

Assessment: Course Four Column

Spring/Summer 2018



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

ECC: FILM 109:Introduction to Media Writing

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SLO #3 Short Non-fiction Program - At the end of this course, students will be able to develop a short non-fiction program based on a current event or issue. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2017-18 (Spring 2018) Input Date: 08/24/2015	Essay/Written Assignment - Students were charged with writing a 5-8 page script in industry format based on an original idea that had been pitched (orally) to the class prior. Standard and Target for Success: 80% of the students would earn a B (3.0) on the assignment. Additional Information: This was the final writing assignment of the semester.	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2017-18 (Spring 2018) Standard Met? : Standard Met All 15 students completed the assignment. Scripts were also read aloud with students reading the actors' parts. Stories were subsequently critiqued by the class and private notes were provided by the instructor. The average grade for the class was a B+ (3.3). Two students scored low relative to the group earning a C (2.0) grade for missing deadlines and not meeting format requirements. Thus, (09/26/2018) % of Success for this SLO: 86 Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O'Brien	Action: SLO needs to be rewritten to include fiction writing. (09/26/2018) Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process

ECC: FILM 110:Film Analysis and Appreciation

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 Rise of American Film Industry - 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.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - The assessment of SLO #1 and the essay on "The Hollywood Style and the Rise of the American Film Industry" resulted in 45 essays.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of the students would earn a C or better.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>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. Students earning Fs on the assignment are all due to a failure to turn in the essay, and D papers didn't take the assignment seriously. 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). (05/06/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kent Hayward</p>	<p>Action: 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. (05/19/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: Instructor who conducted this assessment now is a professor at CSULB. New instructors have been assigned and will be participating in future assessments. (12/07/2017)</p>
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - 95 objective examination that covered the development of the technology, business, and art of cinema circa 1895 through the 1940s. Key inventors and filmmakers were studied within the social and political context of the era.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of the students would score a C- (1.7 GPA) or higher on the exam.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>83 students in 2 sections of Film 110 took the exam. Of the 83 students, 54 students score a C- or higher, 19 students scored lower than the standard. 23% of the students did not meet the target, 77 (03/19/2018)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 77</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O'Brien</p>	<p>Action: The students that scored low or failed the first exam tended to drop the course. They also tended toward excessive absences which contributed to their failures. Though no intervention that I know of can compel an emancipated adult to go to class, the instructor will continue to preach that attendance is the best ingredient for success-that and to take advantage of instructor office</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

hours. (09/26/2018)

Action Category: Teaching Strategies

ECC: FILM 121:Audio Production

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Audio Project - At the end of this course, students will be able to create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project using a minimum of 3 audio tracks with fades, cross-fades, and other special audio effects.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/12/2013</p>	<p>Project - Working individually, students will be assessed on the individual project "Personal Narrative Audio Podcast." To demonstrate proficiency of skills needed to create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project each student will create, record, and edit the project individually. Using at least three tracks (VO, sound effects, music) students will use fades, crossfades, and other audio effects.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The standards for success are defined as follows:</p> <p>Proficient, where students final project included the requisite skills to properly: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects).</p> <p>Near Proficient, where students final project demonstrated the requisite skills needed to properly create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects) but did so either with help from fellow students, the instructor, or TA [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete, were missing fades or crossfades or were lacking in some area].</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>22 students were assessed. They were working individually on a "Personal Narrative Audio Podcast." Each student was to write a personal narrative "Something About Me." Students then recorded narrative using Tascam DR-40 Digital Recorder, import audio files into the DAW (Digital Audio Workstation), edit into a 3-4 minute podcast using three tracks (voice, music, sound effects) and then use fades, crossfades, or other special audio effects .</p> <p>72.7% of student projects (16 students) were proficient in all three areas: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project using a minimum of three audio tracks with fades, crossfades and other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>22.7% of student projects (5 students) were near proficient. The projects were complete but students had difficulty in at least one area; some students lagged in the creation (writing) or recording of the audio project. When it came time to edit, they were more focused on putting sound effects in than on refining sound elements with audio fades, crossfades or other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>4.5% of student projects (1 student) was not proficient. This student did not complete the assignment. This student had difficulty completing the project due to absences and struggling to catch up with the rest of the class. (09/14/2017)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Laura Almo</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Laura Almo</p>	<p>Action: Action: Hours for opening the editing and additional TA hours to support equipment/software instruction and/or practice outside of allocated class time accelerates the learning curve. Students were able to refine projects because we had TA Oscar Vasquez and open lab hours in Spring 2017. Open lab hours have since been cut for FA17. Reinstating open lab hours would accelerate the learning curve and would allow for creating more complex projects and better prepare our students to transfer to competitive 4 year programs. (09/14/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: The 5 hours allocated for open lab hours in Spring 2017 semesters were cut for the Fall 2017 semester. Thus, lab is not available to students outside of class to improve their skills. (12/07/2017)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Not Proficient, where students final project did not demonstrate requisite skills needed to create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects) [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete, were missing fades or crossfades or were lacking in some area].</p> <p>The Target for Success was for 80% of the students to be proficient or near proficient.</p> <p>Additional Information: 22 students were assessed. They were working individually on a "Personal Narrative Audio Podcast." Each student was to write a personal narrative "Something About Me." Students then recorded narrative using Tascam DR-40 Digital Recorder, import audio files into the DAW (Digital Audio Workstation), edit into a 3-4 minute podcast using three tracks (voice, music, sound effects) and then use fades, crossfades, or other special audio effects .</p> <p>72.7% of student projects (16 students) were proficient in all three areas: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project using a minimum of three audio tracks with fades, crossfades and other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>22.7% of student projects (5 students) were near proficient. The projects were complete but students had difficulty in at least one area; some students lagged in the creation (writing) or recording of the audio project. When it came time to edit, they were more focused on putting sound effects in than on refining sound elements with audio fades, crossfades or other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>4.5% of student projects (1 student) was not proficient. This student did not complete the assignment. This student had difficulty completing the project due to absences and struggling to catch up with the rest of the class.</p> <p>Action: Hours for opening the editing and additional TA hours to support equipment/software instruction and/or practice outside of allocated class time accelerates the learning curve. Students were able to refine projects because we had TA Oscar Vasquez and open lab hours in Spring 2017. Open lab hours have since been cut for FA17. Reinstating open lab hours would accelerate the learning curve and would allow for creating more complex projects and better prepare our students to transfer to competitive 4 year programs.</p> <p>Project - Working individually,</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>students will be assessed on the individual project "Personal Narrative Audio Podcast." To demonstrate proficiency of skills needed to create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project each student will create, record, and edit the project individually. Using at least three tracks (VO, sound effects, music) students will use fades, crossfades, and other audio effects.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The standards for success are defined as follows:</p> <p>Proficient, where students final project included the requisite skills to properly: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects).</p> <p>Near Proficient, where students final project demonstrated the requisite skills needed to properly create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects) but did so either with help from fellow students, the instructor, or TA [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete, were missing fades or crossfades or were lacking in some area].</p> <p>Not Proficient, where students final project did not demonstrate requisite skills needed to create,</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects) [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete, were missing fades or crossfades or were lacking in some area].</p> <p>The Target for Success was for 80% of the students to be proficient or near proficient.</p> <p>Additional Information: 22 students were assessed. They were working individually on a “Personal Narrative Audio Podcast.” Each student was to write a personal narrative “Something About Me.” Students then recorded narrative using Tascam DR-40 Digital Recorder, import audio files into the DAW (Digital Audio Workstation), edit into a 3-4 minute podcast using three tracks (voice, music, sound effects) and then use fades, crossfades, or other special audio effects .</p> <p>72.7% of student projects (16 students) were proficient in all three areas: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project using a minimum of three audio tracks with fades, crossfades and other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>22.7% of student projects (5 students) were near proficient. The projects were complete but students</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>had difficulty in at least one area; some students lagged in the creation (writing) or recording of the audio project. When it came time to edit, they were more focused on putting sound effects in than on refining sound elements with audio fades, crossfades or other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>4.5% of student projects (1 student) was not proficient. This student did not complete the assignment. This student had difficulty completing the project due to absences and struggling to catch up with the rest of the class.</p> <p>Action: Hours for opening the editing and additional TA hours to support equipment/software instruction and/or practice outside of allocated class time accelerates the learning curve. Students were able to refine projects because we had TA Oscar Vasquez and open lab hours in Spring 2017. Open lab hours have since been cut for FA17. Reinstating open lab hours would accelerate the learning curve and would allow for creating more complex projects and better prepare our students to transfer to competitive 4 year programs.</p>		
	<p>Project - Working individually, students will be assessed on the individual project "Personal Narrative Audio Podcast." To</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2017-18 (Spring 2018) Standard Met? : Standard Met 16 students were assessed. They were working individually</p>	<p>Action: Consistent open lab hours would accelerate the learning curve and would allow for creating more complex projects and better</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>demonstrate proficiency of skills needed to create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project each student will create, record, and edit the project individually.</p> <p>Using at least three tracks (VO, sound effects, music) students will use fades, crossfades, and other audio effects.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: Proficient, where students final project included the requisite skills to properly: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects).</p> <p>Near Proficient, where students final project demonstrated the requisite skills needed to properly create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects) but did so either with help from fellow students, the instructor, or TA [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete, were missing fades or crossfades or were lacking in some area].</p> <p>Not Proficient, where students final project did not demonstrate requisite skills needed to create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project (use fades, crossfades, and other special audio effects) [final projects still had some audio issues when project was complete, were</p>	<p>on a "Personal Narrative Audio Podcast." Each student was to write a personal narrative "Something About Me." Students then recorded narrative using Tascam DR-40 Digital Recorder, import audio files into the DAW (Digital Audio Workstation), edit into a 3-4 minute podcast using three tracks (voice, music, sound effects) and then use fades, crossfades, or other special audio effects .</p> <p>81.25% of student projects (13 students) were proficient in all three areas: create, record, and edit a 3-4 minute audio project using a minimum of three audio tracks with fades, crossfades and other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>12.5% of student projects (2 students) were near proficient. The projects were complete but students had difficulty in at least one area; some students lagged in the creation (writing) or recording of the audio project. When it came time to edit, they were more focused on putting sound effects in than on refining sound elements with audio fades, crossfades or other special audio effects as demonstrated in the final project.</p> <p>6.25% of student projects (1 student) was not proficient. This student did not complete the assignment. This student had difficulty completing the project due to absences and struggling to catch up with the rest of the class.</p> <p>(04/20/2018) % of Success for this SLO: 93 Faculty Assessment Leader: Laura Almo</p>	<p>prepare our students to transfer to competitive 4 year programs. (10/17/2018) Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

missing fades or crossfades or were lacking in some area].

The Target for Success was for 80% of the students to be proficient or near proficient.

ECC: FILM 124:Production Planning

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>SLO #1 Budget - At the end of this course, students will be able to create a budget for a given screenplay.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/12/2013</p>	<p>Laboratory Project/Report -</p> <p>Students were given a blank budget template with 9 areas common for film production. They were given hypothetical financing of \$3,000 to produce a student film and were asked to complete the budget as a student filmmaker.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success:</p> <p>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 is NOT a part of a student budget.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>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 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. (12/04/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Aminah-Abdul Jabbaar</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O'Brien</p>	<p>Action: Providing students with access to scheduling software (Movie Magic Budgeting) or other industry software (available by subscription) would accelerate the learning curve and give students the opportunity to work on the budget with real world professional software. This would better prepare our students to transfer to competitive 4 year programs. (10/17/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p>Action: 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. (02/08/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: Upgrades are planned for the space, Music 1, and new software for budgeting/scheduling are on order. The Spring 2108 class may</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>Laboratory Project/Report - Students were given a blank budget template with 9 areas common for film production. They were given hypothetical financing of \$3,000 to produce a student film and were asked to complete the budget as a student filmmaker.</p> <p>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 with a grade of C- (70%) or better on this SLO. Standards would include making realistic decisions unique to student filmmaking such as where to allocate funds and whether or not to allocate money for union health care costs which is NOT a part of a student budget.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2017-18 (Spring 2018) Standard Met? : Standard Met 28 students were assessed. The highest score was 100% achieved by eight students. The lowest score was 0% earned by three students.</p> <p>Of the 28 students assessed, 89.2% (25 students) earned 70% (C-) or higher.</p> <p>Three students performed below the target. All of these students were either absent/tardy for class lecture/exercises on creating a budget or did not turn in a budget.</p> <p>There was a very high correlation between class attendance/full participation and successfully creating a budget with a grade of C- (70%) or better.</p> <p>The target met was as expected – as consistent, prompt attendance and full participation is key to success. This mimics the ‘real world’ where people must be on the job on time and ready to work everyday in order to be successful in this line of work. I observed that even the students who were able to create the budget could have benefited from budgeting software (Movie Magic Scheduling) or other software that is an industry standard</p> <p>In sum 80% of the students were able to create budget and articulate why they made certain budgetary allotments. This assessment also revealed the majority of students have a solid grasp of the multiple steps involved in creating a budget for a film shoot. (05/10/2018) % of Success for this SLO: 89 Faculty Assessment Leader: Laura Almo</p>	<p>benefit from the software access but space upgrades will not happen until Summer 2018. A positive step. (12/07/2017)</p> <p>Action: New budgeting software was ordered last spring which will greatly enhance students understanding of scheduling and budgeting. Still awaiting IT to order/deliver. (10/17/2018) Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

ECC: FILM 236:Editing

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>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).</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/12/2013</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Students edited the project in Final Cut Pro X</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: The targets for success are defined as follows:</p> <p>Proficient, where students final project included the requisite skills to properly plan, shoot, and edit the Kuleshov Juxtaposition Project.</p> <p>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].</p> <p>Not Proficient, where students final project did not demonstrate requisite skills needed to plan, shoot, edit project [final projects</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In sum, the target of 80% of students being Near Proficient or Proficient was met.</p> <p>(12/09/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Laura Almo</p>	<p>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)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>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)</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>were not edited satisfactorily and/or did not demonstrate full understanding of the impact of juxtaposition].</p> <p>The target for success was 80% of the students to be Proficient.</p>		
	<p>Project - Objective: To understand the principle of juxtaposition through the creation of your Eisenstein Associative (Intellectual or Idea) Montage.</p> <p>Assignment: Working within your groups, design and shoot an Eisenstein Associative Montage. Do not reveal the intent of your experiment to the group members. Use each other as talent; shooting should be kept to a maximum of 6 shots per student.</p> <p>Idea-Associative Montage Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • similar to the Kuleshov effect (covered in The Cutting Edge documentary) • juxtaposition of two seemingly disassociated images in order to create a third principal idea (1 + 1 is greater than 2 or a + b = c) <p>example: hungry girl starving + fat boy stuffing himself = social injustice example: poor child in rags walking along a dirt road + rich yuppie driving BMW convertible = excessive materialism</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>21 students completed the assignment, 1 student failed to complete it. Thus the range of grades was from a high of 4.0 (8 students) to a low of 0.0 (1 student). The average grade for all students was a 3.25, or a B+. Of the 22 students, 19 achieved a grade of 2.7 (B-) or higher. (03/29/2018)</p> <p>% of Success for this SLO: 86</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O'Brien</p>	<p>Action: Reconsider using this assignment for this SLO and/or rewriting the SLO statement. This is a theoretical and intellectual assignment rooted in Eisenstein Montage Theory and, though the standard was met, a few too many students struggled with the conceptual part of the assignment. Furthermore, the idea of juxtaposition is embedded in ensuing projects where the students learn the power of juxtaposition through these assignments. (09/26/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Standard and Target for Success:

Students were graded on a traditional 4.0 scale with deductions for missing deadlines, missing work, missing in class shooting/editing and/or not following project directions. Target for success was for 75% of the 22 students would earn at least a B- (2.7) or higher on the assignment.

Additional Information: Students were allotted 1/2 of a class period to plan the exercise (about 1.5 hours), one class period to film the exercise (2.25 hours) and one class period to edit/present/critique project (2.25 hours).