

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Spring/Summer 2016



El Camino: PLOs (FA) - Dance

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #5 Goals of Performance Artistry - Students will possess a mastery of the terminology creative development and goal of the performance artistry. PLO Status: Active PLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2019-20 (Spring 2020) Input Date: 10/04/2013</p>	<p>Performance - Students were given a structured technical base and rehearsal schedule. These two processes led to a culminating series of performances that reflected specific theatrical dance styles and the accompanying dance vocabulary germane to that specific style. Standard and Rubric: A complete understanding of this statement was expected of 90% of the students surveyed, a proficient understanding was expected by 80% of the students, a basic level of understanding by 70% of the students and an inability to understand this statement by 60% of the students.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2015-16 (Spring 2016) Standard Met: Standard Met 30 of the 33 students who participated in this PLO assessment responded with a complete understanding of this PLO assessment statement. The other 3 students responded with at least a proficient understanding of this PLO assessment statement. The fact that three faculty collaborate with Dance 183, Jessica Kondrath (instructor of record) with Elizabeth Adamis and Jennifer LaCurran (co-instructors for Dance 171, 172, 271, and 272) that meet at the same time. The other two classes in this PLO #5 assessment were 287 and 289 and all the contributing faculty listed below work simultaneously with the students in this PLO #5 assessment. (06/18/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Daniel Berney Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Elizabeth Adamis, Jennifer La Curran, Jessica Kondrath, Val Cabag, Zari DeLeon, Kanisha Bennett Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Dance 183, Dance 287, Dance 289</p>	<p>Action: The ability for the students to continue having the flexibility in repeating these three performance based classes multiple times and the ability to add additional performance based classes to coincide at the varying performance level opportunities available to the students each semester. (06/30/2017) Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Spring/Summer 2016



El Camino: PLOs (FA) - Film/Video

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #1 Production Equipment - Upon completion of the program, students will demonstrate basic skills needed to operate production equipment to produce short films.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 10/04/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - I accidentally erased this assessment from Fall 2015 when I was working on a Spring assessment. 9.23.16. To my recollection, the assessment was based on a 100 question objective exam that covered the fundamentals of using production equipment: cameras, lighting/grip, audio.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Because Film 234 is a advanced production course, the standard was set relatively high compared to an introductory course. Thus, the standard set was that 100% percent of the students would score at least 70% or higher on the exam given they had prior production experience in the prerequisite class, had practiced production techniques aligned with PLO #1 throughout the semester, and taken previous exams that tested their knowledge of production equipment theory and practice.</p> <p>As this was an objective exam, a traditional percentage scale was used to score the assessment: 100%</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>22 students were assessed. The range of scores 97% correct by two students to 81% by two students. The average score for the group was 88% correct. The target and standard were met. The most important finding was that this culminating exam thoroughly tested the students on the theory and practice of filmmaking fundamentals that they experienced throughout the semester in hands-on small group projects and shoots and verified improvement. At mid semester, a similar assessment was conducted the range of success was a high of 97% one student, to a low of 65% one student, with 3 students scoring below the benchmark of 70%. Compared to the pretest, all but one student improved and that student only slipped from a A- to a B+ because of several absences due to excused illness. Importantly, the student who scored the lowest on the pretest improved from 65% to 92%. The last 8 weeks of the semester saw all students improve in the requisite skills evidenced by their group work, direct observation in lab projects and through the culminating exam. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 120, Film 122, Film 128, Film 234, Film 236</p>	<p>Action: In future assessments, the continued presence of a qualified teaching assistant is imperative to the success demonstrated in this assessment. Due to a slight increase in funding (5 hours per week) the students in Film 234 had the benefit of a TA, Chris Maldonado, who earned his AA in Film at El Camino and his BA in Film Production from CSULB. Thus, it was like having two qualified instructors in the class at all times. Additionally, the TA was able to meet with students outside of scheduled class time to review production practices. Unfortunately these additional hours were cut late in the semester, but he volunteered to finish the semester on his own time and for the benefit of our students.</p> <p>In order to keep these success rates and prepare our production students for continued successful transfer to competitive BA</p>

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>-93% = A, 92%-90% A-, 89%-87% B+, 86%-83% B, 82%-80% B-, 79%-77% C+, 76%-73% C, 72%-70% C-, 69%-67% D+, 66%-63% D, 62%-60% D-, 59% and below F. The assessment was not curved.</p> <p>Presentation/Skill Demonstration - Covering Scenes with Double-System Sync Sound</p> <p>Prior to this project, students in Film 122 had been introduced to the equipment used to produce short films in all of our production classes. This included the Panasonic HMC-150 HD camera, Sekonic L-398 Studio Incident Light Meter, Manfrotto 5036 Fluid Head Tripod, Tascam DA-40 Audio Recorder, Audio-Technica Shotgun microphones and basic lighting and grip gear. Prior to this assessment, working in groups of 4-5 students had completed 3 camera labs, a nondialog 30 second commercial, shot a nondialog master scene from a provided scenario, and developed and shot a short film based on the</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 23 students assessed, 18 achieved a score of 8 or higher, or 78%. The average score was 8.8 of 10 points or 88%. If the 4 students who got deductions for being absent, late to a production meeting, late to set, or violating a set protocol such as using a cell phone were excluded from the sample, then the target rate for success would have been approximately 84%. Overall, like in previous assignments all of the students demonstrated fundamental skills operating the equipment and using the software, while several students consistently struggled with the professional side of filmmaking: being on time and follow protocols while on set or when working in post. (09/23/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Laura Almo</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 121, 122, 232, 234, 236</p>	<p>programs, TA need to be restored and expanded, not cut capriciously. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: For Fall 2016, Film 234 Camera & Lighting, was moved from its usually time slot 9:30-noon on Tuesday/Thursday to Fridays at 9:30am to 2:50pm. This was changed to take advantage of holding the class in a true lighting studio for the first time, Theatre 151. Additionally, 5 hours of TA time were allocated to the class to support the instructor. (09/23/2016)</p> <p>Action: Over the last few years, more students than ever are coming to our program with some production skills learned in high school courses or from being self-taught. While this yields students who typically have some facility with production equipment, particularly editing software, they often exhibit poor set protocols or learned bad habits such as shooting with their own cameras but not really understanding how the image is captured. Thus, more time early in the semester could be devoted to how to behave professionally on set and in post and in the initial 3 camera labs to offer the students the opportunity to bring in their own equipment, on a limited basis, to shoot labs in a controlled fashion. (09/23/2016)</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>premise of a character losing an important object. All postproduction picture and sound was acjoeved using Final Cut Pro X version 10.2.3.</p> <p>The groups were familiar with basic crew positions and set protocols, techniques of cinematography: depth of field, camera angles, lighting styles, exposure concepts, shot composition and framing. They had practiced concepts of invisible editing, montage, and fragmented or disjunctive editing. This assessment was designed to practice what they had been studying and apply their skills to plan and shoot a short dialog scene in a controlled fashion within the timeline established by the instructor.</p> <p>Each group scouted and secured a location and were to shoot their interpretation of the provided script three ways:</p> <p>1) Shoot the scene using master scene technique and dialog. (The objective was to capture the scene with a plan that yielded continuity editing-the invisible style-similar to the Vote for Hernandez exercise they had done earlier in the semester).</p> <p>2) At a new location, shoot the entire scene using a single long take with dialog combining camera and talent movement.</p>		<p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>3) Shoot the scene as a montage that rejects continuity and disrupts the filmic space and time but not the continuity of the dialog.</p> <p>One class session was devoted to preproduction planning, two sessions for shooting the script, one session for editing and one session for screenings/critiques.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: By the 12th week of the semester, 75% of the students should be able to demonstrate the basic technical skills to cover a scene using double-system audio. 75% was set as the target as this was the first project that used audio gear on location. A 10 point scale was used to determine if students met the standard with as 8 or higher established a the benchmark for successfully demonstrating facility with the production and post production equipment required for capturing and editing the scene 3 different ways.</p> <p>Project - Working in small groups of 4-5, Film 122 students were assigned a variety of short projects involving hands-on film production skills including use of digital cinema camera, tripod, light meters, bounce cards and nonlinear editing software. Preliminary exercises were designed to develop the students' basic knowledge of cinematography and how to capture the image as well as capture shot material into a computer for editing. Exercises then</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Students performed well on all 3 projects and in all cases met the target of scoring at least 8 of 10 points. The average score for The Lost Object was 9.5, The Master Scene was 9.5 and for Double System Sync Sound was 8.5. Direct observation of the groups was the method of assessment. (05/08/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 122, Film 128, Film 232, Film 234, Film 236</p>	<p>Action: Shooting in a controlled environment such as a professional lighting studio or sound stage would make for a better assessment where students could be observed more closely without the instructor having to bounce between groups shooting on location throughout campus. (05/08/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>segued into projects where the groups added creative content based on strict assignment patterns. 3 projects specifically tested the PLO: The Lost Object, The Master Scene, and Double System Sync Sound.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Based on a 10 point scale, each group would achieve at least a score of 8. Since filmmaking is a collaborative activity, if a group scored an 8, then that score was given to each student regardless of the job function they performed on a given project. Points were deducted for failure to follow established set protocols, being late to set, lack of professionalism on set, misuse of equipment, substandard cinematography when appropriate.</p> <p>Additional Comments: The process of preproduction, production, postproduction and screening/critique was followed for all projects to emulate a professional approach to shooting a controlled film project.</p> <p>Essay/Written Assignment - 15 question written final exam that covered fundamentals of operating the production camera, light meter, and editing software used throughout the semester. Students were to respond with precise, step by step instructions on how to use or operate the hardware/software in each question.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It was expected that 80% of the students would score 75% or higher on the exam.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>84% of the students scored higher than 75% of the exam. Of the 3 students that scored below the target, 2 scored 72%- and these 2 had irregular attendance patterns. The 3rd student who scored below the target earned a 68%. This was a surprise because this student attended all classes and participated regularly in all the labs-perhaps just an off day. In sum, the average score for the class was an 81%. (09/07/2018)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin O'Brien</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Film 122, 121, 128, 232, 234, 236,</p>	<p>Follow-Up: The recent 2 year CTE Review cites the critical need for a proper production infrastructure backed by data from the LA Economic Foundation. Unfortunately, professional studio space, to compliment our recently acquired professional cinema gear, does not appear to be in the plans for the new Fine Arts building. (05/08/2018)</p> <p>Action: Additional review time will allotted for exam should this assessment be used again in the future. Additional staffed lab hours will be allocated near the end of the semester so students can come in and practice with the production equipment. (10/06/2018)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Spring/Summer 2016



El Camino: PLOs (FA) - Theatre

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #4 Create Character - Upon successful completion students will have the ability to create a character in a live, scripted, and rehearsed Theatre Department Production.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p>Input Date: 03/10/2014</p>	<p>Performance - This Theater Department Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment 4 aligns to Theater 270 Theater Production, 274 Musical Theater Production, and 175 Theater Arts Showcase This assessment was completed immediately following the weeks of March 5, 2016 through March 20, 2016. Students enrolled in sections of Theater Production 270 who were part of the cast for our department production of Neil Simon's "Rumors" were assessed as to their ability to create a character in a live, scripted and rehearsed live production.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Memorization of Text Standard of expectation: 95% of students will achieve "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" level. Performance that demonstrates understanding of "given circumstances", physical and vocal energy and connection to the audience. Standard of expectation: 95% of</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Data</p> <p>1. Memorization of Text Does not meet expectations: 5% of students Meets expectations: 70% of students Exceeds expectations: 25% of students</p> <p>2. Performance that demonstrates student's understanding of "given circumstances" and character motivation as exhibited by physical and vocal energy, concentration and connection to audience.</p> <p>Does not meet expectations: 5% of students Meets expectations: 70% of students Exceeds expectations: 25% of students</p> <p>Observed Patterns and Findings of Data Memorization of Text (students exceeded expectation) For this part of the assessment students were asked to do a run-through of the play to assess their success at learning all of their dialogue. Almost all of the students have succeeded in going through the play without their books in hand. Some at difficulty reciting their lines word for word and they needed additional review. Students have been asked to record and write out their lines. They have also been asked to run their lines with fellow company members. "Line notes," were given by the stage manager and will continue to be given to further aid line accuracy.</p>	<p>Action: It is critical that students learn their lines word for word. There should be several reviews before the assessment so that students can identify sections of the text they are having difficulty remembering. A specific off-book date should be given at the first rehearsal so that expectations are clearly defined. (09/04/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: The college of fine arts department needs to be active in publicity and recruitment for the theatre program so that students with strong acting abilities and interests are encouraged to participate in our theatre productions. (06/01/2017)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>students in this class will achieve “meets expectations” or “exceeds expectations”</p> <p>Rubric</p> <p>1. Students ability to display evidence to recite and create ownership over the lines of dialogue in the production.</p> <p>Does Not Meet Expectation: Student shows little or no ability to accurately recite and display ownership of their lines.</p> <p>Meets Expectation: Student shows some ability to accurately recite and display ownership of their lines.</p> <p>Exceeds Expectation: Student displays considerable evidence of the ability to recite and display ownership of their lines.</p> <p>2. Performance that demonstrates student’s understanding of “given circumstances” and character motivation as exhibited by physical and vocal energy, concentration and connection to audience</p> <p>Does not meet expectation: Student does not evidence concentrated or committed work. Has not memorized work, vocal and physical work is not motivated. There is little connection to “given circumstances” or to audience.</p> <p>Meets expectation: Student demonstrates a basic understanding of and ability to fulfill character within the “given circumstances”.</p> <p>Work is physically and vocally committed and concentrated. Good connection to audience.</p> <p>Exceeds expectation: Student’s</p>	<p>Performance: Students were asked to demonstrate understanding of impact of “given circumstances” on character with performance exhibiting by physical and vocal energy, concentration and connection to the audience After several rehearsals with notes, and technical rehearsals, most students were able to focus their work and bring vocal and physical commitment and strong evidence of good collaboration with other cast members. A small number remained unfocused and uncommitted, while a few exceeded expectations with performances of above average work.</p> <p>(04/04/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: William Georges</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Ron Scarlata</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Theater 270 Theater Production, 274 Musical Theater Production, and 175 Theater Arts Showcase</p>	

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
-------------	--	----------------	----------------

work demonstrates strong evidence of deep understanding of “given circumstances” and character motivation. Physical and vocal work is committed and consistent. Connection to audience is strong.