

BUDGET SUMMARY AND JUSTIFICATION

Identify which of the following you are requesting and explain specific activities to be supported:

 X Faculty course release* \$ 3500
JUSTIFICATION:

As editor of the field’s major online, multimedia journal, I can accurately estimate that it takes approximately 40 hours per article to ready a text from the point of submission (not including peer review) to its acceptance and completion for publication. For that journal, I have a staff of 8 who help me. (Only one is located at ISU.) In relation, my co-editors on *The New Work of Composing*, which is the book project for this award application, include one faculty member (at U of Louisville) who is not very familiar with the technological or theoretical aspects of editing scholarly multimedia, and one graduate student (also at U of Louisville), who while he is more familiar with the technological components, is new to the theoretical aspects of editing multimedia scholarship. Thus, I will be acting as lead editor in many respects. I am estimating that each chapter in this collection will take approximately the same amount of time as editing one of the journal articles I edit (40 hours per). We expect to publish around 15–20 “chapters”.

 Graduate or Undergraduate Student Assistant* (circle one) \$ _____
JUSTIFICATION:

TOTAL FROM REA FUNDS (not to exceed \$3,500): \$ 3500

Please provide the information requested below, if applicable:

Funds from Other Sources: \$ _____

Indicate Source: _____

Project Total \$ 3500

**The Department Chair or School Director agrees to cover whatever additional funds may be needed (beyond the \$3,500 REA) to fully fund the course release or student assistant.*

Department Chair or School Director Date

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (left justified 12 pt. type with 1" margins, not to exceed 3 single-spaced pages. See Guidelines for Proposals, pp. ii-iii, for details.)

1. Scholarly Scope/Significance

In December 2006, the Modern Language Association of America (MLA), which is the guiding association for departments of English and foreign languages and literatures in higher education, published a 100-page report on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. Less than six pages of this report were dedicated to digital forms of scholarship, mostly because so little is known about the differences in publishing or evaluating scholarly when it is presented digitally as opposed to in print. In that report, the authors reminded us that the “MLA Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of Scholarly Publishing indicates, ‘online journals are already being used by many scholars in our fields, and this use is likely to increase’ (180)” (p. 43). While use is likely to increase, the problem remains that “Overall, 52.1% of respondents [department chairs of English and languages programs] report having no experience with evaluating monographs in digital form” (p.45), but the lack of experience does not reflect well on the tenure-ability of a growing number of scholars who publish digitally. The report indicated, “Although digital forms of scholarship increasingly pervade academic life, work in this area has not yet received proper recognition when candidates are evaluated for promotion and tenure. We consider it essential that tenure committees continue to learn about digital scholarship” (p. 46). This call to action is what drives this grant proposal, by theorizing ways that tenure and promotion stakeholders can begin to experience and learn about evaluating digital book projects.

However, what is not said in the report is that most digital monographs are print-based works. In other words, they are word-processed and could be printed, just like any book. And, yet there is an increasing amount of scholarship in humanities that is digital but *cannot* be printed because such work takes advantage of multiple media and interactivity—that is, some digital scholarship is designed to take advantage of the affordances of web media like hyperlinks, streaming video, audio, and so on. Digital, multimedia scholarship—what I have elsewhere called *new media scholarship* (see Ball, 2004; Ball & Moeller, 2008)—has *no* representation in English (and related) departments when it comes to scholarly, book-length projects. That is, department chairs will not have encountered/experienced reading new media books because none have been published. Yet. **The main goal of this project is to edit a new media book.**

The first digital press in writing studies—which is the subfield within English Studies most recognized as pioneering new media scholarship—is coming online (literally) in Spring of 2008. I have been asked to co-edit the first new media book project that the press is encouraging. (See the Appendix for email confirmation of my co-editor status with the second editor, Dr. Debra Journet.) Computers and Composition Digital Press has an impressive editorial board include top, international scholars in digital humanities computing (Katherine Hayles), media studies (Lev Manovich), visual rhetoric (WJT Mitchell), and electronic literature (Matthew Kirschenbaum), among other areas of specialization. The digital book project is an outgrowth of the bi-annual Thomas R. Watson Conference on Rhetoric and Composition, which will be hosted again this October 2008 by the English Department at the University of Louisville. The theme for this year is “The New Work of Composing,” which is described as:

Multiplicity of modes and media; myriad new sites and genres; morphing definitions of what counts as text or author or audience; seismic shifts in means of production and delivery. These changes are all around us, and they are coming fast.

What is the new work of composing in the midst of the cultural and linguistic diversity, increasing globalization, and rapidly changing technologies that characterize contemporary life? These are compelling questions for us—as students, teachers, writers, composers, activists, citizens. The 2008 Thomas R. Watson Conference will explore the complex and semiotically rich challenges we face, in the university and beyond, as we move toward new modes of composing, new forms of rhetoric, new concepts of texts and textuality, and new ways of making meaning. (<http://louisville.edu/conference/watson>)

The conference organizer, Dr. Debra Journet, tells presenters: “We welcome scholarly papers and new forms of scholarship, including videos, sound essays, installations. We encourage you to think creatively about the new work of composing” (“Call for Papers”). Conference presenters will be encouraged to remediate (i.e., compose or revise for digital media presentation) their work for submission to the edited collection, *The New Work of Composing*. The significance of editing this project, then, is to begin the journey the MLA proposed regarding the field needing a better understanding new media scholarship; that understanding will continue to elude MLA constituents and tenure and promotion stakeholders unless more examples of book-length, new media projects are made available. This project hopes to fill that gap.

2. Goals

As articulated in the abstract, this project has four goals that relate to the editing of the new media book, *The New Work of Composing*. These goals include:

- (1) providing initial feedback and editorial support for authors submitting to the collection. Composing new media scholarship is a fairly new endeavor in English studies, so part of the editing process will be mentoring authors through the composition process.
- (2) editing the digital, multimedia submissions, which are due early in the spring of 2009. Editing new media requires not only the print-based editing knowledge most authors, journal editors, and book editors have, but adding to that process the understanding of how to edit multimedia elements in the text that are *as important as* the written words in the text’s meaning. As mentioned in the budget justification, the typical amount of time it takes to edit (from submission to publication) a new media article is approximately 40 hours, not including peer-review. [That is, I spend 40 hours copy- and design-editing each multimedia article that is published in the online, multimedia journal, *Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy*. Those articles are comparable in scope (design content) to the book chapters we are expecting.]
- (3) studying the process of editing scholarly, book-length, digital collections that contain multimedia elements. Work in this area is desperately needed, as a recent conversation and email exchange with the MLA-affiliated Council of Editors of Learned Journals (CELJ) President Jana Argersinger indicated. A subcommittee of the CELJ is working on guidelines for evaluating digital journals, but none of the committee members (until I joined) edited digital journals.
- (4) working toward the publication of a scholarly article about the process of authoring and editing large, digital multimedia collections to satisfy (in small part) the field’s increased interest in understanding and evaluating digital scholarship (especially digital books) for

tenure and promotion purposes. This goal, related to #3—while not necessarily an outcome possible within the scope/timeframe of this particular grant application—will likely be a continuing outcome of my work on editing the new media collection.

Although the main focus of this award application is for release time to edit (and theorize the editing of) this unique book, another related outcome of this project will be work in the following academic year (2009–2010) toward writing an NEH grant to host a Digital Humanities workshop on reading and evaluating digital scholarship for tenure and promotion stakeholders.

3. PI's Preparation for This Project

As my C.V. indicates, I have extensive background in the areas of reading, composing, teaching, and editing new media texts, with a specific focus on new media scholarship. I edit the leading digital journal in my field, *Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy* (see <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net>), which publishes new media scholarship. I have recently presented keynote lectures on evaluating digital/new media scholarship at the University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign and The Ohio State University, and I have presentations on this topic forthcoming at the Conference on College Composition and Communication and the Computers & Writing Conference. I have written several articles/webtexts about this area and was also recently asked to write “the” article on defining new media studies within the field of composition. I am, perhaps (gasp!), the most qualified person in my field to take on this work, as represented by my co-editor’s request to have me participate (see the Appendix email with that request).

4. Work Plan/Timetable

To complete the book project, my co-editors and I will adhere to the following timeline:

June 1–10, 2009	Meet in person at OSU (where press editors are located) to discuss book plans
June 15, 2009	Start publicity campaign for submissions
July–October	Queries (where I will need to provide authors with direction in composing with multimedia)
October 16–18, 2008	Conference (from which submissions will be recruited)
October–January 2009	Queries/Early Feedback to Authors on in-progress works
January 1, 2009	Submissions due
January–March 2009	Editorial feedback (<i>this will be one of my primary tasks</i>)
March–April 2009	Working with authors to accomplish revisions
March–June 2009	Designing the book interface (<i>this will another primary task</i>)
May 1, 2009	Final submissions due
May–June 2009	Copy and Design Editing (<i>design-editing will be my primary task</i>)
July 1, 2009	Submit to press

Optional Appendix (not to exceed 5 single-spaced pages):

Two emails requesting my participation in the Watson Conference from the conference organizer, a description of the conference and the book project, and an invitation to co-edit the digital collection. Used with permission.

From: debra.journet@louisville.edu
Subject: **Invitation to the 2008 Thomas R. Watson Conference**
Date: October 10, 2007 2:42:23 PM CDT
To: cball@ilstu.edu

Dear Cheryl,

I am writing to invite you to participate in a roundtable that will serve as the closing plenary session at the 2008 Thomas R. Watson Conference in Rhetoric and Composition, to be held at the University of Louisville on October 16-18, 2008. The theme of the 2008 conference will be "The New Work of Composing." Our goal is to explore how new communicative technologies and genres are changing what we think of as "composing"--including such core concepts as "writing," "text," "author," and "literacy." We envision lively disciplinary and interdisciplinary discussion about such issues as how "new media" are related to "old media"; how issues of access, materiality, or economics affect composing within and outside the university; how meaning gets shaped in textual, visual, and aural modes; and how this affects our disciplinary work.

As part of the conference, we are planning a session that will specifically consider the impact of these new technologies and genres on our work as composition teachers, as writing program administrators, and as researchers and scholars. The session will be made up of about six speakers, with each participant giving a short (10 minutes or so) talk, and then taking part in a roundtable discussion. Because of your important work, especially your editorship of *Kairos* and your understanding of how digital media may change scholarship, we are especially hoping you will accept our invitation. This session will close the conference on Saturday, October 18. We are able to offer a modest honorarium of \$1,500 plus travel and accommodation expenses. (Conference participants will be housed at the Brown Hotel, a landmark hotel in downtown Louisville; the conference itself will be on the campus of the University of Louisville.)

I hope very much that you can join us for the 2008 Watson Conference. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me at debra.journet@louisville.edu or to call me at 502-852-6801 or 502-852-3056. I would appreciate it if you could let me know within two weeks if you are able to participate in the conference.

Sincerely,

Debra Journet
Professor of English
Director, 2008 Thomas R. Watson Conference

PS: Cheryl, I really hope you can come! I will be back in touch in a day or so with another idea I want you to think about. Debra

From: debra.journet@louisville.edu
Subject: **Re: Invitation to the 2008 Thomas R. Watson Conference**
Date: October 12, 2007 1:04:47 PM CDT
To: cball@ilstu.edu

Oh I'm so glad you will be a part of Watson. As soon as I started thinking about this conference, I knew it had your name written all over it!

So here's my other idea. All the past Watson Conferences have resulted in books--edited collections. And I want this one to be a book too. But I want it to be a digital book. It just makes sense. (And I've become really interested in the question of what digital scholarship is going to be--not just scholarship about digital media, but scholarship that is digital media. I know I'm late on this particular bandwagon, but I am really interested.)

As you probably know, Cindy [Selfe] and Gail [Hawisher] are starting a digital book press, and Cindy has encouraged me to submit this to them. I told her I wasn't sure I had the technological expertise I would need. I have done other edited collections, so I know a good bit about how to put a coherent book-length project together. But I obviously don't have experience with multimodal scholarship. Cindy suggested I ask you to co-edit the book with me, which I thought a fantastic idea.

I should say that though I recognize that you have all the technological expertise I lack, I would not simply expect you to take on all the work of getting it in the right shape alone. I have resources from Watson that I can draw on, including enough money to pay someone to help. I also plan on asking one of the Assistant Directors of the Conference to be the third editor (and he has a good deal of technological expertise as well.)

To give you some idea of how I have, in the past, allocated the work, this is the way I've organized the narrative book: I am taking the book through the submission stage (writing the prospectus, writing the introduction, and copy-editing the chapters), my colleague Beth Boehm is overseeing the book after acceptance (working with authors for revisions, editing proofs), and the third editor (a graduate student) is helping us with these tasks, overseeing production issues, and doing the index. Obviously, a digital book would require a different outlay of efforts, but that maybe gives you a sense of how I've collaborated in comparably sized projects.

So what do you think? If you would like to do this, I think it would be really great to work with you. One thing I've thought about is the need to alert people submitting to Watson from the beginning that this will be a digital book and to encourage them to be thinking about how they would present their scholarship accordingly. So if you're interested, we could start some brainstorming about this fairly soon.

Let me know what you think. And whatever you decide, I'm really glad you're going to be at Watson next year.

Debra

PROJECT IMPACT INFORMATION: Please complete the following:

Proposal Title: “*The New Work of Composing: Editing an Online (Digital) Multimedia Book in English Studies*”
REA Cost: \$3500.00

Educational and Scholarly Implication of the project (check one):

Pilot data or other preliminary work on a proposal to be submitted to an external funding agency

Name of potential sponsors and approximate dates when proposal for outside funds will be submitted.

Briefly explain how the proposed project meets the goals of the potential external funding agencies. You may append a Request for Proposals or similar announcement.

Scholarly or creative contribution

Other (Explain briefly) : seed project that will enable a proposal to an external funding agency in 2009–2010.

Space and necessary facilities are available for this project: Yes No

Is student participation planned for this project? Yes No

If yes, give anticipated number: Undergraduate Graduate Postgraduate

Does the proposed work involve international travel? Yes No

FOLLOW-UP REQUIREMENTS:

The project director should sign below to indicate that he/she understands and agrees to the follow-up requirements below.

a. Reports: The written report of progress on the research funded by the grant shall be filed in the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences within sixty days after the conclusion of the grant period (no later than August 31, 2009). See Guidelines for format of these reports. **Applications from faculty who have not submitted a report on previous awards will not be considered.**

b. Acknowledgments: Any publication resulting from the research supported by a grant from the Research Enhancement Award fund shall include the statement: "This work was supported in full or in part by a College of Arts and Sciences Research Enhancement Award at Illinois State University. This support does not necessarily imply endorsement by the University or the College of the research conclusions generated by this project."

c. Proprietary Information: Proposals resulting in CAS Research Enhancement Awards, unless they contain proprietary information, may be reviewed in STV 141 as an aid to new applicants.

This proposal contains proprietary information.

This proposal does not contain proprietary information.

Project Director

Date

SUMMARY VITA: Include a list of recent publications, presentations, and/or performances as appropriate for your discipline. Note those activities that resulted from a previous URG. Summarize efforts to obtain external funding for your work. Do **not** include your full *curriculum vitae*. **The summary vita should not exceed 3 single-spaced pages, including this one.**

See attached

Reviewer's Number: _____

REVIEWER EVALUATION

To be completed by Applicant:

Applicant Name(s): _Cheryl E. Ball

Proposal Title: “*The New Work of Composing: Editing an Online (Digital) Multimedia Book in English Studies*”

TO BE COMPLETED BY REVIEWER: NOTE: Following are criteria to consider in assigning a final score. Space is provided for your comments; please bear in mind that the comments will be forwarded to the applicants). If you feel that any categories do not apply to this proposal, you may leave them blank.

Project Justification:

Potential Significance of Project Outcomes:

Appropriateness of Project Design or Plan:

Appropriateness of Methods or Approach:

Originality of Concept:

Probability of Achieving Project Objectives:

Budget and Budget Justification:

Qualifications of Applicant:

Potential for Generating Future External Funding:

Potential Impact on Applicant's Discipline:

Appropriateness of Schedule:

FINAL SCORE: _____

Scale: 1 (Lowest) to 10 (Highest)