Action plan for the 2018-2019 academic year (August 2018 through April 2019):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM:</th>
<th>Film Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS:</td>
<td>Donald Jellerson, Janine Tobeck, Holly Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS:</td>
<td>Direct Assessment: assess term papers from gateway and capstone courses (FILM 272 and 485) based on existing SLO performance rubrics. Involve at least five Film Studies faculty members as readers. FALL 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise SLOs. Film Studies faculty to discuss and revise SLOs. FALL 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Assessment: survey existing Film Studies majors. What is their perception of their own learning in each of the program SLOs? Which courses are/were most important to them in achieving competence in those SLOs? Which courses were least important? What suggestions do they have for improving the program and/or particular courses? SPRING 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIONS with TIMELINE:</td>
<td>FALL 2018 (September) — conduct direct assessment, as described above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALL 2018 (October) — discuss results of assessments and assessment planning with the full Film Studies faculty, and present the proposal for revised SLOs with the goal of emerging from the meeting with those revisions. (The proposed revisions will be minimal in terms of actual language to be changed, but important nonetheless.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING 2019 (April) — conduct indirect assessment. Since this is the first year of the major (thus the survey group will be small), we plan to conduct the survey in “focus group” form, in person. Students can mark their responses, add comments, and discuss their perspectives. The Film Studies faculty will decide on the questions and the Coordinator will facilitate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT TOOLS &amp; STRATEGIES:</td>
<td>This summer, we developed an “assignment audit” tool, which allowed us to chart which of our courses were providing instruction on and assessing which of our SLOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have already developed a rubric to use as our direct assessment tool by which we evaluate student papers. When we deploy it once again, we will review its terms, as we have done in the past. So far, we have felt that the tool is efficient and productive, so there has been no felt need among faculty members to change the rubric. When we revise our SLOs, however, the rubric will need adjustment.

We have, in the past, conducted an indirect assessment survey in “focus group” form. That proved productive, albeit, at times, contentious (since a few students were not shy about expressing their biases and their displeasure with certain aspects of our program and certain instructors). Even the consideration of biases and displeasures, however, many grains of salt one needs to take with them, can be instructive. The Film Studies faculty will draw on this past experience to frame the upcoming “focus group” as productively as possible.

### DISCUSSION & USE OF DATA:

At our FALL 2018 meeting, the Film Studies faculty will review assessment data (both our “assignment audit” and our direct assessment). This should prompt interesting and productive discussions. The “assignment audit” in particular promises to prompt a discussion about the place our particular courses occupy in the program overall.

Also at our FALL 2018 meeting, the Film Studies faculty will consider the proposed SLO revisions prompted by our “assignment audit.” Discussion of SLO revisions will help set the agenda for program development for the year.

### MOVING FORWARD:

Each of the above activities builds on the last to help us set an agenda in a particularly important year — the year we launch a major as well as the year we begin our first A&R self-study. Changes to the program (including planned growth models) are already being discussed at the program, department, and college levels. (Just yesterday, in fact, the Film Studies Coordinator, the Interim Dean, and the Assistant Dean met to discuss the implementation of two new courses slated for 2019–2020.) All of those changes have been and will continue to be informed by the data we gather and the discussions we have around that data, which will, we expect, produce a set of goals for the long-term viability of the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE NEEDS:</th>
<th>At the moment, assessment projects, record keeping, and agendas are set by the Film Studies Coordinator. This works for the moment, but we recognize the need to create some redundancy in our systems. Right now, should we lose the Coordinator, we would lose too much data and programmatic impetus. How can we resource faculty time or leverage systems to more efficiently share information and preserve our forward motion in a way that is not as dependent on one person?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARRIERS/DIFFICULTIES:</td>
<td>The largest barrier we face is our interdisciplinarity. Our faculty hails from many departments and more than one college. Speaking to each other across these disciplinary and institutional barriers is a challenge. More importantly, however, the time and resources spent by faculty on Film Studies is not always rewarded (or rewarded equally) by the home departments of particular faculty members. How do we create a space in which faculty time and resources can be efficiently dedicated to interdisciplinary programs, and how do we ensure that departments reward those efforts as much as they do activities that support their home disciplines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY:</td>
<td>The pattern we have developed (direct assessment in one year and indirect the next) has been sustainable. We are simply making it part of our regular operation. When we add additional activities (e.g., the “assignment audit” this summer or the “comparative program review” we conducted in 2016), additional resources are needed. We are grateful to have received those additional resources from both the L&amp;S College and the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>