Accessible Affordances of Asynchronicity

Cripping Online Instruction[1]

Molly E. Ubbesen and Leslie R. Anglesey

Abstract

This article begins with a brief overview of asynchronous online learning scholarship and an introduction to the concept of "crip time" as "a flexible approach to normative time frames" (Price, 2011, p. 62). The heart of this article considers the accessible affordances provided by asynchronous teaching, specifically focusing on "cripping," attendance and engagement to create more accessibility. We share our experiences teaching writing classes asynchronously as well as student reflections regarding how they feel about learning asynchronously. In so doing, we argue that asynchronous writing classes can leverage crip time in ways face-to-face classes cannot to create more accessible learning.

Teaching and learning in the same space at the same time (synchronously) is typically the unquestioned norm for education. However, in times when we are not able to come together, it becomes clearer that synchronicity is both a privilege and a myth. When viewed as a privilege, we acknowledge how synchronous spaces assume a level of access that excludes many learners. When viewed as a myth, we investigate the assumption that the collective presence of learners in a physical or digital space is the same as being present together. With these challenges in mind, this article questions the valorization of synchronous learning models by considering the access constraints of synchronicity. In doing so, our article identifies the accessible affordances we have found in online asynchronous teaching and promotes the inclusion of these affordances in asynchronous literacy education.

We reference the CCCC Online Writing Instruction Standing Group's 2021 "State of the Art of Online Writing Instruction Report" to define online asynchronous teaching as instruction that is "delivered through a digitally-mediated platform (such as a learning management system) with no real-time interaction in a physical classroom on an institutional campus" (p. 13). By "cripping" online instruction, we aim to make it more accessible. As disability studies scholar and activist Shayda Kafai (2021) explained, cripping is "a troubling, a door opening to invite us toward challenging what is normal and what we assume is defective" (188). Cripping comes from the word "crip," short for the derogatory slur "cripple" that has been "reappropriated by some in the disability community and is now being used as a politicized term of empowerment" (Kafai, 2021, p. 183).

Cripping online instruction has inspired our central questions for this article: What does an online asynchronous class provide that a synchronous class does not? And how does asynchronicity help us crip online writing instruction (OWI) to make it more accessible? These questions originated from our informal discussions about our own access needs as instructors as well as the access needs of our students. Our questions have an embedded argument in them: that asynchronous courses have accessibility affordances that are unique from those in synchronous courses.

This article begins with a brief overview of scholarship of asynchronous online learning temporalities and an introduction to the concept of "crip time." Drawing on critical disability studies scholarship, we explore crip time as "a flexible approach to normative time frames" (Price, 2011, p. 62). Much of the work in traditional brick-and-mortar writing courses operates on normative notions of time: peer workshops are completed in fifty-minute class sessions, group discussions start and end when an instructor perceives that most students have accomplished their task, and timed writing persists despite ample scholarship from the field calling for its end. When we consider normative notions of time, we can recognize multiple overlapping layers of inaccessibility in many traditional writing classrooms. Online writing classrooms, however, provide the opportunity to create uniquely accessible spaces because they are not constrained by normative notions of time.

The heart of our article considers the accessible affordances we find in asynchronous teaching, specifically

> " When we consider normative notions of time, we can recognize multiple overlapping layers of inaccessibility. "

focusing on cripping attendance and engagement, such as student-led writing groups and asynchronous peer review. We will share our experiences teaching asynchronously as well as student reflections from our students regarding how *they* feel about asynchronous learning. Our larger purpose is to promote accessibility in online writing instruction that leads to more effective and inclusive online teaching and learning.

Asynchronous Online Teaching

The benefits of asynchronous online learning have been researched for decades. One of the main benefits is the flexibility of course structure, which can create access to higher education for students whose personal circumstances, physical location, and other factors may limit their ability to attend traditional brick and mortar colleges and universities (Foley McCabe & Gonzáles-Flores, 2017; Kear, 2011; Seward, 2018; Warnock, 2009). Asynchronous online classes are perceived to be more flexible because they allow students to work at their own pace and around other school work, jobs, caretaking responsibilities, and other personal obligations (Griffiths & Graham, 2021; Rendahl & Kastman Breuch, 2013). Because students are working more independently and at their own pace, many scholars have argued that this creates opportunities for students to have more self-directed control over their learning (Amy, 2006; Selber, 2004; Seward, 2018). Others have argued that, without the time and space boundaries of typical on-campus class meetings, students have the ability to engage in deeper reflection, a skill central to most writing pedagogies (Hiltz, 1986; Palloff & Pratt, 2013). Researchers have also argued that asynchronous classes are "ideal for the development of collaborative skills" (Jorgensen, 2003, p. 8). Other scholars have advocated that one of the benefits of online learning is that asynchronously structured conversations between students and their teachers have the ability to disrupt traditional hierarchies (Cummings, 2016; Jorgensen, 2003; Seward, 2018). More specifically, many scholars have observed the benefits of asynchronous class structures for writing instruction. Scott Warnock (2009), for example, argued that the "sheer amount of writing exchanged" in online courses exponentially increases the frequency in which students will be asked to use rhetorically responsive writing tasks (xi).

While a substantial body of research has demonstrated the affordances of asynchronous courses, other scholars have considered its limitations. Jorgensen (2003) noted that, even as asynchronous discussions seem to flatten hierarchies, "the lack of nonverbal cues that are inherent in face-to-face communication can lead to a diminished sense of social presence or feelings of depersonalization which may translate into less effort for some members of the class" (p. 8) [2]. Other disparities, such as gendered and racial biases (Anderson, 2006) and the reification of social and institutional power structures and hierarchies (Selber, 2004) can—and do—appear in online classes just as they do in face-to-face ones.

What is most often overlooked in the scholarship on asynchronous course design is the access implications of this modality. The results of Sushil Oswal and Lisa Melonçon's (2014) nation-wide survey of OWI instructors supports this assertion. As they demonstrated, despite one in ten students having a disability, technical and professional communication (TPC) scholars have not sufficiently attended to questions of accessibility in OWI. Not only has accessibility and disability been rarely studied, but TPC instructors do not sufficiently consider these issues within the context of their online courses. Based on their survey of TCP faculty across the United States teaching in a variety of institutional contexts, Oswal and Melonçon (2014) observed a variety of inconsistencies in faculty's perceptions of OWI and

accessibility. Their report indicated hat "less than half of the respondents (42%) reported teaching students with disabilities—surprising result, given the prevalence of students with disabilities in online courses" (p. 279). Furthermore, Oswal and Melonçon (2014) found that only forty-six percent (46%) of respondents reported that their courses were ADA compliant, meaning that the majority of respondents did not believe their courses were in compliance (p. 279). While these results indicate a potential to recognize the presence of disabled students in TCP online courses, the most disheartening result from the survey demonstrated that thirty percent (30%) of respondents chose not to answer the questions on accessibility, indicating to the authors "that respondents either had no interest in the questions or perceived the questions as not applying to them. One respondent even went as far as to write the comment 'I have no interest' in the open-ended box" (Oswal and Melonçon, 2014, p. 279).

The lack of interest in, or awareness of the access implications of OWI is evident in how scholars have framed the value of OWI. For example, Warnock (2009) importantly identified that message board spaces available in most learning management systems create opportunities to sidestep "some normal constraints of synchronous or onsite conversations," which tend to be "fairly linear" and thus "almost always [means] that not everyone can participate" (pp. 69-70). While the critique of face-to-face classroom conversations is valid, Warnock did not address how the shift to asynchronous conversations creates opportunities for participation by fostering more accessible conversational spaces and structures.

Even as scholars have examined accessibility in OWI spaces, they have often focused on either narrow concerns about technological accessibility or only broad, generalized gestures toward Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (CCCC, 2013; Oswal, 2015; Oswal & Melonçon, 2017). We want to acknowledge that both of these approaches to accessibility have been important in creating more inclusive and accessible OWI. Without technological accessibility, such as captioning for videos, tagged html pages and .pdf files, and image descriptions (to name only a few), online courses would remain functionally closed to many disabled students. Scholars who promote UDL seek to broaden the scope of accessibility by focusing less on a checklist mentality that suggests accessibility for all can be achieved through a concrete list of steps to address some aspects of inaccessibility. Instead, "The UDL framework aims at short-circuiting the need for retrofits by employing contemporary technologies to provide access to diverse learners with varying skills, abilities, and aptitudes" (Oswal, 2015, p. 267). UDL promotes flexible instructional and learning management system interface design and advocates for pedagogies that create multiple means of student engagement, representation, and action and expression (CAST, 2023). These areas of access praxis are essential elements of access and inclusivity. However, these two approaches for understanding accessible OWI design must extend to other aspects of access if we want to continue creating greater accessibility for all students enrolled in OWI.

Despite this narrow focus on accessibility in OWI, disability scholars have extended the understanding of access concerns and opportunities in OWI (Borgman & Docter, 2018; Brewer et al., 2014; Hitt, 2021). For example, Paul D.C. Bones and Aubree Evans (2021) noted that asynchronous lessons are easier to accommodate for a wide range of access needs than synchronous lectures or class sessions and meet the access needs of students who may not have formal accommodations on file (p. 6). By destabilizing a reliance upon formal accommodation processes and creating spaces that can meet access needs that may not be formalized within the institution, we see these asynchronous OWI spaces as addressing the call among disability scholars to create a culture of access in writing classes.

> " Asynchronous lessons are easier to accommodate for a wide range of access needs of students who may not have formal accommodations. "

Asynchronicity as Privilege and Myth

The Privilege of Synchronicity: Molly's Perspective

Teaching online has made me think deeply about access, specifically access to the privilege of synchronicity and spaces. When one of my students wasn't able to connect to our synchronous conference because of her Wi-Fi, it made me think about how some students in the past weren't able to be present on campus for a variety of reasons. Everyone being able to come together in the same space at the same time can have a really nice energy to it; it is a privilege we shouldn't take for granted. But, this provokes some questions: Why do we privilege synchronicity so highly for teaching? Is that accessible and equitable? Why was synchronicity the norm before the Covid pandemic and why are many instructors so eager to return to this norm?

I've taught both synchronous and asynchronous online writing classes for several semesters at two different institutions, and I appreciate how the asynchronous classes offer students flexibility even when my courses are structured around weekly assignments. We still need to access the same learning management system (e.g., Canvas) within the same week, but it's not just a one-shot chance for a class session or assignment. This asynchronous modality deserves more of our attention for us to consider its affordances. Access is always essential for learning.

The Myth of Synchronicity: Leslie's Perspective

I've taught a constellation of online writing courses over the years at various institutions: hybrid courses at community colleges a decade ago and fully asynchronous courses and synchronous Zoom courses during the Covid pandemic. These experiences have taught me that synchronicity is not only a privilege; it is also a myth. Our physical or virtual presence does not necessarily correlate with other aspects of presence, such as mental or emotional. Presence is far more complex than that. My chronic health conditions, for example, create demands that, at times, require me to focus on my own wellness, even if that means I'm no longer mentally present in a meeting I am physically or virtually attending.

I think that most of us would agree that it's okay if not all students are hanging on every word of class—that students' mental or emotional presences sometimes come and go. We might recognize, for example, that a student experiencing significant life stressors may not be attentive in ways we might hope for or have come to expect. Having said that, however, in a synchronous class, the myth of synchronicity creates a narrative in which students' bodies, behaviors, and dispositions represent their engagement in the course. This issue is compounded by the fact that students' engagement is often later assessed and given a grade. For example, instructors sometimes imagine that a student who is gazing out the window or doodling on a piece of paper isn't mentally present in class. The problem with this evaluation is that the assessment of student engagement through their embodied performances in class reinforces ableist expectations of what it means to be a "good" or "engaged" student. When we shift to asynchronous classes, however, students' engagement cannot be measured in these traditional ways, making room for more inclusive models of assessing student engagement.

The sudden, mid-semester shift to online synchronous teaching during the spring of 2020 due to the Covid pandemic revealed a lot about academic life to me (Leslie). One of my most significant realizations was how strongly academic life is dictated by normative assumptions about time. As an instructor, I have experienced

when I would have benefitted from more time in class. For example, when a student posed a question that, while important, wasn't headed in the direction I thought the class had been moving, I wished I had a little more time to compose an appropriate response. But students' waiting gazes and the ticking of the clock demanded a response sooner rather than later. As I shifted to fully online, asynchronous teaching later in the pandemic, however, I began to notice that there were access affordances that were made uniquely possible within the context of asynchronous writing classes. These learning spaces are not bound by normative assumptions about learning and time and, without those restrictions, students are able to engage in writing with greater flexibility that meets their access needs and learning preferences.

Cripping Online Instruction

Normative Presence and Participation

Our thinking about asynchronicity was inspired by scholars working at the intersection of writing pedagogy and disability studies. Margaret Price (2011) has encouraged us to rethink normative notions of "presence" and "participation." For example, in typical face-to-face classrooms, "Students are expected to arrive on time, absorb information at a particular speed, and perform spontaneously in restricted time frames (as in discussions or peer-response groups)" (Price, 2011, p. 63). These expectations problematically assume that all students always have the ability and access to attend class and that all students will think and process at the same pace. Price (2011) questioned, "how might we move beyond the circular logic of 'attendance = high grades = students' must attend class toward more inclusive ways of understanding presence in education?" (pp. 72-3).

Crip Time

A concept that can help us move beyond this is called "crip time," a term from disability culture that refers to a flexible approach to normative time frames (Price, 2011, p. 62). Disability scholars have extended the concept of crip time to higher education to better understand how disabled students experience classroom spaces and to identify potential access barriers for students and faculty. Shannon R. Wooden (2022) is among the first to apply the concept of crip time to OWI as a way of exploring "English pedagogy's built-in paradox of time—the need for flexibility and process-orientation contraindicated with the urgency of synchronous exchange—offers a promising origin point for this inquiry" (pp. 3-4). Asynchronous OWI, and the crip time it makes possible, forces instructors to confront normative notions of student participation and encourages them to consider ways of assessing student engagement with course content beyond verbal participation (Wooden, 2022, p. 9). Such a learning environment, Wooden contended, responds to Robert McRuer's (2006) call for "composition to use its process-oriented turn to break out of a 'corporate model' of efficiency" and for a "recentering [of] our attention on the composing bodies" (p. 5). Wooden's conclusions mirror our own, and we extend her work by considering other aspects of asynchronous OWI that creates opportunity to leverage crip time.

In the context of this article, crip time can help us think critically about the time expectations OWI instructors have for students. Creating more flexible timing can benefit students with disabilities as well as all students with changing life circumstances and challenges. For example, setting up an asynchronous class with weekly assignments in which students can choose where and when they want to work is more accessible than requiring them to attend and participate in class during static and limited times during the week.

Tara Wood (2017) also argued for this when she stated, "we must pay attention to how we construct time;

otherwise, we may enforce normative time frames upon students whose experiences and processes exist in contradiction to such compulsory measures of time" (pp. 260-61). Wood (2017) challenged us to re-think timed writing assignments as well as the time we allow for in-class writing activities. Furthermore, data from her study of disabled students suggests that "students' anxiety might be alleviated through 'cripping' time, increasing flexibility, avoiding rigidity, and lowering the stakes of writing" (p. 270). Wood's calls for less rigidity and greater flexibility are hard to achieve consistently in traditional synchronous classes. While instructors can alter what happens during their synchronous class meetings, the larger patterns of time remain unalterable. For example, a writing class will still meet twice a week for seventy-five minutes, no matter how much we crip time for each class session.

We see asynchronous teaching as an approach to crip time since it allows more flexible and accessible affordances. Unlike synchronous teaching, which cannot escape the normative demands of the academic hour, students in asynchronous courses are offered opportunities to be present and engaged in their courses in ways that honor their needs and learning preferences, which creates more equitable access to learning.

Asynchronous Affordances

Central Questions

As we transition to sharing what we find to be asynchronous affordances for attendance and engagement, we return to our central questions to guide us: What does an online asynchronous class provide that a synchronous class does not? And how does asynchronicity help us crip OWI to make it more accessible?

Cripping Attendance: Molly's Experience

Crip time changes how we think about the expectations and time constraints of attendance. Most instructors understandably tell students that attending class is a valuable expectation of the course, but if it is so integral to learning, then why are we making that class time inaccessible to students who are not able to attend class for legitimate reasons? This led me to providing detailed class agendas and course materials on our Canvas site and to creating an attendance make-up policy that allows students to still earn their attendance credit for the day.

I encourage these practices for synchronous classes, but I find the asynchronous writing courses I've taught allow for the most access. We know that we learn to write by writing a lot, receiving feedback, and recursively working through our writing processes. This can be accomplished even more effectively through an asynchronous class that provides students more flexible time for developing their thinking and writing. Students can choose *when* they want to work, which is so beneficial as we all function differently throughout different parts of the day. Additionally, students can choose *where* to work, which allows them to be more comfortable and focused, and hence, ideally more productive, as they can lay down, use a variety of tools, change lighting and noise levels, etc.

In my classes, students still work through weekly assignments with a consistent due date (e.g., assignments are due every Sunday night at 11:59 pm) that provides students some structure and pacing and still allows them to be on the same page in order to collaborate. I've found that changing assignment due dates from twice a week to allowing students a whole week has been much more manageable and beneficial for students as well as for me.

Another opportunity that an asynchronous class offers is organizing student writing groups in which the students get to choose when and where to meet every other week. I organized these groups alphabetically, assigned a facilitator for each meeting, provided agendas for them to work through, and asked each member to turn in their notes to receive credit. While these meetings are synchronous, group members plan their meeting times and can reschedule them if necessary. This provides much more flexibility than having a set class schedule, and students have shared with me that they really appreciated getting to know and learn from their peers during times when they were not all able to come together in class, like during the Covid pandemic.

Molly's Student Reflections

Based on student written reflections, many students appreciate the affordances of asynchronicity. In response to the question "How do you feel about the online, mostly asynchronous, delivery of this course?", many students responded that they enjoyed it, that it felt manageable, and that it provided them more freedom and flexibility. For example, one student shared, "I really liked it, it wasn't overwhelming and that helped me a lot because all of my other classes were extremely overwhelming so this helped because I was still able to learn but not feel overwhelmed." Other students shared this sentiment and also stated that they prefer it over a synchronous class. As one student shared, "I much prefer writing courses to be online. I like how everything is released at a specific date and time, that I can do everything on my own at my own pace. If I have a busier week, I can do the assignment on the weekend, whereas if the course were synchronous, I would be stressed to get it done when I have too much on my plate already. It helped me put more effort into an assignment rather than just getting it done before a class deadline." Some students mentioned that this time frame also allowed them more time to process and retain information, as demonstrated by a student who mentioned that "I was able to retain the information from the way that you paced us, than any other course that had not allowed us to take time on the assignment before giving another." These perspectives are reflected in the quality of students' well-developed and thoughtful writing assignments they submitted throughout the semester.

Molly's Teaching Reflections

For a variety of both personal and pedagogical reasons, I find asynchronous teaching to be much more accessible to me as well. It allows more time to carefully plan out instruction and assignments, and it provides more flexible time to respond to student work and questions. I do sometimes miss the energy of us all coming together at the same time, but I am willing to give that up in order for students to have more accessible and equitable learning opportunities. A challenge is that I don't get to know students and their communication styles quite as well as I might by interacting with them synchronously, but I assign student surveys and reflections throughout the semester to help address this.

> " Crip time changes how we think about the expectations and time constraints of attendance. "

Cripping Engagement: Leslie's Experience

Crip time changes what it means for students to be engaged learners, which requires that we change how we

assess student engagement. In the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, engagement was defined as "a sense of investment and involvement in learning" and in a synchronous class, instructors often use student behavior during class to determine when a student is engaged and when they are not (CWPA et al., 2011, p. 4). For example, my recent analysis of the course syllabi for a first-year writing program of a large public university revealed that sixty-four percent of course syllabi included mandatory participation policies, many of which defined engagement in terms of student participation during class. Behaviors such as listening quietly, verbally participating in class discussions, verbally asking questions in class, and completing in-class writing exercises were commonly listed as examples of what it means to be an engaged member of the class community.

One way I leverage crip time to create a more accessible assessment of student engagement in all of my writing classes, regardless of their assigned modality, is asynchronous peer response. Years ago, I had a student whose willingness to disclose his experiences with peer review completely changed my approach. My practices at that time were not necessarily intentional; I practiced peer response the way I had been taught it, and it looked something like this: Students came to class with a paper draft in hand. I distributed peer review questions to direct students' responses and then randomized students into small groups where they exchanged drafts. I gave students a specific amount of time to read the drafts. At the end of that time, students wrote feedback to their peers and then discussed it verbally once everyone was ready.

During the class period in question, the student appeared to me to be distracted. When other students were done reading their drafts, this student hadn't finished reading half of his. When other students were finishing their written feedback, this student was just beginning to write. As the end of the class session neared, the student appeared increasingly anxious and stressed, and the peer waiting for feedback was becoming impatient.

It would have been really easy to write the student off as disengaged, unmotivated, or lazy. But the student's subsequent disclosure of his ADHD diagnosis helped me to understand that the problem wasn't with *him*; the problem was with my assumptions about time. Since then, I always set up peer response activities in asynchronous, online spaces. Students are given a due date to upload their drafts to the course learning management system and a subsequent due date to complete the peer review. Doing so has helped many students not only feel less anxiety about completing the activity and earning credit, but it has helped me to focus on what is really important about student engagement in peer review.

Some of my students have expressed another affordance of online peer response activities. When students review each other's drafts face-to-face, many of them feel anxious about giving critical feedback. They feel the need to be overwhelmingly positive about the draft, especially when they identify areas for improvement. Students have shared with me that the distance created through asynchronicity helps them to feel more comfortable offering critical, yet generative, feedback and less pressure to sugar coat their responses.

Leslie's Student Reflections

In my recent asynchronous classes, students have expressed appreciation for other aspects of crip time made possible through asynchronicity. Because we don't hold synchronous class discussions, I record and post short videos that introduce students to readings, course concepts, or writing practices. Students have expressed appreciation that they can crip the videos' time as needed. For example, a video I created that introduces students to the concept of the rhetorical situation is one that many students crip in their own ways. Students can use the video features to slow down or speed up my voice. They can replay the parts that they don't fully comprehend during their first viewing, and they can start and stop at will. Other students have observed that it's

beneficial to them to be able to rewatch the video at different times in the unit and later in the semester. They don't have to rely solely upon their written notes or recollections of class discussion, and, because of this feedback, I now regularly link those videos in later modules in order to reinforce their opportunity to revisit class material as needed.

Leslie's Teaching Reflections

My experiences have been both similar to and different from Molly's. As someone who experiences a great deal of brain fog, I likewise benefit from the crip time that asynchronicity affords me. My students still engage in discussion, for example, but those discussions evolve over the course of the week, and I can check in on those discussions at the times of the day that my brain feels the clearest. At the same time, asynchronicity creates some access barriers for me. I rely a great deal on being able to see and respond to students in-person to get a sense of whether or not they are understanding course content (the decreased social presence and depersonalization Jorgensen (2003) discusses). While many people may experience the exact opposite access needs, without the real time interactions that tend to be more accessible for me, I've had to learn alternative ways to solicit this feedback from students. One way I do this is by building into each week's work a variety of optional, informal discussion spaces where students can share how they're doing through words, gifs, and videos. This has become more than just a space where students can commiserate about the mid-semester slump and where we can share personal content, like photos of pets. For me, these spaces make our asynchronous learning space more accessible by creating a sense of social presence with my students.

Another way I'm thinking about social presence for my students is by embedding short writing responses after posted videos in which I ask students to reflect on what they learned and what they still don't understand. This way I can follow up with individual students or create class content that clarifies concepts that are still unclear. As an instructor, I'm finding that reflecting on what is accessible for me in both modalities and then working to incorporate elements of asynchronous and synchronous teaching into every class I teach have been the most accessible teaching experiences I have had as of late.

While asynchronicity has created space for these crip time practices in ways that are not always available in synchronous classes, there are some limitations to teaching asynchronously. One of the difficulties students seem to face is in navigating course learning management systems. A constant refrain I hear from online students is their frustration that all online classes are organized within the learning management system in different ways, some of which are intuitive, while others are not. In my asynchronous classes, I can leverage crip time all I want, but if my students cannot locate course materials or assignment portals, then in the end, that commitment to access has not necessarily improved the accessibility of my class. Starting my online course design process with the principles of UDL and user-centered design has helped.

Conclusion

In this article, we have demonstrated that online writing courses can leverage their modality and crip time in ways that can produce access affordances. But, as our personal reflections remind us, instructors and students can—and do—have competing access needs. Additionally, instructors' abilities to choose the modality of their courses is inextricably linked to myriad local factors, such as university policies regarding offering asynchronous or synchronous online courses. As faculty members working in and synchronous OWI as our university systems declare that things are "back to normal" after the Covid pandemic. Additionally, for all faculty, but especially

for contingent instructors, teaching assignments are often made with little regard for their preferences or access needs.

In light of these constraints, we hope that readers will consider our approaches to cripping time in OWI as starting points, rather than as templates to be followed with exactness. Creating more inclusive and accessible learning spaces requires a kairotic, responsive praxis rather than a checklist. Furthermore, we recognize that these points of access are informed by our own embodied perspectives and the perspectives our students shared. In the context of higher education and OWI, effective uses of crip time can contribute to a larger liberatory pedagogy as instructors move away from "bend[ing] disabled bodies and minds to meet the clock" toward "bend[ing] the clock to meet disabled bodies and minds" (Kafer, 2013, p. 27). Thus, we call for continued research into the access affordances and constraints of OWI. We challenge scholars in online literacy education to take up the call from disability studies scholars to move beyond simply focusing on technological accessibility and UDL (although these aspects of access are vital to an inclusive learning space) and more toward research and practices that create a broader culture of access in OWI. To better support the diverse access needs of our students, we invite others to consider: how might we pursue radically accessible OWI approaches, not only in course design and modality, but also through the rethinking of pedagogical perspectives that inform our practices?

Notes

1. This article is adapted and expanded from our GSOLE webinar in November 2021 of the same name.

2. We do want to point out, however, that while some teachers and learners might interpret this as either a limitation or access barrier—see Leslie's personal reflection later in this article—for many teachers and students, this is an access affordance.

References

Amy, L. E. (2006). Rhetorical violence and the problematics of power: A notion of community for the digital age classroom. In J. Alexander & M. Dickson (Eds.), *Role play: Distance learning and the teaching of writing* (pp. 111-132). Hampton Press.

Anderson, B. (2006). Writing power into online discussion. *Computers & Composition*, *23*(1), 108-124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2005.12.007.

Bones, P. D. C. & Evans, A. (2021). Cripping the COVID classroom: Centering students through transformative disability-informed instruction. *Journal of Transformative Learning*, *8*(1), 1-9.

Borgman, J. & Docter, J. (2018). Considerations of access and design in the online writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, *49*, 94-105.

Brewer, E., Self, C., & Yergeau, M. R. (2014). Creating a culture of access in composition studies. *Composition Studies*, *42*(2), 151-54.

CAST. (2023). About universal design for learning. CAST. https://www.cast.org/impact/universal-design-for-learning-udl.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2013). A position statement of principles and example effective practices for online writing instruction (OWI): Rationale for OWI principle 1. Conference on College Composition and Communication. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples/principle1rationale?_gl=1*2wibb*_ga*MTEyNTg1NTcwMC4xNjczMzAyMDk1*_ga_L5Q68NRK05*MTY3MzMwMjA5NS4xLjEuM TY3MzMwMjU1Mi41NS4wLjA.

Conference on College Composition and Communication Online Writing Instruction Standing Group. (2021). *The 2021 state of the art of OWI report*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. https://sites.google.com/view/owistandinggroup/state-of-the-art-of-owi-2021

Council of Writing Program Administrators et al. (2011). *Framework for success in postsecondary writing. Council of Writing Program Administrators*. http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf

Cummings, L. (2016). Flipping the online classroom with web 2.0: The asynchronous workshop. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, *79*(1), 81-101. 10.1177/2329490615602250

Foley McCabe, M. & Gonzáles-Flores, P. (2017). *Essentials of online teaching: A standards-based guide*. Routledge-Taylor & Francis.

Griffiths, M. E., & Graham, C. R. (2021). The potential of asynchronous video in online education. *Distance Learning*, *18*(4), 93-102.

References

Hiltz, S. R. (1986). The "virtual classroom": Using computer-mediated communication for university teaching. *Journal of Communication*, *36*(2), 95-104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1986.tb01427

Hitt, A. H. (2021). *Rhetorics of overcoming: Rewriting narratives of disability and accessibility in writing studies*. CCCC/NCTE.

Jorgensen, D. (2003). "The challenges and benefits of asynchronous learning networks." *Reference Librarian*, *37*(77), 3-16. 10.1300/J120v37n77_02

Kafai, S. (2021). *Crip kinship: The disability justice & art activism of Sins Invalid*.
Arsenal Pulp Press.

Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist queer crip*. Indiana University Press.

Kear, K. (2011). *Online and social networking communities: A best practice guide for educators*. Routledge-Taylor & Francis.

Oswal, S. K. (2015). Physical and learning disabilities in OWI. In J. Hewett & DePew (Eds.), *Foundational principles of online writing instruction* (pp. 259-295). WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0650.2.08

Oswal, S. K., & Melonçon, L. (2014). Paying attention to accessibility when designing online courses in technical and professional communication. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *28*(3), 271-300. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651914524780

Oswal, S. K., & Melonçon, L. (2017). Saying no to the checklist: Shifting from an ideology of normalcy to an ideology of inclusion in online writing classrooms. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *40*(3), 61-77.

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2013). *Lessons from the virtual classroom: The realities of online teaching*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Price, M. (2011). *Mad at school: Rhetorics of mental disability and academic life*. University of Michigan Press.

Rendahl, M., & Kastman Breuch, L. (2013). Toward a complexity of online learning: Learners in online first-year writing. *Computers and Composition, 30,* 297-314. 10.1016/j.compcom.2013.10.002

Samuels, E. (2017). Six ways of looking at crip time. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *37*(3).
 https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v37i3

Selber, S. A. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age*. Southern Illinois University Press.

References

Seward, D. E. (2018). Orchestrated online conversation: Designing asynchronous discussion boards for interactive, incremental, and communal literacy development in first-year college writing. *Research in Online Literacy Education*, *1*(1). http://www.roleolor.org/seward-orchestrated-online-conversation.html

Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How and why*. NCTE.

Warnock, S. (2010). The low-stakes, risk-friendly message-board text. In J. Harris, J. D. Miles, & C. Paine (Eds.), *Teaching with student texts* (pp. 96-107). Utah State University Press.

Wood, T. (2017). Cripping time in the college composition classroom. *College Composition and Communication*, *69*(2), 260-286.

Wooden, S. R. (2022). Pandemic pedagogy from both sides of the screen: A teacher/scholar/parent's reflections on online time. *Computers and Composition*, *66*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2022.102742

Meet the Authors

Molly E. Ubbesen, Ph.D. (she/they) is Assistant Professor and Director of Writing at University of Minnesota Rochester. She applies critical disability studies to writing studies to support accessible and effective teaching and learning. Her work has been published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* and *Composition Forum*. Additionally, she is an editor for the forthcoming collection *Disability, Access, and the Teaching of Writing*. One of the best parts of her job is teaching the Disability Narratives course she designed.

Leslie R. Anglesey (she/her) is Assistant Professor in the Writing Studies Program at Saint Mary's College. Her research interests focus on disability studies, accessible composition pedagogy, mentorship, accessible health communication, and rhetorics of health and medicine. She is a co-founder of Disabled Campus Community, a disability-focused employee resource group at SHSU. She is a co-editor of *Standing at the Threshold: Liminality and the Rhetoric and Composition TAship* (Utah State UP, 2021) and *Threshold Conscripts: Rhetoric and Composition Teaching Assistantships* (WAC Clearinghouse, 2023). Her work has also appeared in *College Composition and Communication*, *Prompt: A Journal of Academic Writing Assignments*, and *The Peer Review* and in multiple edited collections on rhetorics of health and medicine.