<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLOs</th>
<th>Assessment Methods &amp; Standard and Target for Success / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Film/Video - ECC: FILM 153 - American Independent Cinema - SLO #2 Alternative Cinemas - At the end of this course, students will be able to describe the salient characteristics of alternative cinemas such as experimental and underground cinema. (Created By El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Film/Video)</td>
<td>Assessment Method Description: An essay question specific to the SLO was included in the final exam which was: &quot;Describe any alternative cinemas, such as experimental and underground, that influenced each filmmaker where appropriate. Please make sure to list the film movement and characteristics of each movement.&quot;</td>
<td>02/09/2014 - Out of 25 students who answered the question: 23 answered with Italian Neorealism 17 answered with French New Wave 12 answered with Surrealism/Experimental 8 answered with American Independent Cinema 5 answered with Dogma 95 4 answered with Blaxploitation/ Black Exploitation</td>
<td>03/06/2015 - In terms of grading the written responses, the standard was met with all but 3 students responding with a score of 2 or higher. Of the 24 students, 37.5% scored 4, 25% scored 3, 25% scored 25% with just 3 students scoring a 1 or 12.5%. The three students who scored low did not address the prompt and simply listed 1 Alternative Cinema with lack of details such as the influence on other filmmakers or movements that ensued. Though these results were encouraging, with the majority of student responses indicating they were retaining knowledge of the various cinemas and movements discussed in class, I believe the essay question could have been structured more precisely. For example, a more precise rewrite would be: &quot;Describe at least 2 alternative cinemas discussed in class. Include in your response at least 2 filmmakers associated with each movement and describe at least 2 characteristics associated with each movement.&quot; This wording would build into the question a rubric with minimum standards for the student and the instructor making the grading on a 1-4 scale less subjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18 (Fall 2017)</td>
<td>Course SLO Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input Date: 12/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard and Target for Success: The target for success was for 75% of the students to answer the question with a score of 2 or higher with 0=fail to answer, 1=below average, 2=average, 3=above average, 4=excellent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Method: Exam/Test/Quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Met? : Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Fall 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Assessment Leader: Aminah Abdul-Jabbaar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O’Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Method Description: 10 questions were embedded in the Midterm examination that dealt specifically with basic Marxist ideology of Russian Cinema of the 1920s as practiced by our representative director Sergei Eisenstein and his film Battleship</td>
<td>02/09/2014 - Item analysis of the 10 questions was used to determine success rate. Overall, the 40 students who took the midterm answered the questions correctly at an average of 67.5%. This was a bit below the target of 70% correct. Question #14 skewed the results somewhat with 83% of the students missing that</td>
<td>03/06/2015 - On review, for the most part students demonstrated that they were retaining some of the concepts presented and discussed in class. Introduction to Marxist ideology in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Course SLO: ECC: FILM 234 - Camera and Lighting - SLO #3

Style Described by Director - At the end of this course, students will be able to plan, light, and shoot a given scene based on the style described by the director. (Created By El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Film/Video)
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Assessment Methods & Standard and Target for Success / Tasks

Potemkin.

Assessment Method:
Exam/Test/Quiz

Standard and Target for Success:
The standard for success was established at 100% of the students answering the 10 questions at an average passing rate of 70% (C-) or higher for the questions combined.

Assessment Method Description:
1. 14 question nongraded assessment that tested basic knowledge of lighting terms and concepts needed to plan and light a given scene. Assessment included fill-in-the blank questions, short answer, and lighting diagrams. 2. Following the written assessment, the class previewed a scene provided by instructor then recreated the camera and lighting style in a lab assignment that involved photographing the scene.

Standard Met? :
No

Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:
2013-14 (Fall 2013)

Faculty Assessment Leader:
Kevin O’Brien

Results

question, which was the most missed question on the entire exam. Eliminating that question, the target would have been met with a potential 73% of the students meeting the target.

Standard Met? :
No

Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:
2013-14 (Fall 2013)

Faculty Assessment Leader:
Kevin O’Brien

Action & Follow-Up

Russian Cinema is one of the most difficult concepts for the students who rarely have any knowledge of Marxism and typically associate it, incorrectly, with Communism as practice by the Soviet Union. Reflecting on the discussions in class, additional readings or handouts distributed prior the film screening and read prior to the discussion would give the students at least some basics of Marxism prior to the discussion. Prepping the ahead of time should yield better outcomes, but the key will be for the instructor to find (or create) a reading that synthesizes these difficult concepts into language the novice film student can understand. Thus, reading Sergei Eisenstein’s seminal text Film Theory would be the wrong approach.

Action Category:
Teaching Strategies

02/09/2014 - Questions 1-6 on the assessment were technical terms and the average percentage of correct responses was 61.45%. Though this was lower than expected, combined with the 92.97 percent of average and superior short answer and diagram responses on Questions 7-14, this was an acceptable result. On close analysis, the questions the students missed the most, Questions #2, #3, #6 were facts that needed to be memorized but an erroneous answer would not affect the outcome of the rest of the assessment or the practical exercise that followed. For example, more than half the students missed Questions #2 and #3 which asked for the Color Temperature of our Motion Picture Studio Lights (3200k) and Average Daylight (5500k). An incorrect answer to these questions would not affect the practical exercise since with our digital cinema camera (Panasonic AF-100), white balancing the camera corrects for color temperature problems when shooting and the actual Kelvin Scale numbers are not displayed in the camera. In the future or in advance classes, students will need to know the Kelvin scale when they become involved with film cameras or digital cinema cameras that utilize filtration to achieve color correctness.

The short answer and diagram questions suggest students had absorbed basic cinematography principles to an acceptable level. Some of the questions were designed as fill-in-the-blank assessments to force students to think about the answers that could be easily looked up online. Another reason for the high passing rate on the assessment was that the diagram questions combined.

03/06/2015 - The written portion of the assessment was non graded and student buy in was fairly weak. Several students did not bother to fill out the diagrams and did so only at the behest of the instructor. Future assessments will be formulated as quizzes or exam questions so the stakes are higher and hopefully student responses will be more accurate.

For the lab, lack of studio space hindered, somewhat, the project. Though the results of the lab (the video produced) showed the assessment was met, too much time was spent rigging. Proper studio space would allow for additional time spent on the aesthetics of lighting. Additionally, the group was broken into two, but crew sizes were still too large and several students relegated themselves to observers rather than participants. No doubt they learned something from the experience, but it is not observable. Future practical lab assessments should include smaller groups with each student assigned a
2. For shooting the scene in the camera/lighting lab, the class was broken into three groups: Group 1 roughed in the lighting scheme for the master shot and the coverage. Group 2 set up the main camera, dolly track, and blocked out the camera moves with coverage. Group 3 roughed in the lighting scheme for the cutaways and inserts that did not involve the performers and blocked out the basic camera shots. As this was a group lab project involving 23 students, the target was for each group to successfully set up and capture their portions of the scene within the specified time frame: one class period (2.5 hours) to prelight the scene and a second class period (2.5 hours) to set up and shoot the scene planned the session prior. Success was measured by direct observation by the instructor during the shoot and then subsequently critiquing the dailies (the shot footage) and comparing the shot material to the model studied. 5 areas were analyzed: exposure, white balance, focus, shot design, light style.

From the prerequisite class, Film 22, and from the labs and critiques completed in the previous 7 weeks of the assessment semester.

The planning and shooting of the re-created scene was as successful as could be expected given the Film/Video Department does not have a professional lighting studio to properly conduct such experiments. There is no way to actually quantify the two days of roughing in and shooting the scene other than through direct observation and a critique of the actual footage. For the most part, the 3 groups of students were engaged during the rough in of the main scene, setting up camera and dolly track and the second camera covering the cutaways and inserts. The Haag Recital Hall was used as studio space and the main stage had the space for laying out track and lighting the main scene. The back portion of the room was used for second camera. Like in any class, there were leaders and followers and the most useful information came from observing the students who actively engaged in the problem solving required, those who observed from a distance, and the 2-3 who were more interested in checking their phone messages and texts. Day 2 went more smoothly as the first day was to work out the kinks, diagram the lighting plan, block out the shots and camera moves. The scene was covered, multiple students rotated operating jobs, and for the most part stayed engaged in the process. As in Day 1, a couple of students stayed in the wings though they were given ample opportunity to participate.

Footage was critiqued after the shoot during the ensuing class meeting. 1. Exposure calculations were consistent from A Camera to B Camera and the footage from each was deemed acceptable and able to be intercut. 2. White balance (for proper colors) was acceptable for each camera as well. These two technical factors are critical when shooting multiple cameras and each group met the standard practiced in previous labs. 3. Focus on A camera was acceptable for the most part, though focus was soft 3 times during the longer tracking shots. This is understandable given our dolly does not support a second rider (the 1st Assistant Camera) nor does the school own a proper follow focus for the AF-100. These are difficult moves and as this is an introductory class and the students have little experience with moving camera, a few focus errors was to be expected. Focus on Camera B was excellent as all shots were from a static camera. 4. Shot design matched the original scene as closely as possible given the lack of studio space and equipment limitations. 5. Lighting style emulated the model scene with reason given the
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definitive role within the crew.

Action Category:
Teaching Strategies
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students skill set.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In sum, the shooting of the scene was deemed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>successful by both the instructor and the students after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the critique which include a discussion of the problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of lighting for a moving camera and following focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard Met? :</strong> Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</strong> 2013-14 (Fall 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Assessment Leader:</strong> Kevin O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>