<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLOs 1 and ctu.unitid = 726</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><strong>ECC: FILM 110 - Film Analysis and Appreciation - SLO #1 Rise of American Film Industry</strong> - At the end of this course, students will be able to identify key innovators and inventions that led to the rise of the American film industry circa 1890.</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Method Description:</strong> The assessment of SLO #1 and the essay on “The Hollywood Style and the Rise of the American Film Industry” resulted in 45 essays. <strong>Assessment Method:</strong> Essay/Written Assignment <strong>Standard and Target for Success:</strong> 70% of the students would earn a C or better.</td>
<td>05/06/2014 - The assessment of SLO #1 and the essay on “The Hollywood Style and the Rise of the American Film Industry” resulted in 45 essays with the following grades earned: five As, thirty Bs, three Cs, two Ds and five Fs. My target was that 70% of the students would earn a C or better and over 80% of the class earned a C or better on the assessment. There are still students earning Ds and Fs on a fairly standard writing assignment, which is notable. This could be an area where new approaches are needed. The vast majority of papers are Bs, with room for improvement. Since last year, the use of the writing lab clearly brought up grades for those who used it, even though all of the writing lab papers earned Bs (6 papers) and As (1 paper). <strong>Standard Met?</strong> : Yes</td>
<td>05/19/2015 - Revision of the assignment to an extended format, making a draft due in class for peer review then allowing students to rewrite a final draft for final evaluation. Peer review has improved writing on another essay given, this may improve the lower grades and encourage participation from the few students who chose not to complete the assignment. I will also consider increasing the point value of the assessment to encourage the students to spend additional time on this writing assignment. <strong>Action Category:</strong> Teaching Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Course SLO Assessment Cycle: | 2013-14 (Spring 2014) | 09/04/2014 - 43 students were assessed and the class averaged just over 94% correct for all 15 questions. This was a bit higher than expected and the target was met. The range was from 100% correct for Question #56 Special Make Up Effects to a low of 81% for Art Director. Within the overall context of the complete exam, the solid performance of the students was consistent with the class averaging 3.29 GPA for the | 03/03/2015 7:04 PM |

**ECC: FILM 114 - Story Development - SLO #1** Logline, Pitch, and Synopsis - At the end of this course, students will be able to write a logline, pitch, and synopsis for an original screen story. | **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 | 09/04/2015 - Though the target was met, the assessment method did not test thoroughly if students understood the responsibilities of each crew position. In future assessments, written responses from the students would more accurately gauge their retention of a particular position’s range of |

| Course SLO Status: | Active | Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O’Brien |

| Course SLO Assessment Cycle: | 2013-14 (Spring 2014) | Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kent Hayward |

| **ECC: FILM 120 - Introduction to Film/Video Production - SLO #2** Key Production Roles - At the end of this course, students will be able to identify key film production roles and explain each job’s responsibilities. | **Input Date:** 12/12/2013 | 09/04/2015 - Though the target was met, the assessment method did not test thoroughly if students understood the responsibilities of each crew position. In future assessments, written responses from the students would more accurately gauge their retention of a particular position’s range of |

| Course SLO Status: | Active | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course SLO Status: Active</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>12/12/2013</td>
<td>were that person’s responsibilities within the film crew.</td>
<td>final, a B+.</td>
<td>Responsibilities. The exam questions demonstrated that students learned key roles and their associated departments on a film shoot but the assessment did not provide enough data on whether they learned the specific responsibilities those roles demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After the screening, the film was reviewed and students shared their observations. Accurate and inaccurate identifications/descriptions were encouraged and discussed thoroughly in an open dialog with students and instructor. It was noted that these positions would be continually referenced in exams and in discussions throughout the semester.</td>
<td><strong>Standard Met? :</strong> Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In preparation for the final exam, this initial discussion was followed up with an outside reading published by Kodak that described typical film crew jobs and responsibilities for both professional and student shoots.</td>
<td><strong>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</strong> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally, 15 questions True/False were embedded in the final exam that specifically tested students’ knowledge of the jobs depicted in the documentary, discussed in class and used throughout the semester in subsequent units on specific areas of film production. An additional 4 questions specific to the reading were added to the mix. Using item analysis, these questions were broken out from the 100 question mid term exam and analyzed separately.</td>
<td><strong>Action Category:</strong> SLO/PLO Assessment Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Method:</strong> Exam/Test/Quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard and Target for Success:</strong> A target of 80% of students correctly answering all 15 questions was established given the amount of class time spent on covering the material, plus the fact these jobs were continually referenced in terms of their technical and aesthetic functions throughout the semester.</td>
<td><strong>ECC: FILM 121 - Audio Production - SLO #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Method Description:**
Initial methodology and protocols for on-set strategies to assure down-the-line and efficient workflow for synchronizing soundtracks is covered in a workshop format on second class session. Shot and take nomenclature and best practices (industry standards) are covered in lecture/demonstration, supplemented with a 4 page hand-out, then followed with a 05/19/2014 - This was the first time Film 121 (formerly Film 21) Audio Production was offered since its creation over 12 years ago. A total of 18 students were enrolled in this lecture/lab course which meets 5 hours weekly. Of the students assessed 7 (39%) were deemed Advanced, 5 (28%) were Proficient, 5 (28%) were Satisfactory, 1 (5%) student was found to Need Improvement, no students Failed the assessment. Approximately 67% of the students met the Proficient Standard or higher. 05/19/2015 - 1. Demonstration of complications/inefficiencies in post-production synchronization of audio tracks resulting from failure to follow proper production phase protocols should be illustrated early in semester. This reinforces the fact that production-phase discipline is clearly grounded in the practical necessities of efficient post-production phase workflow in the current technological era, and that these

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2013-14 (Spring 2014)  
**Input Date:** 12/12/2013  
**Course SLO Status:** Active  

**03/03/2015 7:04 PM**  
Generated by TracDat a product of Nuventive.
### Assessment Methods & Standard and Target for Success / Tasks

**Results**

Thus, the target of 75% of students meeting the standard of Proficient or higher was missed by 2 students. Several factors may have contributed to not meeting the target:

1. Early demonstration of potential workflow problems in post synchronization was not possible for Spring 2014 semester as the computer lab/DAW software were not accessible until 12th week of semester. This should not be an issue in future semesters as now the Editing Lab construction and software installation has been completed.

2. Students not in attendance during initial workshop lacked full comprehension of postproduction methodology.

**Standard Met?**

No

**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:**

2013-14 (Spring 2014)

**Faculty Assessment Leader:**

Jeff Crum

---

**ECC: FILM 122 - Production I - SLO #1**

Calculating Exposure and White Balance - At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate how to properly calculate exposure, white balance, and focus on selected camcorders.

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:**

2013-14 (Spring 2014)

**Input Date:**

03/03/2014

---

**Assessment Method Description:**

Within the 18 question final exam, 3 written questions were created that specifically addressed the SLO. Q#2 asked students to describe how to focus a shot using our production camera, Panasonic DVX-100 in manual mode. Q#3 asked students to describe how to manually set white balance to ensure proper color rendition on the DVX. Q#4 asked students to calculate exposure. 09/11/2014 - 29 students participated in the assessment. The average score for Q#2 (Focus) was 1.76, for Q#3 (White Balance) was 1.81 and for Q#4 (Exposure) was 1.55 revealing that controlling the exposure manually was the most difficult of the tasks to describe. Breaking down the individual scores reiterated that exposure was the most problematic of the questions and though the target was met for Q#2 (Focus) and Q#3, the target was just missed on Q#4 (Exposure). Results uploaded as a
### Course SLO Status:
Active

### Assessment Methods & Standard and Target for Success / Tasks

- **Assessment Method:** Essay/Written Assignment
- **Standard and Target for Success:**
  - Each response was evaluated for accuracy of the instructions given to achieve the task described.
  - A 3 point scale was used to assess the responses. A score of 2 meant the student accurately detailed the process well enough that a new student would be able to complete or learn the task. A score of 1 meant the student demonstrated an understanding of the process but the description may have lacked clarity. A score of 0 meant the student did not respond or the description was inaccurate and not related to the task.

Given these basic camera operations were introduced the first week of the semester and practiced every week in lab exercises through the final exam, a target of 75% of the students scoring a 2 on the each of the three responses was established.

### Results

- **Standard Met? :** No
- **Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2013-14 (Spring 2014)
- **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kevin O’Brien

### Action & Follow-Up

- separate file.

---

**ECC: FILM 124 - Production Planning - SLO #1**

**Budget** - At the end of this course, students will be able to create a budget for a given screenplay.

**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:**
2013-14 (Spring 2014)

**Input Date:**
12/12/2013

**Course SLO Status:**
Active

### Assessment Method Description:

- **Assessment Method:** Laboratory Project/Report
- **Standard and Target for Success:**
  - Target for success was 80% of the students would stay on budget and make realistic budget choices given this was a student production. Standards would include making realistic decisions unique to student filmmaking such as whether or not to allocate money for union health care costs which

### Results

- **12/04/2014 -** Of the 17 students who participated in the assessment, 15 stayed on budget (88%). Generally speaking, most of the students grasped the concept of the importance of a budget and the categories specific to student filmmaking that needed to be allocated money. In Section 1, Fringe Assumptions, all 17 students left this section blank as it would be appropriate for a feature or professional film project. In section 2, Student Film Information, 14 put in shoot days and 3 neglected to do so. In section 3, 7 put in a total amount, 6 put in figures but did not total them, 4 put in no figures as they assumed the service were pro bono. In Section 4, Total Production Budget, 9 student input total dollars, 8 had numbers but no totals. In Section 5, Total Post Production Budget, 9 put in a total budget, 8 put input costs but no totals, 1 student put in

---

**02/08/2015 -** 1. Classroom (Music 1) needs to have greater access to technology. There is no computer/projector/screen/Internet. In a Smart Classroom, students would see and practice with digital budgets sooner and more often. 2. Decide on a budgeting and scheduling software package that could be consistently used across production classes. With the opening of the Post Production Lab, software such as Movie Magic Budgeting or the like would enable students to readily access industry standard templates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>is NOT a part of a student budget.</td>
<td>no money arguing they would do post themselves, common in student productions. In Section 6, Other, 9 had allocations, 8 did not. The assumption here is the 8 without a line item budget here would be shooting without insurance. Not recommended, but common amongst students. In Section, 7, Above and Below the Line Costs, 13 had totals and 4 did not. All students should have totals for this section. In Section 8, Grand Total, 15 were at $3,000 or below and 2 went slightly over budget. Overall, most students correctly allocated the key areas for a student film: camera, lab and telecine, craft services, actors' gas money, basic props and wardrobe, permits, location rentals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Met? :</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Program/College Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</strong></td>
<td>2013-14 (Spring 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Assessment Leader:</strong></td>
<td>Aminah-Abdul Jabbaar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</strong></td>
<td>Kevin O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Method Description:**

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 into 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 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.

09/12/2014 - 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 allotted 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.

**Standard Met? :** Yes

**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2013-14 (Spring 2014)

**Faculty Assessment Leader:** Kevin O'Brien

**Action Category:** Program/College Support

09/12/2015 - 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.
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