Film Program Assessment Report

Narrative:

The faculty and staff who teach in the Film Program are committed to the mission of Georgia Perimeter College. To that end, the program assessment goals are intended to strengthen student success. These goals foster a culture of teamwork as instructors collaborate in the assessment process and offer feedback and suggestions based upon the results. The programs in Film enhance the economic, social, and cultural vitality of our communities by assisting students to complete their General Education requirements prior to transferring to four-year institutions. The program also offers film courses in different manners of delivery to support the College’s goal to expand access and enrollment capacity.

Assessment Goals:

Film 1010: Introduction to Film and Film 1010H: Introduction to Film Honors

Goal 1: Students will recognize the stylistic aspects of cinema (cinematography, mise-en-scene, sound, and editing).

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of film as works of art, as entertainment, and as a business.

Goal 3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the Classical Hollywood style of cinema as well as other cinematic techniques and forms.

Film 2700: Film History

Goal 1: Students will demonstrate their understanding of film history and its development throughout the decades. The student will have a comprehensive understanding of the evolution of cinema from the great silent films to contemporary global film.

Goal 2: The student will be able to historically analyze a wide assortment of films and to understand their place within the history of cinema and their relevance to social, political, and cultural issues.

Film 2900: Film Genres

Goal 1: Students will demonstrate their understanding of various film genres (Westerns, Film Noir, Comedy, Science Fiction, Melodrama, Horror, etc.) and their assorted conventions.

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the way cultural history and industrial practices impact the form and content of genre production and reception.

Goal 3: Film analysis, discussion, and writing skills will be developed.
Development of the Uniform Assessment Instrument:

The members of the Film Discipline Committee formulated the assessments and the Chair of the Committee met with Patti Gregg of OIRP for additional guidance on developing assessment instruments.

Process:

Film 1010

A ten-question assessment was administered in all face-to-face sections during the Spring 2012 semester. This consisted of a pre-test administered during the first two weeks of the semester and a post-test administered during the final two weeks of the semester.

Film 2700

A ten-question assessment was developed during the Spring 2012 semester and administered to a section of students as a test-run of the assessment instrument. From the initial findings (using the post-test only), the assessment instrument was revised on May 29, 2012 and is ready to be implemented discipline-wide in the Fall 2012 semester. It will follow the same pre- and post-test format as the Film 1010 assessment described above.

Film 2900

An essay-based assessment and rubric for evaluation were initially developed on May 29, 2012. The assessment will be ready to be implemented in the Fall 2012 semester.

Explanation of Findings:

Film 1010

Competency on the assessment was to be determined by a 70% performance or higher.

Students showed a 70.9% gain and a 74.5% success rate on question #1 related to the sectors of the film industry. This represents an achievement of the discipline goal.

Students showed a 26.4% gain and a 66.8% success rate on question #5 related to parallel editing. This came very close to the 70% goal of the discipline.

Students showed a .6% gain and a 50.5% success rate on question #8 on the concept of mise en scène. This did not reach the discipline goal and highlights an area that deserves greater emphasis to students.

Students showed a 35.9% gain and a 59.8% success rate on question #9 related to the concept of the auteur. This did not reach the discipline goal and highlights an area that deserves greater emphasis to students.

Many of the questions (#2, #3, #4, #6, #7, and #10) on the assessment instrument proved to not be valid outcome measures because many students scored too high on them on the pre-test. These questions will be eliminated or changed in the revised assessment instrument.

Program Improvements Resulting from Program Assessment:
Only 50.5% of the students answered the questions related to mise en scène correctly. Within the discipline, students seem resistant to the concept of mise en scène because most textbooks on the market insist on using this term rather than the more accessible and practical “art direction” or “production design.” While the former is primarily grounded in French film criticism, the latter terms are more commonly used in film production and the film industry in which students have greater interest and experience. Despite this fact, this key concept of the Film 1010 course needs greater clarification within sections, which will be communicated to all film instructors. Likewise, another term derived from French film criticism, auteur, proved to be a problem area for students with only 59.8% of the students answering a question related to the term correctly. A need for greater emphasis on this foundational concept of film criticism will also be communicated to all film instructors.

**Action Taken:**

Over the Summer semester, the Film 1010 assessment will be revised for implementation in Fall 2012. All film instructors and their department chairs will be contacted regarding the results of the Film 1010 assessment and the committee’s recommendation regarding the teaching of the concepts of mise en scène and the auteur.

**Future Action:**

The revised Film 1010 assessment will be implemented in Fall 2012. This assessment will be extended to include Film 1010 Honors and online courses.

The revised Film 2700 assessment will be implemented in Fall 2012.

The Film 2900 assessment will be implemented in Fall 2012.
**FILM 1010 Assessment Summary**  
Spring 2012 Pre- and Post-Test Results

Analysis prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning from data summaries provided by discipline faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY TABLE</th>
<th>Total Completed</th>
<th>% #1 Correct</th>
<th>% #2 Correct</th>
<th>% #3 Correct</th>
<th>% #4 Correct</th>
<th>% #5 Correct</th>
<th>% #6 Correct</th>
<th>% #7 Correct</th>
<th>% #8 Correct</th>
<th>% #9 Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test, all sections</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test, w/o 240 &amp; 250</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test, w/o 240 &amp; 250</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Pre to Post, all sections</td>
<td>-30.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>-20.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Pre to Post, w/o 240 &amp; 250</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
Because the raw data (student-level assessment results) were not available, tests of statistical significance could not be performed.  
Based on the small sample size, differences smaller than 5% are probably not significant.  
Those items should be treated as if no change occurred between the pre- and post-assessments.

Sections 240 and 250 were included in the original pre-test sample; however, post-tests were not conducted in those sections.  
Change from Pre- to Post-tests is provided both for the original sample and for the original sample with those sections excluded.

**OIRP Analysis of Findings:**  
Due to the high percentage of students who answered the items correctly on the pre-test, it should be assumed that items #3, #4, #6, #7 and #10 were not valid outcome measures.  
Not surprisingly, those items all showed no appreciable change from the pre-test to the post-test.

Additionally, item #2 showed a notable decline from the pre-test to the post-test, again suggesting that item may not be a valid measure.

Only item #1 showed any substantial gain. The gains evidenced by Items #5 and #9 were relatively small, as was the overall success rate.

**OIRP Recommendations:**  
There is no evidence to suggest that the assessment instrument appropriately measured collegiate-level knowledge and skills consistent with the objectives in the Common Course Outline.
OIRP recommends that discipline faculty revise the assessment instrument, with guidance from OIRP. The revised assessment should be administered in Fall 2012, if at all possible, but no later than Spring 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% #10 Correct</th>
<th>% with at least 70% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>