

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) BACHELOR OF FINE ARTS Cinema

Academic Year:	AY 18 – 19	SU18	FA18	WI19	SP19
Annual Due Date:	8.9.19	Due Date:	Due Date:	Due Date:	Due Date:
Annual Submitted:	8.9.19	10.1.18	2.1.19	4.26.19	7.26.19
Campus:	Los Angeles	Submitted:	Submitted:	Submitted:	Submitted:
Prepared By:	Dave Martin (Cinema Dept. Chair)	10.1.18	3.19.19	4.18.19	7.26.19

The BFA Cinema program is assessed according to the program learning outcomes.

Upon successfully completing the BFA in Cinema, students will be able to:

PLO 1: Implement storytelling form and technique in the cinematic arts, from writing and development through production and post production.

PLO 2: Make use of the tools and techniques of professional cinema production.

PLO 3: Evaluate works of cinema with regard to cultural influences and historical precedents.

PLO 4: Apply knowledge of business practices, legal standards, and protocols specific to entertainment industries.

PLO 5: Justify plans and decisions as the result of research, consensus building, and critical thinking.

Outcome 6 Student Success (Source: Registrar)

A. Retention Rates

B. Graduation Rates

Outcome 7 Student Satisfaction

A. Pending Graduate Survey (Source: Academics)

B. Student Satisfaction Survey (Source: Student Affairs)

Outcome 8 Instructor & Course Quality (Source: Academics)

Assessment Method

PLOs: Direct Assessment of student work.

Based on the course rubric, assign a score:

Goal: > 3.0 0 = Not Present

1 = Novice

2 = Developing

3 = Proficient

4 = Accomplished

Deadlines

Quarterly IERs are due Week 3 of the following quarter. Annual IERs are due Week 5 of summer quarter of the following Academic Year. Actual dates indicated in header.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

PLO 1: Implement storytelling form and technique in the cinematic arts, from writing and development through production and post production

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale (0-4).		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 PLOs were assessed according to PLOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: F101 Principles of Production	25	1.06
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	12	1.8
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	14	2.29
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Scores were lower than average for this capstone group on this PLO. Part of the reason for that is a group that was skewed towards the more technical disciplines. The group included only 2 directing emphasis students, and no screenwriting students, who generally score more highly on story (PLO1). The numbers, while skewed, offer insight into the need for more production classes for students of all emphases early in the curriculum. This has been addressed in the new program, but will likely not bear fruit for a few years. In the meantime, students are being advised to take these additional courses as electives. PW sections are being rearranged to organize students by project, and not by emphasis. The aim of this is to get the student the support she needs based on her progress on projects, and not rely on an emphasis instructor to shepherd many different types of projects from inception to conclusion.</p> <p>Y2 course is also on the low side. The Directing 1 course is one that is due for a refresh in the new program. Students are asked to coordinate many elements in this course – from casting, to coverage, to production design. In the new curriculum, these expectations will shift to the Production I: Short Film class. This will free Directing 1 up to address storytelling more exclusively.</p> <p>Y1 course is within range. As a first quarter class, students are not expected to attain more than a novice level of storytelling. The function of this course is to focus on equipment and set protocol. Plans to improve the course will focus on this element, and in terms of storytelling we plan to simplify the process by providing the students with stock scripts to choose from. New full-time faculty are leading an effort to standardize this course and create support material for instructors across sections to use.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	16	1.25
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	20	2.15
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	3.2
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Scores all around on this PLO improved from last quarter. The year 1 course – FILM101 Production Fundamentals – is consistent with what it was last quarter. This course has undergone a refresh – full-time faculty have spearheaded and effort to reconceptualize FILM101, which will be discussed more in depth under PLO2. However, we will continue to monitor this PLO to make sure we don't lose the basic introduction to storytelling with a camera that this course represents.</p> <p>The year 2 course, F110 Directing 1, also made the goal. There is often a discussion about how approaches to the course differ dramatically from one section to another, but in this assessment process it was not so. Both sections (sections 1 & 4) assessed saw students choose scenes from films, and take those scenes from page to screen. However, one section (4) worked entirely from a script in "turnaround" – an industry term for a script that a studio put money into developing, but declared a loss. It was a professional-level script that never was produced. Each student in the class chose a scene from the script, and prepped it to shoot. The overall schedule was the same for both classes, but the results were not. The class that worked from the same script saw better results overall, and the</p>		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

instructor reported an elevated sense of collaboration amongst the students. In terms of story, this approach ensures that each student has in-depth knowledge of the scenes the others are working on, so each student could connect their short scene to the longer piece. This approach warrants further exploration to see how many variations on it we can come up with.

F335 Production Workshop was very much an average quarter for story. There were no shining standouts, but stories were for the most part developed thoughtfully and with an expected level of craft. The directors had a personal connection to their stories, and were supported by a strong group of Cinematography emphasis students. In fact, of the 10 graduating students, 4 were Directors, and 5 Cinematographers. This allowed for some interesting comparisons when it comes to the PLOs: the cinematographers all outscored the directors on every metric. In terms of storytelling, it's hard to say if this is because they were objectively better, or if it's because the director's job is much more difficult, and directors are more likely to be "penalized" for errors that may not have been entirely theirs. Perhaps in school as in the industry, the director gets and outsized portion of the glory for success, and the blame for failure.

SP19

Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	11	1
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	14	1.5
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	42	2.4

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

A First-Year Experience class, being developed for the Fall, could address concerns of student preparedness by offering sessions on critical thinking, time management, and how to be an active learner.

Further, there was continued discussion about the balance between the lecture and the hands-on portions of the class. Weighing all of the considerations of Production Fundamentals can be a daunting task – introducing the procedural specific of working on a professional set as well as getting students familiar with the creative process is a big ask for a single course. As it relates to this PLO, that means that students will continue to work from open scenes, and for the time being each student will direct a shoot as well. The question for the academic committee to consider this quarter is this: is it better for each student to act as a director on a limited shoot, or would it be better to have a bigger class where not every student has a chance to direct, but the overall class is a richer experience because the students get the experience of working on a bigger crew, which would be more like the ones they will encounter in the professional world?

Production Workshop 3 saw the culmination of our biggest class since the advent of this report. Most of the students in PW were directors, and were all making thesis films. The number here, a 2.4, is decidedly lower than it should be. In our assessment conversation, it seemed that many directors were strong in certain parts of the process, but weaker in others. And since our rubric takes into account the entirety of the filmmaking process, this hurt scores. This is evidence that the current curriculum needs to include the making of more complete films, from start to finish. Dedicated classes to development, production, and post in the Producing and Directing tracks will raise these scores over the long run. In the short run, we now know that extra resources must be devoted to PW in the case of a large class like this. We were able to extend the shooting quarter to accommodate the extra projects, however we were not able to be as flexible on the post-production side, and that hurt some of the films. Also with a group this large, a disproportionate amount of the instructors' resources were going to logistical concerns, leaving less time for creative mentorship and guidance.

PLO 2: Make use of the tools and techniques of professional cinema production

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale (0-4).		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 PLOs were assessed according to PLOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Y1 Course: F101 Principles of Production	25	1.1
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	12	1.7
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	14	3.43

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

Low scores for Principles of Production do suggest an issue with the course. In theory, this is the class we give students to introduce them to the basic tools of the trade. As such, we should expect to be closer to a 2 on average. Plans are underway to standardize a course of study when it comes to equipment. Meetings have been held with new full-time faculty members and Principles of Production instructors (which, going forward, will be called Production Fundamentals). These two full-timers are also creating instructional materials covering the cameras and lighting packages students will use in the course. The cap on all of this is a standardized final exam that can be implemented on Canvas, across all sections. This should establish better familiarity with the equipment coming out of the course, and prepare students for a course of study with elevated expectations.

Lower than expected scores in F110 Directing 1 as well. Assessment notes indicate technical difficulties and post-production issues plague student projects at this point. This bears out the need for additional post-production training, which is covered in the new curriculum by the Editing II class. Low scores here suggest a class that asks too much of students too soon.

Scores are good for the capstone course, but before we count this as a victory it's important to note the cause. This is likely the result of a graduating group heavy on cinematographers and editors (the more technical emphases), who typically score high on this PLO. The fact that we do have higher scores here bears witness to the general feeling that our emphases new more evening out when it comes to equipment use.

WI19

Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	16	1.125
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	20	2.05
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	2.9

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

Scores are overall good on this PLO. Production Fundamentals held the same from last quarter. Moving into the Spring quarter, we are rolling out a new set of standardized materials for Production Fundamentals that emphasizes equipment use and safety more so than in the past. The guiding philosophy is to teach them to work safely, in crews, before diving into storytelling. Some elements of the films in Production Fundamentals speak to the YouTube background of many students (films end not with credits, but with a "thanks for watching" tag), so Production Fundamentals needs to create a clean break between that and the way a professional production is run.

F110 Directing 1 is, in the legacy program, taken after a student has completed all of her Tier 1 classes. Watching the films in both sections, it isn't clear that the students have all taken F141 Production Sound or F102 Cinematography 1. Lighting is marginally better than what's found in Production Fundamentals, and some films display a surprising lack of basic compositional skills and camera operation. This suggests that F102 (CINE110 in the new program) should address some level of camera operation (perhaps some exercises) that would better prepare students for the Directing 1 exercises, or for FILM290 Production I: Short Film. It also suggests that Directing 1, in either its current incarnation or in the new program (in which there are not as many prerequisites), is not the place for a summative assessment – there does need to be a class dedicated to making a first short film. We'd look to Fall 2019 as the earliest possible quarter to begin assessing on this new class.

In F335 Production Workshop, it was the Directing students, and by extension the Thesis films, that kept this score low. Again, that may not all be attributable to the particular student, but still does reflect on the curriculum as a whole. In observing the films, it's the sound and the editing that are problematic. This isn't an indictment of the post-production emphases either, it merely shows that students are still not leaving themselves enough time in post-production. More organization is needed in PW to structure the post-production schedules, with various instructors to contribute at different points along the journey. In PW2, students interact with a cinematography, a directing, and a producing instructor. In the next quarter, we will bring in adjuncts for assisting with sound editing, and leverage the Cine instructor's skills in color grading and finishing to We take a multi-faceted approach to production, it only makes sense to do the same in post.

SP19

Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
---------------------	------------------------	---------------

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	11	1.1
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	14	1.7
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	42	2.4
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Overall, scores are still low. However, a small sample of Principles of Production students is not sufficient to draw broader conclusions from. This score should be monitored again in the Summer quarter as the new Production Fundamentals material goes into wide circulation, with an initial assessment on its efficacy to come in the Fall 2019 assessment.</p> <p>The Directing 1 class scores are dropping, possibly as a result of new program students starting to take this course. This is, as has been said before, an awkward time for the Y2 assessment points with the teach in/teach out. Many of the same issues persist from the Winter quarter's comments. All F110 instructors for the Fall quarter are recommended to make use of course tutors to help even out uneven proficiencies amongst the students. I hold that Fall 2019 will be a good quarter to begin assessing on the FILM290: Short Film class.</p> <p>PW3 scores in this arena are especially low – well below the desired average of “3”. From the data, the lower scores clearly belong to the Directing and Producing students, who are largely judged based on the overall quality of the film they deliver. This is another area in which the exceptionally large size of this PW class was an issue. We did not have the equipment or the facilities to give each student what students in the past have had. In many cases, the school did rent equipment to supply students with a basic package, but students were required to pick that gear up from the rental houses themselves, cutting into already tight production schedules. There was little to no room for re-shoots or pickups in some cases, and due to the extended production period many students were left with little time in post-production. Should this situation arise again, it will be necessary to effectively double the size of PW – both in terms of equipment and instructors. And given recent budget cuts, its questionable how much financial support such a request would receive.</p>		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

PLO 3: Evaluate works of cinema with regard to cultural influences and historical precedents

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale (0-4).		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 PLOs were assessed according to PLOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	12	1.87
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	14	2.43
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
Directing 1 scores are within range. However, improvements could come with a more structured general education component of the curriculum, since this is a very liberal arts-influenced PLO. Survey motion picture history courses have been running as electives, and will become required courses in the new program.		
Capstone: This score reflects a course of study that doesn't emphasize the liberal arts. Students overall demonstrate vague or superficial knowledge of the history of the medium and outside intellectual influences on their work. New program initiatives, including survey courses in film history, are aimed at improving this particular metric in the new program. In the meantime, more time could be carved out in PW to address the influences on the students' films. The particular makeup of this group also likely influenced scores down – the more technical tracks of study are not as sensitive to the nuances of this PLO.		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM Production Fundamentals	16	1.06
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	20	2.25
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	3.2
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
Instructors were asked to evaluate students based on this PLO for FILM101 Production Fundamentals. Assessment was based on the instructor's interaction with the students in class critiques, and if the student's preparation for the scene contained any references to films they'd seen. Scores were generally a 1 (to be expected), balanced out by a few 2's (one student was previously a manager at a movie theater) and a couple of scores of 0. Assessment on this PLO, in this class, is helpful to establish a baseline for the PLO.		
A few standout 3's in section 4 of F110 Directing 1 brought this average score higher. The instructor in this course gave tailored film recommendations to students based on their chosen approach to the scene. Again, this section was the one that used only scenes from a single script. Because of this, the instructor could come into the class able to anticipate what films might be relevant to students, rather than leaving it to the students. When instructors are able to play to their strengths, they are better able to impart the importance of what they are teaching. So, because an instructor is situated to give relevant inspirations, the students understand better the general importance of working from reference material.		
Overall, the Capstone group was one that was in touch with the issues and influences of their films. The cinematographers demonstrated in their oral presentations an awareness of other professionals working in the field, and illustrated influences on their work. In the future, a heavier emphasis on the students articulating a personal brand may guide the research process into how that brand fits into the historical lineage and contemporary milieu of motion pictures.		
SP19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	11	.8
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	14	1.5

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	42	2.5
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Spring starts at CCH are the smallest of the year, so it is harder to draw conclusions from this data. Scores dropped slightly from last quarter, but not to a troubling degree. However, if this score continues to fall, then it could be a sign that the correction towards equipment and process in FILM101 is over correcting, or that another 1st quarter class should be assessed for this PLO. FILM105 Visual Storytelling could potentially suffice as that course. Another possibility could be to add an assignment in Production Fundamentals that requires students to cite references used for their projects, or in critiquing the work of other students, being asked to compare the work of their classmates to the other films they've seen.</p> <p>PW3: The large number of presenting students meant we had to do presentations in two different spaces, so not every instructor was able to see each student's presentation. This made the calibration that normally happens at the assessment meeting more difficult. In Summer, time has been carved out for students to meet with their emphasis advisor. This puts ownership of this PLO back into the hands of the instructors, who can work with them on articulating a vision of themselves as a filmmaker with a wider cultural and historical context. Should see scores improve as these conversations become more commonplace.</p>		

PLO 4: Apply knowledge of business practices, legal standards, and protocols specific to entertainment industries

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale (0-4).		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 PLOs were assessed according to PLOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: F101 Principles of Production	25	1.02
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	12	1.4
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	14	2.36
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Low scores here line up with expectations for this first-quarter course. Certain on-set protocols are addressed, but not business practices or legal standards to any meaningful degree. Plans for improvement in this course will focus elsewhere – but perhaps with a renewed focus on set procedures we could see this score rise. It isn't a priority, however, at this point in time.</p> <p>Directorial procedures, from casting to shot listing to leading a set, are an important element of this PLO at this point in the course, but more general procedures are not addressed as thoroughly. The students do go through a production in the course, but are measured only in terms of how they direct the films. More accurate scores from this course could be gleaned by evaluating how the students are fulfilling other roles (producing, assistant directing, etc.) in the course. This would only need be a temporary fix, as the next version of the program will include a year 2 production course, thus facilitating a more comprehensive evaluation of this PLO.</p> <p>Producing emphasis students were both at 4, and Directing at a 3 and a 4. Here, the technical emphases are pulling scores down, with a number of students scoring at a 1. More internships and professional development classes earlier in the curriculum would help prepare the technical emphases (Cinematography, Editing, Sound) for the realities of the trade beyond the creative skills.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	16	1.19
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	20	2.1
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	2.6

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

issue in particular that came up in this round of assessment is the disconnect in Production Fundamentals between the crew hierarchies as explained in the lecture, and the actual crew roles the students practically perform in class. For example, someone filling the role of First Assistant Camera might also have to clap the slate and call the shot. Those are three distinct roles on a professional film set. This disconnect coming so early in the program is of concern. Possible remedies could be combining sessions of Production Fundamentals, or raising caps. Increasing the number of students in the course doesn't seem viable (not every student would have the chance to direct, for instance) and the class would have to be 20 or so to truly replicate a full on-set crew.

This was the first quarter of F135, 235, 335 Production Workshop under the reorganized structure, and a certain amount of confusion plagued the workshop all quarter. Students who were used to reporting to an emphasis instructor now report to an instructor based on their track and level. No matter how PW is "sliced", it always creates some awkwardness for cross-collaboration. The plan to fix this is embedded in the strategy to evolve Production Workshop into the Thesis Workshop and Creative Professional Development courses. One course is about making senior-level work, the other about prepping and packaging the student to join the professional world. In PW, the plan is to work with the Career Development office to give each student in 1, 2, and 3 a series of checkpoints that she must hit. The flow of the meetings will be handled through the CD office, while the instructors in PW will be checking with the students in their emphasis to be sure the content is appropriate to the student. This collaboration with a co-curricular department should ensure that the students are looking not just toward but beyond graduation, while leaving the instructors to focus on the work at hand.

This shift in strategy should also help to improve the still-lagging scores in PLO4. This has long been a bugaboo for the program - these scores remain below the 3.0 mark. Discussions with the CD office also look at the internship course, as a strong internship program will also help boost this PLO, and some level of involvement in FILM130 Business of Entertainment, a course class that all Cinema students will be required to take in the new program.

SP19

Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	11	.8
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	14	1.79
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	42	2.67

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

Overall, scores are holding steady at the upper end, and dipped slightly in year 1 & 2. Production Workshop is settling into its new structure, and the Career Development integration is happening. However, students were in the habit of putting off meetings with Career Development or doing them late in the quarter.

On Mondays, students in PW now go with their emphasis instructor after the group meeting. A set of Professional Development activities and assignments has been implemented, with room for customization by each emphasis instructor. This is intended to start moving toward the Thesis Workshop / Creative Professional Development split coming soon. We should see scores rise over the next year as we tackle this issue head on.

In the lower levels, less emphasis on this PLO keeps this score a little lower. Y1 and Y2 scores here were plagued by the same issues as described above – particularly a weak section of Directing 1.

One interesting option would be to create something akin to the Writing and Math Labs, but for business practices. Our lead business instructor has commented how upper-level students often ask her to review material covered in her Hollywood Business Practices course. Something like this would be a great supplement to the career development office for students making a thesis film. Her specialized knowledge of the film festival world would greatly benefit PW students about to launch into that world. Of course, this is a significant budgetary item, as each consultation would be paid.

PLO 5: Justify plans and decisions as the result of research, consensus building, and critical thinking

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale (0-4).

Goal:	Average > 3.0
--------------	---------------

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

SU18		
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 PLOs were assessed according to PLOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: F101 Principles of Production	n/a	n/a
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	12	1.3
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	14	2.57
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Again, no scores captured for the year one class. It does seem that some meaningful assessment could occur in this course as students are working in teams on the productions, and “teamwork” is one of the four components in the rubric for this PLO. Assignments such as peer reviews could be added to the course to get a better idea of how well individual students are working in teams.</p> <p>From the notes on the assessment meetings, it's difficult to glean many useful insights regarding this PLO. This is another class that would benefit from a peer evaluation assignment given to students. Directors engage in multiple decision-making processes, from casting, to creating coverage plans, to creating mise-en-scene. Careful calibration with the adjunct instructors involved at this level of assessment could help generate more helpful assessments.</p> <p>Personality can play an outside role in this PLO more than in any of the others. Teamwork, articulating issues/needs, and acting logically all have a component of maturity and temperament beyond what's easily taught in the classroom. Plans for improvement would include creating more opportunities for collaboration. It is again worth noting that this group underperformed in general, but a close watch should be kept over the next quarters to determine if this is an aberration or a new norm.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	16	1.13
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	20	2.1
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	3
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Year 1 instructors observe their students working in teams, turning in shooting plans, and so assessment meetings included discussion on this PLO. Again, the goal of this first-quarter class is to establish a baseline. The students are guided through all the steps of production, so progress on this PLO entails them understanding the necessity for teambuilding, research, and critical thinking.</p> <p>It is in F110 Directing 1 that students are challenged to create a shooting plan on their own, under the close guidance of the instructor. Section 4 students were also required to do a self-assessment, and the instructor reported that these self-assessments revealed that the students were, of the most part, self-aware about their shortcomings and where they need to improve. This is of course instrumental in education, and this self-evaluation is something we'll include in all sections going forward.</p> <p>The capstone saw an improvement in this score as well. This could reflect the new organizational structure of PW, as the emphases are mixed up more now than they had been in the past. The instructors in PW have also been making efforts toward encouraging collaboration. For example, directors and producers choosing to work with CCH cinematographers (especially those in PW) are given priority access to our top-tier camera packages. We are also developing a system for students to give feedback on each other through a peer evaluation system.</p>		
SP19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Y1 Course: FILM101 Production Fundamentals	11	1.18
Y2 Course: F110 Directing 1	14	1.57

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	42	2.64
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>During the past two quarters as this PLO has been assessed at Y1, scores have held in an acceptable range. This likely emphasizes the teamwork criteria of the rubric. We should see this hold steady, if not improve, due to the changes coming in Production Fundamentals.</p> <p>The drop in Directing 1 scores was in line with what's been recorded throughout each PLO this quarter. We will monitor scores next quarter to determine if this is just an aberration, or indicative of a longer-term problem.</p> <p>Issues in PW with this PLO highlight two main problem areas: taking notes and teambuilding. Students in many cases had a difficult time putting effective teams together and in staying committed to projects. One way to fix this issue downstream of PW is create more opportunities for students to make films earlier in the program, such as in FILM290 and in the new Producing and Directing tracks. New courses like "The Director in Postproduction" and "The Producer in Postproduction" will help future Thesis students absorb and process notes given by instructors and by their peers.</p>		

Outcome 6: Student Success

Assessment Method 6A: 1 year retention data		
Goal:	> 80%	
LQ vs. TQ	BFA (all students) Retention %	1st year BFA student Retention %
FA17 – FA18	74% (279/376)	72%
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
AY18-19	Numerous retention initiatives have been implemented since Fall of 2018 most prominent is the first year experience course.	

Assessment Method 6B: 4 year graduation rate / 6 year graduation rate		
Goal:	50% graduate within 4 years (or less) / 60% graduate within 6 years (or less)	
Quarter	4 year graduation rate (FA15 – SP19)	6 year graduation rate (FA13 – SP19)
SP19	18%	40%
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
AY18-19	Request additional institutional research data to determine the profile of a student who drops.	

Outcome 7: Student Satisfaction

Assessment 7.A: Pending Graduate Survey (relevant questions)

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Goal:	Likert scale > 3 Students self-score their own abilities in these areas of the program learning outcomes				
Quarter	Q #3A: Score Your command of storytelling through cinema	Q #3B: Score Your proficiency of cinema technology	Q #3D: Score Your awareness of cultural influence as it pertains to cinema	Q #3E: Score Knowledge of business practices, legal standards and protocols for the industry	Q #3F: Score Your ability to work in teams and obtain consensus
SU18	2.86	2.00	3.43	2.43	3.0
FA18	3.23	2.85	3.15	2.69	3.54
WI19	3.63	3.38	3.38	3.13	3.88
SP19	3.49	3.03	3.51	2.79	3.69
Comments & Plans for Improvement:					
SU18	Summer is a small graduating class so it is difficult to draw conclusions. Typically student will score themselves above average on storytelling (PLO1).				
FA18	Overall scores are within range. The score on Q#3E suggests students feel less prepared to enter the working world of the industry. Stronger collaboration between Academics and Career Development could go a long way toward inspiring confidence in the students. The scores on the technology question (Q#3B) could be alleviated by ensuring that the curriculum has enough classes where the students get hands-on with a variety of filmmaking tools, and that the Equipment Center has enough equipment to support those classes.				
WI19	Generally high scores indicate a confident group. While student scores are higher than our assessed scores, the patterns are roughly the same. In response to the score on business practices, legal standards, and protocols, plans for more Career Development involvement in PW are moving forward, and we should expect to see a continued increase through next quarter. With three quarters of data in this report, it is clear that we are on the right track when it comes to instilling confidence in our grads.				
SP19	39 out of the 42 students in PW3 responded to the poll. Scores again are generally high, and demonstrate that students have a more positive sense of their abilities than do instructors. And once again, the lowest score is in regard to PLO4. Continued integration with the CD office, as well as other initiatives proposed, should result in these scores climbing.				

Assessment 7.B: Student Satisfaction Survey (relevant questions)	
Goal:	Likert scale 1 – 4: Score > 3
Program Courses	
	Weighted Average
Courses are relevant to the industry and will help me with my future career	3.29
The film courses emphasize the roles and responsibilities of the film industry	3.21
The film courses emphasize the processes involved in filmmaking	3.29

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Courses familiarize students with ideas, concepts or practical approaches potential problems one may face in the film industry		3.23
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SP19	Scores here do not demonstrate any serious issues. It's interesting that the scores are all within a few hundredths of a point, showing that we are consistent in how our program addresses industry needs and preparedness.	

Outcome 8: Instructor Quality

Assessment 9: Instructor and Course Evaluations completed by students		
Goal:	Likert scale 1 - 4: Average Score > 3	
Quarter	Total # number of evaluations	Average Instructor Score
FA18	679	3.5
WI19	134	3.6
SP19	124	3.5
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
FA18	Scores are above the target range. Overall response rates were low – continued efforts to make students aware of the evaluations and having instructors remind student to take the survey during class break would benefit the process. General themes in the dissatisfied comments are in regards to unclear expectations (both in grading and assignments) and limited to no Canvas use. This suggests that we continue to push Canvas usage, and perhaps step up the requirements for instructors to use the LMS. Researching ways to integrate the evaluation process into Canvas would also likely yield higher response rates.	
WI19	Student satisfaction with their instructors remains at a high. The Graduate Survey reflects this sentiment a well. Similar comments to last quarter – no new issues to report. Improvement plans for instruction are centered around getting the new full-time faculty geared up to conduct in-class observations of adjunct faculty.	
SP19	Comments suggesting dissatisfaction are all isolated and don't reflect any major faculty-wide issues or concerns. CCH students are generally satisfied, or at least the ones who complete the evaluations are. Average response rate for this quarter was 42%	

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) BACHELOR OF FINE ARTS Cinema

ANNUAL SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

Academic Year:	AY18 -19	Due Date:	8.9.19
Campus:	Los Angeles	Date Submitted:	8.9.19
Prepared By:	Dave Martin	Title:	Dept. Chair - Cinema

Summary Comments:	<p>The single most impactful factor on CCH Academics this past year has been the reorganization of the academic department, and the implementation of the chair and new full-time faculty positions.</p> <p>We graduated our biggest class of PW students in the Spring, moving nearly 30 thesis films through the PW pipeline. This required a highly coordinated effort between the Academic and the Operations team. This was an annual effort, as PW takes a student 3 quarters to move through successfully.</p> <p>In the midst of this, we also changed the section structure to reflect a student's chosen project path rather than their emphasis. Results have been mixed so far, as the structure seems to work well for students on the Thesis track, but the Portfolio students, being that they are a mix of emphases, has been more difficult to find a structure for. Having one instructor oversee all the Portfolio sections is good for bookkeeping purposes, but it may not satisfy the individual needs of the students of different emphases. However, we'll need one or two additional quarters under this structure to make a determination.</p> <p>Production Fundamentals continues to improve, as it is re-focused to orient students to the gear and to on-set safety. Finding the right approach and the right instructors for this course is crucial, as it sets the tone for the rest of the student's education at CCH. As we continue to reshape the course, decisions will need to be made to balance the need between teaching students to work collaboratively on set, and make sure that all students are able to have the opportunity to direct an exercise. 11 weeks may not be enough time to sufficiently do both, and splitting the difference may simply render both efforts ineffective.</p> <p>Scores overall this past year were down from last year. However, the opinion of this author is that the quality of work overall has not lessened, especially in the 4th year capstone, but that the rigor of the assessment teams has increased. PW now includes more full-time faculty members than it ever has before, and as such the level of commitment to academic standards is higher than it has ever been before. The full and complete integration of the full-time faculty into PW was completed by the Spring, the quarter for which PW saw scores drop. The next challenge for this team will be to see if they can elevate the student work to meet those standards.</p> <p>That isn't to understate the real challenges this past year has presented the Cinema program with. Technology and equipment shortages are going to become more and more of an issue. The teach-out exacerbates this issue, as scheduling for two programs puts additional constraints on the amount of electives the Cinema department can run. The growth of the VFX and GDIM programs has contributed to this as well.</p>
--------------------------	---

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

	<p>The teach-out of the legacy program also creates advising issues. Students, in particular legacy program students with their plentiful open electives, are as a whole not as diligent in signing up for required classes. Logistical issues, such as making sure cross-listed courses fill amongst students taking both codes, have not been fully worked out. Full-time faculty were instructed in their first quarter (Winter 2019) to conduct evaluations on all continuing students and reach out to those who were deemed good candidates to switch. Structural differences in the two programs made it such that any student with 96 or more credits was effectively ineligible to switch, and we found it was inadvisable for many students in their sophomore year to switch. The added benefit of this exercise was that it exposed the new full-time faculty to both the legacy and new curriculums quickly, and gave them the tools they have continued to use in advising students.</p>
<p>Plans for Improvement:</p>	<p>Teach out sections: Keeping up with what students need what course will be a significant chunk of time. The full-time faculty can do some of this, but it really needs additional dedicated advising support. This could be an adjunct faculty who gets additional hours and training. In the long run, this can help keep costs down as we get to the end of the teach-out and are running courses for a limited number of students.</p> <p>New courses to develop, current courses to re-work. The emphasis required tracks (especially Directing and Producing) need work. The addition of a full-time directing instructor will greatly aid in this process.</p> <p>Tighter coordination of equipment use across the curriculum. With more production classes being rolled out over the coming near term, scheduling will have to take place across the entire campus, and not just in individual classes. The model built in PW is a good one, and could be implemented campus wide. Determination for the point person in operations needs to be addressed.</p> <p>More Career Services Integration: Plans are being developed to have PW closely integrated with the career development office. A rubric is being developed with the head of the department and the PW instructors.</p>