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“Must it *Always* be a Paper?*

Switching to Multimodal Assignments to Enhance Motivation, Collaboration, and 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Multi-literacy Skills in the Diverse Classroom”
MUST IT **ALWAYS** BE A PAPER? AGENDA:

1. Who’s in the room?
   - Feedback slip #1: “Why go multimodal?”

2. The course - challenges/solution/theories

3. Glimpses of final results

4. Instructor’s Paper-to-MM transition story [pics]

5. Tutors’ Paper-to-MM transition stories [words]
   - Feedback slip #2: “What worries you about going multimodal?”
1. WHO’S IN THE ROOM?

What faculty are you from?

Who has tried a multimodal assignment?

Who has thought about trying it?
PLEASE SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS: (1 MIN!)

Feedback Slip #1: WHY GO MULTIMODAL?
2. THE COURSE - CHALLENGES/SOLUTIONS/THEORIES

• BP WRS 101: First year 3 CR Writing-About-Writing (WAW) writing studies course for BP3 students

• 2 sections: @ 16 students, 1 tutor
CHALLENGES:

• Declining motivation for Paper 2
• Few 21st century rhetorical skills
• Not tapping skills/creativity of multilingual students (i.e. deficit model)
• Same-old, same-old; needed challenge
SOLUTIONS:

• Re-define “writing”
  o multi media literacies / multiple intelligences & expression / Universal design for learning (UDL) [3]
  o collaboration (zone of proximal development [1]; experiential learning [2])

• Create ‘real’ writing for ‘real’ audiences

SOLUTIONS cont’d:

• more choice / decision making, application/interpersonal skills/significant learning [3,4,5]

all of which caused me to....

CUT Paper 2.
REPLACE it with a multimodal project.

Students’ task:
“Choose a personally impactful strategy or concept from the course and convince Bridging Program students of its value in a 4-6 minute multimodal project.”
(OR a written form with image)
3. GLIMPSES OF FINAL RESULTS...
MM PROJECT #1

Wu, Zhangxinyu JANE + Yang, Chen GRACE

“Writing Adventure; Learning to Write vs. Writing to Learn” 6:56 Colour GoAnimate

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wuS7-LJr_No&feature=youtu.be
MM PROJECT #2

Chen, Yanjun CHLOE + Ruan, Anqi ANGEL

Topic: (No title) READ A LOT!

5:25. iMovie. Dramatic staging using themselves.

Problems: words over faces, exact repeating of dialogue and text, language errors; overly-fast pacing; uneven sound.

https://youtu.be/Tprzf2pNaJE
MM PROJECT #3

Yang, Min SUKI + Li, Yiyao

“Writing is not only for marks” iMovie. 4:49. Live ‘teaching’ design

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eqN1zfRLfcw&feature=youtu.be
MM PROJECT #4

2. OK Yang, Zhengzhe BILLY + Li, Xianhang ANDY

“Less Time, Better Writing.” B&W line drawing GoAnimate; mechanical voices, 5:30
Original tree metaphor. Some problems in ideas, language, & production

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mg0u7qB13GI&feature=youtu.be
Tips about revision process:
1. About feedback
   Getting feedback from teachers and friends is the most important part in revision. The reason is audiences can find the problems you may not notice. You may lack strategies to revise your essays. Like a famous writing expert Nancy Sommers, from Harvard University, states in her article “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers,” she claims “a reader gives them just what the students lacked: new eyes to "re-view" their work.” Therefore, getting feedback becomes very important and cannot be ignored.

2. About recursion
   The revision process is recursive. It means I can start your second revision. Keep doing these actions repetitive. For example, The revision process is similar to writing expert professor Christina Grant’s drawing about writing process. In her drawing, she also describes revision is recursive. Her revision is more complicated and more academic. If you have interests, you can go check it.

Say, No! To your Low Writing Grades:
Doing Real Revision Improves your Writing Grade

THIS MYTH IS BAD:
As a former BP student, I am very familiar with how you revise your essay. fixing grammar, finding better words and checking spelling. However, are you really sure this is the real revision? I guess in your mind revision is equal to grammar correction or spelling checking, but the real revision is very different from this and even will cause bad results. When I took the course in EAP 140, I focus more on grammar and vocabulary. Like Professor Duncan Carter, as known as an expert of writing, concludes in his article, “Five Myth About Writing.” He states “Students don’t rewrite so much as they “reword,” rarely engaging in the kind of “global” revision - cutting, adding, reorganizing, doing more research, and developing ideas to make your ideas and arguments stronger. In contrast, fixing grammar, spelling, and punctuation—that is proofreading, not the real revision.

WHAT IS REAL REVISION?

— Definition
   “Re” means again, “vision” is sight. Combining them together, revision is a strategy to rethink and reconsider your arguments and ideas, then cutting, adding, reorganizing, doing more research, and developing ideas to make your ideas and arguments stronger. In contrast, fixing grammar, spelling, and punctuation—that is proofreading, not the real revision.

REAL REVISION HELPS YOU:
1. Strengthen your Arguments
   Revision is the most important part for you to strengthen your arguments. If you write the argumentative essay you may need to rethink and reconsider your arguments during the revision. Are they powerful? Are they convincing? After editing your arguments, your essay will become more persuasive and can get a better grade.

2. Build your Own Knowledge:
   When you revise your essay, you may need to do more research to find some examples. They are needed to support your arguments. So when you do the research in the library or getting access online, you can acquire more knowledge or even gain the authority from your field. It will help your future career.

HOW TO DO THE REAL REVISION:
Now you may are confusing how to revise your essay, here I am going to share my process to do the revision!

1. Doing first revision. 
2. Take a break. 
3. Rethink your arguments. 
4. Get feedback from your friends and teachers. 
5. Revise your second draft.
4. INSTRUCTOR’S STORY – IN PICTURES!

What problem will you help B.P. students solve?
- not really revise
- not enough ideas
- too deep enough
too much attn to grammar
- too broad
- off topic

What will they (you hope!)

1. Know? how to get strong ideas
   how to revise

2. Do? really revise.
   define “real”
   they change words
   or stay broad
   (diff)
Specialist James Park gives an overview of GoAnimate in the fabulous
Students learning iMovie, GoAnimate, Prezi, podcast and more!

A team working one-on-one with technician

Students teaching themselves GoAnimate...with a little help from the techs!
NEW KINDEGS OF COACHING...NEW PRESENTATIONS!
FINAL CLASS DAY SCREENINGS!

Also collaborated with EAP instructor Priscilla Nieto in grading
5. TUTORS’ STORIES – IN WORDS!
Is my training, as a writing studies tutor, enough?
The students: both excited and confused
A student’s success
Keeping track of their learning styles
• Tutoring prompts I found to be successful
• Teaching writing to teaching multimodal: the conversion
• It’s all about a positive attitude!
TAYA\textsuperscript{[3]}

- Exciting, unique projects!
- Student confidence
- The value of this learning experience for students
- My experience tutoring (being a confidante)
- Breaking the illusion: my professor is my only audience
SOYEON [1]

Positives

• Paper format vs. MM project
• No room for procrastination
• Self Immersion into the project + more dedication = more learning!
SOYEON [2]

Negative

• Time consuming
But, time invested = more dedication + more learning
Key: MM Project is directly linked with the students’ futures
SOYEON [3]
Educational

• Script writing = writing
• Researching, researching, and more researching
• Struggles with citations
PLEASE SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS:

Feedback Slip #2: “WHAT WORRIES YOU ABOUT GOING MULTIMODAL?”
Thank you!

~ We welcome your feedback

cmgrant1@ualberta.ca

tthibeau@ualberta.ca

soyeon@ualberta.ca

*Watch for follow-up handout on FoTL website
WHAT’S “MULTIMODAL”? 

- Uses at least two communicative modes
- Examples: animation, video/movie, Prezi with voice, brochure

http://3844s15.tracigardner.com/multimodal-dig/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Course Contract** | 30%        | **Contract fulfillment: Graded by instructor**  
All items on contract evaluated for completion and/or quality: (i.e. check minus/check/check plus): For example: Exploratory writing (i.e. inksheards/loops; quality of feedback given to other students; classroom engagement/participation. See contract for full list. Detailed records kept.  
**Explanation:** If a student is still on contract at the end of the course, he or she gets 100% (or 30/30) for this component. If the student has put him or herself off contract, he or she can get any grade (0-30/30) for this portion. |
| **2. Portfolio**       | 30%        | **Portfolio: Graded by instructor**  
Content list will be supplied. (It will be made up of existing writings from the term. Examples: 2 most illustrative inksheards; exploratory writing; major assignment drafts and reports; final copy of Literacy Narrative; exploratory writing and drafts of end-of-term multi-modal project; reflective writing assignments; feedback forms; post-conference report; evidence of effective use of feedback; substance and polish of metacognitive cover letter; other items as indicated.  
**Grading:** Evaluated and graded holistically according to effort, application, and engagement. Assigned a grade (x/30) based on clearly provided criteria. |
| **3. Annotated Bibliography** | 10%        | **Annotated Bibliography: Graded by instructor**  
Grading: The 3-source annotated bibliography will be assigned a grade (x/10) based on provided criteria. |
| **4. Multi-modal project** | 30%        | **Multi-modal project: Graded by Instructor and Outside Reader (50/50)**  
Grading: The project will be assigned a grade (x/30) based on provided criteria. The instructor and an outside reader will each grade it independently and the two grades will be averaged to get the final project grade.  
**NOTE:** This project may be completed individually or in pairs. In the case of pairs, a joint [the same] grade will be assigned to both students. |
<p>| <strong>Final course grade</strong> | 100%       | <strong>FINAL COURSE GRADE = X/100:</strong> Converted to Letter Grade: A-, B+, C-, etc. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Strands</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Averaged Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION/RHETORIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>x + x =</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating and expressing thoughts in a multimodal format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Suitability of mode(s) to audience</td>
<td>Very effective choices and uses of modes to communicate message(s) to target audience. Strong design. Acceptable or better production values. Fits within length requirements.</td>
<td>Somewhat effective choices and uses of modes to communicate message(s) to target audience. Moderate design. Acceptable or better production values. May or may not fit within length requirements.</td>
<td>Less effective choices and uses of modes to communicate message(s) to target audience. May show lack of design awareness. May lack acceptable production values. May not fit within length requirements. <strong>Not suitable for publication.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Use of mode(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Design elements (as taught)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Rhetorical choices to interest, engage, inform, persuade, convince, motivate, or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Organization (focus, guides the audience, structure shaped by content)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Overt or covert “call to action”—inciting audience to think or act differently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Production—audience can easily see, hear, read, follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adheres to min/max length (audio/video: 4-7 min. Text article: as approved.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>(8-10 points)</td>
<td>(5-7 points)</td>
<td>(0-4 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student’s Name:** xx  
**Date:** Dec. 15, 2016  
**Grade = average of instructor’s + outside grader’s marks:** xx/30  
**Acceptable for publication as submitted:** NO  YES
**THINKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing studies topic somehow connected to personal experiences in WRS 101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WR 101 topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3 expert sources effectively used and cited (APA) as taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connections to personal experiences in WR 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deep vs. surface level thinking about topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 points

| 8-10 points | 5-7 points | 0-4 points |
| Strong thinking on a writing studies topic and effective use of 3 expert sources plus clear and relevant personal connections | Moderate thinking on a writing studies topic and/or somewhat effective use of 2-3 expert sources plus clear and relevant personal connections | Some or relatively weak thinking on a writing studies topic and/or ineffective use of or lacking expert sources and/or personal connections. Not suitable for publication. |

**KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grasp of WRS 101 concepts and practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Message shows accurate/in-depth understanding of WRS concepts and practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 points

| 4-5 points | 3 points | 0-2 points |
| Shows in-depth grasp of concepts and practices | Shows some grasp of concepts and practices | Shows less than required grasp of concepts and practices. Not suitable for publication. |

**LANGUAGE**

| Clear and effective expression and wording |
| Correct use and/or explanation of writing studies terms |
| Standard Written English (few or no language errors that affect meaning in scripted spoken and/or written parts) |
| Final polish in textual elements (grammar, spelling, mechanics) |
| Note: Accurate SWE not required in unscripted spoken parts—though students should aim for it |

5 points

| 4-5 points | 3 points | 0-2 points |
| Excellent and effective language use and professional polish. Written and scripted speech parts achieve SWE | Somewhat correct and effective language use and professional polish. Written and scripted speech parts barely achieve SWE—may contain some errors that affect meaning. May not be suitable for publication at time of grading. | Multiple language challenges (i.e. expressions, syntax, grammar, spelling, wording) that obscure meaning. Written and scripted speech parts may not yet achieve SWE. Not suitable for publication at time of grading. |
WHAT WENT RIGHT AND WRONG?

- **RIGHT**: Greatly increased motivation, engagement, pride, delight, confidence, & learning

- **WRONG**: Struggles with modes & aspects of process, wildly different time investments, confusions around citations, need to clarify & hone rubric, should provide/analyze models