomes those activities are helping students reach. I'd also argue that a map should have the purpose of each activity articulated so instructors can follow the madness behind the methods. The key, though, is sharing it. As I've learned recently, it's also about explaining how to use it. The course map can give instructors an idea of where to personalize (based on the activities they know students will be completing and the outlined purpose for students), and the overview makes the course arc accessible to instructors in

ways that a fully fleshed out LMS can't. Having the purpose laid out this way can give instructors agency over their personalization of the course. Figure 14.1 is a very small piece of the course map created for the same deadline that the instructor guide is for. (See the instructor guide in Appendix B.)

Due Date	Goals	Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Activity	Purpose
XX/XX	Goal 1	1A. Analyze a text's genre and how that influences and guides reading and composing practices. 1C. Apply knowledge of rhetorical options in reading practices.	DD2HW1: What Is a Genre? (Discussion Topic)	Start exploring what a genre is in order to understand the genre of literacy narratives.
	Goal 2	2B. Support ideas or positions by discussing evidence from multiple sources.		
	Goal 4	4A. Adapt composing and revision processes for a variety of technologies and modalities. 4D. Identify the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes.	DD2HW2: Understanding Literacy and Project #1 (Discussion Board)	To begin understanding literacy and to understand what is being asked of you in Project #1
	Goal 5	5A. Narrate their processes and progress as writers throughout Foundations Writing courses.		

Figure 14.1 A Piece of the Course Map

This can take time, but all asynchronous online courses should have a course map anyway (in instructional design, this is a mapping of course activities to the course outcomes). Taking the time to add the purpose to each activity and sharing the map and its uses is an easy first step to creating an accessible curriculum that can be personalized.

The Website

The website starts with instructions for getting started that are particular to the LMS and program size. Instructors request their own course shell and copy the PDCs into their own classes. Instructors are then guided to their particular courses, where the website includes the following sections for each (I've included sample text for our ENGL101 course and website, designed for accessibility, in Appendix A):

- **The course:** This section of the course page gives an overview of what the course arc is. There's a statement of how many projects, what those projects are, and how they connect.

- **Updates**: This section gives instructors information about bigger changes made to the course and the timeframe in which they were made. This is for the instructors who have taught these courses before.
- **What You'll Find:** This section articulates the two spaces where instructors will find course materials and what they'll find in each space. The online courses use Google Drive to both give students space to ask live questions on major projects and have a central storage location. This section articulates what "things" live where.
- **D2L Walkthrough and Eli Review Walkthrough:** This section contains two screencast, captioned videos that provide a walkthrough of what instructors will find in the LMS and how Eli Review (the peer review program we use) integrates and weaves with our LMS.
- **Course Content Preview:** This section gives links to the LMS and the GDrive folder in case instructors want to take a look. These courses are available for our instructors who teach face-to-face to use, and so they might want to look through the materials before deciding what to copy. This section also gives instructions on where to find the next steps and various support materials.

The website content is about orienting instructors to the how and why of the course as a whole. The website provides an overview of the course arc, of the course map, and the overall structure. It also provides a series of short help videos and documents specific to both the course setup and potential issues instructors might encounter. The goal here is to remember that you and the instructor are co-agents and articulating the overarching purpose is key in transitioning agency from your position as administrator/designer to the instructor as the deliverer/facilitator of the content.

The Instructor Guide

The instructor guide is the next level of transition. The guide has a "Start Here" section that provides more information about the initial steps for setup like copying all the Google elements and where to update the links, the sections of the course that need to be updated with instructor information, etc. Then, every deadline in the course (referred to as due dates) has a guide built in with reminders, to-dos, and things to look out for. You can find an example in Appendix B, where I've included the instructor guide for the second deadline of the course in which students are asked to explore the concept of genre in a discussion board and explore their literacies.

As you can see in the sample, there are a few key elements to help translate the course to the delivering instructor:

1. **Overarching reminders:** These can be things to remember to return to outside of the LMS (like Google or Eli Review), reminders for students (like

support, signing up for notifications, etc.), things to consider when creating their videos or announcements to overview the deadline to students.

2. **Activity-specific information:** Each activity has information about what students are being asked to do, why they're being asked to do it, and how it plays into the rest of the course.

The LMS instructor guide also contains two feedback forms. The Error Report Form is a form used to report small errors like broken links, places where rubrics are incorrect, typos, etc. It lives as a Google form that I receive notifications for. It's important to skim the forms as they come in in case there's a large issue (like when *Writing Commons* did a re-org or the OWL at Purdue redid its website) that should be addressed on a larger scale. Other small stuff can wait until the end of term. The Module Suggestion Form is a form used for instructors to suggest larger revisions based on their experiences teaching the course. This can be completed anonymously (see Mitchum & Rodrigo, 2021 for more details).

The information in the guide is updated right along with the course and has had edits based on instructor questions and feedback since its initial implementation. These guides are about orienting instructors to the details of the course content. Again, it's about articulating the purpose to instructors in finer detail so that instructors, as co-agents, can enact their agency (through delivery of the course). It's important to have this information "physically" close to the content for students so instructors both remember the tool is there and can access it easily; this is done through "hiding" content from students in the LMS.

Wish List

Creating this online teaching and learning ecology was a lot of work. More work than I care to admit, but it also makes a good argument for having a team. I was lucky enough that our lecturers, of which I was still one, have service, and some were willing to dedicate that service time to helping improve the courses through feedback on the curriculum, but also on the support being offered. Even with that support, there are still places where more support could be offered by the institution. In an ideal world with a full team to work on it, creating slide decks with a script for instructors who want to adapt something instead of starting from scratch when they record would be fantastic.

Labor

While the initial setup is a lot of work, having these support tools has helped to mitigate repetitive labor. For example, each time I was asked how to do something new, it became a video that lives on the website. The overview videos can be watched as many times as instructors need, and this has reduced the amount of time that I spent in one-on-one meetings. This work isn't about automating (these videos still need to be recreated periodically) but creating tools that make

the information more accessible to instructors (they have faster access to a video when it's convenient for them than they did to me).

Finding ways to mitigate administrative labor is important because the overall goal here is to relieve instructor labor. Many instructors who teach online writing courses have no other support because they're adjuncts, graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), or NTT lecturers. They also aren't paid for the serious uptick in labor that designing an online course well requires. When OWPAs create PDCs, it's a good first step in relieving that labor, but let's not create more work by not giving them support.

Conclusion and Takeaways

In this chapter, I've attempted to show how, while implementing a PDC as an OWPA, you might create a collaboratively inclusive shared curriculum by answering those very important PARS questions in a way that considers and balances the idea of instructor agency using Burke's Pentad. It requires accepting that we're co-agents (who do the design and curriculum) with instructors who teach (deliver) the class and so need to keep them in mind as we transfer agency during the lifecycle of a PDC. In order to do this, though, you need a team that's both dedicated to improving the experience and also fairly compensated for it.

In conclusion, here are a few things to remember:

- Improving the instructor experience improves the student experience.
- Support should be provided in various ways at various times because we're all on the same team.
- You need support as well.

References

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

Boston, W., Diaz, S. R., Gibson, A. M., Ice, P., Richardson, J., & Swan, K. (2009). An exploration of the relationship between indicators of the community of inquiry framework and retention in online programs. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *13*(3), 67-83. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v13i3.1657

Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. University of California Press.

Cavanagh, S. R. (2016). *The spark of learning: Energizing the college classroom with the science of emotion*. West Virginia University Press.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (1999). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *2*(2–3), 87-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Meyer, K., Bruwelheide, J., & Poulin, R. (2009). Why they stayed: Near-perfect retention in an online certification program in library media. *Journal of*

Asynchronous Learning Networks, *13*(3), 129-145. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.
v10i4.1747

Mitchum, C., & Rodrigo, R. (2021). Administrative policies and pre-designed
courses (PDCs): Negotiating instructor and student agency. In C. K. Theado &
S. NeCamp (Eds.), *Working with and against shared curricula: Perspectives from
college writing teachers and administrators* (pp. 29-44). Peter Lang.

Penrose, A. M. (2012). Professional identity in a contingent-labor profession:
Expertise, autonomy, community in composition teaching. *WPA: Writing
Program Administration*, *35*(2), 108-126. https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/
sp/journal-archives

Powell, P. R. (2013). *Retention and resistance: Writing instruction and students who
leave*. Utah State University Press.

Rodrigo, R., & Ramírez, C. (2017). Balancing institutional demands with
effective practice: A lesson in curricular and professional development.
Technical Communication Quarterly, *26*(3), 314-328. http://doi.
org/10.1080/10572252.2017.1339529

Appendix A: Sample Text English 101 Course

The Course

The ENGL101 PDC has 3 major projects. The project flow builds off of the Students' Guide concept of "a genre you know" and "a genre you don't know." The first project is a genre literacy narrative, and students are asked to write a narrative about how they became literate in particular genres that they know well. The second project is a genre analysis. Students are asked to do secondary research and primary research in order to learn about a new genre. The final project is an ePortfolio that students have been working toward during the term.

Updates for AY21-22

In addition to the updates made for the academic year, the following updates were made for Summer 22:

- Module 1 shifted to 8 due dates and framing it as learning the genre of literacy narrative together.
- Module 2 gained a due date, divided up the secondary research notes, and streamlined the 2 options.
- Module 3 was updated with all new support materials for students to choose between Adobe Express or Google Sites.

For Fall 2021-Spring 2022, the ENGL101 asynchronous online sections will return to using the pedagogical tool Eli Review (instructions are located in D2L). Some additional updates to the course for AY21-22 are:

- More accurate estimated work times. Each reading, video, and step has an estimated time associated with it. The reading times were calculated with a reading speed of 200 words per minute. Many writing tasks were given concrete time limits within which to write.
- More specific rubrics. Rubrics were shifted to a 1/0 point scale and required elements were broken down into small, observable pieces.
- Improved scaffolding in Module 1.
- Shift in Module 2 away from multiple reports to asking students to take notes on secondary and primary sources in order to articulate the way the community uses the genre. You will have the choice between two deliverables: a report or an infographic. You will need to delete the Module 2 option that you don't want to use.
- Module 3 has shifted away from requiring an essay and instead asks students to integrate and weave their reflections throughout their portfolios.
- Removal of images with a box to better divide up the text of the assignments as well as the inclusion of more linked videos and updated program videos.
- Eli Review assignments have been updated and improved upon based on an assessment of student reviews in Eli during 2020-2021 academic year.
- 197B is now just one section instead of two.
- Updated SLOs and textbook links.

What You'll Find in GDrive and D2L

After you copy the course over, within the D2L course, there is an instructor manual in each module. To access materials, you need to help you set up your class, you'll want to click on **Content>START HERE Due Date 1>Instructor Manual** in the course. It will have everything you need to prep the course. However, if you want to explore the course and the projects before copying over, you can do that using the links on this page.

In addition to the content in the PDCs, there is content in a shared GDrive folder where you will find major assignment prompts that you need to copy in order to update the links in D2L to your own copies and the "Getting to Know You" Survey. You will also find a course map and suggested schedules for each course length. The course map indicates which assignments you need to make sure you update with your own preferences or information. Those elements are in red text in the D2L assignments, but the course map helps you to quickly identify the areas that need your attention. The D2L shells and GDrive folder are linked below.

D2L Walkthrough & Eli Review Walkthrough

These are both captioned videos that provide a walkthrough of the two different course pieces.

Course content preview

Below, you'll find the link to the PDC and a link to the GDrive Folder content. Feel free to use the PDC link to orient yourself to the course; however, copying over is a different process that is outlined in the Copy Your Course video. Use the title next to the link to search for the correct course. You can find more videos, suggestions, and guidance on the Support page.

Appendix B: Instructor Guide

Read Before Due Date 2

Be sure to check the Project 1 Google Doc to answer any questions/comments students have posted. If you click on Comments in your document, you can select how/if you receive notifications that comments have been made.

Remind everyone to be logged into their UA Gmail to work with/access course materials (I've gotten many requests for access; almost all come from regular Gmail accounts).

Post an overview for both the module and the DD. Also remind them to allow time for a response if they email you questions. This might also be a good time to set up your office hour scheduling (you might use the free version of Calendly or Google Calendar Appointments). This due date is all about getting students thinking about the two big concepts of the literacy narrative: narrative as a genre and what literacy is. It might be helpful to make that connection for students here so they see how this work is going to help them reach the SLOs and work toward the project.

HW1: This discussion is students' first introduction to the concept of genre. Since the course focuses on understanding genres within their contexts, this is a critical first discussion. You might want to do a bit more explanation of how the writing program thinks of genre (we define it broadly) and be sure to keep a close eye and give feedback on this particular discussion so you can correct misconceptions of genre and try to prompt them to make connections to previous reading, writing, and working experiences. Be very present in this particular discussion board (however, don't feel like you have to do it for every discussion board).

HW2: This is asking students to explore the concept of literacy and apply it to the literacy narrative. Share a Google Doc version of the Project 1 assignment instructions with ability to comment and be sure to change the link in the activity prompt. Make sure you read and respond to questions on the Google doc. In DD3HW3, students will be asked to consider their own literacies, so they will have another activity that asks them to think about literacy. This, though, is a good time to make sure, again, students are starting to think of literacy broadly.

Make sure you also update the link under the "Syllabus and Major Assignment Quick Links" area

Before and/or after this due date, consider posting this message about tech support.

Remember that if you run into tech troubles with <institutional system>, please start with:

- <LMS> Support: <LMS Support URL>
- General IT (Non-Bookstore Software): <IT URL>
- Contact the 24/7 IT Support Center at <insert phone number> for issues related to non-Bookstore downloads: <URL>
- <institution> Library Software: Contact the <institution> Library at <phone number> via Live Chat <URL>, or complete a webform <URL> for issues related to <institution> Library Software or Databases.
- <institution> Bookstore Software: Contact the <institution> Bookstores Licensing at <phone number> or email <email> for issues related to <institution> Bookstores software licenses.