

MAKING PROGRESS

*Programmatic and Administrative Approaches for
Multimodal Curricular Transformation*

LOGAN BEARDEN

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Logan

© 2022 by University Press of Colorado

Published by Utah State University Press
An imprint of University Press of Colorado
245 Century Circle, Suite 202
Louisville, Colorado 80027

All rights reserved
Manufactured in the United States of America



The University Press of Colorado is a proud member of
the Association of University Presses.

The University Press of Colorado is a cooperative publishing enterprise supported, in part, by Adams State University, Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, Metropolitan State University of Denver, Regis University, University of Alaska, University of Colorado, University of Denver, University of Northern Colorado, University of Wyoming, Utah State University, and Western Colorado University.

∞ This paper meets the requirements of the ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (Permanence of Paper)

ISBN: 978-1-64642-212-8 (paperback)
ISBN: 978-1-64642-213-5 (ebook)
<https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646422135>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bearden, Logan, author.

Title: Making progress : programmatic and administrative approaches for multimodal curricular transformation / Logan Bearden.

Description: Logan : Utah State University Press, [2022] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021050442 (print) | LCCN 2021050443 (ebook) | ISBN 9781646422128 (paperback) | ISBN 9781646422135 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: English language—Rhetoric—Study and teaching (Higher)—United States. | Media programs (Education)—United States. | Curriculum change—United States. | Academic writing—Curricula. | Modality (Linguistics) | Education, Higher—United States—Computer-assisted instruction. | English language—Rhetoric—Curricula—United States.

Classification: LCC PE1405.U6 B43 2022 (print) | LCC PE1405.U6 (ebook) | DDC 808/.0420711—dc23/eng/20211122

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021050442>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021050443>

The University Press of Colorado gratefully acknowledges Eastern Michigan University who supported, in part, this publication.

Cover illustration © MJgraphics/Shutterstock

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ix

1. Carving Out Space for Multimodal Curricular Transformation 3
2. The Processes of Multimodal Curricular Transformation 17
3. Outcomes, Definitions, and Values in Multimodal Curricular Transformation 45
4. Manifestations of Multimodal Curricular Transformation 79
5. An Evolving Heuristic for Multimodal Curricular Transformation 102

References 113

Index 121

About the Author 125

1

CARVING OUT SPACE FOR MULTIMODAL CURRICULAR TRANSFORMATION

“To ensure that our courses do not become irrelevant—or depending on one’s perspective, to ensure that they do not become increasingly irrelevant—we must ask students to examine the designs of words on a page as well as the relationships among words, images, codes, textures, sounds, colors, and potentials for movement. We need, in short, to embrace composition” (Shipka, 2013, p. 211, emphasis added).

“Even though some scholars in the field have persuasively argued for the value of multimodal composing practices and the learning that occurs in the process, implementation of multimodal instruction has remained nominal in many writing programs. Attempts at implementing multimodal approaches are sporadic at best. Even those attempts are mostly individual instructors’ initiatives in a handful of institutions. Multimodality—so highly hailed in scholarship as the means of preparing the writers and communicators of the future—is largely ignored in most writing classrooms. Frankly speaking, multimodality is still far from being a norm in the majority of writing classes, and it is miles away from being adopted by a large section of writing instructors and programs” (Khadka & Lee, 2019, p. 4).

Over the last 30 years, prominent scholars in writing studies have made persuasive and compelling arguments to expand the curricular circumference of composition, specifically first-year composition (FYC). In the introduction to their recent edited collection, Santosh Khadka and J. C. Lee (2019) list some of the major figures in the field who have made such calls: Cynthia Selfe, Kathleen Blake Yancey, Stuart Selber, Anne Wysocki, Geoffrey Sirc, and Jody Shipka, just to name a few (p. 3). Cynthia Selfe, for example, argued in 1999 about the “perils” the humanities face by not considering the ways in which digital technologies impact literate

practices. Ten years later, in 2009, she went on to argue that “when we insist on print as the primary, and formally most acceptable, modality for composing knowledge, we . . . unwittingly limit students’ sense of rhetorical agency” (p. 618). To teach alphabetic writing *only*, Selfe and these other figures argue, is to limit the rhetorical potentials of our students, especially in an increasingly digital world, where communicating with more than just words on a page is necessary.

As a discipline, those of us in writing studies have turned to the concept of *multimodality* and multimodal theory as a way to develop a more capacious composition curriculum. First, I would like to clarify what I mean when I invoke the term “multimodality,” specifically the literate practices that the term describes and the value of a multimodal composition curriculum, because according to Pegeen Reichert Powell (2020), “perhaps the most persistent assumption about multimodality is that we know what it is” (p. 5). Multimodality, as a term, concept, and theory, comes from the study of linguistics and semiotics. Gunther Kress (2010) and others in the New London Group (NLG), have used the proliferation of digital technologies in the past 30 years to make the claim that there is a need to develop new pedagogies and curricula to prepare students to participate in the global-digital world by expanding the means of communication in which students are educated (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). *Modes* are the building blocks of multimodal theory, and Kress defines a mode as a socially situated resource for communicating and lists image, writing, speech, music, gesture, and color as examples of modes (p. 1). Each of these have different affordances, different grammars, and different ways of communicating meaning, which are shaped by both the histories of their materialities and the social value of those materialities. For example, in print, alphabetic English, we read typed/graphic texts top to bottom, left to right, in (mostly) sequential order. Conversely, according to Kress (2005), images present all semiotic material at once, and he argues that this allows the audience of the image to follow points of individual interest: “It is the viewer’s action that orders the simultaneously present elements in relation to her or his interest” (p. 13). Elsewhere, he claims that “in a social semiotic approach to mode, equal emphasis is placed on the affordance of the material ‘stuff’ of the mode (sound, movement, light, and tracing on surfaces, etc.) and on the work done with that material over very long periods” (2010, p. 80). In this way, he accounts for the ways in which we as meaning-makers shape the materials that make communication possible as much as our communications are influenced by the materials that we use. Indeed, per Kress, multimodality is a social-semiotic theory

of communication that considers the symbiotic relationships among the contexts in which meaning-making takes place, the agents involved in the process, and not least, the semiotic potentials of the resources those agents employ. Although this theory describes a complex constellation, Paul Prior (2009) quite succinctly states that multimodality is a “routine dimension of language in use” (p. 16). In other words, communication and meaning-making are and always have been multimodal because multimodality is a central facet of literacy. Therefore, multimodality is not new; our (scholarly) attention to this phenomenon is new. This is the richness of multimodal theory: it emphasizes the materiality of communication and meaning-making, and it gives us a vocabulary with which we can theorize those processes. This is also why I choose to invoke the term “multimodal” rather than digital/new media, digital humanities, or digital rhetoric, because those terms allude to or imply the digital in ways that multimodal does not.

Multimodality—as a term and concept—has the ability to create more capacious composition programs by not prescribing the materials and media with/in which students work, thereby expanding their rhetorical potentials. Within this framework, alphabetic writing is but one in a capacious repertoire of skills necessary for communicating, which destabilizes the privileged position of print literacy, both in and out of the academy. Rather than theorizing the process(es) of writing only, a composition curriculum that attends to multimodality, as Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis (2000) argue, “focuses on modes of representation much broader than language alone” (p. 5). These authors claim that “the changing world and the new demands being placed upon people as meaning makers in changing workplaces, as citizens in changing public spaces” (p. 4) outside of the academy demand transformed curricula within. In these revised programs and curricula, students learn about the role of design in literacy and meaning-making, utilize their personal, individual literacy practices through situated practice, and eventually exhibit transformed practice, which “involves students’ transfer, reformulation, and redesign of existing texts and meaning-making practice from one context to another” (Angay-Crowder et al., 2013, p. 38). Students write in these programs, but they do not just write; they compose with/in a variety of materials and for multiple audiences, which prepares them to do so in the future.

We have, to be sure, responded generously to calls to expand the curricular content of composition. Teacher-scholars in writing studies/rhetoric and composition have made space for video (see, for example, Sheppard, 2009; VanKooten, 2016; VanKooten & Berkley, 2016), audio

(Ceraso, 2014; Ceraso, 2018; McKee, 2006), and design as a multimodal-rhetorical process (George, 2002; Hocks, 2003; Stroupe, 2000; Wysocki, 2005; Leverenz, 2014; Purdy, 2014). Further, we have a plethora of models of what these expanded, transformed curricula might look like, especially within individual classrooms (see Alvarez, 2016; Graban et al., 2013; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Kynard, 2007; Martin et al., 2019; Rios, 2015; Shipka, 2013; Shipka, 2011). In “Made Not Only in Words,” Kathleen Blake Yancey (2004a) details that transformed composition classes would emphasize an approach to rhetoric and literacy that acknowledges that “we *already* inhabit a model of communication practices incorporating multiple genres related to each other, those multiple genres remediated across contexts of time and space, linked one to the next, circulating across and around rhetorical situations both inside and outside of school. This is composition—and this is the *content* of composition” (p. 306, emphasis original). Indeed, the association of rhetoric with alphabetic writing only is a “by-product of print culture rather than the epistemological limits of rhetoric itself. We use rhetoric to help us think more clearly, write more elegantly, design more logically. . . . Rhetoric has always been important to the composition classroom, but we are only now beginning to understand how it might work as a device to help our students understand and create visually and verbally interwoven texts” (Handa, 2004, p. 2). Similarly, Joyce Walker (2007) has suggested that, in attending to a capacious understanding of rhetoric and literacy, these transformed curricula would “attend to the materiality of texts . . . [offering] students the opportunity to make knowledgeable choices about software, hardware, structural organization, and to examine the *rhetorical potentials of different visual, aural, and alphabetical compositions*” (“What does new media writing mean to you?” emphasis added). Thus, while the composition curriculum has traditionally encompassed rhetoric and literacy as they pertain to alphabetic writing, a multimodal composition curriculum expands the available means and materials of persuasion and communication, allowing students to cultivate a more nuanced understanding of their composing processes and choices. In doing so, the curriculum helps students become more effective composers both in and out of the academy.

These calls and arguments are persuasive, and the new curricula detailed in these publications are innovative and exciting. And yet, we see similar arguments appear again and again in our scholarship. In 2014, Carrie Leverenz wrote, “As a teacher concerned with my students’ ability to participate in a future of writing, I believe we need to question

our complicity with this predominantly conservative educational mission” of focusing on print, alphabetic writing as the sole content of composition (p. 2). This is a strikingly similar concern to the one Kathleen Blake Yancey raised in her 2004 Conference on College Composition and Communication Chair’s Address, in which she demonstrated that “literacy today is in the midst of a tectonic change. Even inside of school, never before have writing and composing generated such diversity in definition. What do our references to writing mean? Do they mean print only?” (2004a, p. 298). Yancey’s claim then—the urgency of which was made even more potent by the data she cited demonstrating alarming declines in enrollment in traditional English departments—was yet another iteration of Selfe’s 1999 admonition about the perils of not paying attention. To put it plainly, leading scholars have urged *repeatedly* for us to make these curricular, programmatic changes, and we have a wealth of scholarship including models of those changes, but as Emily Isaacs (2018) has argued, “what is a trend in the literature and conversation at conferences is often revealed not to be the case when we look systematically” at individual institutions (p. 47). This is especially true of multimodal composition. In an article detailing an examination of composition textbooks, Aubrey Schiavone (2017) writes:

Instruction in composition has tended to privilege the *production* of text and the *consumption* of visual and multimodal artifacts. In this way, my findings demonstrate a disparity between theories and practices associated with multimodal composing, especially at the juncture in composition’s relationship with multimodality that these textbooks capture. *Theories* posit the importance of teaching students to produce visual and multimodal compositions, while the *practices* encapsulated in textbook prompts tend to promote the consumption of multimodal compositions more so than their production. (p. 359, emphasis added)

There persists a profound disconnect between the changes for which leading figures and key scholarship advocate and the day-to-day realities of composition programs, and that disconnect, as Jody Shipka outlines in the quote included at the beginning of this chapter, places the future of composition at risk.

To illustrate a possible explanation for this vexed issue, I offer a brief story of my personal experience with multimodal composition. Multimodality became a part of my pedagogy in my first semester of teaching FYC. Specifically, I included what Wendy Bishop (2002) called a “radical revision” as the final major project in ENC 1101: Freshman Composition and Rhetoric. In his description of Bishop’s assignment, Jeff Sommers (2014) states that the radical revision asks students to

“consider changes in voice/tone, syntax, genre, audience, time, physical layout/typography, *or even medium*” (p. 295, emphasis added). In my course, I asked students to take one of the projects they had composed earlier in the semester—an academic essay four to seven pages in length about the students’ digital literacy practices—and transform it into a different medium for a different audience. These requirements meant that the products were necessarily multimodal. The students made scrapbooks, posters, paintings, and videos, all of which required that they consider sounds, color, images, etc., and how those resources communicate to nonacademic audiences. They had the final 2 weeks of the semester to complete the task, it was worth 10% of their final grades, and I cannot recall if we actually spent any time in class discussing drafting and revising such projects. They handed it in to me on the last day of class, and I never saw most of those students again. I do not know what the students learned from the project, or whether they found it to be a productive intellectual task, because I never bothered to ask them how it might have influenced their understanding of rhetoric and/or of the composing process.

The following year I taught a class called Writing about Harry Potter and Pop Culture, a theme-based FYC course that I designed to incorporate an early iteration of the teaching-for-transfer (TFT) curriculum developed by Liane Robertson and Kara Taczak.¹ The third major project in that class received a full month of time in the course schedule and was another variation of a radical revision: a multigenre, multimedia project that students used to share researched arguments composed in a previous assignment—an 8–10 page, double-spaced application of literary/cultural theory to the Harry Potter series—with audiences outside of the classroom. The students staged protests, created social media accounts, posted their fliers and posters around campus, were asked questions as they drew with chalk on the sidewalks between buildings, using multiple modes to convey their arguments and share their research. Alongside this assignment, students submitted a rationale that explained the rhetorical choices they made in their compositions and a reflection that explained what they learned about composing.

1. Kara Taczak and Liane Robertson were finishing their dissertation research projects as I began my graduate studies and teaching appointment at Florida State University. The pilot TFT curriculum that they utilized to collect their first rounds of data was detailed in FSU’s Teacher’s Guide, and I used that description to inform my own course. The results of those studies were shared in the 2014 book they co-authored with Kathleen Blake Yancey, *Writing Across Contexts*.

I *loved* that assignment for several reasons. First, while the low-stakes radical revision I assigned during my first semester was fairly stress-free for me and the students, I know that no one but me and the students ever saw those projects. The multigenre option that second year required that students circulate their work, sharing it with people who were not me. This reminded them that composing is inherently social, that people do interact with texts, that texts do work out in the world, and, not least, that texts beyond the academy require multimodal composing to reach their audience effectively. Second, those students were able to articulate to me what they had learned in reflection—they shared what it was like to have people interact with their online social media accounts or to have someone ask them about their research while they drew with sidewalk chalk—and explain *why* they created their compositions the way that they did. Those documents demonstrated specifically what and how those students learned about composition and rhetoric. Third, my colleagues began asking me about my classes after seeing student projects across campus and online. Those conversations provided me with an exigence, a kairotic opportunity, to discuss my values as an instructor of composition, to think through counter-arguments for the “how is this even writing?” question that plagues multimodal instruction, and to reflect on my teaching practices.

The multimodal assignment included in the Harry Potter class was better than the one I assigned in ENC1101. However, there was a major flaw with that project: *I made the decision to include it in my course*. The TFT curriculum I used to develop the assignment for the Harry Potter class was one of five or six options presented in the program guide, which came predesigned with weekly plans, assignment sheets, readings, activities, assessment rubrics, etc. so that instructors could select one, personalize the template information with their office location and email, and walk into class (somewhat) ready to deliver a curriculum on the first day. This particular assignment was *not* something to which the entire College Composition program was committed. Many composition programs in the country follow this model—crafting a fairly flexible curriculum from/with/in which instructors can make their own choices to align with programmatic goals. Multimodal composition, as a curricular component, can be taken up by those instructors and delivered to students. Or it cannot. Such flexibility, while certainly beneficial, does not allow for what is absolutely necessary: making sure that the entire program becomes committed to multimodal composition, delivering that commitment consistently to all students within the program, helping students become more adroit twenty-first-century composers in the process.

The programmatic restructuring that I am envisioning here is what Jason Palmeri (2012) has termed multimodal curricular transformation. While Palmeri does not offer a specific, concrete definition of this concept in his book, I will work toward one here. First, the choice of “curricular transformation” in Palmeri’s term is worth noting because, according to Jennifer Grant Haworth and Clifton F. Conrad (1990), curricular transformation refers to “those informal and formal procedures through which knowledge within the curriculum is *continually* produced, created, and expanded by a wide range of stakeholders acting within a broader social and historical context” (p. 3, emphasis added). Similarly, Stephanie G. Hein and Carl D. Reigel (2011) argue that revision and transformation are different programmatic tasks because “curricular transformation does not stop at curricular revision,” but rather, it “involves radical changes in structure, content, outcomes, *and at times, even culture*” (p. 3, emphasis added), which “requires continuous improvement efforts” (p. 8). Curricular transformation, then, is an ongoing process of programmatic remaking through reflective praxis, which has the potential to shift programmatic cultures, making space for new and different kinds of curricular content, like multimodal composition. Second, Palmeri suggests that a transformed multimodal composition curriculum would include the following features: (a) flexible ways for using multimodality as invention and revision techniques (p. 149), (b) engaging rhetorical concepts to compose multimodal texts (p. 152), and (c) providing students with the opportunity to use multimodal texts to cultivate critical digital literacies (p. 158). Based on these features, multimodal curricular transformation does not mean ancillary, low-stakes assignments tacked on to the end of the semester, which only work to reinforce the privileged position that print, alphabetic writing possesses within the academy (Whithaus, 2005; Alexander & Rhodes, 2014). Rather, multimodal curricular transformation describes a continual, intentional *infusion* of multimodality throughout the curriculum and a *redefinition* of the work of the composition classroom from alphabetic writing to rhetoric, including the full available means of persuasion and requiring that students utilize multimodal composition to demonstrate rhetorical proficiency. It is not the inclusion of flashier digital technologies in first-year composition courses; it is a call to craft programs that reflect what we know and believe about literacy and meaning-making and that foster the development of a capacious repertoire of rhetorical skills necessary for students to be more effective and engaged citizens. This is what we need to address the problems described above, and we must acknowledge that writing about multimodality in our scholarship

and including it in our individual classrooms is not enough to lead to transformation. While a multimodal composition curriculum is delivered to students via instructors, it cannot be the sole responsibility of the individual instructor—those instructors graduate, retire, move to a different institution, etc., taking their innovative pedagogies and assignments with them when they go. It must be an ongoing program-wide commitment.

However, as I mentioned earlier in this chapter, we have not yet been able to accomplish this across programs at the national level. Khadka and Lee remind us in no uncertain terms that multimodal composition is *not* a common curricular component in FYC. There are many possible, interrelated reasons for this. First, too often, when those who are not familiar with multimodal theory and scholarship encounter the term “multimodal,” they presume that it means “digital.” When we conflate these, Jody Shipka (2013) suggests we “may severely limit the kinds of texts and communicative strategies or processes students explore in our courses” (p. 74). In short, Shipka suggests, when we prescribe “digital” (or any other kind of mode/medium for our students), we limit students’ rhetorical possibilities: the texts they make, the audiences to whom they speak, and the spaces in which they can effect change. Similarly, we rarely present a consistent definition of multimodality to students. In a previous article, I isolated four types of multimodal outcomes: (a) multimodality as the simple addition of another mode on top of writing curricula (typically public speaking or discussion); (b) multimodality as visual rhetoric (prescribing that image be the mode through which students communicate); (c) multimodality as digital or technological literacy; and (d) multimodality as material-rhetorical flexibility, making use of the full available means of communication appropriate for the purpose and situation (Bearden, 2019a). Only the fourth category enacts a multimodal curriculum in the way that scholarship suggests it should.

Additionally, even if we do not conflate multimodality with digitality, multimodal composition can be met with resistance from the teaching faculty within the program. We know that instructors resist certain curricular changes if those changes challenge their personal construct or self-efficacy (Dryer, 2012; Ebest, 2005). These instructors may not understand how multimodality fits within the composition curriculum or are worried that they lack the technical/technological expertise necessary to make a multimodal curriculum work (Horn, 2002; Khalil, 2013; Moerschell, 2009; Oreg, 2006). It would make sense for instructors to resist a composition curriculum that diverges so greatly from

their personal conception of first-year composition. Or these instructors might perceive multimodality (as it has been defined above) as a valuable part of composition curricula generally, but that it does not necessarily need to be something that students encounter in FYC. I disagree; multimodality is inextricable from composition (as a literate practice and field of study), and therefore *must* be situated within FYC. For years, scholarly conversations have engaged the question of FYC's curricular content. For example, Doug Downs and Elizabeth Wardle (2007), in their description of a reimaged version of FYC that functions as an introduction to writing studies, argue that the content should shift from "teaching 'academic writing' to *teaching realistic and useful conceptions of writing*" (p. 557). Rather than teaching students grammars or "absolute rules" associated with academic writing, this FYC introduces to students how writing actually functions, sharing disciplinary knowledge with them. One of the core threshold concepts of our discipline is that all writing is multimodal (Ball & Charlton, 2015), and, following Downs and Wardle's example, as one of the central principles of our discipline, *multimodality must be a part of FYC*. This does not mean that students leave our classes proficient in any one kind of multimodal composing (filmmaking/video, for example, could be explored in greater depth in an upper-level, major-specific course). This does mean, however, that multimodality is the purview of FYC: Students should understand that meaning-making is multimodal; students should begin to think about (if not theorize and practice) the limitations and affordances of different modes as part of their understanding of rhetoric. Leaving multimodal composition as optional curricular content can give students an incomplete and inaccurate understanding of the discipline.

Third, and perhaps most important, there are larger systemic barriers to multimodal curricular transformation. Tarez Samra Graban et al. (2013) summarize the impediments in the following way: "Campuses are not uniformly equipped, teachers are not technically expert, and curricula dedicated to critical [alphabetic] writing cannot also accommodate multivalent aims as they are delivered through unfamiliar technological contexts" (p. 250). In terms of campus equipment and infrastructure, it is true that some institutions simply do not have the budget or the physical space to create labs/studios that might foster and support multimodal composition. However, there are two counterclaims I would make here. The first is to reemphasize that multimodal compositions do not have to take the form of digital texts—students (and instructors) do not need access to sophisticated computing systems. For example, the kinds of texts that students create in Shipka's class are made from

materials that programs can easily provide with available budget or that students can provide as part of their materials cost for any course, like paper, pens, folders, printing, etc. The second is that programs that have made *digital* multimodality a part of their curricula can make use of open-access software or, according to Rory Lee (2018), “expect their students to have their own access to technology. In other words, many majors [in writing] operate according to a Bring-Your-Own-Technology (BYOT) model” (p. 102).² Such a policy makes the curriculum flexible, allowing students to bring the materials with which they are the most comfortable to the classroom to engage multimodal composition.

Graban et al.’s concern about teachers’ expertise is well taken. While they are specifically addressing the means/materials with which composers make multimodal texts, FYC does have a larger issue when it comes to the expertise of the individuals who deliver our courses. FYC is often taught by those least valued by the institution: graduate teaching assistants, part-time lecturers, or those not on the tenure track. For these individuals who are overworked and underpaid, teaching can be a matter of survival. Additionally, they are more than likely to not have been trained in the discipline of writing studies. FYC programs routinely hire those who are studying or have backgrounds in creative writing, literature, linguistics, and other areas of English studies. Kristine Hansen (2018) writes that this places a lot of pressure on composition program directors, who are “expected to make writing teachers out of dozens of people who have had little to no opportunity to study the discipline of Writing and Rhetoric prior to teaching” (p. 136). It is unrealistic to expect these instructors to embrace multimodal composition enthusiastically when they are perhaps still trying to grasp that the teaching of composition has a history, has theories undergirding its various iterations, and has a growing body of scholarly literature. This is the problem: we know that there are serious impediments to multimodal curricular transformation, not the least of which involve the instructors upon which we routinely rely to deliver FYC to students. We also know that, without multimodal curricular transformation, FYC will become increasingly irrelevant.

What, then, are we to do? How do programs make space for multimodality in composition curricula? What are the methods, processes,

2. There are, of course, several problems with this. The digital divide still exists across several demographic lines, and not all students have the same access to the same materials. Too, disability studies scholarship reminds us that not all students access materials in the same way. BYOT may not be the best solution for this programmatic problem, but it is a possible solution, nonetheless.

and strategies by which multimodal curricular transformation can be initiated? The answers to these questions will be productive to those of us who work within composition programs and are interested in making our programs align more closely with contemporary trends in scholarship regarding multimodal composition, but do not know where or how to begin. Systematic inquiry into programs that have successfully entered into multimodal curricular transformation can provide us with possible insights that can be extrapolated to other contexts. To that end, this book will share the results of a mixed-methods research project with the goal of helping readers leave this book not only with a better understanding of multimodality and of curricular revision, but also with

- specific strategies for having the conversations necessary to initiate change,
- models of the documents that support a programmatic ecology in which multimodal composition is vital, and
- understandings of the varied roles that program directors and instructors can play in these processes.

I will argue that multimodal curricular transformation is something that all programs can work toward if we work collaboratively and equitably with instructors to revise the documents that constitute our programs, creating a curricular content that invites multimodality and a programmatic culture that provides the support structures necessary for instructors to accept (if not embrace) multimodal composition.

Chapter 2 asks what the strategies and procedures are by which composition program directors help their programs initiate multimodal curricular transformation. To work toward an answer to that question, I conducted interviews with 10 writing program administrators who have overseen and participated in multimodal curricular transformation at their own institutions.

By reading across interview data, I trace similarities and parallels in the process along the following axes:

1. Motivations and exigences for initiating multimodal curricular transformation,
2. the processes involved in multimodal curricular transformation (including stakeholders involved, documents changed, new initiatives developed, etc.),
3. reasons for resistance to multimodal curricular transformation, and
4. strategies for dealing with resistance to multimodal curricular transformation.

The chapter, thus, presents a set of strategies—collaboration, conversation, decentralization, and professionalization—that can be adopted and adapted within a variety of composition programs. Readers will be able to utilize these in their own contexts and leave with a more nuanced understanding of the processes of multimodal curricular transformation.

Additionally, the interview data revealed that outcomes statements can be a textual site of multimodal curricular transformation through the articulation, renegotiation, and revision of programmatic values, thereby making space for multimodal composition. Taking up this finding, Chapter 3 asks what kinds of curricular content composition programs value currently, and do those values make space for or preclude multimodal composition? I present the analysis of a corpus of outcomes collected from 82 different programs across the field—including those who emphasize multimodal composition and those who do not—yielding a total of 1,353 outcomes. Using a modified version of the outcomes statement released by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA OS) as a coding scheme, I coded each statement to see how frequently certain values, like multimodal composition, appear (or do not). While outcomes statements do not and cannot delineate all of the work done in the composition classroom, they are integral parts of it. They present a definition of and vision for composition to our instructors, our students, and the public, in addition to often providing the means by which we assess our programs. My analysis reveals that, while the frequency with which multimodal composition appears in our published scholarship can suggest otherwise, composition programs remain fairly conservative in content, continuing to emphasize a prescriptive version of alphabetic writing. Thus, the field at large's outcomes present a definition of composition and a set of compositional values that are at odds with our published scholarship. In Chapter 3, I also suggest the ways we might return to, reflect upon, and revise these documents as part of the process of working toward multimodal curricular transformation.

Chapter 4 asks what a transformed multimodal composition curriculum looks like in practice. To answer that question, the chapter utilizes two data points—the interviews referenced in Chapter 2 and programmatic documents from each case study (outcomes statements, sample syllabi, program guides, assignment sheets, etc.)—to detail assignments that instantiate multimodal curricular transformation. The most frequently occurring kind of multimodal assignment in the case study programs was the Remediation Project, in which students shape previously composed material (most often a research project/paper) for a different audience, utilizing a different medium, genre, or constellation

of modes. This chapter explores the limitations and affordances of the various iterations of the Remediation Project: Some programs standardize the kinds of remediations that students complete (requiring that all students transform their research papers into digital editorials, for example) while others allow students to make their own choices regarding the materials with which they compose, the audiences for whom they compose, and the vehicles through which their compositions circulate. But while the remediation project can be a beneficial inclusion to the FYC curriculum, adding an assignment is not enough; the case study programs present a consistent vision of composition as multimodal across programmatic documents, including outcomes statements, websites, *and* the assignments delivered to students. The work of multimodal curricular transformation, then, is multitextual.

I end the book by synthesizing my major findings and returning to the overarching question: How can multimodality become an integrated part of composition curricula in the way scholarship argues that it should? My research suggests that changing the content of the FYC curriculum from *writing* to *composition*, using programmatic documents to articulate values that make space for and perhaps require multimodal composition, creating a programmatic culture that allows instructors to deepen their expertise in the field and in multimodality while also allowing them to shape the content of the program are all vital parts of the process of multimodal curricular transformation. Readers will leave this book with strategies for initiating the process in their own contexts, textual models of programmatic documents that support the transformation, and an understanding of the roles that administrators can play in these processes. In other words, multimodal curricular transformation is achievable, and in working toward it, we align ourselves more closely with the discipline, we increase students' rhetorical possibilities, and we position FYC well to serve a vital role in helping students cross contexts and cultures as twenty-first-century meaning-makers.