

# Multimodal Assessment Project

“The language of evaluation,  
the language of instruction”

Funded by the National Writing Project and  
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

## The MAP Team

**Carl Whithaus**, University of California, Davis (co-chair)

**Elyse Eidman-Aadahl**, Executive Director of the National Writing Project at  
the University of California, Berkeley (co-chair)

**Kris Blair**, Bowling Green State University

**Danielle DeVoss**, Michigan State University

**Will Hochman**, Southern Connecticut State University

**Lanette Jimerson**, University of California, Berkeley

**Chuck Jurich**, University of New Mexico

**Sandra Murphy**, University of California, Davis

**Tara Porter**, University of California, Davis

**Becky Rupert**, Hoosier Writing Project

**Joe Wood**, Area 3 Writing Project

## MAP Discoveries

- The importance of **context** or situation when evaluating a digital, multimodal composition
- How the qualities or material conditions associated with digital, multimodal **artifacts** or compositions reshape assessment processes
- How the **substance** or validity of student arguments presented in digital, multimodal texts may become part of the evaluative criteria
- Shifts in what **process and skill acquisition** and/or transfer may mean in digital writing
- How students developing **habits of mind** may differ when multimodal compositions are valued over the creation of primarily alphabetic texts

# The Domains

- Artifact
- Contextual Awareness
- Substance
- Process Management and Technique
- Habits of Mind

ccdigitalpress.org/dwae

## The MAP Framework

The MAP Framework is a set of five domains—areas of growth, development, and ultimately performance in multimodal composition. Although specific dimensions might be the focus of attention at any one time, all five dimensions are present in every act of composing. A comprehensive curriculum or set of learning opportunities should support authors in developing knowledge and capacity across all five dimensions over time.

The **artifact** is the finished product. Audiences expect artifacts to convey a coherent message with a clear focus created through an appropriate use of structure, medium, and technique. Artifacts incorporate elements from multiple modes, and are often digital, but do not have to be—they may be analog works (e.g., texts that incorporate both writing and drawing). They identify the connections among resources, composers, and ideas and may demonstrate habits of mind such as innovation, creativity, and critical stance.

As a domain, **context** is the world around the artifact, around the creation of the artifact, and how the artifact enters, circulates, and fits into the world. Authors attend to the context of a multimodal artifact when they make design decisions related to genre or to an artifact's intended uses. Given their purposes, authors consider the affordances, constraints, and opportunities, given purpose, audience, composing environment, and delivery mode. [Note: also referred to as "contextual awareness"]

**Substance** refers to the content and overall quality and significance of the ideas presented. The substance of a piece is related to an artifact's message in relationship to the contextual elements of purpose, genre, and audiences. Considering the substance of a piece encourages authors to think about elements such as quality of ideas, quality of performance, credibility, accuracy, and significance.

**Process management and technique** refer to the skills, capacities, and processes involved in planning, creating, and circulating multimodal artifacts. Creating multimodal products involves the technical skills of production using the chosen tools, but it also includes larger project management skills as well as the ability to collaborate with others in diverse and often interactive situations. Over time, individuals learn to more effectively control the skills and manage the processes of producing and circulating digital content.

**Habits of mind** are patterns of behavior or attitudes that reach beyond the artifact being created at the moment. They develop over time and can be nurtured through self-sponsored learning as well as teacher-facilitated activities throughout the process. Examples include creativity, persistence, risk-taking, mindfulness, and engagement. Habits of mind can also include an openness to participatory and interactive forms of engagement with audiences.

Eidman-Aadahl, E., Blair, K., DeVoss, D. N., Hochman, W., Jimerson, L., Jurich, C., Murphy, S., Rupert, B., Whithaus, C., & Wood, J. (2013). Developing domains for multimodal writing assessment: The language of evaluation, the language of instruction. In H. McKee & D. N. DeVoss (Eds.), *Digital writing assessment & evaluation*. Logan, UT: Computers & Composition Digital Press, Utah State University Press. Retrieved from <http://ccdigitalpress.org/dwae>.

## Students' Reflections on Their Work

Which domain was a strength?

which domain was an area of need of improvement?

“Even though it was created for this Children’s Literature class, I feel the artifact is strong enough to stand on its own as a thought provoking piece. The use of iMovie to compose the piece was a suitable choice that allowed for music, sound effects and zooming in and out of images for visual interest. The entire piece was held together by “Music for a Found Harmonium” by Strung Out. This background music told a story in and of itself due to its *accelerando*. As the music increased in volume and tempo the mood became unmistakably frantic. This mood was an integral part of the message; when the music ended the relief was palpable.”

“I also realized that many of my pictures were of low pixel quality and seemed distractingly fuzzy when viewed on a large screen.”

Considering the quality of the “sources”  
and “delivery medium”

“I think that the one domain my piece was strongest was habits of mind... Whenever I hit a roadblock I would sit back and watch YouTube videos until I thought of a way to fix the idea. This usually led to me finding videos to input in my project.”

Going back into the “data/literature” and  
shows the connection between writing  
processes and products

“What I was most scared of was that my message wasn’t clear. I really didn’t want me speaking in the beginning because I felt it threw off the piece, but knew some description of my connection had to be there. I just didn’t think people would catch the connection without me talking in the beginning. So the artifact didn’t come out as I’d hoped. I definitely forgot to cite my sources, mainly because I didn’t think of it and because to me they were obviously from Disney.”

“I used this program (PowerPoint) in a way I had never used before and think that I was creative in my exploration.”

“I was really unsure of this assignment from the start. It was very open with a lot of room to wiggle with ideas... After watching my video in class I was already thinking of ways to make it better.”

“I could have improved my presentation by managing the resources and digital assets used to compose my multimodal response. At first I thought PowerPoint was a great digital production (tool) to create my response. However, I could have used iMovie to create some spice towards improving my presentation.”

“In regards to Contextual Awareness... I only considered my sisters to be my audience and at that, didn’t really consider the classroom much after that point. I should have strived for a happy medium between my two audiences as my project became very emotional.”

# Strengths of the MAP Framework

- can be used to **assess** but also to guide **instruction**
- **portable**: works with a variety of texts, age/grade levels, genres
- addresses **multiple (group) authorship**
- addresses both the **processes** and the **products** (artifacts) of writing

## Crucial!

Assessment leads to **focused** instruction

“The language of evaluation, the  
language of instruction.”