

## 2007-2008 Program Assessment Report: Cinema and Television Arts

### **Name of Department/Unit:**

Cinema and Television Arts

### **List of Programs:**

There are seven Undergraduate Options within the department.

1. Film Theory
2. Film Production
3. Media Management
4. Multimedia Production
5. Radio Production
6. Screenwriting
7. Television Production

**Graduate Program** – Screenwriting.

### **Department Vision:**

The vision of the Department of Cinema and Television Arts is to inspire the highest level of creative activity and scholarship in advancing students' understanding of media arts, their importance to human culture and communication, and their power to affect social behavior. The CTVA Department strives to maintain its excellent standing in the educational community and entertainment industry as a professional, ethical and high-quality media program that prepares students for diverse careers.

### **Department Mission:**

The mission of the CTVA Department is to install in students the knowledge, expertise, and creative skills that will allow them to pursue their goals in the field of cinema, television, screenwriting, management, radio and multimedia. The CTVA curriculum promotes the critical, analytical, creative, ethical and conceptual thinking that will enrich the students' academic and professional careers.

### **Department Goals:**

At the end of a program of study, students should (as reflective of the curriculum in their individual option) be able to:

1. understand and articulate the history, theories, and critical models of cinema and the electronic media;
2. research, structure, and write dramatic and non-dramatic scripts for cinema, television, and multimedia;
3. employ pre-production, production, and post-production techniques for all electronic and digital media formats in both the studio and the field;
4. conceptualize, produce, direct, edit, and distribute cinema projects for both entertainment and informational purposes;
5. operate and manage business structures, personnel budgets, advertising, sales, research, and regulation of independent, studio, and network electronic media.

**Name of Assessment Liaison:** Jared Rappaport

**Name of College:** Mike Curb College of Arts, Media, and Communication

**2007-2008 Program Assessment Report**  
**Assessment Activities for Screenwriting Program**  
**CTVA 320—Writing for Film and Television**

Student Learning Outcomes (which SLOs were assessed?)	Assessment Dates (when was SLO assessed)	Assessment Procedures (what did you do?)	Summary of Findings (what did you learn?)	Use of Findings for Program Improvement (what recommendations for program improvement did you make?)
<p>SLO 2: Research, structure and write dramatic and non-dramatic scripts for cinema, television and multimedia.</p>	<p>Fall 2007</p>	<p>Two sections of this intermediate screenwriting course, CTVA 320, were selected, one taught by a full-time instructor and one by a part-time instructor.</p> <p>1. At the <u>beginning of the semester</u>, students were asked to write a <u>one-page synopsis</u> of the plot for the fictional narrative script (30-60 pages) that they expect to write as the final project for the course. Assessed using a rubric.</p> <p>2. <u>Mid-semester</u>, students were asked to turn in a <u>2-page scene</u> from their scripts-in-progress. Assessed using a rubric. (Note – one of the instructors neglected to collect these, so the sample for this was reduced).</p> <p>3. At the <u>end of the semester</u>, students were asked to write a <u>one-page synopsis</u> of the plot for the final-project script that they ultimately wrote, reflecting its development over the course of the semester. Assessed using a rubric.</p>	<p>The total of <u>beginning-of-semester story synopses</u> submitted in both classes was 36. The average score was 63.06 out of a total possible 100 points.</p> <p>The total of <u>end-of-semester story synopses</u> submitted in both classes was 28. The average score was 69.86 out of a total possible 100 points.</p> <p>The total of <u>scenes</u> submitted (in one class only) was 16. The average score was 74.44 out of a total possible 100 points.</p> <p>The evidence suggests that the quality of the students' stories increased marginally over the course of the semester. The average score of the end-of-the semester stories, 69.86, falls within the C- range, or slightly less than satisfactory. This could be interpreted as suggesting that CTVA 320 as currently taught is not adequately meeting the intended learning outcome. It must be mentioned, however, that this was a statistically tiny sample and that different assessors might have rendered different assessments.</p> <p>The average score of the submitted scenes, 74.44, falls within the C range. If C represents "average," then this is an acceptable finding.</p> <p>The performances on the story synopses suggest that the Screenwriting faculty should consider ways to improve the manner in which fictional screen storytelling is taught in CTVA 320. It is important to recognize, though, that this course is taken as an upper-division elective by many CTVA students who major in an option other than Screenwriting (e.g., Multimedia Production, Film Production or Television Production). Fewer than 1/3 of the enrolled students are Screenwriting majors. We expect to see marked improvement when these results are compared to the advanced-level work of CTVA 425 students (nearly all of whom are Screenwriting majors).</p> <p>The scenes were assessed to shed light on how well CTVA 320 students have learned the mechanics of screenplay format, elements of scene construction and principles of dialogue writing. The evidence indicates that the students are learning these aspects of screenwriting at an acceptable level, but we should strive to improve. Again, though, with Screenwriting majors in the minority of those enrolled in CTVA 320, these findings will be more significant when compared with the advanced-level work of CTVA 425 students (nearly all of whom are Screenwriting majors).</p>	<p>Recommendation: The Screenwriting faculty should meet to examine the CTVA 320 curriculum and to explore ways to strengthen the presentation and implementation of screen storytelling concepts and techniques.</p> <p>Recommendation: Assess work by CTVA 425 students in AY 2008-9.</p>

**2007-2008 Program Assessment Report**  
**Assessment Activities for CTVA Media Theory & Criticism Curriculum**  
**CTVA 210—Television and Film Aesthetics**

<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b> (which SLOs were assessed?)	<b>Assessment Dates</b> (when was SLO assessed)	<b>Assessment Procedures</b> (what did you do?)	<b>Summary of Findings</b> (what did you learn?)	<b>Use of Findings for Program Improvement</b> (what recommendations for program improvement did you make?)
<p>SLO 1: Understand and articulate the history, theories, and critical models of cinema and the electronic media.</p>	<p>Spring 2008</p>	<p>Two sections of CTVA 210 were selected, class #10172, with a total enrollment of 71 students; and class #11042, with a total enrollment of 74 students. The instructors assigned the following, which were collected and assessed:</p> <p><u>Entrance exam</u>, administered at the beginning of the semester, before any instruction. Each student answered 25 multiple-choice questions (25 total points), which were assessed using the Scantron grading tool.</p> <p><u>Exit Exam</u>, administered at the end of the semester, after all instruction had been delivered. The multiple-choice questions were exactly the same as those asked on the entrance exam (25 total points), which were assessed using the Scantron grading tool.</p>	<p><u>Entrance exam</u>: The average performance of students in class #10172 was 11.48 points out of a total possible 25 points. The average performance of students in class #11042 was 13.04 points out of a possible 25 points. Together, the average performance of all students from both sections was 12.26 points out of a total possible 25 points.</p> <p><u>Exit exam</u>: The average performance of students in class #10172 was 19.54 points out of a total possible 25 points. The average performance of students in class #11042 was 20.54 points out of a possible 25 points. Together, the average performance of all students from both sections was 20.04 points out of a total possible 25 points.</p> <p>The evidence indicates that students performed significantly better on the exit exam than they had on the entrance exam. This suggests that CTVA 210 succeeds in introducing students to the various topics that fall under the umbrella of the SLO.</p>	<p>The increased improvement in the overall performance of the students does suggest that there has been notable success in introducing and communicating the course material to the majority of enrolled students. It should be recognized that CTVA 210 is a general lower-division elective, and is therefore open to all (not exclusively CTVA) students. The continuing presence of a small number of very poor scores on the exit exams also suggests that there might be room for improvement in terms of reinforcing basic course information.</p> <p>Recommendation: The instructors of CTVA 210 should develop creative strategies to accomplish this goal in conjunction with a re-emphasis on the importance of course attendance and participation.</p>

**2007-2008 Program Assessment Report**  
**Assessment Activities for CTVA Media Theory & Criticism Curriculum**  
**CTVA 310—History of American Film**

Student Learning Outcomes (which SLOs were assessed?)	Assessment Dates (when was SLO assessed)	Assessment Procedures (what did you do?)	Summary of Findings (what did you learn?)	Use of Findings for Program Improvement (what recommendations for program improvement did you make?)
<p>SLO 1: Understand and articulate the history, theories, and critical models of cinema and the electronic media.</p>	<p>Spring 2008</p>	<p>Two sections of CTVA 310 were selected, class #10188, with a total enrollment of 98 students; and class #10189, with a total enrollment of 51 students. The instructor assigned the following, which were collected and assessed:</p> <p><u>Entrance exam</u>, administered at the beginning of the semester, before any instruction. Each student answered 25 multiple-choice questions and a short-answer essay worth 5 points, for a total of 30 points possible. The multiple-choice responses were assessed using the Scantron grading tool, and the short-answer essays were subjectively assessed by the instructor using a rubric and 5-point scale.</p> <p><u>Exit Exam</u>, administered at the end of the semester, after all instruction had been delivered. The multiple-choice and short answer essays were exactly the same as those asked on the entrance exam and again there were 30 points possible. The multiple-choice responses were assessed using the Scantron grading tool, and the short-answer essays were again subjectively assessed by the instructor using a rubric and 5-point scale.</p>	<p><u>Entrance exam</u>: The average performance of students in class #10188 was 10.86 points out of a total possible 30 points. The average performance of students in class #10189 was 10.42 points out of a possible 30 points. Together, the average performance of all students from both sections was 10.64 points out of a total possible 30 points.</p> <p><u>Exit exam</u>: The average performance of students in class #10188 was 22.78 points out of a total possible 30 points. The average performance of students in class #10189 was 23.40 points out of a possible 30 points. Together, the average performance of all students from both sections was 23.09 points out of a total possible 30 points.</p> <p>The evidence indicates that students performed significantly better on the exit exam than they had on the entrance exam. This suggests that CTVA 310 succeeds in introducing students to the various topics that fall under the umbrella of the SLO.</p> <p>The multiple-choice component in the exit exam showed the most improvement over that of the entrance exam. While there was a general slight improvement in basic familiarity with the information tested in the short-answer essay component of the exit exams over that of the entrance exam, it was here that students still struggled and point totals were most adversely affected. See recommendations in next column.</p>	<p>The performances on the short-answer essay components of the exam suggest that the critical writing requirements of the program should be reassessed, and reemphasized, if necessary.</p> <p>The significant improvement in the overall performance of the students does suggest that there has been some success in introducing and communicating the course material to the majority of enrolled students. However, the continuing presence of a small number of very poor scores on the exit exams also suggests that there might be room for improvement in terms of reinforcing basic course information.</p> <p>Recommendation: The instructors of CTVA 310 should develop creative strategies to accomplish this goal in conjunction with a re-emphasis on the importance of course attendance and participation.</p>

**2007-2008 Program Assessment Report**  
**Assessment Activities for CTVA Graduate Master of Arts in Screenwriting Program**

<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b> (which SLOs were assessed?)	<b>Assessment Dates</b> (when was SLO assessed)	<b>Assessment Procedures</b> (what did you do?)	<b>Summary of Findings</b> (what did you learn?)	<b>Use of Findings for Program Improvement</b> (what recommendations for program improvement did you make?)
<p>Graduate SLO #1: A developing ability to construct screen stories and write feature length screenplays which reflect meaningful themes, while engaging an audience.</p>	<p>Spring 2008</p>	<p>One graduate screenwriting course focuses specifically on the creation of screen story, CTVA 525.</p> <p>In this class, on the first night, all students were asked to summarize in one page the screen story they wished to develop during the current semester. This written summary served as an <u>Entrance Exam</u> example of their command of screen story principles before the course.</p> <p>On the last night of class, all students were asked to summarize in one page the screen story they had developed during the spring semester as a 20-25 page treatment (in preparation for writing the actual complete screenplay the following semester). This written one page summary served as an <u>Exit Exam</u> example of their command of screen story principles at the conclusion of the course.</p> <p>A rubric was used that assigned a numeric score in the ranges of EXCELLENT, GOOD, AVERAGE, or POOR to assess a student's command of the key areas of screen story construction—PROTAGONIST/GOAL, CONFLICT, STORY STRUCTURE, and CONCEPT. The total numeric score possible ranged from zero to 100.</p>	<p><u>The average entering score was 43.</u> <u>The average exiting score was 95.</u></p> <p>With graduate students, a basic command of the key elements of screen story construction is to be expected at this entrance level.</p> <p>We found that there was a great disparity of knowledge about the basics of screenwriting from incoming graduate students, many of whom had never taken screenwriting courses before.</p> <p>Upon completion of the course, though, the students were consistently at a very high level of understanding of these basic precepts.</p> <p>These numbers suggest quite a high degree of success in ultimately communicating SLO #1 in this course.</p>	<p>These assessment results represent a single class in a course that is currently offered only once a year. Course content seems to be working.</p> <p>The challenge will be to standardize the developing course content over the life of the CTVA Master of Arts in Screenwriting program to keep results consistent.</p> <p>Also, as our program increases in profile, which we expect to happen in the next few years, we expect incoming students to be more knowledgeable, and will have to revisit our curriculum in order to make sure we're not redundant in teaching what is already known by the students.</p>