UNIT 1
The Possibly Impossible
Research Project

ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY

The Possibly Impossible Research Project (180 points) - For this assignment, students will choose from a list of authors of early children's picture books supplied by the Baldwin Library of Historical Children's Literature at the University of Florida. These authors are largely unknown and the library has very little information about their lives, publishing history, education, or other work. Each student will engage in original research to locate and record as much biographical information about his or her chosen author as possible, using both digital, physical, and archival methods of research. The ultimate goal will be to create a public facing digital biography of this author to be added to Wikipedia.

HOWEVER, it is entirely possible that a student will be unable to find much information at all on the chosen author, making the creation of a complete, detailed, multimodal Wikipedia biography IMPOSSIBLE! Therefore, the final artifact for this unit will be a portfolio of work; for some students, this artifact may take the more traditional form of a written biography, a bibliography, and supporting documents, while for other students, it make take the form of various process documents, detailing the research work completed, in order to help future researchers build from the work already completed.

Students should approach this project as a journey into the unknown. They should be prepared to make mistakes, get messy, and potentially come up empty handed. A large part of the project will include figuring out how to make failure and frustration productive, how to document a research process so that future researchers might benefit, and how to enjoy the research rabbit holes.

SOMETIMES I'VE BELIEVED AS MANY AS 6 IMPOSSIBLE THINGS BEFORE BREAKFAST.

FINAL ARTIFACT: RESEARCH PORTFOLIO (100 pts)

To successfully complete this research portfolio, students must choose **at least 3** of the following elements:

- **Public Facing Multimodal Biographical Article on Author via Wikipedia -** minimum 250 words, following the tone, format, and style of Wikipedia. Multimodal elements like images, links, sources required. Turn in screenshot.
- **Public Facing Biographical Information for Baldwin Website-** minimum 300 words, following format and style set by the Baldwin Library (largely academic). Turn in text or screenshot.
- **Bibliography of Sources in MLA format -** minimum of 5 sources, cited in MLA 8
- **Archived Twitter Research Journal-** minimum of 25 student generated tweets on the research process; may include responses, replies, retweets, and commentary/narrative. Must be archived and turned in as PDF.
- **Research Narrative-** 600-800 word first person narrative of student's research process; may include multimodal elements such as screenshots, embedded Tweets, photos, handwritten materials.
- **Archived Correspondence with Librarians, Scholars, Archivists etc**.- minimum of 4 part correspondence (sent from student, reply from librarian, response from student, reply from librarian), or 4 queries on the part of the student; correspondence may provide vital information or be evidence of a dead end.
- **Archived Image Files -** minimum of 5 relevant images, such as family portraits, illustrations by the author, estate images, photos of materials discovered; images archived and turned in as a PDF

Students should archive materials as appropriate, combine into one PDF with an appropriate cover page, and turn in to Canvas no later than **11:55pm on Monday, February 12**

PROJECT STAGE: TWITTER RESEARCH JOURNAL (50 pts)

Each student will use Twitter to chronicle the research process, share resources, seek out assistance from other academics on Twitter and add productive discussion to the course research project as a whole.

At the start of Unit 1, each student will use their Twitter feed to begin documenting and chronicling their research into their chosen author. In addition to the standard #1102kidsci hashtag, each research journal tweet should include #RJ.

Over the course of their research, from January 22-February 12, students will be expected to send at least **30 tweets documenting their research process**. Tweets can be multimodal and informal. Tweets for this assignment may include (but are not limited to):

☐ Questions the student hopes to answer or would like help in answering
☐ Sources the student has found to be useful, either for primary or secondary research
☐ Observations from research or from work with experts like librarians
☐ Relevant discoveries from sources, other students, experts, online sources, archives, correspondence etc.
☐ Search terms, paths of inquiry, key terms, databases explored,
☐ Dead ends, disappointing results, lack of responses, setbacks, failures, frustrations
☐ Plans, drafts, versions of portfolio pieces, such as text for Wikipedia article or links to images

Students will also be required to **REPLY to at least 10 tweets from peers** who are also engaged in original research.

Therefore, by the end of Unit 1, students should have, at minimum, **40 tweets total** dedicated to their research process with the hashtag #RJ. Students should aim to use Twitter as a research journal to both record and reflect on their research process as well as to provide feedback and learn from others' progress.

As always with Twitter assignments, keep in mind the potential for a wider audience; students should strive to make Tweets understandable to those outside our course. Making use of additional (existing) hashtags or participating in online forums or discussions may provide you with additional feedback or advice from other scholars. Students should also consider also how to make use of Twitter genre conventions (like threads, group tweets, or tagging) to help communicate ideas to that wider public audience.

PROJECT STAGE: BLOG POST 1 & RESPONSES (30 pts)

Wednesday, January 31 by 11:55pm: Students will write a 300-500 word blog post on the course blog detailing their progress with the Possibly Impossible Research Process. Each blog post must contain the following:
1. The name of the author being researched
2. A summary of the work done to date
3. A brief reflection on the research process (what has worked, what hasn't, what is next to try)
    then EITHER
    4. A proposed plan for the final portfolio
    OR
    4. 1-2 questions or concerns the student needs help addressing in order to complete the project*

Friday, February 2 by 11:55pm: Each student will then respond to at least 2 peer blog posts, using the reply function on the course blog, with constructive feedback. Each brief response (100-200 words) should offer feedback, advice, information, tips, or ideas about how the original poster can work through their concerns, improve their research methodology, access materials, or move to new avenues of investigation. Students should consider these two responses an open-ended peer review and should strive to help fellow students improve their work through constructive criticism and concrete feedback.

*Questions should be content based ("How do I best track down publication data on a book? Where can I find census records for the UK?") rather than procedural ("How many tweets do we need? When is the project due?")

Georgia Tech's Communication Center is located in Clough Commons, Suite 447. It is an excellent resource for all students (undergraduate or graduate) who want help with a communication-related project, from their multimodal assignments for English 1101 and English 1102 to graduate school applications, from engineering and science reports to oral presentations, from storyboards for videos to poster designs, from grant proposals to job cover letters and resumes. The trained professional and peer tutors in the Communication Center help all students with their written, oral, visual, electronic, and nonverbal communication in every discipline. The staff includes professional tutors specially trained to assist non-native speakers. All services are free and confidential.

> Website for Appointments: communicationcenter.gatech.edu/content/make-appointment
> Phone: 404-385-3612
> Visit: Clough Commons Suite 447

Georgia Tech's Library Resources

Karen Viars (LMC Subject Librarian) - Karen will visit our class to give an overview on research and Georgia Tech resources. She also holds regular office hours on Tuesdays from 1:30-3 p.m. in the Sci-fi Lab, Skiles 349A and Thursdays from 1:30-3 p.m. in the Design and Social Interaction Studio, TSRB 209.
For updates to this schedule see https://karenviars.weebly.com/officehours.html
You can email her questions at karen.viars@library.gatech.edu.

Ask A Librarian feature on the GATech Library Website: http://www.library.gatech.edu/services/help.php

Baldwin Library of Historical Children's Literature at the University of Florida

Suzan Alteri (Curator) You can email her questions at salteri@ufl.edu.

Baldwin Library Homepage: http://cms.uflib.ufl.edu/baldwin/Index.aspx

Baldwin Digital Collection Homepage: http://ufdc.ufl.edu/juv

"Guiding Science" Annotated Bibliography Project: http://cms.uflib.ufl.edu/guidingscience/bibliography

RUBRIC

Scale	Basic	Beginning	Developing	Competent	Mature	Exemplary
Rhetorical Awareness Response to situation, including purpose, audience, register, and context	Overlooks two or more aspects of the situation or assignment, and thus does not fulfill the task	Overlooks at least one aspect of the situation or assignment and thus compromises effectiveness	Attempts to respond to all aspects of the situation or assignment, but the attempt is incomplete	Addresses the situation or assignment in a complete but perfunctory or predictable way	Addresses the situation completely, with unexpected insight: could be presented to target audience with small changes	Addresses the situation in a sophisticated manner that could be presented to target audience as is.
Stance Argument, significance and implications ("so what" factor)	Involves an unspecified or confusing argument; significance is not evident	Makes an overly general argument; significance is difficult to discern, or not appropriate to the rhetorical situation	Makes a simplistic or implicit argument, or multiple arguments that have no clear connection to one another; gestures towards significance, but does not fully develop it	Makes an explicit and straightforward argument that does not oversimplify the problem or question; explores at least one implication of the argument in depth	Makes a complex, unified argument that clearly articulates a position or stance; explores multiple implications of the argument	Offers an inventive, expert-like argument that clearly articulates a sophisticated position/stance; explores multiple implications of the argument in a compelling manner
Development of Ideas Evidence, analysis, and substance	Claims requiring support are not backed by necessary evidence; lacks analysis of major pieces of evidence; content is not substantive	Evidence and/or analysis is weak or contradictory; does not account for important evidence that could support or disprove the argument	Evidence provides minimal but necessary support to each point; attempted analysis is not sufficient to prove the argument	Evidence and analysis are substantive; they support the argument and related claims, but are mostly predictable	Evidence fully supports and proves the argument and all related claims; evidence is always paired with compelling analysis	Evidence and analysis are precise, nuanced, fully developed, and work together to enhance the argument,
Organization Structure and coherence, including elements such as introductions and conclusions as well as logical connections between points	Lacks unity in constituent parts; fails to create coherence among constituent parts; contains major argumentative holes or fallacies. Organization impedes understanding.	Uses insufficient unifying statements; uses few effective connections; some logical moves necessary to prove the argument are absent. Organization does not improve understanding.	Uses some effective unifying claims, but a few are unclear; inconsistently makes connections between points and the argument; employs simplistic organization	States unifying claims with supporting points that relate clearly to the overall argument and employs an effective but mechanical scheme. Logical organization supports understanding.	Asserts and sustains a claim that develops logically and progressively; adapts typical organizational schemes for the context; achieves substantive coherence	Artifact is organized to achieve maximum coherence and momentum; connections are sophisticated and complex when required. Organization anticipates readers' needs.
Conventions Expectations for grammar, mechanics, style, citation	Involves errors that risk making the overall message distorted or incomprehensible	Involves a major pattern of errors;	Involves some distracting errors	Meets expectations, with minor errors	Meets expectations in a virtually flawless manner	Exceeds expectations and manipulates conventions to advance the argument
Design for Medium Features that use affordances of the genre to enhance factors such as usability and comprehensibility	Lacks features necessary or significant for the genre; uses features that conflict with or ignore the argument]	Omits some important features; distracting inconsistencies in features; uses features that don't support argument.	Uses features that support the argument, but some match imprecisely with content; involves minor omissions or inconsistencies.	Supports the argument with features that are generally suited to genre and content.	Promotes engagement and supports the argument with features that efficiently use affordances.	Persuades with careful, seamless integration of features and content and with innovative use of affordances.