APPLICATION FORM
IUP Center for Teaching Excellence
2019 Faculty Recognition Awards

FACULTY NAME(S)	Mary Stewart
DEPARTMENT(S)	English Department
CAMPUS ADDRESS	Humanities and Social Sciences Building, Office 506E
CAMPUS PHONE	n/a. Cell = 254-537-2400
E-MAIL ADDRESS	mstewart@iup.edu

☑ **I AGREE with this submission that if awarded, I permit submitted materials to be shared via posting on the CTE website or other university promotions.**

AWARD CATEGORY: Note: Faculty are permitted to apply for an award in one category only and may only submit one application.

❑ ACCESSIBILITY

❑ ADVISING

❑ COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE

❑ CONTENT PEDAGOGY

❑ EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

❑ INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE

❑ INNOVATION

☑ INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

❑ JOHN WOOLCOCK TEACHER/SCHOLAR AWARD FOR REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

❑ LIVING-LEARNING

❑ PEDAGOGICAL RESEARCH

❑ TEACHING ASSOCIATE

❑ TEACHING WRITING

DESCRIBE: How does your application fit this category?
This application describes my design and facilitation of a fully online research writing course (ENGL 202). I highlight the way I leverage instructional design strategies and online pedagogies to achieve student learning outcomes. In particular, I have designed a combination of asynchronous and synchronous activities to build a community learning environment that reinforces the social nature of writing and of learning.

ABSTRACT: Provide a summary of your accomplishments in 300 words or less. (Note: this abstract may be used on CTE website and as part of the program for the annual CTE Recognition Dinner)

See next page.

ABSTRACT: Provide a summary of your accomplishments in 300 words or less. (Note: this abstract may be used on CTE website and as part of the program for the annual CTE Recognition Dinner)

Mary K. Stewart (English Department) designed a fully online section of ENGL 202 that utilizes asynchronous and synchronous modalities to facilitate an engaged and interactive community of learners. Students work in research teams to locate sources, draft annotated bibliographies and literature reviews, engage in IRB-approved field research, draft methods and findings, create data visualizations, and then revise and compile all of the elements into a 15-20 page research paper. The students' learning experiences are facilitated by careful attention to instructional design and thoughtful integration of technology, including a custom navigation bar in D2L, weekly videos in which the instructor responds to student work, and synchronous video chats that facilitate peer review. The course also adheres to the best practices in online pedagogy by presenting multimodal and interactive instructional materials that foster group cohesion, such that learners work towards a common goal and engage in collaborative inquiry.

Three-Page Rationale

The primary goal of ENGL 202 is to engage students in a sustained inquiry project, such that they develop the ability to integrate sources and synthesize multiple perspectives. I opt to teach ENGL 202 as a fully online course because research in the field of online writing instruction indicates that writing students benefit from learning in textual environments that require them to write-to-learn as well as learn-to-write (Hewett, 2015). Research additionally indicates that writing, like learning, is a fundamentally social activity (Bruffee, 1999), and that online courses have tremendous potential for facilitating interactive learning, given the appropriate instructional design (Garrison, 2017). This rationale explains how my sections of ENGL 202 integrate a combination of asynchronous and synchronous activities to guide my online students towards collaborative, community-based learning that supports their achievement of the ENGL 202 learning outcomes. I will particularly highlight the ways I leverage instructional technology to facilitate: 1) an accessible and organized course, 2) research teams, and 3) peer review.

Accessible & Organized Course. One of the tenets of effective online pedagogy is an accessible and clearly organized course site (Blythe, 2001). Before we can help online students achieve learning outcomes, they must be able to easily navigate the course and comprehend expectations. To facilitate this in ENGL 202, I created a custom navigation bar in D2L (see Appendix A) that renames D2L's Content Page to "Weekly Modules" and includes a "Syllabus and Major Assignments" tab that links students to related Google Documents. I also added a "Course Home" tab that brings students directly to the announcement page, where I frequently post multimodal messages. These seemingly small details have a big impact on the student experience, and I credit the site layout to students' frequent reports that the course is well organized and easy to use (see Course Evals).

The weekly modules are especially effective in supporting student learning. The modules open at 8am on Mondays and contain three activities: a full group discussion (due Thursdays at 2:30pm), a research team discussion (due Fridays at 2:30pm), and an individual assignment (due Sundays at 11:59pm). I respond in writing to one-third of the forum posts each week and also post a video that offers a more general verbal response to the discussions. These videos reference particular students who have performed well in the forums, clarify any common misconceptions, and recommend strategies for how students might approach the individual assignment. I also provide personalized written feedback to the individual assignments, paying particular attention to how well the students meet the requirement of integrating a direct quote or paraphrase. The requirement to integrate sources requires students to frequently practice that skill in low stakes tasks, thus preparing them for the higher stakes research paper. The personalized feedback highlights a major value of teaching writing online: I intervene more frequently in my students' writing process and become well acquainted with them as writers. In addition to facilitating their achievement of a key course learning outcome, the interaction helps students feel connected to the course and to me.

The weekly structure (full group discussion, research team discussion, individual assignment) remains consistent throughout the course, with the exception of the weeks that conclude the major course units. In those weeks, the research team discussion is replaced with a synchronous video chat in Zoom (see Appendix B). In advance of these chats, the students complete peer review of their major assignment drafts, and then discuss the peer feedback with their research teams in the

video chat. To enable these synchronous sessions, I requested that the registrar reserve one hour (Fridays from 2:30-3:20pm) in the students' schedules. During the weeks in which we do not have full group meetings in Zoom, I offer students the opportunity for additional office hours. Zoom has proven to be a particularly effective tool for conferencing. Appendix B features screenshots from these video calls, as well as a link to a recording of a conference. As you'll see, I ask students to share their screen when we meet, so that they are projecting their papers, scrolling through them and asking questions, and beginning to revise in real time as a response to our conversation.

Research Teams. In addition to developing a more tangible online student-instructor relationship, one of the major benefits of the video chats is that it allows me to organize the students into small groups, which I call research teams. At the beginning of the semester, I group the students based on their area of interest (e.g., Team Education, Team Politics & Social Justice). They meet with their teams every week, either asynchronously in research team discussion forums or synchronously via video chat. These meetings give students an opportunity to regularly interact with and get to know a smaller population of students (7 instead of 28), thus enacting the emphasis on social learning in online pedagogy (Garrison, 2017).

Grouping the students into interest-driven teams also allows them to share resources, and I employ a variety of instructional technologies to facilitate that process. I use an embedded librarian who provides videos and interactive modules and answers questions as students search for sources, I organize a series of Google Folders where the teams share their downloaded PDFs, and I use an online program called Annotate.co to help students engage in close reading. As students interact with these technologies and with their peers, they gain information literacy skills, digital literacy skills, and an appreciation of the value of collaboration in the research process.

After the sources are collected, the teams continue to interact as they draft annotated bibliographies and literature reviews. Because they are drawing on similar sources, they are able to act as informed and confident peer reviewers for each other. Similarly, as the students develop individual research questions in response to their literature reviews and then collect primary data via interviews and surveys, they support one another. They provide feedback on each other's interview and survey development and on their IRB applications (I submit descriptions to IRB to secure Classroom Research approval). This collaboration continues during data analysis, as students employ digital tools to create data visualizations and work to synthesize the field research with their literature reviews. The students then engage in a final round of peer review when they revise the individual elements into finalized 15-20 page research papers.

While the students are each writing their own individual papers, they are drawing on the collective intelligence of their research teams to do so, which illustrates that knowledge construction is collaborative and that research writing is first and foremost and attempt to contribute to an ongoing conversation among a community of scholars.

Peer Review. Putting the students in situations where they feel confident and able to act as peer reviewers for their research teams is a key element in achieving this understanding of social knowledge construction. Truly collaborative peer review is also a notoriously difficult one to achieve in college writing classes (Corbett, LaFrance, & Decker, 2014). In my approach, the students begin by learning about the role of peer review in professional academic publishing and

reflecting on the differences between professional peer review and their prior experiences with peer feedback. This framing creates an opportunity to discuss the differences between substantive revision in response to content-driven feedback from fellow experts and editing in response to grammar correction, which is another critical, yet difficult-to-achieve, learning outcome in any writing course (Sommers, 1980). Building on this foundational understanding of what peer review is, the frequent asynchronous discussions and synchronous video chats create a sense of cohesion among the research teams that enables productive peer review. Peer review is additionally supported by instructional technologies such as MS Word track changes (students create marginal comments on each other's drafts) and online discussion forums (students post their drafts to the forum and then post their feedback as a reply, so that their drafts and comments are available to the entire research team). But the most important instructional technology in this process are the video chats: the opportunity to talk, in real time, about the comments and about their plans for revision, solidifies the students' roles as active collaborators who have the potential to benefit and benefit from their peers' writing process.

My goal for ENGL 202 is to create an interactive and engaged community of learners who support one another as they work through the process of locating sources, drafting annotated bibliographies and literature reviews, engaging in IRB-approved field research, drafting methods and findings, and finally revising and compiling all of the elements into a 15-20 page research paper. Engaging in a sustained inquiry project that requires students to integrate and synthesize multiple different sources (and different types of sources) is an important skill that lays the groundwork for the critical thinking, information literacy, and written communication skills that students will continue to develop throughout their college careers. Without careful attention to instructional design and online pedagogy, these outcomes would be difficult to achieve, especially in a fully online learning environment. I believe that the use of research teams, the emphasis on peer review, and the implementation of synchronous video chats are particularly responsible for the successful student learning in this course.

References
Blythe, S. (2001). Designing online courses: User-centered practices. *Computers and Composition, 18*, 329-346.
Bruffee, K. A. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Cargile Cook, K. & Grant-Davie, K. (Eds.) (2013). *Online Education 2.0: Evolving, Adapting, and Reinventing Online Technical Communication*. New York: Routledge.
Corbett, S. J., LaFrance, M., & Decker, T. (2014). *Peer pressure, peer power: Theory and practice in peer review and response for the writing classroom*. Southlake, TX: Fountainhead Press.
Downs, D., & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions:(Re) envisioning "first-year composition" as "Introduction to Writing Studies". *College Composition and Communication, 58*(4), 552-584.
Hewett, B. L. (2015). *Reading to learn and writing to teach: Literacy strategies for online writing instruction*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
Garrison, R. D. (2017). *E-Learning in the 21st Century: A Community of Inquiry Framework for Research and Practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4), 378-388.