Assessment: Course Four Column

FALL 2016

El Camino: Course SLOs (FA) - Film/Video

ECC: FILM 154:Regional Cinemas

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 Italian Neorealism Film Movement - At the end of this course, students will be able to describe the basic historical context which gave rise to the Italian Neorealism film movement (or a similar a movement within the region studied). **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** Objective Exam with 10 embedded questions on the final exam that related to the contextual factors, key players, and key films that contributed to emergence of British Social Realism in the 1960s-70s and La Movida Madrilena in Spain during the 1970s-80s. **Standard and Target for Success:** 80% of the students would correctly answer all 10 questions. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Success rate of each of the embedded questions were as follows: Q#3 - 60% of students answered correctly Q#6 - 85% correct Q#17 - 92.5% correct Q#21 - 95% correct Q#23 - 95% correct Q#29 - 90% correct Q#35 - 95% correct Q#37 - 87.5% correct Q#47 - 90% correct Q#51 - 90% correct Of the 40 students who took the final exam, the number of students who answered the 10 questions correctly ranged from 24 for question #3 to 38 for questions #21, #23, and #35. The average number of students who correctly answered all 10 questions was 35 or just over 87%. This is consistent with the success rate for all questions on the exam where the class average score was 86% for the 55 questions exam. (03/03/2017)	**Action:** While the target was met, the data suggests students can recall certain facts or films or filmmakers associated with a movement, but the construction of these types of questions make it difficult to assess if they understand the connection to the socio political events of the time and how these contribute to a movement's ideology and the like. Future assessments of this SLO might want to include a short, written constructed response that would require students to make a connection between a movement and real world events, in addition to understanding the key players and aesthetic characteristics of a movement. Last, Question #3 asked if Shane Meadows was credited for revitalizing British Cinema in the 1960's. Since this is a false statement and students

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		% of Success for this SLO: **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Elyusha Vafaeisfat **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Kevin O'Brien	performed poorly on this question relative to the others, I would suggest a bit more class time spent on differentiating the eras along with the the filmmakers who were most influential during that movement. (03/03/2017) **Action Category:** SLO/PLO Assessment Process **Follow-Up:** Course was next taught in Fall 2017 with the Region relegated to Italy only. Additional class time was spent on understanding the importance of film movements in general and specifically the impact of Italian Neorealism on European Cinema and American Cinema of the 1960s. (12/07/2017)
SLO #2 Marxist Cinema - At the end of this course, students will be able to describe the basic ideology of Marxist cinema as practiced by filmmakers such as Jean-Luc Godard. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2017-18 (Fall 2017) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** 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 Potemkin. **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. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2013-14 (Fall 2013) **Standard Met? :** Standard Not Met 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 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. (02/09/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kevin O'Brien **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** 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 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

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			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. (03/06/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** This is a flexible course where the regions can change from semester to semester. The follow up course focused specifically on Italian Cinema and basic concepts of Marxist Cinema were covered in conjunction with Italian Neorealism and the work of Roberto Rossellini. (12/07/2017)
SLO #3 Key Filmmakers and Contributions - At the end of this course, students will be able to identify key filmmakers and their contributions to the development of their country's cinema. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** 10 questions were included on the final exam that asked students to match 10 seminal directors with 10 statements that articulated contributions they made to their respective cinemas. These questions were broken out and analyzed separately from the rest of the final exam. **Standard and Target for Success:** Questions were either correct or incorrect and the target was 70% of the students would answer correctly the questions assessing the SLO.	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Not Met 23 students took the final exam which included the 10 questions specifically linked to the SLO statement. Item analysis revealed the following: Question #46 = 73% of students answered correctly; Q#47 = 65% correct; Q#48 = 48% correct; Q#49 = 78% correct; Q#50 = 53% correct; Q#51 = 39% correct; Q#52 = 65% correct; Q#53 = 39% correct; Q#54 = 30% correct; Q#55 = 65% correct. Overall, the average percentage of students who answered correctly was 54.6%. This number was somewhat skewed lower as 8% of students overlooked the last page of the exam that	**Action:** After reviewing the assessment questions, shorter readings that compliment topic will be tried in future courses. Also, students tended to score lower on questions that included geography (where a director is from, for example). Inclusion of maps and additional historical context would illuminate the lessons. Additionally, there was a parallel section of 154 taught this semester and more direct

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	Additional Information:	contained the SLO assessment questions. However, even if those students answered the majority of the questions correctly, the target was lower than expected. Looking closely at each question, the ones where students scored the highest had complimentary readings and may have contributed to those stronger results. (02/09/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kent Hayward **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Kevin O'Brien	collaboration with that instructor might improve student learning. (02/09/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** This is a flexible course where the regions can change from semester to semester. The follow up course focused specifically on Italian Cinema and a map of Italy, its provinces and its geographical relationship to the rest of Europe were introduced the first day of instruction. After the first screening, The Trip to Italy, students charted the characters journey on a map of Italy which began in the northwest and ended south of Naples. Additionally, a short Pentagon produced WWII film, The Liberation of Rome, was screened so students could see the landscape of Italy as the war was coming to a close. The film charts the Allies landing in Sicily and traveling north towards Rome. Last, the second film screened, Paisan, also tracks the liberation of Italy through its narrative and also begins in the south and ends in the north, near Venice. Thus students were prepped with fundamental knowledge of the Italian peninsula's topography and how that contributes to a better understanding the subtext of the narratives. (12/07/2017)

ECC: FILM 232:Production II

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 Advance Digital Cameras - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to operate advanced digital cinema cameras and DSLRs (digital single lens reflex cameras) including setting exposure, white balance, focus, ISO. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Presentation/Skill Demonstration -** Working individually, students will demonstrate how set exposure, white balance, focus, and set ISO on advanced digital cameras. To demonstrate proficiency, students will how to set exposure, white balance, focus, and set ISO using the following Panasonic HMC150 **Standard and Target for Success:** The targets for success are defined as follows: Proficient, where students demonstrated how to properly set exposure, white balance, focus, and set ISO. Near Proficient, where students where students were able to demonstrate the skills to successfully set exposure, white balance, focus, and ISO but with some hesitation or uncertainty, or with help from student peers or the instructor/TA. Not Proficient, where students were not able to properly use the camera to set exposure, white balance, focus, and ISO. Each student was evaluated on a three point scale to assess skills: A score of two (2) meant the student	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 22 students were assessed. Each student was asked to demonstrate the four camera skills to the instructor and TA. 77% of students (17 students) were proficient in each of the four areas (exposure, white balance, focus, ISO). 23% of students (5 students) were Near Proficient in the four areas (exposure, white balance, focus, ISO). This was due, in part, to the fact that they hesitated in at least one area and needed assistance from the instructor or TA. In sum, the target of 75% of students scoring proficient on camera skills was met with 77% of students scoring a two (2 points) (12/09/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Laura Almo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** A dedicated space and open lab hours with additional hours for TA hours to support equipment instruction and practice time with equipment would accelerate learning curve and provide students with the additional lab time to practice camera skills. (03/02/2017) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Action:** A dedicated space and open lab hours with additional hours for TA hours to support equipment instruction and practice time with equipment would accelerate learning curve and provide students with the additional lab time to practice camera skills. (12/09/2016) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** 5 hours of open lab were cut by the Division for the Fall 2017 semester and students have no access to equipment outside of class time. (12/07/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	could demonstrate skills in all areas without hesitation. A score of one (1) meant the student could demonstrate skills in all areas but with some hesitation or help from instructor or TA. A score of zero (0) meant the student could not demonstrate skill even with help from instructor or TA. The target for success was 75% of the students to be Proficient. **Additional Information:** 22 students were assessed. Each student was asked to demonstrate the four camera skills to the instructor and TA. 77% of students (17 students) were proficient in each of the four areas (exposure, white balance, focus, ISO). 23% of students (5 students) were Near Proficient in the four areas (exposure, white balance, focus, ISO). This was due, in part, to the fact that they hesitated in at least one area and needed assistance from the instructor or TA. In sum, the target of 75% of students scoring proficient on camera skills was met with 77% of students scoring a two (2 points)		
SLO #2 Mixing Music - At the end of this course, students will be able to	**Project -** Working in groups of 2-4 students, students will mix music	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016)	**Action:** A dedicated space and open lab hours with additional

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
demonstrate how to effectively mix music under dialog to enhance the dramatic needs of a given scene. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	under a dialog scene from the film Modified Red Flag. Students filmed scenes from this film earlier in the semester. To demonstrate the proficiency of skills needed to mix music under a dialog scene, students will take given scene, add music to enhance storytelling, augment mood/tone and increase dramatic tension. Using one music track, students will determine how music (or lack of music) creates mood/tone, enhances storytelling, and creates dramatic tension. **Standard and Target for Success:** The targets for success are defined as follows: Proficient, where student groups' final project included the requisite skills to properly and effectively mix music under dialog to enhance the dramatic needs of a given scene. Requisite skills 1. Import music into Final Cut Pro X project 2. Lay music track(s) 3. Adjust/mix levels of music and dialog tracks 4. Add fades/audio dissolves Near Proficient, where student groups' final project demonstrated the requisite skills needed to effectively mix music and dialog tracks but did so either with help	**Standard Met? :** Standard Met 22 students were assessed. Each student was asked to demonstrate the four camera skills to the instructor and TA. 77% of students (17 students) were proficient in each of the four areas (exposure, white balance, focus, ISO). 23% of students (5 students) were Near Proficient in the four areas (exposure, white balance, focus, ISO). This was due, in part, to the fact that they hesitated in at least one area and needed assistance from the instructor or TA. In sum, the target of 75% of students scoring proficient on camera skills was met with 77% of students scoring a two (2 points) Action A dedicated space and open lab hours with additional hours for TA hours to support equipment instruction and practice time with equipment would accelerate learning curve and provide students with the additional lab time to practice camera skills. (03/02/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Laura Almo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	hours for TA hours to support equipment instruction and practice time with equipment would accelerate learning curve and provide students with the additional lab time to practice camera skills. (12/09/2016) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** 5 hours of open lab were cut by the Division for the Fall 2017 semester and students have no access to equipment outside of class time. (12/07/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	from the instructor or TA [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete]. Not Proficient, where student groups' final project did not demonstrate requisite skills needed to effectively mix music and dialog tracks. [students were not able to operate software, import music and mix music and dialog]. The Target for Success was for 80% of the students to be proficient or near proficient. **Additional Information:** Six groups were assessed. Groups were mixing music/dialog for a film (Modified Red Flag) shot in class. Each group imported music, added music track to existing dialogue track in Final Cut Pro, adjusted/mixed levels of music and dialog tracks, added audio fades/dissolves and then exported mixed project for class screening. Four groups (67%) were proficient in all areas 1. Importing music into FCP X 2. Laying down music track 3. Adjusting/mixing levels of music and dialog tracks 4. Adding Audio fades/dissolves. Four groups were proficient in all areas as students of varying skill levels collaborated and helped each		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	other complete the group assignment. Two groups were near proficient and needed help from instructor or TA. The projects were complete but the student group had difficulty in at least one area: levels were not mixed well. In both student groups music was too loud for dialog. Both groups had difficulty understanding how to use the software to effectively mix music and dialog. This was due, in part, to the fact that students come in to Production II with different levels of experience/proficiency with editing software (FCP X). In sum, the target for success was met with 100% of groups proficient or near proficient. 67% percent (four groups) were proficient and 37% (two groups) were near proficient.		
SLO #3 Shooting a Scene - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to shoot a scene using both double-system and single-system sound production techniques. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Presentation/Skill Demonstration -** Working in groups of 4, students will be assessed using the following film production equipment: 1. Tascam DR-40 Digital Audio Recorder 2. Panasonic HMC 150 camcorder 3. On board camera microphone 4. Lavalier microphones 5. Slate To demonstrate the proficiency skills needed to operate the equipment as	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 17 students were assessed and all 4 crews interviewed a high profile subject, El Camino President Dr. Tom Fallo. They were working on a strict time line with each group having 15 minutes to secure the interview. 50% of students (2 groups) were observed to be Proficient all four areas: audio recorder, camcorder, lavalier microphones, proper slate technique and they secured their interviews without assistance from the instructor. 50% of the students (2 groups) were observed to be Near	**Action:** Dedicated studio space for camera/lighting and dedicated space for sound would be of great value for properly practicing and rehearsing with talent and equipment to professionally produce these types of productions. Additional TA hours to support equipment instruction outside of allocated class time would also accelerated the learning curve and shooting high profile interviews like these could then occur earlier in the semester.

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	per the SLO, students will shoot a personal interview with a live subject recording the interview using both double and single system production technique simultaneously. **Standard and Target for Success:** The standards for success are defined as follows: Proficient, where the students demonstrated the requisite skills to properly: 1. Operate Tascam recorder (turn on, off, adjust levels, record audio tracks for double-system). 2. Operate Panasonic (turn camera on, white balance, set exposure, manual focus, set audio levels for on board microphone for single system recording). 3. Set up lavalier microphones, set audio levels for double-system recording. 4. Properly slate shot for synchronization in postproduction. Near Proficient, where students were able to demonstrate the skills needed to successfully shoot the interview but with did so with some hesitation, uncertainty or need for help from group members or the instructor. Not Proficient, where students were unable to properly use the equipment and failed to shoot and record the interview.	Proficient in most areas but had some difficulty with audio: one group of students forgot to turn on Tascam and then had to readjust levels wasting valuable time. In another group the lavalier microphone was causing problems and students had to swap out batteries before conducting the interview. These two groups still captured their interviews, but need minor assistance from the instructor or their peers. No students were observed to be Not Proficient. (03/06/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Laura Almo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Kevin O'Brien	Furthermore, dedicated space, hours for opening the editing lab, and hours for equipment instruction would allow for creating more complex projects and better prepare our students for transfer to competitive 4 year programs. (03/08/2016) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** Grant money has been allocated for new equipment and to upgrade Music 1 which is a positive step, but no studio space has been secured. Also 5 hours of open lab were cut by the Division for the Fall 2017 semester and students have no access to equipment outside of class time. (12/07/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	The target for success was for 75% of the students to be Near Proficient or Proficient. **Additional Information:**		

ECC: FILM 234:Camera and Lighting

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 Calculating Exposure - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to properly use an incident light meter to calculate normal exposure for digital cinema cameras. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Laboratory Project/Report -** Two camera labs were assigned to students working in small groups of 3-4. Specific parameters for each shot for calculating normal exposure in a variety of lighting situations were given in a handout. Previous class time was devoted to studying the factors that govern exposure and covered basics of using the Sekonic L-398 incident light meter. **Standard and Target for Success:** Students were tasked with using the meter to establish normal, under, and over exposure settings including shutter speed/frame rate, aperture, and ISO. Success determined by projecting and reviewing each shot in a critique session the following class. Target for success as 75% of the students could use the light meter properly. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Of the 16 students observed during the two labs and the two critique sessions, only 2 struggled with the concept of using the incident meter to calculate exposure. One student had taken the prerequisite course at another school and lacked the skills developed in ECC's prerequisite course Film 122. The other student had met the prerequisite through still photography courses but the incident meter is not used in those courses and thus concepts such as footcandles and incident light were unfamiliar. Aside from those two individuals, 14 of the 16 students (87.5%) showed facility with the meter during shooting and the results were validated in the subsequent screenings. Further evidence was that projects shot later in the semester using the same technique showed consistent exposure control. (02/08/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kevin O'Brien **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** When curricular changes commence in 2015 for aligning the program with the AA-T degree, serious consideration should be to remove the prerequisite and allow all students to practice cinematography at the beginning level. (02/08/2015) **Action Category:** Curriculum Changes **Follow-Up:** No changes have been made to curriculum at this time as the AA-T degree has not been released from the Chancellor's office for whatever reason. Curriculum was approved at the Division and College level over two years ago. (12/07/2017)
SLO #2 Measuring Lighting Ratios - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to measure lighting ratios using an incident light meter. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Multiple Assessments -** Throughout the semester, students were working in a studio environment designed to replicate a professional film set. All 24 students practiced fundamentals of cinematography including weekly practice with the Sekonic Studio L-398 Incident light meter to calculate exposure and lighting ratios for a variety of lighting setups. The meters were introduced during the first class session and used in all 16 class sessions. In	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Through direct observation, I concluded that by the end of the semester all 24 students were able to effectively use the Sekonic light meter to calculate lighting ratios such as key light to fill light ratios or foreground to background ratios. Beginning with the first class session and concluding with the last, the meter was the key tool the students utilized in their roles as Directors of Photography to correctly execute the look of the lighting plans that were filmed each week. (03/03/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:**	**Action:** After conferring with other film faculty, we concurred that teaching this course in Theatre 151 (Theatre Lighting Studio) was a key factor in the student's success and mastery of the SLO. Working from a blank canvas (a dark studio) allows for complete lighting control and facilitates teaching and practicing concepts like lighting ratios. Unfortunately, the course will not be taught in the same facility in Fall 2017 and

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	addition to written material, students had ample time to practice with the meter and receive additional help from the instructor, the teaching assistant, and their peers. A new practicum was introduced each week and a lighting plan was developed, executed, filmed, and the results critiqued. All students were actively engaged in calculating lighting ratios and developed a solid understanding of how ratios contribute to the overall look of the lighting plan. **Standard and Target for Success:** 75% of the students would show facility with the meter when calculating ratios. **Additional Information:**	**Faculty Assessment Leader:** Jeff Crum **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Kevin O'Brien	the Film program still lacks for dedicated studio space for students to practice the art and craft of cinematography in Film 234. (03/03/2017) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** Though no true studio space has been allocated for Film, the program is working with the Theatre Department and the dean to shuffle some courses around so one or two film courses could be taught in Theatre 151 and the Haag Recital Hall. (12/07/2017)
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. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2017-18 (Fall 2017) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Laboratory Project/Report -** 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 re-created the camera and lighting style in a lab assignment that involved photographing the scene. **Standard and Target for Success:** 1. On the written assessment, the target was for 75% of the students to respond to the short answer and diagrams at average or better. 75%	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2013-14 (Fall 2013) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 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	**Action:** 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

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	was established as the target because 4 of the 16 students tested took the prerequisite course at another institution and their cinematography knowledge was unclear. For the lighting concepts and lighting diagram questions 7-14, a 4 point scale was established: 3=superior, 2= average, 1=below average, 0=did not answer. 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	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 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.	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 definitive role within the crew. (03/06/2015) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** Though no true studio space has been allocated for Film, the program is working with the Theatre Department and the dean to shuffle some courses around so one or two film courses could be taught in Theatre 151 and the Haag Recital Hall. (12/07/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	design, light style. **Additional Information:**	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 students skill set. In sum, the shooting of the scene was deemed successful by both the instructor and the students after the critique which include a discussion of the problems of lighting for a moving camera and following focus. (02/09/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kevin O'Brien **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	

ECC: FILM 236:Editing

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 Unrelated Shots - At the end of this course, students will be able to plan, shoot, and edit footage that demonstrates the principle of putting two unrelated shots together to create a new meaning (juxtaposition). **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Project -** Students did a project on the "Kuleshov Effect and the Power of Juxtaposition." Working in groups of 4-5 students, each group planned and shot footage. Students then edited individually by each student. Students were tasked with replicating the Kuleshov Experiment in which they edited unrelated shots juxtaposed against a neutral face in order to evoke different emotions. Students edited the project in Final Cut Pro X **Standard and Target for Success:** The targets for success are defined as follows: Proficient, where students final project included the requisite skills to properly plan, shoot, and edit the Kuleshov Juxtaposition Project. Near Proficient, where students final project demonstrated the requisite skills needed to properly plan, shoot, and edit the Kuleshov Juxtaposition Project, but did so either with help from fellow students, the instructor, or TA [final projects still had some editing issues when project was complete]. Not Proficient, where students final project did not demonstrate requisite skills needed to plan, shoot, edit project [final projects	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 22 students were assessed. Each student was part of a group for planning and shooting the project. Students then edited individually using Final Cut Pro X software. 52% of students (11 students) were proficient where final project was edited using requisite editing software and demonstrated full understanding of juxtaposition. 38% of students (8 students) were Near Proficient where final project was edited using requisite editing software but needed assistance from the instructor or TA. Project demonstrated understanding of juxtaposition but did not follow assignment with precision. The projects were complete but students had some difficulty with editing. This was due, in part, that some students were new to the editing software and required more practice. Additionally, some students were absent for planning and shooting stages and didn't fully understand Juxtaposition. 10% of students (2 students) were Not Proficient. These students did not complete the assignment. Both of these students had difficulty completing the project due to absence and struggling to catch up with the rest of the class. In sum, the target of 80% of students being Near Proficient or Proficient was met. (12/09/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Laura Almo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Hours for opening the editing lab and additional TA hours to support equipment/software instruction outside of allocated class time would accelerate the This would also enable instructors to create more complex projects and better prepare our students to transfer to competitive 4 year programs. (03/02/2017) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** At this time there are no open lab hours for any film students. The 5 hours allocated in the Spring 2017 semester were cut for the Fall 2017 semester. (12/07/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	were not edited satisfactorily and/or did not demonstrate full understanding of the impact of juxtaposition]. The target for success was 80% of the students to be Proficient. **Additional Information:**		
SLO #2 Invisible Style of Editing - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to edit a scene that employs the principles of the invisible style of editing. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2013-14 (Spring 2014) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	Each student was assigned a workstation in the Editing Lab and provided raw footage from an editing exercise ("Rich Stew") the library had purchased from an Australian Film & Television School. It is a 3 person period piece shot with a single camera approach that had three distinct components to the scene. Students were tasked with capturing the footage into Final Cut Pro X, our primary nonlinear editing software introduced Spring 2014, breaking the footage in to shots, then cutting the scene together using the Hollywood tradition of invisible or seamless editing to telling a coherent story. Additionally, the footage had continuity problems from shooting mistakes that the student editors had to solve. **Standard and Target for Success:** Individual meetings were held with each student to evaluate their project. They were assessed using a traditional 4 point GPA scale: 4=excellent with no obvious editing errors; 3=above average with 1-2	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2013-14 (Spring 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Of the 22 students assessed, 12 scored a 4.0, 2 scored a 3.5, 5 scored a 3.0; 1 scored a 2.0; 2 scored a 0. The average score for the class was 3.6. 90.9%, 20 of the 22 students, successfully performed the editing task and the target was met. Though the target was met, future assessments for this SLO should strive for more students scoring in the 3.5-4.0 range. Part of the reason that more students did not score higher is the fact the Editing Lab did not come online until the 8th week of the semester and several students struggled with the learning curve adapting to new Editing software and spent too much of the alloted time learning software and less time on the principles the assessment attempted to measure. The 2 students who were not assessed missed their scheduled appointments for evaluation due to absences. One student asked to be excused due to extenuating medical issues involving a family member and another was chronically absent throughout the semester and never completed the assessment. (09/12/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kevin O'Brien **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Students taking the hands on intensive lecture/lab courses would benefit from open lab hours where they could come and practice in the Editing Lab outside of class time under the supervision of a qualified teaching assistant. Editing assignments are done during class time and students do not have access to the Editing Lap outside of class time which is a disservice to those students who need extra instruction or practice. (09/12/2015) **Action Category:** Program/College Support **Follow-Up:** At this time there are no open lab hours for any film students. The 5 hours allocated in the Spring 2017 semester were cut for the Fall 2017 semester. (12/07/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	errors; 2=average with 3-4 errors; 1=below average with 5 or more errors; 0=failed if student did not complete project or missed assigned meeting with instructor. Target: 90% of the students assessed would be able to demonstrate the fundamentals of continuity editing. **Additional Information:**		
SLO #3 Advanced Editing Software - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to import, edit, and export picture and soundtracks utilizing advanced editing software such as Final Cut Pro. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2017-18 (Fall 2017) **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**			