

Google Docs

Between [Chris Andrews](#), [You](#), [Ronda L Wery](#) and [Kristi Dunks](#)

[Monica Wesley](#)

July 4 at 7:29pm

Do we have a google doc set up yet to develop our survey questions and groups? If we do, I haven't received a invite to work on it and was wondering if someone could send that link. If we don't do you need me to set that up? Was I supposed to do that in the first place?

[Chris Andrews](#)

July 4 at 8:01pm

I think we're doing some of that in the doc that's set up already--can you not see it?

[Chris Andrews](#)

July 4 at 8:02pm

Just sent you an invite, to both your ttu and your uwyo address.

[Monica Wesley](#)

July 4 at 8:17pm

OK, so everyone's gmail messages have been dumped into my junk folder in my TTU email account. You've got to be kidding me! Apparently, you're all toxic! :) Thanks for resending the invitation. Sorry to have not contributed up until this point. I'll get on it.

[Chris Andrews](#)

July 4 at 8:23pm

Bad Monica, Bad. :)

[Monica Wesley](#)

July 4 at 8:25pm

Consider me sufficiently shamed :)

[Kristi Dunks](#)

July 5 at 7:42am

We still love you.

[Monica Wesley](#)

July 5 at 12:03pm

Just an aside... I was reading through the MOO transcripts from the other classes and came across a nugget from last week's class. Our deliverable project does not need to be turned in until the very end of class, we will simply need to be able to use the information collected in three weeks time which gives us a full five weeks to build and present the deliverable. Thought that might make everyone realize we've got a bit more breathing space.

[Chris Andrews](#)

July 5 at 12:22pm

<does a little dance>

[Monica Wesley](#)

July 5 at 12:39pm

Glad I could provide a bit of joy where previously there was none :)

[Ronda L Wery](#)

July 5 at 1:06pm

Glad we don't need the polish quite so soon. I just had a BFO (blinding flash of the obvious) that research I gathered in Field Methods last spring may have some limited use for our project. Here is the gist of my project's intent:

How are instructors and students perceiving and adapting to the recent explosion of digital

technology and 21st-century literacy practices? With a survey, I hoped to “take the pulse” of students and instructors experiences with and attitudes toward digital technologies and how/whether they should be employed for teaching students at KCC. Questions I sought to answer included the following:

Which digital technologies and 21st-century literacy practices are part of KCC students’ and instructors’ everyday lives?

What are KCC student and instructor perspectives regarding the need for and/or use of digital technologies and 21st-century literacy practices in education?

What are KCC instructor and student perceptions regarding their own readiness to address any perceived needs?

This study was intended as an initial step toward better understanding KCC’s place in the digital literacy continuum, perhaps as one small step toward “articulate[ing] an epistemology a way of knowing that includes student and teacher in a knowledge-making enterprise” (Barker and Kemp, p. 6).

Do you think this could be useful to our larger project, or is it too limited in scope (i.e., KCC focus) to really have a place? Just food for thought. It isn't useful--no worries, but it does exist.

Thoughts? I promise not to be insulted if this doesn't seem relevant.

Monica Wesley

July 5 at 1:31pm

I'd be interested in seeing what sorts of survey questions you asked – there is probably some relevance there or questions that could be reformulated to our purposes. The KCC-findings might be too limited to apply to our purpose but your overall findings, if shared, might lead to some other ideas within our group. I'd like to see it.

Kristi Dunks

July 5 at 3:16pm

I agree with Monica. I think that it could provide some helpful information to us.

Chris Andrews

July 5 at 3:38pm

And would be awesome.

More seriously, this is exactly what we're talking about--a broader compilation and aggregation effort, but something grown up from localized questions, results, experiences, etcetera.

Ronda L Wery

July 5 at 3:47pm

Well, it was my first research effort and far from perfect, but if we can learn/leverage from it, then let's do so. Here is a link, and the password is the second part of our cohort's name.

Results – Digital Technology Survey

Source: www.surveymonkey.com

SurveyMonkey.com is a revolutionary tool to create and publish custom surveys in minutes, and then view results graphically and in real time.

Monica Wesley

July 5 at 6:19pm

Here's the epiphany I had this evening... BTW, I recognize 'epiphany' may be too strong of a word, but nonetheless... I came up with a working metaphor for our site which will eventually showcase

our raw data as well as the supportive materials to move towards a definition of rhetoric of personal agency in academia 2.0

I can envision our site as a META ANALYSIS in the form of a depository of what research is currently out there and applicable to our questions. So in addition to showcasing our study's results, we include links to other applicable resources, as Chris put it an aggregation, a compilation. I could even see with time going into the raw data and adding tags and hypertext links that connect the raw data to other parts of the resource bank, whether that link be to a published article, another comment, a best practice case study, etc.

Just my thought for the evening.

Chris Andrews

July 5 at 6:38pm

metAcademia :) That's a great thought, Monica.

Ronda L Wery

July 5 at 8:57pm

metAcademia is a brilliant plan!

Kristi Dunks

July 6 at 6:56am

Monica, I like the ring to that!

So, based on our expanded time frame, are we going to extend the deadline with our questions/groups? I was traveling home yesterday and did not get to spend a lot of time on it. Would Tuesday night work for everyone?

Ronda L Wery

July 6 at 12:23pm

Tuesday after the MOO? Fine by me.

Monica Wesley

July 6 at 12:35pm

I'm fine with extending the deadline to Tuesday night.

Kristi Dunks

July 6 at 8:04pm

Dr. Kemp has been invited into our Google docs. He may be able to provide some useful comments along the way.

Chris Andrews

July 6 at 8:28pm

Hey!! Somebody cleaned up our dope chatter!!

Kristi Dunks

July 6 at 10:26pm

Dope chatter is for Facebook! Ha ha.

Ronda L Wery

July 6 at 11:10pm

Oh, the googledocs is still dope. It is WAY DOPE!

Monica Wesley

July 7 at 10:14am

Thanks for cleaning up the document, Kristi. If nobody objects, I'm going to start a cleaner compilation of all the survey parts at the end of the document but still leave the rest of the

document intact. By the way, does anyone currently have a Survey Monkey account active? If not, I can get us access to one.

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 10:41am

I have one active and am paying a monthly subscription for some of the extras that don't come for free. Let me get you the info.

Monica Wesley

July 7 at 10:54am

I'll offer up my web hosting account through Fat Cow for our website if everyone agrees that's the direction we want to go. I think it has all the features and support capabilities we will need, plus unlimited storage and free onsite 24-hour support which I suspect I might need :)

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 10:59am

Just IM'ed Fred, asking if he'd taken a peek at our googledocs. He'd been writing and hadn't checked email in a bit, so I let him know he'd been invited.

He says, "Oh, you know me. I always have feedback. :)"

Chris Andrews

July 7 at 11:30am

That's a great idea, Mon, and if you've got the space and the willingness to share, we can do it to it.

Monica Wesley

July 7 at 11:33am

I know most of you are busy with work right now and not on Facebook, but I'm working to get our survey cleaned up by class tonight. Hope no one minds... As I'm reading through our document so far, it seems like we are moving towards asking a series of attitude and opinion questions about three closely-related areas: use of Web 2.0 in personal life, in professional/scholarly life, and in the classroom life. So I'm going to take a leap of faith here on the cleaned up draft I'm including at the end of our document and break the survey questions into these three main areas. I propose we ask a series of questions that are the same for each area but applicable only to that area... so we might ask the respondent to rate their comfort with use of Web 2.0 in personal life, in the classroom, AND in scholarly/research life. And then incorporate also any area-specific questions. There will be some redundancy but I would wager there are significant differences among how people incorporate these in different areas of their life and this I think would be telling.

So if you disagree with me, it's easily changeable. I haven't done anything to modify the original document thread.

Kristi Dunks

July 7 at 11:40am

Sounds good, Monica. Thanks!

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 12:50pm

Terrific, Monica! I'm off to teach and will check in later.

Chris Andrews

July 7 at 2:17pm

Monica's the shizzle.

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 4:01pm

That, she is. Heading home to read and MOO.

Chris Andrews

July 7 at 5:09pm

So, what's our idea for mapping this onto a schemata for our Rhetoric of Personal Agency? IDEas?

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 5:11pm

Uh. Er. Uh.

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 5:14pm

Seems like the purpose of our study/site/project is to enhance the personal and professional agency of those who teach rhetoric through sharing collective insights about how social networking/web 2.0 can be used to to enhance students' rhetorical agency. At least that's part of it.

Ronda L Wery

July 7 at 5:15pm

We need to map it out, though. You are right about that. We need a visual representation.

Monica Wesley

July 7 at 6:54pm

I'll get back with you, Chris, on your question when I've had a chance to make tangible what I see in my head.

Ronda L Wery

July 9 at 12:34pm

Have been checking GoogleDocs regularly for edits/etc. Plan to give it one more look before entering into SurveyMonkey this afternoon (after 2 pm PDT). Of course we can still make changes once it's in SurveyMonkey; it will just be harder to track our changes by then.

Has anyone heard from Dr Kemp? I don't see any comments from him yet in the GoogleDoc.

Also, we should consider a little usability testing on the SurveyMonkey version before sending it out, no? Perhaps fellow classmates or a friend/coworker from our workplaces?

Kristi Dunks

July 9 at 1:52pm

I resent to Dr. Kemp on Tuesday and followed it up with an email to him via Facebook.

I added a couple of things earlier today but I think that Monica's is looking good.

Monica Wesley

July 9 at 2:07pm

I think the changes everyone has made look good and yes, we should either test run it among ourselves or among some willing classmates with fairly stringent deadlines for testing it.

Chris Andrews

July 9 at 3:07pm

Looks and sounds good. Let's just invite two or three from our class to take it (send them a msg on FB), have them do it by sometime Sunday (it should be in SMonkey by Friday or Saturday morning, yes?).

Doesn't matter who--Christine, Julie, and Shirley come to mind immediately, but others would be great, too.

Ronda L Wery

July 9 at 3:16pm

I'll have it in SBMonkey today.

Ronda L Wery

July 9 at 3:26pm

Well, tonight, anyway!

Ronda L Wery

July 9 at 7:04pm

If y'all would like to see the survey before I send it out to our usability testers, here is the link. You can take it yourself or just browse. I'm taking a little break before proofreading.

I made a few minor changes in wording and arrangement of choices. Let me know if you want more specifics or rationale re: the changes, and if you see anything egregious, do tell. Otherwise, as I say, I'm planning to proofread before sending it out for usability.

Monica Wesley

July 9 at 7:38pm

I'd change 'introductory statement' to something warmer like "welcome."

On the fourth paragraph of the informed consent statement there is an errant "be" in the second sentence. Also on informed consent there is a portion that says to contact via email with questions. We need to include an email here.

Looks like none of the questions are required; do we want to make any questions required before people can move on to the next question?

On demographics you may want to set the options on the majority of questions so that only one selection can be chosen (for instance on the age question you can pick all the options). This is a setting that is available when you set up your question. At question 4 this suddenly changes.

Question 15 needs to be changed so that only one choice can be selected.

Question 19 first word should be changed to "To." Question 13 and 20 and 27 pluralize "tool". Question 19 does not allow you to choose the same level of significance of the problem for multiple barriers. So each column can only be selected once. You couldn't rank two barriers as significant. Same problem with question 11 and 17 and 25.

Ok sorry for being picky. Overall this looks really great. I hope lots of people take it. If they do, we've got some great data that we could even use beyond this project for future research/publishing opportunities.

Thanks, Ronda for taking this portion on.

Monica Wesley

July 9 at 7:38pm

Ronda, I'm sure you know this, but once we test this, we'll need to make sure to erase the results from the survey database before sending it out for actual results.

Ronda L Wery

July 9 at 7:51pm

Yes, indeed. I was actually thinking of giving the usability survey and the actual survey unique names, in case we get feedback from testers that causes us to make changes before sending out the "real" survey. Sound like a plan?

Ronda L Wery

July 9 at 8:36pm

New link to the survey, with Monica's excellent corrections and most questions "required" :

Kristi Dunks

July 9 at 11:06pm

I just went through it and I think it looks great. I know since we are four that you may want to say "investigators" in this sentence, but I just want to make sure- "For questions about this research, please contact the principal investigators at ronda.wery@ttu.edu."

I am curious to get some additional feedback from our classmates. Thanks for setting this up, Ronda!

Ronda L Wery

July 10 at 6:37am

FYI Teammates:

In 2 hours, 'm hopping a train to Seattle 12+ hours for a family reunion, so I'll be offline till late tonight or early Saturday. Back home late Sunday night.

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 9:47am

So what do we need to do know to get the survey sent out to our groups? Are we shooting for trying to do that today or tomorrow?

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 10:00am

I thought so.

Have test comments been incorporated? How should we divide up distribution of survey? I am on a plane for next 5 hours but back online tonight.

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 10:08am

We should get this out as soon as we get it tweaked according to usability comments. I'm happy to distribute as much as the group needs.

(And can more than one of our email addresses go in the survey response? Just a thought.)

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 10:23am

Let me share some comments I've received via e-mail and get you the link so we can all briefly peruse the actual survey responses. Any and all e-mail addresses you want should go in the survey- the key is not to confuse those who are taking it. If we went the IRB route, Fred would have been the principal investigator, and his and our e-mails would probably be included.

Would it be better to have one e-mail that we could all access, or that would automatically get forwarded to us all? Anyone who did send a question re: the survey should only get one response, to be sure, but it would be good for all to see it.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 10:26am

Here is a link that will let you browse the results we got from 11 responses to the survey. Please take a peek if you have time:

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 10:29am

Here is feedback on the survey itself, from gz:

having text spread entire way across the screen is distracting/frustrating to read--is it possible to limit it to a smaller area?

under #3, maybe have contract staff? where/how would online instructors qualify themselves.

under #4, transgender is the least likely to be selected, I think, and so it should be at the bottom, not the top

#5 do all schools use the term FTE? shouldn't that be spelled out for clarity's sake at least at the start?

#5 again, my concern is for schools/programs that teach online

#5 do you expect/want any feedback from private institutions or people who teach at for-profit or non-credit institutions

#6 associate's college is weird wording--what happened to community college?

#9 comment section seems unguided/unfocused/undirected. perhaps offer a prompt, or put the box at the bottom of the page after you've asked some more stirring/cotemplatable questions #10 seems like a jump from prof to personal life. will there be introductory text for any of these questions? what level of comfort are you assuming on behalf of the survey takers?

#11 scoring of other in last section doesn't make sense to me when there is a box for comments on other

#12 what is the difference between long and short distance networking? these seem like ideas you've worked with elsewhere and assume the reader knows what you're talking about. definition, please.

#13 i'm picky here: delivery structure seems like a funky phrase. it's distracting

#14 you want just one value instead of a number? this seems like an essay length question

#18 disseminate has a capital D

#19 should lack of institutional support be broken down into lack of departmental support and lack of administrative support; how about lack of competent IT department (oompaloompas currently staff my school's IT dept. seriously.)

#21 when did you ask if I taught online and on site courses?

also, what about angel and blackboard and those turgid proprietary CMSes?

#30 that question seems massive, i.e. huge.

I skipped the last three questions. Toss my results if you like since I was testing the site.

Overall, worked/read pretty smoothly.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 11:18am

Fred's feedback via Yahoo IM. Short answer: He thinks it looks legit and agrees we might want to pare it back just a little but wouldn't insist on it. Here is our chat.

ronda.wery: Fred?

ronda.wery: Could you take a look at our Academia 2.0 survey?

fredokemp: here

ronda.wery: It's too long, I know.

ronda.wery: We are planning to send it out today. I had classmates test it out this weekend.

fredokemp: checking it out now. Out of town this weekend.

ronda.wery: Okay. I couldn't remember if we sent you the link or not. Hope you had a good trip.

ronda.wery: I was at a family reunion this weekend. Train ride to Seattle. Long, but scenic, and a nice break from driving.

fredokemp: I think you have a problem. On the demographics page I hit next and come back to this page.

fredokemp: The page with the red warnings.

fredokemp: is it because I didn't answer anything?

ronda.wery: Hmm. Okay. Let me check it out. That shouldn't/hasn't come up yet, but I've tweaked the access and we may have multiple people looking at it simultaneously.

fredokemp: okay, when I entered answers I moved on

fredokemp: I'm getting through it, but I'm having to enter a bunch of junk answers, hope you give me option to cancel at the end, or you're going to get junk from me.

ronda.wery: junk is okay for now; this is just a usability test

fredokemp: okay

ronda.wery: We're going to tweak and rename it before sending it out officially

fredokemp: It is long. The questions seem legit to me. How are you distributing this?

ronda.wery: We are thinking various rhetoric and academic Facebook groups, Twitter, various listservs

ronda.wery: It seems like targeting individuals we know in the groups to help get the ball rolling would be helpful

fredokemp: I have no criticism, other than to suggest maybe cutting it back by about 5 questions, but maybe that won't matter.

ronda.wery: The key with these things is always getting people to actually take time to do it.

fredokemp: right

ronda.wery: I'll chat with Chris, Monica, and Kristi about paring back a little.

fredokemp: surveys are tough to get people to do, but good luck with it.

ronda.wery: Thanks for taking a look. Any suggestions on distribution?

ronda.wery: It's only a piece of our overall plan, but I do hope we get some responses. Should be fun/interesting to see

fredokemp: you can try some of the professional email lists: wpa-l, techrhet

ronda.wery: Yep, we are planning on those.

fredokemp: right, there's no harm in trying.

ronda.wery: Sounds like you generally approve, then?

ronda.wery: May I share our chat with my group?

fredokemp: you might look for groups on Facebook, but I think you suggested that.

ronda.wery: yep

fredokemp: sure

fredokemp: I won't require an IRB for my commentary. :)

ronda.wery: Okay. Thanks for taking time to look at this. Much appreciated on not requiring the IRB just now! :)

fredokemp: couldn't have been done for this, but unnecessary if you don't publish this without a retroactive IRB. Again, good luck

ronda.wery: Thanks. Bye for now!

fredokemp: bye

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 11:22am

The feedback and survey results look good so far. Not to dismiss GZs comments, but I would take them with a grain of salt. Some are worth incorporating, some... eh. I would include a "not applicable" option on the "which of these do you incorporate in your life questions" (i.e. the professional/scholarly one). Not sure if the other two questions that are like this for personal and classroom use have the N/A option. Given the responses to jobs held in academia maybe we need to add other categories here. GZ's distinction between online vs. onsite institutions seems to me to be covered in our categories of schools – maybe put a slash after associate's college and add community college. I don't agree with his comment #9–10. I think his comment #12 is negligible. Question 14 is fine – we want open-ended not an arbitrary number rating. I think #19 is fine as is – no need to get too finely detailed.

So those are my thoughts – I agree mostly with how others have responded within FB. Maybe you disagree with me on the above comments.

The one thing I wonder about though is the inclusion of Web CT, Blackboard, CMS's... I don't

consider these to be Web 2.0 technologies because of their top-down hierarchy. They can take on some of the characteristics enabled by Web 2.0 but I don't think they are indicative of social networking. What do you all think?

Ronda, I trust whatever changes to the survey based on the feedback we've received you want to make or ignore. I do think we need to strive to get this out quickly so we can start to receive results. Given the depth of information in just the 12 tested surveys, we're going to have a lot to wade through.

It looks good, Ronda. Let us know when it's ready to go and we can work on how and who distributes it to our groups. Thanks everyone!

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 11:28am

I say let's put it out there with all of our questions and maybe add a prompt in the introduction that says how many questions there are total. If we see a lot of people exiting the survey before finishing it, then we know it's too long. but I think people are more amenable to surveys than Fred thinks. We're asking mostly academics to report on something that is presumably of interest to them, so I think the length is ok – if we were to remove anything, I'd maybe take out Q 21–22 (the ones that refer to the differences between online and onsite use of Web 2.0). These questions perhaps drill down a little deeper than what we're doing with the other questions.

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 11:54am

I'd intended CMS's and the like to be included under the "education-focused" (if I remember the term aright) option, though it's perhaps unclear that it should have been contained. I would consider them to be web 2.0-like enough that we could include them, just to see what percentage of folks are/are not using them. I think it'd be a good data point.

I do think that a line to the effect of "the following questions ask about your use of Web 2.0 in Personal Contexts" (professional, instructional, etcetera) might be a bit of helpful redundance at the beginning of each section of questions. Doesn't need to be more than that.

I agree with Mon in retrospect--q21 & 22 might be good to ask later, but might go too deep for such a "lengthy" survey.

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 12:02pm

I agree with Chris.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 12:58pm

Thanks all for taking the time to sift through the feedback. I have a lunch/meeting a a couple minutes (noon PDT) but will make changes right after. Should be complete by 3 p.m. PDT.

Okay? Must get to meeting.

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 4:09pm

Just got in to DC!

I am wondering if we should make the fill in the blank questions optional and then note that on the survey? The one thing that I do not want to lose is data from someone that is willing to click on a few boxes, but not write in a narrative summary (questions like 31 and 32). I am happy with whatever you all think but this is just an idea.

I like the summary before each section– similar to what we have for professional.

Also, since one of our testers missed it, maybe we should bold/highlight the information about educators only on the first page.

How should organize distributing the survey?

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 4:10pm

Hopefully you can understand what I was asking in that last question. :)

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 4:24pm

Kristi, you raise excellent points. I think it's okay if we "accidentally" get non-educators as long as we can tell they are non-educators. What do you think.

Regarding optional answers, see if the following makes sense.

I didn't note in words which questions were optional (other than the e-mail one at the end), but all the narrative responses, in fact, are optional.

I was hoping to encourage narratives (by not stating outright that they are optional) while not discourage survey completion (by making them optional).

I think most folks will click next and try to skip something if they aren't willing to answer. We could consider making all questions optional and hope for the best. I have had success with that in the past. People usually will give what they can.

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 4:31pm

It looks good, Ronda. The only thing that I noticed was that Question 19 has a typo– should be To instead of Do.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 4:32pm

AAAAAAAACK! Thanks. I'll fix it.:)

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 4:39pm

Here are the folks we listed as possible respondents (in googledocs). I think we discussed a few hashtags, etc., too, but this is just the list in the middle o' our collaborative doc. Any preferences about who does what? Additions?

Facebook Groups:

STC (plus regional divisions of STC)

CCCC

Tech Rhet

Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy

National Communication Association

Reviewing Rhetoric...

American Association of Community Colleges

Faculty Members of Universities and Colleges

Twitter:

STC

Computers & Writing (C&W, probably on FB too)

ATTW

Listsers:
TTU TCR
WPA-L

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 5:06pm

I think that this will be a good start. What are the user accounts for ATTW and C&W on Twitter? I have been unable to find them.

As for Facebook:
NCTE/CCCC Facebook Friends (probably some overlap)
H-DigiRhet
Computers and Composition Online (must be a member)

Listserv:
teaching_composition@mailm

an.eppg.com

In Facebook are we thinking about posting on the group wall? Some of these groups are not very active so I am wondering about response rates? What about Twitter? Listsers should be easy with a standard format explaining what we are trying to do.

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 6:21pm

I took your Twitter post and retweeted it. I'm also posting to my personal Facebook wall since I've got friends at other institutions of higher ed who teach and who might pass it along (sort of a snowball effect). Do you need me to distribute it to one of our designated groups?

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 6:29pm

Should we plan on meeting tomorrow night after the MOO again to talk about where we go from here and how we make sure that our contributions are obvious enough for Fred to understand that each of us contributed something – he really stressed this point in his podcast.

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 6:39pm

Monica, I will do the same with my Facebook.

I can meet tomorrow after class. I will also distribute survey to the listsers teaching comp and TTU TCR. I am not familiar with WPA.

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 6:40pm

I'm not familiar with WPA – I think that was Chris' suggestion. Chris?

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 7:06pm

Kristi, if you can do those listsers, that will be great! Thanks for the FaceBooking, too, Monica and Kristi, both! Let's see how much cultural capital we can muster.

I just sent one to WPA-L (writing program administrators).

I also posted to the following FaceBook groups:

Computers and Composition Digital Press (CCDP)'s Wall
TechRhet discussion board
Friends of Computers and Writing 2010 at Purdue discussion board
National Communication Association discussion board
Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy discussion board
Reviewing Rhetoric... discussion board

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 7:07pm

Oh, and I tweeted Zdenek's accessibility class.

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 7:19pm

Awesome- we are so converging! I will post on the Facebook groups for NCTE/CCCC Facebook Friends and H-DigiRhet.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 7:31pm

I think I have turned into a survey posting whore! I just joined/posted to the following FaceBook groups and will now desist for a little while.

4Cs: Conference on College Composition and Communication group

Rhetoric discussion board

BYU Rhetoric discussion board

Graduate Program in Writing, Rhetoric, and Discourse at DePaul discussion

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 7:35pm

Well, things could be worse right? :)

So, tomorrow night we will discuss how we are going to work through our data and the next steps in this process?

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 7:38pm

Sounds good to me!

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:11pm

Aaaack! I totally missed this in the swirl of an insane evening (why, why did I volunteer for VBS this year?)

I'll post this to the WPA-L & my Facebook (and a few niche groups I can think of); I'm not seeing any gaping holes in this list, but will fill as necessary.

Sorry for missing this today...

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:11pm

will RT as well.

Kristi Dunks

July 13 at 8:17pm

Does anyone know if they have been having problems with the TCR TTU listserv? No luck on the email coming through yet.

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:20pm

It takes a while to filter through the system, if I remember right, Kristi.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 8:26pm

Chris, my post to the WPA-L hasn't shown up yet, but I suspect it will tomorrow, so please check that listserv before re-posting. I think your approach to niche groups is a good idea. We all have certain groups and individuals with whom our cache is high, and we should be looking to those folks, for sure!

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:27pm

Oops. Already sent it, Ronda--must've missed that you'd listed it under your purview! :)

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:30pm

You people are MAKING ME LOOK BAD! :)

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 8:30pm

No worries about missing our little flurry tonight. We can't expect you 24/7. But Chris, what is VBS? Virtual Boy Scout? Are you helping little old ladies cross the street in Second Life?

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:30pm

Vacation Bible School, you know, church and Jesus and crafts and snacks and stuff. :)

Chris Andrews

July 13 at 8:53pm

I'm guessing (and just throwing this out there) that some sort of aggregation of academic/popular literature would be in order for other parts of our project; we could do something with that (don't know if we want to play around with tagging or not).

Thinking in the context of our readings, are we interested in mapping things along tracks of knowledge-creation? convergence? expertise? agency & autonomy in economic/individual/political/cultural terms? something else?

I'm still wrapping my brain around the possible directions, but wanted to put some thinking out there before tomorrow.

Monica Wesley

July 13 at 9:01pm

No worries, Chris. Nobody's keeping score in this group of ours. I think it's unreasonable to think we can compete on par for your attention with God :)

I'll probably send our survey out tomorrow to the Visual Communication group on FB and possibly through faculty senate here at UW.

I,too, am struggling to wrap my brain around where we go from here... in a way that is both interesting and sufficiently deep but also manageable and technically doable. We can continue to talk tomorrow

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 9:15pm

Chris, I hope the VBS is going well (and would love to get your ideas next time I teach Bible as Lit). I'd have to concur with Monica, that we are not keeping score and do NOT want to compete with God for your attention. Besides, we all know your brain is constantly working, anyway.

Ronda L Wery

July 13 at 9:21pm

26 respondents, and counting

Kristi Dunks

July 14 at 4:46am

I think one of our biggest challenges is finding away to create something that can be built upon. We are the dream team though, so I am sure we will figure it out.

I am stuck in meetings all day so will probably not have access to Facebook. See you in class tonight!

Ronda L Wery

July 14 at 3:50pm

64 and counting. We haven't exactly "gone viral," but it's a start.