

Collaborative Approaches to the Digital in English Studies

CHAPTER	8
TITLE	The Polyphonic Classroom: A Collaborative Pedagogical Approach to Information Literacy and Digital Composition
AUTHORS	Caroline Cason Barratt Jill Parrott Erin Presley
OVERVIEW	<p>This chapter presents a pedagogical model that uses collaborative instruction to draw attention to the relationship between information literacy and digital composition. The chapter will explain the context for the authors' collaborative teaching and describe how the collaborative relationship facilitated the creation of an instructional space in which students could see research and technology integrated into a method of gathering and producing information. When collaboration, multiple literacies, and digital technology combine to form a model for blending information and computer literacy instruction, students are not only provided with new skills but also with a way to think differently about their roles as information creators and consumers. We posit that in any similar project, where various literacies are used simultaneously by student and instructor, the varied expertise of several instructors is essential to student goal comprehension and task implementation. Further, collaborative teams composed of instructors and librarians can illuminate ways in which instructors often underutilize the library's main resource: its staff. Employing librarians as co-instructors fosters an increase in both breadth and depth of research skill development while embedding critical thinking skills into the curriculum, creating a more sophisticated academic environment for students.</p>
TAGS	collaboration, computer literacy, co-teaching, digital, information literacy, librarian, pedagogy, research, teaching, team
AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES	<p>Caroline Cason Barratt is the director of the Miller Learning Center Learning Commons and a teaching librarian at the University of Georgia. Her publications include book chapters and scholarly articles about undergraduate research and writing behavior, librarian and faculty collaboration in the classroom, the emerging Learning Commons environment in academic libraries, and faculty learning communities on college campuses.</p> <p>Jill Parrott is an assistant professor of English and theatre specializing in rhetoric and composition at Eastern Kentucky University. Her publications include webtexts arguing for multi-genre literacy narratives in the composition classroom and a reflection on the relationship between Google and the rhetorical canons. Her recent research</p>

	<p>focuses on current evolutions in copyright law and their effects on student authorship.</p> <p>Erin Presley is an assistant professor of English and theatre at Eastern Kentucky University, where she teaches courses in rhetoric and composition as well as Appalachian literature. Her research examines the rhetoric of novel appropriations of <i>King Lear</i> and <i>The Tempest</i>, and she has published on Shakespeare and blogging.</p>
<p>COPYRIGHT AND REPRODUCTION</p>	<p>Copyright is held jointly by the Press and the author(s). Ebooks and projects can be displayed or reproduced (with the exception of limited reproduction by indexing and abstracting services) only with prior permission of both parties. Readers may view the projects and download/print a copy of the ebooks found on this site for their personal use or link to this page. Readers may not reproduce this ebook or project or display it on another web site. According to U.S. Copyright law, scholars can use limited samples of the Work for the purpose of analysis, parody, etc. All such reproduction and use should be accompanied by appropriate attribution to both the Author and the Press.</p> <p>Requests for permission to use materials from this ebook or project in other publications will be handled by Utah State University Press on behalf of Computers and Composition Digital Press. For permission to use materials in this ebook or project, please contact Utah State University Press.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Utah State University Press 7800 Old Main Hill Logan, UT 84322-7800</p>
<p>PRESS URL</p>	<p>http://ccdigitalpress.org</p>
<p>BOOK URL</p>	<p>http://ccdigitalpress.org/cad</p>



Computers and Composition **Digital Press**

AN IMPRINT OF UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Polyphonic Classroom: A Collaborative Pedagogical Approach to Information Literacy and Digital Composition

Caroline Cason Barratt

Jill M. Parrott

Erin Presley

As Cynthia Selfe (1999) recounted in *Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-First Century*, the [Technology Literacy Challenge](#) that the Clinton-Gore administration presented in 1996 looked toward a future of not only traditional alphabetic literacy but technological literacy as well. Selfe analyzed the social and cultural implications of such an endeavor but also emphasized the “professional responsibility” of educators in that challenge. She rightly pointed out that “teachers remain comfortable with the culture’s traditional separation of arts and technology” (p. 9). Even more than a decade removed from that publication, we still see resistance to the melding of traditional and technological literacies into singular pedagogical endeavors. We hope that our pedagogical design challenges that resistance and offers an example of ways to become *uncomfortable* with the separation of art and technology. In this chapter, we offer a pedagogical model that uses collaborative instruction to press forward for the purpose of drawing attention to the relationship between information literacy and digital composition. This model, the polyphonic classroom, begins to address the three challenges Yancey (2009) lists in the NCTE report “[Writing in the 21st Century](#)”:

- developing new models of composing,
- designing a new curriculum supporting those models, and
- creating new pedagogies enacting that curriculum. (p. 8)

As we will describe, the three of us co-teach a course designed to introduce students to the technology resources available to them, to improve their research and information literacy skills, to teach them how to present research findings using a multimodal approach (thereby providing experience with digital composition), and to enhance specific technical competencies. In designing our polyphonic classroom environment, we have focused on developing a pedagogy that plays to each of our strengths in ways that facilitate our students’ digital composing. In this way, we feel that collaborative instructorship improves the quality of our pedagogy with the accumulation of our expertise, and sharing these responsibilities also covers some weaknesses we might have as individual instructors.

CONTEXT

The [Division of Academic Enhancement](#) (DAE) at the University of Georgia, a unit of the Office of the Vice President for Instruction that operates independently from the university's schools and colleges, provides excellent opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaboration and teaching. This department offers a variety of classes, generally in support of improving students' study and life management skills, and tutors students in particular areas (see [Academic Enhancement Full Course List](#)). According to the DAE, their mission is "to provide entering and continuing UGA students a wide range of services to support their academic efforts." Classes in the DAE are often taught by instructors with ties to other academic departments. Additionally, the [UGA Libraries' Reference Department](#) has enjoyed a strong relationship with the DAE for years, adding to the cross-disciplinary nature of many courses they provide. As a free-standing and multi-disciplinary academic department, the DAE, like the UGA Libraries, has an interest in serving all students on campus. This flexibility allows instructors to reach a broad segment of the university population and to experiment freely with new collaborations.

One course that has benefited from a long-standing interdepartmental collaboration is [UNIV1120: Online@UGA](#). UNIV 1120 is set up as a workshop-style learning environment wherein we, as instructors, give the students the tools to complete a project and provide the necessary support to help them as they progress toward that final goal. The class meets one hour a week for a full semester and provides one hour of academic credit. In terms of instructors' teaching loads, this means that three one-credit-hour sections are equivalent to one three-credit-hour course. This course is a particularly pointed place for the study of collaborative technological pedagogy as it brings together instructors and students from various disciplines across the university, encouraging those involved to see the broader ideological implications of the classroom environment and technological focus beyond potentially near-sighted disciplinary concerns.

UNIV 1120: Online@UGA arose from a concern that students were not coming to college equipped with the computer and information-literacy skills they need to succeed in an academic environment that emphasizes technology. Additionally, there was no other course offered that specifically addressed these skills for students who either needed a refresher or wanted more individualized instruction in improving their academic-computing and information-literacy skills. The course attracts students who are just entering the university environment and feel that their level of technical expertise may be inadequate, students who are about to graduate and want to develop skills that will enhance their résumés, and students who simply need an extra credit hour.

UNIV 1120: Online@UGA is graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory (S/U) basis, meaning that students must accumulate points equivalent to a passing grade or above to receive a Satisfactory assessment. A positive aspect of this grading system is that it contributes to the relatively low-stakes nature of the course. These low stakes may encourage grade-conscious students unsure of their technological skills to take the class, as the grade of S/U is not included in the academic average. On the other hand, due to scholarships and other GPA-based programs, the S/U grading for this class may appear unattractive to students who depend on accumulating high grades to remain eligible for their scholarships, to satisfy the requirements for particular programs, or to remain competitive when applying to graduate or professional schools. As instructors, our main concern with the S/U system is the disparity in grading it causes in that a student who accumulates 95 points gets a Satisfactory as well as a student who did not perform as well and received only 72 points. Discussions with administrators about the possibility of transitioning UNIV 1120 into a traditionally graded class are ongoing as we continue to develop the course to best meet the needs of our students.

Students receive a Satisfactory if they successfully complete the course requirements: choosing a topic to investigate, completing research to compile an annotated bibliography on that topic, writing a narrative script using that information, creating a digital movie based on this research and writing, and pulling everything together in a hand-coded Web site. We see UNIV 1120's textured or layered assignment structure as an "intertextual [application] of the new-media literacies . . . which rely as much on images, video clips, animation, sound, and still-photography as on words—[and] have begun to emerge and compete vigorously with more traditional alphabetic print texts for readers' attention" (DeVoss, Johansen, Selfe, & Williams, 2003, p. 163). We will describe the sequence in detail in the "[Assignment Sequence](#)" section of this chapter.

For educators as well as students, new communication technologies and textual practices require a shift in our understanding of the ways we make meaning. Over a decade ago, Gunther Kress (1999) noted that a singular "emphasis on language alone simply will no longer do" (p. 67) and that the "distinct possibilities of speech and of the visual [have led] to different cognitive action, to different representations, to the construction of a different world, with a different order" (p. 81). We agree with Kress's argument but also realize that a transition to the pedagogical application of this wider understanding of meaning-making in academe is slow for many reasons including, but not limited to, traditional university structures and instructor trepidation and lack of experience with the technology.

In this slow transition, we believe that collaboration is one method of challenging silo-like university structures, easing instructor fears about teaching with and about

technology, and increasing instructor experience with technology for academic purposes. When projects require both students and instructors to employ multiple literacies and technical competencies, teaching partnerships that bring together instructors with various relevant proficiencies is beneficial if not essential. Further, collaborative teams composed of instructors and librarians can illuminate ways in which instructors often underutilize the library's main resource: its staff. Employing librarians as co-instructors rather than as one-day guest speakers fosters an increase in both breadth and depth of research skill development while embedding critical thinking skills into the curriculum, creating a more sophisticated academic environment for students.

Using the definitions laid out in *Collaboration in Composition Studies* by Sheryl Fontaine and Susan Hunter (2006), we see our project as truly collaborative rather than merely cooperative. Fontaine and Hunter insist that these are two separate concepts and that understanding the difference is important to successful collaboration; their definitions provide an integral ideological foundation for our classroom planning. Cooperation, they say, occurs when two or more people work near each other on the same project; the participants work for the same goal, yet they have different tasks. This concept is best illustrated by student work groups: with three students in a group, one student might do research, another may write a rough draft, while the third may edit and proofread. This is cooperation. Collaboration, on the other hand, occurs when groupmates work in tandem toward the same goal at the same time on the same tasks. As instructors, we focus on collaborating with one another in the planning and implementation of our classroom goals. While one of us may "control" the classroom environment more on a particular day and another on another day (a more cooperative approach), each of us has had previous input on the goals and purpose for each individual instructional element.

In our classroom environment, each instructor brings particular expertise to the classroom but also has a voice in overall assessment and implementation of goals. Jill Parrott's background is in rhetoric and composition, from which she brings expertise in copyright law and its effects on authorship, a topic particularly pertinent to a project like the one in UNIV 1120, which requires students to integrate images and information from many different sources and adapt them for this new, unique composition. She also provides instruction in MovieMaker and provides technical support for Mac users. Erin Presley also specializes in rhetoric and composition theory and has a particular interest in technology in the classroom. She teaches HTML coding and assists students in completing their Web sites. The participation of Caroline Barratt, the UGA Libraries' liaison for the UNIV 1120 course, shows how the involvement of librarians in technology-enhanced assignments from creation through implementation is particularly beneficial in that, mirroring the attention to technology emphasized by the other instructors, librarian-led instruction focuses on critical assessment of information and

information-seeking strategies. Throughout the semester, we three instructors and our students work collaboratively to learn and create. Our syncretic approach to assignment design, instruction, and research mirrors the students' task of forming a coherent whole over the course of the semester by completing discrete tasks that build to a large-scale project.

The video to the right mirrors the process that students use to create their projects, while simultaneously describing the processes the students complete. As a meta-commentary, our method and choice of production software and hardware reflect the process described in this study, providing an accurate illustration of the assignment discussed. Indeed, as the video suggests, we emphasize that students should understand media as a way to consume information and as a way to create information and participate in conversations.



See [Appendix D](#) for video transcript.

PARTNERSHIPS AND PLANNING

The Role of Technology

We understand that “technology fosters collaboration, but it doesn’t ensure or in any way make collaboration happen” (Fontaine & Hunter, 2006, p. 92). People make collaboration happen, not technology, but having access to computers and the Internet certainly makes collaborating easier. While teaching this class, we have relied on e-mail for sharing ideas and coordinating meetings. We have also employed GoogleDocs as a way to share our work when we cannot physically be in the same space. This Google program has been a boon to our collaboration. It allows us to share and edit documents easily without clunky e-mail attachments and to do so from remote locations. For classroom matters, we use Google Docs to construct planning documents, collect assignments, and keep grade rosters in a single place where we can all have access at all times. Professionally, Google Docs provides us with a forum where we can share our work and write collaboratively about our teaching and our research (as we did in creating this chapter). Like Fontaine and Hunter (2006), “technology has allowed us to

enter into one other's writing in a way that couldn't occur if we were retyping manuscripts" (p. 92). With Google Docs, we can add and delete without tracking changes, though we can see the document's revision history if necessary. Composition theorists such as Mary Belenky (as cited in Ashton-Jones & Thomas, 1991, p. 32) have expressed concerns about collaborative writing, but we view the creation of "a third voice," as discussed by Fontaine and Hunter (2006, p. 93), as an asset in the classroom, not a loss of identity. We like to think that our situation has created a fourth voice. In writing about our experience, in creating syllabi and lesson plans, and especially in our polyphonic classroom, we want to create in accord.

Collaborative Planning and Teaching

Collaboration has characterized all aspects of the planning and teaching of UNIV 1120. Assessment of each part of the assignment is facilitated by a detailed rubric, created by the librarians in collaboration with the UNIV 1120 instructors ([UNIV 1120 Grading Guidelines](#)). The instruction team also created tutorial documents like Web sites and "[how-to](#)" [handouts](#) to help students learn the material. And, as mentioned previously, we divide the topics covered in classes according to our particular strengths. Caroline Barratt conducts the research workshops and introduces students to the library's resources. Jill Parrott teaches the students about copyright law and using Creative Commons as a valuable resource for finding images, audio files, and video clips. She also helps Mac users troubleshoot any issues that they may have with iMovie. Erin Presley introduces students to HTML coding and assists them in building their Web sites. While we divide the teaching responsibilities, we are all still available to assist students on the days when one or two of us may not be leading the class. Each one of us is also familiar enough with all aspects of the course to adequately instruct when needed; in other words, if Erin is busy working one-on-one with a student on his Web site, Jill may be helping another student simultaneously. We utilize simultaneous instruction every time the students participate in a workshop. This setup makes it possible for all of us to have the same level of authority in the classroom, while simultaneously allowing each of us to teach to our strengths. The frequent workshops and rotating lectures in our classroom necessitate an "all hands on deck" approach in order to help our students reach their goals.

Co-teaching is not without its challenges. Previous iterations of UNIV 1120 were problematic because students were confused about who was in charge. This confusion was counterproductive in two ways. Ideologically, it detracted from the environment we wanted to create wherein the students focused on the creation of projects and we facilitated their comprehension of technology as a tool as well as a filter for information retrieval and composition. Practically, students' distress over classroom authority made class more difficult because they did not know whom to approach with questions or in

what ways their work would be assessed. The point-person system was our solution to this problem; we share the workload by dividing the number of students as equally as possible for evaluation purposes. This system also prevents confusion for the students in terms of which instructor is evaluating their work, since the same instructor grades every element for a specific set of students.

The Learning Center and Library as Essential Partners

The UGA Libraries and DAE have worked cooperatively for several years. The two academic departments coordinate to provide a variety of tutoring services within library buildings in addition to supplying staff to co-teach the UNIV1120 course. What makes this last endeavor different is the level of collaboration required throughout the semester. The UGA Libraries and DAE are completely integrated within the UNIV1120 program in a way that touches on all aspects of the course, from the location of the classroom to the creation and assessment of assignments to the human and technical resources provided in support of the students' work. Resources to support this course include the people who teach it, but also the hardware and software that are essential components of the tasks performed in this technology-intensive course. The course is taught within UGA's Learning Commons, the [Miller Learning Center](#), a building comprised of [an electronic library, classrooms, and a computer lab](#). With librarians, computer technology help, and faculty support offices located in the Miller Learning Center, support for both students and faculty is available within the same building. In addition to the support they receive in the classroom from their instructors, students can also obtain technical support and research assistance at the service desks after class is over, making it possible for instruction to continue outside of classroom hours. The intensively integrated environment of this particular learning space provides the perfect setting for UNIV1120. Having a wealth of technology is a boon to the course, but the real key to the success of the program is the collaborative effort of the instructors, librarian, and support staff at the Miller Learning Center to provide students with instruction and support.

When librarians were first invited to participate in UNIV 1120 classes, they visited as guest lecturers for three sessions. The librarian covered the library's online catalog, one or two article databases, and searching the Internet effectively for scholarly information. After these three sessions, however, the librarian was not involved in the course. Students may have followed up with the librarian for an additional research consultation or with questions, but the librarian was not included in the class after this contact. In response to the library sessions, students were asked to compile a short list of sources on their topics using the resources covered by the librarian, but they did not have to read the information contained in the sources or create a product from their contents. This often led to a "good enough" approach to student bibliographies, where students

simply chose the first source that matched their keywords in order to fill the requirement. Because this activity did not ask students to evaluate and use the information they discovered, librarians lobbied for a change to the assignment to include the creation of a short synthesis of their findings. These essays became part of the assignments and were graded by UNIV 1120 instructors.

In 2007, the coordinator for the UNIV 1120 program asked librarian Caroline Barratt for assistance in designing a new assignment that would integrate the information literacy and computer literacy components of the course, informed by principles described in the [Association of College and Research Libraries' information literacy standards and guidelines](#). Barratt suggested a project that would ask students to create a digital movie using Apple's iMovie software, based on a similar assignment created by Lisa Smith and Mildred Pate at Georgia Southern University. Like Smith, a librarian, and Pate, an English department faculty member, the instructor and librarian at UGA worked together to discuss the goals of the course and how an assignment like this one would support both the information- and computer-literacy learning outcomes. The assignment was written to incorporate several stages, each building skills and content that would inform the next portion of the assignment, in a way that combined information literacy, visual literacy, and computer literacy while strengthening students' communication skills.

Previously, in order to prepare for each coming semester, the librarian liaison and UNIV 1120 instructors met to discuss lessons learned from the previous semester, plan course activities and content, and set logistical details like due dates and room assignments. Multiple sections of the same course complicated planning as due dates, librarian visits, and other class activities varied slightly between sections. A different librarian liaison was assigned to each class section. He or she would lead the library sessions and was also responsible for grading the annotated bibliography portion of the project. The difference between a coordinated approach versus a collaborative one became apparent when some students, as discussed previously, became confused as to who was responsible for their grades and to whom they should address their questions. Added to this, coordination of grades and student feedback was more successful among some instruction teams than others, and there were a few times when grading or communication slipped through the cracks.

Instruction teams that achieved the most consistent and clear approach used online collaborative communication like Google Docs to share grade rosters. A reduction in the number of sections offered made it possible for one librarian to act as the single liaison to each UNIV class, joining the instruction team to assess all parts of the assignment for her cohort. This less fractured approach clarified roles and provided more cohesion to the course. Students were clearer on who their contact would be for grades and other questions that arose. In all, a librarian is present in approximately six out of fifteen

classes with the two UNIV instructors team-teaching the remainder of the sessions. This intensive involvement in the classroom has evolved over the years, finding the most profound change with the implementation of the digital movie assignment described above. From that point onward, the investment in the partnership between the instructors and librarians increased. With the librarians and instructors working collaboratively to craft the assignment, teach content, and assess students' work, the UNIV 1120 course moved from one that was simply cooperative to a class that was truly collaborative. Now, the instructors collaborate on every aspect of the class to create a truly integrated curriculum.

ASSIGNMENT SEQUENCE

In UNIV 1120, students complete a creative research project, which is comprised of [five components](#): research topic e-mail, annotated bibliography, script, documentary movie, and Web site. This project has several complementary goals, such as introducing students to the technology resources available to them at the university, improving their research skills, and teaching them how to present their findings by employing a multimodal approach. We also hope to encourage students, as they create their documentaries and Web sites, to look actively *at* technology instead of passively looking *through* it, as suggested by Richard Lanham in *The Electronic Word* (1993) and *The Economics of Attention* (2006). Another proponent of technology in the classroom who informs our strategies is Gregory Ulmer, who coined the term “electracy” in *Internet Invention* (2003). Ulmer argues that a “proper task” for humanities programs is “to develop rhetorical and composition practices for citizens to move from consumers to producers of image discourse” (p. 6). We agree with Ulmer and hope that our course joins his cause of “inventing electracy” by fusing the literate, oral, and electrate in the classroom (p. 7). While our project may not take as many risks as Ulmer, we do agree that “literacy did not have enough computing power to think formless, or to exploit the holistic moods of categorical images. The mathematical order of chaos emerged only within the patterning made legible by the computer” (p. 323). We hope that directing students to look at technology, specifically computer-related technologies, as more than just a tool is an important step in fostering electracy. Our students conduct their research through online databases and with search engines such as Google, then employ software to produce documentaries that will eventually become the centerpiece of hand-coded Web sites. In UNIV 1120, we ask students to combine the oral, literate, and electrate as they complete their projects.

The first facet of the assignment involves asking students to define their research questions. At the beginning of the semester, students submit their topics to us via e-mail, and we give them feedback based using the “point person” system that the three of us established. Each student will have a point person (instructor) to whom he or she

can go throughout the semester for questions, feedback, and assessment. We created this system for two main reasons: to increase instructional efficiency and to decrease student confusion. In terms of topic selection, we encourage students to choose topics that complement their studies. After submission, students receive feedback from their point person on how to focus the topic so it lends itself to a three- to four-minute movie. Once topics have been approved, students receive library research instruction before conducting their research. After two consecutive research workshops—which cover searching the library’s online catalog, working with a selection of databases, and using the Internet for academic research—students are asked to compile information they discover into an annotated bibliography (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Student bibliography sample.

Although the project as a whole emphasizes the idea that academic conversations can take multimodal forms, Figure 1 demonstrates that the annotated bibliography assignment follows a traditional academic format. In order to foster reflection on source type and authority, students are required to include at least four sources from at least three different source type categories (e.g., book, Web page, journal article, film) and format the bibliography according to a particular style (e.g., MLA or APA). Students have the freedom to mix source types as they wish, as long as the sources are from different categories ([Appendix C](#) provides a citation analysis of their choices). The annotated bibliography is the basis for the third part of the assignment, the movie script.

Scripts are generally two-pages long, and students write them in two drafts. They receive instructor feedback on the first draft but no grade. We aim to provide this feedback quickly so students can take it into consideration as they revise their first draft. Some students approach the script as they would a typical essay (Figure 2); others

compose a more theatrical script that incorporates sound effects, music, and dramatic narration. The final draft receives a grade, and the student generally records this version for the movie after taking any final comments into consideration.

Slide 2:
\$3 billion dollars is spent every year by fast food companies to place ads targeted towards children on television ("The Role of Media in Childhood Obesity" 5). This seems like a lot of money, but it is a small amount when compared to how much young children spend on food products. Just four years ago, in 2004, it was expected that children under the age of twelve would spend \$35 billion of their own money on food items ("The Role of Media in Childhood Obesity" 5).

Slide 3:
Ted Lempert, president of a research company called Children Now, explains that out of all of the ads aimed at kids, most of them are "for candy, sugared cereal, soda, and fast food" (1). He explains that companies are using eye-catching commercials with popular TV characters to sell their products (Lempert 1). When these techniques are used, children become captivated with the entertainment that is being displayed before them and make unhealthy food choices as a result.

Figure 2. Excerpt from student script draft.

The students also receive instruction in the parameters of copyright law, which equips them to gather legally available images for their movies. After receiving instruction on the Windows-based Movie Maker software, students choose to use either Movie Maker or iMovie to complete their movie projects. The lab in which we teach is equipped with PCs, but we encourage and support Mac use as well for those students who are most comfortable with that platform. Several class periods are workshop days in which students compile images, audio, and film clips to produce a three- to four-minute documentary on their respective topics.

The final assignment for the course is a hand-coded Web site (Figure 3 and Figure 4), which showcases the students' work and includes their embedded documentary movie file. Students use the Web space provided to them by the university to host their Web sites. Using HTML coding, students also include internal links to their documentary scripts and annotated bibliographies as well as external links to pertinent sites about their topics. Once the Web site is completed, students share their work with the class in an informal presentation at the end of the semester.



Figure 3. [Student Web site design sample.](#)

Using our objectives and our assignment sequence as a starting place, we invite other teacher-scholars to imagine their own cross-disciplinary collaborations and polyphonic classrooms. In each case, instructors will bring their own strengths and weaknesses to the pedagogical table, and each institution will have its own exigencies and structures in play. In order to recreate the project we have described, the infrastructure needed would be university-provided Web space; access to Movie Maker, iMovie, or a similar program like Google's free image editor and video slideshow maker, [Picasa](#); NotePad for PCs or TextEdit for Macs, for HTML coding; and a computer-enhanced classroom or lab space. That being said, a movie isn't the only way for students to present their research while gaining valuable digital composition experience and developing technical competencies. Collaborative technological instruction lends itself to any number of assignments that facilitate "at" vision rather than "through" vision, as Lanham (2006) explains those concepts. Simply focusing on PowerPoint is certainly a possibility. Anecdotally, we have found that students are more comfortable with PowerPoint than other types of presentation software, so assigning a project involving Microsoft PowerPoint or an open-source equivalent such as OpenOffice's [Impress](#) might prove to be a fruitful way of having students look "at" a technology they have probably most often looked "through."

If an institution does not automatically grant students a certain amount of server space for Web publishing, the IT department may be able to provide space for the small number of students in the class. Alternatively, students can still see their Web sites

without having to publish them by opening their files in a Web browser. Reflection on “at” versus “through” can be encouraged even if the site is not online, although a live page is certainly optimal.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES

Throughout the semester, the three of us meet often to discuss issues that have arisen in the different classes. It is productive to meet away from the students so that we can discuss, as pedagogues, what is working in the classroom and what may not be. Sometimes, it becomes necessary to adjust the syllabus to meet the needs of the students or to change focus for a day to facilitate their projects. Also, although we each have assigned students whose work we grade, grading issues occasionally come up for which an instructor would like advice or affirmation. Our collaborative team provides pedagogical focus, feedback, and support that traditional single-instructor classroom environments simply do not. Our frequent face-to-face conversations and e-mails keep us connected as instructors both inside and outside of the classroom. It was the frequent conversations about what is working and not working that led us to create a survey to more formally evaluate student perceptions. Although the initial sample size is small and further research is necessary, the results and our responses to student feedback are worthy of attention.

Because of the unique and evolving nature of our classroom structure, we felt it was necessary to evaluate the class using our own criteria rather than the standard generic criteria set forth by the university through its end-of-the-semester evaluation process. Surveys that questioned students about their experiences in the class were administered at the beginning and end of the semester (see [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B](#)) to students in two separate undergraduate sections of UNIV 1120. We designed the questions to address the students’ motivations for taking the class, their experience in the class, and their reflections on the class. We hoped that the students’ answers would provide insight into what parts of our pedagogical plans had made an impact on their experience and what parts of our plans still needed improvement in order to reach our goals. We also hoped to be able to see how we could hone our collaborative relationship as instructors to facilitate the attainment of the course goals and student learning objectives.

First Survey

We started with demographic information to determine academic class standing amongst our students in terms of how far along they were in their college careers. We asked students to list their majors in order to evaluate which students from which colleges were most comfortable with technology before they came to class and which

became most comfortable with the concepts we introduced. The questions we considered most important, however, were concerned with the students' perceptions of the assignment and the classroom environment. In the survey given at the beginning of the semester ([Appendix A](#)), the majority of students said they wanted to take the class because they felt that becoming more comfortable with the technology we present to them will help them either in college or in their future careers. In other words, they were mostly goal-oriented, hoping that the project would help them reach a goal beyond our classroom. Most were not interested in the class simply for the sake of completing an interesting project. In fact, fourteen out of the seventeen students who took the first survey ([Appendix A](#)) stated that they took the class only because they needed an hour's worth of credit, and three respondents said they were apathetic about the project. Some apathy is not all that surprising for a class assessed as Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory and worth only one credit hour. More interesting is the wide array of disciplines in which they thought the uses of technology covered in UNIV 1120 would be appropriate; the answers included a discipline from nearly every college on campus from accounting to chemistry to English, education, theatre, sociology, and political science.

We were particularly interested in students' perceptions about the role of technology in the classroom and the purpose of the project. When asked "What have you been taught is the purpose of technology in learning in the classroom?" the vast majority of students declared that technology was a way for them to find information or complete projects more efficiently. One even said he had been taught that technology was "a means to an end and not the end itself." Similarly, when asked "What do you feel is the purpose for this assignment?" the vast majority of the answers revolved around some variation of using technology and research together to complete the assignment. These answers show us that the students came into the classroom expecting to learn a skill or tool that might help them meet larger goals concerning research, academics, or career. Although we certainly hope that what we teach will be applicable outside the classroom, the students' steadfast focus on that singular goal has the potential to undercut what we hope they will learn about consumption versus creation.

Rather than seeing the tools we introduce to them (such as movie making software and HTML coding) as means to an end, we hope that they will be able to look "at" the technology. Lanham describes a spectrum of attention: "At one end, the *through* ideal. Minimal awareness of an expressive medium. At the other end, the *at* ideal. Maximal awareness of how we say what we do, or paint it, or sound it out. In the middle, all the daily mixtures. Please note: no point on the spectrum is intrinsically evil or virtuous; it seeks to describe rather than to proscribe, to analyze rather than condemn" (p. 159). We do not wish to condemn "through" vision. The students so often consume technology-mediated content (as we all do) from TV, search engines, social media, word processors, and so forth that looking "through" it has become somewhat of a

necessity of surviving everyday life. We do believe, however, that instruction that emphasizes “at” attention provides essential balance. Software and Web design instruction is often focused on “through” vision wherein, as our student pointed out, the technology is seen as “a means to an end and not the end itself.” This is “minimal awareness of an expressive medium” as Lanham (2006) describes it, and we aim for attention closer to maximal awareness (p. 159).

One example of how our pedagogy encourages “at” vision is our insistence on teaching HTML hand-coding—see Figure 4—rather than a What-You-See-Is-What-You-Get (WYSIWYG) program such as Dreamweaver. Students often ask why they *have* to do HTML, and our answer is that it allows them to understand how a Web site works (i.e., to look “at” it). Using a WYSIWYG program allows a Web designer to see what the page will look like, but it does not allow her to see how the page works—how the code is laid out so the Web browser can read it. We show students how they can go to any Web page on the Internet, and choose View > Source Code from the menu to see the coding used to create the page. Viewing the code is “maximal awareness” and requires the students to lean toward the “at” side of the attention spectrum (Lanham, 2006, p. 159). Although their pages are simpler and less user-friendly than they might be with a WYSIWYG program, our pedagogical purpose is achieved. Further, if they choose to continue developing as Web designers and use a WYSIWYG program, knowing how to look “at” the code will allow them to be more sophisticated designers and adept troubleshooters.

```

</head>
<body style="color: rgb(0, 0, 0); background-color: rgb(204, 255, 255);" alink="#000099" link="#000099" v1
<big><big>Go to my <a href="project.html">Documentary
page</a>.</big></big><br>
<br>
<div style="text-align: center; font-family: Arial; color: rgb(255, 102, 102);"><big><big><big><big><span
</big></big></big></big></div>
<center> <big style="color: black; font-family: Arial Black;"><big><big><span style="font-weight: bold;">T
Childhood Obesity?</span></big></big></big><br>
<br>
<br>
<a href="http://www.myextralife.com/?p=8959">Link</a> <span style="color: rg
<h2>
<center>
<center><big><br>
<span style="color: rgb(255, 102, 102); font-family: Candara;">External
Links to Related Articles:</span></big><br>
<br>
<a href="http://www.childrenow.org/newsroom/press_coverage/childhood_obesity_op_ed.html">Childhood
Obesity Fueled by Marketing Tactics</a> - <span style="color: rgb(1, 0, 0);">Ted Lempert</span><br>
<br>

```

Figure 4. Student HTML hand-coding sample.

Another important way we attempt to emphasize creation over consumption is the introduction of [Creative Commons](#) to the students. Creative Commons, we explain to

students, provides a variation on copyright to composers of text, art, photography, music, or any kind of intellectual property. Traditional copyright is “all rights reserved” while works in the public domain have “no rights reserved.” Creative Commons is that middle ground of “some rights reserved,” wherein creators can choose how their audience can use and manipulate the work. A search engine accessible from the Creative Commons Web site provides access to work that has been licensed under Creative Commons. Defining terms such as *copyright*, *public domain*, *fair use*, and *intellectual property* opens the door to a conversation with students about which sources are appropriate to use and which are not.

That is, of course, only part of the discussion. Importantly, we provide the students with a framework for seeing themselves as authors with intellectual property that can be shared in the same way that their sources represent intellectual property that was created and shared by authors. They are building on the expertise of others to create a new and unique composition. We spend an entire class period defining key terms and introducing the students to [Creative Commons licenses](#). We make sure to show students the steps that authors can take to acquire a Creative Commons license for their work. Although we do not require students to license their compositions, we believe this knowledge provides a sense of reality for them as authors. The option is there; they have the same rights as other authors to choose how their work is used and manipulated by others.

We insist that students not use any images, music, or video that is licensed under a traditional “all rights reserved” copyright. Because the students’ work is displayed on a Web site that can be viewed by any individual with Internet access, educational fair use does not apply. We introduce them to the concept of Creative Commons—that an author would willingly allow others to use his work and build upon it—and then instruct them to use only their own images or videos or materials that can be used legally for their digital movies, such as those in the public domain or that have the appropriate Creative Commons licenses.

Throughout the course, we focus on the process of composing the movie. Part of this process includes encouraging students to question their content consumption. In terms of video content, for example, we might ask the following questions: Where do these videos come from? Whose creations are they? Who has a right to them? Students must look “at” the videos rather than “through” them. In addition, we challenge students to think about their own roles as authors: To whom do they owe credit for their work? Which other individuals have contributed to this new creation? Who “owns” this new work? Any similar assignment involving the collection of outside resources for the creation of a new digital composition must involve a conversation about copyright law

and authorship. Creative Commons is an excellent tool for furthering that goal and starting a conversation about creation and consumption.

Second Survey

At the end of the semester, participants were given another questionnaire ([Appendix B](#)); some of the questions remained the same while others were added or removed. In some cases, students responded to the same questions differently. One noteworthy change in answers from the beginning-of-the-semester survey involves the courses in which they thought the uses of technology covered in UNIV 1120 would be appropriate. While their original answers varied widely, the second round answers included six students giving some variation of “any class” or “all classes.” So, our survey shows that, after completing the assignment, some students saw its worth and appropriateness broadened.

We were most disappointed by changes in the way some students answered the question about the purpose of the class and project. We had hoped that students would say that the goal was to develop information and computer literacies simultaneously. Almost every student, however, said the purpose was to learn the technology. This change/simplification may have been associated with the fact that every student except two said that the technology was more difficult to master than the topic. Because our project schedule plans for them to complete their research and scripts before midterm and to use the software and HTML coding at the end of the semester to bring the project to fruition, the students probably had technology on the brain as they were answering our questions. In fact, in the “Final Thoughts” section of the survey, most answers focused on Web site creation or movie making instead of their research. We hypothesize that because research is not a novelty to the students—they often do research in their various discipline-oriented classes—it seems less important than the technology, which was new to them. We also hypothesize that the students may not be equipped with the vocabulary to articulate these ideas, so we plan to provide some theory-based digital composition instruction in future classes and suggest that educators teaching similar courses do the same in order to emphasize and reinforce these essential concepts.

These few thoughts are a brief representation of the survey results, but our point is to describe how the surveys have shown us ways our pedagogy might be improved. The next few paragraphs summarize the problems we are currently addressing—problems that should be considered by other educators planning or teaching courses that emphasize information literacy and digital composition. One issue involves troubleshooting the technology. Just as we collaborate in the composition of lesson plans and goals for the classroom, we want our students to have a collaborative

component to their projects. The projects are individual; these are not group compositions. However, we desire for our classroom environment to encourage students to rely on one another to find answers to some of their technical and digital composing questions. How can we share knowledge in the classroom concerning technology troubleshooting in a way that includes students in the process? We plan to create a peer-support space using the discussion board available in our learning management system. Although we are experienced with the technology and research tactics our students are using, we are not actually composing projects simultaneously; the students are. Therefore, other students are often a good resource for troubleshooting. A peer-support space gives students the opportunity to learn from one another and work together to solve common problems in a way that parallels our own support network of co-teachers.

Further, in response to the students' confusion with the technology and their sense that it was the technology more than the topic that impeded the progress of their projects, we worked together to create a course packet that explains the project step-by-step and offers advice and tips that we have picked up in our semesters of teaching the course. Previously, we had posted much of the information online piecemeal or simply distributed paper copies of handouts. This new packet, which is distributed to students in printed form, consists of all original material created and gathered by us to meet the specific needs of students in our courses. Each of the three of us gave input about what should be included and excluded from the packet.

A packet may seem obvious as a pedagogical tactic. However, if we desire our students to see this project as digital composition—not research, technology, and composition as separate entities awkwardly intertwined, but different literacies working together toward the same goal—we as instructors must make the technology less complicated in practice but not concept. Frustration with software necessarily brings about “through” vision. If a student is thinking, “How do I make this work?!?” then focus is placed on mastering the software in order to complete the project and get a grade. When the software applications are made simpler by clear explanation and guidance, the students have the freedom to see the import of the research-technology-composition connection.

We have also found that some students (particularly non-traditional and international students) take the class to become more comfortable with technology rather than to learn a specific software program or fulfill a credit hour requirement as many of the other students do. These non-traditional students are comforted by the recognizable textbook/packet format and rely heavily on it to help them with their projects inside and outside of the classroom environment. Since implementing the paper version of the packet, confusion has been lessened for the non-traditional students. And, it certainly does not hinder the comprehension of those students who are already comfortable with

technology when they come through our door. We debated this switch to a paper format; after all, the class focuses on technology literacy and digital composition. In the end, however, as instructors we agreed that the students needed a print reference that contained step-by-step instructions. As we continue to hone the course, we will ask questions about what specific aspects of the technology the students find troubling. We can then address these specific issues, continuing to lessen technology troubles and allowing more time for reflection on and comprehension of the connection between consumption and composition of information.

Finally, to facilitate reflection on the consumption-creation relationship, we intend to integrate peer review into our curriculum. Erin Presley and Jill Parrott are also often first-year composition instructors, and so we are familiar with common approaches to peer review. A peer review activity is a way to increase students' interactions with one another and also increase their awareness of the audience toward whom their digital movies are aimed. Giving feedback to another student can make a student more aware that she also has a tangible and real audience for her own composition. As previously discussed, one of our goals is to keep students from seeing technology as merely a tool or a means to an end. We hope that by including peer review—a required pause and change in perspective—the students might become less product-oriented (consumptive) and more process-oriented (creative). Further, just as we disperse classroom authority amongst the three of us as instructors, “another way to redistribute authority in the classroom [is] to disperse it among students” (Crowley, 1998, p. 207). Reflecting on audience, context, and purpose is just as essential in digital composition as it is in other more traditional academic genres. The literacy skills required to create and give feedback are different, but the rhetorical concept is similar: “invention may go on throughout the composing process” (Crowley, 1998, p. 208). We hope that the interactive and reflective nature of peer review in this class will allow students to see themselves composing for an audience and to better understand the relationship between their research and the technology they use to create their projects.

CONCLUSION

In short, our goal as co-teachers has been to provide an instructional space wherein students can develop multiple twenty-first-century literacies in an integrated, academically relevant way. UNIV 1120 students benefit from our diverse expertise as they gain experience using technology to gather information (Google, article databases, and online catalogs, Creative Commons search) and to author compositions (the digital movie and Web site). Further, we facilitate their development of “at” vision in ways that we hope will make them more aware information consumers and producers. We will continue to refine the course in ways that will further encourage students not to view the

technology as a tool for creating a fancier version of PowerPoint but instead to see the project as a composition and themselves as authors and participants in a conversation.

Our collaboration enriched our pedagogy, and we believe that cross-disciplinary collaboration is an effort worth undertaking because—though many of us would not like to admit it—disciplinary insularism sometimes detracts from our ability to be wise, efficient educators and to provide strong academic connections for our students. Classroom settings similar to the one we describe in this chapter can be one way to provide opportunities for instruction that is not compartmentalized. A limitation of discipline-centered, single-instructor courses is that “composition teachers simply cannot anticipate every discursive exigency their students will be asked to meet in college or in life” (Crowley, 1998, p. 27, 28). Further, courses on information literacy and digital composition require such a breadth of expertise and involve such a variety of disciplines, literacies, and competencies, that cross-disciplinary collaboration is ever more important.

Overall, we believe that our collaborative teaching model is a strong one that might be adapted and adopted by other English studies scholar-teachers seeking to teach information literacy and digital composition in ways that begin to address the challenges identified by Yancey (2009):

- developing new models of composing,
- designing a new curriculum supporting those models, and
- creating new pedagogies enacting that curriculum. (p. 8)

The assignment sequence and the collaborative planning and pedagogy we have described are certainly transferable to other classroom environments and contexts. For those considering such an undertaking, we must emphasize the most important variable in the polyphonic classroom: volition. Collaborative pedagogy will be unsuccessful unless the instructors involved desire collaboration and not just cooperation. Cooperation requires less time and effort than collaboration, but we have found that the classroom is much more successful—with success defined as student attention to and investment in the assignment—when the instructors are aligned as partners and focused on the same goals. This is what Finkel (2000) calls “collegial teaching” (p. 139).

DeVoss, Johansen, Selfe, and Williams (2003) ask, “What new understandings of terms such as *text* and *composing* will students bring with them to the college classroom in the next decade—especially those students habituated to reading and composing the kinds of new-media texts that have come to characterize contemporary computer-based environments?” (p. 157). We believe that our classroom environment begins to address this question. When collaboration, multiple literacies, and digital technology combine to

form a model for blending information and computer literacy instruction, students are not only provided with new skills but also with a way to think differently about their roles as information creators and consumers.

REFERENCES

- Ashton-Jones, Evelyn, & Thomas, Dene Kay. (1991). Composition, collaboration, and women's ways of knowing: A conversation with Mary Belenky. In Gary A. Olson & Irene Gale (Eds.), *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on rhetoric and literacy* (pp. 27-44). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Creative Commons. (2009). Retrieved from <http://creativecommons.org/>
- Crowley, Sharon. (1998). *Composition in the university*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- DeVoss, Danielle Nicole, Johansen, Joseph, Selfe, Cynthia, & Williams, John. (2003). Under the radar of composition programs: Glimpsing the future through case studies of literacy in electronic contexts. In Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, & Edward M. White (Eds.), *Composition studies in the new millennium* (pp. 157-173). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- The Division of Academic Enhancement. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.uga.edu/dae/>
- Faigley, Lester. (2003). The challenge of the multimedia essay. In Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, & Edward M. White (Eds.), *Composition studies in the new millennium* (pp. 174-187). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Finkel, Donald L. (2000). *Teaching with your mouth shut*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Fontaine, Sheryl I., & Hunter, Susan. (2006). *Collaborative writing in composition studies*. Boston, MA: Thomson Higher Education.
- Information Literacy*. (2003). Association of College and Research Libraries. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/issues/infolit/index.cfm>
- Kress, Gunther. (1999). "English" at the crossroads: Rethinking curricula of communication in the context of the turn of the visual. In Gail Hawisher & Cynthia Selfe (Eds.), *Passions, pedagogies, and 21st century technologies*. (pp. 66-88). Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.
- Lanham, Richard. (1993). *The electronic word: Democracy, technology, and the arts*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lanham, Richard. (2006). *The economics of attention: Style and substance in the age of information*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Online@UGA Homepage. (2009). Retrieved from <http://uga.edu/online/>

Selfe, Cynthia L. (1999). *Technology and literacy in the twenty-first century: The importance of paying attention*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Smith, Lisa, & Pate, Mildred. (2007, May 27). *Extreme makeover: How collaboration and hard work improved English 1102 students' multi-genre projects*. Paper presented at the Atlanta Area Bibliographic Instruction Group Conference, Athens, GA.

Ulmer, Gregory. (2003). *Internet invention*. New York, NY: Longman/Pearson.

The University of Georgia Libraries. (2008). Creative Research Assignment. Grading Guidelines. Retrieved from <http://www.libs.uga.edu/ref/univ1120/assessment.html>

Yancey, Kathleen. (2009). *Writing in the 21st century*. Urbana, IL: NCTE. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Press/Yancey_final.pdf

APPENDIX A: FIRST SURVEY**Part 1: Demographic Information**

Age: _____ Gender (circle): M F Year in School: _____

Area of Major (please circle):

Agriculture	Human Sciences
Architecture, Design, and Construction	Liberal Arts
Business	Nursing
Education	Pharmacy
Engineering	Science and Mathematics
Forestry and Wildlife Sciences	Veterinary Medicine

Do you own a computer? Yes or No

If yes, is it a:

(if you own more than one, please circle all that apply or indicate multiples with a number)

PC Desktop	Mac Desktop	Other _____
PC Laptop	Mac Laptop	

If no, where do you use a computer when necessary and what kind is it?

How much time do you normally spend a day on the computer?

Part 2: Use of Technology

1. What kind of technologies are you most comfortable or familiar with?
2. Where/how did you become familiar with those technologies?
3. What technologies are you hoping to become more familiar or comfortable with in this class?
4. Why do you want to learn these new technologies?
5. What was your motivation for taking this UNIV 1120 class? (Please pick the two most important.)

Needed 1 hour credit

Wanted to become more familiar with computer technologies

Wanted to learn how to create my own Web page

Wanted to become more familiar with library resources

Wanted to learn how to use iMovie or MovieMaker

My adviser suggested it

I just sort of wandered in

6. How do you feel about the experience of learning a new technology?
- | | |
|-------------|---------|
| Excited | Nervous |
| Apathetic | Bored |
| Other _____ | |
7. What classes do you feel are appropriate venues for assigning technology assignments (like the one we will have completed here)?
8. In what other classes have you or do you expect to use technology extensively (as in, more than just word processing for papers)?
9. Do you view access to a computer as essential to your education at The University of Georgia? Why/why not?

Part 3: The Assignment

1. How much time do you anticipate you will spend working on your presentation outside of class? (circle one)
- Less than ten minutes
 - Between 10 and 30 minutes
 - Between 30 minutes and an hour
 - Between 1 hour and 2 hours
 - More than 2 hours
2. Which do you think will be more difficult: mastering the technology you use or mastering the topic? Why?
3. Do you plan to use instructor office hours during the semester for extra help with the technology?
4. What have you been taught is the purpose of technology in the classroom?
5. Regardless of what you've been taught, how do you think technology works in the classroom?
6. Do you feel that right now you are prepared to complete the requirements for this assignment? Why/why not?
7. What do you feel is the purpose for this assignment?

APPENDIX B: SECOND SURVEY**Part 1: Demographic Information**

Age: _____ Gender (circle): M F Year in School: _____

Area of Major (please circle):

Agriculture	Human Sciences
Architecture, Design, and Construction	Liberal Arts
Business	Nursing
Education	Pharmacy
Engineering	Science and Mathematics
Forestry and Wildlife Sciences	Veterinary Medicine

Do you own a computer? Yes or No

If yes, is it a: (if you own more than one, please circle all that apply or indicate multiples with a number)

PC Desktop	Mac Desktop	Other _____
PC Laptop	Mac Laptop	

If no, where do you use a computer when necessary and what kind is it?

How much time do you normally spend a day on the computer?

Part 2: Use of Technology

1. What kind of technology did you use for your presentation?
2. Were you familiar with that technology before this presentation or did you have to learn something new?
3. Did you attend the classes that were specifically set aside as workshops?
4. If so, were they helpful? In what way or why not?
5. Did you visit your instructor during his/her office hours for further instruction on the assignment?
6. If so, were they helpful? In what way or why not?
7. If not, do you wish you had? Why or why not?
8. If you used a technology that you were already familiar with: Why did you choose to take UNIV 1120? And, where did you become familiar with that technology?
9. Did you use any new effects/applications in that program? Which ones? Why?
If you used a new technology:
10. Why did you choose to take UNIV 1120?

11. How do you feel about the experience of learning this new technology?
12. What classes do you feel are appropriate venues for assigning technology assignments (like the one we completed here)?
13. Do you view access to a computer as essential to your education at The University of Georgia? Why/why not?

Part 3: The Assignment

1. How much time did you spend working on your presentation outside of class?
(circle one)
Less than ten minutes
Between 10 and 30 minutes
Between 30 minutes and an hour
Between 1 hour and 2 hours
More than 2 hours
2. What, if anything, do you wish you had done differently?
3. Now that you are finishing your project do you feel that giving the technology: helped you with understanding your topic, distracted your understanding of the topic, or neutral?
4. If you were grading the presentations, what criteria would you use?
5. What grade do you think you deserve on this project, and why?
6. Which was more difficult: mastering the technology you used or mastering the topic? Why?
7. Did class discussions/lectures/instructions help prepare you for this assignment? If so, how? If not, what would have been helpful?
8. Do you feel that now, at the end of class, you were prepared to complete the assignment?
9. What do you feel is the purpose for this assignment?

Part 4: Final Thoughts

1. What are your final thoughts about this assignment?
2. What was the most enjoyable part?
3. The least enjoyable part?
4. Sum up what you have learned from this assignment: technology, topic, and process.

APPENDIX C: CITATION ANALYSIS

Notes:

- “Print” and “Online” refers to method of access. Sources categorized as “Other” are not included in this designation as many times they would fall into neither category (i.e., a movie, photograph, or song).
- “Owned” and “Not Owned” refers to whether or not the item is owned by the UGA Libraries. Those “Not Owned” are sources likely drawn from a student’s personal collection (including course materials from another class).
- Students were asked to provide a minimum of five sources from three of the following categories:
 - Book or book chapter
 - Scholarly/peer-reviewed article
 - Magazine article (popular or trade magazine)
 - Newspaper article
 - Film/TV/Audio clip
 - Web site (of academic quality - reputable, up-to-date, and authoritative)
 - Government document

1. Spring Semester: Two undergraduate sections, sixteen students

	Print	Online	Owned	Not Owned
Book	25	0	16	9
Journal	3	13	12	2
Magazine	0	6	5	1
Newspaper	0	6	6	0
WWW: gov		3		
WWW: org		9		
WWW: edu		3		
WWW: com/net		2		
WWW: news		3		
Other	19			
TOTALS	28 (excluding “Other”)	45 (incl. Web sites)	39	12
Note: Other sources included a dissertation abstract, an online governmental white paper, and visual sources like YouTube videos, film, and photos.				

2. Fall Semester: Two undergraduate sections, twenty-one students

	Print	Online	Owned	Not Owned / Not Accessed
Book	22	3	21	3
Journal	0	15	15	
Magazine	0	15	14	1
Newspaper	0	17	16	1
WWW: gov		7		
WWW: org		5		
WWW: edu		4		
WWW: com/net		14		
WWW: news		2		
Other	7	0		
TOTALS	22 (excluding "Other")	82 (incl. Web sites)	66	5
Note: Other sources included a TV program transcript and visual sources like YouTube videos and film.				

APPENDIX D: VIDEO TRANSCRIPT – The Polyphonic Classroom

The Polyphonic Classroom, a meta-multimodal video, offers a pedagogical model that uses collaborative instruction to draw attention to the relationship between information literacy and digital composition by providing an example process for a digital student project involving collaborative instruction. Collaborative teams composed of instructors and librarians can illuminate ways in which instructors often underutilize a library's main resource: its staff. Employing librarians as co-instructors rather than as one-day guest lecturers fosters an increase in both the breadth and depth of research skill development while embedding critical thinking skills into the curriculum. Each instructor should bring a particular expertise to the classroom but also have a voice in overall assessment and implementation of goals. Throughout the semester, the instructors and students work together to learn and create. A syncretic approach to assignment design, instruction, and research mirrors the students' task of forming a coherent project over the course of the semester by completing discrete tasks that build to a large-scale composition.

The project upon which our experience and research is based has several complementary goals, such as introducing students to the technology resources available to them, improving their research skills, and teaching them how to present their findings by employing a multimodal approach. The first task of the assignment requires students to define their research question. After two consecutive research workshops which cover searching the library's online catalog, utilizing a selection of databases, and using the Internet for academic research, students are asked to compile information they discover into an annotated bibliography. The annotated bibliography is the basis for the third part of the assignment, the movie script. Some students approach the script as they would a typical essay. Others compose a more performative paper incorporating sound effects, music, and dramatic narration. The final draft receives a grade, and the student will ostensibly record this version for the movie after taking any final comments into consideration. The students also receive instruction in the parameters of copyright law which equips them to gather legally available images, video, or sound clips for their movies. Several class periods are workshop days in which students compile images, audio, and film clips to produce a 3 to 4 minute documentary on their respective topics. The production of the movie you are now viewing has intentionally followed a similar process in order to provide a commentary on how this type of composition could work for building information literacy in various contexts. But instructors need not follow our exact example in order to enact polyphonic strategies in the classroom.

The final assignment for the course is a hand-coded Web site, which showcases the students' work including the embedded documentary movie files. Using HTML coding,

students also include internal links to their documentary scripts and annotated bibliographies as well as external links to pertinent sites about their topics.

Although everyone's institutional structure might not allow a project exactly like this, collaborative teams can come up with successful classroom plans according to their own situations. We suggest focus on developing a classroom that plays to each of the collaborative instructors' strengths and interests. In this way, collaborative instructorship improves the quality of pedagogy with the accumulation of expertise. Further interdisciplinary collaboration is an effort worth undertaking because, though many of us don't want to admit it, disciplinary insularism detracts from our ability to be wise, efficient researchers and to provide strong academic connections for our students.

It has become an expectation rather than an exception on both the part of the student and teacher that technology will be used in some way in the classroom. Our research finds that we should draw attention to the technology in the ways that it makes meaning rather than simply using these tools without thought to how digital environments create contexts. A collaborative approach such as the one that we suggest here can facilitate this goal.

In short, our goal for the collaborative relationship between instructors is to provide an instructional space where students can see research and technology integrated as both method of gathering information and method of information production. When collaboration, multiple literacies, and digital technology combine to form a model for blending information and computer literacy instruction, students are not only provided with new skills but with a way to think differently about their roles as information creators and consumers.