**Assessment Report – 2013**

Evidence collected in spring & fall 2012

Report due March 30, 2013

**Directions:** Please complete a form for each of the programs within your department. This form was designed to provide a format for assessment reporting and should not be used to limit the amount of information provided. Each box that is attached to each of the sections is designed to adjust to varying lengths. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Dan Bubb at x51506 or via email.

***Email form to assessment@unlv.edu (Academic Assessment/UNLV)***

**Program Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Bachelor of Arts (BA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department(s)</td>
<td>Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>Francisco Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report submitted by (include phone/email)</td>
<td>54223 / <a href="mailto:francisco.menendez@unlv.edu">francisco.menendez@unlv.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>4/30/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Student Learning Outcomes for the program.** List the Student Learning Outcomes for the program. *Number for later reference.*

1. Identify Film History in Context. Distinguish major figures instrumental in the creation of world cinema and distinguish different film genres, film forms, national cinemas, their production and distribution systems.

2. Comprehend Film Language. Communicate cinematic language in terms of the art and craft of cinema including: mise-en-scene, cinematography, editing, sound, acting, directing, narrative storytelling, documentary, film criticism and film theory.

3. Analyze Screen Stories. Recognize and discuss strengths and weaknesses with structural elements of a cinematic story.

4. Apply Film Research. Use library resources, search the internet, and understand a foreign language sufficiently to conduct emphasis-appropriate research in their selected field of cinema.

5. Write Filmic Analysis. Implement the terms taught and apply them to any discussion and assignment of the field of cinema.


7. Execute Film Response & Criticism. Evaluate films and screenplays and communicate through critical writing and oral response.

8. Determine Track Specialization. Select with a faculty advisor to focus on one of these areas: film history, screen performance, production methods, and screenwriting. Proactive meetings with the faculty professional will allow to tailor seven track electives to meet their needs, interests, and career goals.
2. **Planned assessments: Methods, Instruments and Analysis.** According to the Assessment Plan for this program, what were the planned assessments to be conducted during the Spring & Fall 2011 Academic Semesters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument (e.g., survey, exit exam)</th>
<th>Learning outcome(s) assessed (list by #)</th>
<th>Expected Measures (results that would indicate success)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation of FIS 100 Intro to Film. (Fall 2012)</td>
<td>2,3,5,6&amp;7</td>
<td>Tracking by chair by student progress the reboot of this introductory co-taught by film scholar Elvis Mitchell. Use of journals, filmographies, research and execution and discussion of essential films and their filmmaker’s reflected success in fundamental areas in the program that prepare them 400 level courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation of FIS 415 Story Development. (Spring 2012)</td>
<td>2,3,6&amp;7</td>
<td>Continued tracking by chair of student progress in the evolution of this class. Use of story sessions, screenplay format, adaptation skills and execution and discussion of the craft of story reflected success in fundamental areas intro to screenwriting program prior to these 400 level courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Results, conclusions and discoveries. What are the results of each planned assessment listed above? Is the outcome at, above, or below what was expected? What conclusions or discoveries do you draw from the results? Describe below or attach to the form.

FIS 100 had been taught effectively by a UNLV graduate, but he now was leaving to attend a Masters program at UCLA. The hire of renowned American Film Critic Elvis Mitchell gave us the unique opportunity to reboot this class. The chair Prof. Menendez and Mr. Mitchell co-taught the class with the attempt to create a new foundational approach to teaching Intro to Film.

Traditionally this class has been used, not only to prepare students, but to harvest majors from the general population who might be taking the course as a fine arts credit. This had succeeded in the past as Mr. Kynan Dias had been effective bridge between freshmen and the department.

For this semester only the discussion sections were synthesized from two to one to create a larger forum for discussion and afford and interplay between the two course instructors.

In terms of knowledge, the student should be able to recognize, based on filmographies and lectures, the major figures instrumental in world cinema the creation of and the credits of their major films. The goal of the discussion sessions is for them to communicate the relationship between film genres, film forms, national cinemas, their production and distribution systems.

In short, during course the student will be taught how to “see”, recognize, and interpret a film. The students are required to use the analytical tools above to write an analysis on each of the films screened in this course. In the end, the student will be able to compare and contrast the “essential films” screened and understand their context within the history of film.

Despite the synthesis of both discussion groups, the class quickly divided itself film majors passionate about film and filmmaking, and the students that were taking the class as fine arts requirement.
This forced us to reconsider a synthesized discussion group and in Spring 2014 the discussion groups were once again split. This seemed to allow for less pressure, and separation during the discussion.

The integration of Mr. Mitchell into the Intro to Film course proved effective. He created a through-line of the examination of race and identity in the chosen films that had not been there before as the class tracked bias and prejudice in a historical context as well as reflected on the onscreen works in the films chosen and analyzed.

The Story Development class had needed to be reconnected to personal storytelling. Since the last assessment a new syllabus addressed all areas of story development, but furthered the essential connection of the personal meaning of storytelling to the students. The intent is to fuel the construction of stories in other courses in the rest of the program. The course was effectively redesigned and received high marks in student evaluations in Spring 2012.

The course succeeded in training the students to recognize the importance of emotional truth and the value of incepting personal material in the process of developing stories. The examination and synthesis of character, plot and them was improved with a series of exercises that proved effective and students responded to.

Both courses benefitted from transformation and retuning. The work accomplished in FIS 100 provided a useful guide for the future of the course, and it will be revisited and tracked for its evolution in 2014. The story development proved to have benefitted from its restructuring, and does not merit reexamination for the next couple of years.
4. **Use of results.** What program changes are indicated, and how will they be implemented? Include a description of who will review and act on the findings. If none, describe why changes are not needed.

Results will be, and are, shared with the department and college administration. Professional benchmarks are publicized the moment they are announced to the program’s director. One of the crucial use of the findings is that we continue to adapt and change our courses to reflect our learning outcomes, and use these as models for other courses throughout the program.

5. **Progress.** Describe program changes that have been recommended in past reports. What progress has been made since the recommendation?

As has been stated in the past, the tracking of learning outcomes has allowed us to proactive and responsive to other larger courses taught by part-timers, or the remodeling of courses by tenured faculty to achieve the Departmental outcomes has served as direct and indirect models for other tenure track faculty teaching similar courses.

All in all, the courses documented in the past have been changed, and the impact has been of benefit for the department and its students.