

## **Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards**

### **Assessment 6: Additional Assessment that Addresses NCTE standards**

#### **Critical Analysis of Non-Print Media Lesson**

##### **1. Description of and Use of Assessment:**

The Critical Analysis of Non-Print Media assessment evolved from a programmatic need to more directly satisfy NCTE's non-print text/media standards (3.6 and 4.6). Though we require teacher candidates to take a film cognate in their English coursework, ENGL 116: Introduction to Film, this course also fulfills a General Education requirement at the College and enrolls enough students per semester to fill 26 sections of the course. Given the number of ENGL 116 courses and instructors and students, it is currently impossible to require an assessment of our teacher candidates in this course. And so, we have created an assessment of our teacher candidates' knowledge of non-print media that is couched in their unit-planning work with us in their Practicum course and student teaching seminar.

The Critical Analysis of Non-Print Media lesson is taught and practiced (scaffolded) in the Practicum semester, as one component of the Teacher Candidate mini-Work Sample. This assessment is also required of our candidates in the Student Teaching semester, as one graded component of their TCWS. Used in conjunction with our reading and application of Deborah Appleman's *Critical Encounters in High School English* (2009), the Critical Analysis of Media lesson assessment asks that our candidates not only demonstrate to us their understanding of "critical analysis" via literary and cultural theories, but also that they demonstrate to us their understanding of non-print media and their application of various methods of interpreting and analyzing film, television, and other visual media.

##### **2. Description of How the Assessment Specifically Aligns with NCTE Standards:**

The scoring guide below represents how the requirements of the Critical Analysis of Media Lesson align with NCTE standards, most notably Standard 3.6, one of the Standards not specifically addressed by any other program assessment. More specifically, Assessment #6 addresses these Standard 3.2, 3.6, and 4.0 indicators:

3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5

3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3

4.1, 4.6

### 3. Analysis of Data:

In compiling the data for this report and this table, we quickly recognized deficiencies in this assessment instrument, most notably that we need to develop richer indicators for each measure of the assessment (the 1-4 rating scale). While this data provides us with general information about consistent weaknesses of our candidates in the production of lessons that allow for students to critically analyze media, it does not provide us with rich enough information to help us develop a more accurate or better measure of their knowledge in this area. We now understand the need to work on developing a more effective assessment of candidates' knowledge of non-print texts/media and their applications, interpretations, and analyses. Our plan this fall (2010) is to collaboratively study past candidate work samples—their response to our assignment for this assessment (attached, and part of the TCWS instructions, also attached)—and to allow our joint reading to inform our revision of an assessment tool. Our revision of this assessment will involve discussions/collaborations with Dr. Vince Bohlinger, coordinator of Film Studies in the English Department, in an attempt to coordinate a non-print media assessment as part of candidates required film course in English.

#### Key to scores:

**1=the skill is not significantly present**

**2=the skill is evident, but is vague or not appropriately developed**

**3=the skill is evident, but does not fully meet all criteria in the indicator**

**4=the skill is evident and addresses all criteria in the indicator**

	Fall 2008 Mean Score	Spring 2009 Mean Score	Fall 2009 Mean Score	Spring 2010 Mean Score
1. Understands the purposes and characteristics of different kinds of curricula and related teaching resources and selected or creates instructional materials that are consistent with what is currently known about student learning in ELA (NCTE 4.1)	3	3	3	3
2. Engages students in critical analysis of different media and communications technologies and their effect on students' learning (NCTE 4.6)	2	3	3	3

3. Creates opportunities and develops strategies that permit students to demonstrate, through their own work, the influences of language and visual images on thinking and composing (NCTE 3.2.1)	3	3	3	3
4. Creates opportunities and develops strategies for enabling students to demonstrate how they integrate writing, speaking, and observing in their own learning processes (NCTE 3.2.2)	3	3	3	3
5. Demonstrates a variety of ways to teach students composing processes that result in their creating various forms of oral, visual, and written literacy (NCTE 3.2.3)	2	2	2	2
6. Engages students in activities that provide opportunities for demonstrating their skills in writing, speaking, and creating images for a variety of audience (NCTE 3.2.4)	3	3	3	3
7. Uses a variety of ways to assist students in creating and critiquing a wide range of print and non-print texts for multiple purposes and helps students understand the relationships between symbols and meaning (NCTE 3.2.5)	3	2	2	2
8. Understands media's influence on culture and people's actions and communication, reflecting the knowledge not only in her own work but also in her teaching (NCTE 3.6.1)	3	2	3	3

9. Uses a variety of approaches for teaching students how to construct meaning from media and non-print texts and integrates learning opportunities into classroom experiences that promote composing and responding to such texts (NCTE 3.6.2)	3	2	3	2
10. Helps students compose and respond to film, video, graphic, photographic, audio, and multimedia texts and uses current technology to enhance their own learning and reflection on their learning (NCTE 3.6.3).	3	3	3	3

Given the shortcomings of this assessment tool, the data above still tell us something. Our students are consistently weak in demonstrating to us these 3.2 and 3.6 indicators:

- Demonstrates a variety of ways to teach students composing processes that result in their creating various forms of oral, visual, and written literacy (NCTE 3.2.3)
- Uses a variety of ways to assist students in creating and critiquing a wide range of print and non-print texts for multiple purposes and helps students understand the relationships between symbols and meaning (NCTE 3.2.5)
- Uses a variety of approaches for teaching students how to construct meaning from media and non-print texts and integrates learning opportunities into classroom experiences that promote composing and responding to such texts (NCTE 3.6.2)

When we examine the above indicators, we notice that the words “variety” and “various” appear several times:

- a **variety** of ways to teach composing processes,
- students creating **various** forms of literacy,
- a **variety** of ways to assist students in creating and critiquing,
- a **variety** of approaches, and so on.

Our candidates’ shortfalls in these areas seem to point to a **lack of variety** in their approaches to the Critical Analysis of Media assignment and in their teaching ideas and methods. We believe that one way we might provide our candidates with additional experiences in creating other assignments that meet these criteria is to require similar lessons from our candidates in their Methods courses (SED 406 and SED 407) as well as in their film cognate in the English Department (ENGL 116). This would not only

provide candidates with some scaffolding for this assessment but would also allow them to, perhaps, develop a deeper repertoire where their knowledge of a variety of approaches/methods is concerned. We will begin tackling this assessment challenge in fall 2010, with help from the English Education Advisory Committee.

#### **4. Interpretation of Data as Evidence of Standards Met:**

Knowing that we plan to significantly revise this assessment, we can report here that in the past two years, our candidates have demonstrated an understanding of Standard 3.6—of the relevance of non-print texts and media, and of the methods of interpreting and analyzing such texts and media--on English studies and on the teaching of English language arts. We are proud to have developed an initial assessment of our candidates' understanding of these important Standard 3.6 indicators; we are especially proud of developing it as a response to a programmatic need to address this standard. The act of reporting on the data from two years of this assessment has allowed us to see the need for our program to develop a richer, more meaningful assignment where the assessment of Standard 3.6 is concerned. We have made this a priority in our program and will begin working on revision of this instrument—and the application of it--in fall 2010.