

## What's your preference

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

### [Monica Wesley](#)

July 16 at 1:58pm

So for our website for ENGL 5369, what's everyone's preference for the site name? Academic\_2.0 or Metacademia? (looks a little like macadamia :) Maybe metAcademia?

### [Chris Andrews](#)

July 16 at 2:07pm

I'm leaning more toward Academia 2.0, though it might be a little cliché...

Though I like it, metAcademia as meta-academia isn't... obvious (?) enough. Maybe something like akademeia 2.0 might be appropriate (going back to the ancient Greek)?

### [Kristi Dunks](#)

July 16 at 2:47pm

I like Academia 2.0.

### [Ronda L Wery](#)

July 16 at 3:43pm

I like Academia 2.0 and won't have a problem with it. I did like the metAcademica idea as "met" (a place where people meet) in addition to the "meta," but that may be too obscure. Let's face it, I'm the one who suggested pen(ta)guins for our group name, so I'm into obscure.

### [Ronda L Wery](#)

July 16 at 3:47pm

Oh, I missed Chris's Akademeia 2.0 idea. That's pretty cool. How do y'all feel about Akademeia 2.0? Too obscure?

### [Monica Wesley](#)

July 16 at 5:25pm

Either spelling of Academia 2.0 is fine with me.

### [Kristi Dunks](#)

July 17 at 2:30pm

I am fine with either of the Academia takes.

I am going to be offline until Sunday morning/early afternoon. I will check back in then and have some time to put in here. Have a great weekend everyone!

### [Monica Wesley](#)

July 17 at 7:01pm

So my plan tomorrow is to work up a proposal for what the website might look like, with overall layout and major categories fleshed in. I hope this will help some of the discussion that is going on in the group document (where I've also recently commented). None of this is set in stone; just intended as a place to begin. Many things I know how to do with website design; some things I may or may not be able to learn by August 4th, but I'll be upfront about that. I picked up some books today on database driven scripting to help with our design.

### [Chris Andrews](#)

July 17 at 8:38pm

Sounds excellent, Mon.

Note on Academia 2.0. If you google it, the very first hit is a youtube video from Kansas State (you know, Mike Wesch). I don't think they've got a copyright on it, of course, but do we want to collide with that head-on or try to bring it under our wings at all? (Or just ignore it and be our own Academia 2.0?)

**Ronda L Wery**

July 17 at 9:23pm

Hmmmm. Keep thinking about Lanham's notion of the "rhetorical paideia," What we are doing really fits with that. . .Thinking about Weinberger's miscellany and the orders of order. Maybe we can come up with something else.

**Chris Andrews**

July 17 at 9:27pm

Good turn, Ronda--how do we curl this back toward thinking in terms of Rhetoric of Personal Agency--even terminologically speaking? I'll try to sit down with this some tomorrow and come up with some thoughts....

**Ronda L Wery**

July 17 at 9:29pm

Yes. "Agency" is the sacred word.

**Chris Andrews**

July 17 at 9:36pm

And we can't forget about Rhetoric. I'm all about the rhetoric. Even a little light rhetorical analysis might be appropriate for us.

**Ronda L Wery**

July 17 at 9:39pm

Oh, HELL YES!

**Chris Andrews**

July 18 at 3:36pm

Was playing around with some analysis today, and I thought of making this:

<http://www.wordle.net/gallery/wrdl/1005512/ProfessingWeb2.0>

(it's the responses to question 25).

I totally call dibs on Wordle (and can remake this to fit with our site design, Mon). :)

**Monica Wesley**

July 18 at 6:06pm

I was thinking of doing a very similar thing for all of my open ended questions. Thanks for the resource, Chris. :) Would you feel like I stepped on your toes if I used Wordle or a similar utility as a jumping off point for a Flash or Vimeo animation? I will probably do a content analysis on the qualitative stuff with some appropriate graphs but then likely translate them into an animated cloud tag that zooms in on key themes through their key words and then pull up appropriate comments that tie to these words. Commentary laid over top will provide the context. Sound ok (if not confusing?)

I think what you're doing is great, Chris.

**Ronda L Wery**

July 18 at 6:49pm

Chris's Wordle is quite cool. I like your ideas, Monica--as far as I can follow them. :)

**Monica Wesley**

July 19 at 10:20am

I'm getting ready to send you all an Excel document with a preliminary web structure with main categories and content type worked in. Looking for comments (including the "Oh, hell no!" variety if you feel so moved), additions, concerns, whatever you want to remark. The categories along the top are meant to be the main web pages for the site. The multicolored boxes below include a summary of the proposed page content and the form it might take.

### **Kristi Dunks**

July 19 at 11:55am

Nice Wordle Chris! We used that a lot in my field methods class last Spring. It was always fun to see the results.

Monica, I like the look of the document. I just have a few questions and not even one "Hell no!"

How will the query function work for accessing the data (I am picturing tagged random data)? I assume we will do this for video, audio, ect.

If we are inputting resources that instructors will find useful, do we also provide guidance to them on submitting data so that others can find it?

How much structure is necessary for this site?

Do you think that the process should be moved to the end since we have a summary in the "About" section and the "Process" is more of a class requirement? I would imagine many users would want to get directly to the data/resources? I definitely think this should be included and expanded as we proceed, but it seems like an area not all users would be interested in.

I need more time to consider the Academia 2.0. Thinking about this now it seems "agency" needs to be pulled into it. Maybe we can do a Wordle plot of Weinberger and see what emerges? :)

### **Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 12:28pm

<incredibly pissed because i'd written a really long response here before FB inexplicably shut down on me>

Good ideas, Kristi; it might be good to "move" process for now. I think "agency" could be a powerful central concept for our site, and not one we should overlook accidentally. (That, and it's in the course title!)

I've got lots of ideas today, and am not sure we can work them all in right now, but as I see this being a project that grows with us, that's not the end of the world.

In my head, I see the site as a hypertext, where users can navigate through content in whatever way is meaningful to them. Using some of the big concepts from our study (agency, knowledge, rhetoric, economics, convergence, networks, clouds, power, and so forth) to see connected/related content. I've got this vision (and it's utterly unrealistic at this point) of clouds within clouds as a kind of navigation. (I think the tag/word/link cloud is a very powerful visual metaphor for what we're doing, and we'd be shooting ourselves in the collective foot if we didn't embrace it). Click in, out, back in, deeper in, etcetera, with content and video and text and whatever right there, to be gotten to in any number of ways. All this ALONGSIDE a more traditional, linear process/study/data/results/etc scheme.

We can de-/re-/hyper-heirarchize it however we want... I'm just not sure how to do it right now. (All I know is I see lots of black backgrounds!) :)

At any rate, right on, Mon; we're going in the right direction.

## Ronda L Wery

July 19 at 12:36pm

First thoughts, is it possible to set up an area within Resources where we have not only links but RSS feeds (like in Google Reader)? Would it be good to have RSS feeds, or should we stick to links?

I think "methods" is a more traditional academic way to refer to "process" (though we may or may not want to rename it). It's interesting thinking about our audience and possible uses. Must run. More in just a bit.

## Chris Andrews

July 19 at 12:40pm

RSS feeds could be helpful, actually (actually, we could insert multiple feeds for "shared" items--I know you can do this for GR, and am sure we could with others) that are specific to this project. (I have one that I've been using for my students this semester, actually. I don't think they've touched it, but it's there.)

We can use multiple names for multiple audiences, too, I think.

## Ronda L Wery

July 19 at 12:41pm

BTW, Monica. I absolutely LOVE that you thought of everything. I like the videos of us, etc., though I'll hate doing it. If only we could all wear pirate hats for our introductions. That would really make it awesome! ;)

Chris's ideas about working in certain key terms are terrific, too. Again, I'll be back shortly. Quick run to store for cough syrup, etc. Freaking bronchitis is hanging on.

## Monica Wesley

July 19 at 1:08pm

I think we can "bury" the process or methodology section in the About menu item. This way it still exists but doesn't compete as much with the core of the Academia 2.0 concept.

Chris, I think you and I have the same vision of data tagged in multiple ways and accessible in different ways. I could see where if all the raw survey data was in a database and someone clicked on a word in a cloud tag, the site randomly generated survey responses with that tagged word included in it. Having said that, I'm not sure I can get the site to that point by our due date, but as we've noted before, I think it would be incredibly helpful if we all see our goal not as producing a finished site by August 4th, but a pretty comprehensive one with room to grow and evolve. Fred is going to assess us on what conclusions we came to with our survey results and how we present it. I'm all for the hypernarrative Chris is envisioning, b/c I've thought about it myself, but I don't know how to make that happen in a website yet – that's going to be a significant learning curve and one I can't likely climb by our deadline. Just trying to be realistic without squashing any future ideas.

I think we can bring in the agency aspect in our textual summaries and any text that talks about our project. My guess is that the rhetoric of personal agency can come through in what we present about our results. We could also include some sort of sidebar question, very directly asking our agency question with a form for people to submit their insight.

Ronda, yes I think multiple RSS feeds are possible (Chris, I may need some help on inserting those and it seems like you've got some experience).

Kristi, in terms of providing guidelines on submitted resources, I think we could work this up in how we set up the form. We could use multiple form fields (title of resource, link to resource, summary of resource, keywords or tags). I think the form option would provide a moderated presence vs. allowing people to upload whatever they want. It's a difficult balance – the site is intended as a

conversation but at the same time you don't want the concept to dilute to the point that it becomes some general purpose academic site. Thoughts? Whatever ideas you have for the resources site would be welcomed; this is the page that I think will be most difficult to set up so that it remains useful and coherent.

Also, I was going to go ahead and try to secure/purchase the domain name Academia2.0; however, you can't have a period in your domain name, so any suggestions on the domain name you'd like to try to see us get (Academia2 is taken)... Thoughts?

**Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 1:18pm

academiatwopointoh?

**Monica Wesley**

July 19 at 1:34pm

Academia2pt0?

**Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 1:46pm

I dunno. My gut reaction to that is "ick."

On a side note, one of the best quotes i've come across in my analysis is this one:

"It's amazing we could even \*be\* scholars before all these tools"

**Kristi Dunks**

July 19 at 1:52pm

I think we can come up with something a little stronger.

**Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 5:41pm

Just fyi, really (maybe it'll spark an idea for you); I'm working my analysis into a prezi presentation: taking some of the results graphically and then doing some analysis, compilation, and presentation of selected comments from respondents.

It'll be good, I hope. (I Hope).

**Ronda L Wery**

July 19 at 6:24pm

Me, too--at least experimenting with it. Not sure if I'll end up there, though. Good luck!

**Kristi Dunks**

July 19 at 6:54pm

I think that Prezi would make a great format for the presentation of this data. I am thinking something along the lines of a simple video but we will see.

So, in trying to consider different names for what we are trying to do, I am coming across a lot of similar websites, blogs, and nings that are in some way named Academia 2.0. I wonder if our site (or at least our process) should have a defined name. I have seen several acronyms out there (SNAP! aka Social Networking for Academic Professionals). I do not have any light bulbs going off as far as a specific name but I am going to keep thinking about it. Or, we could do something as simple as "networked academia" or "collaborative academia" since 2.0 is not available. I will keep thinking.

**Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 7:00pm

Come to think of it, "networked academia" isn't a bad idea, Kristi.

**Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 7:32pm

Okay. Check this out; it's a first (drafty) draft of my analysis. (I worked on it for far too long, of course.)

I'm planning on integrating a bit of media content, but thought I'd show y'all what I'd done thus far.

<http://prezi.com/131488/>

**prezi.com**

Source: prezi.com

**Ronda L Wery**

July 19 at 7:38pm

Sweet! This is terrific, Chris. Now, what the hell am \*I\* going to do?

(Just kidding: I will pull something together, brain is messed up with cold and cough medicine.)

I really like it!

**Monica Wesley**

July 19 at 7:40pm

Nice job, Chris.

**Monica Wesley**

July 19 at 7:41pm

Ronda, just because Chris used this as a tool doesn't mean that you can't. There's some benefit of consistency if you were to use Prezi in a similar manner. It's still your interpretation of the data.

**Kristi Dunks**

July 19 at 7:50pm

Nice work, Chris!

**Monica Wesley**

July 19 at 8:39pm

In terms of our domain name... what about something like "SocialKnowledge" or "SocialKnowing"... something to reference the communal knowledge creation?

**Kristi Dunks**

July 19 at 8:47pm

I like that but do we need academia or pedagogy in there somewhere- social pedagogy?

**Chris Andrews**

July 19 at 8:56pm

I think "networked academia" covers that communal angle, Mon. I wouldn't put the word pedagogy in the title at all; not because I'm a snob (I'm a big fan of the scholarship of teaching thing), but because it's pretty limiting for the site as a whole.

Social pedagogy could be a subsection, though... I like how it rolls off the tongue.

**Ronda L Wery**

July 19 at 11:03pm

I love the "SocialKnowing" idea, and I think "Academia" needs to be in there, too. Maybe we can use "social pedagogy" in the instructional portion of the survey results, and in a "tools/links" section somewhere in the site. Knowing, Networked. Hmmm.

What about "Networked Epistemology: Academic and Social Knowing" ?

Wait, I'm still in journal-article-mandatory-subtitle mode.

**Ronda L Wery**

July 20 at 8:42am

Just saw that Monica was talking about the domain name, not the name of the website. <blush>

SocialKnowing is an awesome domain name IMHO.

**Kristi Dunks**

July 20 at 5:03pm

So, do you all want to meet after class tomorrow?

**Chris Andrews**

July 20 at 5:07pm

Yep. And I'm in no rush, so we can dig deep.

**Kristi Dunks**

July 20 at 5:24pm

oh dear.

**Monica Wesley**

July 20 at 5:48pm

Yeah, I'm good with meeting after class tomorrow.

**Ronda L Wery**

July 20 at 7:40pm

After class sounds good. How deep, Chris? Should we bring our hip waders? ;)