1. **Describe your artifact. Using our new terminology, describe your artifact. Is it static/dynamic? What modes does it use and what was your intention behind engaging the viewer with that mode?**
   1. My artifact is a dynamic, multimodal video, compromised of the usage of videos and still photos, including a narrating audio over the whole video. My intention behind engaging the viewer was that by making it multimodal, specifically the visual mode and linguistic mode, it keeps the viewer engaged and keeps the story moving through dynamic videos, as well as including the static images to enhance the story with evidence of real-life events happening, including ethos. The still image of the basketball team jumping into the air, while Jared stayed on the ground emphasized the storyline that he was still being included by the whole team by being there, however he did not have to comply to the standards of the group and jump with everyone. The audio when the narrator of the story describes how “the anonymous author noted that he or she believed that children with autism should NOT be taught in the same classrooms as the regular education students, since they are a DISRUPTION and a WASTE OF RESOURCES to the school”, with the emphasis on the wrongdoing practices of the anonymous author enhances the story by providing the “fire” that ignited the situation, and the emphasis on “NOT “ and “DISRUPTION” emphasizes the contrasts in beliefs that the speaker has with the author of the article. The emphasis on “NOT” and “DISRUPTION” also expresses the discriminating mindset that individuals who are uneducated on disabilities rather than someone who, like the speaker, has always had experience with, which also established the speaker ethos, or credibility on the topic.
2. **Where do we see each of these in your artifact? You need to name specific actions, images, text in the artifact so I can “see” or remember what your artifact did.** 
   1. **Credible sources. How do we measure or judge them: on what criteria? (Ch 6 writer/designer):** credible sources are measured in a multimodal piece as about knowing your genre and figuring out how the readers of that genre expect citation to appear. For my artifact, the credibility of my sources is demonstrated through the inclusion of the real articles in the video; because this genre of vlog-style video does not include formal citations in the video, the credible sources, much like in my artifact, must be shown directly in the video to represent that they are not fictionally created, and that they are true articles and websites that relate to the video.
   2. **Use of Logos/Parts of the argument:** Logos can be defined as persuading the audience with the use of facts and evidence to support the argument of the speaker. Logos is best portrayed through the use of the visual mode in my artifact, specifically the use of the direct articles from the Richmond Times Dispatch. The use of the actual articles portrays the logos of my artifact because it provides the hard evidence that this story actually occurred in our lives, as well as the fact that my mom and cousin’s responses to the article are directly shown and not made up, and that the facts of the article being presented are legit and evident.
   3. **Identity/Persona**: The identity of the designer of an artifact often is portrayed through their voice that is interpreted throughout their work. The identity of my artifact is presented through the use of the visual and linguistic modes presented in my artifact; my persona is evident in the visual mode, with the inclusion of my vlog-style videos, specifically the series of videos of me at the beginning trying to come up with ideas to write about, and this presents my persona because it demonstrates the struggle I have with writing and coming up with what to write about through my body language towards the computer. My identity is presented through the linguistic mode, specifically where I discuss that “I found it so aggravating that people still had this discriminating mindset about individuals with disabilities” , and this exemplifies my identity because it presents my ideals about my stance on individuals with disability’s education, and shows my passion about the situation, since I found it “aggravating” and “discriminating”.
   4. **Ethos:** Ethos can be defined as convincing an audience of one’s argument though the use of their credibility. The ethos in my artifact would be the use of specific images of my brother and I together, such as the picture of us at the Spread the Word to End the Word campaign table, showing that this story is a real-life situation, since including an image of us there shows that the event actually took place and is vital to the story.
   5. **Pathos:** Pathos can be defined as convincing an audience of ones argument by creating an emotional response for the audience. The use of pathos is incorporated throughout the entire narrative, since it is a personal artifact dealing with a real situation in my life, however I think it is best exemplified through the linguistic mode. The specific moment I feel best exemplifies this pathos through the linguistic mode would be the moment when I said “the anonymous author noted that he or she believed that children with autism should NOT be taught in the same classrooms as the regular education students, since they are a DISRUPTION and a WASTE OF RESOURCES to the school”, and this exemplifies pathos because the audience can physically hear the emphasis in my voice and can feel the anguish I had towards this author of the Richmond Times Dispatch for saying that discriminating statement, while also allowing the audience to feel the same anguish that I had, since individuals with disabilities have a large prevalence in a lot of different people’s lives, and the anger I had could translate to anyone with a disability or know someone with a disability.
3. **What did revision or re-visioning your project look like?** 
   1. **What substantive change did you make from first critique by final publication and why? The terms above should be used for your answer. Not all of them, just one or some:** My artifact required changes to my linguistic and visual mode from the first critique to the final publication. Regarding the linguistic mode, in my first adaptation of the artifact, I was lacking in connecting the experience of writing to the Richmond Times Dispatch to the rest of the experiences in my life, therefore lacking some ethos, since the credibility began to lack between the connection of the events in my life. Regarding the visual mode, the moments where I was not writing or typing were noticeable and needing to be changed, and this also affected the ethos, since the credibility of the story was slightly affected with me not directly doing these tasks and essentially “making it up”.
   2. **If you had time/tools enough, what changes would you make to better fit your vision for this multimodal narrative?**: Some changes that I would make to better my narrative would be to refilm all of my video portions to be on the same day and time so that they look better connected to each other to strengthen the bond between my video without the distraction of the lighting changing in those videos, as well as possibly add some music to the story to add another multimodal element to the story and so another aspect could contribute to the meaning behind the narrative.