2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 11: Students will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing and engaging wi

3. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:**

   Area II: Humanities

4. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   The assessment plan for this course identifies skills that students need to demonstrate advanced, intermediate, basic and little/none mastery of course materials. These skills are evaluated by student performance on three assignments: the midterm and final exams, and the final written assignment.

5. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   see attached

   Attachment name: RTVF 2350 Assessment Fall 2013.docx

6. **Based on the comprehensive rubric for the appropriate SLO(s), indicate the extent of competency of the average student who has completed this core course in each learning outcome assigned to it:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Level of Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 11</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   : I believe the above assessment demonstrates that most students grasp the core concepts of RTVF 2350 at a fairly high level; scores on the midterm and the final are where one would expect, and the final written assignment for the course demonstrates that students are able to grasp some of the more challenging concepts presented. The adjustments to the exams seem to have had some good impact on student performance, and the boldface requirement on the final assignment did clear up some confusion regarding what students meant by a particular statement. In future courses offerings, I will continue to refine lecture material to clear up any confusion about concepts, particularly about ideological meaning.

8. **Additional Comments:**

   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

9. **Committee Comments:**
The assessment plan for this course identifies skills that students need to demonstrate advanced, intermediate, basic and little/none mastery of course materials. These skills are evaluated by student performance on three assignments: the midterm and final exams, and the final written assignment.

**Examination of exam questions from both midterm and final exam.**

The midterm exam for RTVF 2350 includes two different styles of identification question. In the first, students are provided stills from films seen during regular course screening periods and must identify the name of the film and any relevant stylistic details (e.g. whether it is a long shot or close up, or a low angle medium shot). The purpose of these questions was to address development of aesthetic judgment, a key element of SLO 11. Advance and Intermediate students are able to judge structural elements of the film and advanced students separate the performance from the execution. The second section calls on students to define several key terms drawn from lectures and readings and use examples from the aforementioned films. Grades on the midterm were generally strong—the average score was 83 out of 100, which would indicate that the majority of students fell into the advanced and intermediate categories. Advance and intermediate students demonstrated that the understanding of key elements of cinematic aesthetics. However, most students did much better on the first section, but struggled to write complete definitions of terms on the second section. This could be for two reasons:

- Beginning with the Summer 2012 session, I have utilized a multiple choice format for the first identification section; course enrollment had swelled to 60 students, making it difficult to grade exams in a timely fashion. This might have made it easier for students to identify the correct answers since the correct one was provided.
- Students still seem to spend more time on the first section than on the second and ran out of time to complete the exam (the test is administered during a normal 50 minutes lecture period). Several students simply left sections of the exam blank or wrote hurried answers. Of course, it is possible that at least some of them could not write more coherent answers because they had not mastered the material yet. However, the high average score would seem to indicate that many students had worked hard to understand the concepts tested on the exam.

The final exam consists of essay questions that require students to synthesize material from the second half of the course; this material includes film theory & criticism, foreign cinema, genre and new media. The median score for the final exam was almost identical to the midterm—82 out of 100. Students have more time (two and a half hours), and the exam structure requires less memorization and more creativity—but it also requires them to demonstrate an understanding of more esoteric (theoretical) concepts or the art form and the creative expression of film. The fairly high scores on the exam indicate that students are able to apply these concepts at the advanced or intermediate level fairly consistently. I plan to continue to utilize the essay format for final exams in the future.

**Evaluation of final written assignment.**
This assignment requires students to analyze the surface level, the subtextual level and the ideological level of meaning in any film seen during regular course screening periods. The scores on this assignment—25 out of 30 is the average score—generally indicate that students understand these concepts and are able to critically analyze the films seen in class for more than their aesthetic elements (i.e. cinematography, mise-en-scene, montage: core course concepts from the first half of the semester) at a high level. Indeed, scores might have been higher had four students not skipped the assignment outright. (This, unfortunately, was common last semester; each assignment had students who either never turned it in or turned it in so late as to lose almost all points.) Encouraging students to recognize and elaborate on the relationship between aesthetics and theme are among the key goals of the course and SLO 11. This assignment is a direct reflection of that goal. The one area where students do seem to struggle with this assignment is the distinction between subtext (unspoken connections between textual events that help give the film meaning beyond the surface narrative) and ideological meaning (the social and cultural values that make any text coherent); subtext must be expressed in the terms of the film itself (e.g. a subtext of *Casablanca* is Rick’s support for the underdog; he claims “I stick my neck out for nobody” then acts to protect the “nobodies” of the world) while ideology must introduce concepts from outside the film (e.g. an ideological reading of *Casablanca* would suggest that it reinforces the belief that America must take an active role in world affairs).

Normally, students who are confused about these concepts, they tend to present a second subtextual reading in place of an ideological one (e.g. Renault prods Rick to abandon his cynicism even as he acts to stop Lazlo from leaving Casablanca). In hopes of correcting this, I required students to offer specific subtextual and ideological statements in bold face type (e.g. “A subtextual reading of *Casablanca* suggests that, far from staying out of politics, Rick actively but subtly supports the cause of the oppressed”; “An ideological reading of *Casablanca* would highlight the film’s geopolitical contexts and analogies”). This in theory would require students to think more clearly about their ideas so they can be coalesced into single expressions. It also can prevent any disagreements between students and me about what was actually written and what was meant: I require them to identify for me what they think is the clearest expression of the subtext and ideological meaning of their chosen film.

Interestingly, students who had problems with the assignment tended to present multiple ideological readings, apparently overreaching when attempting to analyze the subtext. This might be because I emphasized ideology in lectures and discussions, as it was the concept that students had the most problems with in past semesters; students at this level in general seem to have a hard time not thinking of certain social and cultural values as “common sense” or eternal. I don’t anticipate that this confusion will be an ongoing problem but will try to ensure that I am presenting the material with equal and due emphasis and encourage students to work with me more closely to clear up any confusion.

**Plans for the future:** I believe the above assessment demonstrates that most students grasp the core concepts of RTVF 2350 at a fairly high level; scores on the midterm and the final are where one would expect, and the final written assignment for the course demonstrates that students are able to grasp some of the more challenging concepts presented. The adjustments to the exams seem to have had some good impact on student performance, and the **boldface** requirement on the final assignment did clear up some confusion regarding what students meant by a particular statement. In future courses
offerings, I will continue to refine lecture material to clear up any confusion about concepts, particularly about ideological meaning.