

FILM STUDIES MINOR

ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019 REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

- **Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), as well as 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 in separate sections.**
- **Undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs must submit separate reports**
- **It is recommended that each assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices.**
- **A curricular map should be submitted along with each assessment report (we suggest that the curricular map should be informed by recent assessment outcomes).**

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@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

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

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).

Danny Plotnick, Program Director dplotnick@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

A Minor.

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? 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 programs

- **Mission Statement (Minor):**

The Film Studies minor at USF is a liberal arts-based program that combines film practice and film theory. In today’s media landscape, being able to tell a story in 3-5 minutes with video and audio is an essential skill for artists, activists, journalists, citizen filmmakers and creative professionals. Our program teaches students how to analyze historical and contemporary film movements, as well as how to use the tools of the trade to create their own personal works, and to be creative and innovative storytellers in their own right.

The Film Studies Minor 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 video works; 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; museum and festival curation; video and broadcast journalism; graduate study in film production; non-profit video production; advertising and marketing; and elementary and high school teaching.

2. **Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? 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: It is expected that PLOs will vary in level of mastery between different programs in the same discipline (e. g., a major and minor in the same subject area). Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

- **PLOs (Minor):**

No changes made to the PLOs.

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.
3. **State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019.**

What rubric did you use?

The Role of Rubrics

The rubric is the single most important thing you need for assessment, and putting time and thinking into designing a good rubric is going to make the entire process a lot easier, faster, and meaningful. Your rubric should break down your chosen PLO into the smallest measurable components, so that the assessment of each piece of work becomes linear and easy, and the calibration among different faculty assessing more objective. If you still have to debate a while whether that one line of the rubric has been fulfilled or not, chances are your rubric item is still an aggregate and can be broken down further into smaller components. Once you have made a detailed rubric, then not only the

“grading” work will be faster and straightforward, but at the end of it you will have data that is significantly more meaningful. For example, some parts of the PLO may be in tiptop shape while others may need to be massaged or tweaked, with more attention given to that particular item in class. Conversely, your data may show you that the PLO itself is not what you thought it should be—it may be that it duplicates something other PLOs include or that a crucial part of what you teach is getting lost in the cracks between your PLOs. So do make sure that the rubric is as detailed and thorough as you possibly can manage (a short rubric in fact makes the grading longer, as counterintuitive as that seems).

- **PLO(s) being assessed (Minor):**

Learning outcome #3:

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

III. METHODOLOGY

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 score for responses to those questions.”

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods,” which consist of 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.*

- **Methodology used (Minor):**

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

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section asks 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 question, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	8.7%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	20.3%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	66%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	5%

Results (Minor):

Here are the notes on the assessed projects.

I have assessed one class from Spring 2019 and one class from Fall 2018.

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



Story – Score 4

I love the subject you picked for this. I also loved that you travelled to the South Bay to get the material. You did a great job writing a script that was easy to follow and laid out the story of the Lodge. Also, you got some nice interviews to add flavor to the piece. Excellent work. I also like that both your narrative and doc explore the paranormal. A directorial voice emerges!

Cinematography – Score 3

Your film pulls from a lot of different visual sources. There is archival footage mixed with footage you shot. As we discussed in class, there's a fair amount of lo-res footage bringing the overall visual quality down a little bit. The original material you shot is fairly strong. The interview of the guy who works there is okay. I felt that interview could be a bit more interesting. The visuals you shot of the location are very nice.

Editing – Score 3

This is the area where you could put some effort to bring the overall quality of the film up. Your story is clear, but the vo moves at a rapid pace, leaving the audience little time to absorb the material. I would open the film up and give it some room to breathe. You might also intermix the interviews with your voice over. Create a conversation between the history lesson and those affected by the location.

Sound – Score 3.5

This sounds good. I know one of the interviews had a lot of ambient noise in it. You did good to filter some of that out, but now you are affecting the voice a little too much. Ease off that filter a bit.

Effort – Score 4

Great work. You two seem to have a solid partnership going with both of you invested in these projects.

Grade A-

**Story – Score 4**

I love that you tackled the topic of the University raising tuition for student. You should be applauded for getting interviews with Father Fitz and the Provost. You asked tough questions and got a lot material to work with. I think the structure of your film is very solid and you do a really nice job laying out the arguments. You've also kept an objective distance. Really timely stuff.

Cinematography - Score 3

I love the Provost interview. It looks really good, as does the interview with Father Fitz. The student interviews look OK. They're solid with clean backgrounds, but perhaps a hint drab. At this point, you need more and better broll to enliven the piece and to do some storytelling for you. As discussed in class, one of the main focuses of the piece is student's job/workload. We need to see that. We need to see the toll being taken by high tuition figures. Also, I want to see more faces of students. You need the power of the close up to personalize the film a bit more.

Editing – Score 3

You've done a nice job structuring the interviews and having them talk to each other. You've created a conversation. I still feel the cut is a bit long. I think there are ways to knock out 60-90 seconds without losing the impact of the words. Also, B roll is incorporated in a funny way. It pops in and out in a jarring fashion. You need to build in B roll sequences to help story tell.

Sound – Score 3

On balance the sound is good. Father Fitz's interview less so, but it is acceptable. I think you can use the sound of protest as a score or soundtrack to the film. In lieu of music, we need the sound of the campus.

Effort – Score 4

Great job. Again, I love that you tackled this issue and you've put in the effort to talk to those in charge!

Grade B+. You can make this shine and you should. You are entering a fiery debate and I want you putting the best foot forward. This is strong, as is, but it can be appreciably better, and it's important for this to be as good as possible.

Story – Score 4

Great job on the film. You do a nice job telling the story of Young Life. It is clear what the organization is about and the passion of the leaders and students really come across. This is the type of film that could be used to promote the organization.

Cinematography – Score 3

The original material that you shot looks very good. Also, in your latest cut you really did a better job selecting b roll. All told, it's a very strong looking piece. The one area that is a bit challenging in the film is the fact that you are using materials from a variety of different sources and that difference shows through. Hopefully you might have found another export setting that will decrease the artifacting on the materials you didn't shoot less noticeable.

Editing – Score 4

Again, this is a very tight film with a clear structure to it. The initial cut felt a bit long and conversations that seemed done would re-emerge later in the film. In the final cut, you have streamlined the conversation which makes it more impactful.

Sound – Score 4

The film sounds good. You did a nice job on your production sound and I like the way you've incorporated and mixed your music.

Effort – Score 4

██████████, I really appreciate all your hard work and effort this semester. You made two very strong films all on your own. That's a very nice accomplishment.

Grade A

Story – Score 3

I like the idea behind this story. You are looking at two different approaches to tattooing from both an artistic and business perspective. You picked two good subjects to tell that story. As discussed in class, however, I'm not feeling those differences as acutely as I would like. Though your subjects talk about the difference, I'm not seeing it as much as I feel like I should.

Cinematography – Score 3

What is here is strong, but I want to see more. I want to feel the difference between their spaces. More B roll of the conventional space would really help in this regard. We get a glimpse of your brother's work space, but I want to see that in greater contrast with the

more conventional work space. I also get a greater sense of your brother's tattoo artistry more so than the other guy. So again, another round of footage would definitely help.

Editing/Sound – Score 3

The piece feels a little long to me. That said, with more b roll and a cleaner sound mix, the length of the film may not be an issue. Both of your guys are articulate, but my struggle to hear the one guy makes me tune him out a bit. One more sound mixing pass would be beneficial. That will help the one guy's story land, which then might also improve my understanding of the difference between the 2 worlds.

Effort – Score 3.5

I appreciate all the struggles you had in attempting to make the Fort Point film. And I appreciate you coming up with a completed, well thought out and executed film that was made in the last minute. I do feel like what we were seeing in class this week is a rough cut, rather than a final cut. Put in a little more effort, send it my way and I'll raise the grade.
Grade B+



Story – Score 3.5

Nice job whittling your story down. I love that you went to several organizations and several individuals, but were willing to reduce the film down to tell a more focused story. Sometimes it is tough to let go of some of the interviews, but you ended up with a strong piece as a result. The information is there. I do want to "feel" the impact of your piece more emotionally than I do, however. That's the missing element.

Cinematography – Score 4

The footage shot in the dog shelter is indeed impactful. That footage looks nice. I think the interview is ok. There is some shakiness and sometimes it feels like the image stabilizer is on. I know you had focus issues, but that said, you do a good job using the good bits. I do want more and better dog footage. You could run nothing but dogs and people would go nuts. But there aren't enough dog close ups. We usually are seeing group shots of dogs. That's not as powerful as it could be. That footage is good, but not great. Having great footage on that front would transform your film.

Sound – Score 4

The film sounds great. Nice job recording the interview.

Editing – Score 3

You've done a nice job shaping the interview into a cohesive, coherent argument. At this point, you need to open up the interview and allow it to breathe. We are bombarded with information, but don't have the time to absorb the information. This film should give us the feels, and it doesn't quite get there. A little more breathing room and a little more beautiful dog footage is in order.

Effort – Score 4

I really appreciate how hard the two of you have worked all semester. You seemed to work really well together and put your heads down and did the work.
Grade A-

████████████████████

Story – Score 3.5

I like that the two of you were willing to go out and push buttons. That you managed to keep a straight face and convince people of your proposition is, on the one hand, scary, but on the other hand, a testament to your own acting abilities. Hopefully you didn't ruin anybody's day!

Cinematography – Score 3.5

The interviews look really good. You picked a neutral background, but one that has some nice texture and energy. Good job.

Editing – Score 3

Your film is almost there. You have the elements in place, but the comedy isn't fully realized. In class we discussed a couple strategies to maybe get you there. Using some Trump/Devo footage over your questions. Accompanying those bits with music. This strategy might bring a certain kind of energy. Maybe doing quicker supercuts of the outrageous answers, and then sliding into the more cerebral responses. Another editing session might yield benefits.

Sound – Score 2.5

The sound quality is a bit all over the map. Some interviews are sharp and clear, others plagued by background noise. Ultimately, they all have a different tone. That actually makes it tough to cut for the impactful comedy you are going for. You want sharp cuts between some of the lines, but when you do that, we have to adjust our hearing at each of those edit points. Not much to do now, but this is important to keep in mind for your next projects. Getting quality, consistent sound is so important.

Also, as discussed in class, perhaps you can use some music during some of the title cards to set a tone and play off of that sound in some way. There might be some comedy to be mined based on how you play that.

Effort – Score 4

You two worked really well together as a team and seemed to support each other in all of your crazy ideas.

Grade A-

████████████████████
-I appreciate you pulling together a cut of the interviews. But let me be clear to the both of you that this is pretty unacceptable for a final project. In my 10 years of teaching this class, this is one of the most underdone projects I have seen. This is not a finished film. This is not even a rough cut. This is a first pass of a cut of the interviews. I think you had these interviews several weeks ago, so the piece should be beyond this. I'm not sure what happened here. You two seemed to have a rough partnership and an inability to communicate. ██████████, you seemed to disappear over the last several weeks of class. You were rarely in class and I imagine this didn't help on the project. I am being generous in

giving you a C for this project. To be fair, you did shoot the film, but then the work kind of stopped. There you go. Grade C.

Story – Score 2. There could have been something here, had you delivered a fully realized film.

Cinematography Score 3 The interviews were shot very well.

Edit – Score 1.5 This is a rough cut at best.

Sound – Score 2.5 This sounds fine from a production sound level, but there is no mix or sound design present.

Effort – Score 1

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

████████████████████
Story – Score 3.5

This is a really nice job tracking the KUSF story. I do think there are a couple missing pieces. What happened and why did the license get sold. It's touched upon, but that's an important moment. I could argue there could be more talk of the transition after the sale of the license could be brought up.

Cinematography – Score 3

Of the three interviews, the ██████████ (?) one is really nice. ██████████ is composed well, but it could visually pop more in terms of the lighting. The other interview is a bit soft. Nice incorporation of B roll which enlivens the piece. A little more archival footage would have been great.

Editing – Score 3.5


Nice job on the cut. The film has really improved since the rough cut stage. I like the new opening you added. It brings a great energy a necessary addition in a film about college radio. I love the Ramones quote. That's super fun. I do like the archival footage you've found and added. That helps bring that section to life a bit more. I like how intercut the two younger KUSF djs. That section does start to feel a little long to me though. At some point, it feels like we are wrapping up, but then the film keeps going. I start feeling that way around the introduction of the KUSF app.

Sound – Score 3

The interview quality is great. Nice job on the recording. I like that as you moved from Rough Cut to Final cut, you got more adventurous with your sound design and mixing, which is befitting a film about radio. The archival audio you incorporate is a nice touch.

Effort- Score 4

I feel like you've been working hard. Obviously, what we saw today was a rough cut, which why some of the above scores are low. That's more of a reflection of the rough cut state of the film as opposed to where the film can land.


Story – Score 4

This is a great story. And I love how much this transformed from the interview only rough cut, to the b-roll only final cut. You brought the story to life with the visuals. You had an engaging subject and did her story justice. Nice job, structuring the interview and shaping the story.

Cinematography – Score 3

The interview was a little flat, and I'm glad you chose to only use the b-roll, which looks great. There are some beautiful shots here. I love that you got a GoPro and took it into the ocean. Nice job stabilizing the GoPro footage. It is much more stable now, which befits the meditative quality of the story.

Editing – Score 3

Again, great job incorporating the b-roll. That's all about the edit and you've done a nice job. From a big picture perspective, you've done a nice job of settling the film down once she gets into the water. When you mention the "meditative state", I like the shot you use. That gets the audience to enter the framework of the film.


Sound – Score 4

The interview sounds great. I love the way you've brought in the wave sounds. This style of sound design works well in the film. In fact, I think you could pepper those in a little more throughout the film.

Effort – Score 4

I love how much this film progressed from Rouch Cut to Fine Cut. Such a huge jump in quality. I appreciate your work and I appreciate you getting in the water!

Grade A



Story – Score 4

I love what you've done here. You've created these very nice portraits of your subjects. Their personalities come across and you've done a great job treating your co-authors with respect.

Cinematography – Score 4

The film looks great. I love the backdrop you shot against. Visually, your subjects really pop. Also, shooting photographs was a nice touch and adds an additional strong visual element to your story.

Editing-Score 3.5

I like the structure of the individual portraits. As discussed in class, I think  portrait could land a bit more. I appreciate the changes you made to it from the first cut, but I still think this is the one part of the film that feels less complete than the other two. If you can unlock the key to figuring out that segment, the film will benefit.

Sound – Score 3

There is a hiss going on in the interview. The interview sound quality is recorded at a nice level and the interviews are pretty clear, but there is that noise floor that is noticeable. It would be good to figure out what happened on that front.

Effort – Score 4

Great job. I love all the little touches like the photographs and the art direction. It's clear you were passionate about this subject and it shows in the final result.

Grade A


Story – Score 3.5

This is a really nice portrait of an artist. You've treated your subject with a lot of respect and you did a great job bringing us her story. We understand who she is as an artist, as well as getting some background into her history and the artistic influences she carries. That said, I think you can cut down a bit more, maybe just 30 seconds, and that will keep anyone's attention from wandering.

Cinematography - Score 3.5

Very nice work here. During the first cut, I wasn't sold on a lot of the hand held camera work. Your final edit, however, manages to elevate the cinematography. You pulled out the rougher hand held work, and focused on the more stable photography you had. Not only is this visually appealing, but it is more in keeping with your artist's design sense.

Editing – Score 4

Tremendous work here. I love how this film transformed from your rough cut to your final cut. You really brought this story to life with your editing. I love how you opened up the film – creating more space, more stability, and slowing the film down – allowing us to absorb what we're being presented. Great work.

Sound – Score 4

Your production sound was very strong and I love the way you worked with music in the film. Again, the music usage was a bit rough in the first cut, but you definitely nailed it in the final cut. Nice work.

Effort – Score 4

Great work all around. I love that you got out in the community. I love that you shot early. I love that you had a rough cut early. This allowed you to really tighten the film up.

Grade A


Story – Score 3.5

I like how you've brought this science essay to life. The story/essay itself serves as a vehicle for the filmic presentation which is super fun. The essay itself is good, but not revolutionary by any means.

Cinematography – Score 4

I love the way this is shot. It looks great. You've got complete control of the camera. I also like that you turned it black and white. That's a nice stylistic, and in keeping with the found footage portion of the film.

Editing – Score 4

Great work. Again, the film has total style. You do a great job weaving between the found footage and the original material that you've shot. There's a crispness to the edit and you do a nice job bringing about the humor in your cutting.

Sound – Score 4

Again, great work. The original production sound is excellent, and I like how you've stylized the sound on your voice over to match the found footage. The mix is also nice and the music does a nice job adding to the energy.

Effort – Score 4

I love the way this came together. Though you indicated what you were going for along the way, the end result is much more than I expected. This has to do with your vision and attention to detail at the cinematography and editing level. Great job.

Grade A


Story – Score 3.5

I think you've done a great job telling not only the story of the 3 women in the film, but also showing us how their individual stories reflect bigger concerns in society at large. In the initial cut, the film seemed too long, and as a result it could cause the audience to drift for a bit, which undercut their stories. In your new cut, you got to the individual stories by the 3 minute mark, and as a result the story of your film becomes clear.

Cinematography – Score 3.5

The interviews look great and you do a nice job introducing B Roll as well. A hint more B Roll may have enlivened the piece just a bit more. It would be interesting to get your three subject out into the real world a little more. They talk about the world outside their apartment walls, so seeing them in that space could be nice.

Sound – Score 4

The sound production is great. All the interviews are nice and clear.

Editing – Score 3.5

This film really jumped up from rough cut to final cut. So much attention was paid to the editing in this phase. Shortening the film, including Broll, changing the structure ever so slightly. This attention to detail really got your film to elevate.

Effort – Score 4

Great job. I like that you two have made some very ambitious films in class and have pulled those off with a great deal of ease. It's clearly a partnership that works well.

Grade A


Cinematography – Score 3**Editing – Score 3**

I think the film looks really nice. The interviews are shot well. I would have loved to see more b-roll of dogs. Visually, the film focuses more on the people. This makes sense, because the film is about community. But, everybody loves dogs and I'd like to see the personality of the dogs come out more. Or, I'd like to see the owners interacting with their dogs. We don't get any of that. Also, we don't see the people interacting with each other. They all occupy their own space in the film. So, what is here is good, but I want to see more types of footage. More dogs. More people interacting with their dogs and more people interacting with other people. This would have given you more options in the edit. But all told, what is here is nice.

Sound – Score 3

The sound is very nice. The interviews are clean. I do think Julie's dialogue is all happening in one ear only. So that needs to be panned appropriately.

Story – Score 3

I like this story of community. That comes across in the interviews. I do wish we could visually see that a little more. This gets back to the visual coverage and the editing. But nice job shaping the story out of all of these interviews.

Effort – Score 3

It really feels like you pulled this together last minute. You did a good job, but a little more time would have meant a little more attention to detail.

Grade A-

Summary of Findings

Film Studies Assessment October 2019					
Intro Video Production Spring 2019	Story	Cinematography	Edit	Sound	Effort
	4	3	3	3.5	4
	4	3	3	3	4
	4	3	4	4	4
	3	3	3	3	3.5
	3.5	4	3	4	4
	3.5	3.5	3	2.5	4
	2	3	1.5	2.5	1
Average S 18	3.43	3.21	2.93	3.21	3.50
Intro Video Production Fall 2018	Story	Cinematography	Edit	Sound	Effort
	3.5	3	3.5	3	4
	4	3	3	4	4
	4	4	3.5	3	4
	3.5	3.5	4	4	4
	3.5	4	4	4	4
	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	4
	3	3	3	3	3
Average F 17	3.57	3.43	3.50	3.57	3.86
Average Both classes	3.50	3.32	3.21	3.39	3.68
Scale of 1-4 4 - Excellent 3 - Above Average 2 - Average 1 - Below Average					

V. CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are 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 any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

- **Closing the Loop (Minor):**

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

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2017-2018, submitted in October 2018)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

- **Suggestions (Minor):**

Last year it was suggested that I develop a Mission Statement for the Program that is separate from the Media Studies Major. This is something that I tackled this year. Please note the Mission Statement in the first part of the assessment.

VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

- **Big Picture (Minor):**

Year to year, the results of the assessment have shown consistency. This is great. Year-in, year out, our students are taking what they learn in class, and putting it into practice, making very strong films. These skills that they are beginning to master will help them as they move forward, not only in their academic careers, but in their lives after college.

VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

None.

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

