

Catherine Howes, Christopher Knapp, Christa Wolbers
Teresa Dobson
LLED 368 (951)

1. What process did you use to develop your idea? Include any brainstorming prompts and approaches.

Building on the Shakespearian character dating profiles and the casting call from our first Media Project, we wanted to experiment with a medium that would allow us to bring the characters and their quirks to life. The format of the dating game show "Baggage" allowed us to explore each of the main characters from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the manner in which they interact with one another, and how each of the player's contribute to the complex plot of the play. The format for this show also allows for each character or contestant to be broken down into a series of three quirks. Therefore, we began the entire process by determining our featured characters, and what their baggage would be.

2. What other pre-production strategies did you employ?

The first thing we did to re-create our own episode of "Baggage" was to determine and record each characters' piece of "Baggage." Once this was decided, we selected the location and began storyboarding the episode. We chose Capilano College for our filming location as we felt it reflected the naturalistic setting of the play well. The storyboarding aspect of our assignment was kept fairly general, as we planned to improv most of the actual dialogue and character interactions. Therefore, our storyboards mostly consisted of a single representation of each of the key segments from the show. However, we found that because we kept our storyboarding so general, we were missing several clips when we reached the editing stage. To avoid continuity issues, we were required to film additional scenes to fill in the gaps. In order to do justice to Shakespeare's characters, we referenced the original text as often as possible through the dialogue. This required a thorough reading and understanding of the play itself. In addition, we each watched several episodes of the TV show "Baggage" to ensure we understood the genre and format for our re-creation.

3. How did you assign tasks or roles within your group? How did you manage time?

We have been fortunate enough to have worked together on numerous occasions. Therefore, the collaboration process was uncomplicated and fun. We delegated each of the tasks as evenly as possible, and again ensured that each person's opinion was heard and considered. We each chose our own character to portray, and were lucky enough to have a bit of help from some of our peers. Because we decided to film on a location outside of UBC, we mostly used class time to discuss scenes and segments. The responsibilities for storyboarding and filming were shared, while the physical editing was mostly completed by Cat (who already had some experience working with iMovie). However, each of us contributed our opinions and decisions were made cooperatively concerning each component of the film.

4. What approaches would you use to assess this activity that takes account of the following: a) the multimedia nature of the assignment; b) the collaborative nature of the assignment?
*include a draft assessment rubric.

For this activity, where students will be creating a visual representation of a dating game show (either in skit or video format) using novel characters from Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, we decided to create a 4-point rubric. The areas that we are focusing on for the overall project are: analysis/interpretation; creativity; content; and presentation.

The assessment of analysis/interpretation focuses on the extent to which student(s) have analyzed the given characters of the literary work they have chosen for their project and how appropriate the interpretation is of the characters (i.e. does the 'dating profile' accurately represent *A Midsummer Night's Dream* characters in detail?).

The assessment of creativity focuses on how much creative effort has been placed into the project; hence, the more creative expression within the overall product (i.e. the dating game show skit/video), the better the grade. Students are encouraged to reveal their own understanding or readings of each of the play's characters based on the original text. However, students should not take too many liberties with the source text, that it is no longer recognizable.

The assessment of content focuses on how well students have connected/engaged with the source material and to what extent the source material was used. For example, the assessment of content in our activity may go as follows: How well do the students engage with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*? Are any additional sources used? How are the additional sources used?

Finally, the assessment of presentation focuses on both parts of the activity – the 'dating profile' and the skit/video – and looks at a number of factors. It considers how well the overall project is presented to the class (i.e. was it clear and insightful, or, was it unclear and muddled?). Does the project fall within a given time limit? How much engagement with the media source is shown, for example, does the skit/video effectively show analysis and engagement with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*? And finally, how well has the group worked on and come together while creating their project(s)? Hence, the presentation aspect of our assessment focuses on more than just the media project itself, but also the collaborative aspect of our activity.

The rubric used to assess this assignment can be found below.

5. What are the greatest challenges in using this approach in a classroom and can they be ameliorated through careful instructional design? What learning opportunities did this activity afford? *Include a formal statement describing your goals in completing this assignment along with the drawbacks and affordances of the approach.

We were required to learn a lot of new skills in creating this project. We imagine we felt very much as our students would when creating this project, as we learned and experimented as we

went. Only one of our group members was familiar with iMovie and film editing, and therefore, we all learned a lot about that aspect of filmmaking. We would expect that while some students may have experience with filming and editing programs, others may not. Therefore, we understand that some class time or a complete lesson would be necessary for us to educate our students on this process. Another question that came up throughout the process was regarding storyboarding and scripting. We wound up storyboarding our episode very generally, and omitting the scripting process. Even with the storyboard we missed some of the necessary transition scenes. We decided that this task, though tedious, can save a ton of time in the long run and is therefore a valuable part of the process. Scripting is one that we are still unsure of. On one hand, working without a script allows for improve and an organic development of ideas. However, on the other hand, some students may feel less comfortable or sure of the direction that their video will take. Finally, despite our intent that this be a less intimidating introduction to Shakespeare and his characters, we understand that some students may struggle with the analysis of the text itself. This will require thorough scaffolding and support from the teacher, as well as sufficient time for students to explore and discuss the text together. We also recognize that some students may be uncomfortable with the creative nature and direction of the assignment itself, and may wish to focus their efforts on a product that is more concrete. Again, it should be noted that students would be permitted the freedom to produce the assignment in any way they choose as long as the process is similar, and they are fully engaging and exploring the text.

Works Cited:

Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ed. Peter Holland. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2008. Print.

Baggage: Various Episodes. Comcast Entertainment, 2010-2011. Web.

	1	2	3	4
Analysis & Interpretation	Little to no evidence shown of research and/or engagement with the source material	Minimal evidence shown of research and/or engagement with the source material	Shows evidence of concrete research and engagement with the material	Shows evidence of thorough research and effective engagement with the material
Creativity	Demonstrates little to no originality and creativity	Demonstrates a minimal amount of originality and creativity	Demonstrates originality and creativity	Effectively demonstrates originality and creativity
Content	Little to no connection and/or evidence of content/source material; demonstrates no original content	Minimal connection and/or evidence of content/source material; demonstrates minimal original content	Concrete connection and/or evidence of content/source material; demonstrates solid use of original content	Thorough connection and/or evidence of content/source material; demonstrates thorough use of and engagement in original content
Presentation	Unclear and disorganized; shows little engagement with the material and tends to meander	Adequate delivery of message, minor corrections; goes over/under time limit; minimal engagement with media source	Great delivery of message; good time management; demonstrates effective engagement with the media source	Clear and insightful; falls within structured time limit; shows thorough engagement with the media source