

## CONTENTS

Professionalizing Multimodal Composition: An Introduction

*Santosh Khadka and Shyam B. Pandey* 3

### **PART I: FACULTY PREPAREDNESS** 23

1. Graduate Student and Faculty Development in Multimodal Composing  
*Wilfredo Flores, Teresa Williams, Christina Boyles, Kristin Arola, and Dànielle Nicole DeVoss* 25
2. (E)merging Expertise: Multivocal, Multimodal Preparation and Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Writing Programs  
*Kelly Moreland, Sarah Henderson Lee, and Kirsti Cole* 43
3. Practicing (Antiracist and Anti-ableist) Multimodality: TA Training and Student Responses to Implementing a Multimodal Curriculum in First-Year Writing  
*Megan McIntyre and Jennifer Lanatti Shen* 61
4. Professional Development for Multimodal Composition: Preparing Graduate Teaching Assistants for the Twenty-First Century  
*Tiffany Bourelle* 78
5. Incorporating Multimodal Literacies across an FYW Program: Graduate Instructors' Preparation and Experiences  
*Lauren Brawley, Morgan Connor, Meghalee Das, Aliethia Dean, Claudia Diaz, Michael J. Faris, Michelle Flahive, Maeve Kirk, Max Kirschenbaum, Joshua Kulseth, Alfonsina Lago, Kristina Lewis, Lance Lomax, Brook McClurg, Zachary Ostraff, Anthony Ranieri, Sierra Sinor, Rebekah Smith, and Yifan Zhang* 95

### **PART II: INSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES AND SUPPORT** 113

6. DMAC at Fifteen: Professionalizing Digital Media and Composition  
*Scott Lloyd DeWitt and John Jones* 115

7. Looking beyond the Writing Program: Institutional Allies to Support Professional Development in the Teaching of Digital Writing  
*Alison Witte, Stacy Kastner, and Kerri Hauman* 139
8. A Fresh Catalyst: Invigorating the University with Integrated Modalities  
*Daniel Schafer and Josh Ambrose* 158
9. Embedding Multimodal Writing across a University at the Institutional, Administrative, and Curricular Level: The Undergraduate Professional Writing and Rhetoric Major as Agent of Change  
*Li Li, Michael Strickland, and Paula Rosinski* 175

**PART III: ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP** 195

10. The Art of Responsiveness: The Ongoing Development of a Master of Arts in Composition, Rhetoric, and Digital Media (CRDM)  
*Claire Lutkewitte* 197
11. “Go Make Things Happen”: Professionalizing Graduate Students through Multimodal Composing  
*Sauna Chung, Stephen Quigley, and Tia Dumas* 213
12. Centering Translingualism in Multimodal Practice: A Reflective Case Study of a Linguistically Diverse Graduate Program  
*Megan E. Heise and Matthew A. Vetter* 233
13. Multimodality as a Key Consideration in Developing a New Communications Degree at UMass, Dartmouth  
*Anthony F. Arrigo* 250

*Epilogue: Multimodal Professionalization during and after the COVID-19 Pandemic*

*Santosh Khadka and Shyam B. Pandey* 271

*Index* 275

*About the Authors* 281

**PROFESSIONALIZING MULTIMODAL  
COMPOSITION**

# PROFESSIONALIZING MULTIMODAL COMPOSITION

## *An Introduction*

Santosh Khadka and Shyam B. Pandey

It took us three decades to get to where we stand today in terms of programmatic implementation of multimodality. Over the years, there have been multiple calls to incorporate multimodal and digital literacies into writing curricula (Kress 1999; Kress and Van Leeuwen 2001; New London Group 1996; Selber 2005; Selfe 1999; Takayoshi and Selfe 2007; Wysocki et al. 2004; Yancey 2004). Even though some scholars argue that multimodal predates digital and that writing has always been multimodal (Palmeri 2012; Shipka 2009), the urgent call for embracing multimodal composition in the field of English/writing studies came with New London Group's "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracy" in 1996. NCTE later responded to this call with a position statement on multimodality in 2005. This institutional call was echoed again in 2009 by the past CCCC's chair, Kathleen Blake Yancey, who noted, "We can and should respond to these new composings and new sites of composing with new energy and a new composing agenda" (7). She further maintained that given the technological moment we are in, we have an opportunity to foster "new models of writing; designing a new curriculum supporting those models; and creating models for teaching that curriculum" (1). No question, that was an opportune moment for multimodal intervention in curricula and programs; however, the instances of actual design and implementation of multimodal writing curricula and programs are rare even today in 2022. Most of the published scholarship on curriculum design and implementation is at the course level—either as an addition of a multimodal component to an existing first-year composition curriculum or development of a new course on multimodal and/or digital composition. There are hardly any accounts of programs built completely around multimodal or digital composition and emerging media. For instance, Dànielle Nicole DeVoss, Cheryl Ball, Cynthia L. Selfe, and Scott Lloyd DeWitt (2015), Chanon Adsanatham, Phill

Alexander, Kerrie Carsey, Abby Dubisar, Wioleta Fedeczko, Denise Landrum, Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson, Heidi McKee, Kristen Moore, Gina Patterson, and Michele Polak (2013), and Ericsson et al. (2016) describe processes and challenges of introducing a multimodal component or course curriculum at their respective institutions. But these attempts, as Carrie Leverenz (2008) notes, have yielded results only thanks to individual teachers' drive and motivation, not because of a program-wide endeavor (41). Adsanatham et al. (2013) actually discuss some programmatic, curricular, and classroom changes initiated in the composition program at Miami University to "promote the teaching and learning of multimodal composition" (282). They actually created the Digital Writing Collaborative (DWC) at the same time "to develop and sustain a culture and community of digital writing, learning, and teaching in all areas of English studies, especially in composition" (282). In order to materialize this multimodal initiative, they had to go through a process of institutional change—"from building alliances across campus to integrating the teaching and learning of multimodal digital composition into our first-year composition curriculum, classroom practices, and teacher training" (282). While this is a notable initiative, it is still an attempt to add a multimodal component to a first-year curriculum, not an initiative to develop and launch a full-fledged multimodal program.

While multimodal instruction itself is a relatively recent phenomenon in US higher education, the last two decades have witnessed exponential growth in multimodal composition research. That research has then seeped into disciplinary publications, conference presentations, and some upper-division and graduate seminar courses in the larger field of rhetoric and composition. In fact, multimodal composition, a progenitor of other cognate study areas, such as digital rhetoric, computer and composition, and digital writing, has emerged as an exciting subfield within writing studies, with its own unique identity and an impressive set of professional activities. Not just that, even mainstream rhetoric and composition as a field regularly features multimodal composition and/or digital rhetoric as an integral part of larger disciplinary conversations, even though there is a slight difference between the former and the latter. While multimodal composition relates to the production of digital or nondigital texts in more than one modality, digital rhetoric is primarily an analytic method and a heuristic for production and dissemination of digital texts in different platforms, including today's pervasive social media. Gloria E. Jacobs (2013), in fact, clarifies fine distinctions between the terms *multimodal* and *digital*. According to her, "Multimodal communication refers to the simultaneous use of more than one textual form to make meaning (Kress and

Van Leeuwen, 2001)” (102), but multimodal composing does not necessarily require the use of digital tools or technology, “although digital tools have democratized the production and distribution of multimodal texts (NCTE 2008)” (102). In that sense, there is a distinction between but also a significant overlap in these modes of composing.

Since multimodal composition is a predecessor of digital composition and encompasses both digital and nondigital texts, this collection clearly chooses to engage multimodal composition in its broader sense. One salient fact about multimodal composition as an academic subject and as a composing praxis is that it coevolves with advancements in information and communication technologies. From visual and spatial arrangement of typefaces, white spaces, and images on a print page, to 3D animations, AR and VR simulations, and a rapid development of artificial intelligence, multimodal composition has expanded substantially in both its scope and its varied forms of composing. Some popular forms of multimodal composing college students are routinely assigned these days include video/audio remixes, visual analysis, PSA, video/audio documentaries, podcasts, posters, infographics, memes, web and database design, 3D animations, and app development, among others. This range and variety of multimodal assignments reflect the field’s effort to keep up with innovations in composing technologies taking place outside the academy. The good news is that the effort has been worthwhile. Multiple research studies into student responses to multimodal and traditional assignments have shown students, in fact, prefer multimodal projects over traditional essay assignments for their real-life applications. For instance, Santosh Khadka, in his monograph, *Multiliteracies, Emerging Media, and College Writing Instruction* (2019), reports findings from a research study on the writing practices of diverse college students. While analyzing interview data around a documentary production project in his multiliteracies-based sophomore-level course, he found students in his class “preferred new literacy practices over the traditional ones. The traditional essayist or critical literacies are not in their list of favorites, but digital, multimodal, visual, and social media literacies are, even though, to many of them, these new literacies meant hard work, and [a] steep learning curve” (102–3). In their reflections and interviews with him, “most students said that they preferred documentary or web design assignment over an academic essay even though many of them also agreed that documentary filmmaking in particular was much more complex and labor intensive than writing an essay because it involved technology, and multiple semiotic modes of composition” (98). Based on this and similar findings, he claims,

Students these days are more into technology than into alphabetic literacy practices. They are immersed into digital and emerging media technology since early childhood, but their alphabetic literacy practices, in the traditional sense of the term, have become mostly limited to academy. This has raised some serious questions about disconnect between our students' literate practices outside and inside the academy. (98)

Given these exciting new developments and research findings, faculty members, academic leaders, and students have come to recognize that traditional and new technologies have enabled and even demanded they use more than one mode of composing to communicate, solve problems, and engage in public discourse. However, as different faculty members and programs are situated in their own specific institutional contexts, their recognition and implementation of multimodality in their research and teaching vary drastically.

In fact, as Khadka and Jennifer Lee, in their recently edited book *Bridging the Multimodal Gap: From Theory to Practice* (2019), succinctly note, "Attempts at implementing multimodal approaches are sporadic at best" (4). They further maintain that despite increased productivity in scholarship, attempts at integrating multimodal/digital components into the curriculum have been limited to a handful of individual faculty members and programs across the country. This glaring gap between theory and practice can be attributed to a number of factors, including complex and differing understandings of what writing is and what goals the writing curriculum should have, varied professional-development opportunities for faculty across institutions, and wide-ranging programmatic and institutional support for faculty to pursue multimodality in their scholarship and in their classrooms. Rory Lee (2020), in his recent work, argues along similar lines, noting implementation of multimodality is largely influenced by institutional and departmental contexts and distribution of labor in a given institution. Therefore, being mindful of the given institution's contextual constraints and possibilities should be the first priority while reimagining any writing curricula to incorporate multimodality (267).

So, a critical question many faculty members and higher education leaders are asking at this moment is how to expand the implementation of multimodality across programs and institutions. They are in unanimity that we must create or allocate more curricular space for multimodality in both its traditional and contemporary forms. However, the departmental or programmatic adoption of this new study area and these new forms of composing has not gained momentum at the level or velocity expected by multimodal scholars and instructors because of

some obvious challenges. The first among them is our or our institution's inability or unwillingness to expand our faculty pool with new members capable of developing, redesigning, or reimagining writing curricula and programs with multimodal focus or components, and then implementing them effectively across different course or degree levels. The other related challenge is bringing the existing faculty pool on board to take up multimodality and/or digitality in their courses or programs. As Cynthia Selfe (1999) said some twenty years ago, instructors identify themselves as either *pro*technology or *anti*technology when it comes to reimagining writing curricula, and it is always easier to preach to a convert than to someone who disagrees or is outright hostile to the whole notion of multimodal and/or digital composition. A similar challenge is bridging the existing disconnect between what position statements of our major professional organizations, such as CCCC, NCTE and CWPA, encourage writing programs and faculty members to do and what faculty members across institutions are actually capable of or equipped to do. In her empirical qualitative study titled "Technology Professional Development of Writing Faculty: The Expectations and the Needs," Lilian W. Mina (2020) analyzes forty CCCC, NCTE and CWPA position statements to study technology-related teaching expectations for college writing faculty and characteristics of technology professional-development programs. The findings of her study revealed there was a critical gap between the desired and the actual qualifications of many faculty members. She learned that the conceptual, pedagogical and technological knowledge necessary to comfortably and effectively teach writing curricula with technological components in them was expected of writing faculty. However, when the faculty members were asked to teach with technology and achieve technology-related outcomes, they were found to be lacking one or more of those qualifications. In fact, Mina found problems with the workings and the thought processes behind the position statements themselves. All these statements brilliantly articulate the expectations or outcomes for different writing courses; however, Mina asserts, they are silent about what institutions or programs need to do in order to bring their faculty on par with the expectations.

The leading organizations in the field have invested large resources to clearly articulate the conceptual, pedagogical, and technological expectations of teaching writing with technology (92 clauses coded), with less emphasis on describing the need for and characteristics of robust TPD programs for in-service writing faculty (39 clauses coded) to be able to meet those expectations.

This lack of desired qualifications among a large number of writing faculty is further complicated by the fact that many of our faculty members are contingent (part timers, adjuncts, and graduate teaching assistants), and there exists a significant opportunity gap between full-time and contingent faculty members. Full-time and tenure-line faculty members in R1 institutions and four-year colleges usually have access to some form of funding and benefits package, which allows them to enroll into new courses or attend workshops and professional conferences to learn new or advanced theoretical insights and functional digital skills necessary to teach writing courses with multimodal focus. However, the same opportunity is not available to contingent faculty members and even full-time faculty members in two-year colleges. These faculty members are, in fact, overworked and underpaid, and they lack access to funds and opportunities to learn and experiment with digital media and technologies in their classrooms. This opportunity gap is the single most impactful factor in the slow adoption of multimodality and/or digitality in our writing classrooms and is partly an outcome of the neoliberalization of higher education, which has pushed faculty positions into precarity and dramatically cut funding and resources for teaching and research activities. As such, higher education in the United States is reeling under severe budget cuts, reduction of permanent positions, and increased reliance on contingent staff for both teaching and research. This is concerning because federal or state budget cuts trickle down to department and program levels, compelling them to prioritize teaching over professional-development programs or even faculty research. On the other hand, contingent positions come without security, decent pay, or benefits, which keeps faculty at the edge all the time and forces them to overwork or take jobs at multiple institutions just to support themselves. No doubt, this less-than-ideal state of educational institutions and faculty status is undermining the overall quality of teaching and research, but it is also severely impacting the implementation or expansion of multimodality in college curricula because this initiative requires not just funding and resources but also time and eagerness on the part of faculty members to learn new forms and technologies of composing.

Thus, we will need to square multiple dimensions of academia to get to the bottom of the causes behind the slow and differential professionalization of multimodal composition across programs and institutions. However, scholars differ in their views when it comes to placing value on different factors causing the sluggish adoption of multimodality. For instance, Michael J. Faris (2019) finds WPAs to be key players in the professionalization of multimodal composition. Faris argues, “WPAs

can and should be at the forefront of this work, regarding technology as central to their advocacy work in ways that adjust to and change the local rhetorical ecologies of their programs and institutions” (110). Mina (2020) also notes that involving WPAs in advocacy for multimodality matters because professionalizing multimodal composition is contingent on their awareness of this new field and the goals they set for their respective writing programs.

In fact, academic leaders, including WPAs, department chairs, deans, and so on, can be instrumental in realizing the expectations or outcomes as outlined in the position statements of our professional organizations. To invoke academic leaders here is basically to invoke institutional, programmatic, and faculty-level initiatives to bridge the existing theory-praxis gap in our field by professionalizing faculty of all standings to engage multimodality effectively in their classrooms. Given this context, the authors in this book discuss three major areas these initiatives must focus on at the moment: (1) faculty preparedness to take up multimodality in their curricula; (2) institutional support to professionalize faculty to incorporate multimodal composition in their curricula or programs; and (3) academic leadership and those leaders’ willingness to introduce and support multimodal composition in different levels of writing courses and/or degree programs. All these areas definitely intersect and work in tandem. For instance, faculty preparedness to engage multimodality/digitality in their research and pedagogies is contingent on the kind of institutional support and academic leadership faculty get in their home institutions. As a result, institutional support for faculty can come in different forms. Direct funding for research and professional development is one form of institutional support; the other form could be tuition remission or financial assistance for faculty to enroll in courses, institutes, or boot camps to learn or upgrade their multimodal composing knowledge and skills. Yet another form of support could be faculty-development programs and opportunities made available to them right there in their own academic units or institutions. Workshops and boot camps run in-house are examples of such opportunities. Faculty-development opportunities could also come in the form of year- or semester-long teaching practica or extensive orientations for incoming faculty or teaching associates at the beginning of an academic year. All these different programs and events can serve as gateways for the majority of our faculty to enter into the world of multimodality. Professional-development programs, particularly the workshops and boot camps, could also be instrumental in introducing this exciting subfield to many non-writing specialists. However, academic

coursework or research would be the most important of all these initiatives. Be it mentoring our graduate teaching assistants or training our doctoral students with adequate coursework and research assignments on emerging media and composing, our graduate programs are and should be at the heart of producing some top-notch next-gen multimodal instructors and scholars for the field (more on this below in the “Defining Professionalization” section).

Two major points become evident in our discussion here. First, our current understanding of professional development through GTA mentoring and graduate course offerings is a necessary but not sufficient step to expand the implementation of multimodality in our field because a large body of contingent faculty do not have access to professional-development opportunities, nor do they hold a terminal degree with multimodal focus that makes it possible for them to initiate or enact changes in their curricular and pedagogical practices. Second, while there is an increasing interest among individual faculty and programs to incorporate multimodality, there still is a dearth of research studies that present clear evidence that writing instructors have the knowledge and skills to implement multimodality at the programmatic, departmental, or institutional level. Even more critically, there are not many published accounts of successful academic interventions or faculty-development initiatives launched to prepare or mentor faculty of all standings at a programmatic, departmental, or institutional level to teach multimodal or digital composition. This chilling absence has two major implications. First, there is no exchange of experiences and lessons learned within the communities of practice, and second, such a lack of exchange has considerably delayed the process of integrating multimodality into the larger college writing curriculum. Therefore, we must expand both the definition and implementation of multimodal professionalization and publish and circulate the results or findings of such initiatives throughout a wider community of practice.

#### **DEFINING PROFESSIONALIZATION**

Numerous studies speak to the condition of the majority of our institutions and faculty, one that calls for immediate actions. Our programs and field must focus on pedagogically based rather than tool-based training, make professional development ongoing, discipline-specific, and rhetorically situated to the institutional and teaching contexts. This training basically is what professionalizing with/through/for multimodality requires.

To begin with, Felice J. Levine and Nathan E. Bell (2015), in their article “Social Sciences Professions and Professionalization,” define professionalization as “the development of skills, identities, norms, and values associated with becoming part of a professional group” (679). They note that through professionalization, “individuals pursuing careers in specific social sciences acquire both substantive and methodological knowledge and develop understandings of their roles that permit them to function as professionals in their fields” (679). In general, the definition of professionalization includes some concrete criteria, such as a body of knowledge, exclusiveness, lengthy training, practitioner autonomy, and a code of ethics. As per Saul Carliner (2012), professionalization is primarily connected with infrastructures, which typically include five common components: professional organizations, bodies of knowledge, education, professional activities, and certification. Armin Krishnan (2009), however, takes a sociological perspective on professionalization and describes it as “a social process through which an activity becomes a means for people to make a living. A professional is someone who can carry out a certain activity with a higher level of skill and knowledge than an amateur and someone who is paid for it sufficiently to base their own livelihood on that activity” (26–27). However, as Richard Ohmann (1990) discusses in his *College English* article, the process and practices of professionalization are contentious in nature.

Professions are . . . socially made categories, and processes. A group that is doing a particular kind of work organizes itself in a professional association; appropriates, shares, and develops a body of knowledge as its own; discredits other practitioners performing similar work; establishes definite routes of admission, including but not limited to academic study; controls access; and gets recognition as the only group allowed to perform that kind of work, ideally with state power backing its monopoly. The process doesn't end there. Every constituted profession must continue to defend its rights and its borders. (250)

If we were to extend such a definition of professionalization to multimodal composition, we would have to generate a list of criteria for members to enter the profession of teaching multimodal composition, which, sure enough, would be contentious as well. Ideally, the members should earn a degree in writing studies with a focus on multimodal composition, produce and read bodies of knowledge in the field, engage in professional activities, and be affiliated with professional organizations. These would sound like minimal professionalizing expectations in other fields because fields like medicine and law have even more stringent requirements, such as certifications or credentialing and their maintenance

over the life of the profession, but the field of multimodal composition doesn't have any agreed-upon set of expectations for multimodal faculty, even though they would need academic and professional preparation to be able to teach courses on multimodal composing. The same is roughly the case with first-year composition. Faculty teaching first-year writing courses are not required to have any particular academic or professional preparation other than a degree in English studies or a cognate field. Wouldn't it be contentious if we started talking about a need for a degree in a particular subject area, let alone certification or credentialing to qualify as a faculty member to teach multimodal composition, or first-year composition for that matter? We are not arguing here that we devise gatekeeping measures, as Ohmann (1990) describes above, but we must ensure our faculty have academic and professional preparation to teach multimodal composition competently and effectively.

As per Lisa Meloncon, Peter England, and Alex Ilyasova (2016), our contingent faculty, in particular, lack professional-development opportunities "defined as those opportunities to stay current in the field or improve as a teacher and scholar" (221). They report data and case studies showing "significant gaps in professional development and training opportunities for contingent faculty" (264). Apparently, these faculty require "training, mentoring, and practice" (Cook et al., 2013, p. 311) in order to be able to integrate multimodality into their curriculum. In other words, faculty members would need learning opportunities or professionalization before they could design and implement a multimodal curriculum in their classrooms or in their programs. An upshot of involving faculty in learning opportunities or professionalization would be their participation in educational changes (Voogt et al. 2015). According to Joke Voogt, Therese Laferrière, Alain Breuleux, Rebecca C. Itow, Daniel T. Hickey, and Susan McKenney (2015), faculty can be involved in educational change "through a national/state reform or a local reform, or through collaborative design of instruction or curricular materials, which they adapt to their context" (260). Such an involvement could change the faculty's instructional practice and also help develop a sense of ownership for the reform. This shared process of adaptation through collaborative design of curricular materials offers ample opportunities for faculty professional development (260). Thus, Voogt et al. make it clear that collaborative design of curricular/instructional materials could be a professionalizing experience for both new and veteran faculty. This experience creates a mutually rewarding situation because when it comes to multimodal composing or learning about new technologies or tools, veteran faculty need as much training,

workshopping, or mentorship as the new faculty. In that sense, multimodal composing and new media can serve as equalizers or democratizing forces in our departments and institutions.

When it comes to multimodal professionalization, how to professionalize faculty for multimodal composition is even more important than why to professionalize them. No wonder there are and could be multiple models of professionalization. For instance, Punya Mishra and Matthew J. Koehler (2006) propose a conceptual framework that integrates technology, content, and pedagogical knowledge (popularly known as TPACK). According to Seyum Tekeher Getenet (2017), “TPACK stems from the notion that technology integration benefits from a cautious alignment of content, pedagogy, and technological knowledge” (2630) and, obviously, to integrate multimodality in their teaching practice, faculty must be competent in all three domains. According to Laura McGrath and Letizia Guglielmo (2015), DMAC (Digital Media and Composition Institute) could also serve as a model for faculty professionalization of multimodality. For them, “DMAC offered a model of goal-oriented activity and playful experimentation complemented by ongoing reflection and the support of co-learners and mentors, a model similar to what Barb Blakely Duffelmeyer (2003) described as a community of practice” (45). As the authors argue, this “community of practice” model can be “adapted for use in professional development contexts as well as in the classroom” (46). They actually present some case studies of how they adapted the DMAC model first to facilitate professional technological development of faculty at their institution and then to teach an upper-division Writing in Digital Environments course in their department (46). They found DMAC’s “careful framing and community building,” which allowed “messaging around” and “reflective practice,” to be a particularly effective approach both for the professional-development (PD) programs and classroom teaching. Another important insight gained from the DMAC model was that faculty professional development in teaching digital writing and digital writing scholarship is and should be the domain of rhetoric and composition faculty (52). This insight ties back to the TPACK framework discussed above. Any technology PD events divorced from content knowledge and pedagogical practice is simply useless. The DMAC Institute is effective because it’s run by faculty members in rhetoric and composition. A chain impact such as that of the DMAC Institute is testimony to the fact that individual professionalization can eventually accumulate into a program-wide and discipline-wide kind of professionalization.

Sharla Berry (2018) concurs with McGrath and Guglielmo and claims departmental colleagues are the best resource for professional-development programs. Berry, in fact, presents the results of a qualitative case study in which she drew on interviews with thirteen faculty members in an online doctoral program to find out how professional-development offerings strengthened distance instructors' technical, pedagogical, and content knowledge. She found both newer and veteran faculty agreed that the most impactful form of professional development was the one "designed for instructors, by instructors" (132). Under this PD model, "Faculty would meet in groups by course to discuss curriculum and instruction for the week's course sessions" (130). Their weekly meetings were productive for a number of reasons: (1) they were designed with instructors in mind, (2) they met instructors' needs by focusing on curriculum and content of the week, and (3) the instructors got the opportunity to learn from the content experts they trusted.

Kristine L. Blair (2014), on the other hand, has a slightly different take on how to professionalize multimodal composition among graduate students and faculty members. She calls for the entire department to be involved in the professional development of its faculty and graduate students. She laments that "all too often the task of technological training is delegated to the single course, the single expert in the program, a technical role those earlier theorists have referred to as the 'white coat syndrome' (Zeni)" (104). Graduate students, in particular, must be afforded learning opportunities across a spectrum of courses, from multimodal composing to the course in research methods. But she also sees value in making graduate students coteachers and researchers and immersing them in multimodal publication processes and editorial work on journals. She notes that this level of student engagement with digital and multimodal literacies is not possible with an individual effort, so the "graduate programs in the field should view the digital-literacy acquisition of graduate students as a shared responsibility among colleagues that includes the students themselves in a reciprocal, recursive mentoring model that will shape their future faculty identities, online and off" (105).

#### INTERVENTIONS OF THIS COLLECTION

This collection strives to respond to an unusual gap that exists between multimodal theory and practice in the field (Khadka and Lee 2019) and brings together academic leaders, scholars, and instructors who have successfully designed and launched academic programs or

faculty-development initiatives, either institutionally or individually, and want to discuss the theoretical and logistical questions considered while designing those initiatives, the outcomes they achieved by successfully running those programs or initiatives, and how others can emulate those initiatives. This exchange of knowledge, insights, experiences, and lessons learned among community members is critical for enabling or inspiring many other programs, departments, and institutions to conceive, design, and launch academic programs or faculty-development initiatives for their own faculty. To be more precise, this collection explores the individual faculty, programmatic, and institutional initiatives for integrating multimodal composition into various writing or writing-intensive courses and programs across institutions. Since the larger goal with professionalizing is to work with teaching faculty to increase their interactional expertise with multimodal composition, this collection offers a set of models (divided into three sections) for how faculty can do that at their own institutions and in their own programs. In that sense, this collection advocates for an approach to professionalizing that works for multimodality, which is detailed in three sections and thirteen individual chapters.

With similar goals in mind, the editors of this collection, Shyam B. Pandey and Shantosh Khadka, recently edited another collection, *Multimodal Composition: Faculty Development Programs and Institutional Change* (2022), focused on faculty development, which has launched conversations on multimodal professionalization of writing faculty. Whereas each of the chapters in these two collections is based on research studies conducted in different institutional settings and with different research questions and participants, and their findings are unique and distinctive, these collections perfectly complement one another, and, taken together, they could provide an array of ideas, approaches, models, and best practices for multimodal professionalization. This particular collection, for instance, focuses more on institutional initiatives, faculty preparedness (primarily grad students/TAs), and institutional academic leadership on those initiatives, whereas *Multimodal Composition* centers more on individual faculty initiatives, curriculum design, faculty-development programs, and writing across the disciplines.

In summary, this collection brings together thirteen ground-breaking essays, which, individually and collectively, address the following set of critical questions about multimodal professionalization:

- What progress have we made in the last twenty years to embrace and implement multimodality in our writing programs? How do university, department, or writing program administrators go about

professionalizing multimodal composition in their respective units? What struggles and successes have they realized?

- How has multimodal composition been part of faculty-development programs? Has it received any priority in faculty hiring processes?
- How are, can, and should graduate teaching assistants be trained to engage multimodality in their coursework, teaching, and scholarship? To what extent do they feel prepared to incorporate multimodality in their course syllabi upon completion of their degree?
- What challenges, struggles, and successes have been identified to integrate multimodality in first-year composition and upper-division writing or writing-intensive courses across the curriculum or disciplines? How can writing faculty better integrate multimodality in their curricula?
- How are writing faculty trained to utilize multimodality to teach the diverse student population more effectively? How do the different variables, such as the age, sex, class, access, abilities, literacy level, and socioeconomic status of students play into the successes and failures of adopting multimodal composition pedagogies in writing classrooms?
- To what extent are writing instructors prepared to implement multimodal pedagogies in multilingual and online spaces? What challenges and opportunities are identified in those spaces?
- What departmental and institutional challenges to and opportunities for studying and teaching multimodal composition exist in today's higher education settings? How can those challenges be turned into opportunities?

## CHAPTER SUMMARIES

This book includes thirteen distinct chapters, which are divided into three thematic sections: “Faculty Preparedness,” “Institutional Initiatives and Support,” and “Academic Leadership.” The first section has five chapters, the second has four chapters, and the final section has four chapters.

In chapter 1, “Graduate Student and Faculty Development in Multimodal Composing,” Wilfredo Flores, Teresa Williams, Christina Boyles, Kristin Arola, and Dànienne Nicole DeVoss discuss the scholarly landscape to examine how multimodal composing and teacher professional training have run perpendicular to one another and describe the teacher-development and writing center-anchored components of supporting their first-year writing curriculum, specifically one of its shared assignments: a remix composition. In chapter 2, “(E)merging Expertise: Multivocal, Multimodal Preparation and Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Writing Programs,” Kelly Moreland,

Sarah Henderson Lee, and Kirsti Cole discuss one institution's curricular revision to merge and update three different writing programs in the same English department, while taking into consideration their institutional context and the revision work they were doing to their curriculum for their first-year writing program. They also describe how, in their specific contexts, the faculty worked to mentor their graduate teaching assistants to teach and evaluate multimodal composition for diverse student populations. In chapter 3, "Practicing (Antiracist and Anti-ableist) Multimodality: TA Training and Student Responses to Implementing a Multimodal Curriculum in First-Year Writing," Megan McIntyre (a WPA) and Jennifer Lanatti Shen (a graduate teaching associate) discuss implementing a multimodal pedagogy and offer insight into how multimodal composition supports the professional development of GTAs, how these new instructors apply multimodal theory and praxis when designing their own courses, and how students respond to a multimodal curriculum. In chapter 4, "Professional Development for Multimodal Composition: Preparing Graduate Teaching Assistants for the Twenty-First Century," Tiffany Bourelle argues for administrators to extend opportunities for GTAs to learn and experiment with the theory behind multimodal composition to advance their knowledge and experience as writing instructors in these times of great technological innovations. She also discusses different professional-development opportunities, including developing seminars or practicum courses, facilitating one-on-one mentoring, and conducting ongoing workshops and focus groups, among others. And, finally, in chapter 5, "Incorporating Multimodal Literacies across an FYW Program: Graduate Instructors' Preparation and Experiences," a WPA, Michael J. Faris, and eighteen graduate instructors, Lauren Brawley, Morgan Connor, Meghalee Das, Aliethia Dean, Claudia Diaz, Michelle Flahive, Maeve Kirk, Max Kirschenbaum, Joshua Kulseth, Alfonsina Lago, Kristina Lewis, Lance Lomax, Brook McClurg, Zachary Ostraff, Anthony Ranieri, Sierra Sinor, Rebekah Smith, and Yifan Zhang, share their program's experiences preparing new graduate instructors to teach multimodal composition. Together, they reflect on and discuss four different themes: (1) preparation for teaching multimodality through the practicum course and peer mentoring programs; (2) teaching functional aspects of digital and multimodal literacy; (3) teaching critical and rhetorical aspects of digital and multimodal literacy; and (4) exploration, play, inquiry, and risk taking. They conclude the chapter with discussion of implications for faculty development in any writing programs that incorporate multimodal composition.

The second section of this book, “Institutional Initiatives and Support,” starts with chapter 6, “DMAC at Fifteen: Professionalizing Digital Media and Composition,” in which authors Scott Lloyd DeWitt and John Jones report the findings of an impact study that examines the influence of the Digital Media and Composition Institute’s instructional experience on all past attendees and analyze the significance of associated pedagogical, scholarly, and community outcomes. In chapter 7, “Looking beyond the Writing Program: Institutional Allies to Support Professional Development in the Teaching of Digital Writing,” Alison Witte, Kerri Hauman, and Stacy Kastner profile six award-winning writing programs that assign digital writing projects to illustrate how writing programs interact with their broader campus technocologies to access technology pedagogy professional development and support. As the authors put it, the goals of their chapter are to (1) highlight innovative and effective high-impact strategies for tech-ped PD developed beyond writing programs and (2) discuss how and why writing programs, and individuals within them, access these PD opportunities, in order to (3) ultimately encourage WPAs and faculty to consider leveraging connections/networks across campus in their local contexts. In chapter 8, “A Fresh Catalyst: Invigorating the University with Integrated Modalities,” Daniel Schafer and Josh Ambrose discuss the model being developed at McDaniel College—a framework built around internship-based courses in which multimodal composition is integral—and argue that the model can be adapted for implementation at any college or university. Finally, in chapter 9, “Embedding Multimodal Writing across a University at the Institutional, Administrative, and Curricular Level: The Undergraduate Professional Writing and Rhetoric Major as Agent of Change,” Li Li, Paula Rosinski, and Michael Strickland present a case study on how multimodal writing has been advocated and implemented at three different levels—institutional and administrative, curricular, and class—at their university (Elon University).

Finally, the third section, “Academic Leadership,” begins with chapter 10, “The Art of Responsiveness: The Ongoing Development of a Masters of Arts Degree in Composition, Rhetoric, and Digital Media (CRDM),” in which Claire Lutkewitte uses Nova Southeastern University’s masters of arts degree in composition, rhetoric, and digital media (CRDM) as an example to explore the strategies for successfully responding to the multifaceted needs of developing a program focusing on multimodal writing and preparing the faculty to write about and teach multimodal composition effectively. Similarly, in chapter 11, “En(Act)ion: Bridging the Graduate School Digital Divide,” Stephen Quigley and Shauna

Chung describe a cutting-edge cross-curricular digital-literacy program designed to address transferable skills, beginning with matriculating graduate students before they arrive on campus and after they have established themselves in their courses of study. In chapter 12, “Centering Translingualism in Multimodal Practice: A Reflective Case Study of a Linguistically Diverse Graduate Program,” Megan E. Heise and Matthew A. Vetter explore how a linguistically diverse doctoral program in composition and applied linguistics uses multimodal practices in a course on digital rhetoric in an effort to identify challenges and successes, which sheds light on the intersections between translingual and multimodal theories and practices. Along similar lines, in chapter 13, “Multimodality as a Key Consideration in Developing a New Communications Degree at UMass, Dartmouth,” Anthony F. Arrigo presents a case study of how and why faculty at the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, focused on multimodality as a key feature in designing a brand-new communications BA degree. This chapter primarily discusses how multimodal writing and communication has been a structural focus throughout the curriculum and what the resulting expectations and opportunities for educators in their program and beyond have been.

## REFERENCES

- Adsanatham, Chanon, Phill Alexander, Kerrie Carsey, Abby Dubisar, Wioleta Fedeczko, Denise Landrum, Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson, Heidi McKee, Kristen Moore, Gina Patterson, and Michele Polak. 2013. “Going Multimodal: Programmatic, Curricular, and Classroom Change.” In *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres*, edited by T. Bowen, and C. Whithaus, 282–312. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Berry, Sharla. 2018. “Professional Development for Online Faculty: Instructors’ Perspectives on Cultivating Technical, Pedagogical and Content Knowledge in a Distance Program.” *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* 31: 121–36.
- Blair, Kristine L. 2014. “Composing Change: The Role of Graduate Education in Sustaining a Digital Scholarly Future.” *Composition Studies* 42 (1): 103–6.
- Carliner, Saul. 2012. “The Three Approaches to Professionalization in Technical Communication.” *Technical Communication* 59 (1): 49–65.
- Cook, K. C., & Grant-Davie, K., eds. (2013). *Online Education 2.0: Evolving, Adapting, and Reinventing Online Technical Communication*. Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Ericsson, Patricia, Leeann Downing Hunter, Tialitha Michelle Macklin, and Elizabeth Sue Edwards. 2016. “Composition at Washington State University: Building a Multimodal Bricolage.” *Composition Forum* 33. compositionforum.com/issue/33/wsu.php.
- Faris, Michael J. 2019. “Writing and Technology in WPA: Toward the WPA as an Advocate for Technological Writing.” *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 42 (3): 106–12.
- Getenet, Seyum Tekcher. 2017. “Adapting Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge Framework to Teach Mathematics.” *Education and Information Technologies* 22 (5): 2629–44.
- Jacobs, Gloria E. 2013. “Multi, Digital, or Technology? Seeking Clarity of Teaching Through a Clarity of Terms.” *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 57 (2): 99–103.

- Khadka, Santosh. 2019. *Multiliteracies, Emerging Media, and College Writing Instruction*. New York: Routledge.
- Khadka, Santosh, and J. C. Lec. 2019. *Bridging the Multimodal Gap: From Theory to Practice*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Kress, Gunther. 1999. " 'English' at the Crossroads: Rethinking the Curricula of Communication in the Context of the Turn to the Visual." In *Passions, Pedagogies, and Twenty-First-Century Technologies*, edited by G. F. Hawisher and C. L. Selfe, 66–88. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Kress, Gunther, and Theo Van Leeuwen. 2001. *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.
- Krishnan, Armin. 2009. "What Are Academic Disciplines? Some Observations on the Disciplinarity vs. Interdisciplinarity Debate." ESRC National Centre for Research Methods Working Paper. [https://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/id/eprint/783/1/what\\_are\\_academic\\_disciplines.pdf](https://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/id/eprint/783/1/what_are_academic_disciplines.pdf).
- Lec, Rory. 2020. "Making the Case: Implementing Multimodality in Undergraduate Major Programs in Writing and Rhetoric." In *Writing Changes: Alphabetic Text and Multimodal Composition*, edited by P. P. Powell, 253–70. New York: MLA.
- Levine, Felice J., and Bell, Nathan. E. 2015. "Social Science Professions and Professionalization." *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* 22 (2): 679–86.
- Leverenz, Carrie. 2008. "Remediating Writing Program Administration." *WPA: Writing Program Administration: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators* 32 (1): 37–56.
- McGrath, Laura, and Letizia Guglielmo. 2015. "Communities of Practice and Makerspaces: DMAC's Influence on Technological Professional Development and Teaching Multimodal Composing." *Computers and Composition* 36: 44–53.
- Meloncon, Lisa, England, Peter, & Ilyasova, Alex. (2016). "A Portrait of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Technical and Professional Communication." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 46(2), 206–235. doi:10.1177/0047281616633601.
- Mina, Lilian. W. 2020. "Technology Professional Development of Writing Faculty: The Expectations and the Needs." *Composition Forum* 43. <https://compositionforum.com/issue/43/professional-development.php>.
- Mishra, Punya, and Koehler, Matthew J. 2006. "Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge." *Teachers College Record* 108 (6): 1017–54.
- NCTE. (2009). *Writing in the 21st Century: A Report from the National Council of Teachers of English*. [https://archive.nwpa.org/cs/public/download/nwp\\_file/12440/Kathleen\\_Blake\\_Yancey\\_Writing\\_21st\\_Century.pdf?x-r=pcfile\\_d](https://archive.nwpa.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/12440/Kathleen_Blake_Yancey_Writing_21st_Century.pdf?x-r=pcfile_d).
- The New London Group. 1996. "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures." *Harvard Educational Review* 66 (1): 60–92.
- Ohmann, Richard. 1990. "Graduate Students, Professionals, Intellectuals." *College English* 52 (3): 247–57.
- Palmeri, Jason. 2012. *Remixing Composition: A History of Multimodal Writing Pedagogy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Pandey, Shyam B., and Santosh Khadka. 2022. *Multimodal Composition: Faculty Development Programs and Institutional Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Selber, Stuart A. 2005. *Multiliteracies for a Digital Age*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Selfe, Cynthia. 1999. "Technology and Literacy: A Story about the Perils of Not Paying Attention." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (3): 411–36.
- Shipka, Jodie. 2009. "Negotiating Rhetorical, Material, Methodological, and Technological Difference: Evaluating Multimodal Designs." *College Composition and Communication* 61: 343–66.
- Takayoshi, Pamela, and Cynthia Selfe. 2007. "Thinking about Multimodality." In *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers*, edited by C. Selfe, 1–12. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

- Voogt, Joke, Therese Laferriere, Alaine Breuleux, Rebecca C. Itow, Daniel T. Hickey, and Susan McKenney. 2015. "Collaborative Design as a Form of Professional Development." *Instructional Science* 43: 259–82.
- Wysocki, Anne Frances, Johndan Johnson-Eilola, Cynthia L. Selfe, and Geogrey Sirc. 2004. *Writing New Media: Theory and Applications for Expanding the Teaching of Composition*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. 2004. "Made Not Only in Words: Composition in a New Key." *CCC* 56 (2): 297–328. doi:10.2307/4140651.