**Timeline: Major Deadlines**

10/3 (M) or 10/5 (W) Proposed art pieces for analysis due at individual conference

10/26 (W) ONE printed Half Draft in class for peer review and ONE electronic copy shared in your Google folder

11/2 (W) Final draft (and Invention Portfolio) due

**Assignment Description**

You will select two pieces of street art that you perceive to be connected in some way – they might convey the same message in different ways, or relay opposing messages, or use a similar image or style to speak to two very different issues. For our purposes, we will define street art as visual art created and displayed in public locations, executed outside of the context of traditional art venues. This term usually refers to unsanctioned work, but for this project, you are free to consider sanctioned murals and sculptures as well. I urge you to focus on art that resonates with you as something that might change hearts and minds, compel agreement, or communicate to others in such a way that makes a difference. Famous artists who are known for creating waves with their public rhetorical displays include Banksy, Shepard Fairey, and Jean-Michel Basquait. You should not limit yourself to the top Google images, however. Poke around a bit until you find things that strike you – you might consider beginning your search with “[a keyword of a social issue that matters to you] + street art” and see what you see. As a movement, street art has been around for decades and can be found all over the globe, so your search should not be too daunting. Really try to rely on your felt sense in this selection process. Choose pieces that *feel* meaningful to you – the analysis component will be more interesting this way.

Next, you will put your two pieces into conversation with one another. Your analysis will account for your perceptions of the artist’s ethos [this will likely involve critical assumptions about ability in the craft and understanding of the issue being addressed in his/her work], how that piece makes a difference using language or visual rhetoric, how that difference might be tangible or verifiable in the world [or not]. In other words, you are comparing and contrasting the potentialities of communication within and between your pieces of public art. Since this is perception work, you should not use any sourced material outside of the images. You may choose to read a bit about the artist or the piece [though oftentimes this information is difficult to find – you will have better luck reading to understand the social context], but your analysis should only reflect your understanding of what you see/read in the piece as a rhetorically savvy audience member. Because effective communication *is* rhetorical in nature, you will include rhetorical concepts to frame your selected visuals as communicative.

**Getting Started: Heuristics**

You are not expected to answer all—or any—of the following questions. These are possible questions that you might consider when generating ideas to include in your Public Rhetoric project. You should not restrict your brainstorming to only the questions listed here.

* What is effective visual communication? What is visual rhetoric?
* How does public rhetoric work both at a large, popular scale and also at personal, local, and private scales?
* What makes street art a powerful mode of communication? Is it more or less powerful than art displayed in a museum? How or why?
* What are the implications of communicating publicly? How is this different from writing in class or texting a friend or even posting to a restricted social media audience?
* What was the context or background of the rhetorical situation and how did that influence the artist’s rhetorical enactment?
* How do you know if a rhetorical message has reached and influenced an intended audience? How much influence is necessary to qualify a rhetorical message as successful?

**Conventional Formatting**

Your project should be 2000-2400 words long. Papers should be typed, double-spaced with 12-pt Times New Roman font and 1 inch margins. MLA style and formatting conventions should be followed. For additional information about using MLA, please refer to chapter 49 of *Writing in Action* or the OWL of Purdue website linked in our website as a resource.

\*\*Because this project is an analysis, you should include a photo of your selected pieces in your document.

**Grading Criteria**

1. Rhetorical Vocabulary: Your essay should use the rhetorical concepts [ethos, pathos, logos, kairos, mythos, metanoia, and exigence] to justify and analyze your framing of selected pieces as rhetorical.
2. Specificity: Your essay should be articulated with as much precision and clarity as possible. This does not mean that you should overexplain, but rather give thought to using “just right” words and phrasing as you provide your reader with an understanding of the physical qualities of the piece and your interpretation of the situation.
3. Development: Your essay should feel complete. You should use several modes of analysis [ethos, pathos, logos are required—plus at least one more rhetorical concept of your choosing] to support your argument and framing.
4. Arrangement: Your essay should be arranged as a cohesive piece of text—that is, it should be organized in a way that allows your reader to easily navigate your writing. Be sure to use examples that correlate with the rhetorical concepts you choose to include in your analysis. I’d also encourage you to be creative with headings, subheadings, and other organizational strategies to compose an engaging essay.
5. Conventions: Your essay should be proofread for spelling, capitalization, and syntax errors. Reading aloud can help you catch these errors, as well as repeated phrases and unfinished sentences. A fresh set of eyes can help in this process as well, so rely on one another to give a last glance before submission. The University Writing Center is also an excellent resource to this end. Remember that writing is collaborative.

**Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NA | NI | AC | EX |
| Rhetorical Vocabulary |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity |  |  |  |  |
| Development |  |  |  |  |
| Arrangement |  |  |  |  |
| Conventions |  |  |  |  |
| **Invention Portfolio** |  |  |  |  |
| **Participation** |  |  |  |  |

EX: Exceptional. The writer has applied the criterion with distinction.

AC: Acceptable/Meets Expectations. The writer has applied the criterion to an acceptable degree.

NI: Needs improvement. The writer has minimally applied the criterion in the project.

NA: Narrowly applied or not applied. The writer has not applied the criterion in the project.