|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning**  **2021-2022** | |
| *Potter College of Arts & Letters* | *School of Media* |
| *BFA in Film Production (#530)* | |
| *Sara Thomason* | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***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** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: BTL Job Performance Evaluation** | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **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: Production Presentation** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: ATL Job Performance Evaluation** | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3:** Demonstrate an understanding of the structures and means of production in studio (Hollywood) and independent film production. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Portfolio Review** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Indirect: Exit Interview** | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met\*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4:** Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: ATL Job Performance Evaluation** | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 5:** Communicate effectively, orally and through the written word, on set and in film analysis. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: Film Theory Essay Evaluation** | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 5.** | | **Met** | **Not Met\*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 6:** Coordinate and supervise a crew/team, and, in turn, serve as a collaborative crew/team member. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: ATL Job Performance Evaluation** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: BTL Job Performance Evaluation** | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
|  | | | |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)** | | | |
| \*For the purposes of this report, Student Learning Outcome #3 has been left unmarked and SLO #5 has been marked “not met” because students have not reached the senior level in the program. Hence, no measurements were taken.    AY 2021-2022 data provided helps continue a baseline for future evaluation with a few caveats:  First, the first true cohort of BFA students will reach their senior year during AY 2022-2023, therefore SLO #3 and #5 will be evaluated during that AY.  Second, the rubrics used to evaluate performace in presentations and on set were done on an individual basis for each professor depending on their area of expertise (cinematography, producing, directing, etc.). A standardized system of rubrics which share a common weighted scoring system, yet still account for different areas of expertise was developed and implemented in fall 2021, but is being re-evaluated and revised for fall 2022.  Finally, in most cases, the sample size of the cohort evaluated was only *N*=14, since this is the number of students in the senior-most level of the BFA. In the future, a typical cohort of BFA students will be N=24 once the program is running at full capacity, which might affect the instrument averages.  s | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 measure 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 43 students enrolled, 36 had a mean practical score of 90% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in a below-the-line (crew) 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** | | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (*N*=14) enrolled in FILM 491 Below-the-Line (BTL) Practicum III during Spring 2022 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. the shots were in focus for 1st AC, the sound mixer’s sound was clear, 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 were anonymized and each student’s BTL scores were averaged to create a BTL mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | | | **Met** | | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | | |
| The film program is in the process of standardizing scoring across all faculty members to incorporate VALUE (LEAP) rubrics for grading on-set performance and student presentations for greater transparency and consistency. These rubrics were implemented in Fall 2021 evaluations and are being re-evaluated and revised for Fall 2022 evaluations. | | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | | |
| As a new program, we are still collecting and analyzing assessment data. Students improved from last year to this year, by a small margin. We will continue to gather data and assess the prerequisite courses as well as the measurement instruments. | | | | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | | | | |
| Since students in the BFA in Film Production are working in Below-the-Line positions every year, these 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: Students present to the entire film faculty 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. | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (N=*14*) enrolled in FILM 390 Pre-Production Practicum II during Spring 2022 were scored based on faculty assessment of both the content and the delivery of presentations using a professor-designed rubric. These scores were anonymized and each student’s presentation scores were averaged to create a presentation mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean presentation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (N=*14*) enrolled in FILM 392 Above-the-Line (ATL) Practicum III during Spring 2022 were 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 were anonymized and each student’s ATL scores were averaged to create an ATL mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | | | **Met** | | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | | |
| The film program is in the process of standardizing scoring across all faculty members to incorporate VALUE (LEAP) rubrics for grading on-set performance and student presentations for greater transparency and consistency. These rubrics were implemented in Fall 2021 evaluations and are being re-evaluated and revised for Fall 2022 evaluations. | | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | | |
| As a new program, we are still collecting and analyzing assessment data. Students improved from last year to this year, by a small margin. We will continue to gather data and assess the prerequisite courses as well as the measurement instruments. | | | | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | | | | |
| Since students in the BFA in Film Production are working in Above-the-Line positions every year, these assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Demonstrate an understanding of the structures and means of production in studio (Hollywood) and independent film production.** | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: In their capstone course, students submit professional materials, such as resumés and reels appropriate for the film industry. Students are evaluated by the professor of record on both the content and the delivery of these materials using 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** | | **See “Actions” below** | |
| **Methods** | Going forward, the film program will incorporate standardized VALUE (LEAP) rubrics to evaluate student portfolios, and each film professor will be asked to score the portfolio. The resulting scores can be collected and anonymized to track performance. As an INDIRECT measure, these portfolios will be submitted to a professional advisory council for review. | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | INDIRECT measure of student learning: In their capstone course, students were given an online student survey measuring their self-reported satisfaction of learning in the program. | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | | **See “Actions” below** | |
| **Methods** | Going forward, the students will be given an exit survey to provide numerical data based on students’ self-reported satisfaction of learning in the program related to the six programmatic outcomes. | | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | | | **Met** | | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | | |
| \*For the purposes of this report, Student Learning Outcome #3 has been left unmarked because students have not reached the senior level in the program. Hence, no measurements were taken. | | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | | |
| The first cohort of students will work their way through the entire program by AY 2022-2023. Data for SLO #3 will be available at that time. | | | | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | | | | |
| Since students in the BFA in Film Production will be in the senior capstone every year, these assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason, starting AY 2022-2023. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4** | | | | | | | | |
| **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 present to the entire film faculty 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. | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (N=*14*) enrolled in FILM 390 Pre-Production Practicum II during Spring 2022 were scored based on faculty assessment of both the content and the delivery of presentations using a professor-designed rubric. These scores were anonymized and each student’s presentation scores were averaged to create a presentation mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean presentation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (N=*14*) enrolled in FILM 392 Above-the-Line (ATL) Practicum III during Spring 2022 were 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 were anonymized and each student’s ATL scores were averaged to create an ATL mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | | | | | | **Met** | | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | | |
| The film program is in the process of standardizing scoring across all faculty members to incorporate VALUE (LEAP) rubrics for grading on-set performance and student presentations for greater transparency and consistency. These rubrics were implemented in Fall 2021 evaluations and are being re-evaluated and revised for Fall 2022 evaluations. | | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | | |
| As a new program, we are still collecting and analyzing assessment data. Students improved from last year to this year, by a small margin. We will continue to gather data and assess the prerequisite courses as well as the measurement instruments. | | | | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | | | | |
| Since students in the BFA in Film Production are working in Above-the-Line positions every year, these assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 5** | | | | | | | | |
| **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 present to the entire film faculty 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. | | | | | | | |
| **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** | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (*N*=14) enrolled in FILM 390 Pre-Production Practicum II during Spring 2022 were scored based on faculty assessment of both the content and the delivery of presentations using a professor-designed rubric. These scores were anonymized and each student’s presentation scores were averaged to create a presentation mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean presentation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Final essays written in FILM 466 Film Theory (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., a subset of the 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** | | | **BFA students have not taken course yet** | |
| **Methods** | At the completion of each FILM 466 section, a representative sample of 20% of the essays written (typically N=5) will be selected and evaluated 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 5.** | | | | | | **Met** | | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | | |
| The film program is in the process of standardizing scoring across all faculty members to incorporate VALUE (LEAP) rubrics for grading on-set performance and student presentations for greater transparency and consistency. These rubrics were implemented in Fall 2021 evaluations and are being re-evaluated and revised for Fall 2022 evaluations. | | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | | |
| As a new program, we are still collecting and analyzing assessment data. Students improved from last year to this year, by a small margin. We will continue to gather data and assess the prerequisite courses as well as the measurement instruments. Once students in the BFA program take FILM 466, 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 students in the BFA in Film Production are working in Above-the-Line positions every year, these assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 6** | | | | | | | | |
| **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 either a below-the-line (crew) or 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. Performance is evaluated 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** | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (*N*=14) enrolled in FILM 392 Above-the-Line (ATL) Practicum III during Spring 2022 were 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 were anonymized and each student’s ATL scores were averaged to create an ATL mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in a below-the-line (crew) 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** | | | **85%** | |
| **Methods** | Students (N=14) enrolled in FILM 491 Below-the-Line (BTL) Practicum III during Spring 2022 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. the shots were in focus for 1st AC, the sound mixer’s sound was clear, 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 were anonymized and each student’s BTL scores were averaged to create a BTL mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. | | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.** | | | | | | **Met** | | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | | |
| The film program is in the process of standardizing scoring across all faculty members to incorporate VALUE (LEAP) rubrics for grading on-set performance and student presentations for greater transparency and consistency. These rubrics were implemented in Fall 2021 evaluations and are being re-evaluated and revised for Fall 2022 evaluations. | | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | | |
| As a new program, we are still collecting and analyzing assessment data. Students improved from last year to this year, by a small margin. We will continue to gather data and assess the prerequisite courses as well as the measurement instruments. | | | | | | | | |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | | | | | | | |
| Since students in the BFA in Film Production are working in Above-the-Line positions every year, these assessments will be performed on an annual basis by Sara Thomason. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CURRICULUM MAP** | | |  | |  | | | |
| **Program name:** | BFA in Film Production (#530) | |  | **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** | **LO6** |
|  | | | 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. | Demonstrate an understanding of the structures and means of production in studio (Hollywood) and independent film | 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 |  | 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 |  | R |  |
| FILM | 251 | Film Directing I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 252 | Film Producing |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 253 | Cinematography I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 254 | Production Design I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 256 | Film Editing I | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 290 | Practicum: Pre-Production I |  |  | R/A |  | R/A | R/A |
| FILM | 291 | Practicum: Below-the-Line I | R/A |  | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 292 | Practicum: Above-the-Line I |  | R/A | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 350 | Screenwriting II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 351 | Film Directing II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 353 | Cinematography II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 354 | Production Design II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 355 | Film Sound | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 356 | Film Editing II | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 367 | Introduction to Film Genres |  |  |  | R | R |  |
| FILM | 369 | Introduction to World Cinema |  |  |  | R | R |  |
| FILM | 390 | Practicum: Pre-Production II |  |  | R/A |  | R/A | R/A |
| FILM | 391 | Practicum: Below-the-Line II | R/A |  | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 392 | Practicum: Above-the-Line II |  | R/A | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 393 | Practicum: Post-Production I | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 466 | Film Theory |  |  |  | M/A | M/A |  |
| FILM | 486 | Film Capstone |  |  | M/A |  |  |  |
| FILM | 489 | Thesis Development |  | M |  |  | M | M |
| FILM | 490 | Practicum: Pre-Production III |  |  | M/A |  | M/A | M/A |
| FILM | 491 | Practicum: Below-the-Line III | M/A |  | M/A |  |  | M/A |
| FILM | 492 | Practicum: Above-the-Line III |  | M/A | M/A |  |  | M/A |
| FILM | 493 | Practicum: Post-Production II | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A |  | M/A |

\*\* FILM 155 is a zero credit hour required course where students attend on-campus film screenings

**Show Name/Number: Dir. Prep Feedback Reviewer:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |  |

**Notes:**

 

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria**  **(Score 0 if element is absent)** | **1 - 2** | **3 - 4** | **5** | **Score** |
| Attendance | Required crew members are not present. Few (2) to none (1) are here. | Some required crew members are present. | All ATL, Editor, and AE are present at time of dailies. All aspects of the presentation were presented professionally. |  |
| AE Paperwork | The AE does not present the appropriate paperwork for the film. They deliver it late (2) or not at all (1) during Dailies. | The AE presents the appropriate paperwork for the film. They deliver it mostly (4) to somewhat (3) at the start of Dailies. | The AE presents the appropriate paperwork for the film. They deliver it to the ED expediently at the start of Dailies. |  |
| Timeline Organization | The timeline is not appropriate for the film. There is little (2) to no (1) organization on the timeline. Many shots are out of sync. | The timeline is somewhat appropriate for the film. There is some (3) to much (4) organization. Some shots are out of sync. | The timeline is appropriate for the film. Title card included. All shots are synched correctly, from wide to close in the timeline. |  |
| Director | The DR is unclear and communicates disrespectfully with the AE and ED. | The DR communicates somewhat clearly and sometimes respectfully with ED and AE. | The DR communicates clearly and respectfully with the ED and AE during Dailies. |  |
| Editor | The ED conducts themself inappropriately during Dailies. Few (2) to none (1) of their interactions are clear, thorough, or professional. They take little to no notes. | The ED conducts themself somewhat appropriately during Dailies. Some (3) to most (4) of their interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They take some notes. | The ED conducts themself very appropriately during Dailies. All interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They record notes for every shot. |  |
| Assistant Editor | The AE interacts inappropriately during Dailies. Few (2) to none (1) of their interactions while running Dailies are clear, thorough, and professional. They are unprepared. | The AE conducts themself somewhat appropriately during Dailies. Some (3) to most (4) of their interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They are somewhat prepared. | The AE conducts themself very appropriately during Dailies. All of their interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They are prepared and operate the timeline. |  |
| Collaboration | All parties have little (2) to no (1) collaboration. | All parties collaborate adequately (3) to (4). | All parties collaborate thoroughly. |  |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL** |  |