

## Film Studies Minor

### ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018 REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

**Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated.**

**Note:** Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

**Some useful contacts:**

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – [adamati@usfca.edu](mailto:adamati@usfca.edu)
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – [lendvay@usfca.edu](mailto:lendvay@usfca.edu)
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – [meritt@usfca.edu](mailto:meritt@usfca.edu)
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – [mrjonas@usfca.edu](mailto:mrjonas@usfca.edu)
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – [schakraborty2@usfca.edu](mailto:schakraborty2@usfca.edu)
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- [ceschwabenland@usfca.edu](mailto:ceschwabenland@usfca.edu)

**Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:**

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

**Email to submit the report: [assessment\\_cas@usfca.edu](mailto:assessment_cas@usfca.edu)**

**Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.**

**For example: FineArts\_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);**

**FineArts\_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)**

## I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

- a. Danny Plotnick, Program Director [dplotnick@usfca.edu](mailto:dplotnick@usfca.edu)

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

No.

The Media Studies major at USF is a liberal arts-based program that combines media theory and practice. We believe that understanding media is an essential component of modern citizenship. Creating media that should contribute positively to a multicultural, global, future is an equally important task. Consequently, we teach students to be both critical analysts of media genres, institutions, and texts, and to be creative and innovative storytellers in their own right.

The Media Studies Major works within, and is infused by, the USF Jesuit mission, which stresses ethical decision-making and promotes social justice goals. Students graduating from the program should not only demonstrate a deep understanding of media in contemporary society, and be able to create short works of media art, in the form of journalism, audio/video works, or web-based projects; they should also reflect the University’s social justice mission in their concern about the ethical values of the media system and its role in serving human needs. Graduates of the program have gone on to careers in media writing, directing and producing; print and broadcast journalism; graduate study in media, communications, law, and politics; non-profit organizational research, management and media relations; corporate public relations, advertising and marketing; general business, and elementary and high school teaching.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, [gamson@usfca.edu](mailto:gamson@usfca.edu)). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

No.

#### Program Learning Outcomes Film Studies

- a. Students should develop an understanding of the language of film.
  - b. Students should be able to analyze and critically discuss the aesthetic quality of contemporary videos and films and should understand the formal and rhetorical devices to understand film language on its own terms.
  - c. Students should gain an understanding of film as artistic expression and understand how film communicates ideas through image and sound.
4. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

Learning outcome #3:

“Students should gain an understanding of film as artistic expression and understand how film communicates ideas through image and sound.”

## II. METHODOLOGY

5. Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions.”

**Important Note** – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods” which relate to a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

**Important**: *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

For each project, students receive extensive feedback in the form of raw footage critiques, rough cut critiques and final critiques. They receive feedback from their fellow students and from the instructor. After each critique session, students have the opportunity to incorporate the feedback that they receive into the cuts of their film. Students can receive more feedback at any time during the post-production process by attending office hours.

Each film is critiqued in the following five areas.

1. Is the **Story** unique and told in an effective way? Taken into consideration are the following.

- Is the story unique?
- Is the plot clear? Can we tell what's happening in the story?
- Is there underlying thematic content?
- Is there a discernable arc to the story?
- Is there a beginning, middle and end?

2. Is the **Cinematography** effective? Taken into consideration are the following.

- Is the film well shot?
  - Is the film well composed?
  - Is the film well lit?
  - Is the film in focus?
  - Are the compositions comfortable?
- Does the style of cinematography help tell the story?
- Did the student shoot enough material/coverage to support the story?

3. Is the **Sound** effective? Taken into consideration are the following.

- Has the production sound been recorded in a clear and audible manner?
- Is there any level of sound design? If so...
  - Are the levels good in the mix?
  - Does the sound design help tell the story?

4. Does the **Edit** strategy serve the story? Taken into consideration are the following.

- Does the editing scheme support the clarity of the story?
- Does the edit strategy serve as a storytelling device?

5. **Effort**. Taken into consideration are the following.

- Did the student work hard on the film?
- Did they re-shoot if necessary?
- Did they work hard in the edit to overcome production problems?
- Did they spend enough time in each stage of production?
- Did they incorporate the feedback received during critique into their final film?

For the assessment, each film is rated on a scale from 1-4 for the above categories. A narrative analysis is also attached to each category. The scale is as follows:

4-Excellent

3-Above Average

2- Average

1-Below Average

### III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,
- b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and

- c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Here are the notes on the assessed projects.

I have assessed one class from Spring 2018 and one class from Fall 2017.

At the end of this section, I have included a table that summarizes the findings.

**Assessment of Final Projects from:**  
**Intro To Video Production (MS 222-01)**  
**Spring 2018**  
**Professor: Danny Plotnick**

A short doc where students talk about their thoughts around the gun control debate.

### **Story – Score 3.5**

This was a very strong film. The story was clearly articulated. \_\_\_\_\_ did a nice job getting viewpoints from different groups of students and have done a nice job giving voice to a variety of opinions. As filmmakers, they also took a neutral position, which is commendable. This allowed for their subjects to carry the film. The structure of the film needs adjusting to bring some greater 3 act clarity to the proceedings.

### **Cinematography – Score 2.5**

- The interviews were a little flat from a visual standpoint.
- The professor interview looks really nice.
- The anti-gun student interview is really nice (though reflections of the filmmakers were seen in the window a little bit).
- The other interviews are a bit dark or the focus is off. This brings down the energy of the film. This is one of the reasons why having more B-roll would be beneficial. It will bring energy at the visual level and cover up some of the challenges that the darker interviews present.

### **Editing – Score 3**

The structure of the film needs adjusting. This will balance the pro-gun/anti-gun factions. Right now for half the film we are lead to believe this is a film about how we address gun violence. Ultimately, that isn't the story your presenting, and so you need to adjust the edit to better articulate the thesis of the film. Incorporating more b roll will give your film more energy at the edit level.

### **Sound - 3**

The sound recording on the interviews is fairly strong.

- The level of the professor interview is too low.
- The parametric equalizer could be employed on the Professor section to fill out his sound.
- Some students suggested using more music. That t could help with the energy of the piece.

### **Effort – Score 4**

Nice work. A lot of effort was involved in pulling this off. There are a good number of interviews around a controversial topic. It's clear \_\_\_\_\_ spent a significant amount of time in the edit room, pulling out the good audio clips.

A short doc about people who still buy physical copies of music – such as CDs, vinyl and cassettes.

### **Story – Score 3.5**

The story is very clear. They did a nice job interviewing a variety of subjects, and the interviews are very strong. The subjects are clear and articulate. They do a nice job making the argument, talking about why physical media is still an important factor in today's media landscape.

### **Cinematography – Score 3**

The film looks nice. The interviews are solid, though a couple of them are in these drab spaces, so that brings down the visual engagement a bit. Also, though a nice job is done capturing much of the vinyl and cds, there is a lot of glare from plastic sleeves throughout the film. \_\_\_\_\_ could have done a better job capturing the beauty of the lps and the space. Amoeba is a visual goldmine, and the film doesn't quite capture it.

### **Editing – Score 3**

The film has a nice flow and the overall length feels right. The subjects don't overstay their welcome. At the edit level, the film does a nice job giving us pauses, allowing us to look and listen. This echoes the mood of a record store where one looks and listens. I do wish some of the broll could be more pointed. When talking about items that can't be heard via mp3, show us some rarities, rather than the hits. This type of editing would help elevate the film.

### **Sound – Score 3**

Very nice use of music. Good choices, and the placement of the music tracks work well. Some of the audio transitions need to be cleaned up. Some of the clips cut out or fade too suddenly. Watch those transitions. This will help create a smoother piece. Also, at times, a line or two of interview seems to get buried by the music. Watch for those moments. More careful attention to sound mixing is in order.

### **Effort – Score 4**

Nice work. \_\_\_\_\_ went out and shot in the space a couple of times. After the first round of shooting did not deliver great interviews, they went back out a second time to get better interviews. Also, after my initial comments about their editing, they spent more time making stronger connections between the interviews and the b roll.

Short doc about a student with serious health issues, focused on how the student copes with the day-to-day, and stays positive as she deals with a battery of medical tests.

Great job on your film. This film is so good. I know that you have to spend some time working on the sound, landing the ending, and maybe opening it up to breathe a little more, but this is really strong. You have a great story, an engaging character and the film visually pops. Nice work. Grade A- (but that will go up when you fix a couple of items)

#### **Story – Score 4**

Great job finding an interesting subject and figuring out what story you wanted to tell. The lead character is such an engaging character that the audience wants to spend time with her. Her story is really interesting, and do a great job structuring it, which sucks in the audience. We really want to see how things turn out.

#### **Cinematography – Score 4**

The camera work is fantastic. Simply put, this is a really beautiful film. A great job is done photographing the interview subject as well as the b roll.

#### **Editing – Score 3.5**

The structure created in the edit is one of the elements that makes this such an engaging story. Also, the mix of the broll and the interview flows very naturally. I think creating a bit of space, allowing us to absorb and reflect would be nice. The film could be opened up a bit in this regard. Otherwise, we are just being bombarded by story. Also, the end doesn't quite land. It seems to happen too quickly. Find a better way to land the story. The film has such a nice flow, you don't want to spoil it at that point. I love the moment when she starts talking about how she can get down, and we cut to a b roll scene in her apartment that is dark and moody. It's the one sequence of shots that has that tenor and you use it at just the right point. I love how they have edited all the doctor's office footage as well. That is very strong. I do want us to linger on her desire to work with kids. There is an emotional impact there that isn't as fully realized as it should be.

#### **Sound – Score 3**

This is the section that still needs the most attention. The quality of the interview is great. The sound editing and design still need a little work. Audio cross fades are needed to smooth out some abrupt transitions. And, there is a need to figure out how to incorporate music. The audio levels are also a bit low. Again, sound design is always the last element addressed. Your picture is in place, but some audio sweetening needs to happen.

#### **Effort – Score 4.**

Great job all around. A lot of hard work went into making a film of this caliber.

A short doc about the challenges of having University Programs staffed by so many adjuncts.

#### **Story – Score 4**

I love that made a film about something that is personal and important to them. The importance of the arts comes across here. They picked great people to be in the film and did a great job interviewing them. The interview subjects clearly lay out the successes and the challenges of their programs. They are also have a strong, engaging screen presence. I also love the creative approach. The decision to have one of the

adjuncts perform in your film and use that as a suture that weaves throughout the piece is so smart. It brings creativity to a film that is trying to showcase the value of creativity.

### **Cinematography- Score 3**

The interviews look great. The rap/performance has really stylized and strong look. I like the b roll in the shop. I think that looks really strong. The strobing in the b roll is a strong look, though I'm afraid it can read as a mistake. I also do with there was at least one more type of b roll. More performances or classroom material could have added another level of energy. attempted to gather this, but best laid plans don't always work out. Unfortunately, an audience doesn't cut you slack, because they don't know the backstory.

### **Editing - Score 3.5**

Great job weaving all of these elements together. The film really jumped up between the rough cut and the final cut. In the rough cut, there were a lot of great elements, but the cut wasn't structured for maximum effectiveness. The final cut brought out the story. However, even at this stage, it does feel a little long. I think y another 30 seconds to 1 minute can be trimmed and the film will greatly benefit. I think we hear too much about facilities issues. I think you can tighten up that section of the piece.

### **Sound - Score 4**

Nice work on the interviews and recording the performance. The mix is quite nice. There's not much to say here, other than, great job.

### **Effort - Score 4**

Great job. Again, it's clear how much time was spent in the edit to get the film to this point. took the time to gather great source material to work with, and the heavy lifting in the edit is clear.

A short doc about Mission murals

### **Story - Score 3.5**

Great job interweaving your various storytellers to create a compelling look at the Mission murals, giving us both history and artist's perspective. The end is a bit strange. talking about consumerism does not fit in the piece, and it shouldn't be the spot where you end. This becomes a confusing story point. That story works, but not as a closing statement. You need to swing back around to the importance of the murals in the fabric of San Francisco. This will give us a solid third act.

### **Cinematography - Score 3**

The film looks good, but there is some room for improvement. It seems like you were having a little more trouble with the run and gun style on a doc, where you can't always control what's in front of the frame. Sometimes more stability in the shots would have helped. The handheld look doesn't always work for you. At times it also felt like you were shooting from the back of a tour (which you were). Again, the film looks nice, but for a film about art, I would have liked to see a little more control.

### **Editing - Score 3.5**



did a great job moving from rough cut to final cut and weaving together the strands of the film. He needs to still land that ending to bring the 3<sup>rd</sup> act home. It's clear that spent a lot of time shaping the interviews and coming up with a compelling story that follows along. The key now is to fix up the sound and land the ending.

### **Sound – Score 2.5**

The interviews sound really good, but audio post is the area where more effort is needed.

needs to equalize the Clarion Alley interview to make that sound richer. A lot of audio crossfading is needed to make everything sound more seamless. From an edit perspective, there is one scene where the sound is really dead (from an energy perspective) at the moment the film needs to be energized with more music/sound. That can all be accomplished with just a couple more hours of work

### **Effort – Score 4**

effort in the entire class was comendable. Not only on his film work, but how engaged he was in class and willing to talk about and critique the works of others. As a teacher, I really appreciate having students like him in the classroom.

Short doc featuring 3 young women talking about life experiences and the challenges of being a woman in this political/cultural moment.

### **Story - Score 4**

Great job identifying 3 women who were engaging on camera. They had great stories, and were able to bring those out with their interview questions.

They did nice job of making the personal, universal. We got to know all these women, follow along with the challenges in their life, and their stories left us hopeful. More than that, their individual stories speak to universal challenges that women encounter. This is a powerful piece that will speak to and engage your audience. Great work.

### **Cinematography - Score 4**

The film looks great. All the interviews are nicely composed and lit. The B roll that all looks good as well. It has a nice, natural feel and showcases the subjects in an engaging way.

### **Editing – Score 3.5**

There was clearly a tremendous amount of material to work through to get the film down to its 7-minute length. I don't know what the editing strategy was at a process level, but it was clearly working. I'm not concerned about the length of the film, but cutting in a little more b-roll into the film may make the film seem shorter. When we first see the b roll with I think having a series of shots, rather than just one would be more effective. Also, any shots of the teen years are always audience-pleasers. All told I like the pacing and the flow, so no need to gunk it up with b roll, but a little more would go a long way.

### **Sound – Score 4**

The interviews sound great. There is a simple quietude to the piece that works.

### **Effort – Score 4**

I love how well these three filmmakers worked together this semester. They were all engaged in all of the projects, and ended up making two very strong pieces, that were

ambitious in terms of the scope. That's great to see. Sometimes groups can be challenging, but when they work, you can produce sophisticated pieces that would not be achievable if one was working solo.

Short Doc on how we consume and engage with news.

Hey guys, nice work here, though what I saw seems like a rough cut. All told, the interviews are strong. Right now it just feels long, which is fine for a rough cut. Tightening it up is key.

### **Story – Score 3**

I like that \_\_\_\_\_ tackled a topical subject. I like the mixture of expert opinion (professor) and general opinions. This is an issue that affects us all, whether we are experts or not on news sources. The only question is have \_\_\_\_\_ elevated it beyond just “man-on-the-street” interviewing of random people. It leans that way, but at least most of the interview subjects are well spoken on the topic. That said, there are a couple of subjects who don't add much to the conversation and there are sections where people essentially offer “no opinion” and that undermines the authority of the film.

### **Cinematography – Score 4**

The film looks great. Really nice interviews. Great work

### **Editing – Score 2.5**

The film feels long and this also feels like much more of a rough cut than other people's films. It needs to be tightened up. There needs to be a strategy to eliminate the filmmaker questions, so we are not looking at people just nodding to the camera. Also, eliminate the folks who don't have strong/solid opinions. The section about Russia is particularly void of content. I like the way b roll is incorporated, but use more of it. Use that type of news montage to set up the different sections.

### **Sound – Score 3**

I think the music choice is not effective. It does get repetitive. It is neutral (which is good), but it just kind of lays there. That said, the sound mix is quite good. Can you get away with silence?

### **Effort – Score 4/1**

\_\_\_\_\_ did almost no work. He let \_\_\_\_\_ do the heavy lifting. Score 1  
\_\_\_\_\_ really did all of the work solo. He gets a 4.

A short doc about a pole dancer and her relationship with her family.

### **Story – Score 3**

There is an engaging lead character here. She has a great screen presence and the way she reveals her story is really interesting. The film moves in an unexpected fashion. As a simple portraiture, this is a great little story.

### **Cinematography – Score 2**

The main shot of the interview is a bit weird. I like the color, but the composition is not that flattering. Also, there are 2 shots covering the interview, but they don't match at all in terms of look and that's a bit distracting. It's the right idea, but the wrong execution. Some more b roll would have also really raised the game.

### **Editing – Score 2**

The film is comprised of 3 shots. They cut well, but more b roll would have allowed for a more dynamic cutting strategy. A film about a pole dancer should have brought more energy. More b roll would have helped you there. Also, you need to grade the two interview shots to get them closer to matching.

### **Sound – Score 2.5**

The levels for this piece are all over the map. You need to work on bringing them into line.

### **Effort – Score - .5**

was total no-show in the class. He didn't come to class and didn't keep me apprised with what's going on.

**Assessment of Final Projects from:**  
**Intro To Video Production (MS 222-01)**  
**Fall 2017**  
**Professor: Danny Plotnick**

Short doc about an on-line cooking show produced by USF Students.

### **Story – Score 3.5**

Really nice work. The story of these two and their cooking show has been told in a nice manner. There is a nice job of establishing who they are and how they came together in the first act. The second act shows them at work. It wraps up nicely as well.

### **Cinematography – Score 3**

The cinematography is ok, but could be a bit stronger. For a cooking show it's a little drab at times. This has to do with using available light. But compositionally it's very nice and the interviews look really good.

### **Editing – Score 3.5**

All told, there is nice ordering and structuring of the film. I appreciate the energy they put in after the rough cut screening to re-cut the opening. It is much more effective now. I do think they have to deal with the energy lag in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the film and work on bringing in the studio show earlier. Also, some more attention to color grading will help the visual appeal.

### **Sound – Score 4**

Some minor audio fixes to smooth out audio transitions would be in order, but the quality of recorded sound is excellent.

## **Effort – Score 4**

Short poetic doc about North Beach.

## **Story – Score 2**

Right now there are a lot of beautiful shots of North Beach. They have captured the natural and architectural beauty of the place. That said, I don't feel the story has been settled on. What is the film about? What are we supposed to feel? What are we supposed to take away? Are we lamenting a change? I'm not sure. Are we celebrating the people? I'm not sure.

## **Cinematography – Score 4**

The film is beautiful, but what other elements can you bring in to tell the story. I think there needs to be a different b roll emphasis. Bring in people. Let's see their faces. Create more emotion that way.

## **Editing – Score 2**

You need to find the story in the edit. Can there be more audio clips? Can the piece be enlivened with ambient sounds. Bring in more people and sounds of the street. The beauty of North Beach is here, but not the vibrancy of the people.

## **Sound – Score 3**

What is hear is very clean. But, does the song work? Do the lyrics create a dialogue with the Ferlinghetti piece? I want to hear more voices and sounds from the street.

## **Effort - 4**

Short doc on how immigrants adjust to life in America.

## **Story – Score 3**

- I like that they are telling this story about immigrants adjusting to life in the U.S. This is a great idea.
- I think the first guy has a lot of insights and takes us on a journey.  
do a very nice job shaping the arc of his story.
- The second story is a bit rougher. It ends too abruptly. It is hard to understand his last line. It doesn't have the closure that the end of the first interview has, both in terms of narrative clarity, and the time for the audience to reflect.

## **Audio – Score 2.5**

- Interviews sound really good and clean.
- However, the sync needs to be fixed.
- When the interviews cut out, we are left with total silence. Need to fix that with room tone or other sound design elements.
- What about using audio from the city, from the b roll? This could be a nice touch.
- There is a lack of sound design going on that could enrich the film.

### **Cinematography – Score 3**

- The interviews are nicely shot, though the dog was distracting in the second interview.
- The shots of the city were nice, though at times they were shaky. The film could have benefited from a tripod.
- I would have liked to see b roll of them going about their day, experiencing the city. I want to see and feel their experience. That isn't coming through enough with your choice of footage.

### **Editing – Score 3**

- Fix some of the jump cutty feel of the opening. By re-sequencing shots, the film will benefit.
- Fix the length of the text scroll and lower thirds. All of this was too quick, making these moments hard to follow

### **Effort – Score 4**

- Nice work!

An experimental doc contrasting the calm of the ocean and the hectic nature of living in a city.

### **Story – Score 3.5**

### **Cinematography – Score 2.5**

### **Editing – Score 3**

### **Sound – Score 4**

### **Effort – Score 4**

This is an interesting film to talk about. I love that this group fully committed to an experimental approach to storytelling. The interviews are fantastic and they do a really nice job in the edit shaping them to tell a story about our need for nature and escape. As discussed in class, I don't know that I fully believe the images support the dialogue. I know what the film is going for, but I don't always feel that the images are having enough of a conversation with the dialogue. I want them to be in lockstep, or to be a polar opposite, or to comment on the dialogue. At times they feel a bit random. A very nice job has been done with the edit (especially in the re-edit) to structure the images so that they flow smoothly and there are some nice connections between the text and the image, but they are as good as can be, given the footage. I don't read the footage being so mundane or being so horrid that they necessitate a need for escape.

I'd like to see the cameras given to another batch of subjects to see what footage could have been gotten on a second go round. Ask this group to more specifically capture the mundane and day-to-day aspects of their life and work in that footage.

Again, I really appreciate a group taking a chance with such a piece, but I do believe that an audience member, without having watched the process, will think “?!?!?”.

A short doc about the storefront gallery, Park Life.

**Story – Score 3.5**

did a really nice job shaping this doc. They brought out the story of Park Life, of its proprietor and also did a great job in the 3<sup>rd</sup> act of addressing community-minded members of the audience.

**Cinematography – Score 3**

Compositionally, the film looks very nice. It does have a bit of a drab feel at times due to the lighting and shooting much of the film in the evening. I do wish the film had more “pop” to it from a visual perspective.

**Editing – Score 4**

As mentioned, they did a really nice job shaping the film. One more round of color grading would be beneficial.

**Sound – Score 3.5**

The interview is crisp. I think the sound edit could be finessed and the sound design could be a little richer.

**Effort – Score 4**

Short doc about the rock band class at USF

**Story – Score 3**

I like how they’ve told the story of this class. I’m glad that were able to get interviews from a number of people in the class, as well as the instructor. Having all these voices was really nice. I do still wish they would have followed the notion of how classroom rock and roll differs from rock and roll in the wild.

**Cinematography – Score 3**

What’s here looks good, but I would have loved some more dynamic b roll. A film about music should visually be more energetic.

**Editing – Score 3.5**

They did a nice job working with the interviews and constructing a story that flowed. They do need to fix some of the audio transitions and levels throughout.

**Sound – Score 4**

The interviews sound nice.

**Effort – Score 4**

Short doc about a nature preserve in the North Bay

**Story – Score 4**

I love the content of this doc. I think did a great job telling the story, not only of Spawn, but of the people who work there. Excellent work.

### **Cinematography – Score 3**

There are some absolutely beautiful images in this film. I do think the shakiness could be improved upon – in future projects. I do think the hand held nature feels a bit like operator error at times and not always like a conscious choice. I think it's fine for this project, but something to keep in mind for future projects.

### **Editing – Score 4**

Great job shaping this story. Many of the adjustments made between rough cut and final cut paid off. Great ending – which is often tough to figure out in a doc.

### **Sound – Score 3**

The film sounds good. There needs to be some work done on the sound editing. Also, as we talked about, the sound choices for the intro and outro could be improved upon – getting rid of the traffic and air traffic noises don't always benefit the film.

### **Effort – Score 4**

I'm really happy to see how hard [redacted] worked on this film. I know it has been a rough semester for him, so I am really pleased that he was able to make such a standout film. He should be very proud.

## **Film Studies Assessment October 2018**

<b>Intro Video Production Spring 2018</b>	<b>Story</b>	<b>Cinematograph y</b>	<b>Edit</b>	<b>Soun d</b>	<b>Effor t</b>
	3.5	2.5	3	3	4
	3.5	3	3	3	4
	4	4	3.5	3	4
	4	3	3.5	4	4
	3.50	3	3.5	2.5	4

	4	4	3.5	4	4
	3	4	2.5	3	2.5
	3	2	2	2.5	0.5
Average S 18	3.56	3.19	3.06	3.13	3.38
<b>Intro Video Production Fall 2017</b>	<b>Story</b>	<b>Cinematograph</b>	<b>Edit</b>	<b>Sound</b>	<b>Effort</b>
	3.5	3	3.5	4	4
	2	4	2	3	4
	3	2.5	3	3	4
	3.5	2.5	3	4	4
	3.5	3	4	3.5	4
	3	3	3.5	4	4
	4	3	4	3	4
Average F 17	3.21	3.00	3.29	3.50	4.00
<b>Average Both classes</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.69</b>

<b>Scale of 1-4</b>
4 - Excellent
3 - Above Average
2 - Average
1 - Below Average

The results from the Assessment show me that students are leaving class with a strong set of skills. Clearly, their effort is commendable and that's what I've seen in classes over the years. This year's assessments show that student are very focused on coming up with engaging stories. The storytelling aspects of their films is at times stronger than their technical mastery. That is ok for an intro class. They will develop their technical skills over time. Below I have included the summary scores from last year's assessment. The scores are similar between the two years, which shows consistency in the program.

<b>Assessment October 2017 Avg Both classes</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>3.92</b>
---	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------



#### **IV. CLOSING THE LOOP**

- 7. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.**

I feel the program is in strong shape. Students continually to produce strong work with an emphasis on solid storytelling.

8. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

**Mission Statement:** This year, I was sure to include the Media Studies Mission Statement in the report.

**Closing the Loop:** In past years, I have given students extensive feedback in class and then followed that up with written feedback. That said, I had never given them scores on the individual aspects of filmmaking like Cinematography and Editing. We certainly talked a lot about that and students were given the feedback about those areas of filmmaking, but I never gave them scores.

When I did the assessment last year, I assessed the areas of Story, Cinematography, Sound, Editing and Effort and rated those areas on a scale of 1-4, for the sake of the assessment. I found that an interesting exercise that I have now incorporated into the feedback I give students. I break these areas down for the students in the same way that I have presented the feedback here. Students have really liked that.

It's exciting to me that something I did in the assessment has been incorporated into the classroom setting.

## ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

Tables have been included above. Below is the Film Studies Flowchart.

### Film Studies Courses

