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Introduction

Over the course of the past decade, digital technologies have brought the world to the threshold of a communications revolution comparable in impact and significance to the invention of the printing press. Many of today’s children are exposed from the earliest years of their lives to digital technologies—video recorders, cell phones, games, computers, and more—and they immerse themselves in creative pursuits such as making films, participating in online communities, mixing music, and crafting websites.

Through these practices, many of today’s youth have developed technical skills well beyond those of their parents’ generation. Their proficiencies with new technologies, however, are often gained without appropriate contextual knowledge, and few young people learn to examine the social and cultural implications of the media they consume, produce and reproduce. On the other side of the spectrum, however, many children from poor homes and communities still lack basic access to computers, the Internet, and other tools for making media. While they often have televisions and DVD players at home, many still do not have a working computer or Internet connection. For these children, schools are a critical place to gain access to technology and develop the technical and expressive skills needed to communicate with media. But schools vary widely in the resources they provide students, both in terms of access to equipment and technology, and also in terms of how well media and technology are integrated into instruction. These shortcomings leave most children, for one reason or the other, insufficiently prepared for the world they will face as adults.

The USC Institute for Multimedia Literacy (IML) has established several major initiatives to work with students, teachers, and professors to develop the philosophy and methodologies appropriate for a new multimedia vernacular. In doing so, the IML seeks to take longstanding traditions of critical reasoning and academic rigor that have grounded intellectual inquiry throughout the print era and invigorate them with the dynamic energy and expressive potential inherent in today’s digital technologies.

The flagship program for K-12 education at the IML was the Wallis Annenberg Initiative. Begun in 2003 through the vision and generous support of Wallis Annenberg, this program has included middle school teachers and administrators from across the nation to provide professional development in media literacy and media arts. In particular, the program has focused on efforts to integrate media literacy and media arts into the curricula of multiple and diverse disciplines. For three years (July, 2003—June, 2006), the Initiative promoted and supported multimedia literacy and media arts for K-12 educators and students.

The goal of the Initiative was to design, implement and test a model for professional development that would increase teachers’ ability to incorporate media literacy and media arts into classroom teaching and learning. Drawing on the insights from summer symposiums that were held during the first two years of the Initiative, the IML piloted a revised, full-year approach to professional development in its third and final year of implementation. In collaboration with Los Angeles Unified School District, the IML
recruited five middle-school teams, each composed of three teachers, one administrator, and a coach (usually a teacher from a nearby high school), to participate in a Summer Institute and a year-long series of professional development sessions and on-site technical and conceptual support.

This report provides an overview of the 2005-06 Initiative. It documents the curriculum and program of professional development offered to participants over the course of the year, and provides examples of how teachers implemented media arts-infused units into their classrooms. The report also summarizes key findings, conclusions, and recommendations from program evaluation and research efforts that were conducted throughout the school year.

Background

In the initial stage of its implementation, comprising its first two years, the Wallis Annenberg Initiative provided professional development in the form of a summer symposium. From July 14th – July 26th, 2003, six principals and twenty-two teachers from Kansas, New Jersey, and California participated in the first annual Wallis Annenberg Summer Symposium. IML instructors and teaching assistants, as well as faculty from the USC Rossier School of Education, facilitated the symposium. Throughout the two weeks, participants learned basic concepts of multimedia analysis and completed hands-on media production exercises including production planning, videotaping and editing interviews, and presenting their projects. Participants also took part in discussion and planning sessions about how to incorporate multimedia project-based learning into their particular school sites.

During the school year following the first symposium, the IML held a follow-up meeting for teachers and principals from the two Los Angeles schools that participated in the symposium. At this meeting, teachers presented examples of multimedia-enhanced teaching materials and student projects developed in their classrooms, and discussed successes and challenges associated with incorporating media literacy into instruction. A team of IML staff and faculty from the USC Rossier School of Education also conducted a site visit to one of the Los Angeles schools to better understand the school’s progress with media-related instruction.

The second Wallis Annenberg Summer Symposium was held at the IML from July 12 – July 23rd, 2004, with a new cohort of teachers and principals from four schools across the country. The group of educators included representatives from Southern California, New Mexico, New Jersey, and Maryland, as well as colleagues from the USC Rossier School of Education and the USC Annenberg Center for Communication. The format for the symposium was similar to the first year, but was enhanced by the inclusion of local teachers and principals from the first Summer Symposium, who shared their experiences with the new cohort. The teachers demonstrated how they had incorporated multimedia into their curricula and the principals discussed lessons learned about trying to support multimedia literacy at their schools. During the school year following this second symposium, the IML invited local symposium participants to its international summit, Scholarship in the Digital Age, where they contributed to a Workshop on Youth Media and Media Education.
The first two years of the Wallis Annenberg provided valuable experience in the implementation of K-12 professional development, as well as data in the form of participant feedback. The IML solicited commentary using several strategies. All participants completed detailed written evaluation forms about the symposia, and several participants provided additional comments through follow-up interviews, email correspondence, and an on-line discussion list. According to the responses, most teachers who participated in the symposium were very pleased with the presentations, discussions and hands-on workshops, and were enthusiastic about integrating multimedia into their classes. Many, however, still faced significant challenges. For example, some teachers needed more time to develop new lessons, some were still confused about how to incorporate multimedia into diverse subject matters, and some did not have access to the technological infrastructure or support they needed to teach with multimedia.

The third year of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative (July, 2005—June, 2006) represented a significant departure from the previous two years, and was identified as a discrete phase in the program. The IML made significant adjustments in its professional development program to address perceived shortcomings and to capitalize upon lessons learned. The most important of these adjustments were extending the schedule of the program beyond the summer symposium to the full school year, refocusing the efforts to local schools, and seeking an institutional collaborator at the level of the school district, rather than individual schools. In February 2005, IML staff met with representatives of the LAUSD, Arts Education Branch to explore the possibilities for implementing a revised version of the Initiative exclusively for LAUSD.

For a number of reasons, LAUSD was ideally suited for a productive collaboration with the IML under the auspices of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative. With over 100,000 teachers and more than 800,000 students, LAUSD is the second largest school district in the United States. The Arts Education Branch (AEB) has representatives for each of the eight districts that comprise LAUSD. It is in the forefront of national efforts to develop programs and curricula in the media arts, and these efforts are helping set the agenda in the state of California for developing standards in this rapidly expanding field. In 1999, the AEB drafted the LAUSD Arts Education Plan, which includes a visionary program in the media arts. Since that time, it has convened a wide variety of state and national study groups for the media arts with representatives from the California Department of Education, local media educators, and prominent representatives of the arts and entertainment industries.

In Spring 2005, the IML submitted a revised proposal to the Annenberg Foundation for continuation of funding on new terms (see Proposal), and with the AEB began a sustained effort to redesign the Wallis Annenberg Initiative for the third year of the program. The result of this process was an integrated, collaborative, professional development program in media arts and multimedia literacy. Among the most significant changes and additions from previous years, the Initiative:

- Redirected its scope geographically to focus on teachers, schools and students in the Los Angeles region, to give better opportunities for follow-up and research efforts during the school year;
• Diversified the program of instruction and support beyond the initial summer symposium at the IML to include peer coaching, regular on-site visits by IML staff and researchers, guest lectures and presentations by leading specialists in media education, and an online networked forum for participants to share ideas, information and experiences;
• Raised the expectations for teachers to include developing and implementing curricular units that integrate media art and media literacy concepts and activities;
• Developed specialized professional development activities for school administrators to help ensure school support for the Initiative and to facilitate schools developing a long-term arts plan that incorporates multimedia literacy and media arts; and
• Incorporated a significant research and evaluation component to assess the program, to analyze findings and disseminate them to the general public, to make improvements for future iterations of the program, and to respond to needs throughout the program year.

In addition the IML and AEB sought to increase the likelihood of the program’s long-term success through a more effective and focused recruitment strategy. The recruitment effort centered on identifying schools and teachers supportive of small learning communities, integrated lessons between teachers of different disciplines, and/or project-based inquiry. It also sought schools with existing on-site services or peer-knowledge networks for media and technology-related support. In this way, the Initiative aimed to identify schools that offered a baseline of supportive conditions for project-based learning with multimedia.

**Participant and School Characteristics**

The 2005-06 Wallis Annenberg Initiative recruited school teams from throughout the Los Angeles area, making special effort to provide the resources and opportunities of the Initiative to children from underserved communities. The schools selected—Berendo, Dana, Mark Twain, Markham, and Mulholland—represent neighborhoods including South Central and West Los Angeles, Watts, San Pedro, and Van Nuys. These schools serve high concentrations of minority students, particularly of African American and Hispanic/Latino descent. Students attending these schools face significant educational disadvantages. For example, the schools’ overall Academic Performance Index scores in 2004 ranked them between one and three on a scale from one to ten (with one being the lowest). All five schools are also all classified as Title I schools, meaning their students face high rates of poverty.

When the Initiative began, each school team was comprised of three teachers and one administrator. In total, there were fifteen teachers and five assistant principals. The teachers represented a range of disciplines, including: Language Arts (four teachers), Social Studies/History (three teachers), Science/Math (two teachers), Theater (one teacher), Visual Arts (four teachers), and Technology (one teacher). In one school, Mulholland, the three teachers were also special education teachers.

Schools were selected based on their demonstrated commitment to integrated, project-based learning,
standards-based instruction, and collaborative teaching. The school sites also had to meet minimum criteria for technology support at their campus, and they had to be characterized as having an administrative vision and leadership for teacher professional development related to media arts.

**Professional Development Model**

The model for professional development implemented by the Wallis Annenberg Initiative has theoretical and practical dimension. It combined current thought in education, media arts and media literacy with an engaging, hands-on programmatic structure whose objectives and strategies are outlined below.

*Theory*

The theoretical underpinnings of the 2005-2006 Wallis Annenberg Initiative were articulated as a set of *enduring understandings*. “Enduring understandings” is a term coined by Wiggins and McTighe as part of their “backwards design” model of curriculum development to represent the “big ideas and questions” (as distinct from mere content knowledge) retained by a student after the completion of a course of instruction (Wiggins and McTighe, Understanding by Design. 1998). Enduring understandings figured twice in the Summer Institute: firstly, in workshops, as part of the process of curriculum development, where teachers envisioned the ultimate goals of their instruction; secondly, as an overarching set of learning goals set by IML and AEB planners for the Institute as a whole. These latter enduring understandings consisted of the following:

1. Multimedia literacy is the ability to communicate using image, text, sound, movement, sequence and interactivity in combination.

2. Arts are essential for communication and expression in multimedia.

3. Media acquire meanings dependent upon context and point of view.

4. Media analysis is an integral part of media production and provides learning opportunities throughout the production process.

5. Students have complex background knowledge and experiences related to media and technology that teachers recognize, incorporate, build on, and transform.

The WAI enduring understandings were distilled from research findings and best practices in the field of K-12 education. The enduring understandings were distilled from research findings and best practices in the field of K-12 education and drew on the perspectives of both the IML and the LAUSD Arts Education Branch.

*Program Objectives*

The theoretical claims of the 2005-2006 Initiative were embedded in a practical program with an emphasis on tangible outcomes, active, hands-on work, and exposure to relevant experts and resources.
in the field of media education. The objectives of the Initiative in 2005-2006 were to:

1. encourage effective integration of multimedia literacy into standards-based curriculum;
2. improve teachers’ and students’ acquisition and fluency in the creation and critical analysis of media forms;
3. collaborate with media education specialists around critical topics of multimedia literacy and K-12 education; and
4. develop an understanding of curricula and methods for professional development in multimedia literacy.

Implementation

The programmatic objectives of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative were implemented in the following sequence and time-line. In the spring of 2005, the LAUSD Arts Education Branch contacted several middle schools in the District and invited them to complete an application to participate in the Initiative. Once the five middle schools were selected, the Initiative provided a five-day Summer Institute of professional development for the twenty middle school educators (five middle school teams composed of one administrator and three teachers per team). The Summer Institute introduced participants to multimedia production, analysis, and curriculum development, offered a hands-on practicum, and hosted a guest-facilitated seminar series. In addition, a special track for administrators focused on strategies for developing school capacity in multimedia literacy and media arts. Following the five-day Summer Institute that took place August 8-12, 2005, the Initiative consisted of:

1. four one-day “integration” workshops held in October, December, February, and June;
2. ongoing assistance to teachers as they developed and implemented their media arts-integrated curriculum units;
3. on-site “coaching” by experienced media educators; and
4. web-based communication and on-site support from the IML.

Each component of the Initiative is described in further detail below.

Summer Institute

The five-day Summer Institute consisted of an introduction to multimedia production, analysis, and curriculum development, a multi-media practicum, and a guest-facilitated seminar series. Initial surveys conducted by program evaluators indicate that the teachers came to the Summer Institute with a range of skill and comfort levels in the areas of media arts, media literacy, and technology-integrated instruction—ranging from very inexperienced to moderately experienced. The teachers all expressed very positive attitudes about the potential for teaching media analysis and production skills to their students, and for integrating media and technology into their teaching. As the following quotes from
the surveys demonstrate, they anticipated benefits for their students both in technical proficiency and in basic media literacy skills:

“I want my students to learn to be more discriminating about media’s validity. I want them to question what they see and hear. I also want them to be able to produce not only still images, but also animated messages. I want them to be multi-literate.”

“I expect students to gain confidence in using technology. I would like my students to use technology to do research and produce creative works of art as an expression of their interpretation of reading comprehension projects.”

“I hope my students will have more access to technology. I hope that they will understand basic skills for a computer as well as extensive programs such as iMovie and Power Point. I hope they will be able to express themselves through technology.”

During the Summer Institute, the teachers prepared to implement media arts into their classrooms. Participants met twice daily in the IML labs for instruction and hands-on experience in media production and analysis. They also attended seminars and joined open discussions about strategies for adapting what they learned to the classroom. Participants were asked to choose one of two areas of concentration, or “tracks”, to focus on during the Institute: a documentary video track or a multimedia presentation track.

**Media Practicum Track 1: Documentary Video**

Three of the five school teams selected the documentary video track for their five-day practicum. In this track, participants learned the process of creating a documentary film using digital video cameras and iMovie. Through hands-on lab experiences, participants were expected to learn how to analyze and create meaning through creative combinations of moving images, graphic images, sound, and text. Participants focused on a single genre during the week, the “self-reflexive” documentary video, and learned foundational production skills and concepts. Instructors presented clips from a variety of documentary videos, such as Ross McElwee’s “Sherman’s March” (1986), Jonathan Caouette’s “Tarnation” (2004), and Michael Moore’s “Roger and Me” (1989), and led discussions about their genre, relative balance of subjectivity and objectivity, found verses, created footage, and point of view.

Participants then applied these analytical concepts to their own video production work, and were asked to justify their choices of incorporated media, shot strategies, and editing techniques. The documentary video track culminated with a final project: a ninety-second documentary revealing an aspect of the participant’s identity or a personal perspective on a historical event. In their documentary videos, participants covered three self-selected topics: the Los Angeles riots of 1992, the 2000 presidential election, and caffeine.

**Media Practicum Track 2: Multimedia PowerPoint Presentation**

Two of the five school teams selected the multimedia presentation track. Over the course of five days, participants were exposed to a variety of genres and practices associated with PowerPoint, both as a
presentation tool and a stand-alone medium of expression. Topics included: text, image, moving image, sequence, interactivity, interface, and presentation. During the week, participants produced a series of short projects representing a range of techniques and approaches to communicating with multimedia. Participants also learned strategies for doing web-based research and evaluating online media sources. A special focus of the track was media literacy, particularly as it was articulated in the third enduring understanding: “media acquire meanings dependent upon context and point of view.” For example, the instructor presented a series of images he had “mashed” (composed from multiple media objects), showing how a single photograph of pistol-bearing Iranian women acquired different meanings depending on its context, e.g., on a newspaper front page, a network newscast, a webpage, or a museum exhibition.

Administrator Track
During the Summer Institute, the four attending administrators took part as active members of their school-based teams. Along with the teachers from their schools, the administrators participated in team building and unit development activities, including the preliminary drafting of enduring understandings, essential questions, and student skills and knowledge. Administrators also joined teachers in media analysis and production exercises and attended the seminar series. In addition, the administrators participated in three special work sessions facilitated by the director of the LAUSD Arts Education Branch. In these sessions, the administrators were presented with a new strategy, developed by the Arts Education Branch, for assessing their schools’ capacity, needs, and priorities in the arts. The administrators identified descriptors for qualified teachers, resources, curriculum instruction and assessment, professional development, and partnerships to support media arts activities, and then began the process of articulating a vision and developing a comprehensive arts plan that included media arts.

Seminar Series
The Summer Institute included a seminar series facilitated by guest lecturers specializing in the areas of media education, youth and the media, and media arts. Guest speaker Tony Streit, Director of Youth Learn, Education Development Center (EDC), began the series with presentations on the general topic “Producing Media with Young People: Mapping the Field of Possibilities.” Streit spoke of the creative and academic possibilities of youth media production. Guest speakers Miriam Neptune and Tim Dorsey introduced participants to the pedagogical methods and techniques they use at the Educational Video Center (EVC) in Brooklyn, NY. Citing the foundational work at the EVC by Steven Goodman, they outlined key principles of an effective pedagogy based in critical literacy, including teaching multiple literacies, continuous inquiry, and reflection. To conclude the seminar series, Ellen Seiter, Professor of Cinema Television at the University of Southern California and an expert in youth and the media, demonstrated strategies for teaching popular media in the classroom. Professor Seiter screened an episode of a popular Disney Channel children’s sitcom That’s So Raven and an action film starring the professional wrestler The Rock, and then led a formal analysis and discussion of representations of race
and use of stereotyping in these two genres.

The seminars provided concrete models for the participants to consider in their own efforts to incorporate media into the classroom, and acquainted participants with leading figures in the field. The guest speakers, who remained on hand throughout the five-day Institute, participated in many of the activities and provided additional ideas, inspiration, and guidance on an informal and one-on-one basis.

**Participant Reactions to the Summer Institute**


Immediately following the Summer Institute, the attendees were asked to share their experiences and opinions of the Institute by completing a survey. In general, participants viewed the Summer Institute as a very positive experience and indicated that they came away feeling more prepared to integrate media literacy into their classrooms. Over 95% of participants reported that the Institute helped them: increase their knowledge of how multimedia literacy can be integrated into instruction; understand how student thinking can be extended through media literacy; and acquire the design and technical skills needed to complete a media project.

**Follow-up “Integration” Workshops**

Throughout the year, the IML hosted four one-day workshops on the USC campus. The workshops were held in October, December, February, and June. The purpose of the workshops was to provide the participants an opportunity to continue to develop specialized media production and analysis skills and knowledge, and to gain additional support in developing media arts instructional units.

*October Workshop*

On October 8, 2005, participants met at the IML for the first of the four follow-up workshops. The day’s events followed the format of the Summer Institute: a morning session focused on curriculum unit development, a seminar discussion, and a hands-on practicum in media production.

For the session on curriculum unit development, a member of the LAUSD Arts Education Branch led participants through a protocol for giving and receiving peer critiques of teachers’ lesson plans. The facilitator illustrated the techniques through a “fish-bowl” demonstration of the protocol. In this session, a teacher-volunteer: described her unit plan; responded to a series of clarifying and probing questions from her peers; listened to her peers discuss and critique the unit; and then responded to topics she felt would help her further develop her unit. Following this model, teachers worked in small groups to practice the protocol with each other and to give and receive feedback on the unit plans they were developing.
The workshop continued with a presentation on blogging and networked communication by a guest speaker, Jason Nolan, a leading expert on blogs. Using a wiki-based interface as his visual aid, Nolan gave examples of work from the “blogosphere,” including examples from prominent bloggers and networked resources relevant to teachers and students. The presentation concluded with a discussion on the possibilities, challenges, and dangers of blogging as it concerns children and youth.

In the afternoon, the Media Practicum session gave participants practical, hands-on experience in blogging. Practicum instructors ran parallel, synchronized sessions providing participants with step-by-step instructions to sign up and use a blog account. The workshop culminated in the collective writing game of “Exquisite Corpse,” wherein all participants began stories as separate entries on the community blog and then continued others’ stories in sequence as comments. This activity took participants through the steps of blogging in real-time rapid succession. The objectives of the seminar and practicum sessions were to attract participants to the practices of blogging, both as a form of media literacy and as a medium of communication.

December Workshop

The second workshop was held on Saturday, December 3, 2005. Approximately one month before the workshop, the IML asked participants to use the Initiative’s community blog to communicate the type of assistance they would like to receive at the December workshop. The primary purpose of the workshop was to address immediate, practical concerns among participating teachers about implementing their units; the secondary purpose was to provide a forum to discuss the process and results of Lesson Study. The day’s activities consisted of a morning session facilitated by an LAUSD Arts Advisor to debrief the participants’ experiences with giving and receiving peer feedback using the Lesson Study model that teachers had recently experienced at their school sites. The Lesson Study debrief was followed by “Open Space” breakout discussions and an extended media practicum where participants continued working on their projects.

February Workshop

On February 17, 2006, participants were invited to attend a workshop focused on creativity and self-expression using new media. The objectives of the February workshop were to: develop participants’ appreciation for the arts and artistic processes in new media production; instill a sensitivity for issues of personality, vulnerability, and self-expression when students explore and reveal aspects of their own identity as subject matter for media projects; draw attention to pre-production as an important, but often overlooked, moment in the media production process for teaching and learning; and demonstrate a complete media-production exercise led by Juan Davies, an experienced youth media educator.

Participants were directed through a series of steps related to the production of a final PowerPoint presentation that explored multiple facets of the participants’ own identities. The exercise began with a reading and discussion of a poem by Pablo Neruda, “Muchos Somos” (“We are Many”), which described many voices within the narrator’s personality. Participants were then instructed to write and
present three short poems on the model of Neruda’s poem, describing distinct voices within themselves. On the basis of their written work, the participants designed a visual complement to each of their poems, comprised of still photographs of themselves in various poses and costumes, along with found media and text. By the end of the day, participants had synthesized the visual and acoustical elements into a PowerPoint presentation.

**June Workshop**

The final workshop was held on Saturday, June 10, 2006. The purpose of the final workshop was to bring the participants together to present and discuss the curriculum units they had developed and to share examples of the types of multimedia projects their students engaged in during the year.

The workshop began with a brief PowerPoint lecture by IML representative Chris Gilman, describing the practice of lesson sharing by analogy with recipe sharing, with the objective of encouraging an informal networked community of practice among participants, using the Wallis Annenberg Initiative community blog. The remainder of the morning was spent in a lab session, where participants learned how to make concise summaries of formal lesson plans or informal lesson ideas as entries for the blog. The lab included a brief refresher on blogs: how to login, compose and post blog entries with images and links to media. Participants then composed and posted a lesson idea, drawing on the curriculum units which they had done in their classes.

In the afternoon session, teachers presented examples of their students’ media projects and described their experiences implementing media arts units in their classrooms. Presentations were followed by a reflective group discussion among all teachers and administrators about their experiences in the Initiative and their needs and suggestions for moving forward.

**Unit Plan Development and Lesson Study**

As part of their participation in the Initiative, teachers were asked to draw upon their year-long training to design and implement a curriculum unit that combined content and arts standards, and helped young people develop skills in media analysis and production through a creative multimedia project.

During the Summer Institute, teachers met daily for a session in unit development facilitated by arts advisors from the LAUSD Arts Education Branch. Participants were introduced to a modified version of Wiggins and McTighe’s “backward design” (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998), a method for creating standards-based curriculum through active questioning and a clear articulation of desired outcomes. This method of curriculum design has been identified by the Arts Education Branch as a particularly valuable method for developing media arts curriculum in K-12 education because it provides a model for generating new and innovative approaches from standards. By the end of the Summer Institute, teachers had completed outlines of their unit plans.
In November 2005, teachers at each school site participated in a one-day “Lesson Study.” Lesson Study is a form of professional development, originating from Japan, which provides a structured process for refining curriculum through in-class observation of a lesson and collective reflection on its effectiveness for student learning. Teachers from each school selected a sample lesson related to media arts and/or media literacy. Then, one teacher taught the lesson while being observed by the other teachers. Following the lesson, the team met for the rest of the day to review, discuss, and revise the lesson.

Coaches and IML staff were expected to participate in the Lesson Study activities at each school and to provide feedback. To make the Lesson Study possible, funding from the Wallis Annenberg Initiative provided teachers with a day of substitute teacher coverage in order for them to be able to observe each other teach and participate in the process of reflecting on and revising their curriculum. The intent was that this process would help prepare teachers for successful implementation of their unit plans, as well as provide them with useful professional development in the Lesson Study model of curriculum development.

Participant Reactions to Unit Plan Development and Lesson Study


One hundred percent of participating teachers completed their unit plans and utilized the unit development protocol. Three of the five schools completed the Lesson Study in full and two schools partially completed the Lesson Study.

The December workshop included a debriefing session about the Lesson Study led by LAUSD. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statement, “I found the Lesson Study Debrief session useful.” Sixty percent of respondents agreed with the statement and an additional 30% strongly agreed.

Ongoing Instructional Support and Technical Assistance

Throughout their participation in the Initiative, teachers received on-site instructional support and technical assistance to help them implement and refine their media arts instructional units. They received this support from three primary sources: peer coaches; IML instructional staff; and IML research staff.

Throughout the year, peer coaches provided a primary means of supporting teachers. Each school team participating in the Initiative was paired with one of five coaches. The coaches were recruited by LAUSD on the basis of their experience as teachers who produced and analyzed media in their own classrooms. Their responsibility was to periodically visit the school team they had been assigned and to provide them with support and advice for integrating multimedia literacy into instruction. The coaches were expected to attend the ongoing workshops offered at the IML and participants were encouraged to contact their coaches for assistance at any time.
In addition to the support provided by the coaches, participants were given access to the expertise of the IML instructional staff. Participants were encouraged to contact the IML staff with questions and needs, and the IML staff would respond either through web-based knowledge sharing or on-site technical assistance. One IML staff member was designated with the responsibility to respond to and follow up with requests for assistance. Other IML staff members were periodically enlisted to visit classrooms or provide participants with additional assistance.

IML research staff provided a final support mechanism to teachers. The Initiative included a research component with staff dedicated to collecting ethnographic data. Throughout the year, two researchers visited the schools regularly as participant observers, meaning that they would collect observational data and also be available to provide support and assistance to teachers and students. As a result of this role, the researchers were able to provide additional knowledge, reflection, and technical support to the teachers throughout the year.

IML staff and researchers maintained a database throughout the year in which they logged their on-site contact with participants. Over the course of the school year, they recorded 176 points of on-site contact with participants. On average, each contact lasted 87 minutes. Purposes for the visits included providing technical assistance and instructional support to teachers, assisting students with their projects, handling program logistics or administrative concerns, and observing participants in classrooms.

Classroom Integration of Multimedia Literacy and Media Arts

Examples of Unit Plans and Student Projects

The student projects produced in conjunction with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative incorporated a variety of academic content and media production styles. Projects included the following:

- PowerPoint presentations juxtaposing a series of self-portraits created in various media (e.g., pencil, paint, photography) and a poem written by the student about his/her identity.
- Video PSAs presenting information about issues such as health, safety, environmental issues, and the debate over school uniforms.
- Persuasive posters created in Painter 6.0 using original photography and artwork intended to promote a healthier and safer environment in school.
- Video advertisements for student-designed products showcasing a variety of persuasive techniques.
- PowerPoint presentations conveying research about a notable artist, displaying students’ artwork produced in the style of the artist, and showing video of students’ producing the artwork.
- Short films of original stories written by students and a dramatization of a hostage situation intended to convey information about Islam and dispel stereotypes and assumptions about the
faith and politics of Muslim people.

- PowerPoint presentations demonstrating the steps of the scientific method and describing findings from students’ experiments.

- Video sketches about the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse and peer pressure refusal strategies using idiomatic language.

Each of these projects married media arts standards and subject-specific content standards. In addition, several of the projects were designed to promote interdisciplinary learning and incorporated standards from two or more content areas. Some examples of teachers’ instructional units are briefly described as follows.

At Mark Twain Middle School, an art teacher taught her students how to use PowerPoint as a tool for exploring their own identities. Throughout the school year, students experimented with a variety of artistic techniques and media to create self portraits. Each student wrote a poem describing aspects of his/her identity and integrated the text of the poem with scanned or photographed images of his/her self within a PowerPoint presentation.

At Berendo Middle School, a visual art teacher worked with his students to create posters designed to raise awareness about issues important to the school community—issues such as graffiti and littering—using persuasive techniques common to advertising. Students demonstrated an understanding of such techniques by creating their own persuasive media. They used digital design tools to create the images and Windows Media Recorder to record a short voiceover to accompany images in a PowerPoint presentation.

An art teacher at Dana Middle School taught her classes to use PowerPoint to present research reports on artists. While she has assigned this project many times in her years of teaching, she had never, before this year, chosen to use media technology to enhance the project. Believing that the technology would make the project both more challenging and more salient for her students, she revised the project parameters to include the PowerPoint presentation. The artist reports and PowerPoint presentations were produced by her students over a period of several months, giving them ample opportunity to learn and practice the new technology skills required by the project. In addition, this timeline allowed the teacher to continually change the project in order to incorporate her new technology skills, including scanning images, recording audio, and embedding video clips.

A health science teacher at Markham Middle School implemented multimedia in his classes by asking students to produce video PSAs about health, safety, or environmental issues. Students shot and edited video, and added additional images, text, and audio.

At Mulholland Middle School, special education teachers collaborated throughout the year to produce several multimedia projects with their students. Their culminating project for the WAI was a series of videotaped skits written by the students to inform others about the dangers of drug use and strategies for resisting peer pressure. A case study highlighting the work of these teachers and their students
follows in the next section of this report.

Case Study of Media Arts Instructional Units at Mulholland Middle School

Mulholland Middle School is in Van Nuys, a neighborhood in the San Fernando Valley area of Los Angeles. The school is situated a few blocks away from a major street with strip malls and fast food chains and a few blocks north of the Balboa Reservoir Park, a huge recreation area. Mulholland is designated as a Title I school, which indicates that most of the students it serves come from low-income families. In order to accommodate the large student body of more than two thousand students, the school is divided into small learning communities (SLCs). The teachers who participated in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative were faculty members of the Comm-Tech House, an SLC with a focus on supporting student achievement through the use of technology.

Ms. Cain and Mr. Bernstein are young and energetic teachers, and both have taught at Mulholland for several years. Experienced special education teachers, they understand the challenges of teaching students with learning disabilities and behavioral difficulties. In addition, as members of the Comm-Tech house, they are committed to using technology in creative ways to assist their students in overcoming these impediments to learning.

Most of the students Ms. Cain and Mr. Bernstein teach read far below grade level. A few students in the class barely read at all. Other students are placed in the class because of behavior problems that make it impossible for them to learn in a general education classroom. For these students, Ms. Cain and Mr. Bernstein are the last stop before they are expelled, transferred to a different school, or assigned to one-on-one remediation. In most schools, special education students—particularly those with severe learning and behavioral difficulties—are last in line for curricula and projects that take a non-traditional approach to literacy and content area knowledge. At Mulholland however, a growing number of teachers (including Ms. Cain and Mr. Bernstein) view multimedia as a tool for leveling the playing field for their students. While their students do not typically have the literacy skills to write a traditional essay, they do have the skills necessary to create a documentary video, a video timeline, or a PowerPoint presentation. The process of making a media project, they believe, provides their students with many opportunities to develop their literacy skills in ways that are both challenging and engaging.

From the beginning of the project, Ms. Cain and Mr. Bernstein acknowledged that their situation is different from that of most other teachers because they work as a team. In addition, they work with a small group of about 30 students. Because the students are nearly always in class with either Ms. Cain or Mr. Bernstein, the teachers are able to rearrange the schedule to accommodate media projects. “Block scheduling” allows them to work with a particular group of students on a production for extended periods of time. This type of flexibility is quite valuable for helping to meet production deadlines. Lastly, all of the teachers at Mulholland benefit from the presence of a full-time technology coordinator, Mr. Dale, who is both passionate and knowledgeable about using media in school.

Despite the many advantages enjoyed by these teachers, they inevitably face other challenges to their
pedagogical styles, classroom management techniques, and learning objectives. These challenges often require a quick restructuring of the multimedia-based lessons and assignments in order to better serve the needs of students. At times, they expressed uncertainty about the proper balance of media production and explicit, formal instruction and reverted to traditional teaching methods for a period of time. Over the course of the school year, however, they found a balance of formal instruction and production that worked well, and the media arts became a normalized part of everyday life at school.

Ms. Cain and Mr. Bernstein facilitated eight multimedia production projects with their special education classes over the course of the 2005-2006 school year. These projects increased in difficulty throughout the year and required students to develop a variety of research and production skills. Students demonstrated marked progress in the projects, which improved in quality and increased in complexity throughout the school year. Several of the projects are described in detail below.

The 1 Poem Project: Poetry for beginners

Mr. Bernstein’s language classes began the year with a poetry assignment. Students were given the following prompt of 10 statements: I am..., I see..., I touch..., I feel..., I hear..., I laugh..., I cry..., I fear..., I need..., and I am... Students were asked write about themselves by completing each of the ten statements in the prompt. Mr. Bernstein has kicked off the school year with this exercise for a number of years. In the past he asked students to create a paper collage. This year, however, he decided to have them create their poems in iMovie.

Students used still images, text, and music to convey the message of the poem. Almost all of the students wrote their poems and chose the images and music without help, a difficult task for children who read (on average) at the third grade level and many of whom have limited experience using computers. The content of the students’ iMovies varied greatly. A boy wrote his poem about playing basketball, and used images of NBA players and a rap song to accompany his words. A second boy used images from videogames to describe himself as a gamer. Yet another student used images of the Gulf Coast after Hurricane Katrina and wrote about his fear and confusion related to the disaster. Each poem was a glimpse into the history and personality of the students in the class.

The use of images and music to support students’ writing made the task of writing a poem manageable. Students were both challenged and engaged with the project. Out of 30 students, all but three students completed their iMovies within two weeks. Considering the students’ poor literacy skills, the timing of the project, which asked students to share very personal information with classmates whom they had just met, and the fact that during the first few weeks of school students’ schedules change frequently, this was quite an impressive achievement for both students and teachers alike.

The project was not, however, without its drawbacks. The quality of the writing from some students was lower than expected, likely because they focused their energy on learning to use the technology. Completing the iMovies also took much longer than completing the project as a paper collage. However, despite the challenges, Mr. Bernstein felt that producing the assignment in iMovie was superior to
doing it on paper because, as he put it, “technology acts as a bridge—kids with very low literacy skills are able to use the technology.” Even those students who barely read and write were able to complete the assignment and produce a product they were proud to show to their classmates and other people at the school. At a school-wide assembly held several weeks after the project was completed, several of the students’ projects were screened, stunning the faculty and students in attendance.

Sara

Sara’s I Poem exemplified the personal nature of the assignment: “The first time [I showed my work] was my I-Poem and I was so nervous ‘cause I wrote how I felt about my family and my parents living apart...And I got shy. Now I’m pretty used to it to show my movies...I just show my movies to my parents and my uncles and aunts, my brothers...They thought it [my I Poem] was pretty cool. My mom, well she was crying...‘cause she thought that I would never write that before, the way that I feel. Now she read it; she was crying for how proud she was how I was making it.”

— Sara

Sara’s I Poem

I see my parents fight. I touch my feelings. I feel like screaming. I hear them fight every night. I am afraid. I laugh when I am with my friends. I cry when my parents fight. I fear my parents will never get back together. I need my parents back together. I am lonely.

The Junk food Documentary Project: Debate over Hot Cheetos

The second multimedia project of the year was assigned in Ms. Cain’s health classes. Students were asked to create a documentary on childhood obesity and the recent legislation passed in California to ban “junk food” from schools. The project addressed a salient issue in the students’ lives, as they were beginning to feel the effects of the school district phasing out some of their favorite snack foods. Because childhood obesity is currently a major social problem, and the incidence of obesity is particularly high in children from low income families and those of particular ethnic backgrounds, the issue was an important one to address in a thoughtful way.

In essence, this project asked students to write a persuasive essay. They were instructed to represent both sides of the debate over junk food in schools before expressing their own opinions on the issue. Clearly, this project was more complex than the I Poem project students had just finished with Mr. Bernstein. It required a great deal more research, writing, and more complex production. However, it built upon the production processes and workflow that had been established in the I Poem project, providing reinforcement for acquired skills.

Each part of the project was broken down into steps. In order to research and write the text of the “script” for the iMovies, students were given a series of prompts or questions to which they were asked...
to respond. Students used their health textbooks, online resources and library resources to research the issues. The students’ answers served as the outline and script of the documentary.

Once the research component of the project was finished, students began searching online for images that represented their arguments. For a variety of reasons, the process of “asset gathering” was very time consuming. First, many of the students were still becoming comfortable with using the computers and with online research. They spent a good bit of time following poor leads for pictures. They had learned about Google Image Search during the production of their I Poems, and Ms. Cain gave them a refresher on how to use the tool to find images for their documentaries. Students learned to use the image size filter to obtain higher quality images. They also worked on their search skills—learning quickly, for instance, that searching for “fat lady” produced different results than searching for “obese woman,” and that the images produced by the latter search were infinitely more appropriate for the project.

Students’ newly developed iMovie skills were tested by this project. A greater number of images to include, longer blocks of text to format, and several video clips to incorporate at the end of the project required students to stretch what they learned producing their I Poems as well as to develop new skills. Over the course of about 3 weeks, students learned how to manipulate the length of clips, how to use effects to enhance their images and text, and how to shoot, import, and edit video. Students spent a great deal of time editing the text, as the videos did not include voice over narration, making the on-screen text essential to telling the story.

The final step in the production process was shooting and incorporating several video clips in which the students interviewed people at Mulholland about their opinions on the topic of junk food on campus. Students were instructed to find at least one person who was in favor of allowing junk food on campus and one person who was against having junk food on campus (and by extension in favor of the legislation.) Finally, students were to tape themselves giving their opinion on the topic. Each movie ended with the video clip of the student producer’s opinion. For some students, the interviews represented the most difficult part of the assignment, as it required them to venture out of their small group of classmates and teachers and talk to school personnel and students with whom they did not have much of a relationship. For several of the more camera shy students in the class, the task of articulating their own positions in front of the camera proved to be the biggest challenge.

The students worked diligently on the project each day for about three weeks. Some days they were, of course, more productive than others. In particular, students struggled to find enough images to fill the amount of time required by the text on the screen, and had difficulty taping the interviews. File management also became an issue at several points in the process, as a few students lost parts (or all) of their projects, or found that some of their assets were offline. Despite the challenges encountered during this project, the class successfully produced five short documentaries.

The question that remained after the Junk Food Documentary project was the degree to which students would retain the information. The teachers were in agreement that the students learned more about the issue by doing the documentary than they would have learned with other instructional techniques, in
large part because of the amount of time and repetition required to produce the movies.

Carlos

“I would get stuck with the big words then [at the beginning of the year]. Not that big, but, like “should”, “could”, “would”. Now I know how to even spell them without thinking about it.” — Carlos

Carlos is one of the class’s biggest success stories. He began the year barely reading at a first grade level. By the end of the school year, however, his decoding and comprehension skills were assessed at the 4th/5th grade level. Both he and his teachers attribute a great deal of credit for his gains to his diligent work on his multimedia productions.

The “Stories of My Life” Timeline Project: The challenges of web research

Shortly after the winter holiday break, students began their third media project of the year. This project, created using iMovie, used scanned photographs, images found on the Internet, text, and music to create a timeline of important events in each student’s life. The timeline project was an assignment in documenting oral history, as students were asked to research and document family history that rarely is formally recorded. It was, however, also an exercise in conducting Internet research, sequencing events, and writing about history, tasks that can be particularly challenging to students with low literacy skills.

At the beginning of the project, students were asked to find photographs of themselves at important moments in their lives—first birthdays, births of siblings, school graduations, etc. These photographs were then scanned and imported into iMovie, where students added descriptive text. In addition, students paired each of their personal events with an historical event that occurred in that same year. As with the personal photographs, students added descriptive text to these images. The final image in each movie was a photograph of the student taken at school.

This assignment was important, challenging, and successful for largely the same reasons. First, it drew upon students’ own experiences and knowledge as a way of framing the historical events. This is a known strategy for student engagement. Second, at the same time that the assignment leveraged students’ own experiences, it challenged students’ egocentrism. Reaching the understanding that the world is bigger than one’s own personal experience is an important part of adolescent development, but many students resist it. Third, the assignment asked students to critically evaluate information found on the Internet. Students frequently go online to research a variety of topics, but do not often have the skills necessary to assess the credibility of information.

In our interviews with students, most cited the timeline project as their favorite project from the year. Generally, they liked the project because of its connection to their lives and their family histories. Several students talked about the project as a way of getting to know their friends and classmates better.
The research portion of the project, however, was not as highly regarded. The students found conducting the Internet research confusing and had great difficulty distinguishing important events from those that were less important.

Andrew

Andrew, a 6th grader, was one of the younger students in the class. While he struggled quite a bit with Internet research, he was one of the class’s most talented students in editing and operating the video camera.

“Everything [in production] is hard. …Because it doesn’t do it by itself, we have to do it. But then it looks hard, but then when we do it, it starts getting easier. Then, I am like, ‘I know this!’ and so we just do it.” — Andrew

The “Muchos Somos” (We are Many) Project: We are many…and we are experts

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative Follow-up “Integration” Workshop in February inspired many teachers to try what they learned at the IML with their students. At the IML workshop, teachers read and discussed the Pablo Neruda poem, “Muchos Somos” (We are Many), in which the author writes of the many aspects of his identity, or the multiple “people” who live inside him. Teachers then wrote original poems about three of the different “people” who lived inside of them (e.g. the proud teacher, the woman looking forward to retirement, the father, etc.), took photographic self-portraits in which they performed or otherwise illustrated that “person” inside of them, and recorded a dramatic reading of their poems. The teachers then made a PowerPoint slide for each of their poems that combined and presented their text, photo, and audio. After experiencing first-hand this process of moving from poetry analysis to creating original media art, many teachers adapted the unit to their classrooms.

Mr. Bernstein’s class took the “Muchos Somos” unit on the road, sharing the experience with one of the classes within the School for Advanced Studies (SAS). This was the first project the SAS class had undertaken in PowerPoint. Although some of the students had used the program for basic presentations, very few had used it for image manipulation or graphic design. The SAS students’ lack of experience with the features of the program and with this kind of multimedia production for self-expression positioned the special education students as experts, a position they do not often have the opportunity to occupy. The feeling of being as capable as the students who are constantly identified as “the smartest kids in the school” was a huge confidence booster for the special education class.

Like the teachers at the IML workshop had done, students were asked to write three poems about themselves, modeling Pablo Neruda’s poem, “Muchos Somos.” Students then chose one of their poems, took a posed photograph to accompany the poem, and used PowerPoint to manipulate the
image and present the poem and the image together. Some students brought props and costumes for their photographs, while others relied on their pose and facial expression to convey the message. Students manipulated the images in a variety of ways, such as adjusting the color, cropping, and copying and pasting parts of the image to create a pattern. Some also added an audio component, combining a dramatic reading of their poem into their PowerPoint slide.

The project took about ten school days to complete, although some students finished more quickly than others (In general, the SAS students took much longer to complete the project). At the end of the project, it was difficult to tell which poems the SAS students had written and which the special education students had written. The special education class left the experience with a greater understanding of the value of their multimedia production skills and a group of new friends.

Michelle
The “Muchos Somos” project was not Michelle’s first foray into photo manipulation in PowerPoint. The creative 7th grader had tinkered with the program in order to enhance some photos of her friends prior to doing the assignment. As such, she was one of the leading experts in the classroom.

“My friends and I] sat on the computer, we started messing around with PowerPoint, and then we just started fixing it [the picture], and that’s how I learned how to do it.” — Michelle

The “Too Good For Drugs” Project: Interdisciplinary media arts in action
Mr. Bernstein, Ms. Cain, and Mr. Heywood, the third teacher on the Mulholland team, collaborated to develop a media arts unit related to drug abuse prevention. After completing a three week instructional unit following the “Too Good for Drugs” curriculum mandated by the district, students were tasked with writing, storyboarding, videotaping, and editing 2 minute documentaries conveying information about drugs, consequences of drug use, and peer pressure refusal strategies to get out of tough situations. In addition, students were to include idiomatic language in their scripts in order to reflect one of the major emphases of their language classes. Students worked in 3 groups of three to five students each. When needed, students from other classes were recruited to act or to provide technical assistance.

This project was different from the others the students had produced throughout the course of the year because of its scale, its explicitly interdisciplinary focus, and the more advanced production planning, scripting, shooting, and editing skills it required. Most of the students had never written dialogue or drawn storyboards. None of them had experience with continuity editing. The teachers were cognizant of the learning curve of this project, and were careful to scaffold the project in order to provide students with the support they needed at every step. These videos were also different because the students
worked on them periodically throughout the spring semester, rather than spending most of the school day working on them every day for a week or two, as they had done with their other multimedia projects. Ms. Cain’s science classes began the research and scripting in February, shot the video in March, and edited the videos in April and May.

Each of the three videos that resulted from this assignment is a testament to the skills the students developed over the course of the year. In the video “Garden Cigarette,” a female student feels pressure to smoke from two male students, but resists the temptation and enlightens them on the dangers of smoking. In “Girls Smoking,” a student has to make a choice between two friends—one who has been smoking marijuana with her and one who wants her to quit. In the third video, a student is pressured to smoke marijuana by another male student who insists that marijuana is beneficial. Eventually, the student being pressured is helped by another student who teaches him the facts about marijuana and convinces him to avoid smoking dope. Each of the videos gained an extended ending when they entered the editing process. In reviewing the rough cuts, the class decided that the videos were not dramatic enough to clearly make their intended points, and rewrote the endings to add drama. For example, the boy who pressured his friend into smoking marijuana ends up dead, leaving behind “disappointed parents, a failing report card, and a baby brother who will never know him.” The other videos ended in equally dramatic ways.

The production of these videos was a huge undertaking for the teachers and students. However, students appeared to gain content knowledge, technical skills, and self-confidence through the process of producing them—the exact skills and dispositions that the teachers hoped to nurture through the multimedia projects.
James

For James, starring in one of the class’s Too Good for Drugs videos was an important experience that helped him realize an interest in acting. He hopes to continue exploring this interest next year in high school.

Working in a team of three, James and his partners wrote, storyboards, shot, and edited their video. He explained that the production process was “a lot of work,” but he valued the opportunity to improve his acting ability and learn about the content. He is not concerned about facing peer pressure at high school. His advice to kids feeling pressured to try drugs: “tell ’em straight up in their face, ‘I don’t wanna do it.”

Program Evaluation

A team of external consultants provided evaluation services for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative during the 2005-2006 school year. The evaluation plan, developed in collaboration with IML staff, included evaluation activities conducted by the external consultants as well as researchers on staff at the IML. The external consultants were responsible for developing survey instruments, a classroom observation protocol, and the interview and observation protocols for the site visits. The external evaluation team also provided guidance on the design of the Initiative’s activities database that was used to document implementation and participation rates. The IML researchers contributed to the evaluation efforts by conducting observations of participating classrooms and by providing the evaluation team with observational field notes and other data relevant to the evaluation questions.

The goal of this evaluation was to examine the quality and effectiveness of the Initiative’s professional development model. The evaluation plan aimed to address the relationships between (a) the context in which the Initiative was initiated, (b) the implementation of the various Initiative activities, and (c) the outcomes for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students.

A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods were used to address the evaluation questions, including:

- Pre-Survey and Year-End Survey to collect information about participating teachers’ and coaches’ backgrounds and experiences using technology and multimedia in the classroom prior to their involvement in the Initiative, and the changes in the participants’ knowledge and skills using technology and multimedia at the end of the year.

- Classroom Observation Protocol to document the ways in which the teachers increased their
understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy and how they were able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of standards-based instructional units. The IML researchers conducted the classroom observations.

- **Summer Institute and Workshop Questionnaires** to collect information about the quality and utility of the professional development.

- **Site Visits** (including interviews and focus groups with teachers, administrators, coaches, and students) to gather additional contextual information regarding classroom practices and perceptions regarding the quality and impact of the professional development.

- **Interviews** with Los Angeles Unified School District Arts Advisors to gather background information about the advisors’ and the district’s involvement in the Initiative.

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative 2005-2006 Evaluation Report, authored by the external program evaluators, is included in its entirety following this Project Report. The report details the evaluation questions, methods, findings, and conclusions. Here, data from the report is summarized that relates to student and teacher outcomes, key findings, and recommendations.

**Participant Outcomes**

External program evaluators and IML researchers pursued a variety of strategies to learn about the outcomes of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students. These strategies included pre- and year-end surveys, classroom observations, and site visit interviews. The Wallis Annenberg Initiative 2005-2006 Evaluation Report provides a thorough presentation and discussion of this data. Below are excerpts from the report that summarize findings related to teacher and student outcomes. Quotations from participants are also included to provide examples from the data that are in the participants’ own words.

**Teacher Outcomes**

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative was designed to influence four aspects of teachers’ practice: (1) experience levels and use of media and technology, (2) knowledge and skills related to multimedia literacy, production, and analysis, (3) knowledge and skills related to multimedia pedagogy, and (4) the integration of technology and media with standards-based instructional units.

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative 2005-2006 Evaluation Report provides the following summary of teacher outcomes:

“…The findings indicated that although the teachers began the Initiative with few hesitations and a positive outlook toward media and technology, their teaching practices and perspectives about multimedia literacy, production, and analysis were positively influenced by their participation in the Initiative. For example, teachers’ mean ratings of media and technology use for instruction or for personal use were greater on the post-survey than the pre-survey for almost
all items. The same pattern was true for teachers’ ratings of their own multimedia analysis skills.

Although the differences in mean ratings were much smaller, teachers’ attitudes on the post-survey about teaching and learning with media and technology were more positive on average than their responses on the pre-survey. In addition, the IML researchers’ observations of the teachers’ classrooms indicated some growth in teachers’ multimedia knowledge and skills. Although there was a range of experience and skill levels observed, teachers were attempting to implement the strategies and approaches to multimedia pedagogy they learned in the Summer Institute and workshops.1

When teachers responded to a post-survey question about what, if anything, they gained from their experience with the Initiative, their responses related to improved technological skills, organizational and collaboration skills, motivation, the ability to adopt multimedia pedagogy, and expanded beliefs or expectations about their students’ potential. Examples of their reported gains are presented below:

“I gained insight and knowledge about what media arts is and how it can be incorporated in the Language arts curriculum. I am more confident as a teacher about using technology in the classroom.”

“In addition to the skills I have gained in the media arts, I have gained self confidence in knowing that I can make these projects work in my classroom. I have also gained friendships and outstanding contacts!”

“This has been a teaching transforming experience for me. I never imagined that it will be possible to get so much out of my students while at the same time teach the standards, life skills, and computer and multimedia skills. I have gained a new way of teaching and addressing students’ needs while maintaining enthusiasm and excitement.”

Evidence from the final unit plans indicates that the teachers were successful in understanding the use of multimedia in instruction, but not as successful at using multimedia across different subject areas. The integration of multimedia and diverse content may be a skill or strategy that was not fully realized or developed by teachers. Finally, teachers’ own reports about the changes in their teaching practices and skill levels indicated that the majority of teachers have been positively influenced by their participation in this Initiative. Several interviewees reported that they would likely continue using media and technology in all of their courses and would be interested in more professional development opportunities to continue implementing what they learned. In response to whether or not the Initiative met their expectations, teachers said:

“I came in with little to no expectations. I was blown away with the level of professionalism and competency I encountered at the WAI (Wallis Annenberg Initiative). Everyone in my team continually looked forward to attending the workshops and working with both the WAI team and other teachers attending this program. It was | is a VERY positive experience. Thank you!!”

“It has beat my initial expectations. I honestly didn't know what I was getting into, but this has been a completely different year for me because of this Initiative. It has opened my eyes to incorporating technology into the lives of special education students.”

“I didn't expect my experience to be this rewarding. I am more experienced with the computer and incorporating media arts in my classroom. I feel more confident as a teacher incorporating media arts in the curriculum. This was my first time using iMovie as well so the experience was a journey with my students.”

**Student Outcomes**

A primary goal of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative was for participating teachers to infuse media arts units into their classrooms. IML and LAUSD staff anticipated a steep learning curve for teachers, but they also expected that students would benefit even from teachers’ initial efforts to integrate media arts into instruction. Program evaluation of student outcomes focused on the perceptions of teachers and students regarding their use of media and technology, and on the influence of multimedia teaching approaches on student learning and engagement with content. The data collected was qualitative in nature and involved surveys, interviews, and observations. Program evaluation of student outcomes sought to address the influence of teachers’ participation in the Initiative on their students’ experiences in the classroom, specifically asking the following evaluation questions:

1. What are the characteristics of participating middle school students?

2. What background knowledge and prior experiences do students have related to media and technology?

3. How does participating in the Initiative influence students (e.g., interest, motivation, engagement, learning)?

The evaluation of the Initiative found that students valued and benefited from their participation in media arts instructional units. Teachers reported, for example, that technology and media arts integration promoted student confidence, efficacy, and motivation. To illustrate this point, one teacher explained that when students were involved in a video camera lesson, “Even one of my kids, who usually ditches class and everything, and he was like leading his group and like trying to show them where the different camera parts were and whatnot. And some of the kids, like they've just been asking, ‘When are we going to film? When are we going to film?’ Like ‘Can we bring in stuff? Can we come after school to create our product?’ and all that. And they're really into it, like they really want to get it done. So, that's been exciting.” Another teacher explained, “I've seen them doing research on their own now, and looking for information off the computer. They've gone and opened up a book on their own, looking for information to put into their iMovie…”

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative 2005-2006 Evaluation Report provides the following summary of student outcomes:

“Based on discussions with students during site visit focus groups, there is a range in the type
and amount of use of media and technology outside the classroom. However, students were generally positive about their experiences in the classrooms of teachers participating in the Initiative and they valued their opportunities to use media and technology in creating projects for their coursework. Indeed, the students reported increased motivation, engagement, and learning as a result of their media and technology experiences.”

When students were asked directly about their satisfaction with their experiences with the classes of their teachers who were participating in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, they referred primarily to the benefits of having access to technology and media, and they particularly emphasized the ways in which technology integration enhanced their learning experiences. They also discussed how using technology and making media art projects increased their engagement in the classroom and motivation to learn. Examples of students’ comments are provided below.

“All enjoy it because it’s just better than writing on paper.”

“I guess we’re just lucky. Not all the schools have like PowerPoint and everything. And not all the classes do.”

“I thought it was cool that they taught it to us. It’s more fun to learn it like that, than just reading the textbook. It’s a funner way of learning because like when we learned it before, and he’d explain it, it was more like you didn’t want to listen. But now you want to. And then doing it on the computer now so it’s interesting.”

“Because like if they give you funner and easier ways to learn, you’re gonna want to learn. Right? Than like having some boring lesson.”

“I mean it’s like it makes you go to the school. Because like some people, like without fun in the school they just don’t want to go. This encourages people to come to school more.”

When teachers responded to a post-survey question about what, if anything, their students gained from their experience with the Initiative, their responses related to increased technological skills and interest, improved ability to analyze and critique media messages, as well as understand production techniques that shape the media messages, and increased self-confidence and academic growth. Illustrative quotes are provided below.

“Our students have greatly benefited from your efforts. This year students have created 12 DVDs of their projects to date and many are on sale in the student store. We have seen videos, presentations, blogs, and Web pages blossom. The effect of media projects is so impressive that other teachers are asking IML participants to help them get started.”

“They have also gained a better understanding of how media influences them and how they can influence their own audience with their own media presentations.”

“It has helped them believe in themselves. Even though they may not be proficient in the area of reading and writing, they are able to develop high quality work using multi-media.”

———

“My students have gained a SKILL that they can use throughout their lives, in addition to better learning/understanding the subject matter in their science class.”

“They learned how to be in control of their learning. How to use technology in ways that make them special and unique.”

Key Findings

The evaluation of the 2005-2006 Wallis Annenberg Initiative found that the Initiative met its primary objectives, which were to: (1) encourage effective integration of multimedia literacy into standards-based curriculum, (2) improve teachers’ and students’ acquisition and fluency in the creation and critical analysis of media forms, (3) collaborate with media education specialists around critical topics of multimedia literacy and K-12 education, and (4) develop an understanding of curricula and methods for professional development in multimedia literacy.

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative 2005-2006 Evaluation Report contained the following key findings:

- Survey and interview data indicated that teachers generally reported greater use and comfort with media and technology in their instruction by the end of the project.

- Participants gravitated toward the multimedia production aspect of the Initiative, with fewer advances in multimedia analysis. The focus on multimedia production was reasonable given that multimedia analysis represents an abstract and complex set of skills that likely require long-term professional development and practice.

- Teachers were generally successful in designing multimedia unit plans and engaging students in multimedia projects. There was limited integration of teaching standards across subjects. The limited integration of cross-subject standards was considered an acceptable response due to the significant learning curve some participants faced. The participating teachers were proud of the amount of progress they made, highlighting the fact that there are developmental stages involved in the process of effectively integrating multimedia literacy into a standards-based curriculum.

- The IML staff made strides in their ability to provide high quality professional development, and they demonstrated a commitment to adapting and responding to the ongoing needs of the participants. It was a big undertaking for the teachers to do what they were asked to do, and, for the most part, teachers rose to the occasion by genuinely engaging in the professional development sessions and making earnest attempts to implement what they had learned from the Initiative. The support from the IML was integral to the teachers’ successes.

The Wallis Annenberg Initiative 2005-2006 Evaluation Report reported the following summary-level findings:

---

conclusions: 4

Based on survey and interview data, teachers generally reported greater use and comfort with media and technology in their instruction by the end of the project. A testament to the integration of media and technology into their teaching was the variety and quality of teachers’ unit plans, classroom assignments, and the student work products that were submitted to the IML at the end of the year.

The findings also indicated that the participants gravitated toward the production aspect of the Initiative, with fewer advances in multimedia analysis. The focus on multimedia production is reasonable because, for many participants, multimedia analysis represent a more abstract and complex set of skills that will likely require more professional development and practice, as was offered in this Initiative. As noted in the IML’s materials to their participants prior to the February 2006 workshop, “New means for expression, analysis and communication require, in short, a new kind of teaching, one that is comfortable with complexity, creativity and multiple approaches to shared goals.”

Furthermore, although the teachers were generally successful in designing multimedia unit plans and engaging students in multimedia projects, there was limited integration of teaching standards across subjects. For example, even in a science class, the unit observed was focused on the media arts aspect of the lesson, rather than the integration of science and media arts standards together. Indeed, it seems reasonable to focus on the media arts aspect of a lesson rather than cross-content integration as a first step. Again, the evaluation team finds the focus on the multimedia aspect of the instruction acceptable given that the instructional approaches promoted in this Initiative were new for most of the participants. Indeed, the participating teachers were proud of the amount of progress they had made this year, which highlights the fact that there are developmental stages involved in the process of effectively integrating multimedia literacy into a standards-based curriculum.

Taking a broader perspective, the IML and others involved in the design of the Initiative set fairly ambitious goals for the participants in terms of the desired skill levels (e.g., media and technology skills and multimedia pedagogy skills). The evaluation team finds it helpful to view these outcomes on a continuum from the teacher who has little or no experience with any form of media or technology, to the teacher who is extremely media and technology savvy and who has a keen sense for multimedia analysis. Even though the Initiative set high standards for the teachers, the participants of this Initiative made great strides in how far they traveled along the continuum in just one year. Similarly, the IML staff made strides in their ability to provide high quality professional development and to adapt to the ongoing needs of the participants so that the support for teachers was improved throughout the year. To be certain, it was a big undertaking for the teachers to do what they were asked to do, and, for the

most part, they rose to the occasion by genuinely engaging in the professional development sessions and making earnest attempts to implement what they had learned from the Initiative in their classrooms.

**Conclusion 1:** The IML delivered professional development that was truly professional. Teachers described being very impressed with the support of the IML staff, as well as the state-of-the-art resources available at the IML facilities. The mutual respect and professionalism likely contributed to higher standards and performance on the part of the teachers.

**Recommendations related to conclusion 1:** The findings suggest that the Initiative was worth the investment and should be continued.

The evaluation team was impressed that the teachers remained committed throughout the year in the face of what could have easily been seen as a challenge. One plausible reason for this is that the teachers volunteering for this project already had an interest in the topic and a willingness to embrace the strategies and approaches. It also seemed that their willingness to use the Initiative approaches was affirmed when they saw their students’ responses. Teachers reported being pleased, and even surprised, at how their students responded in terms of improved attitudes and engagement. In many cases, the quality of the students’ work exceeded teachers’ expectations.

**Recommendations related to conclusion 2:** Volunteer involvement and a willingness to participate are essential to the success of the Initiative. The findings also speak to the importance of fostering efficacy and empowerment on the part of the teachers so that they can experience successes, which in turn keeps them motivated.

**Conclusion 3:** The coaching role was underutilized.

**Explanation of conclusion 3:** The role of the coach lacked definition and was not clearly distinguished from the role of the IML researchers and technical assistance providers. It was also noted that the coaches’ support was limited by logistical factors (e.g., schedules at their home school or the long distance they had to travel to get to the participating school). The overriding conclusion was that the coaching role was underutilized.

**Recommendations related to conclusion 3:** For future implementation, it would be beneficial to clearly define the role of the coach and find ways to provide more on-site support that would include modeling and feedback. This would require that the coaches have a legitimate job description and that they have sufficient time available to carry out their distinct responsibilities as a coach.

**Conclusion 4:** It takes time and risk-taking to develop multimedia analysis and media arts skills.
Explanation of conclusion 4: Teachers reported that their students were engaged in the projects, but often in a superficial way. Because multimedia analysis and media arts skills were new for many of the participants, teachers reported that they needed ways to help their students become engaged in the material at a deeper level so that students could critically analyze media messages and discuss the implications of the choices they were making in the multimedia projects. It is likely that the degree to which teachers succeeded in getting their students to approach media with a critical lens and aesthetic eye were proportionate to teachers’ own confidence and skill level in teaching multimedia analysis and media arts skills.

Recommendations related to conclusion 4: Continue working with the same schools again to build on what has already been developed and established. It might be beneficial to reconsider the configuration of the team by adding more teachers to the pool of participants and using the current teachers as leaders. Starting over with new schools, and terminating the Initiative’s involvement with the 2005-2006 schools, is not recommended because this type of Initiative requires a multiyear process and longer-term investment to develop the skills and strategies that enable schools and teachers to sustain their efforts.

Conclusion 5: The Initiative had a limited impact on schools’ capacity to sustain the project.

Explanation of conclusion 5: Teachers reported increased collaboration and enthusiasm at their school for this project, although the collaboration was informal and occurred primarily among the participating teachers. While the types of on-site support that occurred in this first year were viewed as positive, the Initiative did not result in specific school structures or support mechanisms that would help teachers sustain their learning as they continued practicing and implementing what they learned in the workshops or Institutes.

Recommendations related to conclusion 5: For future implementation, consider on site capacity building structures to enhance the more formal professional development sessions that were offered. Developing the capacity to teach in ways promoted by the Initiative is best understood as a long-term process that will require additional professional development, such as that provided by the IML, as well as ongoing, job-embedded structures to support teachers’ use and development of these new approaches.

Conclusion

Over its three years of implementation, the Wallis Annenberg Initiative made significant inroads toward the advancement of the media arts and media literacy in middle school education. The Initiative made it possible for a wide variety of teachers and schools across the country to develop new strategies for teaching with media and technology.

In Los Angeles, the 2005-2006 Wallis Annenberg Initiative made it possible for a core group of middle schools to begin the path towards a fully-articulated program in media arts. Teachers from five schools
learned to develop curricular units that addressed content standards in both the arts and other subject areas, and they learned how to scaffold the creative media production work of their students. Participating teachers finished the school year with plans and enthusiasm to continue integrating the media arts into instruction in the year ahead. Administrators at their schools became more aware of how media arts could benefit their students, and were advised on specific measures they could take to support media arts at their schools.

The various successes of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative represent initial, but important, steps towards the ultimate goals of providing standards-based education in media arts for all grade levels and integrating media literacy into instruction across the disciplines. To reach these goals, teachers will require further professional development and peer coaching in both media arts and media analysis, as well as in related instructional strategies. They will also require access to the basic technical resources needed to support students’ creative media production activities, as well as ongoing support from the school district for teachers to integrate media arts and media literacy into instruction. The LAUSD Arts Education Branch has taken a leadership role at the district level to address these needs and to build on the insights and successes of the Initiative, and the Institute for Multimedia Literacy remains committed to supporting these efforts in future programs.
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Executive Summary

In the summer of 2003, the Institute for Multimedia Literacy at The University of Southern California launched The Wallis Annenberg Initiative with the generous support of the Annenberg Foundation. The Wallis Annenberg Initiative promotes and supports multimedia literacy for K-12 educators and students. The goal of the three-year Initiative was to implement a professional development model that would increase teachers’ understanding of multimedia literacy and their ability to incorporate multimedia into classroom teaching and learning. Drawing on the insights from summer symposiums that were held during the first two years of the Initiative (2003 and 2004), the emphasis of the Initiative in 2005-2006 was to pilot a revised approach to professional development. In partnership with Los Angeles Unified School District, the IML recruited five middle-school teams, composed of one administrator, a coach, and three teachers per team, to participate in a year-long series of professional development sessions and on-site technical support.

A team of external consultants conducted an evaluation of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative during the 2005-2006 school year. The goals of this evaluation were to examine the quality and effectiveness of the Initiative’s professional development model. Following a description of the program’s background and the evaluation methods, this executive summary presents key evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The full report provides an in-depth presentation of the evaluation methods, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Background

The theoretical underpinnings of the Initiative were based on a set of working postulates, also referred to as enduring understandings. The enduring understandings reflected the combined perspectives of the IML and the LAUSD Arts Education Branch in the areas of media arts and multimedia literacy. The enduring understandings consisted of the following:

1. Multimedia literacy is the ability to communicate using image, text, sound, movement, sequence and interactivity in combination.
2. Arts are essential for communication and expression in multimedia.
3. Media acquire meanings dependent upon context and point of view.
4. Media analysis is an integral part of media production and provides learning opportunities throughout the production process.
5. Students have complex background knowledge and experiences related to media and technology that teachers recognize, incorporate, build on, and transform.

The objectives of the Initiative in 2005-2006 were to: (1) encourage effective integration of multimedia literacy into standards-based curriculum, (2) improve teachers’ and students’ acquisition and fluency in the creation and critical analysis of media forms, (3) collaborate with media education specialists around critical topics of multimedia literacy.
and K-12 education, and (4) develop an understanding of curricula and methods for professional development in multimedia literacy.

The Initiative consisted of:

- Five-day Summer Institute of professional development for the 20 middle school educators that took place August 8-12, 2005;
- Four one-day integration workshops held in October, December, February, and June;
- Ongoing assistance to teachers as they developed and implemented their media arts-integrated curriculum units;
- On-site “coaching” by experienced media educators; and
- Web-based communication and on-site knowledge sharing and technical assistance from the IML.

Evaluation Methods

The evaluation plan, developed in collaboration with IML researchers, aimed to address (a) the context in which the Initiative was implemented, (b) the implementation of the various Initiative activities, and (c) the outcomes for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students. Specific evaluation questions were designed to guide data collection activities for each of these focus areas.

A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods were used to address the evaluation questions, including:

- **Pre-Survey and Year-End Survey** to collect information about participating teachers’ and coaches’ backgrounds and experiences using technology and multimedia in the classroom prior to their involvement in the Initiative and the changes in the participants’ knowledge and skills using technology and multimedia at the end of the year.
- **Classroom Observation Protocol** to document the ways in which the teachers increased their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy and how they were able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of standards-based instructional units. The IML researchers conducted the classroom observations.
- **Summer Institute and Workshop Questionnaires** to collect information about the quality and utility of the professional development.
- **Site Visits** (including interviews and focus groups with teachers, administrators, coaches, and students) to gather additional contextual information regarding classroom practices and perceptions regarding the quality and impact of the professional development.
- **Interviews** with Los Angeles Unified School District Arts Advisors to gather background information about the advisors’ and the district’s involvement in the Initiative.
**Key Findings**

The evaluation team concluded that the Initiative met its 2005-2006 objectives. Key findings included the following:

- Survey and interview data indicated that teachers generally reported greater use and comfort with media and technology in their instruction by the end of the project.

- Participants gravitated toward the multimedia production aspect of the Initiative, with fewer advances in multimedia analysis. The focus on multimedia production was reasonable given that multimedia analysis represents an abstract and complex set of skills that likely require long-term professional development and practice.

- Teachers were generally successful in designing multimedia unit plans and engaging students in multimedia projects. There was limited integration of teaching standards across subjects. The limited integration of cross-subject standards was considered an acceptable response due to the significant learning curve some participants faced. The participating teachers were proud of the amount of progress they made, highlighting the fact that there are developmental stages involved in the process of effectively integrating multimedia literacy into a standards-based curriculum.

- The IML staff made strides in their ability to provide high quality professional development, and they demonstrated a commitment to adapting and responding to the ongoing needs of the participants. It was a big undertaking for the teachers to do what they were asked to do, and, for the most part, teachers rose to the occasion by genuinely engaging in the professional development sessions and making earnest attempts to implement what they had learned from the Initiative. The support from the IML was integral to the teachers’ successes.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Conclusion 1:** The IML provided high quality, professional development that had a significant impact on its participants.

- **Explanation of conclusion 1:** According to the teachers’ reports on workshop questionnaires and during site visit focus groups, the IML delivered professional development that was truly professional. Teachers described being very impressed with the support of the IML staff, as well as the state-of-the-art resources available at the IML facilities. The mutual respect and professionalism likely contributed to higher standards and performance on the part of the teachers.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 1:** The findings suggest that the Initiative was worth the investment and should be continued.
Conclusion 2: The participants’ willingness and interest in the Initiative enhanced the outcomes.

- **Explanation of conclusion 2**: It would not have been unreasonable for teachers to have balked at the time and energy spent on the Initiative projects given the many demands on their time and the pressures to teach content standards. The evaluation team was impressed that the teachers remained committed throughout the year in the face of what could have easily been seen as a challenge. One plausible reason for this is that the teachers volunteering for this project already had an interest in the topic and a willingness to embrace the strategies and approaches. It also seemed that their willingness to use the Initiative approaches was affirmed when they saw their students’ responses. Teachers reported being pleased, and even surprised, at how their students responded in terms of improved attitudes and engagement. In many cases, the quality of the students’ work exceeded teachers’ expectations.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 2**: Volunteer involvement and a willingness to participate are essential to the success of the Initiative. The findings also speak to the importance of fostering efficacy and empowerment on the part of the teachers so that they can experience successes, which in turn keeps them motivated.

Conclusion 3: The coaching role was underutilized.

- **Explanation of conclusion 3**: The role of the coach lacked definition and was not clearly distinguished from the role of the IML researchers and technical assistance providers. It was also noted that the coaches’ support was limited by logistical factors (e.g., schedules at their home school or the long distance they had to travel to get to the participating school). The overriding conclusion was that the coaching role was underutilized.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 3**: For future implementation, it would be beneficial to clearly define the role of the coach and find ways to provide more on-site support that would include modeling and feedback. This would require that the coaches have a legitimate job description and that they have sufficient time available to carry out their distinct responsibilities as a coach.

Conclusion 4: It takes time and risk-taking to develop multimedia analysis and media arts skills.

- **Explanation of conclusion 4**: Teachers reported that their students were engaged in the projects, but often in a superficial way. Because multimedia analysis and media arts skills were new for many of the participants, teachers reported that they needed ways to help their students become engaged in the material at a deeper level so that students could critically analyze media messages and discuss the implications of the choices they were making in the multimedia projects. It is
likely that the degree to which teachers succeeded in getting their students to approach media with a critical lens and aesthetic eye were proportionate to teachers’ own confidence and skill level in teaching multimedia analysis and media arts skills.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 4**: Continue working with the same schools again to build on what has already been developed and established. It might be beneficial to reconsider the configuration of the team by adding more teachers to the pool of participation and using the current teachers as leaders. Starting over with new schools, and terminating the Initiative’s involvement with the 2005-2006 schools, is not recommended because this type of Initiative requires a multiyear process and longer-term investment to develop the skills and strategies that enable schools and teachers to sustain their efforts.

**Conclusion 5**: The Initiative had a limited impact on schools’ capacity to sustain the project.

- **Explanation of conclusion 5**: Teachers reported increased collaboration and enthusiasm at their school for this project, although the collaboration was informal and occurred primarily among the participating teachers. While the types of on-site support that occurred in this first year were viewed as positive, the Initiative did not result in specific school structures or support mechanisms that would help teachers sustain their learning as they continued practicing and implementing what they learned in the workshops or Institutes.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 5**: For future implementation, consider on-site capacity building structures to enhance the more formal professional development sessions that were offered. Developing the capacity to teach in ways promoted by the Initiative is best understood as a long-term process that will require additional professional development, such as that provided by the IML, as well as ongoing, job-embedded structures to support teachers’ use and development of these new approaches.
Introduction

In the summer of 2003, the Institute for Multimedia Literacy at The University of Southern California launched The Wallis Annenberg Initiative with the generous support of the Annenberg Foundation. The Wallis Annenberg Initiative (hereafter referred to as the Initiative) promotes and supports multimedia literacy for K-12 educators and students. The goal of the three-year Initiative was to implement a professional development model that would increase teachers’ understanding of multimedia literacy and their ability to incorporate multimedia into classroom teaching and learning. During the first two years of the Initiative (2003 and 2004), the Institute for Multimedia Literacy (IML) convened summer symposiums drawing educators from across the United States. The summer symposiums reached a diverse group of educators and provided insight into effective models of professional development for building teachers’ skills, knowledge, and ability to plan, facilitate, and assess students’ multimedia projects.

Drawing on the insights from the summer symposiums, the emphasis of the Initiative in 2005-2006 was to pilot a revised approach to professional development. In partnership with Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), the IML recruited five middle-school teams, composed of an administrator, arts teacher, and two subject area teachers, to participate in a year long series of professional development sessions and on-site technical support. Five media-experienced “coaches,” who were otherwise employed as LAUSD teachers, were recruited to provide the teams with on-site support and technical assistance for integrating multimedia literacy into their instruction.

The objectives of the Initiative in 2005-2006 were to: (1) encourage effective integration of multimedia literacy into standards-based curriculum, (2) improve teachers’ and students’ acquisition and fluency in the creation and critical analysis of media forms, (3) collaborate with media education specialists around critical topics of multimedia literacy and K-12 education, and (4) develop an understanding of curricula and methods for professional development in multimedia literacy.

The Initiative’s 2005-2006 Model of Professional Development

The theoretical underpinnings of the Initiative were based on a set of working postulates, also referred to as enduring understandings. The enduring understandings reflected the combined perspectives of the IML and the LAUSD Arts Education Branch in the areas of media arts and multimedia literacy. The enduring understandings consisted of the following:

1. Multimedia literacy is the ability to communicate using image, text, sound, movement, sequence and interactivity in combination.
2. Arts are essential for communication and expression in multimedia.
3. Media acquire meanings dependent upon context and point of view.
4. Media analysis is an integral part of media production and provides learning opportunities throughout the production process.
5. Students have complex background knowledge and experiences related to media and technology that teachers recognize, incorporate, build on, and transform.

In the spring of 2005, the LAUSD Arts Education Branch contacted several middle schools in the District and invited them to complete an application to participate in the Initiative. Once the five middle schools were selected, the Initiative provided a five-day Summer Institute of professional development for the 20 middle school educators (five middle school teams composed of one administrator and three teachers per team). The Summer Institute exposed participants to an introduction to multimedia production, analysis, and curriculum development, a hands-on practicum, and a guest-facilitated seminar series. In addition, a special track for administrators focused on strategies for developing school capacity in multimedia literacy and media arts. Following the five-day Summer Institute that took place August 8-12, 2005, the Initiative consisted of:

- Four one-day integration workshops held in October, December, February, and June;
- Ongoing assistance to teachers as they developed and implemented their media arts-integrated curriculum units;
- On-site “coaching” by experienced media educators; and
- Web-based communication and on-site knowledge sharing and technical assistance from the IML.

Each component of the Initiative is described below.

**Summer Institute**

The five-day Summer Institute consisted of an introduction to multimedia production, analysis, and curriculum development, a multi-media practicum, and a guest-facilitated seminar series. Participants met twice daily in the IML labs for instruction and hands-on experience in media production and analysis. When not involved with hands-on experiences, the participants attended seminars and engaged in open discussions about strategies for adapting what they learned to the classroom. Participants were asked to choose one of two areas of concentration, or “tracks”, to participate in during the Institute. Participants had the choice of a documentary video track or a multimedia presentation track. Through exercises, assignments, and a hands-on multimedia project in their concentration areas, participants were expected to develop skills and competencies in multimedia literacy and media arts.

*Media Practicum Track 1: Documentary Video*

Approximately 50% of the teachers and 75% of the administrators selected the documentary video track for their five-day practicum. With this track, participants learned the process of creating a documentary film using iMovie. Through twice daily hands-on lab experiences, participants were expected to learn how to analyze and create meaning through creative combinations of moving images, graphic images, sound, and
text. Participants focused on a single genre during the week, the “self-reflexive” documentary video, and learned foundational production skills and concepts. The documentary video track culminated with a final project: a ninety-second documentary revealing an aspect of the participant’s identity or a personal perspective on a historical event. In their documentary videos, participants covered three self-selected topics: the Los Angeles riots of 1992, the 2000 presidential election, and caffeine.

The curriculum of the media practicum was designed to give meaning to the Initiative’s “enduring understandings.” For example, instructors presented clips from a variety of documentary videos, such as Ross McElwee’s “Sherman’s March” (1986), Jonathan Caouette’s “Tarnation” (2004), and Michael Moore’s “Roger and Me” (1989), and led discussions about their genre, relative balance of subjectivity and objectivity, found verses, created footage, and point of view. Participants then applied these analytical concepts to their own video production work, and were asked to justify their choices of incorporated media, shot strategies, and editing techniques.

**Media Practicum Track 2: Multimedia PowerPoint Presentation**

In the multimedia presentation track, participants were introduced to PowerPoint. Approximately 50% of the teachers and one-quarter of the administrators selected the multimedia presentation track. Over the course of five days, participants were exposed to a variety of genres and practices associated with PowerPoint, both as a presentation tool and a stand-alone medium of expression. Topics included: text, image, moving image, sequence, interactivity, interface, and presentation. During the week, participants produced a series of short projects representing a range of techniques and approaches to communicating with multimedia. Participants also learned strategies for doing web-based research and evaluating online media sources. A special focus of the track was media literacy, particularly as it was articulated in the third enduring understanding: “media acquire meanings dependent upon context and point of view.” For example, the instructor presented a series of images he had “mashed” (composed from multiple media objects), showing how a single photograph of pistol-bearing Iranian woman gained different meanings depending on its context, e.g., on a newspaper front page, a network newscast, a webpage, or a museum exhibition.

**Administrator Track**

During the Summer Institute, the four attending administrators participated as active members of their school-based teams. Along with the teachers from their schools, the administrators participated in team building and unit development activities, including the preliminary drafting of enduring understandings, essential questions, and student skills and knowledge. Administrators also joined teachers in media analysis and production exercises and attended the seminar series.

In addition, the administrators participated in three special work sessions facilitated by the director of the LAUSD Arts Education Branch. In these sessions, the administrators were presented a new strategy, developed by the Arts Education Branch, for assessing
their schools' capacity, needs, and priorities in the arts. The administrators identified descriptors for qualified teachers, resources, curriculum instruction and assessment, professional development, and partnerships to support media arts activities, and then began the process of articulating a vision and developing a comprehensive arts plan that included media arts.

**Seminar Series**

The Summer Institute included a seminar series facilitated by guest lecturers specializing in the areas of media education, youth and the media, and media arts. The seminars provided concrete models for the participants to consider in their own efforts to incorporate media into the classroom, and acquainted participants with leading figures in the field. Guest media specialists, who remained on hand throughout the five-day Institute, participated in many of the activities and provided additional ideas, inspiration, and guidance on an informal and one-on-one basis.

**Workshops**

Throughout the year, the IML hosted four one-day workshops on the USC campus. The workshops were held in October, December, February, and June. The purpose of the workshops was to provide the participants an opportunity to continue to develop specialized media production and analysis skills and knowledge, and to continue to work on their individual multimedia projects in the presence of the IML’s instructional staff.

**October Workshop**

On October 8, 2005, participants met at the IML for the first of the four follow-up workshops. The day’s events followed the format of the Summer Institute: a morning session focused on curriculum unit development followed by a seminar discussion and a hands-on practicum in media production. For the session on curriculum unit development, a member of the LAUSD Arts Education Branch led participants through a protocol for giving and receiving peer critiques of teachers’ lesson plans. The facilitator illustrated the techniques through a “fish-bowl” demonstration of the protocol, in which a teacher-volunteer described her unit plan, responded to a series of clarifying and probing questions from her peers, listened to her peers discuss and critique the unit, and then responded to topics she felt would help her further develop her unit. Following this model, teachers worked in small groups to practice the protocol with each other and to give and receive feedback on the unit plans they were developing.

The workshop continued with a presentation on blogging and networked communication by a guest speaker. Using a wiki-based interface as his visual aid, the presenter gave examples of work from the “blogosphere,” including examples from leading bloggers and networked resources relevant to teachers and students. The presentation concluded with a discussion on the possibilities, challenges, and dangers of blogging as it concerns children and youth.
In the afternoon, the Media Practicum session gave participants practical, hands-on experience in blogging. Practicum instructors ran parallel, synchronized sessions providing participants with step-by-step instructions to sign up and use a blog account. The workshop culminated in the collective writing game of “Exquisite Corpse,” wherein all participants began stories as separate entries on the community blog and then continued others’ stories in sequence as comments. This activity took participants through the steps of blogging in real-time rapid succession. The objectives of the seminar and practicum sessions were to attract participants to the practices of blogging, both as a form of media literacy and as a medium of communication.

December Workshop

The second workshop was held on Saturday, December 3, 2005. Approximately one month before the workshop, the IML asked participants to use the Initiative’s community blog, established during the October workshop, to communicate the types of technical assistance they wanted to receive at the December workshop. In asking for participants’ input, the IML staff acknowledged that the prospect of teaching with media arts and technologies was no longer an abstraction for teachers, and participants may have had immediate, practical concerns about implementing their units.

The day’s activities consisted of a morning session facilitated by an LAUSD Arts Advisor to debrief the participants’ experiences with giving and receiving peer feedback using the Lesson Study model that teachers had recently experienced at their school sites. The Lesson Study debrief was followed by “Open Space” breakout discussions and an extended media practicum where participants continued working on their projects.

February Workshop

On February 17, 2006, participants were invited to attend a workshop focused on creativity and self-expression using new media. The objectives of the February workshop were to:

- Develop participants’ appreciation for the arts and artistic processes in new media production;
- Instill a sensitivity for issues of personality, vulnerability, and self-expression when students explore and reveal aspects of their own identity as subject matter for media projects;
- Draw attention to pre-production as an important, but often-overlooked, moment in the media production process for teaching and learning; and
- Demonstrate a complete media-production exercise led by an experienced youth media educator.

Participants were directed through a series of steps related to the production of a final PowerPoint presentation that explored multiple facets of the participants’ own identities. The exercise began with a reading and discussion of a poem by Pablo Neruda, “Muchos Somos” (“We are Many”), which described many voices within the narrator’s
personality. Participants were then instructed to write and present three short poems on
the model of Neruda’s poem, describing distinct voices within themselves. On the basis
of their written work, the participants designed a visual complement to each of their
poems, comprised of still photographs of themselves in various poses and costumes,
along with found media and text. By the end of the day, participants had synthesized the
visual and acoustical elements into a PowerPoint presentation.

June Workshop

The final workshop was held on Saturday, June 10, 2006. The purpose of the final
workshop was to bring the participants together to present and discuss the curriculum
units they had developed and to share examples of the types of multimedia projects their
students engaged in during the year.

Unit Plan Development

As part of their participation in the Initiative, teachers were asked to draw upon their
year-long training to design and implement a curriculum unit that combined content and
arts standards, and helped young people develop skills in media analysis and
communication through a creative multimedia project.

During the Summer Institute, teachers met daily for a session in unit development
facilitated by arts advisors from the LAUSD Arts Education Branch. Participants were
introduced to a modified version of Wiggins and McTighe’s “backward curriculum
design” (Wiggins and McTighe, Understanding by Design. 1998), a method for creating
standards-based curriculum through active questioning and a clear articulation of desired
outcomes. This method of curriculum design has been identified by the Arts Education
Branch as a particularly valuable method for developing media arts curriculum in K-12
education because it grounds new and innovative approaches in an understanding of state
and district standards. By the end of the Summer Institute, teachers had completed
outlines of their unit plans.

In November 2005, teachers at each school site participated in a one-day “Lesson Study.”
Lesson Study is a form of professional development, originating from Japan, which
provides a structured process for refining curriculum through in-class observation of a
lesson and collective reflection on its effectiveness for student learning. Teachers from
each school selected a sample lesson related to media arts and/or media literacy. Then,
one teacher taught the lesson while being observed by the other teachers. Following the
lesson, the team met for the rest of the day to review, discuss, and revise the lesson.
Coaches and IML researchers were expected to participate in the Lesson Study activities
at each school and to provide feedback. To make the Lesson Study possible, funding
from the Wallis Annenberg Initiative provided teachers with a day of substitute teacher
coverage in order for them to be able to observe each other teach and participate in the
process of reflecting on and revising their curriculum. The intent was that this process
would help prepare teachers for successful implementation of their unit plans, as well as
provide them with useful professional development in the Lesson Study model of curriculum development.

**Ongoing Instructional Support and Technical Assistance**

Throughout their participation in the Initiative, participants received on-site instructional support and technical assistance from coaches, the IML, and LAUSD. The support and assistance was intended to help teachers and administrators solve site-specific challenges related to media and technology resources and to provide teachers with additional support for multimedia-integrated instruction.

Each school was assigned to work with one of five coaches during the year. The coaches entered into their roles with experience as teachers who produced and analyzed media in their own classrooms. The five coaches were recruited by LAUSD and their primary responsibility was to periodically visit the teachers at their school sites to provide support and advice for integrating multimedia literacy into their instruction. The coaches were expected to attend the ongoing workshops offered at the IML and participants were encouraged to contact their coaches for assistance at any time.

In addition to the support provided by the coaches, participants were given access to the expertise of the IML researchers and instructional staff. Similar to the role of the coaches, participants were encouraged to contact the IML researchers and instructional staff with questions and needs, and the IML researchers and instructional staff would respond either through web-based knowledge sharing or on-site technical assistance.

In addition to this evaluation, the Initiative included a research component with IML researchers dedicated to collecting ethnographic data. Throughout the year, the IML researchers visited the schools regularly to collect observational data. On average, the IML researchers spent one day per week at the schools. The role of the researchers was defined to be a participant researcher, meaning the researchers visited the schools to collect observational data. However, the researchers also provided direct support and assistance in the forms of modeling lessons, responding to technical questions, and providing teachers with feedback. As a result of this role, the researchers provided additional knowledge sharing, reflection, and technical support to the teachers.

**Evaluation Approach**

A team of external consultants provided evaluation services for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative during the 2005-2006 school year. The evaluation plan, developed in collaboration with IML researchers, included evaluation activities conducted by the external consultants, as well as the IML researchers. The external consultants were responsible for developing survey instruments, a classroom observation protocol, and the interview and observation protocols for the site visits. The external evaluation team also provided guidance on the design of the Initiative’s activities database that was used to document implementation and participation rates. The IML researchers contributed to the evaluation efforts by conducting observations of participating classrooms and by
providing the evaluation team with observational field notes and other data relevant to the evaluation questions.

**Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation aimed to address the relationships between the (a) the context in which the Initiative was initiated, (b) the implementation of the various Initiative activities, and (c) the outcomes for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students. The following evaluation questions were proposed to address these relationships:

*Participant & School Characteristics*

1. What were the characteristics of participating middle school administrators, teachers, and coaches?
2. What were the characteristics of the middle school environments?

*Wallis Annenberg Initiative Implementation*

3. How were the activities implemented?
4. What were the value, quality, and utility of the Initiative’s professional development activities?
5. Was the unit development process useful to educators?
6. What were the mediating factors that affected implementation?

*Teacher Outcomes*

7. In what ways did participating teachers increase their knowledge and skills in multimedia literacy, production, and analysis?
8. In what ways did participating teachers increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy (including facilitating students’ multimedia knowledge, production, etc.) and assessment of student learning?
9. In what ways were participating teachers able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of a standards-based instructional unit?
10. To what extent did involvement in this project help teachers understand the integration of multimedia across different subject areas?
11. To what extent did the Initiative foster or allow for the initiation of other activities?

*Administrator Outcomes*

12. In what ways did administrators perceive the Initiative as helping them learn effective strategies to support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at their schools?
13. How did administrators support the facilitation of multimedia instruction and learning at their school sites?
Coach Outcomes

14. In what ways did coaches increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy?
15. In what ways did coaches support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at the school sites?

Student Outcomes

16. What were the characteristics of participating middle school students?
17. What background knowledge and prior experiences did students have related to media and technology?
18. How did participating in the Initiative influence students (e.g., interest, motivation, engagement, learning)?

Evaluation Methods and Data Sources

The evaluation team used a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to address the evaluation questions. A table illustrating the connection between each question, method, and data source is presented in the Appendix A. This table also distinguishes the data collection responsibilities between the external consultants and the IML researchers.

Pre-Survey and Year-End Survey

To determine the degree to which teachers implemented what they learned in the professional development activities, the evaluation team created two survey instruments, in collaboration with the IML researchers. The first survey instrument was designed to collect information about participating teachers’ and coaches’ backgrounds and experiences using technology and multimedia in the classroom prior to their involvement in the Initiative. The second instrument was designed to collect information about the changes in the participants’ knowledge and skills using technology and multimedia. The evaluation team provided the IML staff with a summary of the Pre-Survey responses in October. This report presents comparisons of results between the Pre-Survey and Year-End Survey data.

Both the Pre-Survey and the Year-End Survey were administered online by the IML researchers to participating teachers and administrators. The year began with five schools and 25 participants (15 teachers, 5 assistant principals, and 5 coaches). At the end of the year, 22 participants were actively involved with Initiative (13 teachers, 5 assistant principals, and 4 coaches). Table 1 presents the response rates for each survey administration.
Table 1. Survey Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Survey (August 2005)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Response Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>92%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year-End Survey (June 2006)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Response Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This response rate was calculated based on 19 responses of 22 total participants and does not include the “other” in the calculation.

Classroom Observation Protocol

To further document the implementation of the Initiative, the evaluation team developed a classroom observation protocol in collaboration with the IML researchers. The classroom observation protocol provided a standard form for recording observations of the middle school classrooms. The observation data provided supporting evidence regarding the ways in which the teachers increased their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy and how they were able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of a standards-based instructional unit.

The IML researchers conducted classroom observations between January and May 2006. Observations lasted approximately 45 minutes. Table 2 presents the number of observations conducted in each school.

Table 2. Classroom Observations Conducted by IML Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Classroom Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summer Institute and Workshop Questionnaires

In collaboration with the IML researchers, the evaluation team developed questionnaires that the IML researchers administered to teachers at the end of the Summer Institute and three of the four follow-up workshops. The questionnaires asked participants about the quality and utility of the professional development. The questionnaires were administered on-site at the conclusion of each professional development session. The evaluation team provided the IML staff with summaries of the workshop questionnaire findings in October and December.

Site Visits

A primary interest of this evaluation was to document changes in teachers’ behaviors and approaches in the classroom as a result of their participation in the Initiative. Direct observation by the IML researchers, as noted above, provided an opportunity to identify changes in classroom practices. However, it is important to note that single 45-minute classroom observations, such as those used in this study, do not necessarily provide comprehensive depictions of teachers’ practices. To address this concern, the evaluation team conducted site visits that included interviews with teachers and administrators to gather additional contextual information regarding classroom practices and perceptions regarding the quality of the professional development. The site visit interviews and focus groups were useful in providing a context for the classroom observations.

Site visits were conducted in May 2006 to each of the five participating middle schools. Site visits included individual interviews with the school administrators and coaches, and focus groups with participating teachers and a sample of their students. In preparation for the visits, the evaluation team created interview and focus group protocols, which were submitted to the IML researchers for review and feedback. The site visit interview and focus group protocols are included in the Appendix. In addition, the consultants provided the IML researchers with several documents designed to facilitate the scheduling of the site visit itineraries. The IML researchers arranged the site visit schedules.

Two evaluators visited the five schools during the week of May 1-5, 2006. The IML researchers accompanied the evaluators on the site visits to make introductions and to direct the evaluators to the various interview locations. In addition to the interviews and focus groups, the evaluators conducted brief classroom observations and tours of the schools. Interviews with the coaches were conducted at the schools and at the IML offices. Table 3 shows the number of participants in the site visit interviews and focus groups.
Table 3. Number of Participants in Site Visit Interviews and Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Berendo</th>
<th>Dana</th>
<th>Mark Twain</th>
<th>Markham</th>
<th>Mulholland</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers interviewed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators interviewed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches interviewed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students interviewed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Los Angeles Unified School District Arts Advisor Interviews*

Interviews were conducted with two LAUSD Arts Advisors and one Media Arts Advisor who were involved in the design and implementation of the Initiative. The purpose of the interviews was to gather background information about the advisors’ and the district’s involvement in the Initiative. The interview protocols were also designed to solicit the advisors’ perspectives about the training experiences, the district's support of the Initiative, insights about the quality and influence of the Initiative so far, and their suggestions for improvements to future work. The interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes and were conducted by telephone. The LAUSD Arts Advisory interview protocol is included in the Appendix.

**Analysis**

An important measure of the effectiveness of a professional development program is its ability to improve teacher and student outcomes. The link between teachers’ professional development experiences and student learning is not a direct one, but mediated by a variety of factors, such as the quality of the professional development, administrator and school support structures, teachers’ knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy, and a variety of cultural and family factors. This evaluation attempted to address a number of the potential factors that mediated the linkages between the professional development and the intended outcomes. In addition, this evaluation addressed several other conceptual questions that helped guide the analyses conducted for this study.

- What can be learned from the Initiative about multimedia literacy pedagogy and standards-based curricula development?
- What can be learned from the Initiative about the application of multimedia literacy professional development in the middle school environment?
- What can be learned from the Initiative about sustaining the approaches and strategies?
Limitations

This exploratory investigation used survey, interview, and observation methodologies in order to better understand the relationships between context, implementation, and outcomes of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative. Although this study makes progress in answering the evaluation questions listed above, the results should be interpreted with an awareness of the methodological limitations of this study. The limitations relate to: (1) the relatively short time frame in which teachers participated in the Initiative, (2) the measurement of the variables selected for investigation, and (3) the extent to which the findings generalize to other contexts. The following is a description and comment on each of these limitations.

One limitation relates to the period of time in which this evaluation took place. Evaluations of professional development Initiatives and their impacts require that the professional development itself, as well as the collection of data, take place over an extended period of time. A longitudinal design allows the evaluation to assess the changes that took place in teachers’ practices and organizational structures over time to see if those changes become institutionalized. Although this evaluation marks the beginning of such a process, the relatively short time frame in which the outcomes were assessed is not long enough to determine whether any changes that result will be long-lasting.

Another limitation of this study was the measurement of multimedia production, analysis, and pedagogy and media arts. These constructs are complex variables that were measured using rather simple instruments, particularly the survey instruments. In fact, it is not altogether clear that there is consensus in the field regarding the definitions of multimedia literacy and multimedia pedagogy. Because of the emerging understandings of these variables and the variety of contexts in which they are implemented, the tools for measuring them need further development in order to provide a more complete assessment of multimedia literacy and multimedia pedagogy. Further development of the instruments to assess these variables will significantly increase the ability to evaluate the Initiative more effectively, as well as the ability for teachers, administrators, and technical assistance providers to become more diagnostic as they continue to implement and revise multimedia teaching and learning strategies in the future.

Finally, the site visits involved only a small number of teachers. This small sample raises questions about how representative the evaluation findings are. Despite the small sample, the combination of multiple surveys throughout the year and the collection of qualitative data yield credibility to the findings. Furthermore, the rich description of the various factors facilitating the use of multimedia and technology in classroom practices provided a number of conclusions about the design and content of professional development for practitioners interested in multimedia literacy and pedagogy.
Evaluation Findings

This evaluation aimed to address the relationships between the (a) the context in which the Initiative was initiated, (b) the implementation of the various Initiative activities, and (c) the outcomes for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students. The findings are organized by three categories of questions: (1) participant and school characteristics, (2) implementation, and (3) outcomes for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students.

Participant, School, and Student Characteristics

The 2005-2006 Wallis Annenberg Initiative recruited school teams from the Los Angeles area, making a concerted effort to provide the resources and opportunities of the Initiative to children from underserved communities. The selected schools—Berendo, Dana, Mark Twain, Markham, and Mulholland—represent the neighborhoods of South Central and West Los Angeles, Watts, San Pedro, and Van Nuys. As illustrated in Table 4, these schools serve relatively high concentrations of minority students, particularly of African American and Hispanic/Latino descent. Students attending these schools face significant educational disadvantages. For example, the schools’ overall Academic Performance Index scores in 2004 ranked them between 1 and 3 on a scale from 1 to 10 (with one being the lowest and ten being the highest). All five schools are also all classified as Title I schools, meaning their students face high rates of poverty. According to LAUSD, the demographic composition of the participating schools in 2003-2004 was as follows:

Table 4. Demographics of Participating Schools’ Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White, Indian, Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berendo (Central LA)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana (San Pedro)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham (Watts)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain (West LA)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland (Van Nuys)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Initiative began, each school team was comprised of three teachers and one administrator. In total, there were 15 teachers and 5 assistant principals. The teachers represented a range of disciplines, including: Language Arts (4 teachers), Social Studies/History (3 teachers), Science/Math (2 teachers), Theater (1 teacher), Visual Arts (4 teacher), and Computer/Technology (1 teacher). In one school, Mulholland, the three teachers were also special education teachers.
Schools were selected based on their ability to demonstrate their commitment to integrated, project-based learning, standards-based instruction, and collaborative teaching. The school sites also had to meet minimum criteria for technology support at their campus, and they had to be characterized as having an administrative vision and leadership for teacher professional development related to media arts and media literacy. Individual characteristics of each school are described briefly below.

Markham came into the initiative with a look toward the future. The members of this team had some experience with media arts through their business and technology courses. One or two teachers at the school were leading the way for media-related instruction in the school. Team members described themselves as having “very little” in the way of equipment, resources, or pedagogy for media literacy or media arts. However, expressing high interest in the Initiative (some had to be turned away), the team members began their time in the project with a desire to expand their students’ educational competencies and to help student be competitive in careers increasingly based on skills learned through arts and multimedia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Population: 2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers/Multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with access to computers and Internet at home: Few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mulholland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Population: 1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with access to computers and Internet at home: Most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the schools in the Initiative have diverse student populations both ethnically/racially and in student achievement. Mulholland chose to situate their experiences in the Initiative in ways that allowed them to create learning environments for students where technology leveled the playing field for all the students. This school’s momentum in seeking opportunities for teacher professional development in technology and media made this Initiative a natural fit. All members of this school team had some immediate experiences using media with instruction and they aimed to use this Initiative to learn more methods for infusing media into the curriculum. The school had extensive facilities: a computer lab, computers with high speed Internet access in every classroom, and a team of technology supporters across their school community. The school also had a campus technology coordinator to instruct, troubleshoot, and supply teachers with needed technology resources. The norm at this school is steadily coming to be that teachers and students showcase their learning, knowledge, and creative endeavors through projects using media, visual, and performing arts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Population: 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the start of the project, a member of the team at Dana described their school as being a “technically literate school” committed to arts and media at the core curriculum. Dana entered the initiative with the goal of continuing their ongoing mission to promote visual performing and media arts. Students had the use of computer lab during and after school and could enroll in computer literacy courses. Each classroom had at least one computer and teachers had access to projectors, cameras, printers, and other technology equipment for instruction. A technical team of support staff, teachers, and students had been formed to help troubleshoot technical difficulties during instruction. Dana saw the Initiative as an opportunity to develop teachers’ ability to teach students to do sophisticated multimedia projects and presentations.

One leading teacher is sometimes all that is needed to make a difference in a school. Mark Twain had that teacher as a team member leading the way in recruiting interested others to participate in the Initiative. Technology resources were not in abundant supply at this school. However, there was enough to get things started with the Initiative. The school depended on district supplied technical support rather than a campus-based person to assist with technical difficulties. The team members were focused on their students and the benefits of this Initiative for student learning and future success.

Berendo has the equipment. With two computer labs, laptop mobile carts for science and mathematics classes, and numerous computers with high speed Internet access, Berendo considered itself wired and ready to participate in the Initiative. Teachers had the support of an on-site technical coordinator to assist them in using multimedia. Additionally, the school had experienced the results of a small informal community that formed around an informal network of teachers using video and musical arts in their instruction. One of the reasons for participating in the Initiative was to help young people be more prepared to face a media rich world by sharing the passion and enthusiasm they have for teaching with technology and media.
In order to get a sense for teachers’ typical use of technology in the classroom, they were asked, prior to the Summer Institute, how often during the previous school year they had used different types of technology. For each type of technology listed, teachers indicated the frequency of their use as never, once or twice a year, at least once a month, at least once a week, or everyday.

As shown in Table 5:

- More than three-quarters of the teachers had used the Internet to research information weekly or daily.
- More than 60% of the teachers prepared electronic curriculum maps and lessons either weekly or daily.
- Approximately one-third of teachers had produced and edited media with students, and collected digital images, movies, or sound from the Internet on a monthly basis.

## Table 5. Teachers’ Prior Use of Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the last year, how often did you:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Year</th>
<th>At Least Once a Month</th>
<th>At Least Once a Week</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs, social bookmarking) for collaboration with teachers?</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep a personal or teacher blog or other form of electronic journal?</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with district arts specialists for ideas or directions for instruction with multimedia production?</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and maintain Web pages?</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with other teachers at your school to plan multimedia activities in your content area?</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) with students?</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate information to students using presentation software?</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with other teachers or professionals via online communications?</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for course instruction or projects?</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare curriculum maps or lesson plans electronically?</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research information or ideas using the Internet for classroom use?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 13 Note. Percentages represent small numbers of people.
In contrast to these examples of frequent technology use, more than 85% of teachers had never used social software or maintained a blog prior to participating in the Initiative and 77% had never created a Web page.

With regard to communication and collaboration, more than three-quarters of the teachers (77%) had never consulted with a district arts specialist for ideas using multimedia production with instruction, and 39% had never collaborated with other teachers at their school to plan multimedia activities. However, 39% of teachers communicated online with other teachers about once per month.

Prior to the start of the Initiative, teachers were asked to rate their level of experience with multimedia analysis skills using the scale: not very experienced, somewhat experienced, moderately experienced, very experienced, or expert. As indicated in Table 6, teachers’ self-reports indicated that very few considered themselves to be very experienced or expert with multimedia analysis skills prior to the start of the Initiative. However, approximately two-thirds of the responding teachers felt somewhat or moderately experienced with identifying: (a) the main ideas in media messages; (b) the main purposes of media messages; (c) the various points of view in a media message; and (d) the production techniques used to shape the message content.

Table 6. Teachers’ Self-reported Experience Levels with Multimedia Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your level of experience in:</th>
<th>Not very experienced</th>
<th>Somewhat experienced</th>
<th>Moderately experienced</th>
<th>Very experienced</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the main ideas in media messages or productions.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the purpose in media messages or productions.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying various points of view displayed in a media message or production.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying structural features of a media message or production.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying production techniques to shape the point of view and message content.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating multimedia literacy into your instructional content area.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 13
Note. Percentages represent small numbers of people.
When asked to share their reasons for engaging in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, teachers focused on the opportunity to gain new knowledge and acquire new skills that would ultimately benefit students. For example,

“The reason I signed up for the Wallis Annenberg program is to learn more about my content area, so that I could bring back more for my students. Media literacy and analysis are the two main areas that I feel this program will help me with.”

“I believed it to be an invaluable way to learn to integrate multimedia and technology into my history curriculum. It was also a chance to engage with other teachers with the same interest.”

“I am not satisfied with the amount of technology I have incorporated into my teaching. Through the Annenberg Initiative, I hope to learn more about different forms of multimedia and how I can adapt and teach those programs to my students.”

Teachers were also asked to share their expectations for what their students would gain as a result of their teacher’s participation in the Initiative. A representative selection of the teachers’ comments follows:

“I want my students to learn to be more discriminating about media's validity. I want them to question what they see and hear. I also, want them to be able to produce not only still images, but also animated messages. I want them to be multi-literate.”

“I expect students to gain confidence in using technology. I would like my students to use technology to do research and produce creative works of art as an expression of their interpretation of reading comprehension projects.”

“I expect my students to be able to learn and integrate their understanding of standards of different subjects through the use of multimedia technology.”

“I’d like my students to be able to create a multimedia presentation that demonstrates their understanding of various science content standards.”

“I want them to want to go out and buy a computer. I want them to see it as more than something "college people" have. . . a fancy typewriter. I want them to want to see themselves as being able to be one of those "college people."

“By the time this Initiative is over, I would like to see that my students are comfortable with the technology as well as capable to express content and thoughts via multimedia projects.”

“I hope my students will have more access to technology. I hope that they will understand basic skills for a computer as well as extensive programs such as iMovie and PowerPoint. I hope they will be able to express themselves through technology.”
Implementation of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative

Three evaluation questions were asked about the implementation of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative:

- To what extent was the Initiative implemented as intended?
- What were the value, quality, and utility of the professional development?
- What were the mediating factors that affected Initiative implementation?

Summer Institute

One hundred percent of the teachers and coaches and four of the five administrators attended the Summer Institute.

Table 7. Summer Institute Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14 of 14</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immediately following the Summer Institute, the attendees were asked to share their experiences and opinions of the Institute by completing a survey. Participants rated the Institute on several dimensions using the scale: not useful, slightly useful, moderately useful, or very useful.

- 91% of respondents found the hands-on production activities very useful.
- 83% of respondents thought the organization of the sessions were very useful.
- 83% of respondents found the presentation of the information to be very useful.

Participants viewed the Summer Institute as a very positive experience. All participants found their instructors to be knowledgeable, and the vast majority of attendees thought the hands-on production activities, the organization of sessions, and the presentation of information were very useful.

Respondents indicated that they came away feeling more prepared to integrate media literacy into their classrooms. As shown in Table 8, respondents rated their agreement with statements about the Institute using the scale: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree.
Table 8. Summer Institute Agreement Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speakers and leaders were knowledgeable about the content they presented.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute helped them to increase their knowledge of how multimedia literacy can be integrated into instruction.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute helped them understand how student thinking can be extended through media literacy.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They would recommend the Institute to others.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sessions provided opportunities to practice media production skills and receive feedback from instructors.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute helped them acquire the design and technical skills needed to complete a media project.</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute provided them with active learning experiences that engaged them in meaningful ways.</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The technical level of the Institute was right for the audience.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 24

When asked how they expected to use the information and skills acquired during the Institute, teachers reported the following:

“Incorporate media arts standards with language arts standards to help students interpret meaning through reading.”

“My special education students have never experienced this type of multi media in the past. I am excited to implement our multi-media unit in the class. I know it will take a lot of patience and support on my behalf to implement this program...”

“I am planning to enhance the way that I have been using film in class over the last few years. I haven’t until now had training on arts concepts and filmmaking technique.”

“I plan on including more media analysis and deconstruction in my classes. I plan on using iMovie to give my students another platform to present their ideas.”

“The information gathered in the WAI institute will help me develop my lessons in a more dynamic way. It will help me introduce media and technology to students. It will help me explain how the arts are very well involved with technology and media.”

School administrators added that they would use the information and skills to do the following:

"I will incorporate more media literacy connections into professional development and teacher collaboration. This should hopefully reach the students.”
“I plan to survey teachers to determine who has media skills and to what extent these skills are used in the classroom and how we can increase the use of media skills in all classes. Many of our classes are set up to use media, but we need more resources. Therefore, finding out about the resources we have and need would be another step.”

“I hope to use the new media skills I have acquired to communicate more effectively with large groups of students, parents and teachers.”

Workshops

The attendance rates for each workshop ranged between 17 and 20 participants, with attendance highest at the October workshop. Feedback surveys were given at the conclusion of three of the four workshops: October, December, and February. Surveys were not administered following the fourth workshop in June because the focus of the workshop was having the participants display their accomplishments and projects to one another and did not include the presentation of a significant amount of new content. Further, the year-end survey was administered around the same time and it was determined unnecessary to ask participants to complete two surveys during the same time period.

Table 9. Workshop Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked to describe the workshops, overall, as poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent, between 73% and 87% of the respondents said the workshops were very good or excellent. See the Table 10 for respondents’ ratings across the three workshops.

**Table 10. Overall Ratings of the Workshops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October Workshop (N = 18)</th>
<th>December Workshop (N = 13)</th>
<th>February Workshop (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Surveys were not administered at the June workshop.

Respondents’ overall opinions about the workshops were further probed by asking them to rate the workshops on dimensions specific to the presenters, content, and format. Participants were asked to state their level of agreement with several statements about the workshops using the scale: strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed, or strongly agreed.

As shown in Table 11, respondents thought the workshop presenters were knowledgeable and interesting, they thought the content was clearly presented and professionally useful, and they felt they had opportunities to exchange ideas with others and practice their new skills.

**Table 11. Agreement Ratings of the Workshops**

|                                                               | October Workshop (N = 19) | December Workshop (N = 13) | February Workshop (N = 16) |
|                                                               | Agreed or Strongly Agreed | Agreed or Strongly Agreed   | Agreed or Strongly Agreed   |
| The presenters were knowledgeable about the content.          | 100%                      | 100%                       | 100%                        |
| The objectives were clearly presented and implemented.       | 95%                       | 100%                       | 100%                        |
| The presenters generated interest in the topics.             | 95%                       | 100%                       | 94%                         |
| The workshop will be useful to their work.                   | 89%                       | 100%                       | 100%                        |
| They had opportunities to share ideas and learn from others. | 89%                       | 100%                       | 81%                         |
| The workshop provided active learning experiences that engaged them in meaningful ways. | 89%                       | 100%                       | 94%                         |
| The workshop provided them with an opportunity to practice new skills. | 83%                       | 92%                        | 100%                        |
Participants were asked how they felt about the technical level of the workshops. Participants indicated whether the workshops were too elementary, at just the right level of difficulty, or too technical. As shown in Table 12, nearly all respondents reported that the workshops were presented at a comfortable level of difficulty.

### Table 12. Level of Difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October Workshop (N = 18)</th>
<th>December Workshop (N = 13)</th>
<th>February Workshop (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too elementary</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific to the October workshop, which emphasized teachers’ development of their units and the introduction of blogging, teachers were presented with several statements and asked to rate their agreement using the scale strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed, or strongly agreed. As shown in Table 13, all 18 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to give and receive feedback about unit development, and all 18 respondents felt better prepared to develop standards-based units using multimedia. Additionally, the majority of respondents saw the potential for using blogging to communicate with other participants and most respondents said that the October workshop gave them new ideas and skills.

### Table 13. Agreement Ratings Specific to the October Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learned how to give and receive feedback about unit development during the workshop.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better prepared to develop standards-based units using multimedia as a result of the workshop.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw the potential for blogging to be a useful way to communicate with and learn from others involved with the Initiative.</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop gave them ideas for how to design lessons using multimedia.</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired new technology skills to use in the classroom.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 18

The IML planned the December workshop using a different method than was used in October. Approximately one month before the workshop, IML staff asked participants to use the Initiative’s blog to communicate the types of technical assistance they wanted to receive at the workshop. In field notes recorded after the workshop, the IML staff acknowledged that the December workshop was challenging for the program developers, particularly because the participants had individualized needs. Despite the challenge of meeting the varied needs of the audience, the participants were very pleased with the workshop.
As seen in Table 14, the majority of the respondents to the December workshop survey indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the amount of hands-on time lab time, the amount of time spent on technical discussions, and the amount of time spent on pedagogical discussions.

Table 14. December Workshop Satisfaction Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The amount of hands-on lab time.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of time spent on technical discussions and tutorials.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of time spent on pedagogical discussions and tutorials.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 13

Teachers came to the December workshop with specific questions and the media practicum that was integrated into the workshop allowed the IML staff to address some of the technical hurdles that participants had experienced. Participants reported that they appreciated the opportunity to receive technical assistance that was responsive to their needs, and they indicated that they felt better prepared to move forward with their media instruction as a result of the practicum. Although the majority of respondents (77%) agreed that the workshop provided an opportunity to explore the creative and artistic elements of working with media, this aspect of the workshop was rated less positively than other aspects.

Table 15. December Workshop Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the media practicum, I am better prepared to move forward with my media instruction.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had the opportunity to receive useful technical assistance.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media practicum was responsive to my media and technology needs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In today’s workshop, I had the opportunity to explore creative and artistic elements of working with media.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 13
The February workshop focused on providing teachers with techniques for managing classroom media production, as well as encouraging teachers to explore the creative and artistic elements of working with media. Using the scale, *strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree*, the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop fulfilled its goals.

**Table 16. Agreement Ratings Specific to the February Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was helpful to spend the day completing my own media project.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more prepared to engage my students’ creativity and self-expression using media and technology.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had the opportunity to explore creative and artistic elements of working with media.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of why pre-production activities are important.</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned new and useful techniques for managing classroom media production activities.</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16

**Ongoing Instructional Support and Technical Assistance**

According to a database maintained by the IML researchers, the IML recorded 176 points of on-site contact with participants, in addition to the Summer Institute, workshops, and the assistance provided by the coaches. For each point of contact, the IML researchers described the purpose of the contact as being administrative, observational, instructional support, technical assistance, or working directly with students. Across the 175 points of contact for which purposes were identified:

- 49% of the contacts were visits that the IML researchers made for the purpose of collecting ethnographic data. As previously described, the researchers defined their role as participant researchers and during their visits they occasionally modeled lessons, answered technical questions, and provided teachers with feedback;
- 25% of the contacts were for administrative purposes;
- 14% of the contacts were to provide technical assistance;
- 9% of the contacts were to provide instructional support; and
- 3% of the contacts involved working with students.

Of the 176 points of contact, the majority (95%) occurred between the IML and the teachers. Far fewer exchanges occurred between the IML and administrators (5%). The majority of the contacts (73%) provided one-on-one assistance to participants, as opposed to group support.
The distribution of IML contact was slightly uneven across the five middle schools.

**Table 17. Contact With Each School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of All Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berendo</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 176 contact records

The IML provided support to the five schools beginning in August 2005 and continuing through June 2006. This evaluation analyzed contact records beginning in August 2005 and continuing through May 2006.

**Table 18. Contacts Each Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month of Contact</th>
<th>Percentage of All Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 176 contact records

The IML indicated in the database whether a participant, a coach, LAUSD, or the IML initiated the contact. The IML initiated 46% of the recorded contacts, the participants (teachers and administrators) initiated 34% of the contacts, the coaches initiated 11% of the contacts, and the remaining 9% of contacts were initiated by a combination of IML, LAUSD, and the coaches. On average, each contact lasted 87 minutes.

The teachers were asked to develop and implement a curriculum unit. In the process of developing the unit plan, the teachers were expected to use the unit development protocol and participate in a Lesson Study, both of which were intended to facilitate and support the unit development. One hundred percent of participating teachers completed their unit plans and utilized the unit development protocol. Three of the five schools completed the Lesson Study in full and two schools partially completed the Lesson Study.

The December workshop included a debriefing session about the Lesson Study led by LAUSD. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statement, “I found the Lesson Study Debrief session useful.” Sixty percent of respondents agreed with
the statement and an additional 30% strongly agreed. Ten percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

Separate from the activities and contacts database that the IML maintained, the coaches were expected to keep logs of the time they spent working for the Initiative. Across the five coaches, there was a significant amount of variability in how the logs were completed. As a result, the logs could not be summarized accurately or in meaningful terms.

**Initiative Implementation Summary**

The purpose of this section was to assess the effectiveness of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative by asking the following questions:

- To what extent were the Initiative activities implemented as intended?
- What were the value, quality, and utility of the professional development?
- What were the mediating factors that affected Initiative implementation?

The conclusions about implementation include:

- Based on the number and type of documented activities, the Initiative was carried out as planned.
- Based on the Summer Institute and workshop survey results, the professional development was of high quality, useful, and relevant to the teachers’ classroom practices.
- Based on the survey results, teachers reported mixed responses to the standards-based unit development and lesson study process.
- The knowledge sharing and on-site technical support that the IML provided to the schools exceeded 175 points of contact throughout the year. However, some schools received a greater percentage of contacts than others.
- The extent of the coaches’ support and technical assistance could not be analyzed due to inconsistent and incomplete activity logs.

**Teacher Outcomes**

The previous section presented findings about the degree of project implementation that occurred and participants’ perceptions of the quality of the professional development. The underlying assumption is that quality content and design, matched with high levels of implementation and support, will lead to the desired teacher outcomes. This section continues with this chain of evidence by presenting findings related to teacher outcomes that were expected to result from the Initiative. The Initiative was designed to influence four aspects of teachers’ practice: (1) experience levels and use of media and technology, (2) knowledge and skills related to multimedia production and analysis, (3) knowledge and skills related to multimedia pedagogy, and (4) the integration of technology and media with standards-based instructional units. The results from the pre- and year-end
surveys, classroom observations, and site visit interviews for each of the four teacher outcomes are presented below.

**Teachers’ Media and Technology Experience**

A first step in documenting the influence of the Initiative on teachers’ practices was to establish the teachers’ typical use of technology in the classroom before and after their participation in the project. To do this, the teachers were asked how often during the previous school year they had used several types of technology. On both the pre-survey and the post-survey, teachers were asked to rate the frequency of their use of a variety of technology and media along a 5-point scale (1=never, 2=once or twice a year, 3=at least once a month, 4=at least once a week, 5=every day). A comparison of the teachers’ mean ratings of their previous use of technology to the end of the year is presented in Figures 1-3.

**Figure 1. Teachers’ Mean Ratings of Technology and Media Use**

![Bar chart showing teachers' mean ratings of technology and media use.](chart.png)
Teachers’ mean frequency ratings on the post-survey for the various media and technology uses were generally greater than their mean ratings on the pre-survey prior to participating in the Initiative. Mean ratings for one item (research information or ideas using the Internet for classroom use) was not greater.
Site visit interviews revealed more about the context in which teachers’ use of media and technology changed as a result of their participation in the Initiative. In many cases, teachers explained that they had previously used media and technology in their classrooms, but that the Initiative enhanced what they were already doing or offered more experience with new applications or ideas for them to explore. Some teachers reported never using media or technology in their classrooms prior to their involvement with the Initiative, and others described the ways in which the focus on multimedia literacy was a new aspect that helped enrich their classroom practices. The following comments illustrate the ways in which teachers’ experiences with media and technology were influenced by the Initiative.

“But I mean as far as the technology that was something new to me. That was something new that I learned that I was able to teach the students.”

“I've been making iMovies with the kids for a long time. Maybe almost since I've been here like four years ago I started. But, what I decided to do was also to try podcasting. So that was new for me to try podcasting. The iMovie stuff was old. And then as far as the multimedia, literacy that was also new for me in terms of using those standards.”

“I had been using technology already. But it was more career based, more career-oriented where it was more of a, you know if you're a graphic designer these are the types of projects you're expected to do. You're showing them how to work the software. That was a huge component of my program. But it wasn't so much literacy and so that was new for me.”

Overall, the survey responses and site visit interviews indicated that teachers’ participation in the Initiative had a positive influence on teachers’ technology and media use.

Teachers’ Knowledge and Skills in Multimedia Production and Analysis

Prior to the start of the Initiative, and at the end of the year, teachers were asked to rate their level of experience with a variety of multimedia production and analysis skills using the scale: 1=not very experienced, 2=somewhat experienced, 3=moderately experienced, 4=very experienced, and 5=expert. To assess the effect of the professional development, the mean ratings were computed to compare teachers’ perceptions of their experience levels prior to and after their involvement in the Initiative. As shown in Figure 4, the reported experience levels at the end of the year were greater than at the beginning of the Initiative for all items.
During the IML researchers’ observations of teachers’ classrooms, they rated teachers’ multimedia literacy skills. Table 19 below shows the number of observations at each skill level related to multimedia literacy. The results from the classroom observations indicated that participants possessed a range of skill levels. For those skills that were observed, the majority of skill levels fell within the “somewhat skilled” and “very skilled” categories. These observations are consistent with the self-reported ratings of experience levels shared during the site visit interviews.
Table 19. IML Researchers’ Observations of Teacher’s Level of Multimedia Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not very skilled</th>
<th>Somewhat skilled</th>
<th>Moderately skilled</th>
<th>Very Skilled</th>
<th>Didn’t observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using basic technology (e.g., computers, printers, word processing,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation, spreadsheet software)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing or deconstructing media (e.g., careful or close reading/analysis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a film or video)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting media assets from the Internet (e.g., digital images, movies,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording images using a digital camera/camcorder</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using online journaling or blogging software</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting the entire lesson without relying on someone else for technical</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions or challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=11
Note: Two teachers’ classrooms were observed twice

In the site visit focus groups, teachers provided additional perspectives about the multimedia production and analysis component of the Initiative. The following quotes provide examples of the teachers’ experiences learning about multimedia production and analysis.

“But what really helped me was the media analysis part of it, which I really enjoyed - how you weren't just doing a project, but how to really view it and look at it and how you're going to present it. And even though sometimes people do something, and then intend to present something a certain way, it comes off that way. But this gives us a way to say, "Okay. How's my audience going to view this? Which I think is a very powerful tool. And to see how it's done. I thought that was very good for them to add that in to the project."

“Just learning how media can be used to get people to do certain things, that was very well shown in one of the Wallis Annenberg (Initiative) things we had, where they showed us a picture, and then they would show us a picture after that first picture. And they would say, "In this context, what does this mean?" And then they would change a preceding picture. And then they would show the same picture again. And then the whole context of it changed again, based not on sounds, but just showing two pictures in sequence of A and B. And then like C and B, how that changes the meaning too. So using images and sounds, and things of that sort for really teaching.”
While there is still considerable room for improvement and support, the increases in reported experience levels from the pre- to the post-survey, coupled with the classroom observations and site visit interviews, indicated that the Initiative had a positive influence on teachers’ multimedia production and analysis skills.

**Teachers’ Knowledge and Skills in Multimedia Pedagogy**

Another goal of the Initiative was to improve teachers’ knowledge and skills in multimedia pedagogy. The evaluation focused on two aspects of this: (1) integrating technology and media into classroom practices, and (2) teaching students about multimedia production and analysis and media arts.

Coming in to the Initiative, the majority of the teachers reported that instructing with technology was enjoyable and stimulating. Most of the teachers entered into the Initiative with very little hesitation or anxiety and they expected to benefit from the experience by learning how to incorporate media analysis and production into their instruction.

Teachers were asked on the pre-survey to state their level of agreement with statements about their attitudes on teaching with technology and media. Teachers made their ratings using the scale: *strongly disagreed, disagreed, neutral, agreed, or strongly agreed*.

Responses on the pre-survey indicated:

- 100% of responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed that it is important to teach students how to develop visual representations of their learning using media, and that it is essential for students to be media literate to be truly educated.
- 93% of responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they would benefit from learning how to integrate instruction various media analysis and production tools.
- 92% of responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed that instructing with technology or media is enjoyable and stimulating.
- 77% of responding teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that they hesitated to use technology or media in their instruction, or that using technology or media in their instruction made them feel tense and uncomfortable.

While responses on the post-survey were similar, a comparison of overall mean ratings revealed some changes in perspectives about teaching with technology and media. For example, compared to the beginning of the project, on average, slightly more of the responding teachers agreed at the end of the project that:

- They have a lot of experience using technology or media in their instruction.
- They feel qualified to lead students to use technology or media as an effective means to express their learning and understanding.
- It is important to teach students how to develop visual representations of their learning and understanding using media.
Similarly, compared to the beginning of the project, slightly more teachers disagreed at the end of the project that:

- They hesitate to use technology or media in their instruction because they do not feel prepared to solve problems that may arise.
- Using technology or media in instruction makes them feel tense and uncomfortable.
- Teaching students to use technology or media in the content area is too time consuming, costly, or difficult to accomplish.

The next set of Figures (5-7) presents teachers’ mean ratings on a 5-point scale of agreement about their perspectives on teaching with technology and media. The mean ratings for these survey items about teaching with technology and media are grouped into three categories: (1) teachers’ preparedness to teach with technology and media, (2) teachers’ affective perspectives about teaching with technology and media, and (3) teachers’ beliefs about the importance of teaching with technology and media.

As indicated in Figure 5, teachers reported being more prepared to teach with media and technology, on average, than they did at the beginning of the Initiative. They also tended to agree somewhat more at the end of the project that they would benefit from more training and support.

**Figure 5. Comparison of Teachers’ Mean Ratings of Perspectives on Preparedness for Teaching With Technology and Media**

![Chart showing mean ratings for various statements related to preparedness for teaching with technology and media.](attachment:chart.png)
As indicated in Figure 6, more teachers, on average, disagreed that they hesitate to teach with technology, that it is too difficult to use technology for teaching content, or that it makes them feel tense. In contrast, slightly more teachers, on average, agreed that they enjoy instructing with technology.

**Figure 6. Comparison of Teachers’ Mean Ratings of Affective Perspectives about Teaching With Technology and Media**

Finally, slightly more teachers, on average, agreed that it is essential for students to be media literate to be truly educated and that it is important to teach students how to develop visual representations of their learning and understanding using media.
IML researchers’ observations of participating teachers’ classrooms illustrated ways in which teachers have learned to incorporate technology into their classroom practice. Table 20 shows the number observations at each skill level. The results from the classroom observations indicated a range of skill levels in facilitating the use of technology, however, it is notable that more teachers were observed at the “very skilled” or “moderately skilled” levels than were at the “somewhat skilled” or “not very skilled” levels. These observations are consistent with the self-reports of positive attitude and prior experience with using technology and media.
Table 20. IML Researchers’ Observations of Teachers’ Ability to Facilitate the Use of Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not very skilled</th>
<th>Somewhat skilled</th>
<th>Moderately skilled</th>
<th>Very Skilled</th>
<th>Didn’t observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding to students’ questions about the use of technologies used in the lesson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clear instructions for how to use technologies</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to unanticipated challenges so that the lesson can still proceed smoothly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing students with ample hands-on time with technologies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping students use technology during lesson transitions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging critical/analytical discussions of media images</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=11

Note: Two teachers’ classrooms were observed twice

Teaching Multimedia Production and Analysis

In a related set of survey items, teachers were asked to respond to statements about teaching multimedia production and analysis. Teachers were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a 5-point scale where 1=strong disagree and 5=strongly agree. The comparison of mean responses to these items, presented in Figures 8 and 9, reveal little change. However, the slightly greater means in Figure 8 and the slightly lower means in Figure 9, which were the negatively worded (reversed) items, indicated that, overall, there was some influence on teachers’ perspectives about multimedia pedagogy in the predicted direction.
Figure 8. Comparison of Teachers’ Mean Ratings of Perspectives on Teaching, Learning, and Multimedia Literacy

- Primary goal is to cover material
- Not necessary for students to understand media messages to be proficient in content
- Students motivated to learn by active involvement
- Identifying/analyzing components of media messages is important part of multimedia literacy
- Working in groups is efficient way to learn
- Using multimedia helps students to connect with what they are learning

Post (n=10)
Pre (n=13)

Figure 9. Comparison of Teachers’ Mean Ratings of Perspectives on Teaching, Learning, and Multimedia Literacy (Reverse Items)

- Only especially talented teachers can creatively lead students
- Students should learn basic facts before creating multimedia assignments
- Creating hands-on multimedia activities is too time-consuming

Post (n=10)
Pre (n=13)
During the observations of teachers’ classrooms, the IML researchers rated teachers’ levels of skill in multimedia pedagogy. Table 21 shows the number observations at each skill level. The skills with the highest number of “very skilled” ratings were: (1) demonstrating technology skills during the lesson, (2) being comfortable incorporating technology and media into the classroom, and (3) designing instruction for their grade level/subject area using media. The observations included only two skills that were rated as “not very skilled” more than once: extending student thinking in content area topics while engaged in media-related lessons and encouraging students to explore new ways of making arguments using media.

Table 21. IML Researchers’ Observations of Teacher’s Multimedia Pedagogy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Not very skilled</th>
<th>Somewhat skilled</th>
<th>Moderately skilled</th>
<th>Very Skilled</th>
<th>Didn’t Observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students to critically analyze and interpret media</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing instruction for their grade level/subject area using media (e.g., using multimedia in presentations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading students to create media projects (e.g., multimedia presentations, digital movies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending student thinking in content area topics while engaged in media-related lesson</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students to explore new ways of making arguments using media</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating for students how to Critically analyze and interpret media</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating technology skills during the Lesson</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being comfortable incorporating technology and media into the classroom</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELPING STUDENTS TO CONCEPTUALIZE AND CREATE MEANINGFUL CONTENT DESIGN AND IDEAS FOR PROJECTS (E.G., SCAFFOLDING THE PRODUCTION PROCESS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing time and resources in relation to the available resources and infrastructure (e.g., good use of lab instructor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=11
Note: Two teachers’ classrooms were observed twice

Learning how to integrate media and technology into classroom practice and teaching about multimedia production and analysis are complicated tasks, mediated by a variety of factors, such as existing levels of experience that teachers have with the media or technology. One teacher’s comments during a site visit focus group reveals the complexities of adopting multimedia pedagogy, as well as the benefits of doing so.
“Every time you do something new, it’s a little disconcerting. So going through the first year, there’s some things that we’ve learned, that we can perfect as time goes by. But that’s just a part of natural learning. Every time you learn something new, there’s a little bit of stress associated with it. And a lot of it has to do with, in this case, classroom management. How are you going to manage a class through this? And build lesson plans? How am I going to scaffold this idea? And how am I going to use sheltered methodology and scaffolding techniques, and reciprocal teaching, and all these other sorts of things, incorporate that into the PowerPoint, and tie them to the standards. It’s pretty complicated. It requires some pre-thought. But once you get it going, it’s sustainable. You know it has momentum. Because the kids have so much interest in it, you know, it works well.”

Changes in the ways teachers help students to develop their multimedia production and analysis skills may take more time than other more common instructional approaches or strategies with which teachers may be more familiar. There are a number of nuanced skills and strategies for teaching multimedia production and analysis that teachers are asked to adopt at the same time that they are also asked to become more facile with the technology itself. One teacher explained in a site visit focus group how the Initiative helped her become more effective instructionally:

“When I first used to do iMovies it was like me screaming at them the whole hour, two hours the whole time. Because I didn't know what I was doing and it was too chaotic. So I learned to slow down. I've learned to relax. I've learned to listen more and you might be able to see that.”

Additionally, participants who responded to the post-survey were asked what, if anything, they gained from their experience with the Initiative. Their responses related to improved technological skills, organizational and collaboration skills, motivation, the ability to adopt multimedia pedagogy, and expanded beliefs or expectations about their students’ potential. Examples of their reported gains are presented below.

Technological skills:

“This year I have built up my confidence in the creation of power point presentations. I still have much to learn but feel much more comfortable with animations, timing, and collecting images to use.”

“Learned about Blogging!”

“I have gained a lot of technical information that has been very helpful. I have also learned from the other teachers how to best present certain information.”

Organizational and collaboration skills:

“I have gained better organizational skills by working with the team and have gained new friends from the experience with the Initiative.”
“I have gained insight into the Middle school educational environment. I have met colleagues who I hope to stay in touch with.”

“My skill in visioning projects and supporting my staff is better now. I learn so much form watching and interacting with your wonderful staff.”

Increased motivation and ability to adopt multimedia pedagogy:

“A renewed desire to continue using the latest technology in the classroom.”

“I gained insight and knowledge about what media arts is and how it can be incorporated in the Language arts curriculum. I am more confident as a teacher about using technology in the classroom.”

“In addition to the skills I have gained in the media Arts, I have gained self confidence in knowing that I can make these projects work in my classroom. I have also gained friendships and outstanding contacts!”

Expanded beliefs and expectations about students’ potential:

“I have confidence in my students and their abilities to learn technology.”

“This has been a teaching transforming experience for me. I never imagined that it will be possible to get so much out of my students while at the same time teach the standards, life skills, and computer and multimedia skills. I have gained a new way of teaching and addressing students’ needs while maintaining enthusiasm and excitement.”

As part of the classroom observation protocol, the IML researchers were asked to reflect on the improvements that the participating teachers made since the start of the year related to media production, media analysis, the ability to instruct with technology, and the ability to design effective lessons in content areas while at the same time incorporating media or technology. As indicated in Table 22, the IML researchers reported improvements in media production skills and instructing with technology. There was less reported improvement in designing effective lessons in the content area that incorporated media or technology. The researchers generally did not observe teachers’ media analysis skills; only one observation indicated improvement in that area.
Table 22. IML Researchers’ Perception of Teacher Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Teacher Improvements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the start of the year, have the teachers’ media production skills improved?</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the start of the year, have the teachers’ media analysis skills improved?</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the start of the year, have the teachers’ ability to instruct with technology improved?</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the start of the year, have the teachers’ ability to design effective lessons in the content area that incorporate media or technology improved?</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=9

Teachers’ Development of Standards-based Instructional Units

An important component of the Initiative was the focus on standards-based instructional units as the centerpiece for designing instruction using multimedia production and analysis. At the final workshop in June, teachers submitted their final unit plans. The unit plans addressed a variety of topics and content standards, as shown in Table 23. The majority of unit plans address the visual arts content standards. Three unit plans integrated visual arts standards with reading/language or writing standards.

Table 23. Content Standards Addressed in Teachers’ Final Unit Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Standard Addressed</th>
<th>Number of Unit Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts, Reading/Language, and Writing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts and Reading/Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts/Media Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content standard not identified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the June workshop, teachers were asked to respond to several questions about their experiences in the Initiative. One question addressed their experiences in developing the unit plans. In particular, teachers were asked how the experience of drafting "enduring understandings" helped them to develop unit plans. The following are representative examples of their hand-written responses, organized by theme.

Increased focus and greater clarity about specific/important concepts students should know:

“*The enduring understandings helped me develop my unit by providing a list of skills and knowledge I wanted my students to walk away with. The enduring understandings kept me on task as well as my students. It gave me a clear picture of what skills students were expected to walk away with.*”
“It gave me an idea of what my final goal is. What I want the student to take with him or her for the rest of their life.”

Improved planning and instruction process:

“ It allowed me to think about the backwards plan in lesson planning. Also concentrate on Media Arts Standards and focus on overall goals.”

“By developing an enduring understanding I was able to stay focused on it throughout the unit development. I would continually refer back to my enduring understandings and re-focus my lesson.”

Not helpful; already part of current practices:

“As a teacher with LAUSD, I have used different technology to create a lesson plan. The “enduring understandings” was a foreign terminology to me so it did not help me in developing a unit plan.”

“Just another title for “objectives” used for years.”

When asked during the site visits about their experiences developing the standards-based instructional units, teachers discussed the benefits, as well as the challenges. One teacher described how the selection of standards for their lessons provided a needed focus. Others reported ways in which they adapted the units or the Lesson Study process to their own circumstances or needs. Still others described challenges due to a lack of clarity about what they were expected to do for their projects. Examples of these experiences are provided below.

“I would say that they [standards-based instructional units] were very useful. That's what focused our entire year. I mean everything we did this year was focused around that. We thought we'd do our thing on the scientific method. Again, see the thing that we learned at the institute is that it’s not just for us. We're thinking we're going to absorb this stuff and we're going to come back and teach it to all our teachers at the school. And that's what made us choose the topics that we decided to do our PowerPoint on. So like the scientific method - our district assessments - the scientific method is addressed on all grade levels, and in every assessment. So that's like a key thing we wanted to focus on.”

“The lesson study and things - as a group, we needed to that. But individually, I kind of just had to go with what I was comfortable with in my classroom.”

“I think at the beginning, that people weren't exactly clear on exactly what it was that they really wanted to see on the paper. And that took a while. It really did. I was confused. The whole group was. And that took up a bit of time and I think that caused a bit of discomfort. And I think it kind of bogged us down... And so I think maybe more detail, a clearer explanation of what it is they expected.”
Met Expectations

When asked on the pre-survey to share their reasons for originally engaging in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, teachers focused on the opportunity to gain new knowledge and acquire new skills that would ultimately benefit students. When asked on the post-survey if their experiences with the Initiative met their expectations, respondents reported positive changes in teaching and learning for themselves and their students. The following are representative examples of responses to whether the Initiative met their expectations:

“It has beat my initial expectations. I honestly didn't know what I was getting into, but this has been a completely different year for me because of this Initiative. It has opened my eyes to incorporating technology into the lives of special education students.”

“I never imagined that my students would be able to produce so much work.”

“I didn't expect my experience to be this rewarding. I am more experienced with the computer and incorporating media arts in my classroom. I feel more confident as a teacher incorporating media arts in the curriculum. This was my first time using iMovie as well so the experience was a journey with my students.”

“Initially, I thought that the Initiative was going to be focused more on theory than on practice. While I still feel that this is true in some ways, I appreciate how the workshops eventually became more hands-on in nature.”

“I came in with little to no expectations. I was blown away with the level of professionalism and competency I encountered at the WAI. Everyone in my team continually looked forward to attending the workshops and working with both the WAI team and other teachers attending this program. It was / is a VERY positive experience. Thank you!!”

Although the majority of participants reported that the Initiative met their expectations, several respondents reported missed opportunities, such as wanting even more “hands-on time for teachers,” more information about “setting up shots” from a producer or director, and more tapping into the existing expertise of participants.

Summary of Teacher Outcomes

This section focused on the impact of the Initiative on teachers’ classroom practices. The evaluation questions addressed in this section included:

- In what ways did participating teachers increase their knowledge and skills in multimedia production and analysis?
- In what ways did participating teachers increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy (including facilitating students’ multimedia knowledge, production, etc.) and assessment of student learning?
In what ways were participating teachers able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of a standards-based instructional unit?

To what extent did involvement in this project help teachers understand the integration of multimedia across different subject areas?

To what extent does the Initiative foster or allow for the initiation of other activities?

Together, the findings indicated that although the teachers began the Initiative with few hesitations and a positive outlook toward media and technology, their teaching practices and perspectives about multimedia production and analysis were positively influenced by their participation in the Initiative. For example, teachers’ mean ratings of media and technology use for instruction or for personal use were greater on the post-survey than the pre-survey for almost all items. The same pattern was true for teachers’ ratings of their own multimedia analysis skills.

Although the differences in mean ratings were much smaller, teachers’ attitudes on the post-survey about teaching and learning with media and technology were more positive on average than their responses on the pre-survey. In addition, the IML researchers’ observations of the teachers’ classrooms indicated some growth in teachers’ multimedia knowledge and skills. Although there was a range of experience and skill levels observed, teachers were attempting to implement the strategies and approaches to multimedia pedagogy they learned in the Summer Institute and workshops.

Evidence from the final unit plans provide some evidence that the teachers were successful in understanding the use of multimedia in instruction, but not as much in terms of integrating multimedia across different subject areas. This may be a skill or strategy that was not fully realized or developed by teachers. Finally, teachers’ own reports about the changes in their teaching practices and skill levels indicated that the majority of teachers have been positively influenced by their participation in this Initiative. Several interviewees reported that they would likely continue using media and technology in all of their courses and would be interested in more professional development opportunities to continue implementing what they learned.

**Administrator Outcomes**

School administrators, as an integral part of the middle school teams, participated from the onset of the Initiative. Administrators were apprised of the Initiative’s goals for teachers and students through direct participation in recruitment and application efforts, the Summer Institute activities, and the workshops. This section presents findings related to administrator outcomes that were expected to result from their involvement in the Initiative. Generally, the evaluation was to ascertain middle school administrators’ perspectives on the effects of the Initiative on the teachers’ instruction and students’ learning experiences. Specifically, the Initiative endeavored to impact administrators’ (1) knowledge and understanding of effective strategies to support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at their school, (2) ways of supporting multimedia instruction
and learning at their schools, and (3) continuing understanding of the importance of media arts in education.

Administrators’ Growth in Supporting Multimedia Literacy at Schools

Administrators’ assessment of their schools’ access to technology and equipment was initially ascertained as part of the recruitment process for participation in the Initiative. As discussed previously, all schools indicated they had the equipment necessary to sustain the project and allow the teachers and students the resources they needed to successfully complete assignments. As most of the administrators indicated, only a small number of their students had access to computers or the Internet outside of the school. All of the principals expressed belief that it was important for students’ education to have access to technology and media rich learning experiences at their schools.

During the interviews, administrators were asked to describe their school’s climate for multimedia instruction and learning. Generally, administrators talked more directly about the school infrastructure and access to technology rather than media literacy and media arts. Out of the 5 administrators interviewed, 4 indicated their school had adequate computers, computer labs, and other technology equipment available to teachers and students. Three of the administrators admitted that the school technology was not being used at its optimum level. The other two administrators were maximizing their school’s technology and had budgeted funds to support teachers’ growth in confidence using technology and media equipment for instruction.

The administrators indicated they believed teachers were motivated to use technology and multimedia in instruction because of the convenience to them as instructors, as a means to organize and participate in required administrative activities, and as a means to foster student attention and interest in their learning. The administrators noted that as recent graduates experienced at using technology in college came to the schools using technology and media as instructional tools, older teachers, who had been resistant to the use of technology in their classrooms, often ended up trying various computer or technology tools in their instruction. Several administrators also indicated that as teachers were required to submit attendance, grades, or other administrative data electronically, it resulted in teachers having to extend their skills in the direction of more technology use as part of their professional responsibilities. Lastly, a few of the administrators observed that teachers were motivated to use technology and multimedia as a means to capture student interest and stimulate student motivation for learning.

“I think what motivates [teachers] mostly ... is that it’s motivating the students.”

“I think that the teachers that are using it see that it’s a way of hooking the kids, keeping the kids on task.”

Administrators said they promoted the use of technology among teachers and encouraged their efforts to involve students in media-based projects. The administrators mentioned that they pursued grants and other funding opportunities that provided teachers the
professional development or equipment they needed to teach content to students using media. Several administrators indicated that their schools were predisposed to the use of media or arts because of an overall emphasis in these types of educational initiatives by school administrators, teachers, parents, and community members. With a built in support for this type of Initiative, they felt like the real issue was simply making room for more teachers and students to participate in projects such as the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.

Administrators’ Support of Multimedia Literacy Instruction

Administrators generally agreed that the Summer Institute helped them increase their knowledge of how multimedia literacy can be integrated into instruction, understand how student thinking can be extended through media literacy, and helped them acquire the design and technical skills needed to complete a media project. After the Summer Institute, the administrators indicated how they expected to use the information and skills they learned:

"I will incorporate more media literacy connections into professional development and teacher collaboration. This should hopefully reach the students."

“I plan to survey teachers to determine who has media skills and to what extent these skills are used in the classroom and how we can increase the use of media skills in all classes. Many of our classes are set up to use media, but we need more resources. Therefore, finding out about the resources we have and need would be another step. Also, train teachers in media literacy and assist them with using the skills in the classroom.”

“I hope to use the new media skills I have acquired to communicate more effectively with large groups of students, parents and teachers.”

During the site visit interviews, administrators were asked to revisit their perspectives of how the Summer Institute and workshops helped prepare them to support multimedia instruction and learning at their schools. Generally, all the administrators indicated they appreciated the Summer Institute and workshops for the opportunity to interact with their teachers, but more so for the opportunity to expand their own skills and knowledge in multimedia production and analysis. Administrators specifically mentioned that they appreciated having the opportunities to be involved with their teachers in the creative process of brainstorming and planning for the instructional unit. They also enjoyed working alongside their teachers during the hands-on media production opportunities.

The administrators said they benefited from time spent observing students’ media projects. For example, administrators commented about how campus environments were impacted as students who were engaged in various video or digital photography productions worked on the projects outside of the classroom or involved other students, staff, or teachers in their productions. They also gave examples of how teachers and students shared their knowledge and experience with others on campus, in some
instances, working one-on-one to show students how to use PowerPoint or iMovie. They also said that students’ presentations of their work at parent teacher meetings, open houses, or other special events were well received by all involved as positive examples of student achievement and creativity.

All of the administrators felt their participation in the Initiative was in keeping with their ongoing efforts to provide arts-based or technology-based learning opportunities for students at their schools and they desired to participate in as many projects that furthered those goals as they could. As they participated in the Initiative, some of the administrators were able to dedicate funds to attain additional resources, such as digital cameras, for teachers. Others said their support occurred when they exercised flexibility by arranging additional lab time or temporarily suspended normal school procedures to accommodate instruction and student production time and activities. Throughout the project year, administrators’ plans for technology and media included creating new opportunities for teachers and students, such developing a media center or offering a room to be used as a technology club. Others encouraged teachers to participate in conferences and in-services where they could showcase their instructional enterprises with colleagues and others in the educational community. In these ways, administrators believed they could best support their teachers’ growth and encourage their implementation of instructional units that included media literacy and media arts, and at the same time, accomplish goals in improving student competency in writing, researching, processing information, and making oral presentations.

Some administrators seemed to have an expectation that the Initiative would affect non-participating teachers and students at their schools. The administrators thought their participation in the Initiative had a vicarious benefit in their schools as other teachers and administrators could visibly see their knowledge and support of the Initiative and thus, their level of commitment to the Initiative. For example, one administrator explained:

“I think you’re, wanting some teachers to really jump in to this. And then as they develop a proficiency with it then somebody else would say, oh well you know that looked pretty easy and I liked what your kids produced with that. So I’m going to try that. And I thought that was a good example and it was very simple and not overwhelming….”

Administrators’ Perspectives on Lasting Changes to their Perspectives Due to the Initiative

During the interviews, administrators were asked to speak about ways their thinking about the importance and value of media literacy and media arts in education had changed since their involvement in the Initiative. Several administrators spoke about how the use of media production projects in the content areas had allowed students to express their individuality and learning in new ways. For example, one administrator spoke about how his abiding concern that students learn to express their perspectives and concerns had expanded beyond thinking of student voice in terms of English/Language Arts competencies:
“These kinds of [media] projects are not like that. You know they’re not just simple and fill out a worksheet. So I think that that’s really where I’m thinking about, how do we use these tools to really motivate students to be able to express who they are? And then use that to get them motivated to really understand like you know the rules of rhetoric or looking at like now, persuasive standards…. But you know I think something like this really gives you a motivational way to make that happen and get the students more interested.”

Another administrator spoke about how lower-achieving students who would not have usually had power in school began interacting with other, more accomplished students in ways that showed their competence and confidence in what they were doing through media. Administrators explained that students at all achievement levels were able to put more of themselves into their work and create something they could share with others that expressed their learning and gave them a sense of accomplishment. Administrators valued these benefits and they were pleased that teachers, students, parents, and community members also appreciated and valued them. Administrators expressed satisfaction with the quality of the students’ work, as exemplified by one who declared, “I was amazed at the quality of work that [my teachers] were able to produce, and the students within their classes. I was absolutely amazed.”

Administrators’ suggestions for improving the Initiative included having more time dedicated to production experiences such as an entire day without an agenda at the IML lab to work on various media products. Administrators also hoped for continued involvement with the IML so the teachers could continue to improve their skills.

Summary of Administrator Outcomes

This section focused on the impact of the Initiative on administrators. The evaluation questions addressed in this section included:

- In what ways did administrators perceive the Initiative as helping them learn effective strategies to support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at their schools?
- How did administrators support the facilitation of multimedia instruction and learning at their school sites?

Together, the findings indicated that:

- The Initiative helped them increase their knowledge of how multimedia literacy can be integrated into instruction, as well as how student thinking can be extended through media literacy.
- Administrators appreciated having opportunities to be involved with their teachers in the creative process of brainstorming and planning for the instructional unit. They also enjoyed working alongside their teachers during the hands-on media production opportunities.
Several administrators spoke about how the use of media production projects in the content areas had allowed students to express their individuality and learning in new ways.

Coaches Outcomes

One of the values of the Initiative included the collaborative engagement of participants in media literacy and media arts experiences. The use of coaches assigned to assist the team at each middle school was envisioned as an opportunity for teachers to collaborate with an experienced educator who could provide practical advice and support about classroom level issues of integrating multimedia literacy into standards-based curricula. As reported earlier, teachers had little experience consulting with media arts specialists or other teachers about the use of multimedia activities in their content areas. The coaches were uniquely positioned within the Initiative to participate in the project, as well as observe and speak to issues that teachers often encounter when applying professional development to the classroom.

Coaches’ Background and Media and Technology Experience

Five coaches were recruited to participate in the Initiative by LAUSD media arts staff who invited secondary arts teachers they knew were experienced with integrating media production and arts in their content areas. Two other coaches, who served as general coaches to all of the schools, held unique positions as a technology administrator within a participating school and as a local artist and media educator experienced in working with middle school students. The coaches had extensive experience in media literacy, film, video and audio production, animation/cartooning, music, computer science, and integrated art.

Coaches’ Support of Multimedia Literacy, Instruction, and Learning

Coaches’ survey comments indicated they valued observing their teams working together and having an opportunity to interact with their teams at the professional development sessions. In the interviews, the coaches spoke at length about ways they were able to support the teachers at the schools, about how they personally valued the Initiative, and how the Initiative’s goals for the coaching role did or did not work for them. The coaches indicated that after having been invited, they were motivated to participate in the project out of curiosity, interest in media literacy with this student population, or appreciation for the goals of the Initiative.

The coaches were asked about the value of the training that oriented them to coaching techniques they could use to support the teachers’ media use in standards-based instruction at the schools. Two coaches indicated that they were able to attend the training for coaches. The other coaches’ responses to this item were mixed, indicating they did not find much value in the training and yet were generally appreciative of the Initiative. One coach, for example, said that they relied much more on their prior
knowledge and experience when interacting with the teachers than utilizing information provided by the Initiative.

The coaches’ expectations for their role were expressed during the interviews and in the year-end survey. Coaches’ comments indicated that they began the project with an understanding of their role as one of support to the middle school teachers, administrators, and students. They expected to establish an open line of communication and to be involved on campuses with teachers to offer their advice and expertise as needed. Several coaches intimated that they did not have much guidance on their role beyond that initial expectation. As the project drew to a close, a few of the coaches expressed that they did not experience everything they expected and they found that it was difficult to communicate with teachers who did not regularly use email, that their schools’ climate was not as conducive for successful implementation of the Initiative’s objectives as expected, and their assistance as coaches was not as much in demand as they at first thought it would be. Coaches indicated that they generally initiated contact with the schools and met with the teachers at points required by the Initiative. Several coaches expressed dissatisfaction with what they were able to contribute and accomplish through the Initiative. However, most of the coaches said the experiences they had with teachers who did request their assistance and who were responsive to their advice about media use and production in their classrooms were rewarding and beneficial.

The coaches reported that they supported the teachers in many ways. They assisted by:

- helping teachers get started and ascertain what and how to do what they needed,
- helping teachers with requirements for Lesson Study or instructional units,
- responding to teachers’ requests for assistance or ideas with media production,
- critiquing student work products,
- observing classes when instruction and learning with media took place,
- making suggestions for improving media production and classroom management,
- troubleshooting technical issues with equipment or tools, and
- listening to what teachers were doing and being supportive of their efforts.

The coaches valued the professional development as a means to increase their own media literacy, as well as the teachers’ skills and knowledge. Coaches said they thought the professional development sessions were valuable for their own learning as they participated with the teachers in production activities that allowed them to experience using media in ways they had not used before. For example, one coach who had a great deal of experience in video production had learned ways of using PowerPoint as an instructional tool with students. Other coaches valued the professional development for its contribution to their instruction and interaction with their own students.

Coaches spoke about how they could see that the teachers learned a great deal as they were able to take advantage of the technical assistance provided at the workshops and hands-on interaction with media production tools. Some coaches, however, noted that the instructional aspect of the project was not as well received as the media production aspect of the professional development sessions. They explained that this aspect of the Initiative
was not as clearly organized and presented to the participants. One coach suggested that the theory and understanding of media literacy was not as prominent in teachers’ thoughts about the Initiative as it could have been.

A few coaches thought the Lesson Study was inserted into the program in a manner that was awkward and difficult for the teachers to grasp. Two of the coaches felt, however, that some of aspects of the Lesson Study worked well with the teachers and was valuable once they “muddled through and got it all figured out.” Another coach asserted that the project took time away from teachers’ hands-on opportunities to work directly with technology tools. This coach further explained that teachers, like students, were more likely to remember and use a media tool they had become immersed in creating themselves. The struggle to use the tool to create, analyze, discover, and prepare information in new ways made instruction that co-occurs with that process of greater value.

The coaches were able to speak to changes they saw in the teachers as they participated in the project. The coaches commented that they:

- witnessed “huge production” and “massive changes in character” in what occurred in some of the teachers’ classrooms,
- noted that middle school students’ involvement in media-based learning environments fit well with their high energy levels as it captured their interest, and
- were impressed with the number and quality of the products the teachers and students produced as a result of the Initiative.

The coaches offered suggestions for improving the coaches’ role in future projects. Coaches noted that they had difficulty interacting on a regular basis with their middle school team and recommended that coaches be assigned to a campus within their own locale. That would allow the coach more opportunity to be involved with teachers and students at various points. Additionally, coaches noted the limitation of school infrastructures that hindered teachers from continuing their involvement at a full level. They noted a waning interest as teachers found it difficult to manage project activities due to inadequate technology resources at the school or teacher focus on school-based issues and changes including the preparation of students for state achievement tests.

Coaches suggested they be more involved in sharing their expertise with school teams by filling some of the instructional roles at the professional development sessions. The coaches spoke of a redundancy in roles due to IML technology specialists’ support at the school. While these coaches recognized that the schools benefited from competent support provided by IML researchers and technicians, it was at such a high level that it almost made the coaches’ role seem unnecessary. This situation made it difficult for the coaches to find a defined space to situate themselves with the teachers. As a result, the coaches felt they did a lot less than they expected. The coaches found it easiest to maintain a relationship and connectedness with the teachers at schools they could readily access, schools where technology and media use were highly supported by
administration, and schools with teachers who were highly motivated and involved in multiple media projects with their students.

**Summary of Coach Outcomes**

This section focused on the impact of the Initiative on coaches. The evaluation questions addressed in this section included:

- In what ways did coaches increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy?
- In what ways did coaches support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at the school sites?

Together, the findings indicated that:

- The coaches valued the professional development as a means to increase their own media literacy and arts knowledge and skills as well as the teachers.
- Some of the coaches expressed dissatisfaction with what they were able to contribute and accomplish through the Initiative. However, most of the coaches said the experiences they had with teachers who did request their assistance and who were responsive to their advice about media use and production in their classrooms were rewarding and beneficial.

**Student Outcomes**

As with most educational Initiatives, the student outcomes are ultimately the most important measure of a project’s success. Although the professional development activities took place within a year’s time frame, the IML and LAUSD staff, as well as the teachers, expected that teachers’ participation in the Initiative would result in improved outcomes for students of those teachers. This evaluation focused on the initial perceptions of teachers and students regarding their use of media and technology and the influence of multimedia teaching approaches on their learning and engagement with the content of the lessons. This section summarizes the results from student and teacher focus groups, as well as the pre-and post-survey results and the classroom observations related to student outcomes.

*Students’ Experience with Media and Technology Experience*

During site visit focus groups, students who have attended classes of the participating teachers were asked about their overall background and experience with media and technology. Students’ reported use of technology outside of school ranged from “almost nothing” to “a lot.” The students reported using iPods, Internet (MySpace, to play games and gather information for school classes), television, cell phones (including text messaging), computers, digital cameras, and video games.
On the pre- and post-surveys, teachers, coaches, and administrators were asked how often students use technology during class time. Figure 10 presents the comparison of pre- and post-survey mean ratings of perceived use for a sample of items related to students’ technology use. Levels of use were rated on a 5-point scale where 1=never, 2=once or twice a year, 3=at least once a month, 4=at least once a week, and 5=every day.

For all but two items (creating a newsletter/brochure and Web page), teachers’, coaches’, and administrators’ reported use of media and technology by students increased from the beginning of the project to the end of the project in June. Notably, survey respondents reported more use by students of computer applications and producing or editing media, which is consistent with the type of activities and projects implemented by teachers as a result of their participation in the Initiative.

Figure 10. Teachers’, Coaches’, and Administrators’ Mean Ratings of Student Use of Technology During Class Time

During classroom observations, the IML researchers recorded the amount of time they observed students engaging in a variety of media or technology related activities. The summary of observations related to student activities is presented in Table 24. In the 11 classrooms observed, the activity that students engaged in most often was preparing text and graphics for presentations. This was followed by using computer applications, researching information on the Internet, collecting digital images, and discussing or...
analyzing the meaning of messages. The activities that the students were not observed engaging in were preparing a newsletter or brochure using a desktop application, outreach with experts, authors, or students from other schools, keeping a blog or other form of electronic journal, and using “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs) for collaboration with others.

Table 24. IML Researchers’ Classroom Observations of Students Engaging in Media and Technology Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No time</th>
<th>Minimal time</th>
<th>Moderate to a great deal of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing text and graphics for presentations</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computer applications (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, etc) for a class assignment (software skills)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching information or ideas using the Internet</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for projects</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing and editing media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) for a class project</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing storyboards and/or scripts (preproduction) in preparation for a project</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing or analyzing the meaning of images</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and discussing the purpose and ideas to prepare for a project</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing keyboarding or basic computer skills (hardware skills)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a newsletter or brochure using a desktop application</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach with experts, authors, students from other schools, etc. via email, Internet, or videoconferencing (networking with others)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping a blog or other form of electronic journal</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs) for collaboration with others</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=11

Students’ and Teachers’ Perspectives of Classroom Experiences

Teachers were asked to share their expectations for what their students would gain as a result of their teacher’s participation in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative. A representative selection of the teachers’ comments follows:
“I want my students to learn to be more discriminating about media’s validity. I want them to question what they see and hear. I also, want them to be able to produce not only still images, but also animated messages. I want them to be multi-literate.”

“I expect students to gain confidence in using technology. I would like my students to use technology to do research and produce creative works of art as an expression of their interpretation of reading comprehension projects.”

“I expect my students to be able to learn and integrate their understanding of standards of different subjects through the use of multimedia technology.”

“I'd like my students to be able to create a multimedia presentation that demonstrates their understanding of various science content standards.”

“I want them to want to go out and buy a computer. I want them to see it as more than something "college people" have... a fancy typewriter. I want them to want to see themselves as being able to be one of those "college people."

“By the time this Initiative is over, I would like to see that my students are comfortable with the technology as well as capable to express content and thoughts via multimedia projects.”

“I hope my students will have more access to technology. I hope that they will understand basic skills for a computer as well as extensive programs such as iMovie and PowerPoint. I hope they will be able to express themselves through technology.”

While the students’ own descriptions of classroom activities were not as broad or as sophisticated as the teachers’ expectations for their students, the students did indeed report increased levels of engagement and that they enjoyed the new approaches to learning and teaching used by the participating teachers. When asked directly about their satisfaction with their experiences with these classes, students referred primarily to the benefits of having access to technology and media, particularly the ways in which technology integration enhances their learning experiences. Examples of students’ comments are provided below.

“I enjoy it because it's just better than writing on paper.”

“I guess we're just lucky. Not all the schools have like PowerPoint and everything. And not all the classes do.”

“I thought it was cool that they taught it to us. It's more fun to learn it like that, than just reading the textbook. It's a funner way of learning because like when we learned it before, and he'd explain it, it was more like you didn't want to listen. But now you want to. And then doing it on the computer now so it's interesting.”
“I liked picking out the pictures from Google. Like, all of us shared the pictures, so sometimes we'll steal from each other, like, 'Oh, I got this picture’”

“It's pretty cool because he taught us the scientific method before, early in the semester, without the PowerPoint. And then I guess we're learning it again and it's more interesting. Because he just said it and he just taught it like on the overhead. He'd just write it down. And we never used pictures. But on the PowerPoint now, we use pictures and sound.”

Both teachers and students gave examples of how the new approaches increased students’ interest, motivation, and engagement with the content of the participating teachers’ classes. For example, students argued that the technology increased students’ motivation to learn and even to go to school.

"I mean it's like it makes you go to the school. Because like some people, like without fun in the school they just don't want to go. This encourages people to come to school more.”

"Because like if they give you funner and easier ways to learn, you're gonna want to learn. Right? Than like having some boring lesson”

Similarly, teachers reported the ways in which the technology and media integration promotes confidence and efficacy.

"I would say the same thing about the self-confidence, definitely. But also with decision-making. Because like the teenage psychology - the kids can't do a lot of things these days. Their uniform is controlled. If they want to drink water or go to the restroom, it's controlled. You know my class, they can't use pen sometimes. When they're reading a book, they got to - it's a really controlled environment. But when you put them in a situation where you say, "This is your artwork. You decide what it should look like. You decide -" I mean it's little stuff. The color of your text. The font. There's a lot of decision-making that they don't have to ask permission for. And that's probably one of the reasons they like it so much, is because they're in control. They feel empowered. And then, you know, because they feel empowered, they're interested. And as a result, they do a good job. And then that gives us a reason to give them praises. And so their self-confidence is boosted. So all around. There are a lot of different things that contribute to making it a successful program.”

"Like last week, when Alex came in and did a camera workshop with them, they were so into it. Even one of my kids, who usually ditches class and everything, and he was like leading his group and like trying to show them where the different camera parts were and whatnot. And some of the kids, like they've just been asking, "When are we going to film? When are we going to film?" Like "Can we bring in stuff? Can we come after school to create our product?" and all that. And they're really into it, like they really wan to get it done. So, that's been exciting. “
"I've seen them doing research on their own now, and looking for information off the computer. They've gone and opened up a book on their own, looking for information to put into their iMovie using slides and some certain parts. Either voice over or print, text."

An interesting discussion of grading with one student focus group revealed a difference in the way the students perceive the assessment process in their Initiative teacher’s class compared to their other classes. The students were asked whether they were thinking about their grades more or less in this particular class. The students responded more. When asked why, one of the students responded, “Because if you mess up on your thing then it's a big failure.” The group continued to discuss the ways in which their projects in these classes carry a lot of weight, yet the students reported being satisfied with the increased pressure to do well. At another school, students reported that the importance of the grades “slips sometimes because you're having fun with the PowerPoint.”

Finally, teachers were provided an opportunity on the post-survey to summarize what, if anything, their students gained from the Initiative. Their responses fell into three categories: (1) increased technological skills and interest, (2) improved ability to analyze and critique media messages, as well as understand production techniques that shape the media messages, and (3) increased self-confidence and academic growth. Illustrative quotes are provided below.

Increased technological skills and interest:

“My students have gained a greater variety of media projects to work with in presenting their research topic.”

“Our students have greatly benefited from your efforts. This year students have created 12 DVDs of their projects to date and many are on sale in the student store. We have seen videos, presentations, blogs, and Web pages blossom. The effect of media projects is so impressive that other teachers are asking IML participants to help them get started.”

“My students have discovered another way to use the library for research and reporting beyond books and encyclopedias. They have learned to use the computer for school projects instead of just games. They discovered that a report can be visually stimulating as well as informative. With power point a presentation to a larger group is possible.”

Improved ability to analyze and critique media messages, as well as understand production techniques that shape the media messages:

“They have also gained a better understanding of how media influences them and how they can influence their own audience with their own media presentations.”

“I believe that my students have had a lot of fun with this project. I also believe that many understood that they are targets for advertising companies and they will be more critical of the media.”
Increased self-confidence and academic growth:

“However the best of all is the academic growth and self-confidence gained by our students as a result of the training.”

“It has helped them believe in themselves. Even though they may not be proficient in the area of reading and writing, they are able to develop high quality work using multimedia.”

“My students gained self esteem and confidence in their ability to take on something new they have never tried before.”

“My students have gained a SKILL that they can use throughout their lives, in addition to better learning/understanding the subject matter in their science class.”

“They learned how to be in control of their learning. How to use technology in ways that make them special and unique.”

Finally, one teacher raised an issue during a site visit focus group related to the focus on technology at the expense of content and the balance that must be struck between process and content.

“My major concern, as a teacher in a high poverty, high minority school, in doing these kinds of projects is that we lose time with reading. So we've been spending a lot of time on the computers and on the scripts and with the costumes and the level of engagement, there's no question about it. It's extremely high. And the amount of fun that the kids have is extremely high. It's an amazing hook for them. But it doesn't directly address literacy, which is the underlying issue at a school like this, just the lack of literacy amongst the kids. I already know they're going to love this because who wouldn't love this if you were a kid? And they really do. But then going back to that literacy piece, that's also something that I put on my own shoulders in terms of like, if we're going to do this project then there are ways to make it rigorous and to keep it literacy-based. But a lot of that is because I'm not putting that in or I don't know how to put it in. So it's a concern.”

Summary of Student Outcomes

This section focused on the influence of teachers’ participation in the Initiative on their students’ experiences in the classroom. The evaluation questions addressed in this section included:

- What are the characteristics of participating middle school students?
- What background knowledge and prior experiences do students have related to media and technology?
- How does participating in the Initiative influence students (e.g., interest, motivation, engagement, learning)?
Based on discussions with students during site visit focus groups, there is a range in the type and amount of use of media and technology outside the classroom. However, students were generally positive about their experiences in the classrooms of teachers participating in the Initiative and they valued their opportunities to use media and technology in creating projects for their coursework. Indeed, the students reported increased motivation, engagement, and learning as a result of their media and technology experiences.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

This report summarizes the findings from an external evaluation of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative during the 2005-2006 school year. The goals of this evaluation were to examine the quality and effectiveness of the Initiative’s professional development model aimed at increasing teachers’ understanding of multimedia literacy and enhancing their ability to incorporate multimedia into classroom teaching and learning.

Process in nature, the evaluation aimed to address the relationships between the (a) the context in which the Initiative was initiated, (b) the implementation of the various Initiative activities, and (c) the outcomes for teachers, administrators, coaches, and students.

Considering the objectives of the Initiative in 2005-2006, and in light of the evaluation findings presented here, it is reasonable to conclude that the Initiative met its objectives.

The stated objectives of the Initiative in 2005-2006 were to:

1. Encourage effective integration of multimedia literacy into standards-based curriculum.
2. Improve teachers’ and students’ acquisition and fluency in the creation and critical analysis of media forms.
3. Collaborate with media education specialists around critical topics of multimedia literacy and K-12 education.
4. Develop an understanding of curricula and methods for professional development in multimedia literacy.

Based on survey and interview data, teachers generally reported greater use and comfort with media and technology in their instruction by the end of the project. A testament to the integration of media and technology into their teaching was the variety and quality of teachers’ unit plans, classroom assignments, and the student work products that were submitted to the IML at the end of the year.

The findings also indicated that the participants gravitated toward the production aspect of the Initiative, with fewer advances in multimedia analysis. The focus on multimedia production is reasonable because, for many participants, multimedia analysis represent a more abstract and complex set of skills that will likely require more professional development and practice, as was offered in this Initiative. As noted in the IML’s
materials to their participants prior to the February 2006 workshop, “New means for expression, analysis and communication require, in short, a new kind of teaching, one that is comfortable with complexity, creativity and multiple approaches to shared goals.”

Furthermore, although the teachers were generally successful in designing multimedia unit plans and engaging students in multimedia projects, there was limited integration of teaching standards across subjects. For example, even in a science class, the unit observed was focused on the media arts aspect of the lesson, rather than the integration of science and media arts standards together. Indeed, it seems reasonable to focus on the media arts aspect of a lesson rather than cross-content integration as a first step. Again, the evaluation team finds the focus on the multimedia aspect of the instruction acceptable given that the instructional approaches promoted in this Initiative were new for most of the participants. Indeed, the participating teachers were proud of the amount of progress they had made this year, which highlights the fact that there are developmental stages involved in the process of effectively integrating multimedia literacy into a standards-based curriculum.

Taking a broader perspective, the IML and others involved in the design of the Initiative set fairly ambitious goals for the participants in terms of the desired skill levels (e.g., media and technology skills and multimedia pedagogy skills). The evaluation team finds it helpful to view these outcomes on a continuum from the teacher who has little or no experience with any form of media or technology, to the teacher who is extremely media and technology savvy and who has a keen sense for multimedia analysis. Even though the Initiative set high standards for the teachers, the participants of this Initiative made great strides in how far they traveled along the continuum in just one year. Similarly, the IML staff made strides in their ability to provide high quality professional development and to adapt to the ongoing needs of the participants so that the support for teachers was improved throughout the year. To be certain, it was a big undertaking for the teachers to do what they were asked to do, and, for the most part, they rose to the occasion by genuinely engaging in the professional development sessions and making earnest attempts to implement what they had learned from the Initiative in their classrooms.

Conclusion 1: The IML provided high quality, professional development that had a significant impact on its participants.

- **Explanation of conclusion 1:** According to the teachers’ reports on workshop questionnaires and during site visit focus groups, the IML delivered professional development that was truly professional. Teachers described being very impressed with the support of the IML staff, as well as the state-of-the-art resources available at the IML facilities. The mutual respect and professionalism likely contributed to higher standards and performance on the part of the teachers.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 1:** The findings suggest that the Initiative was worth the investment and should be continued.
Conclusion 2: The participants’ willingness and interest in the Initiative enhanced the outcomes.

• **Explanation of conclusion 2**: It would not have been unreasonable for teachers to have balked at the time and energy spent on the Initiative projects given the many demands on their time and the pressures to teach content standards. The evaluation team was impressed that the teachers remained committed throughout the year in the face of what could have easily been seen as a challenge. One plausible reason for this is that the teachers volunteering for this project already had an interest in the topic and a willingness to embrace the strategies and approaches. It also seemed that their willingness to use the Initiative approaches was affirmed when they saw their students’ responses. Teachers reported being pleased, and even surprised, at how their students responded in terms of improved attitudes and engagement. In many cases, the quality of the students’ work exceeded teachers’ expectations.

• **Recommendations related to conclusion 2**: Volunteer involvement and a willingness to participate are essential to the success of the Initiative. The findings also speak to the importance of fostering efficacy and empowerment on the part of the teachers so that they can experience successes, which in turn keeps them motivated.

Conclusion 3: The coaching role was underutilized.

• **Explanation of conclusion 3**: The role of the coach lacked definition and was not clearly distinguished from the role of the IML researchers and technical assistance providers. It was also noted that the coaches’ support was limited by logistical factors (e.g., schedules at their home school or the long distance they had to travel to get to the participating school). The overriding conclusion was that the coaching role was underutilized.

• **Recommendations related to conclusion 3**: For future implementation, it would be beneficial to clearly define the role of the coach and find ways to provide more on-site support that would include modeling and feedback. This would require that the coaches have a legitimate job description and that they have sufficient time available to carry out their distinct responsibilities as a coach.

Conclusion 4: It takes time and risk-taking to develop multimedia analysis and media arts skills.

• **Explanation of conclusion 4**: Teachers reported that their students were engaged in the projects, but often in a superficial way. Because multimedia analysis and media arts skills were new for many of the participants, teachers reported that they needed ways to help their students become engaged in the material at a deeper level so that students could critically analyze media messages and discuss the implications of the choices they were making in the multimedia projects. It is
likely that the degree to which teachers succeeded in getting their students to approach media with a critical lens and aesthetic eye were proportional to teachers’ own confidence and skill level in teaching multimedia analysis and media arts skills.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 4:** Continue working with the same schools again to build on what has already been developed and established. It might be beneficial to reconsider the configuration of the team by adding more teachers to the pool of participation and using the current teachers as leaders. Starting over with new schools, and terminating the Initiative’s involvement with the 2005-2006 schools, is not recommended because this type of Initiative requires a multiyear process and longer-term investment to develop the skills and strategies that enable schools and teachers to sustain their efforts.

**Conclusion 5: The Initiative had a limited impact on schools’ capacity to sustain the project.**

- **Explanation of conclusion 5:** Teachers reported increased collaboration and enthusiasm at their school for this project, although the collaboration was informal and occurred primarily among the participating teachers. While the types of on-site support that occurred in this first year were viewed as positive, the Initiative did not result in specific school structures or support mechanisms that would help teachers sustain their learning as they continued practicing and implementing what they learned in the workshops or Institutes.

- **Recommendations related to conclusion 5:** For future implementation, consider on site capacity building structures to enhance the more formal professional development sessions that were offered. Developing the capacity to teach in ways promoted by the Initiative is best understood as a long-term process that will require additional professional development, such as that provided by the IML, as well as ongoing, job-embedded structures to support teachers’ use and development of these new approaches.
Appendix A: Evaluation Questions, Methods, and Data Sources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant &amp; School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the characteristics of participating middle</td>
<td>• Pre-Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Administrators &amp; coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school administrators, teachers &amp; coaches?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Application forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of teacher background information (degree, demographics,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-Survey (questions on school climate, availability/use of</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, &amp; Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technology resources, priority of other school initiatives,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards integrated curriculum, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site Visit Observations &amp; Interviews (school resources, deficiencies,</td>
<td>• Evaluator Site visit Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis Annenberg Initiative Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How were the WAI activities implemented?</td>
<td>• Observations of training, teacher classroom implementation</td>
<td>• IML Researchers’ responses from the Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluator Site Visit Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance Sheets, Site Visit Notes, etc. (frequency and counts of</td>
<td>• Activities database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAI activities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What were the value, quality, and utility of</td>
<td>• Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Adkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implementation of the WAI activities (workshops,</td>
<td>• Workshop Surveys</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working as a team, coaches, speakers, etc.)? Was the</td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td>• WAI Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning for lesson/unit process useful to educators?</td>
<td>• Administrator Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach Interviews</td>
<td>• LAUSD Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LAUSD Phone Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What were the mediating factors that affected WAI</td>
<td>• Review of activities and operating characteristics</td>
<td>• Activities database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Adkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrator Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LAUSD Phone Interviews</td>
<td>• LAUSD Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAI Teacher Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In what ways did WAI teachers increase their</td>
<td>• Pre-Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Adkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance?</td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge and skills in multimedia literacy, production, and analysis?</td>
<td>• Coach Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In what ways did WAI teachers increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy (including facilitating student MM knowledge, production, etc.) and assessment of student learning?</td>
<td>• Classroom Observations</td>
<td>• IML Researchers’ responses to Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• Evaluators’ responses to observation protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Adkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• WAI Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• WAI Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In what ways were WAI teachers able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of a standards-based instructional unit?</td>
<td>• Classroom Observations</td>
<td>• IML Researchers’ responses to Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• Evaluators’ responses to observation protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Admins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• WAI Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• WAI Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent did involvement in this project help teachers understand the integration of multimedia across different subject areas? To what extent does the WAI foster or allow for the initiation of other activities?</td>
<td>• Pre-Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Admins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coach Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrator Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAI Administrator Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In what ways did administrators perceive the WAI helped them learn effective strategies to support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at their schools?</td>
<td>• Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Admins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrator Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How did administrators support the facilitation of multimedia instruction and learning at their school sites?</td>
<td>• Year-End Survey</td>
<td>• WAI Teachers, Coaches, Admins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrator Interviews</td>
<td>• WAI Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAI Coach Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15. In what ways did WAI coaches increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy (including facilitating student MM knowledge, production, etc.)? | • Pre-Year-End Survey  
• Teacher Focus Group  
• Coach Interviews | • WAI Teachers, Coaches, Admins.  
• WAI Teachers  
• WAI Coaches |
| 18. In what ways did WAI coaches support multimedia literacy instruction and learning at the school sites? | • Year-End Survey  
• Teacher Focus Groups  
• Coach Interviews | • WAI Teachers, Coaches, Admins.  
• WAI Teachers  
• WAI Coaches |
| **WAI Student Outcomes** |         |              |
| 19. What are the characteristics of participating middle school students? | • Administrator Interviews  
• Teacher Focus Groups  
• Student Focus Groups | • WAI Administrators  
• WAI Teachers  
• WAI Students  
• Review of demographic information | • Student demographics in participating classes |
| 20. What background knowledge and prior experiences do WAI students have related to media and technology? | • Teacher Focus Groups  
• Student Focus Groups | • WAI Teachers  
• WAI Students |
| 21. How does participating in the WAI program influence students (e.g., interest, motivation, engagement, learning)? | • Year-End Survey  
• Teacher Focus Groups  
• Coach Interviews  
• Administrator Interviews  
• Student Focus Groups | • WAI Teachers  
• WAI Coaches  
• WAI Administrators  
• WAI Students |

Red font indicates that the evaluators collected the data.  
Blue font indicates that the IML researchers collected the data.
Appendix B: Site Visit Focus Group and Interview Protocols
START THE RECORDER

Today is [day and date] and I am conducting this focus group with [number of participants] at [school or location].

Thank you once again for participating in this focus group. The first thing I want to ask about is how you came to be involved in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative (which I will refer to as “the Initiative” throughout the focus group).

OPENING QUESTION

• What motivated you to want to participate in the Initiative this year?
• How did you learn about the Initiative?
• Did you apply for the position or were you asked to participate by someone at your school?

PERSPECTIVES ON WAI TRAINING EXPERIENCES

• How would you generally describe your knowledge and skill with multimedia production and analysis before you became part of the Initiative and now that you have participated in the Initiative this year?
• How would you generally describe your knowledge and skill with media arts before you became part of the Initiative and now that you have participated in Initiative this year?
• What have you appreciated most about the WAI training now that you have been participating in this project for almost a year?
• How useful was the Summer Institute and Follow-up Workshops considering what you needed to do to instruct students using multimedia?
• Is there anything else the training could have provided that might have been more useful to you?

YOUR INSTRUCTIONAL EXPERIENCES

• Please describe some of the experiences that you have had with instruction using multimedia this year?
• Were you satisfied or disappointed with your efforts?
• How successfully were you able to integrate your knowledge of multimedia with teaching standards based lessons in your content area?
• What is the biggest difference in your instruction when teaching with multimedia?
  o Selection of what to teach?
  o More time to plan?
  o More interest or motivation in the way you are teaching?
  o Was assessing student learning about the same?
PERSPECTIVES ON STUDENTS’ LEARNING EXPERIENCES

I want to know about your students’ experiences learning with multimedia, but first I want to know:

• How experienced were your students with multimedia prior to being involved in this Initiative?
• Do students typically have access to computers and Internet at home?
• Do you know what kinds of digital media they use most outside of school?
• Do students bring digital media into the classroom? If so, what kinds of digital media?
• In general, do your students use multimedia in their other classes? Is their use of multimedia in your class different from their use of multimedia in their other classes?

Now, I’d like you to describe the differences in your students’ reactions to learning content through multimedia.

• Were students more motivated or engaged in what they were doing?
• Compared to other methods of learning content, did students learn as much, less, or more than they would have?
• Were students more grade-focused or more learning-focused?
• Are students generally excited about using multimedia in the classroom or is it viewed as commonplace?
• Have your students had the opportunity to engage in critical or analytical discussions about the media through their projects in your class? If so, please give some specific examples?

FACTORS THAT HINDERED OR HELPED

• What kinds of barriers (if any) did you need to overcome in order to achieve your goals for instruction using multimedia this year?
• What has been especially helpful to you as you worked to achieve your goals for instructing students using multimedia this year?
• Is there anything you hoped would result in your participation in the Initiative that has not occurred yet?

PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL SUPPORT

• Does your school value and is your school culture generally supportive of students’ learning with media and technology
• In what ways did your school administrators support or encourage your efforts to implement what you had learned and planned through this initiative?
• Were you provided with any additional resources or equipment you needed?
• Did they observe instruction and learning with multimedia in the classroom?
• Is there any additional support or resources you need from your school or district in order to instruct students in standards based content using multimedia?

PERSPECTIVES ON WAI SUPPORT & PROCEDURES

• In what ways has it been helpful to have IML researchers and instructional staff (e.g. Alex Tarr, Katynka Martinez, or Becky Herr) provide support at your school?
  o Have they been responsive to your needs or requests for help?
• In what ways has it been helpful to have Coaches provide support at your school?
  o Have they been responsive to your needs or requests for help?
• In what ways has it been helpful to have LAUSD staff from the Arts Education Branch provide support at your school?
  o Have they been responsive to your needs or requests for help?
• What do you think staff and coaches of the Initiative have learned from working with you this year?
• Were there any requirements of participation that were particularly difficult for you to manage this year?
  o Was any requirement particularly unclear or confusing?
• What would have made these things more clear to you or useful for you?
  o Lesson Study?
  o Unit Development Protocol?
  o Backward Design Exercises?
• Did you get to take advantage of participating in the blog? Did you find it interesting?

FINAL QUESTIONS

• What are some of the most surprising or unexpected things you’ve learned from your and your students’ participation in the Initiative this year?
• What would be most helpful to you from this point on?
  o For enhancing your knowledge and understanding of media art and media literacy?
  o For increasing your proficiency at leading students to create media art projects?
  o For increasing your proficiency at standards-based instruction with multimedia?
• Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experiences with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative this year?

Thank you very much for your time and participation. The information you provided is helpful to us as we consider ways of helping teachers and students learn using multimedia.
Administrator Interview Protocol

START THE DIGITAL RECORDER

Today is [day and date] and I am at [school or location] for this interview. Please state your name and position for the recording. [Participant Response]

Thank you for allowing me to interview you. Before I begin to talk with you about the project your school has been participating in with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative (which I will refer to as “the Initiative” throughout the interview), I want to ask some general questions about your school’s overall use of instruction with multimedia.

SCHOOL CLIMATE AND USE OF INSTRUCTION WITH MULTIMEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY

• First, please describe the use of media and technology for instruction and learning for all the teachers and students in the school in general (prior to involvement in this project).
• In what ways would a newcomer to your school know that you and your teachers value students’ learning with multimedia and technology?
• What motivates your teachers to instruct students using multimedia /technology?
• What motivates your teachers to instruct students using the Arts?
• How do you encourage teachers to integrate multimedia into standards-based lessons?
• Are there any school initiatives that may conflict with teachers’ implementation of instruction using multimedia and media arts?
• Do students typically have access to computer and the Internet at home? Have their prior learning experiences prepared them to be ready to learn using multimedia?

WAI Summer Institute and Workshops

For these next few questions, I’d like to have you talk about your and your teachers’ experiences with the training sessions provided at the IML.

• Did you attend the Summer Institute? Did you attend the Follow up Workshops?
  • If so, what workshops did you attend?
• In what ways were the summer institute and workshops most valuable to you?
• Did the summer institute and workshops prepare you to support teachers in their instruction with multimedia and technology?
  • If yes, in what ways?
  • If no, how could the workshops have been more helpful to you in supporting teachers?

Now, throughout the rest of the interview, when I refer to teachers, I’d like to know about the teachers who participated in the Initiative.
• First, how were teachers selected to be involved in the project?
• Describe the selected teachers’ prior experience with leading students to use multimedia and technology for learning assignments?
• How do the teachers who participated in the WAI differ from the rest of the staff in terms of their use of media and technology?
• Generally, have the teachers found the training opportunities to be of high quality and useful to their work?
  o If yes, in what ways?
  o If no, how could the workshops have been more helpful to the teachers?

INSTRUCTION & LEARNING WITH MULTIMEDIA

For this next section, I’d like to know how teachers participating in the Initiative have used what they learned from the workshops.

• Are you aware of how the teachers have used multimedia in instruction this year? If so, please describe some of their experiences?
• Were teachers’ satisfied or disappointed with their efforts?
• Did students have opportunity to display or present their work to others?
• Were you able to observe or help in WAI teachers’ classes when they instructed using multimedia? If so, what did you notice about students’ engagement in learning?
• Did you notice anything different about how the teachers designed their lessons or how they managed their classes?

IMPACT OF WAI EXPERIENCES ON TEACHERS

Next, I’d like to know how teachers participating in the Initiative may have benefited from what they learned during the Initiative.

• In what ways did the teachers participating in the Initiative increase their knowledge and skill in:
  o Creating media (media production)?
  o Creating media art (specifically)?
  o Media literacy?
  o Effective strategies for instructing students using media and media arts?
  o Helping students’ create media art—or better understand multimedia?
  o Assessing student learning using multimedia?
• Were the teachers successfully able to integrate their knowledge of multimedia and media arts with:
  o Teaching standards-based lessons in their content area?
  o Teaching a full instructional unit using multimedia?
• What would you describe as the biggest change in the teachers’ instruction this year?
• Has teachers’ use of instruction using multimedia increased?
Has their use of multimedia in student assignments increased?
Would you say student assignments requiring the use of multimedia production and analysis have increased?

IMPACT OF WAI TRAINING ON SCHOOL/COLLEAGUES

Now, I have some questions about how teachers worked together for this Initiative.

- Did the teachers work together to plan or implement instruction using multimedia?
- Did the teachers get together to observe each other teach, help each other in the classroom, or provide feedback on their unit plans?
- Did the teachers get together to discuss student work generated from instruction using multimedia?
- Did teachers share their knowledge and skills in media literacy and media arts with other school faculty (those not participating in the Initiative)?
- Did they include other teachers with their multimedia lessons or units?
- Did they help other teachers with their own multimedia lessons or units?

ADMINISTRATOR SUPPORT

I have a couple of questions about how you have been able to support students and teachers.

- In what ways did you support or encourage teachers in this Initiative to implement what they had learned and planned?
- Did you establish a special planning time for teachers to collaborate?
- Did you provide teachers with any additional resources or equipment they needed?
- In what ways have you grown or changed your thinking about the importance or value of media art and media literacy?
  - For you as an administrative and instructional leader?
  - For teachers?
  - For students?
  - For your school?

FACTORS THAT HINDERED OR HELPED

- What kinds of barriers (if any) did your teachers need to overcome in order to achieve their goals for instruction using multimedia this year?
- What has been especially helpful to your teachers as they worked to achieve their goals for instructing students using multimedia this year?
WAI PROCEDURES & SUPPORT

Next I’d like to know about support you and your teachers have received for this Initiative.

- How helpful has IML and LAUSD staff for this Initiative been to you and your teachers this year?
  - In what ways?
- Have they been responsive to your needs or requests for help?
- Has it been helpful for them to provide support at your school?
- How helpful has it been to have the Coach, [name, if known], as support for the teachers?
  - In what ways?
- Have they been responsive to your needs or requests for help?
- Has it been helpful for them to provide support at your school?
- What do you think the staff and coaches have learned from working with you and your teachers this year?

FINAL QUESTIONS

A few final questions about the Initiative.

- What are some of the most surprising or unexpected things you’ve learned from your and your teachers’ and students’ participation in the Initiative this year?
- What would be most helpful to you and your teachers from this point on?
  - For enhancing your knowledge and understanding of media arts and media literacy?
  - For increasing your proficiency at standards-based instruction with multimedia?
- Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experiences with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative this year?

Thank you very much for your time and participation. The information you provided is helpful to us as we consider ways of helping teachers and students learn using multimedia.
Coaches Interview Protocol

START THE DIGITAL RECORDER

Today is [day and date] and I am at [school or location] for this interview. Please state your name and position for the recording. [Participant Response]

Thank you once again for meeting me for this interview. The first thing I want to ask is about your motivation for becoming involved in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative (which I will refer to as “the Initiative” throughout the interview).

OPENING QUESTION

• How did you come to be involved as a coach for the Initiative this year?

PERSPECTIVES ON WAI TRAINING EXPERIENCES

• How would you generally describe your knowledge and skill with multimedia production and analysis?
  o Before you became part of the Initiative?
  o Now that you have participated in the Initiative this year?
• How would you generally describe your knowledge and skill of media literacy, media arts and teaching?
  o Before you became part of the Initiative?
  o Now that you have participated in the Initiative this year?
• What have you appreciated most about this Initiative as a Coach, now that you have been participating in the project for almost a year?
• How useful was the Summer Institute and Follow up Workshops considering what you needed to do as a coach to help the teachers develop and implement their instructional units?
• How useful was the Coach Training at the end of the summer, considering what you needed to do as a coach to help the teachers develop and implement their instructional units?
• Is there anything else the training could have provided that might have been more useful to you?

YOUR ROLE AS COACH

• In what ways have you been asked to assist teachers as part of your coaching responsibilities by IML and LAUSD staff?
• How did communication work between coaches, schools, administrators, and teachers?
  o Who usually contacted whom for interactions?
• In what ways have teachers asked you to assist them or their students?
• Were you able to meet teachers’ needs?
• Have they been responsive to your efforts to help?
• In what ways?
• Was there any situation or request you felt you were not prepared to meet?
• What kinds of barriers (if any) did you encounter in your efforts to provide coaching?
• Was there anything that prevented you from meeting teachers’ needs?
  o In what ways?
• Is there anything you would recommend differently for the coaches role?
• What suggestions do you have for improving your role as a coach?
• What was your initial understanding of the role and expectations of being a coach in the Initiative?
• How has your perspective about your role changed over the year?
• Is there any additional support or resources you need from the school, district, or IML in order to be an effective coach?
• In what ways has your role as coach changed your thinking about:
  o the importance or value of media literacy for students’ education?
  o the importance or value of media arts for students’ education?
  o the importance or value of media pedagogy for teachers?
  o the importance or value of collaborative efforts between teachers at different schools?
  o the integration of multimedia across different content areas?
• What is the most important thing you have learned about this type of multimedia professional development for teachers and schools?
• How helpful do you think it has been for the Coaches in this Initiative to support the teachers and students for a project such as this?

WAI SUPPORT

• How helpful has project staff from LAUSD and IML been to you this year?
  o In what ways?
• Have they been responsive to your needs or requests for help?
• How helpful has project staff from LAUSD and IML been to your teachers this year?
  o In what ways?
• Have they been responsive to their needs or requests for help?
• Has it been helpful for them to provide direct support at the middle school?
• What do you think staff from LAUSD and IML learned from working with you and other coaches this year?
• Is there anything you would recommend differently for the project?

IMPACT OF WAI EXPERIENCES ON TEACHERS & STUDENTS

• In what ways did the teachers participating in the project increase their knowledge and skill in:
  o Creating media (media production)?
  o Creating media art (specifically)?
Media literacy (such as critically analyzing the media, or understanding how to communicate effectively with images & sound)?
- Effective strategies for instructing students using media and media arts?
- Helping students’ create media art or better understand multimedia?
- Assessing student learning using multimedia?
- Did you have opportunities to observe students learning content through multimedia? Please describe the students’ reactions to learning content through multimedia?
  - Were students motivated or engaged in what they were doing?
  - Were students more grade focused or more learning focused?

FACTORS THAT HINDERED OR HELPED TEACHERS

- What kinds of barriers (if any) did your teachers need to overcome in order to achieve their goals for instruction using multimedia this year?
- What has been especially helpful to your teachers as they worked to achieve their goals for instructing students using multimedia this year?
- Is there any additional support or resources you think the teachers need from the school or district in order to instruct students in standards based content using multimedia?
- What would be most helpful to the teachers you coached from this point on?
- Is there any additional support or resources you think the teachers need from the Initiative, the school, or the district in order to instruct students in the Media Arts?

FINAL QUESTIONS

- What are some of the surprising or unexpected things you’ve learned through your participation in the Initiative this year?
- What would be most helpful to you from this point on?
  - For enhancing your knowledge and understanding of media literacy and media arts?
  - For increasing your proficiency at standards-based instruction with multimedia?
- Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experiences with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative this year?

Thank you very much for your time and participation. The information you provided is helpful to us as we consider ways of helping teachers and students learn using multimedia.
Student Focus Group Protocol

START THE DIGITAL RECORDER

Today is [day and date] and I am conducting this focus group with [number of participants] at [school or location].

Thank you once again for participating in this focus group. Your teachers have been involved in a project at USC about instruction and learning with multimedia. It’s called the Wallis Annenberg Initiative and I will refer to it as “the Initiative” throughout this focus group.

PERSPECTIVES ON EXPERIENCE WITH MM/TECHNOLOGY

The first thing I want to ask you is about your experience using media. And by media, I mean computers, the Internet, software like MS Word, PowerPoint, digital cameras, video cameras and things like that.

- How would you generally describe your knowledge and skill using media?
  - Before the beginning of this school year?
  - Now that you are near the end of the school year?
- Do you typically have access to computers and Internet
  - At home?
  - At school?
  - Other places? (e.g., library, home of a friend or a family member, club, coffee shop?)
- Do you typically have access to other multimedia equipment and resources (e.g., digital cameras, camcorders, audio equipment, etc.)
  - At home?
  - At school?
  - Other places? (e.g., library, home of a friend or a family member, club, coffee shop?)

YOUR TYPICAL LEARNING EXPERIENCES

I want to know about your experiences learning with media, but first I want to know about the other classes you have other than the one you are here representing. [Students will confirm on the sign-in sheet the Initiative class/teacher they are representing.]

- How often do you get to use computers and the Internet to learn in your other classes?
  - A great deal
  - Once in a while or not very often
  - Never
- Is that more, less, or equal to how much you use computers and the Internet in the class you are representing?
• How often do you get to use digital cameras/camcorders, media equipment to learn in your other classes?
  o A great deal
  o Once in a while or not very often
  o Never
• Is that more, less, or equal to how much you use computers and the Internet in the class you are representing?
• In your classes other than the one you are representing, please tell me about one of the most interesting or fun ways that you’ve used computers and the Internet in one of your classes.
  o One of the most boring or uninteresting ways that teachers have used computers or the Internet in one of your classes.
• How often do you get to:
  o decide or choose what you want to do to learn during a class?
  o work with other students to complete a project or assignment?

PERSPECTIVES ON LEARNING EXPERIENCES USING MEDIA

Now I want to ask you about your experiences learning using media in the class you are representing in this focus group.

Think of a time when you were given an assignment to learn using multimedia.
  • Did you get to choose what project you would work on?
  • Did you make your own decisions about what you would include in the project?
  • Did you work with other students to complete the assignment?
  • Did you have to solve a problem or learn more about an issue to complete the assignment?
    o If yes, did you use the Internet to learn more about the issue?
  • Did you go to sites that you often visit on your own or did the teacher recommend them to you?
  • Describe your reactions to learning information using multimedia:
    o Were you more or less motivated or interested in what you were doing?
    o Was it easier or harder for you to focus on what you were doing?
    o Did the time you spent working with the technology or equipment leave you with more or less time to learn the subject or information?
  • Compared to learning information without multimedia or technology equipment, do you think you learned as much, less, or more than you normally would have?
    o Were you more grade focused or more learning focused?
  • How do you know that what you did was good work?
    o Were you satisfied or disappointed with your final product?
    o Were you satisfied or disappointed with your grade?
  • Were you involved in any part of deciding your grade?
  • Did you have an opportunity to:
    o show other students how to use equipment (like a camera) or software (like iMovie, PowerPoint, or Painter)?
o tell anyone outside of the school what you were working on? (e.g., family, friends)
o present your work to others or display it so they could see it?
• What did you like the least about learning with multimedia?
• What did you enjoy the most about learning with multimedia?
• Would you recommend your class to other students?
• Would you want to try media production again with another class or topic?
• Were any of the media projects you did for this class similar to activities you do when you’re not at school (for example: digital photography, shooting video, blogging, manipulating images)?
  o If yes, was working on this at school as fun as when you do these things outside of school?
  o Why or why not?
• Has your experience in this class changed the way you understand or look at the media (such as movies, TV, the Internet, photos, or music)? If so, can you give an example or describe the change?

PERSPECTIVES ON WAI SUPPORT

Occasionally staff from the project came to work with your teacher on different parts of this project.

• Has it been helpful or bothersome to you to have others in the class to watch or help with what you were learning?
• In what ways has it been helpful or bothersome?
• Is it common to have other people observing your classes?
• Was the presence of the staff person on this project similar or different than the presence of other observers? How so?

FINAL QUESTIONS

You’ve done really well so far. Here are the final two questions.

• If you were to take a class next year where you learn using multimedia would you want it to be similar to the one you took this year or different from the one you took this year? Why?
• Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experiences learning with multimedia this year?

Thank you very much for your time and participation. The information you provided is helpful to us as we consider ways of helping teachers and students learn using multimedia.
LAUSD Phone Interview Protocol

START THE RECORDER

Today is [day and date]. Please state your name and position for the recording. [Participant Response]

Thank you once again for agreeing to this phone interview with me. The first thing I want to ask about is your motivation for becoming involved in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative (which I will refer to as “the Initiative” throughout this interview).

OPENING QUESTION

- What did you envision as the ultimate goal for the Initiative this year?
- How close or far away from meeting that goal do you think the project will end up?

DISTRICT BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

- What motivates teachers in your district to instruct students using media/technology?
- What motivates teachers in your district to instruct students using the Arts?
- How do you encourage teachers to integrate the media arts into standards-based lessons?
- Are there any district initiatives that may conflict with teachers’ implementation of instruction using multimedia and media arts?

PERSPECTIVES ON WAI TRAINING EXPERIENCES

- Now that the Initiative is nearing the end of the year, how useful or valuable do you think the Summer Institute was to the participants?
- How useful was the Summer Institute considering what teachers and students needed to use multimedia throughout the year?
- Did the Summer Institute accomplish what you had envisioned?
  - Is there anything else the Institute could have provided that might have been more useful to the participants?
- Now that the Initiative is nearing the end of the year, how useful or valuable do you think the Coach Training was for the coaches?
- How useful was the Coach Training considering what you needed coaches to do to help teachers and students use multimedia throughout the year?
- Did the Coach Training accomplish what you had envisioned?
  - Is there anything else the Coach Training could have provided that might have been more useful to the coaches?
- Now that the Initiative is nearing the end of the year, how useful or valuable do you think the Follow-up Workshops were to the participants?
• How useful were the workshops considering what teachers and students needed to do to use multimedia throughout the year?
• Did you accomplish what you envisioned for the workshops?
• Is there anything else the workshops could have provided that might have been more useful to the participants?

DISTRICT SUPPORT OF WAI

I have a couple of questions about the support you have been able to provide students and teachers through the Initiative.

• In what ways did you support or encourage administrators’ efforts to implement what they had learned and planned through this initiative?
  o Did you provide schools with any additional resources or equipment they needed?
• In what ways did you support or encourage teachers’ efforts to implement what they had learned and planned through this initiative?
  o Did you have an opportunity to see teachers’ instruction or student learning products?
• In what ways did you support or encourage coaches’ efforts to execute their role?
  o Did you have an opportunity to see coaches working with teachers and administrators?
• In what ways do you think the participants have grown or changed their thinking about the importance or value of media literacy and media arts?
  o Administrators as instructional leader?
  o Teachers?
  o Students?
  o Coaches?

PERSPECTIVES ON OTHER SUPPORT OF WAI

• How helpful do you think it has been for the Coaches to support the teachers and students directly at the school?
  o In what ways?
  o Is there anything you would recommend differently for the coaches role?
• How helpful do you think it has been for the IML staff to support the administrators, teachers and students directly at the school site?
  o In what way?
  o Is there anything you would recommend differently for the trainers or researchers?
• How helpful do you think it has been for the LAUSD staff (arts administrators) to support the administrators, teachers and students directly at the school site?
  o In what way?
  o Is there anything you would recommend differently for the trainers or researchers?
• What do you think IML staff learned from working with your district with this project this year?

DISTRICT STANCE TOWARDS MEDIA LITERACY & MEDIA ARTS

• In what ways has the Initiative helped the district with thinking about providing media literacy and media arts standards in the content areas?
• In what ways has the Initiative contributed to the district’s willingness to support and sustain the provision of media literacy and media arts professional development for teachers?
• Has the Initiative brought to light any additional supports or resources the district should provide for teachers’ instruction of standards based content using multimedia?

FINAL QUESTIONS

• What are some of the surprising or unexpected insights you’ve learned through your participation in the Initiative this year?
• What is the most important thing you have learned about this type of multimedia professional development for teachers and schools?
• Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experiences with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative this year?

Thank you very much for your time and participation. The information you provided is helpful to us as we consider ways of helping teachers and students learn using multimedia.
Appendix C: Classroom Observational Protocol
Purpose and Observation Instructions
The purpose of this observation protocol is to provide a standard form for recording observations of the WAI middle school classrooms. The notes recorded by the research team and by the evaluators using this form will be analyzed to answer the following evaluation questions:

• Were the WAI activities implemented as planned?
• What were the mediating factors that affected WAI implementation?
• In what ways did WAI teachers increase their understanding and skill of multimedia pedagogy (including facilitating student MM knowledge, production, etc.) and assessment of student learning?
• In what ways were WAI teachers able to incorporate their knowledge of multimedia literacy into the development and implementation of a standards-based instructional unit?

The observation protocol will be used three times in each participating teachers’ classrooms between January and May 2006. Observations should ideally be at least 45 minutes.

[When entering the observation data into a database, assign a unique observation record # for each classroom observation]

I. Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer:</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>Subject area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td>Coach:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
<td>Approximate # of children:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site (check): __Computer lab   __Classroom   __Other: ______________________

Ratio of Students to Computer or Device:  1 to 1  2-5 to 1  6-9 to 1  10 to 1
or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the names of other adults in the classroom (Not including observers):</th>
<th>Their position/title:</th>
<th>What they are doing during the observation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. According to the teacher, what was the purpose of this lesson and how does the lesson relate to the goals of the unit? (if possible try to get this information before observation begins)

2. Did the lesson observed focus on a particular standard? O yes O no
   If yes, which one?

3. Describe the general classroom setting. The following are some things to think about when describing the setting:
   - length of class period
   - classroom layout, how tables arranged
   - classroom and technological facilities
   - general teacher-student affect
   - overall student behavior
   - did students work together, talk with each other about the lesson
   - were students productive or was there a lot of wasted time
3. Briefly describe the flow of activities and how the class/lesson was conducted
   • class period timeline (e.g., 5 minute announcements, 15 minute lecture, 5 minute discussion, 20 min laboratory)

   • topics covered

   • activities observed
     o helping students learn content-related skills, facts or concepts
     o learn a software or application skill
     o plan for a project/develop a project
     o learn a research or analysis skill
     o practice a skill or concept
     o get help from or communicate with resource person or peer
     o testing or assessment

   • student responses (how often they respond, types of responses, quality of responses)

4. Was a coach present during the observation?  O yes      O no
   If yes, how did the coach contribute? Role? What was he/she doing during the observation?

5. Was a lab instructor present?  O yes      O no
   If yes, how did the lab instructor contribute? Role? What was he/she doing during the observation?
II. Instruction and Technology Use

6. Rate the quality of the lesson design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The objectives of the observed lesson were clearly presented and implemented.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The teacher was knowledgeable about the content presented.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The teacher generated interest in the topics and learning activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The lesson provided active learning experiences.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

7. Indicate which of the following types of media and technology tools you observed being used in the classroom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed use by teachers and/or students</th>
<th>Sanctioned</th>
<th>Non-Sanctioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic computer use (e.g. word processing, spreadsheets)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations (e.g., PowerPoint)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video shooting / editing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound recording / editing / publishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital photography / Image manipulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video games</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant messaging / on-line chats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual communities (e.g., myspace.com)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Which of the following activities did you observe students engaged in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1 No Use</th>
<th>2 Minimal Use</th>
<th>3 Moderate Use</th>
<th>4 Great Deal of Use</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Practicing keyboarding or basic computer skills (hardware skills)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Using computer applications (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, etc) for a class assignment (software skills)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preparing text and graphics for presentations</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Researching information or ideas using the Internet</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Preparing a newsletter or brochure using a desktop application</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collecting digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for projects</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Outreach with experts, authors, students from other schools, etc. via email, Internet, or videoconferencing (networking with others)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Keeping a blog or other form of electronic journal</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Using “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs) for collaboration with others</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Producing and editing media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) for a class project</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Discussing or analyzing the meaning of images</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Planning and discussing the purpose and ideas to prepare for a project</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Preparing storyboards and/or scripts (preproduction) in preparation for a project</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Rate the teacher’s ability to facilitate the use of technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1 Not very skilled</th>
<th>2 Somewhat skilled</th>
<th>3 Moderately skilled</th>
<th>4 Very Skilled</th>
<th>Didn’t observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Responding to students’ questions about the use of technologies used in the lesson</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Providing students with ample hands-on time with technologies</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Using strategies to maintain students’ behavior when they are using technology and during classroom transitions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Encouraging critical/analytical discussions of media images</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
10. Rate the teacher’s level of skill using the following digital technology and multimedia 

Teacher’s Multimedia Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>1 Not very skilled</th>
<th>2 Somewhat skilled</th>
<th>3 Moderately skilled</th>
<th>4 Very Skilled</th>
<th>Didn’t Observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Using basic technology (e.g., computers, printers, word processing, presentation, spreadsheet software, etc)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Analyzing or deconstructing media (e.g., careful or close reading/analysis of a film or video)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Collecting media assets from the Internet (e.g., digital images, movies, sound)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Recording images using a digital camera/camcorder</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Using online journaling or blogging software</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Editing media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conducting the entire lesson without relying on someone else for technical questions or challenges</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Rate the teacher’s level of skill using the following digital technology and multimedia

Teacher’s Multimedia Pedagogy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Not very skilled</th>
<th>Somewhat skilled</th>
<th>Moderately skilled</th>
<th>Very Skilled</th>
<th>Didn’t Observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teaching students to critically analyze and interpret media</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Designing instruction for their grade level/subject area using media (e.g., using multimedia in presentations)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Leading students to create media projects (e.g., multimedia presentations, digital movies, etc.)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Extending student thinking through media literacy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encouraging students to explore new ways of making arguments using media</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Demonstrating for students how to critically analyze and interpret media</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Demonstrating technology skills during the lesson</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Being comfortable incorporating technology and media into the classroom</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Helping students to conceptualize and create meaningful content design and ideas for projects (e.g., scaffolding the production process)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Managing time and resources in relation to the available resources and infrastructure (e.g., good use of lab instructor)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Perceptions of Improvements

12. Since the start of the year, have the teacher’s **technology** skills improved?
   O yes  O no
   Brief statement/example of teacher’s technology skills:

13. Since the start of the year, have the teacher’s **media production** skills improved?
   O yes  O no
   Brief statement/example of teacher’s media production skills:

14. Since the start of the year, have the teacher’s **media analysis** skills improved?
   O yes  O no
   Brief statement/example of teacher’s media analysis skills:

15. Since the start of the year, has the teacher’s **ability to use technology for instruction in the content area** improved?
   O yes  O no
   Brief statement/example of teacher’s use technology for instruction in the content area:

IV. Suggestions for More Support

16. Based on your observation, which of the following would assist the teacher in better applying newly acquired skills and strategies? (Mark all that apply.)

   ___ More practice producing and editing media.
   ___ More training on specific instructional strategies using new media.
   ___ More support or involvement of other teachers.
   ___ More support or involvement of administrators.
   ___ More support from my school with technical equipment or resources.
   ___ More opportunities to talk with the WAI trainers, coaches or other district personnel when questions or concerns arise.
   ___ Other (please explain below):

Please explain why you think the teacher would benefit from the above items that you selected.

V. Concluding Notes

17. What are your overall impressions of this classroom in terms of how the WAI strategies have been implemented? Were there any other contextual issues that are important to document?
Appendix D: Survey Instruments
Teacher/Coach Background and Experience Survey

Dear Participant:

You have received this survey because you will be participating in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative for the next year. We ask you to take a few minutes to complete this survey and tell us about your experiences and opinions using technology and multimedia in the classroom.

Please answer each item on the survey. There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will be kept confidential. Your answers will not be reported individually, but only in aggregate form with the other participant responses. The survey information will be used to inform the effectiveness of the Institute. In addition, the survey information may be used for publications or for other educational purposes.

The information you give on this survey and other surveys that you periodically complete throughout the year is helpful for the evaluation of the project and our understanding how to help teachers and students work with multimedia. So that we can compare your response across surveys, we request that you provide your birth date.

Please enter the password from the email you received inviting you to participate in this survey:

Password: ________
What is your primary role in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

- [ ] Teacher
- [ ] Coach
- [ ] Other (please specify)

[This question prompts a branching structure for the next page. Teachers are asked one set of questions and coaches/other are asked a separate set of questions.]

**Participant Information: Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>16-20 years</th>
<th>21 years or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. please indicate the total number of years you have been teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. please indicate the number of years you have been teaching at your current school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. what grade level(s) do you teach?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] 6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] 7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] 8th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What subject(s) do you teach?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Drama/Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Performance Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Media/Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [ ] Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Do you currently use media and technology in your teaching? If so, for how long have you been using these tools in your teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| f. Please describe the type of media and technology tools you currently use in your classroom:
Participant Information: Coaches and other education professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>16-20 years</th>
<th>21 years or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. please indicate the total number of years you have been working in education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. please indicate the number of years you have been in your current position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Please describe your current role within your school and/or district.

d. How long have you been using media and technology as part of your teaching? _____

e. Please describe the type of media and technology tools you currently use in your teaching.

Experience with digital technology and multimedia

Please rate your general level of experience with:

a. using basic technology (e.g., computers, printers, word processing, presentation, spreadsheet software, etc).  
   Not very experienced | Somewhat experienced | Moderately experienced | Very experienced | Expert
   O | O | O | O | O | O

b. analyzing or deconstructing media (e.g., close reading/analysis of a film or video).  
   O | O | O | O | O | O

c. creating media projects (e.g., multimedia presentations, digital movies, etc.).  
   O | O | O | O | O | O

d. designing instruction for your grade level/subject area using media (e.g., using multimedia in presentations).  
   O | O | O | O | O | O

e. teaching students to critically analyze and interpret media.  
   O | O | O | O | O | O

f. leading students to create media projects.  
   O | O | O | O | O | O
Personal technology and media use

This past year, how often did you use digital technology (e.g., computers, printers, projectors, digital cameras, graphing calculators, etc.) to…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Year</th>
<th>At Least Once a Month</th>
<th>At Least Once a Week</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop instructional materials to use in your class (e.g., tests, handouts)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communicate with other teachers or professionals via online communications (e.g., email, listserve, discussion boards)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Communicate information to students using presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Keep administrative records (e.g., grade book, attendance)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Prepare curriculum maps or lesson plans electronically?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Research information or ideas using the Internet for classroom use?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Collect digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for course instruction or projects?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Create and maintain Web pages?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Keep a personal or teacher blog or other form of electronic journal?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Use “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs, social bookmarking) for collaboration with teachers?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) for recreational or personal purposes?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) with students?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Collaborate with other teachers at your school to plan multimedia activities in your content area?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Consult district arts specialists for ideas or directions for instruction with multimedia production.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student technology and media use**

This past year, how often did your students use technology in the following ways during class time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Year</th>
<th>At Least Once a Month</th>
<th>At Least Once a Week</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Practice keyboarding or basic computer skills?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use computer applications (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, etc) for a class assignment.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Prepare text and graphics for presentations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Research information or ideas using the Internet?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Prepare a newsletter or brochure using a desktop application?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collect digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for projects?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Create Web pages?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Collaborate with experts, authors, students from other schools, etc. via email, Internet, or videoconferencing.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Keep a blog or other form of electronic journal?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Use “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs, social bookmarking) for collaboration with others?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) for a class project?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience with multimedia analysis skills

Please rate your general level of experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not very experienced</th>
<th>Somewhat experienced</th>
<th>Moderately experienced</th>
<th>Very experienced</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>identifying the main ideas in media messages or productions?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>identifying the purpose in media messages or productions?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>identifying various points of view displayed in a media message or production?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>identifying structural features of a media message or production?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>identifying production techniques to shape the point of view and message content.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>integrating multimedia literacy into your instructional content area?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspectives on teaching with technology and media

Please read each statement and mark the response that best represents your level of agreement with the statement about using technology (e.g., computers, printers, projectors, digital cameras, graphing calculators, etc.) or media (e.g., graphic images, sound, digital video, film).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I think that instructing with technology or media is enjoyable and stimulating.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I have a lot of experience using technology or media in my instruction.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I hesitate to use technology or media in my instruction because I do not feel prepared to solve problems that may arise.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I feel qualified to lead students to use technology or media as an effective means to express their learning and understanding.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. It is important to teach students how to develop visual representations of their learning and understanding using media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I think it is essential for students to be media literate to be truly educated.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Using technology or media in my instruction makes me feel tense and uncomfortable.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Teaching students to use technology or media in my content area is too time consuming, costly, or difficult to accomplish.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I would benefit from learning how to integrate instruction with conceptual issues specific to my content are using various media analysis and production tools.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Having access to technology or media support people when I need it is important to me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspectives on teaching, learning and multimedia literacy

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Creating hands-on multimedia activities is too time consuming considering other priorities such as instructing the standards.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students should learn basic facts and skills before creating multimedia assignments that require production skills and resources.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Using multimedia helps students to connect with what they are learning.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Working in groups is an efficient way for students to learn to use multimedia production skills.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encouraging students to identify and analyze components of media messages is an important part of multimedia literacy development.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students are motivated to learn by active involvement in hands-on media activities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. It is not necessary for students to understand and evaluate media messages to be proficient in the content area I teach.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My primary instructional goal is to make sure I cover the specified curriculum material in my content area.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Only teachers who are especially talented are able to creatively lead their students to learn multimedia literacy and production.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer these items

a. Describe your reasons for engaging in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.

b. What do you expect to gain or be able to do by the time the Initiative is over?

c. What do you expect your students to gain or be able to do by the time the Wallis Annenberg Initiative is over?

Demographic Information

a. Age:
   - O 21-24
   - O 25-29
   - O 30-34
   - O 35-39
   - O 40-44
   - O 45-49
   - O 50-54
   - O 55 or older

b. Gender:
   - O male
   - O female

c. Highest level of education achieved:
   - O Bachelors degree
   - O Masters degree
   - O Ph.D. or Ed.D.
   - O other (please specify)
Year End Experience Survey

Dear Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches:

You have received this survey because you participated in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative this year. We ask you to take a few minutes to complete this survey and tell us about your experiences and opinions using technology and multimedia in the classroom.

Please answer each item on the survey. There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will be kept confidential. Your answers will not be reported individually, but only in aggregate form with the other participants’ responses. The survey information will be used to inform the effectiveness of the Initiative. In addition, the survey information may be used for publications or for other educational purposes.

So that we can compare your response across the surveys you have completed in the past year, we request that you enter the password from the email you received inviting you to participate in this survey:

Password: ________
What is your primary role in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

- Teacher
- Administrator
- Coach
- Other (please specify)

[This question prompts a branching structure for the next page. Teachers are asked one set of questions and coaches and administrators are asked separate sets of questions.]

**Participant Information: Teachers**

a. What grade level(s) did you teach this year?
   - 5th
   - 6th
   - 7th
   - 8th
   - Other
   - None

b. What subject(s) did you teach this year?
   - English
   - History
   - Mathematics
   - Reading
   - Science
   - Social Studies
   - Other

   If other, please specify the subject area(s):

   O Art
   O Dance
   O Drama/Theatre
   O Performance Arts
   O Media/Technology
   O Music

c. Please describe the types of media and technology you have used in your classroom this year:
Participant Information: Administrators

a. Please describe your current role within your school and/or district.

b. How do you encourage the use of media and technology in your school?

c. Please describe the types of media and technology currently being used in your school.

3. Participant Information: Coaches

a. Please describe your current role within your own school and/or district.

b. How long have you been using media and technology as part of your own teaching?

c. Please describe the types of media and technology you used in your own teaching this year.

Experience with technology and multimedia: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches

Please rate your general level of experience with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not very experienced</th>
<th>Somewhat experienced</th>
<th>Moderately experienced</th>
<th>Very experienced</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. using basic technology (e.g., computers, printers, word processing, presentation, spreadsheet software, etc).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. analyzing or deconstructing media (e.g., close reading/analysis of a film or video).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. creating media projects (e.g., multimedia presentations, digital movies, etc.).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. designing instruction for your grade level/subject area using media (e.g., using multimedia in presentations).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. teaching students to critically analyze and interpret media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. leading students to create media projects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and media use: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This past year, how often did you use technology (e.g., computers, printers, projectors, digital cameras, graphing calculators, etc.) to…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once or Twice This Year</td>
<td>At Least Once A Month</td>
<td>At Least Once A Week</td>
<td>Every Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop instructional materials to use in your class (e.g., tests, handouts)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communicate with other teachers or professionals via online communications (e.g., email, listerves, discussion boards)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Communicate information to students using presentation software (e.g., PowerPoint)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Keep administrative records (e.g., grade book, attendance)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Prepare curriculum maps or lesson plans electronically?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Research information or ideas using the Internet for classroom use?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Collect digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for course instruction or projects?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Create and maintain Web pages?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Keep a personal or teacher blog or other form of electronic journal?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Use “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs, social bookmarking) for collaboration with teachers?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) for recreational or personal purposes?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) with students?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Collaborate with other teachers at your school to plan multimedia activities in your content area?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Consult district arts specialists for ideas or directions for instruction with multimedia production.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student technology and media use: Teachers and Coaches

This past year, how often did the students in your class(es) use technology in the following ways during class time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Year</th>
<th>At Least Once a Month</th>
<th>At Least Once a Week</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Practice keyboarding or basic computer skills?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use computer applications (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, etc) for a class assignment.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Prepare text and graphics for presentations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Research information or ideas using the Internet?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Prepare a newsletter or brochure using a desktop application?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collect digital images, movies or sound from the Internet for projects?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Create Web pages?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Collaborate with experts, authors, students from other schools, etc. via email, Internet, or videoconferencing.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Keep a blog or other form of electronic journal?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Use “social software” (e.g., wikis, blogs, social bookmarking) for collaboration with others?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies) for a class project?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience with multimedia analysis skills: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches

Please rate your general level of experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not very experienced</th>
<th>Somewhat experienced</th>
<th>Moderately experienced</th>
<th>Very experienced</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Identifying the main ideas in media messages or productions?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identifying the purpose in media messages or productions?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Identifying various points of view displayed in a media message or production?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Identifying structural features of a media message or production?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Identifying production techniques to shape the point of view and message content.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Integrating multimedia literacy into your instructional content area?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspectives on teaching with technology and media: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches

Please read each statement and mark the response that best represents your level of agreement with the statement about using technology (e.g., computers, printers, projectors, digital cameras, graphing calculators, etc.) or media (e.g., graphic images, sound, digital video, film).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I think that instructing with technology or media is enjoyable and stimulating.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I have a lot of experience using technology or media in my instruction.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I hesitate to use technology or media in my instruction because I do not feel prepared to solve problems that may arise.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I feel qualified to lead students to use technology or media as an effective means to express their learning and understanding.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. It is important to teach students how to develop visual representations of their learning and understanding using media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I think it is essential for students to be media literate to be truly educated.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Using technology or media in my instruction makes me feel tense and uncomfortable.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Teaching students to use technology or media in my content area is too time consuming, costly, or difficult to accomplish.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I would benefit from learning how to integrate instruction that is specific to my content area with media analysis and production tools.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Having access to technology or media support people when I need it is important to me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Perspectives on teaching, learning and multimedia literacy: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches**

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Creating hands-on multimedia activities is too time consuming considering other priorities such as instructing the standards.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students should learn basic facts and skills before creating multimedia assignments that require production skills and resources.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Using multimedia helps students to connect with what they are learning.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Working in groups is an efficient way for students to learn to use multimedia production skills.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encouraging students to identify and analyze components of media messages is an important part of multimedia literacy development.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students are motivated to learn by active involvement in hands-on media activities.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. It is not necessary for students to understand and evaluate media messages to be proficient in the content area I teach.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My primary instructional goal is to make sure I cover the specified curriculum material in my content area.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Only teachers who are especially talented are able to creatively lead their students to learn multimedia literacy and production.</td>
<td>O O O O O O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches

In what ways has your experience with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative been similar to or different from your initial expectations?

What, if anything, have you gained from your experience with the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

What, if anything, have your students gained from the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

Demographic Information: Teachers, Administrators, and Coaches

Age:
- O 21-24
- O 25-29
- O 30-34
- O 35-39
- O 40-44
- O 45-49
- O 50-54
- O 55 or older

Gender: O male  O female

Highest level of education achieved:
- O Bachelors degree
- O Masters degree
- O Ph.D. or Ed.D.
- O other (please specify)
Summer Institute
Evaluation Survey

Your opinions are important to us! Please take a few moments to evaluate the institute by completing this survey. It is most helpful to us when you answer all the items. Thank you.

For the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, are you a

- O Middle School Teacher
- O Coach
- O School Administrator
- O Other:

In which practicum in media production did you participate?

- O Digital Video (iMovie)
- O Multimedia Presentations (PowerPoint)

1. Overall, how would you rate the WAI Summer Institute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please rate the quality and usefulness of the following elements of the Practicum in Media Production in which you participated (Digital Video or Multimedia Presentations):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Slightly Useful</th>
<th>Moderately Useful</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Did not participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on Production Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts and/or supplementary materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please indicate the extent you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The objectives of the WAI Summer Institute were clearly presented and implemented.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The speakers and leaders were knowledgeable about the content they presented.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The content of the institute was consistent with what was described in the application information.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Attending the institute was not really worth my time.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>The institute speakers and leaders created interest in the topics and learning activities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>I had opportunities to share ideas and learn from other participants.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>The institute provided active learning experiences that engaged me in meaningful ways.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>The institute training and instruction will not be of much use to me professionally.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>The sessions provided opportunities to practice media production skills and receive feedback from instructors.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>I would recommend this institute to others.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For my experience level, the WAI Summer Institute was
   a. too elementary [______]
   b. about right [______]
   c. too technical [______]
5. From the following list of learning experiences that occurred during the WAI Summer Institute, please indicate how useful you found each to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Slightly Useful</th>
<th>Moderately Useful</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Did not Participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Using lesson study as a way to collaborate about integrating curriculum with media arts.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Developing a project-based multimedia lesson or unit complete with curriculum standards.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Developing strategies for connecting media arts standards with content area standards.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Learning media literacy concepts that are relevant for educating middle school students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Learning to scaffold lessons around multimodal communication (e.g., image, moving image, text, graphics, sound, speech, etc.)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Making presentations of the lesson ideas or multimedia projects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Thinking about your experiences during the WAI Summer Institute, please rate your agreement with each of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The WAI Summer Institute helped me increase my knowledge of how multimedia literacy can be integrated into instruction.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The WAI Summer Institute helped me conceptualize issues important for designing learning experiences using multimedia for my students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The WAI Summer Institute helped me understand how to assess students’ media analysis and production work.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The WAI Summer Institute helped me connect conceptual issues of my lessons with media messages.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The WAI Summer Institute helped me understand how student thinking can be extended through media literacy.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The WAI Summer Institute helped me acquire the design and technical skills needed to complete a media project.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The WAI Summer Institute helped me understand classroom applications of technological literacies.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The WAI Summer Institute helped me learn in a media-rich environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The WAI Summer Institute helped me explore new ways of making arguments using media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The WAI Summer Institute helped me think about issues associated with lesson design using new media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. The WAI Summer Institute helped me generate criteria for grading multimedia projects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The items below ask you to rate your level of use for instructional strategies that you discussed during the institute. Your rating will compare where you are NOW that you have completed the Institute to how you would have responded BEFORE you participated in the Institute sessions. Please mark a response in both sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How prepared are you to do the following NOW that you have participated in this Institute?</th>
<th>How prepared were you to do the following PRIOR to participating in this Institute?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Make visual presentations (e.g., PowerPoint)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Collect media assets from the Internet (e.g., digital images, movies, sound)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Record images with a digital camera.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Record images using a digital camcorder.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Produce and edit media (e.g., digital images, sound, and/or movies)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Use online journaling or blogging software</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Please mark each statement according to how true it is for you now, at the end of the Summer Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All True of Me</th>
<th>Somewhat True of Me</th>
<th>True of Me</th>
<th>Very True of Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I have a clear understanding of the Wallis Annenberg Initiative goals and objectives.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I understand what I am expected to do for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I understand what students are expected to do for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I understand what teachers are expected to do for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I understand what administrators are expected to do for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I understand what coaches are expected to do for the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I understand what steps to take if I need additional information about the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I understand what I need to do next for my role in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How do you plan to use the information and skills you acquired during the WAI Summer Institute in your work with students?

10. Which of the following do you think you still need to assist you in your instructional effectiveness with multimedia? (Mark all that apply.)

   ____ More practice producing and editing media.
   ____ More training on specific instructional strategies using new media (e.g., a one day refresher course).
   ____ Support or more involvement of other teachers at my school.
   ____ Support from my school with technical equipment or resources.
   ____ Opportunity to talk with the WAI trainers, coaches or other district personnel when questions or concerns arise.
   ____ Other (please explain below):

11. What hands-on-media production activities and/or tutorials most interest you for one of the follow-up workshops? (please choose no more than 3)

   O Operation of hardware such as digital cameras, scanners
   O Digital video production (e.g. iMovie and/or Final Cut Pro 4.5)
   O Digital sound recording and editing (e.g. Garage Band 1.2)
   O Multimedia presentations (e.g. PowerPoint)
   O Graphics (e.g. Photoshop CS)
   O Web design (e.g. Dreamweaver MX 2004)
   O Animation and digital effects (e.g. Flash MX 2004, After Effects 6.0)
   O Other (please specify)
October Workshop Evaluation Survey

Your opinions are important to us! Please take a few moments to evaluate the workshop by completing this survey. It is most helpful to us when you answer all the items. Thank you.

What is the name of your school?

What is your primary role in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

- O Middle School Teacher
- O Coach
- O School Administrator
- O Art Advisor
- O Other (please specify):

Overall, how would you rate today’s workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:

a. The objectives of the workshop were clearly presented and implemented.  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |

b. The presenters were knowledgeable about the content they presented.  
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |

c. The content of the workshop will be useful to my work.  
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |

d. The workshop provided me with an opportunity to practice new skills.  
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |

e. The presenters generated interest in the topics and learning activities.  
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |

f. I had opportunities to share ideas and learn from other participants.  
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |

g. The workshop provided active learning experiences that engaged me in meaningful ways.  
   | O                 | O        | O     | O             |
For my experience level, the workshop was:

a. too elementary _____
b. about right _____
c. too technical _____

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In today’s workshop I learned how to give and receive feedback about unit development.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. As a result of the workshop, I am better prepared to develop standards-based units for my grade level / subject area using multimedia.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I acquired new technology skills that I can use in the classroom.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. As a result of the workshop, I see the potential for blogging to be a useful way to communicate with and learn from others involved with this Initiative.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The workshop gave me ideas for how to design lessons using multimedia.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, what was most valuable to you about the workshop?

How do you plan to use the information and skills presented in the workshop?

When do you think you’ll use the information and skills you acquired during the workshop? (Mark only one.)

___ Within the next few days  
___ 1-3 weeks from now  
___ 4-6 weeks from now  
___ 7 or more weeks from now  
___ Never  
___ Not sure  
___ Other (please explain below):
What suggestions do you have for making future workshops more useful?

Looking ahead to your next steps, how prepared are you to begin working on the lesson study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not well prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Fairly well prepared</th>
<th>Very prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following would assist you with planning your lesson study? (Mark all that apply.)

- [ ] More information and direction about lesson study
- [ ] More time to meet with my team
- [ ] More training on specific instructional strategies using technology and media
- [ ] More support or involvement of other teachers at my school
- [ ] More support or involvement of administrators at my school
- [ ] More technical equipment or resources
- [ ] More opportunities to talk with the coaches when questions or concerns arise
- [ ] More opportunities to talk with the IML trainers when questions or concerns arise
- [ ] More opportunities to talk with district personnel when questions or concerns arise
- [ ] Other (please explain below):

Since attending the Summer Institute, how much progress did you make with developing your unit plan? (Check only one.)

- [ ] Not much progress has been made, and there is still a lot of work to do.
- [ ] Some progress was made, but there is still a lot of work to do.
- [ ] A moderate amount of progress was made, and there isn’t much more work to do.
- [ ] An extensive amount of progress was made and it is complete.
What kinds of support might be useful to you as you continue developing your unit?

____ More information and direction about unit development
____ More time to meet with my team
____ More training on specific instructional strategies using technology and media
____ More support or involvement of other teachers at my school
____ More support or involvement of administrators at my school
____ More technical equipment or resources
____ More opportunities to talk with the coaches when questions or concerns arise
____ More opportunities to talk with the IML trainers when questions or concerns arise
____ More opportunities to talk with district personnel when questions or concerns arise
____ Other (please explain below):

Is there anything else you would like to share about your participation in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, so far?

Thank you for completing our evaluation survey!
December Workshop Evaluation Survey

Your opinions are important to us! Please take a few moments to evaluate the workshop by completing this survey. It is most helpful to us when you answer all the items. Thank you.

What is the name of your school?

What is your primary role in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

- Middle School Teacher
- School Administrator
- Coach
- Art Advisor
- Other (please specify):

Overall, how would you rate today’s workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:

a. The objectives of the workshop were clearly presented and implemented.  
   - Strongly Disagree  
   - Disagree  
   - Agree  
   - Strongly Agree
   
   O  O  O  O

b. The presenters were knowledgeable about the content they presented.
   
   O  O  O  O

c. The content of the workshop will be useful to my work.
   
   O  O  O  O

d. The workshop provided me with an opportunity to practice new skills.
   
   O  O  O  O

e. The presenters generated interest in the topics and learning activities.
   
   O  O  O  O

f. I had opportunities to share ideas and learn from other participants.
   
   O  O  O  O

g. The workshop provided active learning experiences that engaged me in meaningful ways.
   
   O  O  O  O
For my experience level, the workshop was:

a. too elementary ______

b. about right ______

c. too technical ______

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>In today’s workshop, I had the opportunity to receive useful technical assistance.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>In today’s workshop, the “Open Space” Breakout Discussions were helpful to me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>In today’s workshop, I found the “Lesson Study Debrief” session useful.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>The media practicum was responsive to my media and technology needs.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>As a result of the media practicum, I am better prepared to move forward with my media instruction.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>In today’s workshop, I had the opportunity to explore creative and artistic elements of working with media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your amount of satisfaction with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The amount of hands-on lab time in today’s workshop.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The amount of time spent on technical discussions and tutorials in today’s workshop.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The amount of time spent on pedagogical discussions and tutorials in today’s workshop.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What practical concerns did today’s workshop address for you?

What practical concerns are still left unanswered?

Which of the following would you like future workshops to address? Please rank your selections in order of their importance, with 1 being the most important.

___ Meeting with other teachers or coaches to discuss ideas for teaching camera basics
___ Reviewing what aspects of iMovie to teach, and in what order
___ Learning some advanced PowerPoint (tips and tricks)
___ Getting a software or equipment tutorial in something new
___ Having time (and assistance) to work on your own multimedia project
___ Learning how to digitize media or find images online that your students can use
___ Discussing strategies for managing cameras and equipment
___ Discussing strategies for keeping student projects organized
___ Reviewing sample units in media literacy or media arts by other teachers
___ Other (specify): _____________________________________________

As of today, have you completed the following assignments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Developed your unit plan?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Completed your lesson study?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Read the WAI blog?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Posted to the WAI blog?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful have the following assignments been to your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Developing the unit plan</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>A little useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Completing the lesson study</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Using blogs for communicating with other WAI participants</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything else you would like to share about your participation in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, so far?
February Workshop Evaluation Survey

Your opinions are important to us! Please take a few moments to evaluate the workshop by completing this survey. It is most helpful to us when you answer all the items. Thank you.

What is the name of your school?

What is your primary role in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative?

- Middle School Teacher
- School Administrator
- Coach
- Art Advisor
- Other (please specify):

Overall, how would you rate today’s workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about today’s workshop.

a. The objectives of the workshop were clearly presented and implemented.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O

b. The presenters were knowledgeable about the content they presented.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O
c. Today’s workshop will be useful to my teaching.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O
d. I had the opportunity to practice new skills in today’s workshop.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O
e. The workshop was motivating.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O
f. I had opportunities to share ideas and learn from other participants.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O
g. The workshop provided an active learning experience that engaged me in meaningful ways.

   - Strongly Disagree: O
   - Disagree: O
   - Agree: O
   - Strongly Agree: O
For my experience level, the workshop was:
  a. too elementary 
  b. about right 
  c. too technical 

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about today’s workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I learned new and useful techniques for managing classroom media production activities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It was helpful to spend the day completing my own media project.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am more prepared to engage my students’ creativity and self-expression using media and technology.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I have a better understanding of why pre-production activities are important.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I had the opportunity to explore creative and artistic elements of working with media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was most important thing you gained from today’s workshop?

What, if anything, could have made today’s workshop better or more useful to you?

Is there anything else you would like to share about your participation in the Wallis Annenberg Initiative, so far?
Appendix E: Examples of Standards-Based Lessons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of lessons</th>
<th>Descriptions taken from the classroom observations regarding the purpose of the lesson and how it relates to the goals of the unit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Content Area Standards | • The students were instructed to write 2 poems and took a picture to accompany each poem. What was unique about the lesson was that the special education class taught the SAS (advanced studies) class how to use PowerPoint.  
• The project aimed to have students create a timeline in iMovie that integrated significant events in their lives and world events. It required Internet research primarily on Wikipedia, including evaluation of the information and beginning citation practices, understanding of sequencing, writing skills including grammar and punctuation, and the creation of original artwork. The goal was to finish the timelines and screen them for the class and other invited students.  
• The students worked on taking pictures that would be used as visual illustrations for the three poems that they wrote. The goal of the unit was to encourage self-expression by having the students create a poem that allowed them to reflect on their personality and outlook on life.  
• The students are supposed to incorporate the lessons of the Koran into their podcast or iMovie. |
| Arts/Media Arts Standards | • The goal of the lesson was for students to better understand the role of color in media and art. I don’t think the particular lesson was part of a larger unit, but rather a standalone unit. Students were given one of two handouts with 6 color images—one handout with images by the artist, Cindy Sherman, and one with images from the movie, The Wizard of Oz. Students were instructed to choose one of the handouts, and from that to choose two of the six pictures, look at them closely, and respond to seven questions about their two images.  
• The purpose of this lesson was to continue work on the ongoing research project assigned to students in the class. For the research project, each student has been assigned an artist, and has been tasked with finding biographical information, images of the artist’s work, and interesting facts about the artist. Students are putting together a PowerPoint presentation of this information to supplement a written report. Most students were still inputting text onto PowerPoint slides; a few (2 or 3 per period) were searching online for images.  
• By Monday each student should have their thumbnail sketches complete, and they will have the opportunity to gather their source materials from the Internet. They will also get the chance to practice camera shots and angles as they will go out on campus and take their own photos. They will each get a "Shot list" a sort of check off list to help them practice control over their image selection. This preparation process will help students understand that visual communication is powerful. They will learn that what they imagine and create will eventually be printed and posted for others to see and interact with. They will learn how to craft a message with visuals. |
| Other | • Students have written skits based on the anti-drug strategies outlined in the “Too Good For Drugs” curriculum used by the district. In this lesson, students practice the skits in preparation for beginning to tape them the following week. |
• The goal of the unit is for students to make a narrative video about the “effects of dropping out of school.” According to the teacher, he encouraged them to “make it real,” from the perspective of what they know from their lives and experience. The class is divided into two groups that is each producing a video. Before today’s observation, the groups already had lessons on camera basics, shot composition, and storyboarding. They have also spent approximately a week and a half of class time working on their storyboards and production plans. The purpose of the lesson I observed was for students to continue working on their video projects. “Group 1” continued to work on its storyboard. They estimate they will be done in a day or two. “Group 2” began its first day of shooting. According to the teacher, both groups talk about gangs in their videos, and involve stories in which a kid who drops out of school gets into trouble with drugs & the law, etc., and later in life winds up confronted with a student who stayed in school and is (therefore) successful in his career and relationships.

Note: one observation form did not record purpose of lesson.