|  |
| --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2022-2023** |
| *PCAL* | *School of Media & Communication* |
| *BFA in Film Production (530)* |
| *Sara Thomason* |
| ***Is this an online program***? [ ]  Yes [x]  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here [x]  Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1:** Perform the roles of key Below-the-Line (Technical) personnel on a film crew, including operating equipment, safely and efficiently. |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Timed Practical Exams** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: BTL Job Performance Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:** Utilize Above-the-Line (Creative) skills to create visually appealing short films with compelling narratives. |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: ATL Job Performance Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3:** Demonstrate an understanding of the structures and means of production in studio (Hollywood) and independent film production. |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Portfolio Review** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Indirect: Exit Interview** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met\*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4:** Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion. |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: ATL Job Performance Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 5:** Communicate effectively, orally and through the written word, on set and in film analysis. |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Production Presentation** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: Film Theory Essay Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 5.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met\*** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 6:** Coordinate and supervise a crew/team, and, in turn, serve as a collaborative crew/team member. |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: ATL Job Performance Evaluation** |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: BTL Job Performance Evaluation** |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
|  |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:** |
| These will be assessed each academic year. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Perform the roles of key Below-the-Line (Technical) personnel on a film crew, including operating equipment, safely and efficiently.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students in FILM 202 Basic Film Production are administered timed practical exams on a variety of crew positions and their associated equipment. Each exam has a simple checkbox scoring rubric, indicating whether or not the student completed the task correctly. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | In order to perform the job being tested and use the associated equipment on an actual student film, the student must receive a 90% or above on the scoring rubric. Since it is required that students perform the jobs being tested as part of the film program, students may retake the exam until they receive a 90% or higher. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher receive a 90% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 93% |
| **Methods**  | Students (*N*=52) enrolled in FILM 202: Basic Film Production during Spring 2023 were administered timed practical exams and scored via checkbox rubric by faculty and trained student lab workers. These scores were anonymized and each student’s practical scores were averaged to create a practical mean score per student.  |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in a below-the-line (crew) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Scoring includes professor’s assessment of job performance and peer assessment via by a professor-designed rubric. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **94%** |
| **Methods** | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 491 Below-the-Line (BTL) Practicum III during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. the shots were in focus for 1st AC, the sound mixer’s sound was clear, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores were anonymized and each student’s BTL scores were averaged to create a BTL mean score per student. Of the 15 students enrolled, 14 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: The results were higher than expected.**Conclusions**: Content in FILM 202 was revised to focus more on below-the-line aspects of film production, with less emphasis on above the line which we believe resulted in the higher rate of success.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Because our students exceeded our target for success, we will be able to assess more in-depth metrics for profiency in the equipment in the future. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Utilize Above-the-Line (Creative) skills to create visually appealing short films with compelling narratives.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students present to the entire film faculty in a formal presentation setting before each film they undertake. Students are expected to outline their plan for making their films, effectively communicating how they creatively solved the problems associated with their short film in a way that is collaborative, cohesive, and appropriate to the director’s vision. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% |
| **Methods**  | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 390 Pre-Production Practicum II during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of both the content and the delivery of presentations using a professor-designed rubric. These scores were anonymized and each student’s presentation scores were averaged to create a presentation mean score per student. Of the 15 students enrolled, 15 had a mean presentation score of 85% or higher. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in above-the-line (creative) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Scoring includes professor’s assessment of job performance and peer assessment via by a professor-designed rubric. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **93%** |
| **Methods** | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 392 Above-the-Line (ATL) Practicum III during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. actors were well directed, the shots were well lit, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores were anonymized and each student’s ATL scores were averaged to create an ATL mean score per student. Of the 15 students enrolled, 14 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: Students scored higher than expected.**Conclusions**: Faculty standardized rubrics which created relatively consistent scoring.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Faculty will reassess success target for future. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Demonstrate an understanding of the structures and means of production in studio (Hollywood) and independent film production.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: In their capstone course, students submit professional materials, such as resumés and reels appropriate for the film industry. Students are evaluated by the professor of record on both the content and the delivery of these materials using a professor-designed rubric. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% |
| **Methods**  | Going forward, the film program will incorporate standardized VALUE (LEAP) rubrics to evaluate student portfolios, and each film professor will be asked to score the portfolio. The resulting scores can be collected and anonymized to track performance. As an INDIRECT measure, these portfolios will be submitted to a professional advisory council for review. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | INDIRECT measure of student learning: In their capstone course, students were given an online student survey measuring their self-reported satisfaction of learning in the program. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **100%** |
| **Methods** | Going forward, the students will be given an exit survey to provide numerical data based on students’ self-reported satisfaction of learning in the program related to the six programmatic outcomes. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: Students scored higher than expected.**Conclusions**: Faculty standardized rubrics which created relatively consistent scoring.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Faculty will reassess success target for future. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 4** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students present to the entire film faculty in a formal presentation setting before each film they undertake. Students are expected to outline their plan for making their films, effectively communicating how they creatively solved the problems associated with their short film in a way that is collaborative, cohesive, and appropriate to the director’s vision. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 85% |
| **Methods**  | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 390 Pre-Production Practicum II during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of both the content and the delivery of presentations using a professor-designed rubric. These scores were anonymized and each student’s presentation scores were averaged to create a presentation mean score per student. Of the 14 students enrolled, 12 had a mean presentation score of 85% or higher. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in above-the-line (creative) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Scoring includes professor’s assessment of job performance and peer assessment via by a professor-designed rubric. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **100%** |
| **Methods** | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 392 Above-the-Line (ATL) Practicum III during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. actors were well directed, the shots were well lit, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores were anonymized and each student’s ATL scores were averaged to create an ATL mean score per student. Of the 15 students enrolled, 15 had a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: Students scored higher than expected.**Conclusions**: Faculty standardized rubrics which created relatively consistent scoring.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Faculty will reassess success target for future. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 5** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Communicate effectively, orally and through the written word, on set and in film analysis.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students present to the entire film faculty in a formal presentation setting before each film they undertake. Students are expected to outline their plan for making their films, effectively communicating how they creatively solved the problems associated with their short film in a way that is collaborative, cohesive, and appropriate to the director’s vision. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% |
| **Methods**  | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 390 Pre-Production Practicum II during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of both the content and the delivery of presentations using a professor-designed rubric. These scores were anonymized and each student’s presentation scores were averaged to create a presentation mean score per student. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Final essays written in FILM 466 Film Theory (the most advanced required film studies course in the major) are evaluated by the film faculty using a rubric designed by the film studies faculty (i.e., a subset of the English faculty). |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the essay constitutes a large portion of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **85%** |
| **Methods** | At the completion of each FILM 466 section, a representative sample of 20% of the essays written (typically N=5) will be selected and evaluated using a standardized rubric incorporating VALUE (LEAP) rubric criteria. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: Students scored higher than expected.**Conclusions**: Faculty standardized rubrics which created relatively consistent scoring.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Faculty will reassess success target for future. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 6** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Coordinate and supervise a crew/team, and, in turn, serve as a collaborative crew/team member.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in either a below-the-line (crew) or above-the-line (creative) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Performance is evaluated by a professor-designed rubric. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% or higher | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% |
| **Methods**  | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 392 Above-the-Line (ATL) Practicum III during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. actors were well directed, the shots were well lit, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores were anonymized and each student’s ATL scores were averaged to create an ATL mean score per student.  |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students working on set in a below-the-line (crew) capacity are evaluated by the professor of record on their job performance both in preparation and execution of their assigned position. Scoring includes professor’s assessment of job performance and peer assessment via by a professor-designed rubric. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Since the evaluations constitute the majority of the students’ final grade in the course, and since students must score a minimum of a C (70%) in the course to be counted toward the major, the program considers a mean evaluation score of 85% or higher to be a success. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | **80% or higher** | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **93%** |
| **Methods** | Students (N=15) enrolled in FILM 491 Below-the-Line (BTL) Practicum III during Spring 2023 were scored based on faculty assessment of job performance (i.e. the shots were in focus for 1st AC, the sound mixer’s sound was clear, etc.) and peer evaluation in the areas of job performance, attitude, punctuality, reliability, and safety via online feedback form after the completion of each student film. These scores were anonymized and each student’s BTL scores were averaged to create a BTL mean score per student.  |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results**: Students scored higher than expected.**Conclusions**: Faculty standardized rubrics which created relatively consistent scoring.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Faculty will reassess success target for future. |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map (below/next page) as part of this document**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CURRICULUM MAP**  |  |  |
| **Program name:** | BFA in Film Production (#530) |  | **KEY:****I = Introduced****R = Reinforced/Developed****M = Mastered****A = Assessed** |
| **Department:** | School of Media |  |
| **College:** | PCAL |  |
| **Contact person:** | Sara Thomason |  |
| **Email:** | sara.thomason@wku.edu |  |
|  |  |  | **Learning Outcomes** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **LO1:** | **LO2:** | **LO3:** | **LO4:** | **LO5** | **LO6** |
|  | Perform the roles of key Below-the-Line (technical) personnel on a film crew, including operating equipment, safely and efficiently. | Utilize Above-the-Line (Creative) skills to create visually appealing short films with compelling narratives. | Demonstrate an understanding of the structures and means of production in studio (Hollywood) and independent film  | Critically evaluate a film or solve a production problem in an organized, coherent fashion. | Communicate effectively, orally and through the written word, on set and in film analysis. | Coordinate and supervise a crew/team, and, in turn, serve as a collaborative crew/team member. |
| **Course Subject** | **Number** | **Course Title** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FILM | 100 | Film Industry and Aesthetics |  | I | I | I |  | I |
| FILM | 155 | Film Attendance\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FILM | 201 | Introduction to Cinema |  |  |  | I | I |  |
| FILM | 202 | Basic Film Production | I/A | R |  | R | R | R |
| FILM | 250 | Screenwriting I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 251 | Film Directing I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 252 | Film Producing |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 253 | Cinematography I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 254 | Production Design I |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 256 | Film Editing I | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 290 | Practicum: Pre-Production I |  |  | R/A |  | R/A | R/A |
| FILM | 291 | Practicum: Below-the-Line I | R/A |  | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 292 | Practicum: Above-the-Line I |  | R/A | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 350 | Screenwriting II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 351 | Film Directing II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 353 | Cinematography II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 354 | Production Design II |  | R | R |  | R |  |
| FILM | 355 | Film Sound | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 356 | Film Editing II | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 367 | Introduction to Film Genres |  |  |  | R | R |  |
| FILM | 369 | Introduction to World Cinema |  |  |  | R | R |  |
| FILM | 390 | Practicum: Pre-Production II |  |  | R/A |  | R/A | R/A |
| FILM | 391 | Practicum: Below-the-Line II | R/A |  | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 392 | Practicum: Above-the-Line II |  | R/A | R/A |  |  | R/A |
| FILM | 393 | Practicum: Post-Production I | R | R | R | R |  | R |
| FILM | 466 | Film Theory |  |  |  | M/A | M/A |  |
| FILM | 486 | Film Capstone |  |  | M/A |  |  |  |
| FILM | 489 | Thesis Development |  | M |  |  | M | M |
| FILM | 490 | Practicum: Pre-Production III |  |  | M/A |  | M/A | M/A |
| FILM | 491 | Practicum: Below-the-Line III | M/A |  | M/A |  |  | M/A |
| FILM | 492 | Practicum: Above-the-Line III |  | M/A | M/A |  |  | M/A |
| FILM | 493 | Practicum: Post-Production II | M/A | M/A | M/A | M/A |  | M/A |

\*\* FILM 155 is a zero credit hour required course where students attend on-campus film screenings

**Show Name/Number: Dir. Prep Feedback Reviewer:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria****(Score 0 if element is absent)** | **1 - 2** | **3 - 4** | **5** | **Score** |
| Presentation | The presentation isn’t interesting or engaging. Few (2) to no (1) aspects of the presentation were rehearsed and professional. | The presentation was somewhat interesting and engaging. Some (3) to most (4) aspects of the presentation were rehearsed and professional. | The presentation was extremely interesting and engaging. All aspects of the presentation were rehearsed and professional. |  |
| Headshots/Auditions | The actors don’t have the appropriate look for the film. The audition performance is mildly (2) to not (1) believable.  | For the most part, the actors have the appropriate look for the film. The audition performance is mostly (4) to somewhat (3) believable. | The actors have the appropriate look for the film. The audition performance is extremely believable. |  |
| Location Photos | The location does not look appropriate for the film. There is little (2) to no (1) visual potential. | The location looks somewhat appropriate for the film. There is some (3) to much (4) visual potential. | The location looks appropriate for the film. There is an extreme amount of visual potential. |  |
| Spines | It is unclear what the film is *really* about and what the characters want. | It is somewhat clear what the film is *really* about and what the characters want. | It is very clear what the film is *really* about and what the characters want. |  |
| Cinematography | The visual tone and cinematography plan are not appropriate for the film. Few (2) to none (1) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The visual tone and cinematography plan are somewhat appropriate for the film. Some (3) to most (4) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The visual tone and cinematography plan are very appropriate for the film. All of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. |  |
| Production Design | The design plan is not appropriate for the film. Few (2) to none (1) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The design plan is somewhat appropriate for the film. Some (3) to most (4) of the references are clear, thorough, and professional. | The design plan is very appropriate for the film. All of the references are clear, thorough, and professional.  |  |
| Photoboards | The photoboards are an inaccurate portrayal of what the film will look like. There is little (2) to no (1) coverage.  | The photoboards are a somewhat accurate portrayal of what the film will look like. There is adequate (3) to appropriate (4) coverage. | The photoboards are an accurate portrayal of what the film will look like. There is thorough coverage. |  |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL** |  |

**Notes:**

 

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | 1 – 2 – 3 (extremely bad – poor – fair) | 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 (okay – good – very good – extremely good) | 8 – 9 – 10 (excellent - exceptional – perfect) |
| Job Performance | performed his/her job with little (3) to no (1) effort. Assignments and tasks were rarely completed on time and the degree of effort was poor. | performed his/her job with extremely good (7) to okay (4) effort. Assignments and tasks were completed on time most of the time and the degree of effort was excellent to okay. | performed his/her job with perfect (10) to excellent (8) effort. Assignments and tasks were always completed on time and the degree of effort was exceptional. |
| Attitude | approached work with a fair (3) to poor (1) attitude. Work was rarely approached with a can-do problem-solving attitude. | approached work with an extremely good (7) to okay (4) attitude. Sometimes work was approached with a can-do problem-solving attitude and at other times it was not. | approached work with a perfect (10) to excellent (8) attitude. Work was always approached with a can-do problem-solving attitude. |
| Punctuality | was rarely (3) to never (1) punctual. There was little to no respect for deadlines and he or she was not on time to start work. | was mostly (7) to sometimes (4) punctual. There was an inconsistent level of respect for deadlines and he or she was sometimes but not always on time to start work. | was always (10) to often (8) punctual. There was high level of respect for deadlines and he or she was always on time to start work. |
| Reliability | was organized and prepared little (3) to none (1) of the time. Work was rarely done with an acceptable degree of organization and communication was rarely to never clear and effective. | was organized and prepared most (7) to much (4) of the time. Work was done with an acceptable degree of organization and communication was sometimes clear and effective. | was always (10) to often (8) organized and prepared. Work was done with a perfect degree of organization and communication was always clear and effective. |
| Safety | was rarely (3) to never (1) concerned for the safety of the crew, actors, and work environment. The safety of individuals and property was not respected above all other work. | was usually (7) to sometimes (4) concerned for the safety of the crew, actors, and work environment. The safety of individuals and property was somewhat respected above all other work. | was always concerned for the safety of the crew, actors, and work environment. The safety of individuals and property was always respected above all other work. |
| Collaboration | was a fair (3) to poor (1) collaborator. The input of others was not heard and appreciated even if not implemented. The ideas and effort of others were not considered and appreciated. | was an extremely good (7) to okay (4) collaborator. The input of others was at times heard and appreciated even if not implemented. The ideas and effort of others was sometimes considered and appreciated. | was a perfect (10) to excellent (8) collaborator. The input of others was always to often heard and appreciated even if not implemented. The ideas and effort of others were always considered and appreciated. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Creative Thinking/Communication (LEAP)** |
| **Overall Competency Level of Film**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Creative Risk Taking**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Problem Solving**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Innovated Thinking**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Genre Conventions**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Audience Awareness (Context and Purpose)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Control of Meaning (Syntax and Mechanics)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Cohesiveness (Content Development)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |

|  |
| --- |
| **Individual Film Elements** |
| **Writing**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Locations (Producer)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Casting (Director/Producer)**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Directing**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Production Design**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Editing**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Post-Production Sound**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |
| **Delivery/Press**Introductory 1 2 3 4 5 Mastery |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria****(Score 0 if element is absent)** | **1 - 2** | **3 - 4** | **5** | **Score** |
| Attendance | Required crew members are not present. Few (2) to none (1) are here. | Some required crew members are present.  | All ATL, Editor, and AE are present at time of dailies. All aspects of the presentation were presented professionally. |  |
| AE Paperwork | The AE does not present the appropriate paperwork for the film. They deliver it late (2) or not at all (1) during Dailies.  | The AE presents the appropriate paperwork for the film. They deliver it mostly (4) to somewhat (3) at the start of Dailies. | The AE presents the appropriate paperwork for the film. They deliver it to the ED expediently at the start of Dailies. |  |
| Timeline Organization | The timeline is not appropriate for the film. There is little (2) to no (1) organization on the timeline. Many shots are out of sync.  | The timeline is somewhat appropriate for the film. There is some (3) to much (4) organization. Some shots are out of sync.  | The timeline is appropriate for the film. Title card included. All shots are synched correctly, from wide to close in the timeline.  |  |
| Director | The DR is unclear and communicates disrespectfully with the AE and ED. | The DR communicates somewhat clearly and sometimes respectfully with ED and AE. | The DR communicates clearly and respectfully with the ED and AE during Dailies. |  |
| Editor | The ED conducts themself inappropriately during Dailies. Few (2) to none (1) of their interactions are clear, thorough, or professional. They take little to no notes. | The ED conducts themself somewhat appropriately during Dailies. Some (3) to most (4) of their interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They take some notes. | The ED conducts themself very appropriately during Dailies. All interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They record notes for every shot. |  |
| Assistant Editor | The AE interacts inappropriately during Dailies. Few (2) to none (1) of their interactions while running Dailies are clear, thorough, and professional. They are unprepared. | The AE conducts themself somewhat appropriately during Dailies. Some (3) to most (4) of their interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They are somewhat prepared.  | The AE conducts themself very appropriately during Dailies. All of their interactions are clear, thorough, and professional. They are prepared and operate the timeline. |  |
| Collaboration  | All parties have little (2) to no (1) collaboration.  | All parties collaborate adequately (3) to (4). | All parties collaborate thoroughly. |  |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL** |  |