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| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2021-2022** |
| *PCAL* | *School of Media* |
| *BA in Film (#667)* |
| *Sara Thomason* |

***Is this an online program***? [ ]  Yes [x]  No

|  |
| --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1: Perform the roles of key Below-the-Line (technical) personnel on a film crew, including operating equipment, safely and efficiently.** |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Timed practical exams** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2: Utilize Above-the-Line (creative) skills to create visually appealing short films with compelling narratives.** |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Short Film Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3: Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion.** |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: Job Performance Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4: Communicate effectively, orally, and through the written word, on set and in film analysis.** |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: Introduction to World Cinema Essay Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 5: Communicate effectively, orally, and through the written word, on set and in film analysis.** |  |  |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Job Performance Evaluation** |

 |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**  |
| Student Learning Outcome #4 was marked “not met” because this is a new program and students who entered the program in AY 20/21 have not yet reached the third year of the program, which is when we advise students to take FILM 369: Introduction to World Cinema. Although we have data from Instrument #1 for SLO #4, it only addresses half of the SLO. In next year’s assessment we should have data to use to evaluate whether or not SLO #4 has been met. As technology in the film and television industry continues to grow and change, our assessments, particularly for SLO #1, will need to grow and change too in order to ensure the program teaches industry-standard equipment, practices, and protocols. So far, the program has been successful in doing so. Additionally, as the first group of students in the new BA program continue to move into the higher-level courses, we may need to evaluate the effectiveness of our instruments in evaluating the type of projects the students choose to create, since the degree deemphasizes traditional film production to create a more open-ended liberal arts degree.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Perform the roles of key Below-the-Line (technical) personnel on a film crew, including operating equipment, safely and efficiently. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | **Direct measures of student learning:** Students in FILM 202 Basic Film Production are administered timed practical exams on a variety of crew positions and their associated equipment. Each exam has a simple checkbox scoring rubric, indicating whether or not the student completed the task correctly. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | *In order to perform the job being tested and use the associated equipment on an actual student film, the student must receive a 90% or above on the scoring rubric. Since it is required that students perform the jobs being tested as part of the film program, students may retake the exam until they receive a 90% or higher.* |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 84% |
| **Methods**  | Students (*N*=43) enrolled in FILM 202: Basic Film Production during Spring 2022 were administered timed practical exams and scored via checkbox rubric by faculty and trained student lab workers. These scores were anonymized and each student’s practical scores were averaged to create a practical mean score per student. Out of the 48 students enrolled, 36 had a mean practical score of 90% or higher. |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| Since the BA in Film deemphasizes film production compared to the BFA in Film Production, equipment was changed to create a lighter, more flexible equipment package that still meets industry standards. Since FILM 202 serves both the BA in Film and the BFA in Film Production, students were trained and tested on both equipment packages. This process can be more efficient in the future. Next spring we plan to evaluate, revise, and improve how and when students choose their intended degree program to create a more efficient practical exam process and ensure the students are being tested on the equipment that is applicable to their degree program.  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| Students met the initial goal set by the program for SLO #1, so the program will evaluate whether this goal is sufficient or should be raised for future assesments. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| Since FILM 202 is required for admission to the BA in Film and is offered every spring, assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Utilize Above-the-Line (Creative) skills to create visually appealing short films with compelling narratives. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **DIRECT measure of student learning: Films produced in FILM 282 Film Workshop I are evaluated by the film faculty in the area of writing, directing, cinematography, producing, production design, and editing using standardized rubrics.** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the film constitutes the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher  | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 75% |
| **Methods**  | Students (*N*=24) enrolled in FILM 282: Film Workshop I during Spring 2022 created films that screened at the end of the semester and were evaluated by faculty. These scores were anonymized and each student’s scores were averaged to create a mean score per student. Of the 24 students enrolled in FILM 282, 18 scored higher than 85%.  |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| **The first group of BA in Film students just completed FILM 282: Film Workshop I in spring 2022. Because the BA deemphasizes film production to create a more open-ended liberal arts degree, the students were given a lot of freedom in choosing the projects they wanted to create, which caused inconsistencies. Next time FILM 282 is offered, in spring 2023, we will give the students more structure in how to create a project that is achievable and within scope while still maintaining creative, non-narrative freedom.**  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| In the fall of 2022, faculty will re-evaluate the measurement instrument used in FILM 282 in order to create a more appropriate measurement instrument for spring 2023.  |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| Since FILM 282 is required for the BA in Film and is offered every spring, assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **DIRECT measure of student learning: Students in FILM 282 Film Workshop I present to the faculty member of record in a formal presentation setting before each film they undertake. Students are expected to outline their plan for making their films, effectively communicating how they creatively solved the problems associated with their short film in a way that is collaborative, cohesive, and appropriate to the director’s vision. These presentations will be recorded and evaluated by the film faculty at the conclusion of the course.** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 80% |
| **Methods**  | At the completion of each FILM 282 section, 50% of the presentations given (N=10) were randomly selected and the recordings evaluated by film faculty using a standardized rubric incorporating VALUE (LEAP) rubric criteria. Of the 10 projects assessed, 8 scored higher than 85%. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in above-the-line (creative) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Scoring includes professor’s assessment of job performance and peer assessment via by a professor-designed rubric.** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **80%** |
| **Methods** | At the completion of each FILM 282 section, students are scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. actors were well directed, the shots were well lit, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores will be anonymized and each student’s scores averaged to create a mean score per student. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| **This was the first time a cohort went through the new FILM 282 process and 80% of the program is achieving the target. We have hired faculty to fill a need in post-production to better serve student needs and revised our presentation process to better simulate a professional pitch.**  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| In the fall of 2022, faculty will re-evaluate the measurement instrument used in FILM 282 in order to create a more appropriate measurement instrument for spring 2023. Additionally, the program will incorporate post-production evaluation into the assessment of SLOs. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| Since FILM 282 is required for the BA in Film and is offered every spring, assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Communicate effectively, orally and through the written word, on set and in film analysis. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **DIRECT measure of student learning: Students in FILM 282 Film Workshop I present to the faculty member of record in a formal presentation setting before each film they undertake. Students are expected to outline their plan for making their films, effectively communicating how they creatively solved the problems associated with their short film in a way that is collaborative, cohesive, and appropriate to the director’s vision. These presentations will be recorded and evaluated by the film faculty at the conclusion of the course.** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 80% |
| **Methods**  | At the completion of each FILM 282 section, 50% of the presentations given (N=10) were randomly selected and the recordings evaluated by film faculty using a standardized rubric incorporating VALUE (LEAP) rubric criteria. Of the 10 projects assessed, 8 scored higher than 85%. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **DIRECT measure of student learning: Midterm essays written in FILM 369 World Cinema (the most advanced required film studies course in the major) are evaluated by the film faculty using a rubric designed by the film studies faculty (i.e. English faculty).** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the essay constitutes a large portion of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **See actions** |
| **Methods** | At the completion of each FILM 369 section, 50% of the essays written (typically n=10) will be randomly selected and evaluated by film faculty using a standardized rubric incorporating VALUE (LEAP) rubric criteria. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| **This was the first time a cohort went through the new FILM 282 process and 80% of the program is achieving the target. We have hired faculty to fill a need in post-production to better serve student needs and revised our presentation process to better simulate a professional pitch.** **The SLO goals have been marked “not met” because the first cohort of students have not yet progressed through FILM 369: Intro to World Cinema.**  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| In the fall of 2022, faculty will re-evaluate the measurement instrument used in FILM 282 in order to create a more appropriate measurement instrument for spring 2023.Once students in the revised BA program take FILM 369, the faculty will evaluate whether this goal is sufficient or should be adjusted for future assesments |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| Since FILM 282 is required for the BA in Film and is offered every spring, assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 5** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | Coordinate and supervise a crew/team, and, in turn, serve as a collaborative crew/team member. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in above-the-line (creative) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Scoring includes professor’s assessment of job performance and peer assessment via by a professor-designed rubric.** |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 80% |
| **Methods**  | At the completion of each FILM 282 section, students are scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. actors were well directed, the shots were well lit, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores will be anonymized and each student’s scores averaged to create a mean score per student. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) |
| **This was the first time a cohort went through the new FILM 282 process and 80% of the program is achieving the target. We have hired faculty to fill a need in post-production to better serve student needs and revised our presentation process to better simulate a professional pitch.**  |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) |
| In the fall of 2022, faculty will re-evaluate the measurement instrument used in FILM 282 in order to create a more appropriate measurement instrument for spring 2023. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) |
| Since FILM 282 is required for the BA in Film and is offered every spring, assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map (below/next page) as part of this document**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CURRICULUM MAP**  |  |  |  |
| **Program name:** | BA in Film (#667) |  | **KEY:****I = Introduced****R = Reinforced/Developed****M = Mastered****A = Assessed** |
| **Department:** | School of Media |  |
| **College:** | PCAL |  |
| **Contact person:** | Sara Thomason |  |
| **Email:** | sara.thomason@wku.edu |  |
|  |  |  | **Learning Outcomes** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **LO1:** | **LO2:** | **LO3:** | **LO4:** | **LO5** |
|  | Perform the roles of key Below-the-Line (technical) personnel on a film crew, including operating equipment, safely and efficiently. | Utilize Above-the-Line (Creative) skills to create visually appealing short films with compelling narratives. | Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion. | Communicate effectively, orally and through the written word, on set and in film analysis. | Coordinate and supervise a crew/team, and, in turn, serve as a collaborative crew/team member. |
| **Course Subject** | **Number** | **Course Title** |  |  |  |  |  |
| FILM | 100 | Film Industry and Aesthetics |  | I | I |  | I |
| FILM | 155 | Film Attendance |  |  |  |  |  |
| FILM | 201 | Introduction to Cinema |  |  | I | I |  |
| FILM | 202 | Basic Film Production | I/A | R | R | R | R |
| FILM | 250 | Screenwriting I |  | R |  | R |  |
| BCOM/FILM | 366/256 | Editing I/Film Editing I |  | R | R |  |  |
| FILM | 282 | Film Production Workshop I | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A |
| FILM  | 369 | Introduction to World Cinema |  |  | M/A | M/A |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria****(Score 0 if element is absent)** | **1 - 2** | **3 - 4** | **5** | **Score** |
| Presentation | The presentation isn’t interesting or engaging. Few (2) to no (1) aspects of the presentation were rehearsed and professional. | The presentation was somewhat interesting and engaging. Some (3) to most (4) aspects of the presentation were rehearsed and professional. | The presentation was extremely interesting and engaging. All aspects of the presentation were rehearsed and professional. |  |
| Headshots/Auditions | The actors don’t have the appropriate look for the film. The audition performance is mildly (2) to not (1) believable.  | For the most part, the actors have the appropriate look for the film. The audition performance is mostly (4) to somewhat (3) believable. | The actors have the appropriate look for the film. The audition performance is extremely believable. |  |
| Location Photos | The location does not look appropriate for the film. There is little (2) to no (1) visual potential. | The location looks somewhat appropriate for the film. There is some (3) to much (4) visual potential. | The location looks appropriate for the film. There is an extreme amount of visual potential. |  |
| Spines | It is unclear what the film is *really* about and what the characters want. | It is somewhat clear what the film is *really* about and what the characters want. | It is very clear what the film is *really* about and what the characters want. |  |
| Cinematography | The visual tone and cinematography plan are not appropriate for the film. Few (2) to none (1) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The visual tone and cinematography plan are somewhat appropriate for the film. Some (3) to most (4) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The visual tone and cinematography plan are very appropriate for the film. All of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. |  |
| Production Design | The design plan is not appropriate for the film. Few (2) to none (1) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The design plan is somewhat appropriate for the film. Some (3) to most (4) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The design plan is very appropriate for the film. All of the references are clear, thorough, and professional.  |  |
| Photoboards | The photoboards are an inaccurate portrayal of what the film will look like. There is little (2) to no (1) coverage.  | The photoboards are a somewhat accurate portrayal of what the film will look like. There is adequate (3) to appropriate (4) coverage. | The photoboards are an accurate portrayal of what the film will look like. There is thorough coverage. |  |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | 1 – 2 – 3 (extremely bad – poor – fair) | 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 (okay – good – very good – extremely good) | 8 – 9 – 10 (excellent - exceptional – perfect) |
| Job Performance | performed his/her job with little (3) to no (1) effort. Assignments and tasks were rarely completed on time and the degree of effort was poor. | performed his/her job with extremely good (7) to okay (4) effort. Assignments and tasks were completed on time most of the time and the degree of effort was excellent to okay. | performed his/her job with perfect (10) to excellent (8) effort. Assignments and tasks were always completed on time and the degree of effort was exceptional. |
| Attitude | approached work with a fair (3) to poor (1) attitude. Work was rarely approached with a can-do problem-solving attitude. | approached work with an extremely good (7) to okay (4) attitude. Sometimes work was approached with a can-do problem-solving attitude and at other times it was not. | approached work with a perfect (10) to excellent (8) attitude. Work was always approached with a can-do problem-solving attitude. |
| Punctuality | was rarely (3) to never (1) punctual. There was little to no respect for deadlines and he or she was not on time to start work. | was mostly (7) to sometimes (4) punctual. There was an inconsistent level of respect for deadlines and he or she was sometimes but not always on time to start work. | was always (10) to often (8) punctual. There was high level of respect for deadlines and he or she was always on time to start work. |
| Reliability | was organized and prepared little (3) to none (1) of the time. Work was rarely done with an acceptable degree of organization and communication was rarely to never clear and effective. | was organized and prepared most (7) to much (4) of the time. Work was done with an acceptable degree of organization and communication was sometimes clear and effective. | was always (10) to often (8) organized and prepared. Work was done with a perfect degree of organization and communication was always clear and effective. |
| Safety | was rarely (3) to never (1) concerned for the safety of the crew, actors, and work environment. The safety of individuals and property was not respected above all other work. | was usually (7) to sometimes (4) concerned for the safety of the crew, actors, and work environment. The safety of individuals and property was somewhat respected above all other work. | was always concerned for the safety of the crew, actors, and work environment. The safety of individuals and property was always respected above all other work. |
| Collaboration | was a fair (3) to poor (1) collaborator. The input of others was not heard and appreciated even if not implemented. The ideas and effort of others were not considered and appreciated. | was an extremely good (7) to okay (4) collaborator. The input of others was at times heard and appreciated even if not implemented. The ideas and effort of others was sometimes considered and appreciated. | was a perfect (10) to excellent (8) collaborator. The input of others was always to often heard and appreciated even if not implemented. The ideas and effort of others were always considered and appreciated. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Creative Thinking/Communication (LEAP)** |
| **Overall Competency Level of Film**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Creative Risk Taking**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Problem Solving**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Innovated Thinking**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Genre Conventions**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Audience Awareness (Context and Purpose)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Control of Meaning (Syntax and Mechanics)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Cohesiveness (Content Development)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |

|  |
| --- |
| **Individual Film Elements** |
| **Writing**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Locations (Producer)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Casting (Director/Producer)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Directing**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Production Design**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Editing**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Post-Production Sound**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Delivery/Press**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |