Note: link to Prezi is in the comments of my submission

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?

My artifact has both dynamic and static elements in the modes it engages with. The intention is that the presentation can vary and be tweaked a little according to the audience. The dynamic part is the presentation itself. The oral/audio mode is dynamic, it changes with the presentation each time. The gestural mode can change as well, as I tend to gesticulate as I speak. My intention with the oral presentation was to have a dialogue and narrative more authentic to my written self. The written, visual, and spatial modes to not change and are static. The spatial modes are very intentional. I want to lead the audience with me through growing up and learning how to write, type, and come to terms with my penmanship. I felt that a closer cluster would overwhelm/confuddle my message. I was really intentional in the organization of my piece. I was also intentional in the choice of the visual elements and the pictures I chose. I actually had a good variety of pictures to select from, but not many with computers or me writing in them. Instead, I opted to incorporate them with jokes, so I could set the tone around the pictures. Regarding the handwriting samples, their inclusion is both visual and written. I think they are mostly visual though, as the intent is to see the quality, not the content, of my penmanship. The titles are also static, as I felt them sufficient to introduce the pictures and context before I speak with my extended explanations.

1. 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.

The pictures of me, from a young child to the present day, demonstrate the visual modes. As mentioned above, they are extremely intentional. Additionally, the titles serve as a written mode, introducing my spoken words and the pictures. I also have a set order that the presentation moves through, to guide the audience through my thought process and to preserve the organized intention.

Credible sources. How do we measure or judge them: on what criteria?

(Ch 6 writer/designer)

We judge them through their arguments and who they are. Where did the get the information? What background to they have? Do they have history of credibility?

Use of Logos/Parts of the argument

How are facts used and organized. Are statistics or other hard facts incorporated? For me, the incorporation of my handwriting samples are logos.

Identity/Persona

Identity refers to the assumed or emphasized in the text. In my artifact, I’m me now talking about my younger self.

Ethos

Who is talking about it? What are their credentials? What experience or background do they have? For my project, it’s the background that it’s my story.

Pathos

The emotional appeals. In my project, it is the incorporation of the pictures of myself.

1. What did revision or re-visioning your project look like?

My revision changed mostly between the first crit and second crit. The feedback I got largely impacted how I reformatted it. I also intentionally (with much effort) spoke much slower. My re- envisioning also often meant reigning in my original vision.

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.

The biggest changes I made:

1. I originally intended to record it and do it that way, but through listening to the critique of others, the critique of my own, and personal reflection I realized oral presentation was more authentic to my journey.
2. I merged my last two slides because the “two endings” weakened each other. It was repetitive to the audience and one slide made more sense.
3. I adjusted the tone of my narrative to be more positive and less apologetic. For example, changing the title from “Pardon my handwriting” to “The Type to Type”. I adjusted several points in the script to reflect this more positive tone.
4. Something that was interesting to hear, but I didn’t change was Shawn’s comment about my right-to-left photo description vs (apparently standard) left-to-right. I thought about it, but I hadn’t done it to make a statement. It’s how I do all my presentations. It would be a deviation from my authenticity in this narrative to change it to the standard way. English is my first language and our home language, but this project made me think about my childhood bilingualism in a new light. It was still really interesting feedback to consider, even though I didn’t ultimately make the change.
5. If you had time/tools enough, what changes would you make to better fit your vision for this multimodal narrative?

I would have a lot more handwriting samples. I also would have experimented with framing it in the third person and having audio from other people. I also think I would have kept it as a prezi or something similar, not a video, so that it could be timed as is appropriate to a given audience. Given more time, I would have also had more meta commentary to reflect upon my journey. I also wish I had been able to incorporate more Hebrew into my work, because I don’t think I gave it enough airtime given how much of my writing journey it has been part of. Given more space and skill, I would have definitely brought in more voices, more depth, and explored how bilingualism impacted my writer’s journey.