

To the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee within the Department of Writing and Rhetoric:

I am writing to self-nominate for the 2022-2023 Instructor/Lecturer Excellence in Equity of Teaching Award. Below this letter in attachments are the contribution I'd like to share, which includes a Gendered Rhetorics-Situated Writing and Power Lesson Plan on Visual Rhetorics for ENC 1101. I developed this lesson plan in Dr. Sonia Arellano's Gendered Rhetorics graduate course during the Fall Semester of 2022 and was given the immense privilege of being able to pilot it during the Spring '23 semester.

Attached are my lecture slides and handouts for a class period related to social identity and literacy, which includes an activity where students are invited to think about the ways in which their social identities have impacted their literacy development and the literacy developments of those around them, as well as the rubric and lesson scaffolding related to a summative project where students create a Visual Rhetorical Analysis using two advertisements. In conjunction to scaffolding for Visual Rhetorical Analysis through class readings, an in-class showing of Jean Kilbourne's *Killing Us Softly 4* challenges students to examine how rhetorics of power and marginalization can--and are--manifested in the advertisements we see in mainstream media.

I thank you for your consideration.

Vee Kennedy (they/them/theirs)

Gendered Rhetorics-Situated Writing & Power Lesson Plan for ENC 1101 Unit 2: Rhetorical Situations Across Contexts & Languages

This unit plan for ENC 1101 at UCF was developed as a major assignment in Dr. Sonia Arellano's ENC 6332 Gendered Rhetorics course during Fall 2022, with the intent of providing a gendered rhetorics-situated framework for *Unit 2: Rhetorical Situations Across Contexts & Languages*. Although the unit addresses multiple course learning outcomes, it was created with the frame of thinking through the learning outcome of Writing and Power in the context of gender. The Writing and Power learning outcome, as provided by the Department of Writing and Rhetoric, states: "students will be able to critically examine and act on the relationship among identity, literacy, language, and power."

Assumptions

This unit is designed to be taught as the second unit of the semester, following an earlier unit where students have engaged in reflection of their past literacy experiences, culminating in a summative assessment of a Multimodal Literacy Narrative. Students read or were otherwise exposed to [Deborah Brandt's *Sponsors of Literacy* \(Brandt\)](#) in addition to literacy narratives such as [Anzaldua's *How to Tame a Wild Tongue* \(Anzaldua\)](#) or [Young's "Nah, we Ain't Straight": An Argument Against Code Switching \(Young\)](#), along with Chandra Arthur's [The Cost of Code Switching TedTalk](#). During the Spring '23 semester, in addition to these readings, I also included the following UCF-Student contributed examples from Stylus in order to further scaffold my students' thinking about marginalization, race, and gender: 'With Love, For Love, Through Love': A Literacy Confession of a Middle Eastern Writer by Natali Barakat, *The Story of a Guatemalan Boy* by HP, and Julia Wan's *Chinks in My Armor: Reclaiming One's Voice*.

Summary of Unit and Detailed Class Activities

During the Gendered Rhetorics-Situated Unit, students were introduced to rhetoric (including key concepts of rhetoric such as the rhetorical situation, audience, context, purpose, kairos, and rhetorical appeals) with focus on gendered visual rhetoric. Level-appropriate distillations of this material included freely available texts, primarily from Writing Spaces or otherwise provided by instructor PDFs via Canvas. Examples include Liz Losh's *Why Rhetoric?* Chapter from *Understanding Rhetoric* (Losh et al.), [Grant-Davie's *Rhetorical Situations and their Constituents* \(Grant-Davie\)](#). Major focus was given on notions of power dynamics in the context of the rhetorical situation (who has power? How are they using it? How is this use of power impacting the various constituents of the situation?). Visual rhetoric was introduced and scaffolded through Cohn's [Understanding Visual Rhetoric \(Cohn\)](#). For the purpose of preparing course materials, I also drew inspiration from Royster and Kirsch's *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition and Literacy Studies*, Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* and positioning on visual rhetorics from Daly-Goggin's *Visual Rhetoric in Pens of Steel and Inks of Silk: Challenging the Great Visual/Verbal Divide*.

The core class example of visual rhetoric in advertisements featuring women and femme people will be provided through Jean Kilbourne's [*Killing Us Softly 4*](#) available via Kanopy with UCF Login Credentials). Formative in-class discussions and informal rhetorical analysis of advertisements then followed. The unit concluded with a written Visual Rhetorical Analysis (described below) as its summative assessment. This Rhetorical Analysis was broken down into a first draft, peer review draft, and professor feedback draft before ultimately being revised once again and included in the final ePortfolio.

One additional activity of merit includes the Social Identities and Literacies Wheel Activity, for which I have attached slides and an accompanying worksheet.


Student Learning Outcomes

- Analyze the rhetorical situation through class readings
- Apply basic rhetorical appeals in discussion of course materials
- Examine how gender impacts the rhetorical situation
- Conduct a gender-focused rhetorical analysis

Project 2: Gendered Rhetoric Situated Visual Rhetorical Analysis

In Project 2, you will use the rhetorical vocabulary that we acquired from this unit to complete a gender-focused visual rhetorical analysis in the vein of Jean Kilbourn's *Killing Us Softly*. You will **examine two advertisements in two different media and write about the rhetorical elements of audience, purpose, context, etc.** You will have your choice in advertisements, although you should aim to select ads that incorporate text to provide substantive possibilities for analysis. Your analysis should directly reference, summarize, and compare specific rhetorical appeals.

Requirements:

- Active, informed participation in-class
 - **6 pages, double-spaced in 12-point font, with 1" standard margins, proofread**
 - Examines two advertisements of your choice with special attention to rhetorical vocabulary
 - Peer Reviewed during peer review days
 - **Drafts submitted on the specific deadlines, by 11:59 A.M., meeting criteria on rubric.**
 - **Thoughtful, sincere** revision before the submission of a final draft
 - **Final draft, submitted on time, before 10:59 A.M.**
- 



Steps and Deadlines:

DATE 11:59 A.M. Half Draft due, posted to Canvas

DATE 11:59 A.M. Full Draft for Peer Review, posted to Canvas

DATE 11:59 A.M. Final-For-Now Draft, (1) copy posted to CANVAS and (1) printed out for class.

****Grading: XX% of your overall grade****

Questions that Might Help *(note: you do NOT have to answer all or ANY of these).*

- How do we identify visual rhetorical appeals ad designers use? What audiences are such appeals intended to influence?
- How can we trace, analyze, and communicate the impact of a rhetorical device used in a text or ad in a given context/situation for a specific audience?
- How do images function as arguments?
- What visually effective moves do designers make to advance specific arguments, perspectives, or viewpoints?
- How and why – specifically – do you feel individuals are susceptible to media influence?
- What is responsible advertising? Do advertisers have a responsibility to society? Do they have a responsibility to children? Why or why not?

- What are some stereotypical stories media tell about women? What are some stereotypical stories media tell about men? Give some examples of each. What patterns of difference do you see between these two kinds of typical narratives?

Rubric and Grading

	A	B	C	D (or lower)
Class Participation 20%	Present physically in class and proactive in all/almost all activities, quick writes, homework and brainstorming assignments and reflection activities.	Mostly present, mostly proactive in activities, quick writes, homework and brainstorming assignments and reflection activities.	Only sometimes active in activities, quick writes, homework and brainstorming assignments and reflection activities.	Habitually absent, or generally not engaging with activities, quick writes, homework and brainstorming assignments and reflection activities.
Half Draft 15%	Turned in by 10:59 AM, 3 pages with a beginning, title and outline of what's left, use of some rhetorical vocab.	Turned in, but was late, short, or missing vital pieces	Turned in late and/or with missing pieces	Draft was not turned in.
Full Draft 15%	Turned in by 10:59 AM, full 6 pages, use of rhetorical vocab and discourse about two advertisements.	Turned in, but was late, short, or missing vital pieces	Turned in late and/or with missing pieces	Draft was not turned in.
Peer Review Process 5%	Present and active during peer review activities.	Mostly present and active in peer review.	Not as present and/or active in peer review.	No or little participation
Peer Review Efficacy 5%	Followed instructions and gave sincere feedback	Generally followed instructions, some sincere feedback	Did not follow instructions, little sincere feedback	No or little participation/sincere feedback
Revision 10%	Extensive revisions	Some revision	Superficial revision	No or little revision.

<p>Final Draft 30%</p>	<p>Turned in by 11:59 AM, 6 pages long with proper fonts/margins, and a beginning, middle and end, and some proofreading. Thoughtfully engages with course concepts, extensive use of rhetorical vocabulary used to discuss and examine two ads thoughtfully.</p>	<p>Turned in late, minor length and/or format issues, missing components or errors. Engages with many/most course concepts, including rhetorical vocabulary, and examines two ads mostly thoughtfully.</p>	<p>Considerably late, significant length and/or form issues, missing components. Many concepts missing or ineffectively integrated.</p>	<p>No draft turned in, or excessive issues. Significant absences in content requirements</p>
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Works Cited

- Brandt, Deborah. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 49, no. 2, 1998, pp. 165–85. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/358929>.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1999.
- Cohn, Jenae. *Understanding Visual Rhetoric*. p. 23.
- [FULL PROGRAM] *KILLING US SOFTLY: THEN & NOW*. Directed by Media Education Foundation, 2019. *YouTube*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQ3ESVKighs>.
- Goggin, Maureen Daly. "Challenging the Great Visual/Verbal Divide." *Defining Visual Rhetorics*, Routledge, 2004.
- Grant-Davie, Keith. "Rhetorical Situations and Their Constituents." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1997, pp. 264–79.
- Kilbourne, Jean. *Killing Us Softly ; 4: Advertising's Image of Women*. Media Education Foundation, 2010.
- Losh, Elizabeth, et al. *Understanding Rhetoric: A Graphic Guide to Writing*. Macmillan Higher Education, 2017.
- Young, Vershawn Ashanti. "'Nah, We Straight': An Argument Against Code Switching." *JAC*, vol. 29, no. 1/2, 2009, pp. 49–76.