A liberal arts education in film production:

Instructional assessment of student film projects

by

Troy Daniel McKay

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Leadership)

Program of Study Committee:
Janet Friedel, Major Professor
Larry H. Ebbers
Sharon K. Drake
Nancy Franz
Mack Shelley II

The student author and the program of study committee are solely responsible for the content of this dissertation. The Graduate College will ensure this dissertation is globally accessible and will not permit alterations after a degree is conferred.

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2017

ProQuest Number: 10269444

ProQuest 10269444

DEDICATION

This

dissertation

research

is dedicated to

aspiring teachers

of film and video production.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the faculty members on my Program of Study Committee for their guidance throughout my doctoral program, up to and including the dissertation stage. In particular, I thank Drs. Jan Friedel and Larry Ebbers. I am also grateful for all of the teachers, professionals and classmates who guided me and shaped my academic and intellectual growth during my years as a student. In addition, I would like to thank the participants of this study who offered not only their time, but their specific expertise, experience and perspective with my research topic. Finally, I wish to thank my family for their support and patience during this long process. I am especially grateful to my wife, Stephanie, and my son, Zachary, who have made many sacrafices in order for this process to take place. Their love and support have sustained me throughout this journey. This dissertation research has been the product of a collective effort from all of these people. I am very grateful for the support they have given me throughout this process.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the educational process of instructors teaching film and video production in higher education. Little research has been dedicated to this field of study. As technology advances and the cost of equipment recedes, educational programs in film and video production will experience growth, transformation, and population. Educational leadership and faculty responsible for these programs experience pressure to stay current with trends and technology while building and maintaining these types of programs; thus, the examination of these programs' structures and practices are worthwhile endeavors. In addition, expanded markets for educated professionals in film and video production are being sought not only by the motion picture industry, but also by locally and globally focused businesses that are also searching for film and video production specialists capable of projecting brands and telling the story of such organizations.

Film and video production is a balance of creative collaboration and technical competencies. It has also been suggested that film and video production is built upon complex processes that incorporate higher order thinking skills. An avenue for the attainment and refinement of these types of skills is found in a liberal arts education. Thus, it is important to explore how moving image content producers are educated regarding liberal arts outcomes.

This qualitative study focused on how instructors teaching film and video production are embedding the goals of a liberal arts education in their programs. The assessment process was examined by employing a collective case study of participants with experience instructing film and video production while assessing liberal arts outcomes. The unique

perspectives that were offered by the participants in this study produced findings that suggest a variety of methods are required to assess the complexities of both the filmmaking process and the projected liberal arts learning outcomes.

Three categories of specific inquiry framed the data collection process: foundational information of assessment, assessment of liberal arts domains and assessment of the "4C's" (Communication, Creativity, Collaboration, Critical Thinking). Themes and categories emerged from the data offered by the participants. Bloom's Taxonomy Revised (2001) was applied as a theoretical framework to further examine the data. This lens produced discussion and analysis that led to grouping individual liberal arts outcomes with processes, actions and key indicators used to measure these outcomes.

The findings highlighted the challenges and successes that participants had with the assessment process. Implications for practice addressed the following themes. First is administrative leadership, which focuses on institutional leadership and the challenges that instructors have with assessment in film and video production education. Strategies are highlighted which suggest specific administrative support is needed to yield more effective and efficient results with assessment in this field. Second is the need to address the formal educational process of instructors teaching in film and video production programs in higher education. Third is classroom instruction, which includes tips, techniques and methods that are used in the assessment process of film and video production. Several recommendations were offered for future studies. One, in particular, addresses the previous concern of the lack of formal research in this field. Foundational evidence and guidance is also provided regarding continued examination of instruction, assessment and student learning in the field of film and video production education.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Motion picture content producers play an instrumental role in shaping American culture. The reach of moving images has exploded with the proliferation of personal devices such as personal tablets and smart phones. Coupled with the estimation that 99% of American households use a television as their main source of information and entertainment, this illuminates the importance of this communication platform in today's society (Barry, 1997). This being said, it is concerning that little research has been conducted as to how these content producers are being educated.

Background of the Study

Educating film and video production professionals has evolved from apprenticeship models in the film industry and has made its way into the academy (Muir, 2013). In 2001, there were an estimated 650 institutions that offered motion picture arts education in the United States (Sabal, 2001). In an initial review of literature, the "hard numbers" that indicate the number of new programs being offered in the United States were unclear; however, according to Michael Cieply (2011), "The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences said 136 institutions in the United States submitted entries for its Student Academy Awards program this year, up by a third from 102 in 2009" (p. 2). In addition, Cieply (2011) stated, "applications to university film, television and digital media programs surged in the last few years as students sought refuge from the weak economy in graduate schools and some colleges opened new programs" (p. 1).

The increase of interest to offer or implement programs in digital video/film (DV) in higher education may be due to the decrease in overall cost for equipment to operate such a

program. "During the past decade, DV has developed from an expensive and rather clumsy medium to a cheaper and user-friendly one" (Hakkarainen, Saarelainen, & Ruokamo, 2007, p. 212). Traditionally filmmaking required manipulation of celluloid strips of raw data, which needed to be transferred to a digital format. This process required time and money. Currently, the process is fully digitized, eliminating the need for expensive film processes and formatting. The digital world offers a new realm of possibilities for students, educators and industry. This exciting time in digital media arts presents many challenges and opportunities to both established departments and emerging programs in the field.

The introduction of new programs and the technology shift from film to a digital format puts increased pressure on leaders in higher education. More specifically, leaders need to develop relevant programs that take full advantage of educating filmmakers and content producers ready for the complexity of today's society. Industry professionals rely on a combination of vocational aptitude, personal communication skills and critical thinking in order to succeed. Film production programs must focus on properly developing curriculum to tap into these areas of student development. Aligning institutional goals and outcomes with newly developed curriculum in a field that has little to no academic research only clouds the development and progression of this discipline. According to Hakkarainen et al. (2007), "the amount of in-depth research on students as producers of DV is scant within the area of higher education" (p. 212). Even with this lack of foundational research in this field, there is a strong interest in developing new programs or maintaining established programs within the realm of digital film and video production.

The fact that many of these programs exist and are being developed is not necessarily a reflection of the number of film professionals needed in America to produce moving

images for theatrical release. "Content" has become a catchall phrase for the produced material desired to be monetized through digital distribution. The major player of such content comes in the form of digital videos and films. As more avenues for distribution of this content emerge, the digital communication industry will rapidly evolve.

The rapid growth of these new technologies force content producers to be flexible and rely on higher order thinking skills to access and process information quickly. In order to ensure the development of these types of skills, the educational process needs to be examined. The extent to which these skills are being taught through film/video programs in higher education and the process of film/video student education are prime topics ready for study. A deeper inquiry into how professional educators structure and assess learning for future film/video professionals may offer guidance in program development. In addition, this process may be key to identifying emerging strategies that produce not only technicians in the film/video industry, but leaders and innovators ready to meet the challenges of today's workforce needs.

The education of film and video production students can be viewed as an opportunity to expose students studying a specific discipline to employ interdisciplinary strategies. This can, in turn, yield content producers armed with an array of critical skills that enable them to play a key role in developing their own worldview. To parallel this thought, a commitment to the goals of a liberal arts education is a prime avenue to produce students with these skills. Specifically, the skills of leadership, collaboration, ethics, and creative and critical thinking are examples of areas that a liberal arts education may call on to strengthen the overall skill set of film production students. Film and media production will continue to play a key role in shaping not only American culture, but also that of the world. With this in mind, it is

important to ask, how are film/video production programs in higher education addressing these skills that are deemed crucial to the 21st century workforce?

Examination of a program's curriculum is one way to unearth findings of academic plans that are being developed specifically for these students. A recent theoretically grounded study conducted by Peter Muir (2013) was one of the first to focus on the development of curriculum for film production programs. Muir's research produced a theoretical framework for curriculum design specific to film production programs in a liberal arts setting. In addition, Muir pointed out areas in need of further study. One of the most concerning issues that Muir uncovered was in regards to teaching film production within the goals of the liberal arts institution. After studying 10 liberal arts schools that offered film production programs, Muir (2013) stated, "There were no required classes in subjects such as leadership, ethics, group communication, or conflict management, nor were there any substantial evidences of how these concepts are taught or assessed within specific production classes" (p. 177). If these types of skills are, indeed, crucial to the needs of graduates entering the workforce, it would appear that these topics should be situated in the outcomes assessment phase of curriculum planning. Nevertheless, this is not to say that outcomes are not being produced by classroom instruction within college film and video production programs.

Need for the Study

Instructors teaching film and video production who are actively assessing liberal arts outcomes may hold key insights into how these outcomes are being put into action. The instructional assessment of liberal arts outcomes was at the heart of this dissertation research.

Instructional assessment is a direct reflection of how purpose and skills are being emphasized and valued within the classroom. Currently, no specific research has been conducted in the area of instructional assessment in relation to liberal arts educational outcomes of film/video production students in higher education.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore assessment strategies that address liberal arts educational outcomes for students studying film/video production. By employing the *revised* Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain framework (Anderson & Krawthowl et al., 2001), the intention of this researcher was to discover emerging themes in assessment to serve the education of film/video production students with respect to learner needs as well as industry demands and requirements.

Research Question

This study was conducted to address the question: How do instructors embed the goals of a liberal arts education into the assessment of student work produced in film/video production coursework? Three sub-questions were asked to answer the central research question:

1. How do instructors describe the experience of assessing liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production coursework?

2. How do instructors describe the assessment tools used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production and how they were produced?

3. How do instructors describe the assessment strategies used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production?

Significance

The absence of research in the area of film/video production education was a precursor to the significance of this study. Moving image production plays an instrumental role in shaping culture in today's society. Critical examination of the educational process of the producers of this active cultural agent was a worthwhile endeavor. In education, the use of reel-to-reel film projectors and videos has been accepted as an alternate way to deliver content in the past. In contemporary classrooms, multimedia presentations covering course content are common. This has spurred some instructors to think differently about this delivery technique as merely a way to present content. Educators are now recognizing that in today's technology rich learning environment, new skills and learning opportunities are present in the field of moving images.

Champions of media literacy have suggested there is significance to developing a student's understanding of media content as language (Hobbs, 2005). In addition, the filmmaking process has been introduced in the classroom as a learning tool in multiple subjects (Friend 2013; Hilton, 2007; Kearney, Jones & Roberts 2012; Kearney, 2012). This interdisciplinary strategy has benefit in developing outcomes that are parallel to the goals of a liberal arts institution. These skills are key in developing a workforce for today's industry (Spanbroeck, 2010). "In an information and service-based economy, high-level communication and critical thinking skills are required to navigate a complex and fast-changing information environment in both the workplace and the community" (Hobbs, 2005, p. 15). Ironically, the "soft skill" development opportunities that are inherent in the filmmaking process are not clearly discussed in the current conversation of developing film/video professionals in higher education.

This study was framed in a liberal arts educational context producing specific significance. First, having a better understanding of liberal arts outcomes in film/video production students will help administrators better assess and administer such programs. The data may offer guidance to the development, implementation and relevance of such a program in a liberal arts context. This study may also offer insight in relation to Muir's (2013) proposed curriculum design and clarify preliminary assessment goals and practices.

Second, classroom instruction can be improved by examining the modes of assessing liberal arts outcomes in work produced by students. The instructors who participated in this study were provided initial research on the topic as a guideline to align classroom tasks and assignments with the institution's liberal arts mission. This alignment of assignments and assessment helped to clarify the objectives and overall purpose for students. The purpose was to yield a more clearly constructed classroom experience for all parties in this research.

Third, by conducting a study of this nature, the discussion and evaluation of new research topics linked to the study of film/video production education were expected to emerge. The overall study of film production students is lacking in all avenues of formal training: liberal arts institutions, Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, and film schools. While this purposeful study was rooted in the liberal arts educational realm, this is not to say that other types of educational institutions will not benefit from the findings. Creative work tends to suggest a more subjective practice to assessment, thus creating an array of problems in gauging a learner's understanding and competency; however, a deeper understanding of the experience of assessment by instructors in the creative arts will further the discussion and highlight areas in need of more investigation.

Examining how work created by film/video production students is assessed is a preliminary step in the overall discussion of motion picture education. As the field grows, administrators and educators will need to have a more in depth understanding of how this education is taking place in higher education. Closely related fields such as motion graphics, animation and video game design may be looking for guidance as they struggle to find their way in the academy as well. The findings of this dissertation research may also further the discussion of film/video production research in higher education. It may also illustrate the commitment and value to understanding the educational process of film/video production students, which carries significance to the learning outcomes in their chosen fields of study.

Definition of Terms

Several terms were defined for use in this study:

Assessment: This study employed Latucca and Stark's (2009) definition of Assessment (Goal-Focused Evaluation) as a primary source in order to ground this term for the research conducted. "Assessment is a four-step empirical method of determining the demonstrable intended outcomes of student learning. It includes: (a) establishing clear objectives, (b) developing assessment tools, (c) obtaining the desired information, and (d) interpreting the congruence between achievement and objectives. Most goal-focused evaluation focuses on quantitative assessment of student learning, but alternative forms of assessment, such as judgments of student performances and student portfolios are becoming more common" (p. 234).

Domains (of Liberal Art): The term "Domains" in the context of examining the foundation of a liberal arts education was used to describe categories of intended learning outcomes.

These outcomes or "Domains" included: Communication, Collaboration/Teamwork, Creativity/Innovation, Critical Thinking/Problem Solving, Ethical Reasoning, Leadership and Life Long Learning,

Filmmaking: The researcher uses the term "filmmaking" to refer to the process of producing motion picture communication. It should be noted that the term does not directly define the format that images are capture upon (i.e. 35mm film). Both digital format and analog formats are included in the how this term is employed in this research.

Film/Video Production: This study includes participants who teach in a variety of programs. These programs are defined differently from institution to institution. For instance, some schools refer to their program as cinema production, while other may refer to theirs as digital media production. The overarching category "Film/Video Production" was determined by the researcher as acceptable terminology to include all of these programs. The intention was not to limit the programs by defining them with this category. The intention was to offer more inclusive phrasing that called attention to the specific type of learning activities taking place in the classroom.

Intended Student Learning Outcomes: Intended learning outcomes are student-centered statements that describe what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, understand, know, do, etc., with the knowledge they have gained as a result of the educational experiences they have had (Huba & Freed, 2000; Maki, 2002).

Liberal Arts Outcomes: Liberal arts outcomes are usually defined at the organizational level in higher education. These outcomes can differ from institution to institution. As previously discussed, this study defines these outcomes using specific *Domains* that are linked to the

current literature available on this topic. Participants were questioned on their processes of these *Domains*.

Pitches: The formal oral presentation of an idea, storyline or film project given to a group of gatekeepers or stakeholders with the intention of garnering support in the form of resources.

Production Cycle: The production cycle refers to industry defined steps taken to produce a film/video project. This definition is offered to express the processes and procedures that are referred to by the participants in this study. In addition, this term as well as the definitions of the stages to follow are used by participants as descriptors in assignments, stages of student development, as well as course titling. The following areas make up the production cycle and are listed in chronological order:

> ***Development:*** This stage refers to generating ideas. Some of the related activities include: Idea conception, writing treatments, scriptwriting and pitching just to name a few.

> ***Pre-Production:*** This stage refers to planning the production. Some of the related activities include: Storyboarding, location scouting, script breakdowns, budgeting, scheduling, casting, and rehearsing just to name a few.

> ***Production:*** This stage refers to capturing/recording the performance on visual and audio formats. Some of the related activities include: Lighting, blocking, filming (shooting), audio recording and re-shooting just to name a few.

> ***Post Production:*** This stage refers to the editing process. In editing the captured recordings from the production stage are then manipulated to create a final output. The intention is to construct a final output that meets the communication goals set forth in the development stage. Some of the related activities include: Image editing, story editing, sound editing, color editing, and special effects editing just to name a few.

> ***Distribution:*** This stage refers to delivering the final output to an audience for exhibition. Some of the related activities include: Film festival submission and participation, screenings, sales and marketing, public relations and business dealings with distribution companies just to name a few.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to explore assessment strategies that address liberal arts educational outcomes for students studying film/video production. In order to achieve this goal, a thorough investigation of current literature was conducted. This served the purpose of informing the topic as well as giving context to the research being conducted. One of the goals of the researcher was to discover emerging themes in assessment to serve the education of film/video production students with respect to learner needs as well as industry demands and requirements. Exploring relevant literature produced a deeper understanding of the process instructors were involved in when engaging in the activity of assessment. It also helped to answer the central question of this research: How do instructors embed the goals of a liberal arts education into the assessment of student work produced in film/video production coursework?

Attainment of a Film Production Education

Training for professions in the film industry spawned out of the Hollywood studio system of the 1920s. During this time, on-the-job training and apprenticeships were the main course of educational activities. These informal training programs produced workers with specialization in a variety of positions found at all levels in the film production process (Pawlak, 2011). As the studio system fell, due to political actions and unionized labor, the need for organized formal education in the discipline of moving image production was introduced in higher education in order to meet industry demands.

Today, there are three dominant pathways for education in film and video production. These avenues exist in three distinct institutional settings. The first is what is categorized as

Career and Technical Education. In CTE programs students gain vocational skill training to become technicians in the field. These programs focus on technical training in order to produce specialists with specific competencies relevant to a division of labor in the film industry. "Career and Technical Education (CTE) is the preferable nomenclature for trade schools such as Full Sail Academy in Florida or Compass Film Academy in Michigan, whose mantra is real world instruction – professional rather than academic" (Muir, 2013, p. 3). This view of CTE programs presented by Muir does not include the realm of community college education. In the community college setting, CTE programs are offered with the intention of providing training as pathways to employment and fill a community need in the local industry. However, within this type of educational program, the time and resources needed to cultivate skills outside the essential technical requirements is usually not possible due to the scope and mission of these programs and institutions.

The second opportunity for film production education comes in the form of film schools. Film school education is found in Master of Fine Arts (MFA) programs and specialized art school environments where students engage with film production curriculum only. "A film school is generally described as a separate, predominately graduate focused department within universities" (Muir, 2013, p. 3). These specialized schools have produced successful students ready for the challenges of the film industry; however, they have been the targets for considerable debate.

The "big five" film schools reside at the University of Southern California (USC), the University of California-Los Angeles, the American Film Institute, Columbia University, and New York University (NYU) (Johnson, 1991; Jones & DeFillipi 1996). Johnson (1991) pointed out that these schools' reputations may not stem from their academic rigor and

superior curriculum design but, rather, their geographical location. Each school is situated in

a major production region and capitalizes on the unique opportunity to link students directly

to professional connections within these industry epicenters. However, an industry

gatekeeper, Roger Corwin, offered a specific shortcoming of the educational process within

these types of film schools. "My only criticism of film school graduates is that their

education has been so wholly centered on film that you wish they'd learned a little more

about history or English literature" (as cited by Svitil, 1990, p. 38).

Opportunities within film schools have been recognized as ways to integrate

interdisciplinary strategies to produce wider educational experiences for students (Hodge,

2009). However, the curriculum design at most film schools reflects that of programs

intending on producing specialists armed with film theory and practice. The integration of

such topics of leadership, collaboration or other "soft skills" has been slow to finding its

place in the curriculum of film schools. Muir (2013) stated: "…post-graduate film schools

do not teach liberal arts classes nor generally require an undergraduate degree in the liberal

arts as a pre-requisite. It seems confusing that relatively few film production programs are

integrated at the undergraduate level within liberal arts colleges and universities" (p. 21).

These programs focus on theory and practice and steer away from some of the skills that

seem to be a natural fit in the film/video production education process.

The third setting for film production education is based in liberal arts institutions. In

a liberal arts context, film/video production students engage in an interdisciplinary

curriculum with a goal of developing students with a worldview as well as specific

vocational skill sets. "The overarching goal of a liberal arts education is to provide students

with the necessary skills to construct lives of substance and achievement, helping them to

become wise citizens" (King et al., 2007, p. 1). This integrated approach has a long-standing

history in American education, yet Berberet and Wong (1995) have labeled a liberal art

education as *The New American College Model*. According to the Partnership for 21st

Century Learning (P21), the complexity of the 21st century workplace requires institutions to

offer training that meets industry demands not only in technical capabilities. Areas such as

critical thinking, creative collaboration and leadership skills are vital for current and future

workplaces. Muir (2013) has argued that the natural setting for film production education is

found in a liberal arts context in the following:

> Sabal (2001) states that liberal arts outcomes are inherent in the media
> production process: outcomes such as communication, critical thinking and
> analysis, leadership, and management. Thus film production is much more
> suited to this environment – superior to the apprenticeship or trade school
> system where liberal arts are absent and trades are emphasized, and superior
> to the film school model which adds extraneous stratums of time and money.
> (p. 3)

Jones and Defillippi (1996) reinforced this premise by suggesting that a well-rounded film

education is best attained with the integration of transferable communication skills that are

found in the intended outcomes of a liberal arts education. In order to more fully understand

the intention of a liberal education further discussion is necessary.

The Liberal Arts Tradition

A liberal arts education is focused on producing students with the ability to navigate

complexities through communication, critical thinking, creativity and higher order thinking

skills. The educational process a student engages in while receiving a liberal arts education

is based on an interdisciplinary approach that exposes students to diverse views and subjects.

A liberal arts education often times capitalizes on an integrated approach to learning. "It

provides students with broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g., science, culture, and society) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest" (Association of American Colleges and Universities [AAC&U] Website). The broad goals of a liberal arts education are to produce students armed with transferable knowledge and practical skills in areas such as communication, problem solving, as well as social responsibility and ethical sensibilities (King et al, 2007). This type of student is thought to be ready to contribute to society and live a meaningful life.

These broad goals are at the heart of this long-standing American tradition of education. Even though critics of liberal arts education point to the concepts of these lofty goals as becoming obsolete (Muir, 2013), Glyer and Weeks (1998) eloquently described the existence of a liberal arts education in the following:

> Does liberal education foster independence or interdependence, look to the past or the future, develop national identity or global citizenship, promote unity or diversity, cultivate moral or intellectual virtue, address urgent social problems or timeless human dilemmas, help students understand the world or motivate them to change it, inculcate respect for eternal verities or nurture a spirit of skepticism, lead to personal introspection or promote social action? Is liberal education concerned with transmission of knowledge or with the advancement of knowledge? Is it elitist and aristocratic or egalitarian and democratic? Is it preparatory or an end in itself, an introduction to different disciplines or interdisciplinary, preparation for specialization or a counter balance to specialization? The literature suggests liberal education does all of these things and more. (pg. x)

It is quite possible that this perspective is what leads people into the field of education (Fort, 2011). The philosophy that guides educators and administrators alike is only one variable when searching for validation of the liberal arts education as means to preparing students for today's workforce.

Liberal arts originated in the middle ages as a way to develop well-rounded citizens by exposing them to subjects in the arts and sciences (Wagner, 1983). The world has progressed and new industries have evolved or emerged. King et al. (2007) stated, "As the needs of contemporary society have grown more diverse and complex, the purposes of a liberal arts education have experienced greater pressure to adapt to the changing world" (p. 2). This leads to the question: Are the general concepts of a liberal arts education current as a means to developing the desired outcomes of students in today's world? It was not long ago that the late technology guru Steve Jobs stated: "It's in Apple's DNA that technology alone is not enough. It's technology married with liberal arts, married with the humanities, that yields the results that make our hearts sing" (as cited by Lehrer, 2011, p. 1). Statements like this call for an investigation into what skills are deemed critical for the 21st century.

Partnership for 21st Century Learning is an organization dedicated to identifying and communicating the skills that are critical for today's students as they move through their academic life. The organization not only identifies necessary skills, but strategies for integration, assessment, policy and frameworks for these skills to be capitalized upon in an educational setting. They have identified four key areas that they have coined *21st Century Skills*. "21st Century Skills are a set of academic building blocks—abilities and ways of thinking" (P21 Website). Sometimes referred to at the *4C's*, these skills are critical thinking and problem solving, communication, collaboration, creativity and innovation (P21 Website). These identified skills seem to parallel that which liberal arts education aims to provide.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities has conducted multiple studies on liberal arts education and its relevance and application to 21st century workforce needs. From these findings it appears that a liberal arts education is quite relevant to

industry. "According to a 2013 survey conducted by Hart Research Associates on behalf of

AAC&U, 74 percent of employers would recommend this educational approach to college-

bound students" (Hart Research Associates, 2013). Findings of this study indicated that

innovation is deemed an essential skill that employers are looking for in new hires. "Nearly

all employers surveyed (95%) say they give hiring preference to college graduates with skills

that will enable them to contribute to innovation in the workplace" (Hart Research

Associates, 2013). In addition to these findings, the reports provided a summary of the

following:

- Nearly all those surveyed (93%) agree, "a candidate's demonstrated capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems is more important than their undergraduate major."

- More than nine in ten of those surveyed say it is important that those they hire demonstrate ethical judgment and integrity; intercultural skills; and the capacity for continued new learning.

- More than three in four employers say they want colleges to place more emphasis on helping students develop five key learning outcomes, including: critical thinking, complex problem-solving, written and oral communication, and applied knowledge in real-world settings.

- Employers endorse several educational practices as potentially helpful in preparing college students for workplace success. These include practices that require students to a) conduct research and use evidence-based analysis; b) gain in-depth knowledge in the major and analytic, problem solving, and communication skills; and c) apply their learning in real-world settings.

These findings suggest that potential employers are not missing the value of the intended

liberal arts educational outcomes for the 21st century.

In a different survey conducted by the Conference Board, Corporate Voices and

Working Families, The Partnership for 21st Century Skills and the Society for Human

Resource Management found "that applied skills such as oral communication, critical

thinking, creativity and teamwork "trump basic knowledge and skills, such as reading comprehension and mathematics," for career success" (McNutt, 2014, p. 1). Advertising agency CEO, Val DiFebo, elaborated on the topic of the value of a liberal arts education. "DiFebo says the creativity and critical thinking skills associated with liberal arts majors sets them apart. For success and innovation in her industry, DiFebo believes a liberal arts education might be better than a specific career-ready degree" (p. 1). This suggests that there is merit to developing educational platforms that blend technical skills with intellectual abilities to process information and communicate alternate solutions. Looking deeper into the intended outcomes of a liberal arts education and identifying these outcomes can help educators better prepare students to meet the challenges in the current and future workplace.

Identifying intended Liberal Arts outcomes

A team of researchers set out to identify the prevailing outcomes of a liberal arts education in today's educational environment. "The Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNSLAE) was designed to explore the conditions and experiences that facilitate the achievement of liberal arts outcomes (King et al., 2007, p. 3). This inquiry was based on an extensive review of past and current literature on the topic of liberal arts outcomes. In addition, the researchers conducted a series of interviews with students and faculty to examine their individual experiences. The intention was to identify reoccurring themes that emerged and point to possible outcome domains.

The researchers recognized that their inquiry needed to be situated in the context of the aforementioned "21st Century Skill" based society we live in. "To carry out such visions of liberal education, colleges and universities are seeking to prepare students with skills that

are not context-specific or bound by the limitations of our current understanding of known

problems but that instead are applicable to new and changing contexts, expanding knowledge

bases, and emerging issues" (King et al., 2007, p. 2). The findings of this study cumulated

with seven categories of outcomes. The seven outcomes that the researchers presented are

groupings that are rooted in processes specific to the traditionally broad goals of a liberal arts

education:

- Integration of learning
- Inclination to inquire and life long learning
- Effective reasoning and problem solving
- Moral character
- Intercultural effectiveness
- Leadership
- Well-being (King et al., 2007, p. 5)

The researchers pointed out that this list of liberal arts outcomes has two distinguishing

characteristics. The first is how these outcomes are related. They suggested that each

domain is interdependent with the others, meaning that outcomes are interacting and

mutually shaping each other as the student is constructing knowledge and skills. This

concept suggests that the development of student outcomes is based on a holistic process ie.,

a process that individuals experience as they engage with this integrated outlook of

education.

The second distinguishing characteristic of the seven outcomes is their developmental

grounding. King et al. (2007) suggested "…that the achievement of each outcome requires

integrating abilities across domains of development that have traditionally been separated"

(p. 4). The intention of an interdisciplinary curriculum is for students to make connections

across disciplines. These findings support this strategy of educational organization. The

embedded processes and concepts found within each outcome require interplay in order for students to reach attainment in a domain.

The findings of the study offered insight into the implementation of these outcomes on college campuses. They suggested that curricular and co-curricular activities need to be rooted within these outcomes. Additionally, educational planning and assessment activities need to reflect the underlying concepts of these suggested domains. In conclusion King et al. (2007) offered the following:

> As institutions of higher education help students become wise citizens who embrace education not only as a benefit for themselves but also as a gift for the betterment of the public good, they should strive for development in multiple outcomes. The demands of the twenty-first century require simultaneous growth in all seven outcomes. Each institution should consider how its educators can more effectively apply an integrated perspective to curricular and co-curricular initiatives. The success of institutions in promoting student learning and development depends on finding ways to unite learning outcomes into a comprehensive plan for practice and assessment. While ambitious and intricately interconnected, the purposes of a contemporary liberal arts education remain at the heart of constructing lives of substance. (p. 9)

Assessment in higher education

The term "assessment" has different meanings within higher education (USC Center for Excellence in Education, 2016). The Oxford Living Dictionary (2016) defined the term "assess" as, "The evaluation or estimation of the nature, quality, or ability of someone or something" (n.p.). This definition is furthered by examining the term assessment. The Oxford Living Dictionary (2016) defined assessment as, "The action of assessing someone or something" (n.p.). This definition's sole emphasis on evaluation can be limiting depending on the context or the objective of the evaluation process. However, this basic interpretation can be considered the starting place for the definition of assessment in higher education. A

more robust definition of assessment specific to higher education is "the process of gathering and discussing information from multiple and diverse sources in order to develop a deep understanding of what students know, understand, and can do with their knowledge as a result of their educational experiences; the process culminates when assessment results are used to improve subsequent learning" (Huba & Freed, 2000, p.8). This definition has an emphasis on improving the learning experience.

Another definition that reflects a specific relationship to the educational process can be found by turning to the Glossary of Education Reform. The Glossary of Educational Reform is a project that has been created by the Great Schools Partnership. This organization referred to this glossary as a "comprehensive online resource that describes widely used school-improvement terms, concepts, and strategies for journalists, parents, and community members" (Glossary of Education Reform, 2016). According to the website, "assessment refers to the wide variety of methods or tools that educators use to evaluate, measure, and document the academic readiness, learning progress, skill acquisition, or educational needs of students" (n.p.). This definition included instructional techniques and tools as well as specifics of what educators are interested in evaluating. Still, this definition remains broad.

Assessment can be refined and categorized in multiple functions of assessment in higher education. Some of these areas or functions are: High stakes assessment, Pre-assessment, Formative assessment, Summative assessment, Interim assessment, Placement assessment, Screening assessment, Standardized assessment, Standards-referenced or Standards-bases assessment, Common assessment, Performance assessment and Portfolio assessment just to name a few (Glossary of Education Reform, 2016). Without defining each

of these types of assessments, this list illustrates the multiple variations that exist. "The

purpose of an assessment generally drives the way it is designed, and there are many ways in

which assessments can be used" (n.p.). This statement infers that assessment is not only an

action or process, but a critical step in the educational design for student learning and

program development.

While at Florida State University (FSU), Frank Tomasula was a part of the film

production faculty that developed an assessment strategy relying on quantified analysis of

student projects. This project was spurred on by external accreditation agencies. The faculty

was to develop "measurable outcomes and results, as well as the means by which to evaluate

artistic qualities such as talent; beauty; and 'good' screenwriting, cinematography, directing,

acting, editing, sound and set design, and so on" (Tomasula, 2008, p. 115). This subjective

nature of these qualities were met with resistance and displeasure as follows:

> To begin, I should note that I was not originally a proponent of such assessment
> strategies. The vast majority of professors in the arts disciplines are opposed to the
> "ed-speak" vocabulary and the "one size fits all" measurements that are being
> imposed on universities by state legislatures, regional accreditation boards and
> internal "quality enhancement" initiatives. Initially, I tended to think that the
> professional judgment of a qualified faculty member (usually by means of a letter
> grade) was enough assessment for my taste. True, that sort of evaluation could be
> somewhat subjective, but I felt a certain degree of subjectivity was part of the process
> of measuring student's work in the arts. (p. 115)

The FSU faculty developed specific competencies that would be assessed by multiple

reviewers of thesis film projects. These competencies were reflected in the form of Likert

Scales, expanding on the original work of O'Donnell at Chapman University in a similar

project. The results of this assessment project proved quite useful not only the faculty, but

also the students and the department which were also positively affected.

Tomasula (2008) found that student learning was being affected by providing a numeric value to areas that the student filmmaker was excelling in or needed to strengthen. The FSU Film School itself saw the benefits of this data as a way to pinpoint possible issues within the program. "If the data reveal a trend of low ratings in the areas of editing, for example, the situation can be investigated, and it can be determined whether that situation is a pedagogical problem connected with the editing curriculum or instructors or whether it is an equipment issue" (Tomasula, 2008, p. 116). In addition, this data can be used to shore up areas of weakness in a program's faculty. Trends or weaknesses that are specific to the mission and goal of a department can be used as guidelines and evidence of new faculty hires, training and professional development.

Tomasula's experience with this particular assessment project draws parallels with Lattuca and Starks (2009) work highlighting assessment within the concept of curriculum design. Tomasula plainly stated his reservations of engaging in the FSU project in the beginning stages. The "ed-speak" and concept of measurable outcomes may not always seem like an efficient endeavor for educators in the arts. However, the FSU assessment project illustrates some of the key concepts of why student outcomes assessment is important. Latucca and Stark (2009) developed the following reasoning behind this type of assessment:

- To guide student progress
- To improve course planning, program planning, and teaching
- To provide a vehicle for faculty dialogue
- To help students understand the purpose of their educational activities
- To demonstrate accountability
- To enhance public relations
- To reward (or not reward) instructors
- To gain theoretical understanding about how students change and develop
(p. 253)

When the concept of instructional assessment is embedded into the curriculum design, the application of these data is useful to many parties involved in the educational process. The aforementioned list provided further explanation of the successes that Tomasula discussed regarding the FSU project.

The Glossary of Educational Reform lists two types of evaluations that are common instructional assessments for upper level students in a film and video production program. These are the Performance assessments and Portfolio assessments (2016). "Performance assessments typically require students to complete a complex task, such as a writing assignment, science experiment, speech, presentation, performance, or long-term project, for example" (Glossary of Educational Reform, 2016). Thesis films or capstone film projects would be common assignments that would fall into this type of assessment. The FSU project reflected this type of assessment.

The other type of common assessment in upper level film and video production courses is Portfolio based assessment. "Portfolio-based assessments are collections of academic work—for example, assignments, lab results, writing samples, speeches, student-created films, or art projects—that are compiled by students and assessed by teachers in consistent ways" (Glossary of Educational Reform, 2016). A student demo reel or portfolio of paperwork, scripts, script break downs, set and lighting designs, budgets etc. could be considered portfolio pieces.

These two assessment types are not the only strategies film and video production instructors use in the classroom. The need to define the term assessment for clarification needs to be addressed. Up until this point, basic assessment definitions have been examined, various types of assessments have been listed, and the implementation and importance of this

process has been illustrated. When assessing liberal arts outcomes, the objective is to gage and measure stated liberal arts outcomes. For this reason, Latucca and Stark's (2009) definition of Assessment (Goal-Focused Evaluation) was used as not only a process of assessment, but also as the definition. "Assessment is a four-step empirical method of determining the demonstrable intended outcomes of student learning. It includes: (a) establishing clear objectives, (b) developing assessment tools, (c) obtaining the desired information, and (d) interpreting the congruence between achievement and objectives. Most goal-focused evaluation focuses on quantitative assessment of student learning, but alternative forms of assessment, such as judgments of student performances and student portfolios are becoming more common" (p. 234). This definition includes the process that educators engage in when specific outcomes are intended by the curriculum. Gaging these outcomes through this defined process is then left up to the classroom instructors.

Bloom's Taxonomy

Coursework assessment is a processes that instructors develop as they create assignments which link to a learning objectives or outcome. Oftentimes, instructors search form models to inform both their assessment and instructional processes. One such model that is commonly used by classroom professionals is known as *Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain* (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956).

In 1948, a group of educators led by Benjamin S. Bloom set out to develop a classification system encompassing learning goals and objectives. The results of this project produced what was first published under the title *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain* (Bloom et al., 1956).

This work has since been commonly referred to as *Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain*.

The original taxonomy was structured into levels, or domains. According to Krathwohl

(2002):

> The original Taxonomy provided carefully developed definitions for each of
> the six major categories in the cognitive domain. The categories were
> Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and
> Evaluation. (p. 212)

Progression from one domain to the next is successive and subject to the full understanding

of the prior domain. "The major idea of the taxonomy is that what educators want students to

know (encompassed in statements of educational objectives) can be arranged in a hierarchy

from less to more complex" (Huitt, 2011, p. 1). When applied to coursework evaluation, this

linear progression provides scaffolding to the educational assessment process. "Throughout

the years, the levels have often been depicted as a stairway, leading many teachers to

encourage their students to "climb to a higher (level of) thought" (Forehand, 2010, p. 42).

In 2001, Lorin Anderson, one of Bloom's former students, and Krathwohl led a team

of researchers to re-examine Bloom's original work. This endeavor produced a revision to

Bloom's original framework. The revision included new category names. These names were

switched from nouns to active verbs. This suggested a movement toward the application of

this framework to a more outcomes based educational setting (Huitt, 2011). According to

Krathwohl (2002):

> Our revision of the original Taxonomy is a two-dimensional framework: Knowledge
> and Cognitive Processes. The former most resembles the subcategories of the
> original *Knowledge* category. The latter resembles the six categories of the original
> Taxonomy with the *Knowledge* category named ***Remember***, the Comprehension
> category named ***Understand***, Synthesis renamed ***Create*** and made the top category,
> and the remaining categories changed to their verb forms: ***Apply, Analyze***, and
> ***Evaluate***. They are arranged in a hierarchical structure, but not as rigidly as in the
> original Taxonomy. (p. 218)

According to Forehand (2010), "The Revised Bloom's Taxonomy Table clarifies the fit of each lesson plan's purpose, 'essential question,' goal or objective" (p. 42). Several researchers have examined *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001) citing the framework's foundational relevance and application in classroom assessment (Huitt, 2011; Forehand, 2010; Amer, 2006). Other researchers have studied and applied the concepts of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001) to specific fields spawning new revisions in specific fields (Churches, 2008; Noble, 2004; Pickard 2007).

Assessing Liberal Arts outcomes

The process of identifying liberal arts outcomes is only necessary if assessment is the intended activity on the horizon. Outcomes assessment is a certain reality in the realm of higher education. Outcomes assessment is used in a variety of ways; accreditation, funding, promotion, resource allocation etc. However, the activity of assessing learners in regards to outcomes is sometimes mystifying and frustrating to instructors at the collegiate level (Fort, 2011). According to Andrew Fort (2011), a professor at Texas Christian University, "assessment requires a way of thinking for which the vast majority of professors have not been prepared by their academic training" (p. 1). Fort (2011) further explained, "I have been teaching for over a quarter century, I was never trained in, nor truly understood, "outcomes assessment." I regarded it as a task to be completed for an outside accreditor that had little relation to my real 'liberal arts' goals for students" (p. 1). This challenge to fully embrace assessment of outcomes that professor Fort described was alleviated when he took initiative to engage in a pilot program of liberal arts outcome assessment at his institution.

Dr. Fort engaged in designing rubrics, as well as assignments, with purpose to measure the learning of his students in regards to stated outcomes. This active process reinforced the challenge of assessing liberal arts outcomes. Fort (2011) stated, "Liberal education goals are notoriously abstract and hard to measure". As he progressed through the development of his assessment materials and tools, Dr. Fort became aware of the many benefits to this activity. "I have begun truly to see the point of focusing on student learning, and that doing so has improved my teaching and my students' learning" (Fort, 2011, p. 1). The realization that educators at the college and university level may have little instructional training outside of their specific discipline is a truth that administrators need to accept. Creating 'buy in' to the activity of assessment needs to be built with relevant purpose for those involved.

The challenge of assessing liberal arts outcomes as "value added", that Dr. Fort pointed out, is reinforced by the research team of Grace, Andereck, and Ford (2008). In regards to the intended outcomes of a liberal arts education, Grace et al. (2008) stated, "the concrete evidence supporting that added value claim remains somewhat elusive" (p.1). This research team conducted a three-year study into the effectiveness of a liberal arts education. Their inquiry focused on the assessment of creative and critical thinking in liberal arts based curriculums. These are two of the key skills that P21 defined as 21st Century Skills. The major concern the researchers had was if it was "possible to develop a single instrument or set of instruments to assess critical and creative thinking" (Grace et al., 2008, p. 2). Three of the key initial findings were:

- Creative thinking can be taught;
- Critical thinking and creative thinking are both process and product; and

- Efforts to create a general rubric to assess either critical thinking or creative thinking should be initially subordinated to constructing rubrics that enable faculty members to assess a wide range or qualities and behaviors based on specific assignment and pedagogies.

The team also found that faculty members struggled with defining critical thinking or creative thinking in an educational context. The need for a comprehensive definition of these two outcomes can help clarify this outcome when conducting assessment. In addition, identifying the cognitive process and characteristics associated with these two outcomes will help guide the assessment process.

As their research concluded, new findings were produced. A few of the more relevant findings as it pertains to the development of a rubric and the understanding of creative and critical thinking in an institutional setting were (Grace et al., 2008, p. 3):

- It is possible to construct a valid generic critical and creative thinking rubric that can be used reliably to measure change in critical and creative thinking skills in both longitudinal and cross-sectional testing across the curriculum.

- Faculty and students value both critical and creative thinking.

- Diversity is believed to facilitate both critical and creative thinking.

The development of a generic rubric to gauge critical and creative thinking is possible. Thus, these two somewhat elusive liberal arts outcomes are possible to measure. A discussion of how institutions are aligning programs to capitalize on developing such outcomes in students may produce relevant application for this type of learner assessment.

Rethinking the Liberal Arts curriculum

Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) has developed new educational opportunities for its history undergraduates. According to Benson (2015), President and Professor of Government, "History majors at EKU can now choose from among 23 career paths designed

to meld a broad liberal arts background with specific skill sets via a second major or minor in such fields as broadcasting and electronic media, journalism, public relations, advertising, paralegal sciences, economics, geography, communication studies, management, and globalization and international affairs, among other" (p. 1). As educators and administrators begin to shift traditional approaches to education in order to produce outcomes that are in line with the goals of a liberal arts education, it is important to have a clearer understanding of how specific outcomes are grouped. Additionally, instructional strategies that align with producing such outcomes need to be examined.

Texas A&M University eliminated their journalism program 10 years ago due to the overall cost to operate the program. Leadership at the institution is now reopening the program with a revamped curriculum strategy being branded as a "Liberal Arts Degree in Journalism" (Grasgreen, 2013, p. 2). The new curriculum at Texas A&M will have an "interdisciplinary approach to education that includes an emphasis on critical thinking and writing" (Grasgreen, p. 1). The intention is to produce students that are able to research information, deduce the data and communicate the findings with the objective to solve problems. According to Grasgreen, "The "Liberal Arts Degree in Journalism" curriculum will include a variety of electives and cross-listed courses as well as classes on new media, writing and reporting on multiple platforms" (p. 2). The reopening of the program with a new emphasis on liberal arts outcomes is calling attention to interdisciplinary strategies with the intention of producing 21st Century Skills.

The illustration of existing programs that are retooling to produce liberal arts outcomes is one aspect of the current change happening on campuses across America. It has been established that organizational change is an uncomfortable process for all of those

involved (Bolman & Deal, 2011, 2013; Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 2004; Drucker 2008,

2009). The academic environment is not immune to the strain that change can produce.

Film/video production programs are new to many campus environments. New programs can

cause strain on the existing culture of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2011).

Administrators and instructors may need to examine the curriculum as a means to streamline

a film/video production program's intentions of producing student outcome in tune with a

liberal arts mission.

The potential of film production curricula

The term curriculum has many meanings to various parties. In order to simplify this

term Lattuca and Stark (2009) defined curriculum as an *academic plan*. "Our goal in

conceptualizing curriculum as an academic plan is to identify the critical decision points that,

if effectively addressed, will enhance the academic experience of students" (p. 4). According

to the authors, "The academic plan definition implies a deliberate planning process that

focuses attention on important educational considerations, which will vary by field of study,

instructors, students, institutional goals and so on" (p. 4). Furthermore …

> In our view, an academic plan should involve decisions about (at least) the
> following elements:
>
> 1. Purpose: The general goals that guide the knowledge, skills and attitudes
>   to be learned.
> 2. Content: The subject matter or content within which the learning
>   experiences are embedded.
> 3. Sequence: An arrangement of the subject matter intended to lead to
>   specific outcomes for learners.
> 4. Learners: Information about the learners for whom the plan is devised.
> 5. Instructional Processes: The instructional activities by which learning may
>   be achieved.
> 6. Instructional Resources: The materials and settings to be used in the
>   learning process.

7. Evaluation: The strategies used to determine if skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behavior change as a result of the learning process.
8. Adjustment: Changes in the plan to increase learning, based on experience and evaluation. (Lattuca & Stark, 2009, p. 4)

When developing an academic plan, it is important to keep the complexity of the learners and their needs at the forefront. "Ideas of how students learn in specific domains of knowledge are helpful for thinking about how motivation, interest, prior knowledge, and epistemological beliefs affect what is leaned and how well it is learning" (Lattuca & Stark, 2009, p. 174).

Lattucca and Stark (2009) pointed to the examination of a program's curriculum as one way to produce findings of academic plans that are being developed specifically for students. A recent study conducted by Muir (2013) was one of the first to focus on the development of curriculum for film production programs. One specific challenge that Muir (2013) addressed in this work was the lack of a defined curriculum design for film production programs within a liberal arts setting.

Muir (2013) argued that the lack of a specific governing body for accreditation in this specific discipline has hurt its overall credibility in higher education. A major obstacle to establish credibility within the academy has been the absence of an ongoing conversation of curriculum design. "As a result of this insubstantiality, the film production curriculum design process must be critically studied with particular attention given to how the decisions are made and enacted" (p. 8). Muir's work addressed this shortcoming by conducting a grounded theory study of the decision making process of leaders that are currently designing programs in the field for film production education.

Muir's (2013) findings did not produce evidence of a particular design that is being used by educators; however, emerging themes were categorized and used to build a theoretical framework based on Lattuca and Stark's (2009) sociocultural model. The context of Muir's study was that of traditional liberal arts education. This setting was deemed advantageous due to the value of interdisciplinary educational strategies inherent in liberal arts education and its perceived contributions to a student's filmmaking education (Muir, 2013).

Muir (2013) found that there was a lack of substantial evidence that suggests exactly how institutions are implementing interdisciplinary strategies and measuring outcomes of liberal arts educational foundations in film program curriculum designs. The product of these strategies is what some professional educators believe are at the heart of what students need to develop to be successful within the industry (Hodge, 2009, Harkkarainen et al., 2007).

In addition, Muir's study pointed out areas in need of further study. One of the most concerning issues that Muir uncovered was in regards to teaching film production with the goals of a liberal arts institution. After studying 10 liberal arts schools that offer film production programs, Muir (2013) stated, "There were no required classes in subjects such as leadership, ethics, group communication, or conflict management, nor were there any substantial evidences of how these concepts are taught or assessed within specific production classes" (p. 177). If these types of skills are indeed crucial to the needs of graduates entering the workforce, it would appear that these topics need to be situated in the outcomes assessment portion of curriculum planning. However, this is not to say that the outcomes are not being produced by classroom instruction within college film and video production

programs. Muir's theoretical framework for film production curriculum is only a starting point and lays a foundation for a possible structure in the development of such programs in a liberal arts institution.

The lack of research in the area of film and video production education makes it difficult to determine if current film production curriculums are reaching their full potential for student learning (Erikksona & Swenberg, 2012). It has been established that the liberal arts tradition is concerned with developing a student's worldview. In regards to film production curriculum, this concern can be addressed by implementing strategies to connect the multiple areas of study that are present in the filmmaking process. This may better prepare students for the media production industry as well as needs of today's workforce. However, there is a lack of understanding of how film/video production courses are being taught or assessed at any level. Instructors are left on their own to decide if and how these concerns can be addressed.

In film production academic programs, most textbooks and research lack the idea of creativity collaboration, team building, leadership or any of the overall intended outcomes of a liberal arts education. Erikssona and Swenberga (2012) argued, "these production manuals treat the various production phases as separate, isolated activities and do not explicitly address issues of interconnectivities" (p. 57). The requirements of a liberal arts education expose students to multiple subjects and disciplines. Strategies to shed light on the connection between these subjects are often times left up to the student or instructor (Muir, 2013). Film/video production educators designing learning opportunities to make these connections have a powerful and multifaceted process at their disposal (Theodosakis, 2002). Harkkarainen (2007) suggested the following:

> However, the small body of research on university student producers of DV
> suggest that the production process can promote the active (Hung, Keppell, &
> Jon, 2004; Hakkarainen, Saarelainen, & Fuokamo, 2007), intentional,
> constructive, authentic, cooperative, creative (Hung et al.) collaborative,
> conversational, contextual, and emotional aspects of students' meaningful
> learning processes. (p. 212)

These avenues for learning enable instructors a plethora of strategies for information to be

exchanged. In addition, a byproduct of engaging in this process offers opportunities to

develop student outcomes reflecting the liberal arts tradition.

USC Film School Faculty member Carroll Hodge believes artistic collaboration and

creative conflict negotiation are skills that need to be infused into film production

curriculums. Hodge (2009) stated, "beyond the practical use of skilled collaboration to avoid

disasters, there is much more: the enhancement of a filmmaker's ability to work well with a

rich variety of personalities to consider a wider set of artistic possibilities, resulting in the

realization of a more compelling artistic vision" (p. 1). Hodge urged colleagues to consider

the tools of collaboration as genuine skills that are essential for students studying the art of

filmmaking.

The complex process of filmmaking is best served when different perspectives from

technical experts have the opportunity to exchange ideas in a collaborative environment.

This type of environment is dependent on organizational design and, according to Latucca

and Stark (2009), has a direct interplay in curriculum planning. Hodge (2009) stated, "Our

students need access to the best creative collaboration experiences we can design for them at

the beginning of and throughout their program, not at the end" (p. 1). Hodge (2009) also

offered insight from authors that have written on topics usually intended for business school

and is adamant that filmmaking is starved for creative leadership. "Collaboration thrives

when the creative "leadership" is granted to whoever in the moment has the best idea or

solution to a difficulty rather than who is in the most powerful role" (Hodge, 2009, p. 1). In

an industry that is a balance of technical expertise and artistic vision, a film/video production

student who gains knowledge in collaboration and navigating conflict will be better equipped

for success.

As Muir (2013) has pointed out, there is a lack of understanding of how assessment is

being conducted in regards to student outcomes within liberal arts film production programs.

However, instructors such as Hodge (2009), and Erikssona and Swenberga (2012) recognized

the inherent opportunities and need for 21st Century Skills to be infused into such a

curriculum. The disconnect that these instructors elaborated on may best be resolved by

establishing assessment processes and protocols that are relevant to the field of study in

question.

Filmmaking as a dynamic process

In order to produce relevancy in terms of accessing measurements of student learning,

research on specific 21st century skills related to filmmaking needs to be addressed.

Classroom activities, instructional practices and teacher perceptions are ways to access this

type of information. A deeper review of literature in this area may result in a greater

understanding of appropriate outcomes that should be assessed and how such assessments

can be conducted. This process should not only be limited to film/video production

programs, but also parallel disciplines. Due to the lack of current research, similar types of

programs may offer data that can be used to strengthen the instruction and assessment of

these outcomes. Thus, it may lead to a stronger educational experience for the students. In

addition, examining instructional practices of incorporating the filmmaking process in the classroom needs to be addressed. This may reveal and illustrate the naturally embedded learning opportunities in this creative process in order to identify skills that can be assessed appropriately.

Hodge's (2009) insight into the use of collaboration in the active pursuit of producing a film is only one of the inherent processes a person goes through while working on a film project. The process of filmmaking invites the use of creative expression by participants and offers pathways to apply and develop higher order thinking skills outside the classroom. Theodosakis (2002) stated, "While the benefits of filmmaking in the classroom encompass student awareness, creativity, engagement, technical learning, it also provides a beautiful bridge to life outside the classroom" (p. 21). Theodosakis expressed a belief that filmmaking can be a useful tool in four major student learning skills objectives: communication, problem solving, research, and analysis.

Higher order thinking skills apply to what Theodosakis (2002) referred to as the *Visioning* stage: "Filmmaking is about turning the intangible into the tangible" (p. 21). Making a film requires the participants to develop an idea, explore that idea and logically decide how to communicate the idea to an audience. Within this process, filmmakers engage in in-depth research to enhance the story they are telling. Today, students have a multitude of research devices at their fingertips. Organizing and applying their research into a film project is a practical experience. Actively using analytical skills and applying logical solutions to problems engage students in real world problem based learning. Theodosakis (2002) offered this illustration of a common film production example:

> Sometimes when I am putting together a film, I feel like I'm in the middle of a giant algebraic equation. So many decisions in filmmaking are affected by so many other decisions. IF it is sunny we WILL shoot Scene 16 by the lake with all the actors and props required for that scene, BUT IF it rains THEN we will shoot the interior scene in the cabin living room. There are so many decisions that are interwoven into all of the other decisions that filmmaking requires the development and utilization of good logical thinking skills. (p. 22)

The higher order thinking skills that Theodosakis (2002) referred to make it possible for collaboration to flourish. Film/video production rarely happens without multiple members working in a team environment. Filmmaking presents barriers that students need to work through as a group. In order to optimize student learning outcomes Tatebe (2011) suggested that "…film assignments must be designed so that the difficulties that are inherent in the process, such as the hierarchical organization of production crews and the resulting power relationships, are carefully monitored and structured in order to maintain a sense of respect among team members" (p. 84). Building trust and respect within a group is an important aspect of successful teambuilding (Forsyth, 2006). Leadership skills for the future will rely on teambuilding as an essential practice. The process of making a film has great potential for students to not only develop technical capabilities but also leadership and team building skills.

Columbia College Chicago professor, Hardin (2009), conducted a research project on the topic of collaboration and human behavior traits found in film students. The purpose of the study was to "investigate how interpersonal dynamics affect the final film and the education of the individual student" (Hardin, 2009, p. 1). A major finding was that students are open to the collaborative process and see value in understanding group dynamics, but have more desire to hone technical skills in an institutional laboratory. However, upper level students seemed to find more value in the collaborative process: "To little surprise, advanced

students in the Practicum, Animation and Independent Project initiatives find that

collaboration has been overwhelmingly beneficial to them as developing filmmakers"

(Hardin, 2009, p. 1).

According to the study, students that have a firm grasp of technical experience saw

benefit from understanding the process of group interactions. However, the degree of

engagement in collaboration was not measured, which may alter the findings. Hardin (2009)

suggested:

> Film schools can translate the bottom-line reality of the film industry —
> prioritizing craft over process — into an educational opportunity. By
> facilitating students to become more aware of behavior when collaborating,
> instructors increase the clarity and possible depth to which heartfelt stories
> manifest themselves and resonate in student collaborators, and ultimately to
> the audience. (p. 1)

Additional data should be accumulated to more clearly establish student outcomes.

Filmmaking as a learning tool

Liberal arts institutions rely on a curriculum that reaches across fields of study. This

strategy is employed with the intention of developing a student's capacity to recognize how

topics interrelate. The act of producing a film is a microcosm of this philosophy. Other

areas of study are looking to capitalize on the opportunities and learning experiences found in

the filmmaking process.

Filmmaking is currently being used as a tool to promote interdisciplinary curriculum.

The creative activity of filmmaking employs skills that are embedded in multiple disciplines.

In order to be successful, students call on skills commonly found in fields such as Performing

Arts, Business, Communication, English and Design, just to name a few. However, the

connections of these topics are not usually explicit or defined in film/video production course

design. Ironically, areas of study outside the discipline of filmmaking have recognized the

activities that are inherent in film production as valid learning opportunities. Engaging

students in creative activities such as filmmaking has many intended learning outcomes.

According to Hu, Scheuch, Schwartz, Gayles, and Li (2008), two of these common intended

outcomes will:

> Enhance undergraduate education through hands-on learning activities that
> cultivate students' analytical, logical, and creative thinking, problem solving,
> curiosity, written and oral skills, and self-reliance; sufficiently train students
> to compete in an increasingly global market as future leaders, especially for
> the United States. (p. 8)

Using filmmaking as a tool in the classroom gives students tangible experiences to

apply problem-solving skills, develop research capacities and enhance time management and

logical thinking. Theodosakis (2002) argued: "Now more than ever, filmmaking in the

classroom can play a strategic role in engaging student learning and in encompassing

multiple educational objectives" (p. 23). In order to gain a better understanding of how

assessment of liberal arts outcomes of film/video production students can be accessed,

further investigation of instructional methodology needs to be addressed. Methodologies

used by outside disciplines that can be applied to the filmmaking process as a learning tool is

one way to examine this topic. This will illustrate how others have found value and

exploited this process in order to provide skill refinement and growth to students in other

disciplines.

Kearney, Jones and Roberts (2012) utilized a student-learning model for digital

filmmaking as a tool to enhance interdisciplinary curriculum outcomes at the University of

Technology in Sydney, Australia. The research spanned a two-year period. Participants

were undergraduates studying elementary education. The students were engaged in learner-

generated idea video projects referred to as iVideos. The iVideos are an emerging learning tool that requires students to develop an educational video based on a topic of academic relevance. After the videos are produced, they are then screened to an audience. "These project-based tasks can support a range of learning outcomes in most curriculum and discipline contexts, including the development of traditional and new literacy skills and affective benefits" (Kearney et al., 2012, p. 104). The purpose of the study was to develop a more effective structure to support learning across multiple disciplines when using filmmaking as a tool for teaching.

This emerging learning design was based on Kearney's (2011) prior work on learning designs for student-generated digital storytelling. "This learning design emphasized peer feedback and sharing of perspectives at all stages of the filmmaking process" (Kearney, 2011, p. 104). Digital storytelling slightly differs from iVideos. "Digital stories combine the tradition of oral storytelling with 21st century multimedia and communications tools" (Kearney et al., 2012, p. 104.) Storytelling relies on conveying its message through an engaging story, while iVideos are "research-based and advocate a cause" (Kearney et al., p. 107). However, both forms of communication are similar enough that the researchers perceived it would be advantageous to build on the design suggested by Kearney (2011).

The learning design for digital storytelling was modified specifically for iVideo projects and implemented by the research team. "The design included a requirement for students to write a research-based rationale to enhance academic rigor and guide filmmaking. It also emphasizes wide audience participation and peer feedback, especially from partner institutions (Kearney et al., 2012, p. 118). The findings of this study reflected positive gains by students in regards to these modifications. Both qualitative and quantitative data

supported the requirement for a research-based rationale in the development stage of iVideos. A majority of the students reflected on this requirement as a means to a deeper learning experience in the subject matter. In addition, the students were required to screen their iVideos with students from the United Kingdom who were participating in a similar type of project. Supported by qualitative data, Kearney et al. (2012) stated: "International perspectives on the iVideo topics extended student views on the commonality and difference faced by educators on different sides of the world" (p. 116). Engaging students in idea videos and digital filmmaking is an effective way to reach a broader audience and exchange information in the educational process.

The findings suggest that filmmaking is being offered as a cross-disciplinary tool in higher education. In addition to this study, other activities such as a planned festival showcasing educational films offer evidence of filmmaking as a tool for educational outcomes. In 2012, The University Counsel for Educational Administration (UCEA) held the first annual UCEA Film Festival. Eight films were screened at the festival. Faculty and students in the field of educational leadership produced the films.

Friend (2013) detailed the relevance of this festival and how digital filmmaking can support educational endeavors. Friend (2013) stated, "Advances in video production technology have made filmmaking more accessible as an active learning tool for faculty members and candidates in educational leadership programs" (p. 1). This technology was showcased in the festival with specific attention to educational topics. Friend described the innovative use of filmmaking at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Educational Leadership students that were enrolled in a Media and Public Relations course were required to create "video portfolios that included a formal address to a group of stakeholders and a

simulated television news interview pertaining to a crisis situation in a school" (Friend, 2013, p. 1). These experiential learning exercises simulated real world situations that leaders will face. The experience also gave participants time to review and critique their performance and behaviors during these types of situations.

Incorporating filmmaking as a tool may seem as a non-traditional approach by some educational professionals, however, Friend (2013) argued, "methodologies employed by faculty members to produce educational documentary films have closer ties to scholarship than to Hollywood" (p. 1). Friend (2013) described the parallel process of traditional academic research and the process filmmaking:

> There are many "choice points" in filmmaking that parallel decisions in qualitative research methodology: (a) where to point the camera (site selection); (b) individuals who will be videotaped (participant selection); (c) data collection protocol such as equipment used for recording video and audio, when to begin and end video recording, and what to say to direct or prompt your video participants; (d) data analysis to select video clips during editing, the order in which you will present these clips, and other video elements (such as music, motion graphics, recorded narration, title cards, etc.); and (e) sharing the results with an audience. (p. 2)

The opportunities that are presented by filmmaking in a classroom setting have many applications. These applications are not only limited to student engagement in the classroom, but can also be employed by faculty to enhance their own understanding and exploration of subject materials.

Filmmaking's dynamic platform as a learning tool links multiple disciplines. It also leads to collaborative learning experiences. As film students engage in Problem Based Learning, Active Learning and Experiential Learning when making a film, collaboration skills are enacted. How an instructor designs these opportunities for students will affect their experiences. To better understand how assessment of such collaborative experiences are

taking place in the classroom, one must look deeper into the act of collaboration in the classroom.

Emphasis on collaboration

A distinguished Professor of Business at USC and Chairman of Harvard University's Center for Public Leadership, Warren Bennis has written extensively on the subject of collaboration. The idea of collaboration is not new. Although the "buy-in" by corporate leadership has not always been accepted as a best practice, film production programs need to avoid the same trap that Bennis warns cooperate executives about in regards to collaboration. Bennis (2004) stated, "Almost everyone pays lip service to the notion that today's information-driven organizations need to be more collaborative and less hierarchical to be at their most effective" (p. 1). Bennis cited Disney's former CEO Michael Eisner and then made the connection of Eisner's demise due to his unwillingness to share power.

Embracing collaboration as an essential tool can be directly linked to the effectiveness of leadership. In addition, collaboration is a key ingredient for producing efficiency in a group setting. Filmmaking is rarely conducted without a team of individuals working together. Parallel to a cooperate business setting, educational strategies for any discipline that take advantage of incorporating collaboration can help produce effective leadership skills applicable for multiple settings.

The culture of top-down hierarchal control may have run its course in today's complex organizational structures, but many leaders allow ego to rule their own decision-making process. "Sharing power and sharing information—the prerequisites for collegial organizations—do not enhance the top dog's sense of well-being" (Bennis, 2004, p. 1). This

contemporary flaw in leadership can be linked to stagnant growth and organizational dysfunction. According to Bennis (2004), "There is a growing pile of evidence that more collaborative organizations are better adapted to solving the complex problems we face today" (p. 1). While there has been a movement to support collaboration in today's leadership process, it seems that the incorporation of these principles may be slow in implementation. It is not until an organization instills a culture of sharing power that collaboration will be seen as an imperative attribute to organizational success.

The neglect of recognizing collaboration as a leadership tool that needs to be infused into organizational culture may stem from the educational process. Bennis and O'Toole (2005) offered a look into the future of curriculum development of business schools and remarked that: "Business schools are on the wrong track" (p. 1). His theory is that most business schools are entrenched in misaligned business school culture.

Throughout history business schools have viewed themselves as a discipline rather than a profession. This simple framing of "discipline" versus "profession" aligns the study of business with other professions such as law or medicine. The current view of business as a discipline misaligns the study of business with disciplines such as chemistry or biology. The results of this misalignment cause business schools to function on the principles of a scientific model as opposed to viewing business as a profession made up of specific disciplines *based* on scientific models. Bennis and O'Toole (2005) felt strongly that business school culture is misguided:

> Why have business schools embraced the scientific model of physicists and economists rather than the professional model of doctors and lawyers? Although few B school faculty members would admit it, professors like it that way. This model gives scientific respectability to the research they enjoy doing and eliminates the vocational stigma that business school professors

once bore. In short, the model advances the careers and satisfies the egos of the professoriate. And, frankly, it makes things easier: Though scientific research techniques may require considerable skill in statistics or experimental design, they call for little insight into complex social and human factors and minimal time in the field discovering the actual problems facing managers. (p. 2)

Bennis's statement indicates that the topic of collaboration may not be fully legitimized as an organizational tool until leaders being educated in top business schools are able to make this cultural shift in philosophy. Film/video production programs need to examine this line of thinking in order to produce more effective content producers.

Building on Bennis's critique of business school education, there is evidence that the fine arts educational process is now being challenged on the benefits of collaboration and its outcomes. Fine arts educators, Dunhill and O'Brien (2004) stated: "Clearly there are ways that we can make changes to our courses to better support students choosing to work collaboratively, however we may be missing an opportunity to think about how we understand and promote what we do" (p. 1). The fine arts have traditionally been an area of study that supported the solitary artist and the development of individuality or a personal approach. As some curriculums in the fine arts are finding, collaboration is a way for students to push beyond themselves as artists and become better prepared for the complex art world outside the academic institution.

Dunhill and O'Brien (2004) conducted a series of interviews with fine arts instructors on the topic of collaboration on art projects and student outcomes. Following are samples of the qualitative responses:

"students become more employable, they are better able to network in the art world"

"development of good negotiation and inter-personal skills"

"improvement in student's ability to communicate"

"development of team-working skills"

"learning to articulate processes and communicate with precision"

"an ability to take on much more ambitious projects"

"students can dare more together"

These comments suggest that if collaboration is lacking in a fine arts curriculum, students would be at a disadvantage in the development of critical skill areas.

A similar interview session was conducted with students to gain insight regarding their experience in the collaborative process. "To summarize, students' reasons for collaborating were that they wanted a more challenging and critical kind of practice and wanted to try new or more ambitious ways of working after getting stuck on their own" (Dunhill & O'Brien, 2004, p. 1). Collaboration in the creative arts allows new processes to form, supports skill development and reinforces broad perspectives. These outcomes are crucial in the development of students looking to compete in the global market.

An innovation education fellow at the Technology and Entrepreneurship Center at Harvard University, Wagner (2012) addressed collaboration as a key ingredient for fostering a culture of innovation in the classroom. Wagner pointed out that there is a need for collaboration versus individual achievement: "Conventional schooling in the United States celebrates and rewards individual achievement while offering few meaningful opportunities for genuine collaboration" (p. 1). When developing innovative cultures for educational institutions, collaboration needs to be a stressed student outcome.

In collaborative environments multiple variables need to be addressed in order to solve complex problems. Critical thinking and creative thinking are ways individuals can make informed decisions and spur innovation. The liberal arts tradition embraces the active

pursuit of developing creative and critical thinkers. As informed by King et al. (2007), assessing creative thinking is possible. In order to have a starting point of what creative thinking is and how this skill and outcome is viewed within the academy, more investigation is necessary.

The value of creativity and critical thinking

Currently in American educational settings there has been an increased emphasis on developing an innovative workforce ready to solve the complex problems of tomorrow. According to the National Commission on the Future of Higher Education (2006), "Employers report repeatedly that many new graduates they hire are not prepared to work, lacking the critical thinking, writing and problem-solving skills needed in today's workplaces" (p. 3). In order to alleviate these deficiencies, students will need to be engaged in learning environments that develop skills that are relevant in the 21st century market.

Spanbroek (2010) made a case for future work environments valuing creative thinking as a top priority: "Successful workers of the future must possess intellectual tools which will allow them to be disciplined, flexible and analytical thinkers, able to address and resolve complex problems" (p. 112). Spanbroek perceived that educational institutions are responsible for providing students with opportunities to develop these skills. The liberal arts tradition looks to promote critical thinking and reasoning skills by exposing students to topics and experiences outside their immediate academic interests. Gaining this type of knowledge can foster an environment that allows students to develop new perspectives, leading to innovation. Critical thinking and lateral thinking are the key skills that Spanbroek cited as crucial to building an innovative workforce (2010):

> Those who become skillful at critical thinking are able to reach conclusions
> and develop solutions that generate new results. Central to the idea of
> effective critical thinking is the practice of thinking laterally. Good lateral
> thinkers always see, appreciate and analyze the forest and the trees. The
> central inquiry in lateral thinking is, if I do this, then what? The best critical
> thinkers turn their attention to innovation. They are the creative problem
> solvers who lead the way to the future. (p. 119)

Lateral thinking is present during the film production process in nearly every phase. The use of cutting edge technology, traditional and non-traditional storytelling, field production, non-linear editing, production planning, and human resource management are only a few of the complex variables that affect the production process. Connecting these activities in a classroom environment is a form of interdisciplinary education. This strategy requires students to link topics from multiple disciplines and encourages them to use analytical skills to be successful.

Clinton and Hokanson (2012) supported Spranboek's view and hypothesized that creativity is lacking in most instructional design theories: "Creativity is rarely formally acknowledged in models of instructional design, despite its recognized value in parallel design fields such as architecture, industrial design, and fashion design" (p. 118). The argument that these scholars presented is that the lack of focus on creativity within instructional design lowers the expectation level in regards to creative outcomes. If creativity is not emphasized in a film production program, lower expectations may follow the same path these researchers present. An appropriate learning environment is essential to troubleshoot this potentially crippling deficiency. Developing an environment and structure that invites creativity will allow students to apply technical skills to complex problems and search for new solutions and innovation. Clinton and Hokanson (2012) noted that "…design is more than a series of structured problems, more than a direct application of technical skill.

Within the design process, there are ill-structured aspects that demand the regular application of creativity" (p. 120).

Film and video production are often referred to as members of the creative arts in educational terminology. Creativity is not easily defined or measured. This may be the reason it is often times left out of the curriculum design process. This thought is counterintuitive to producing innovative thinkers in any field of study. The opportunity of building a program that includes an emphasis on group work may have profound effects on developing skills in creativity. Skills such as critical thinking, analytical thinking and divergent thinking are related to creativity (DeCusatis, 2008; Runco, 2010; Spanbroek, 2010). Developing a learning environment and structure that invites creativity will allow students to apply these skills to complex problems, search for new solutions, and foster innovation.

In order to enhance creativity in learning, Clinton and Hokanson examine the social context to which creativity is often found. The theory that creativity is not necessarily an individual journey to explore new ideas is becoming more accepted. "Creativity therefore may be viewed as occurring within a social system, not just within the individual. This is similar to a constructivist view of learning in which the social context is emphasized" (Clinton & Hokanson, 2012, p. 115). Group learning allows ideas to be shared and offers opportunities to tap into prior learning experiences. Again, an interdisciplinary strategy can allow students these opportunities to exist. Clinton and Hokanson (2012) concluded, "As the field of instructional technology continues to grow and develop, it benefits from the advance of knowledge in all related fields" (p. 128). In order to enrich the learning outcomes of

film/video production students, higher education professionals need to explore integrating disciplines to provide opportunities for analytical and creative thinking to occur.

The act of collaboration in the classroom can yield creative thinking and new ways for student to apply theory to practice. By examining the experiences of instructors and students engaged in creative collaboration in the classroom, one may identify assessment opportunities present in such experiences. If Muir (2013) is correct and there is a lack of understanding of how these liberal arts outcomes are being assessed in the classroom, an expanded view of creative collaboration needs to be presented.

Creative collaboration in the classroom

In order to capitalize on creative collaboration, Andy Alyesworth of Bentley College suggested that improvisational acting techniques be used to create new perspective on the group process. Alyesworth (2008) stated, "The improv mindset can be defined as a predisposition to collaborate rather than compete, and support your fellow players actions to see where they lead" (p. 109). He goes on to discuss the implications of the use of case study in most business schools. If a collaborative culture is not supported in the classroom, many of these case study analyses can be limited, as students fear pushing the boundaries of creative perspectives. Students perceive that the "right" answer is the goal, as opposed to the process of finding new solutions or possibly new problems.

Alyesworth (2008) contended that by instilling the guidelines of improvisational acting into classroom discussions, students think differently and are afforded the leeway to explore avenues of discovery. Not all avenues lead to successful outcomes in problem solving, but supporting students with a safe environment to make mistakes may reinforce the

positive outcomes when success is achieved. The goal is not achieving points for what is perceived as the correct answer, but rather collaborative participation in a group searching for a collection of ideas that may achieve a new understanding. "Students are sometimes reluctant to participate because they believe their contributions won't be big enough or won't "crack the case". In reality, however, it is usually a collection of these small contributions that lead to the eventual understanding of the case as a whole" (Alyesworth, 2008, p. 110).

University of Paderborn professor Gitta Domik detailed her course design in graphics and visualization to incorporate an emphasis on teamwork. "My goal is to have students form interdisciplinary teams, distribute skills across each team, and use diversity as a creative source" (Domik, 2012, p. 87). She laid out her entire 15-week course sequence and stressed the importance of classmates making connections with each other early in the process. These connections are fostered by a simple questionnaire that students are allowed to view responses to online. These questions allowed students to make connections on topics such as hobbies, courses, passions and geographical backgrounds. Domik (2012) stated, "Educators normally don't help establish social ties in computer science courses" and "The challenge is that students who don't know each other but might have similar interests and complementary skills must find each other" (p. 88-89).

After the connections are made, Domik (2012) relied on a structure borrowed from Stokol's rules for transdisciplinary scientific collaboration as a guide to support group dynamics and teamwork in the classroom. These guidelines are as follows:

- find unique topics they feel passionate about,
- learn the team-building process,
- establish a common language and social ties,
- structure and conduct face-to-face meetings, and

- use electronic linkages beyond email (for example, version control systems and Wikis) to communicate between meetings. (Domik, 2012, p. 87)

Her students were surveyed about their experience with the collaborative process. It should be pointed out that, "Fifty-nine percent of them had no previous experience with interdisciplinary teamwork, and 74 percent noted they would rather work in an interdisciplinary team at a future workplace" (Domik, 2012, p. 90). In addition, 84% of students responded that their teamwork within their groups was either excellent or good. This endeavor by Dr. Domik expressed the realistic possibility of developing "soft skills" in a scientific discipline with successful outcomes.

Problem based learning (PBL) draws a close parallel to collaborative learning. Professors need not view PBL as an opportunity to allow students free range in developing their own strategies. The opportunities that PBL present in the form of a collaborative experience suggest that a professor understand techniques to foster group learning.   Bruce Speck (2003) touched on ways to create effective outcomes when engaging in PBL group work. He pointed to group size as a variable that needs to be addressed when forming learning groups. "One factor for determining group size might be the complexity of the assignment and the extent of any written or oral product students are required to create" (Speck, 2003, p. 59). There is not a specific number that will ensure success, but a professor needs to be aware of the context of study in order to structure the best learning environment for students.

Gender is another variable that Speck pointed out as a key to successful team experiences. Speck (2003) suggested, "Collaborative groups should be gender balanced because a primary purpose of education is to prepare students to work effectively in a variety

of complex social situations, and few social situations in life are limited to a single gender"

(p. 60). When a professor makes a point to have equal representation in groups, it establishes

a norm. Students will then respond to what is expected and valued in the classroom. The

establishment of structure in the group process allows students to navigate PBL to achieve

successful outcomes. It is a professor's role to act as the leader in the classroom and

determine appropriate structures for collaboration to flourish.

University of Jyväskylä, Finland faculty members Anneli Eteläpelto and Jaana Lahti

conducted a study on the creative collaboration in long term learning groups. They found

that the study of long term learning groups as opposed to short-term learning groups has been

neglected of in depth studies. Their goal was to identify resources and obstacles for creative

collaboration in order to better understand the opportunities to enhance learning for students.

They argued that there is a difference in the collective process as opposed to individual

learning. Group process is a focus on meaning making and knowledge construction.

Individual learning is a process of knowledge acquisition. Although both types of learning

have benefits, their study suggested collaboration is a more effective way to generate

knowledge. Eteläpelto and Lahti (2008) offered the following:

> In a peer-group learning community neither the emerging problems nor their
> solutions are known in advance, but the group needs to work together in order
> to define the problems and find solutions to them. Thus, creativity in
> collaboration can be understood to emerge within dynamic processes of co-
> construction; these will produce novel – and appropriate – ideas regarding the
> problems faced in collective learning endeavors. The creative process in a
> collaborative learning situation further entails opposing ideas being
> thoroughly discussed, in such a way that differing opinions and conceptions
> are related to each other. In such a process of collective learning an elaborated
> understanding of the learning topic can emerge. (p.2)

Developing a learning community that values diversity in opinion is important to successful creative collaboration. The process described prior is only possible if trust, psychological safety and tolerance are present in the culture of the group. Eteläpelto and Lahti (2008) suggested, "creativity in the worst situation was suppressed by an emotionally negative atmosphere that subjects perceived as threatening" (p. 2). The obstacles that can derail creativity and team learning are embedded in the culture of a group.

A study of online creative collaboration

Kurt Luther and Amy Bruckman from the School of Interactive Computing at the Georgia Institute of Technology conducted a study on the challenges of leadership in online creative collaboration. They focused on groups of online animated filmmakers working on collaborative projects called "collabs". They found that leadership is challenged in unique ways in this type of online setting. "Most real-world design problems lack one "correct" solution. Rather, multiple solutions are possible, each with its own advantages and disadvantages. More open-ended or "ill-defined" problems are more difficult to solve" (Mynatt, Nakakoji, Terry & Yamamoto, 2004, p. 711). It is based upon this assumption that they found this study valid. Luther and Bruckman (2008) stated:

> Animated moviemaking is an especially open-ended problem because artistic expression is fundamentally subjective; no animation style is definitively more "correct" than another. Thus, disagreement among artists seems inevitable. Collab leaders manage this challenge by supplying creative direction for the project; artists accept their authority until it is abused. Creative direction provides decisive answers to the many questions that arise during collab production. (p. 347)

Luther and Bruckman found that team leadership in online creative collaboration is the key to its success.

Online creative collaboration is challenged by decentralized organizational structures. In the case of working in collabs, a leader faces the challenge of dispersing different types of workloads to artists that have wide varieties of expertise. Many of the specialized artists never work with other team members. It is up to the team leader to keep the many tasks in motion and piece them together as tasks are completed. Luther and Bruckman (2008) stated, "leaders derive their authority from artists, leaders must find a balance between exercising this authority and leveraging the creativity of individual artists" (p. 348). Keeping the artists motivated was a challenge that was best met by incorporating distinct recognition of ownership to individual artists while stressing the team's goal, which was usually completion of the project.

A leader can navigate the many pitfalls of online creative collaboration by laying out a framework for artists to work within. It is important not to stifle the creative energy that many artists thrive in when given loose constraints, but in a collaborative process, the artist's varying viewpoints within a solid structure ensure clarity to goals and group norms. Successful collab leaders found that, " 'front loading' collab proposals with detailed plans not only helps artists know what to expect, but also provides solutions to likely problems before they arise. As a result, artists can avoid some of the difficulties of distributed teamwork and spend more time working on content" (Luther & Bruckman, 2008, p. 350). This offered artists a work environment that was less ambiguous which was very helpful to fringe participants.

Luther and Bruckman in conjunction with Kevin Ziegler, a researcher at the Georgia Institute of Technology, and Kelly Caine, a researcher at Indiana University, conducted a follow up study focused on collabs and creative collaboration. The first study was based on

qualitative analysis. The second study was based on quantitative data. By using the

foundation of the first study, the researchers used the new data to compare and contrast other

online collaborations efforts such as Wikipedia and Open Source Software (OSS) projects.

The follow up study gave the researchers the belief that creative collaboration is a function

that will be more heavily relied on as technological advancements evolve:

> Online creative collaboration may be one of the most important and surprising
> consequences of increased access to information technology. Its most
> prominent examples, Wikipedia and open source software, offer compelling
> evidence of a third model of production, alongside the familiar firm- and
> market-based models. We are beginning to see new examples emerge in other
> domains, such as video, music, and animation, suggesting that online creative
> collaboration is a much broader phenomenon than just software development
> and encyclopedia writing. (Bruckman, Caine, Luther, & Ziegler, 2010, p. 9)

They suggested that more research dedicated to this topic would produce a better

understanding of how to ensure success in the rapidly changing work environment of

computer-mediated projects.

The major findings of the second study were in support of their theorized variables

that support success in online creative collaboration. These variables were: Planning &

Structure; Reputation & Experience; and Communication and Dedication (Bruckman et al.,

2010, p. 6). It was found that these variables were a direct function of the team leader.

Leadership that incorporates these variables into the development of the group had a much

higher rate of success. Success in a collab was defined as completion, release, and high

marking reviews of by their peers. The success rate in collabs was actually lower than first

hypothesized. In the first study it was thought that nearly 80% of collabs fail. "Our results

show that out of a total of 892 collab threads, 112 were categorized as successful, while 780,

or 87.4%, were categorized as failed" (Bruckman et al., 2010, p. 6). The high rate of failure

was a consequence of a lack of leadership required for success in these complex projects.

As stated earlier, a well-defined plan with specs and developed structure helped leaders alleviate potential pitfalls. The importance of reputation and experiences signifies to potential collaborators that the project has relevance and potential to succeed. Artists are more likely to join a collab and offer their skills when the leader has a positive track record. The need for effective communication and a display of dedication are ways a leader can motivate and keep artists informed of shifting priorities. The research illustrated a direct link between communication frequency and successful outcomes. "Participants suggested that more activity in a thread, indicated by the number and frequency of replies, often corresponds to a greater likelihood of success" (Bruckman et al., 2010, p. 4). If a leader is more involved and shows a positive display of communication to forward the goal of the project, artists respond with dedication. The belief that the group values their work hinges on the leader's communication.

In technical fields such as computer programming, digital animation or filmmaking, one might believe that technical skills are essential for success. The conclusion of this study demonstrated that a combination of technical skills and leadership skills were the formula for success in complex collaborative projects. "We found that across collabs and OSS, successful projects were managed by leaders with solid reputations and respect in their communities. They had both technical competence and soft skills. They had knowledge of the domain and experience running successful group efforts" (Bruckman et al., 2010, p. 9). As the global market expands, more work will be done in the virtual realm. In order to take advantage of technology, it can be argued that leadership skills are invaluable to the process of online creative collaboration.

Summary

Film production education has many avenues for attainment. However, an argument supporting the liberal arts based film/video production curriculum as being a more relevant avenue for producing students ready for today's workforce can be made. The context of a liberal arts education is one that is aimed at yielding students with the knowledge and ability to use critical analysis, creative thinking, and leadership skills to become wise citizens. These lofty student outcomes align with the needed skills for today's complex society.

Educators in film and video production programs have the opportunity to capitalize on these 21st Century Skills that are inherent in the filmmaking process. However, it appears that currently many of these opportunities are being left unchecked. It is fair to say that not all professional film/video production educators have clear a understanding or relevant training in regards to the process of outcomes assessment. This is reinforced by the lack of research dedicated to the process in which film/video production students are being educated. In addition, the literature review suggests that the assessment process of such outcomes in a film/video production program is an afterthought. This disconnect reinforces Muir's alarming discovery of this gap.

Creativity and collaboration are two necessary skills for students in many fields of study. The ability to gauge the learning and application of these two liberal arts outcomes needs to be examined so a more informed conversation can begin. The opportunity to create meaningful learning experiences for students to engage in the liberal arts film/video production curriculum is dependent on a study of the leaner's assessment process. Only then will it be possible to evaluate and adjust the curriculums to align with an institution's goals for students.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The primary goal of this study was to examine the experiences of instructors as they

engage in learner assessment.   The context of this exploration was in regards to liberal arts

skills assessment in film/video production coursework. In order to achieve this goal, a

qualitative study was employed. In a qualitative study the "researchers try to understand the

social processes in context" (Esterberg, 2002, p. 2).   In the case of this particular study, the

context was extremely important in justifying the use of a qualitative inquiry.

Education in film and video production exists in three institutional settings. The first

is what is categorized as film school. Film school education is found in MFA programs and

specialized art school environments where students engage with film production curriculum

only. The second category is CTE programs where students are exposed to vocational skill

training to become technicians in the field. The third is the liberal arts setting. In a liberal

arts context, film/video production students engage in an interdisciplinary curriculum with a

goal of developing a worldview, as well as specific vocational skill sets. It should be noted

that liberal arts skills are not exclusive to liberal arts institutions. This study found that

instructors within both MFA programs and CTE educational settings valued and assessed

liberal arts skills.

The goal of examining the individual experiences of instructors as they engage in

classroom assessment was a key component in this study. Uncovering a deeper

understanding of the process instructors were involved with when framing their classroom

assignments and assessments to reflect the intended outcomes of a liberal arts education was

an underlying theme to the overall study. Qualitative research was best suited to derive this

type of understanding. Merriam (2002) stated, "In conducting a basic qualitative study, you seek to discover and understand a phenomenon, a process, the perspectives and worldwide views of the people involved, or a combination of these" (p. 6). In order to best understand how these individuals constructed meaning from their own experiences, an inductive form of inquiry was needed to obtain rich data. Qualitative research lends itself to gathering this type of data as well as reporting the findings. According to Merriam (2002), "the product of a qualitative inquiry is richly descriptive" (p. 5). Each individual that participated in this study provided their own perspective to the unit that was studied and provided rich data sets.

A constructionist approach was used as the study's epistemology. Understanding how the participants constructed meaning from their individual experiences with assessment of liberal arts skills in a film/video production curriculum was at the heart of the study. Constructionism deals with how meaning is constructed by humans through interaction with the world (Crotty, 1998; Esterberg, 2002; Merriam & Assoc., 2002). In regards to constructionism, David Gray (2014) stated, "subjects construct their own meaning in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomenon. Hence, multiple, contradictory but equally valid accounts of the world can exist" (p. 22). It was important to allow the participants to express their individual perspective that were constructed by their lived and perceived experience with the phenomena being studied.

Furthering the study's structure, the basic interpretivist theoretical perspective of phenomenology was used. Esterberg (2002) claimed that interpretive approaches can be based on three basic premises. First, humans behave certain ways depending on what meaning is assigned to situations. Second, humans derive meaning out of social interaction. Thirdly, interpretations have a direct effect on how humans create and change their

perspectives. This framework allowed the research to capture a dynamic range of meanings that the participants had produced through social interactions, as well as meanings that may have been changing throughout their experience. According to John W. Creswell (2013), "a phenomenological study describes the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon" (p. 76). Creswell (2013) continued, "The basic purpose of phenomenology is to reduce individual experiences with a phenomenon to a description of the universal essence" (p. 77).   This study was an initial exploration of this topic in academic research. It was a crucial component for this study to allow participants to elaborate on their lived experiences with the phenomena of assessment in the liberal arts context, even if their experiences produced contradictive findings.

The methodology that was used in this phenomenological research was case study. "Phenomenological research is about producing 'thick descriptions' of people's experiences and perspectives within their natural settings" (Gray, 2014, p. 30). In order to produce the type of data necessary for this study, a bounded unit was examined. This unit was composed of individuals who had all experienced the phenomena of assessing liberal arts skills within the context of film/video production student work. Creswell (2013) classified this as a *collective case study*. "In a collective case study (or multiple case study), the one issue or concern is again selected, but the inquirer selects multiple case studies to illustrate the issue" (Creswell, 2013, p. 99). The justification of selecting multiple participants from a variety of institutions to make up this bounded unit was appropriate for the intentions of this study. "Often the inquirer purposefully selects multiple cases to show different perspectives on the issue" (Creswell, 2013, p. 99).

The use of case study allowed the researcher to obtain a greater understanding of particular processes, experiences and perspectives of the unit. According to Merriam (2002), "The case then has a finite quality about it in either terms of time (the evolution or history of a program), space (the case is located in a particular place), and/or component comprising the case (the number of participants for example)" (p. 178).   Again, the study involved participants bound by the act of assessment of intended liberal arts outcomes. They all had the common task of engaging in the transfer of knowledge and assessment of student work in a film/video production program, as well. The researcher gathered data from these participants with the intention of understanding experiences within this single unit. The case study methodology was in line with the intentions of this study and allowed the data to be based as an inductive investigation of this single unit.

The methods of this research project were interviews and document analysis. These methods were chosen as the most effective ways to gather information about the unit in question. Interviews were the primary method used to accumulate data. Often times in phenomenological research this is the case (Gray, 2014). This method offered the needed exploration of the individual's experience. The interview process consisted of an initial interview where the participants described their individual experience with the topic at hand. A second interview was conducted as a member check. In this follow up interview participants were given the chance to comment on themes that had emerged and offer more description and clarification of their lived experiences.

Document analysis was used in two specific data sets. The first being an "Internal" data set. This data set involved documents that were produced by the participants. The documents were to serve the study by supplying information that was specific to how each

participant communicates to students about the assessment process. Additionally, this data set supplied information that offered greater understanding of the individual process the participants used in the assessment of liberal arts skills in the classroom setting. Documents that were reviewed in this data set included: Syllabi, course outlines, assignment sheets, rubrics, peer evaluation, student reflections papers and published articles on the topic of their assessment process.

The second data set obtained in the context of document analysis was considered an "External" data set. This data set involved documents that were produced by the institution, department or program. The documents were to serve the study by supplying information that was specific to how the participant's institution communicates and influences the assessment process. Documents that were reviewed in this data set included: Mission statements, institutional vision statement and goals, stated learning outcomes, institutional assessment guidelines, program descriptions, course descriptions and course offerings. The intention of using three distinct data sets was to offer the researcher greater means to collect data and was used to triangulate the data for goodness.

Limitations

An explanation of the study's limitations is divided into two general areas of concern. The first limitation area is in regards to the methodology. The second area is in regards to the researcher. Acknowledging the specific areas of limitations is offered to explain how these factors have impacted the data collection, analysis and interpretation of findings of this research project. The limitations of the methodology are in regards to sampling, lack of

available data, lack of previous research, the measures used to collect data and self-reported data.

Prior to conducting the research, the sample size was projected to account for between five to fifteen participants. The final sample size fell into this projection as ten total participants were selected. Saturation was reached at this number. However, the sample size and selection of the participants produced a limitation. This was due to each participant self-identifying themselves as instructors that actively assess liberal arts skills. Within this context, participants were chosen with purpose. Instructors that did not self-identify as instructors that actively assess liberal arts skills were not included in this study.

The context of a liberal arts education may have reflected slight to major differences between the participants' interpretations of this academic endeavor. Each participant may have defined a liberal arts education differently due to a variety of influencing factors. However, the study's intention was not to produce findings that can be generalized, but rather yield an understanding of the participant's experience and perspective with the phenomena being studied. With this in mind, a general definition of a liberal arts education may not have satisfied the entire scope of this particular setting within higher education. The number of participants that were studied, as well as their geographical setting and cultural perspectives may have also affected the utility of the findings.

Currently, there is a lack of available data in this area of study, which created a limitation for the research that was conducted. A central concern of the research project was addressing the topic of film/video production education. This specific topic has had little examination in past research and literature. In many instances, the researcher was turning to related literature of parallel areas of study in order to produce proper inquiry and

conclusions. The lack of documented information to draw upon in this specific area produced limited conclusions with strong contextual links.

Prior to the dissertation process, the researcher had only been able to uncover a limited amount of applicable studies to build a foundation for the study. Muir's (2013) grounded theory work on film production curriculums and Hardin's (2009) exploration of meaningful learning processes in filmmaking students were highlighted as only a few specifically related studies that had been published. As previously stated, a robust pool of research in this area is non-existent. Grounding the study in a historical and practical perspective was challenged by a limited body of research to draw upon. This stated limitation of a lack of prior studies was a concern, however the infancy of academic inquiry into this topic has lead to needed inquiry and dialogue in this area of future research.

The measures used to collect data held specific limitations. The researcher conducted interviews and document analysis. As the interview process initiated, topics and themes emerged that had not been addressed in the prescribed line of questioning. This was due to the chosen form of semi-structured interviewing. The new emerged themes produced by this interviewing structure shed light on unforeseen topics that needed to be elaborated on in the data collection process. The researcher was limited in conducting a thorough examination into such areas due to insufficient preparation of questions on the emerged topics. This coupled with a lack of substantial literature reviewed in the emerged areas created a limitation. The challenge of conducting a semi-structured interview created this limitation. In the interview process it was deemed crucial that the researcher allowed the participants to elaborate on their experiences outside of the pointed questions. This diversion within the interview process was necessary so that the interview was not steered by the researcher.

Other limitations occurred in the document analysis phase. This inquiry was a case study, where the bounded unit that was studied lacked consistency in the written documents that were offered to explain the topic at hand. Participants were asked to supply documents that they used in their classroom structure in order to provide additional data in regards to their own experience with assessment. These types of documents were categorized as "Internal" documents. Not all participants offered the same types of Internal documents. The researcher was able to collect: Syllabi, course outlines, assignment sheets, rubrics, peer evaluation, student reflections papers and published articles on the topic of their assessment process. The collection process was dependent on the participant providing the documents. This process found that not all participants used similar documents in their classroom assessment.

In regards to institutional documents that were categorized as "External", limitation was evident. Not all institutions offered the same access to published documents such as learning outcomes, institutional vision statement and goals, stated learning outcomes, institutional assessment guidelines, program descriptions, course descriptions and course offerings. This information was provided in inconsistent structures across the participants' institutions that were studied.

The final limitation that was present in the methodology was the concern of self-reporting. The study was a qualitative inquiry and primarily relied on the verbal interactions between participants and the researcher. This type of communication exchange held risk of misinterpretation and misrepresentation of information. The researcher's bias undoubtedly came into play in the process. This concern is clearly stated, examined and transparent in the researcher's positionality statement found in this chapter under the heading *Researcher's*

Position. Not only was the researcher's bias subject to producing limitations, but the

participant's perceptions needed to be accounted for as well. According to Brutus, Aguinis,

and Wassmer, (2013) the following self-reporting limitations should be examined in a

qualitative project:

> (1) selective memory (remembering or not remembering experiences or events that
>   occurred at some point in the past);
> (2) elescoping [recalling events that occurred at one time as if they occurred at
>   another time];
> (3) attribution [the act of attributing positive events and outcomes to one's own
>   agency but attributing negative events and outcomes to external forces]; and,
> (4) exaggeration [the act of representing outcomes or embellishing events as more
>   significant than is actually suggested from other data].

The last limitation for this research project is in regards to the inability to conduct a

longitudinal study. Due to the time constraints and financial burdens of this project, the

researcher intended on studying the instructors' experiences over a short time span only.

Thus, creating a limitation in examining future experiences of the collective unit that was

studied. In addition, the researcher did not include the perspectives of students in this

process. This purposeful strategy limited the data in regards to understanding how a group of

students may experience learning. A longitudinal study and the inclusion of student

participants may have produced richer data for greater understanding of the participants'

experiences.

Delimitations

The initial delimitations have already been briefly discussed in the introduction and

purpose section of this dissertation. Recapping this discussion, the absence of research in the

area of film/video production education has created gaps in the foundational information

required to guide future inquiries in this realm of educational programing. This being said,

the lack of research conducted in this area of study provided great value to the data that was collected.

This study focused on the assessment processes of instructors engaged in film/video production education. The researcher identified a pool of possible participants in this study from the University Film and Video Association, as well as the Broadcast Education Association. The rationale behind identifying these people as potential participants, was that these two organizations primarily consist of professional educators in the field. Contact was made by offering an online survey and personal communication. The potential participant pool was then delimited by two major factors. The first of these factors was potential participants that self-identified as instructors of film/video production. The second of these factors was potential participants that self-identified as those that actively assessed liberal arts outcomes within their classroom. Potential participants that answered "yes" to both questions were ultimately advanced to the sampling pool of participants.

Ultimately, this study focused on the lived experiences of participants engaging with instructional assessment within a film/video production classroom. Delimiting factors such as school size, private or publicly funded, religious or non-religious affiliation, course offerings, areas of specializations, institutional application and acceptance rates, instructor's qualification and educational background, program budget, administrative support, equipment and facilities were not taken into consideration. This choice was made by recognizing that these factors may have influenced the participants' process of assessment. However, the study's purpose was best served by allowing for these influential factors to emerge out of the participants' perspectives rather than limit these experiences and potential data that they had to offer.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval

Ethical considerations are well established for conducting research involving human subjects. Prior to conducting the study, the researcher submitted the study plan to the IRB at Iowa State University for approval. A copy of the approval memo is shown in Appendix A. The research was conducted with human subjects who were primarily current film instructors from post-secondary institutions at a variety of Carnegie class school, both private and public. The interview protocol and prompts used by the researcher when communicating with the participants are provided in Appendix B. Communication to and from the participants is provided in Appendix C. A total of ten respondents were selected and agreed to participate in the study. Each was sent an electronic copy of the Informal Consent Document (Appendix C-1) prior to participation. The following subsection discuss the methodology applied to carry out the research with the participants.

Data Collection

Interviews

Interviews were the primary method used to accumulate data. Often times in phenomenological research this is the case (Gray, 2014). This method offered the needed exploration of the individual's experience. The interview process consisted of an initial interview where the participants described their individual experience with the topic at hand. A second interview was conducted as a member check. In this follow up interview, participants were given the chance to comment on themes that had emerged and offer more description and clarification of their lived experiences.

Internal documents

      Internal documents were gathered as a data set that represented the participants'

materials they use in classroom assessment which included: Syllabi, course outlines, rubrics,

peer-to-peer evaluation forms, client evaluation forms, course assignment sheets and articles

produced by participants explaining their assessment process. These data were provided as a

means to cross reference the information provided by the participants in the interview

process. This process is further explained and discussed later in this chapter under the

section titled, "Trustworthiness".

External documents

      External documents were also gathered as a data set that represented the institutions'

materials that reflect the stated learning outcomes. These outcomes were deemed as

influential to the participant's classroom assessmen and included: Institutional mission

statements, program mission statements, stated learning goals and outcomes, program

descriptions, course descriptions and promotional materials produced for the institution

and/or program. These data were provided as a means to cross reference the information

provided by the participants in the interview process, as well as the internal documents. This

process is further explained and discussed in the following section.

<div align="center">

Trustworthiness

</div>

      The term trustworthiness regarding qualitative research refers to the accuracy of the

findings that are produced (Creswell, 2014). Without such accuracy, the findings of

qualitative research become less useful and parallels fictional work (Morse, Barrett, Mayan,

Olson, & Spiers, 2002). Qualitative research must rely on rigor and structure to assure that

valid findings are produced. Creswell (2014) suggested, "Proposal developers need to convey the steps they will take in their studies to check for the accuracy and creditability of their findings" (p. 201). An audit trail is often used to ensure validity in qualitative studies (Marshall, 1990; Merriam, 2002). The procedures of an audit trail consist of a variety of methods and necessary steps taken to produce trustworthy results. These procedures reflect a detailed account of how the study was conducted and how the data was analyzed. According to Thomas and Magilvy (2011), a degree audit is achieved by:

> (a) describing the specific purpose of the study; (b) discussing how and why participants were selected for the study; (c) describing how the data were collected and how long the data collection lasted; (d) explaining how the data were reduced or transformed for analysis; (e) discussing the interpretation and presentation of the research findings; and (f) communicating the specific techniques used to determine the credibility of the data. (p. 153)

In this study, the audit trail was comprised of detailed descriptions of the methods and procedures of collecting the data, interview reflection journaling, field notes, analytical notes and memos taken while coding the data, as well as the steps taken in the analysis of the data. Other procedures of the audit trail included the many approaches that are consistent with providing trustworthiness to the study's findings. The following sections outline the structure and processes that the researcher used to reach trustworthy results.

Rationale for the data sets

In order to clarify the procedures that were enacted to ensure the trustworthiness of this study, a rationale for the data sets needs to be provided. This study focused on the lived experiences of the participants. Three data sets were determined necessary to the study. The first data set was obtained from the participants, in the form of personal interviews. This was determined necessary to provide in depth descriptions of the participants' experiences. The

strategy provided explanation of processes, as well as further examination of data that was

offered by the participants in the interview process. The second data set was comprised of

the internal documents provided by the participants. The rationale for this data set was the

need to acquire information such as stated purposes, expectations, measurements and

processes that were used and produced by the participants. This second data set allowed

exploration into how the participants communicated and structured their activities that were

instrumental to the phenomena being studied. The third and final data set was comprised of

the external documents that were produced by the institutions of the participants. This third

data set was deemed necessary to examine the projected communication and influences that

were embedded into the experiences of the participants.

All three of these data sets were found useful in providing trustworthiness of this

study. "Validity is one of the strengths of qualitative research and is based on determining

whether the findings are accurate from the standpoint of the researcher, the participant or the

readers of an account" (Creswell, 2014, p. 201). In order to produce such findings, the

researcher of this study implemented a variety of strategies to ensure the validity of the work.

Creswell (2014) recommended, "…the use of multiple approaches and these should enhance

the researcher's ability to assess the accuracy of findings" (p. 201). The following

descriptions outline the specific steps taken to ensure trustworthiness of this study.

Rich, thick descriptive data

As mentioned previously, the procedures of an audit trail are taken to produce

trustworthy results. These procedures suggest that the researcher provides thick descriptive

analysis and explanation to the reader. This rich description is not only applied to the

explanation of methods and procedures taken in the study, but should also be applied to the data sets. This provides an increased exposure to the insights provided by the participants in this study.

The insights that were produced from these data sets proved to produce rich, thick descriptive data from the participants. Chapter 4 includes detailed responses yielded from the interview process. These passages were included in this report to provide context, as well as allowing the reader to experience the raw data that was accessed during the study. According to Creswell (2014), "This description may transport readers to the setting and give the discussion an element of shared experiences" (p. 202). The inclusion of this abundant data allows for the reader to monitor the process of data collection and interpretation. The intention of this transparency was an added step taken to ensure valid findings.

Triangulation

Triangulation is the process of using multiple data sets in coordination to produce and justify an emergent theme (Creswell 2014, Esterberg 2002). "When qualitative researchers locate evidence to document a code or theme in different sources of data, they are triangulating information and providing validity to their findings" (Creswell, 2013, p. 251). The purpose of this process is to ensure that interpretation is not left to a singular data set that may produce bias to the findings. The researcher in this study triangulated the data supplied by the participants. These data were comprised of personal interviews, as well as both internal and external documents. Using these three separately defined data sets for analysis and interpretation allowed for trustworthiness in the themes that emerged.

Member checks

Member checks were conducted with all ten participants involved in this study. The

purpose of member checking is to serve as a way of "…testing information by soliciting

reaction of respondents to the investigator's reconstruction" (Lincoln & Guba, 1994, p. 654).

This procedure involves the researcher supplying the participant with descriptions and

themes that have been derived from the data they have provided with the intention of

clarifying the interpretations of the findings (Creswell, 2014). The researcher in this study

provided participants with transcripts of the initial interview, as well as summarized

descriptions and themes in a follow up interview. During the follow up interviews,

participants also had an opportunity to comment on the initial interpretations and provide

further data to the topic under review.

Data analysis procedures

The following is a brief description of the procedures that were conducted in the data

analysis phase of this research project. Interviews were recorded via a digital recorder. The

researcher then employed an outside contractor, *Rev.com*, to transcribe the interviews. Once

the transcriptions were completed, they were read in a first pass. The intention in the first

read was to investigate the materials to determine if viewing the written words produced a

new perspective on the data. Next, the recordings were listened to again with the same

purpose in mind. Following this step, the transcripts were read a second time. During this

pass, the initial coding process began. Esterberg (2002) referred to this process as *open*

coding. In this phase, Esterberg suggested, "…you work intensively with your data, line by

line, identifying themes and categories that seem of interest" (p. 158). The data were

dissected by the researcher by underlining any statement, topics or words that the researcher believed may lead to something of interest.

Additional review of the data was conducted with the intention of identifying emerging themes. Once the open coding produced initial themes and categories of interest, *focused coding* was enacted. Esterberg (2002) stated, "…focused coding entails going through your data line by line, but this time you focus on those key themes you identified during open coding" (p. 161). A color-coding system was used to categorize themes by using a variety of highlighter markers. Specific notes and descriptions produced by the researcher were taken into account as well.

Document analysis was coded in a similar fashion to the transcripts using both open and focused coding. The preliminary findings in both the Internal and External data sets were examined separately. Then themes and processes were identified. These initial themes were then examined in conjunction with what was produced in the interview analysis. This process of cross referencing was the initial step in triangulation. Thus began the movement towards highlighting the connection of these data sets. This was a critical moment in the analysis phase of the study.

The researcher enacted the use of a mapping technique to illustrate the various themes and possible connections. According to Esterberg (2002), "Many researchers like to use visual techniques in working with their data. For example, you might look at the themes you have developed and create a map or diagram that shows how the themes seem to relate to one another" (p. 162). The mapping that was conducted by the researcher produced a better understanding of the participants' experiences and helped to gain better insight into their

experiences. It also helped to illustrate how their individual perceptions aligned with their actions and external influences.

After generating themes that emerged from the data, the researcher applied the *revised* version of Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain developed by Anderson and Krathwohl et al. (2001). The original framework, Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Domain, was first presented in research conducted by Benjamin Bloom et al. in 1956. This research produced a model of cognitive domains of learning. Bloom's original framework has readily been used as a source to gauge learning (Forehand, 2010). Anderson and Krathwohl et al. (2001) have since updated Bloom's original work to reflect current trends in learning. Within the context of this study, the researcher will refer to Anderson and Krathwohl's updated version of Bloom's original framework as "Bloom's Taxonomy Revised (2001)".

Krathwohl (2002) suggested that the revised theory's utility relies upon a clear model that illustrates the alignment between standards and educational goals, objectives, products and activities. This theoretical framework was appropriate due to the role that assessment played in the context of this study. The framework provided a device that organized themes and illustrated processes that were used to assess certain domains of learning and the activities associated with such domains. A further discussion of Bloom's Taxonomy Revised (2001) and its application in this study is highlighted in Chapter 5.

Researcher's positionality

The nature of qualitative research is subject to the bias of the researcher. This inherent issue is due to the researcher being involved with the collection and interpretation of the data within a study. In order to ensure the validity of this qualitative study, the researcher

turned to Creswell. "Good qualitative research contains comments by the researchers and about how their interpretation of the findings is shaped by their background (Creswell, 2014, p. 202). In order to assure trustworthiness to this study, the researcher needed to state his positionality to the topic under examination.

At the time of this dissertation, the researcher was a fulltime faculty member teaching courses in film and video production at the collegiate level. This position required the researcher to participate in the phenomena directly being studied in this project. The researcher had parallel experiences to the participants in regards to assessment in the field of film/video production coursework. The familiarity and personal experience with the subject matter may have produced bias in the study.

The researcher also had completed graduate studies in both film and video production as well as organizational leadership. This may have caused bias when examining the domains of collaboration, teamwork and leadership. The researcher's education coupled with 15 years of professional experience in the field of film and video production may have produced other unforeseen bias to the study. Areas such as linkage to the professional industry, assessment practices, institutional influences and specific student/teacher experiences may have carried bias in this project as well. To the extent that these biases may have affected the research is undetermined. In order to limit the potential of bias created by the researcher's positionality, the researcher conducted the study in a "…rigorous, systematic, and ethical manner" (Merriam, 2002, p. 24). This was accomplished by taking steps to assure trustworthiness as discussed in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore assessment strategies that address liberal arts educational outcomes for students studying film/video production. The intention of this researcher was to discover emerging themes in assessment to serve the education of film/video production students with respect to learner needs as well as industry demands and requirements. This goal required an examination of the individual experiences of instructors who engage in the phenomenon of classroom assessment. The underlying theme to the overall study was to uncover a deeper understanding of the process instructors in which were involved when framing their classroom activities to reflect the intended outcomes of a liberal arts education. The participants in this study held key insights into how these outcomes are being put into action. With this in mind it is important to ask: How are film/video production programs in higher education addressing specific skills that are deemed crucial to the 21st century workforce?

Participant Coding

The participants involved in this study came from an array of institutions regarding size, geographical location, and Carnegie Classification. All of the participants agreed that they assessed liberal arts skills and outcomes while teaching coursework involving film/video production. In order to conceal the identities of the participants and their corresponding institutions, pseudonyms were assigned as follows:

- Participant 1 (P1)
- Participant 2 (P2)
- Participant 3 (P3)
- Participant 4 (P4)

- Participant 5 (P5)
- Participant 6 (P6)
- Participant 7 (P7)
- Participant 8 (P8)
- Participant 9 (P9)
- Participant 10 (P10)

Interview Results

The central question of this study was:

How do instructors embed the goals of a liberal arts education into the assessment of student work produced in film/video production coursework?

The process of gathering the information needed to answer this question was sectioned into three main areas of concern: (1) foundational information of assessment; (2) assessment of liberal arts domains; and (3) assessment of the "4C's". Three sub-questions were asked to answer the central research question and reflect these areas of concern:

1. How do instructors describe the experience of assessing liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production coursework?

2. How do instructors describe the assessment tools used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production and how they were produced?

3. How do instructors describe the assessment strategies used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production?

Foundational questioning

The participants involved in this study came from various educational backgrounds and academic experiences. An initial foundational phase of questioning was conducted in order to gain a better understanding of this collective unit's understanding and perception of

assessment. The goal in the foundational questioning was to gain insight into the

participants' perceptions and experiences with the act of assessment in a professional

capacity. The participants were first asked to define assessment in their own terms. P3

offered the following description:

> *I see assessment as one part of a continuous process that we talk about in the academic league, this idea of closing the loop. That is that we want to make sure that as we're teaching students and giving them the information about what they are going to learn and expectations of how we're going to measure how we learn that, we and assess them. We measure through various means, through various methodologies, whether it's quantitative, qualitative, whether it's written or performance based; some way of measuring to see if they have learned what the course objectives were, what the learning objectives were. Then we present that back to the students to let them know what they are learning, but we also use that as an internal check to see, are we actually teaching what we say we're teaching? Are students learning what we say that we're expecting them to learn, and if not, what can we do differently to help improve that process? Assessment is a part of that whole process. I think it's something that's been done intuitively up until about twenty years ago, but now we're finally putting some language to it, and giving systematic value to this process. (personal communication, July 2016)*

P5 defined assessment as *"the evaluation of the student's work in a class to see what*

progress has been achieved and where the student needs to go next" (personal

communication, August 2016). P6 echoed the thought of progress toward a stated goal. *"I*

would define assessment as a measurement of progress, particularly in an institutional

standpoint, of achievement on learning outcomes or whatever the program outcomes are

trying to achieve within a particular program or course" (personal communication,

September 2016). P1 outlined a definition that, like P6, was in line with a departmental

process in the following:

> *Well, assessment, I guess, for me, and for us, at XXXX University, has been a way to determine where we are in terms of learning outcomes with our students, and whether or not we are achieving those desired learning outcomes, and then also whether or not we're in line with the learning*

outcomes of the general education requirement of the university. It's a way for us to determine whether we're on target or not, in addition to classroom evaluations, so in addition to grading. It's a way for us to kind of reflect and modify our curriculum to better fit the desired learning objectives and outcomes for our students. (personal communication, August 2016)

The institutional and department influence is only a part explaining how P2 described assessment. *"For me it's really about measuring how the student's knowledge grows over the course of a semester. Really over the course of their time in our program"* (personal communication, August 2016). P2 continued, *"It's really more than just a grade. I think in a semester context, when you're looking at your courses, where we have to assign a grade, but more importantly, how are they growing, how are they developing? That's really how I would look as assessment"* (personal communication, August 2016).

According to P10, assessment is defined as follows:

Assessment is the evaluation of course goals ... I think I look at it this way, you start at the course level and you're in the classroom, you're looking at your course goals and you're seeing if your students are being able to meet those goals and perform the student performance objectives as well. The assessment is just the measuring of that and the documenting of that and reflecting on that and then looking at how well you're doing and how well you're doing on not just the course goals, but the program goals and the institutional outcomes as well. It's kind of a tiered affect throughout the program and the college. (personal communication, September 2016)

P9 explained, *"Assessment, to me, is more of a process, and I think that's sometimes where this is misunderstood, assessment. It's more than just assigning a grade or just evaluating how a student has achieved in a particular assignment because all of those pieces are part of this process."* P7 described assessment as *"...progress towards meeting a requirement or what level someone has achieved required aspects of an assignment"* (personal communication, September 2016). The influence by the institution was present in how P4 explained assessment:

> *I am an assessment coordinator here in our department. The way we define*
> *assessment is a perspective in terms of providing a topic for a subject or a*
> *concept to a student. Then identifying areas in which we want to determine*
> *whether or not they're capable of doing to a particular level and what that*
> *level is and then to gather that information. Then over time, once you've sent*
> *it then we're reviewing the information to determine whether or not they met*
> *what we wanted them to meet. That particular level we wanted them to meet*
> *that at.* (personal communication, July 2016)

The individual experience with assessment came into question when the participants were

asked: What role does assessment play in your teaching philosophy? The act of assessment

has influenced each of these individual's philosophies in classroom structure and, ultimately,

their communication to their students. P2 spoke of the process of assessment as a time to

reflect on ones on teaching:

> *In terms of my teaching philosophy, I think assessment is crucial. I think you*
> *have to sort of know- You have to be able to measure how your students, like I*
> *said before, growing and developing. It's also really important feedback for*
> *myself in sort of the way that I teach. If I'm teaching students something and I*
> *see them making the same mistakes over and over and over again and as I'm*
> *assessing them, I find myself making the same comments over and over and*
> *over again. I sort of reflect back and say what am I doing, why aren't I seeing*
> *progress towards the outcomes that I actually want to see? In terms of my*
> *teaching philosophy, it's as much about a reflection of my teaching as it is,*
> *you know, their learning. It's kind of this reciprocal kind of feed back that I*
> *try to do over the course of a semester. In some of my classes it's easier than*
> *other. For example, I teach several writing classes, screenwriting classes, and*
> *the students will do successive drafts. From draft A to draft B to draft C, I*
> *want to be, as I'm grading them or assessing them, I want to see certain types*
> *of progress from one thing to the next. If I see those things, I sort of say okay*
> *we're making progress towards the outcomes I want. If I don't, then it's very*
> *clear that I've got to go back and do something differently.* (personal
> communication, August 2016)

Taking time for reflection on one's own instructional process is something that P3 offered as

a direct influence of the assessment process:

> *When I began teaching, I had more of an intuitive sense of assessment. I*
> *would try out a teaching technique, or try out a project, and see if it was*
> *useful in terms of students, I would normally poll students, things like that.*

Then I realized that academic life, you get caught up in crisis after crisis, and you don't take that time to step back and look at this. I embraced assessment as a way of creating a moment of reflection, and every semester stepping back and seeing, is there something that I can do different to improve this, or have conditions changed, or have student's cultural concerns changed, in which a project that may have worked for the students in the past, is not working as well now. What can I do differently to improve it? I think that's the most value within my own philosophy that I see assessment as is, it is a construct to force me to stop and reflect, and think about how I could be doing things better or differently. (personal communication, July 2016)

In regards to teaching philosophy, P8 highlighted the term assessment. *"Assessment is this word that always makes me think of quantitative metrics on things and I just don't do that"* (personal communication, August 2016). This thought influenced P8's teaching philosophy in a way that produced a thoughtful workflow in regards to building assignments that yield not only technical capabilities but also engaged the students in conversations about the work being produced. *"I think about this through assignment along the way"* (Personal communication, August 2016). P8 continued, *"I have certain goals in mind with that and I am evaluating those. Are they making shots that have a kind of integrity inside the frame or is it something that looks like they weren't thing too much about it"* (personal communication, August 2016). This workflow of assignments ultimately aligned with P8's teaching philosophy:

I'm looking for intentionality in terms of framing, pacing, shots, kind of a cohesion around a mood or a story. That kind of je ne sais quoi, that clever sort of creativity that comes out in certain kinds of shooting. Like a coherent idea that you can see go from beginning to end. I don't grade those things harshly. We open those up for conversation. (personal communication, August 2016)

P4 and P7 both explained that assessment in regards to their teaching philosophy has influenced how they are communicating expectations to their students. P4 stated:

> *For myself in terms of assessment and my teaching philosophy, I think it's very important that students understand that there's a level of expectation, and whether or not they met that expectation. If they did meet that expectation, there's still room for improvement. What is that improvement? If they didn't meet that level of expectation, why didn't they do that and provide them that feedback.* (personal communication, July 2016)
> P7 described the evolution of their teaching philosophy. In some regards assessment

for P7 had become *"...more sort of checking in and trying to refine without placing a grade*

on it, where people where as far as what they were understanding" (personal

communication, September 2016). This aspect of P7's teaching philosophy is conducted

through engaged communication. *"I could keep a conversation going with the student about*

what they were learning, and then put more emphasis on participation and active

engagement" (personal communication, September 2016).

The teaching philosophy of a student centered approach is found in how P6 described

preparing students for industry realities:

> *I think it comes back to improvement more than anything else, which is something that I try to teach my students, particularly as artists and entrepreneurs, is to always focus on what is it that we could do better than we're doing now. I think that it's a pretty competitive field that we're in, but I think for almost any field, for anything that you want to do to achieve excellence, you have to constantly be taking stock of at what level are you performing right now and are there areas that if you were to give them a little more focus, you would get more of a competitive edge. I guess within my own philosophy of teaching then, doing that assessment helps to figure out where potential weak points and pedagogy or just the experience and the overall flow of a course or a curriculum and what are ways that we can improve it to make it better for the students learning.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P9 stated, *"My teaching philosophy is very student-centered, meaning that I'm teaching to*

the classroom" (personal communication, September 2016). P9 went on and explained,

"How assessment plays a role in my teaching philosophy is that it's not a one size fits all.

That means I have multiple assessment tools and methods that I'm using for multiple types of

assignments" (personal communication, September 2016).

In regards to their teaching philosophy, P10 explained, *"I'm working backwards from*

the assessment tool" (personal communication, September 2016). P10 elaborated:

> *I know my students need objective X and so how am I going to measure*
> *whether or not they've learned objective X?" I take that and I look at what*
> *kind of tool can I use to measure that. I create the tool to measure that, then I*
> *say, "Okay, not how am I going to teach them what is in the tool?" That goes*
> *into the actual curriculum of the lesson plans. It's backward design basically.*
> (personal communication, September 2016)

The link to industry and setting clear expectations drove P5's teaching philosophy.

"In my teaching philosophy, assessment is feedback that I give to the students based on their

work where I share my experiences as a writer and a director myself to show them how their

work compares to what is actually being gone in the real world" (personal communication,

August 2016). This philosophy yielded outcomes-based assessment that parallel industry

standards. *"All of my classes, I connect back to the real world. I'm constantly drawing the*

subject back to where the students are going to be when they graduate" (personal

communication, August 2016).

Outcomes based assessment philosophy was how P1 expressed their own teaching

philosophy. *"For me, my own teaching philosophy is very outcome-based"* ... P1 continued,

"It just so happens that my teaching philosophy is pretty well aligned with the learning

outcomes that we want to see among our majors, and within the department" (interview,

2016).

The process of assessment that each participant previously described has come with

challenges and successes. The participants were asked to describe and highlight both

challenges and successes they have experienced with the act of assessment. P1 described the challenge of meeting the requirements of the institutional assessment process. P1's institution requires that there are assessment rubrics development within the department specific to their major. *"We have to comply with institutional assessment rubrics or data, and then also with departmental, because we're required to assess our own department coursework"* (P1, personal communication, August 2016). According to P1, the process is challenging due to the variations of teaching philosophies that are present in the group developing this measurement instrument (personal communication, August 2016). *"When it comes to developing the assessment instruments within the department, it's a negotiation ... It's an iterative process that requires a lot of negotiation, and so sometimes what you come up with is a one-size-fits-all that doesn't fit anyone very well"* (personal communication, August 2016). P1 believed that this struggle is ultimately worth it in the end, and pointed to the successful use of the rubric. *"Once we can agree on that (the rubric), this it's pretty good."* P1 continued, *"...getting to that point is a little tricky sometimes, but yeah, we can immediately identify a deficiency and then work to address it, so it is useful in that sense"* (personal communication, August 2016). This point was illustrated by P1, highlighting the senior capstone assessment process:

> *I'll start with the capstone class for our majors has really benefited from that*
> *assessment, when we do assessment for those capstone classes as a faculty.*
> *Rather than just me doing the assessment, we have four people, sometimes*
> *five, in the room doing those assessments together of the capstone senior final*
> *class. What's been fantastic about that is that we are then able to modify our*
> *individual curricula to meet those goals. If I teach ... I don't teach the*
> *beginning production class, somebody else does, and they see the student*
> *work, and they say, "Wow, we're really, this batch is not meeting those marks*
> *very well," and so he or she will adjust their class to make sure that we're*
> *getting better outcomes.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P2's experience with the challenges inherent in the assessment process were making sense of the educational process in general. Meeting the challenges of entering the field of higher education from an outside industry created a steep learning curve that P2 articulated:

I have thought about this and there have been different activities I've participated on my campus related to assessment. One of the big things when I first started teaching which was pointed out to me, and it made me feel so much better, was that faculty are experts in their subject area, they're not necessarily experts on how to teach. That was a big thing for me. I worked in industry for a while, and now I'm teaching in a classroom, and all of a sudden you have all these educational practices that I was totally new to.

How do I do this, how do I do that? I think that was when I first started really thinking about assessment. It was sort of wrapping my head around what it is, how to do it, what's the right way ... Those kind of things. Then looking at different types of tools to use for assessment, I'm not a huge fan of rubrics, I feel like they can be very limiting, but at the same time they provide a certain amount of structure, which I think is helpful for students. I think once they know what their expectations are, they understand how they're going to be graded, I think that can be very helpful. I think at times they can limit thinking. Students are only hitting the things that are listed in the rubric. They're not really going beyond, and in a creative field you have to kind of strike that balance between providing some kind of structure, limitations, so that they have a place to start, but you can't provide too much structure, too many limitations, because then it starts to become ... It just limits creativity, I feel, after a while.

So that's been a big challenge for me is finding the right assessment tool at the right time. To be honest, I change it from class to class and sometimes even from assignment to assignment. I think technical assignments in film production are easier to grade, you know, especially when they're learning say a camera. Go out and do a camera test and we're going to talk about exposure and focus and things like that. These are easily measurable outcomes. When you talk about the aesthetics of something, why did you make a certain choice, why did you deviate from what might be considered classical cinematic grammar? Why did you frame something in an unusual way? Is it because you didn't notice or you didn't care? Or because you were actually trying to do something new?

That's when it gets tough. The more artistic, the more subjective, the more wanting kids to just kind of experiment and make mistakes without penalty. Because I think that's a big thing is to let kids just experiment with different things. I mean failure is just part of creativity in general. I think you have to encourage it the right way and sort of take that sense of penalty away.

That's the biggest challenge for the assessment. What's the right tool for each assignment? Trying to find a way that makes sense to me, but also makes sense to the students. If you're changing up your grading from assignment to assignment to assignment, in every class, each individual class, then it seems kind of random to them, it seems like ... what's this professor doing? Trying to strike that balance between customizing how I'm going to assess a particular assignment and being consistent so that they don't feel completely lost. (personal communication, August 2016)

P2 spoke in detail about a specific success that they had experienced with assessment. This success has been a direct reflection of P2's teaching process that has been refined in this particular illustration. This refinement has been guided by implementing specific assessments during the overall process of writing a short screenplay as a class assignment. Ultimately, P2 attributed the assessment process to structuring the assignment in a way to strengthen the learning by students in this classroom. P2 articulated the following process:

With that script assignment, it took me a while to figure this out, but basically I have to break it down- it's their first attempt at screenwriting- so I break it down into smaller pieces. Each week they have a writing assignment, they turn in their writing assignment to me, I give it back to them the next week with comments and feedback. We kind of build the script from there. The first drafts, I don't grade them. I give them credit for turning it in on time, and there's penalties if they don't turn it in on time. What I do is I give them feedback on their script and I give it back to them the following class and they have another full week to do the final script. That gap, between turning in their first draft and they have two week to do the final draft, and even having no grade for the first draft of the script, I've found that works really well. Because the hardest thing to do when you're writing is to just get it done, just get it on paper. We take away, again this idea of failing. So this is their first screenplay for most of them ever. It's going to be terrible, because that's what it is, but it's okay. You got your ten pages down, you handed it in on time. That's an accomplishment, you should feel good about that. Now let's break it down and do it better and then we'll grade. I'll give you a grade for the final draft. This kind of iterative process, draft after draft after draft, kind of building things slowly. That has worked well. It's more grading for me. It's more time-consuming, but I see clear growth even from the first draft to the second draft, but certainly from their beginning idea all the way to the final draft. The growth is really, in some cases, it's really impressive, that these students just kind of like they start to really internalize what it is their doing.

They start to really understand the story they're trying to tell. (personal communication, August 2016)

P3 expressed the challenge of professional educational studies being foreign to those outside this academic pursuit. P3 was able to sum up this major challenge with the assessment process by stating, *"First of all, the word (assessment) itself"* (personal communication, July 2016). This statement was furthered explained by P3:

> *There is such good research in philosophy of education and pedagogy, and yet, I'm only conjecturing here, because this research takes place in close-term environments in schools of education, separate from other academic divisions or institutions, there's this vocabulary that has emerged in the educational administration that sometimes seems foreign to faculty members. When they hear the words, all of a sudden, they get this glazed over look in their eyes, and they think, "Oh my goodness, we're going down the route of standardized testing." They attach to it the worst stereotypes that they can think of when it comes to educational administration. When I hear the word, I try to create a word family of other words that have more direct connection to what our every day experience is in the classroom. It's overcoming that initial, almost like a knee-jerk reaction to the word itself, and what it implies. That's the biggest challenge so far for me.* (personal communication, July 2016)

The challenge of getting beyond the word, itself, has been possible for P3 by becoming more educated and involved in the assessment process. P3 described their personal transformation. *"It's been this really interesting, education process for me, because when I first began this, I was interested more in doing the least amount of harm. Heard the horror stories of over assessment, and external interference, and of course, the issue of academic independence, and academic freedom, and the encroaching world of external controls around that"* (personal communication, July 2016). P3 continued, *"As I got involved in the process, I started seeing there's actual benefits to going through this"* (personal communication, July 2016). The realization of how valuable this information is and

how it fits into the process of educating their students has been a positive byproduct of fully

engaging in assessment. P3 summed up this thought in the following:

> *It's actually pretty useful to have this moment where you collect real*
> *information, rather than everyone just saying, "Oh, we're doing a great job*
> *here, we're doing a great job," and having that echo chamber, to collect some*
> *external information and seriously take a look and say, "Okay, what's*
> *working, and what is surprising you about this?" That's been probably the*
> *most useful transformation that I've gone through in doing this process,*
> *probably over the last seven years.* (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 echoed the thoughts of P2 and P3 by pointing to their own education and prior

experience as a specific challenge with assessment. P4 explained, *"I think assessment is*

subjective. I think it depends on our training as a professor, as a faculty" (personal

communication, July 2016). However, this challenge that P4 spoke about diverted from the

thought of prior training specific to the educational process and pointed to the expansion of

knowledge within the field of film production. P4 described this experience:

> *I'm coming out of the MFA in film and television. My background was in*
> *broadcast journalism. The way I was taught with broadcast journalism was*
> *how to pick up the camera and shoot a story. There wasn't a whole lot*
> *involved in the technique, the look, the feel and even really the development.*
> *As I'm coming out of the MFA program, I've learned so much more that as*
> *I'm assessing students now, then I'm looking at different qualities than I have*
> *before.* (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 identified prior knowledge of students coupled with shifts in technology as other

major challenges to the assessment process. The ease of use and access to industry

technologies created a moving target for P4 assessment process. *"I think the challenge is*

determining what are they capable of doing when they come in the door and identifying

whether or not I'm teaching them something that's going to challenge them and raise their

knowledge" (personal communication, July 2016).

The successes that P4 identified were very student centered. Working with students to successfully identify areas that need improvement to yield better overall productions has been a major theme to this type of success experienced by P4. *"The successes I would have to say would be the credibility that students gain from the assessment. Their ability to push themselves to do things that are a little more challenging."* P4 added, *"The successes are really about the improvements that are made over time once they receive that feedback"* (personal communication, July 2016).

The challenge of balancing objectivity and subjectivity when assessing students work was the area that P5 identified. This challenge was compounded by making the assessment relevant to the student's progression towards an intended outcome. P5 highlighted this unique challenge in the following:

> *Obviously the biggest challenge in assessing something like script writing is, while there are a lot of objective things that students need to learn to do such as breaking a story down into themes, proper formatting and the like, there's always going to be a certain subjectivity involved in evaluating another person's creative work. The biggest challenge for me is just that, to not eliminate the subjectivity, but bring to students' attention the fact that, "Yes, I am giving you a certain amount of my opinion of what your work is, but I've also shown you these real-world examples. That's something that you're either coming closer to or not coming closer to. That's the challenge.*
> (personal communication, August 2016)

Successes with P5's assessment process were reflected in an informal summative evaluation of each student's perceptions. These perceptions were of value to P5 as a way to check how the students had progressed to an outcome of a specific course. Specifically, P5 identified a scriptwriting course to illustrate this point. P5 stated, *"…on a 'good semester' maybe 10% of the students who take that class are really passionate about writing, want to be writers, want to be script writers"* (personal communication, August 2016). The other

students in this course were on different trajectories to become members of a camera crew,

editors, producers, etc. A major success that P5 and their students engaged in throughout the

semester is described in the following:

> *My biggest success is at the end of the semester, I always take an informal survey, not for a grade, but just to get perspective. One of the questions is do you agree or disagree with the statement, "I have learned that there is more to being a writer than I ever thought"? Overwhelmingly, they agree that there's more to writing for this field than they ever thought. That's one of the big successes that I see, that just the process, putting them through a constant evaluation, constant feedback on their work, shows them how much the writer contributes and how much work the writer does for the production. I think that's a real success of my assessment policy.* (personal communication, August 2016)

Again, the challenge of overcoming the term assessment and the perceived negativity

associated with the assessment process was what P6 pointed to as major challenges. P6

believed that this challenge stemmed from a variety of circumstances. *"I think a lot of*

people feel like it's something we just have to do. It's one more thing that we have to do in

order to check a box, rather than seeing it as something like how can we make use of this

thing as an avenue to make use of assessment as something that would be valuable for us to

learn from" (personal communication, September 2016). This challenge of perception is not

easily shifted. However, P6 confided:

> *I think that assessment doesn't really come up as a topic until it's time to do it because you're required to. I think like anything else if you're going to do assessment well, you've really got to plan for it ahead of time. Ideally, at the front end of the process. I think that when you're dealing with existing programs that weren't necessarily designed with assessment in mind, sometimes the assessment process feels a little bit more like it's just something that has to be done in order to meet accreditation guidelines, rather than something that can really be used to improve your teaching or your program.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 illustrated this idea using a personal experience when leading an assessment

project at a prior college. They were tabbed with the task of identifying specific program

learning outcomes to assess and what types of artifacts the department would use to identify

these outcomes. The major challenge that P6 found was the lack of engaged support or

interest in this process. *"No one was really interested in that so it was just a matter of doing*

it because it had to be done" (personal communication, September 2016). P6 suggested:

> *It would have been great to be able to have a conversation with colleagues, at*
> *the beginning of the process, to be able to say, okay, what do we as a program*
> *really want to know about ourselves and try to improve over the long haul. I*
> *think for most faculty that's just not something that's of interest. I think that*
> *we are all very busy and I understand the reasons for it. I think assessment is*
> *seen mostly as a chore.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 suggested that some faculty feel as if they are required to engage in assessment.

This requirement has been ordered with little to no explanation of its purpose or benefits.

According to P6, this has been one of the reasons for faculty being assessment averse. P6

said:

> *Never at the front end of the process is it really explained what could you get*
> *out of assessment? How could assessment be of benefit to you and what*
> *you're doing? It's always kind put in the terms of we have to do this to meet*
> *our accreditation guidelines. This is being imposed on you by an outside force*
> *that's sort of faceless. It doesn't come from the "how could assessment be*
> *good for you?" It's rarely sort of couched in those terms. I think that's sort of*
> *one problem.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 identified the challenge of organizational change as another factor that negates the

acceptance and full embracement of assessment. In P6's experience, a seasoned faculty who

has been in place and operating under entrenched norms causes a push back from accepting

assessment as a positive process. P6 explained:

> *I get the sense that around the time that I started, assessment at some*
> *institutions was just sort of a new thing that was like, "Oh, now we really*

have to do this because the accreditors really want it." There were faculty who had been working for potentially decades and never had to do that kind of work before. I think that for those who started their careers before assessment became what it is now, it's seen as this thing that was added on and I think maybe viewed as "We didn't have to do this before when I started and everything was fine, so why are we doing it now?" (personal communication, September 2016)

The successes that P6 offered were in two categories. The first is the improvement of one's own teaching, and the second is the ability to identify program needs, deficiencies or successes. Both of these positive experiences are directly related to improvement of the student's educational experience. *"When I started out teaching, I think the need for assessment was very — I really wanted to get as much feedback as I could to try to figure out how to teach because I wasn't really taught how to teach"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). P6 conducted midterm course evaluations that were not required by the institution, but used as a means to gain insight into what was working for the students and what was not working. According to P6, these informal evaluations *"...had the most direct impact upon improving my teaching early on, in terms of getting a sense of what I was doing and how it was affecting students"* (personal communication, September 2016).

The second success with assessment pointed out by P6, aligns with program assessment, not necessarily student assessment. However, the importance of this type of assessment was instrumental in how P6 described it as a way to directly affect what a student is being taught and how they would be receiving this information from a program standpoint. This success is highlighted in the following:

> *I have seen comprehensive program reviews be useful for making a case for much-needed change within a program. Whether it's the hiring of a certain faculty with a certain skillset because that's clearly missing within the program or making a case for other larger structural changes. What's interesting about that is my perception is outside reviewers in their larger*

assessments have a voice that is sometimes more well-respected by
administrators than the faculty within the program. I have seen cases where
outside reviewers have carried significant amount of weight in potentially
making a change for a program that everyone knew was there for a long time
and had been talking about, but it wasn't until someone from the outside said
it that it was taken seriously. (personal communication, September 2016)

The major challenge that P7 described was taking consideration of artistic expression into the process of instructional assessment. The technical aspects of film/video production assessment are, oftentimes, less challenging to gauge. According to P7, *"...in an introductory level course there's some things that are easier. Is it in focus? Did you white balance? There's some very skillset things. Then I think it becomes difficult as maybe the semester progresses or in a higher level class where you're starting to try to push the person to reach a professional level"* (personal communication, September 2016).

As the student moves through the program and gains mastery of some of these basic technical skills, artistic choices begin to become more clear in the student work being produced. This progression produces a challenge when P7 is engaged with assessment. P7 explained, *"...there's also a level of opinion, like I wouldn't watch this, or I don't find this interesting, and always trying to monitor yourself as the person who is grading and the person who is making those decisions in an academic space, whether you're making them out of your own taste, or if you're making them out of something that is more definable"* (personal communication, September 2016). The struggle to balance a student's artistic choices while monitoring their progression toward an intended outcome is not only a present in the academic setting. This struggle can also parallel what is seen in the professional industry as well. P7 stated, *"I think it's hard when somebody is trying to be artistically true to themselves to find that line between trying to make sure they understand the mainstream*

and what most people expect and not stifling their creative desires" (personal communication, September 2016).

The successes that P7 described were in regards to their own teaching and course structure. The act of assessment has guided P7 to become more clear with expectations and has helped them design assignment feedback at specific times during specific assignments. P7 expressed, *"...giving a clear communication of what I want and what I expect to the students so that they can, and do similar things early on in the course of the semester or course"* (personal communication, September 2016). P7 furthered this thought by explaining, *"What I guess I've figured out is that the more you can do early on at fairly low stakes, but with the same structure in place helps them figure out expectations"* (personal communication, September 2016). P7 has given a lot of thought to how and when assessment will be most impactful for a student's learning. *"Again, what I've learned is that the feedback early on and the quality of it needs in a way to be higher than the feedback that they get on their final project because we're all human, and once you've clicked that box, you've moved on"* (personal communication, September 2016).

P8 identified prior knowledge as a challenge with assessment. The fact that students come into the classroom with a wide range of skill and capabilities makes it difficult to assess them against a single measurement. P8 described this challenge:

> *There are all kinds of skill levels in a class like this. I had 23 students from 17 different majors in the first class that I taught. There's like four people that have done journalism work and they already know how to do everything. Then there are ten people who don't and then there are a few people that are really scared like super intimidated both by their classmates and the equipment. I think it wouldn't be right for me to have like a single standard of evaluation across those people.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P8 addressed this challenge by shifting their mindset when it came to assessment. *"I guess with assessment we usually think about assessing individual students. We don't think about assessing the entire animal of a class. I really try to assess the entire animal of the class"* (personal communication, August 2016). This mind shift away from the thought of assessing students against a single standard opened P8's evaluation process to place a high value on the collaborative experience their students were working through.

In this case, the films being produced and the collaborative process of filmmaking are examined for the assessment. P8 explained, *"What are the directions of the films as they're kind of being worked on. They're all collaborative projects"* (personal communication, August 2016). This collaborative learning experience is one of the successes that P8 attributed to assessment. By allowing students of different skill sets to work together, peer-to-peer learning is promoted and the final product has the opportunity to showcase each of the student's strengths. P8 illustrated this point by describing a scenario where a nontraditional student with little prior knowledge, but excellent producer skills with connections to the subject matter has been working with a traditional college student with advanced technical skills. According to P8, *"...when they work with one of these younger students who already knows a fair amount and can learn a lot of the technical stuff, they get really far on a film because they have these deep connections in the community. They have a real reason for wanting to do it"* (personal communication, August 2016). This type of learning and educational experience for students was present due to P8's philosophy of assessment.

P9's teaching philosophy was embedded with the challenge of assessing students with prior knowledge. They expressed this challenge as follows:

I think that you need multiple methods and tools to assess multiple types of assessments. Also, in this day and age, you've got students coming in with experience and some coming in with no experience in this particular field, so it's almost an individual assessment at times. When I've got a student that comes in with a few years of high school work in a media department, I'll probably hold them to a different standard than I would if a student came in and they'd never turned on an editing software or never had turned on a camera, which happens. To hold the entire class to a specific standard all the time probably doesn't benefit, really, anyone. (personal communication, September 2016)

In order to perform assessment that is being challenged by a student with prior knowledge, P9 suggested, *"...you have to get to know your students and get to know what they're capable of to perform a proper assessment at times"* (personal communication, September 2016). *"The prior knowledge that students may have gained before stepping on campus can be linked to technology"* (P9, personal communication, September 2016). In regards to technology, P9 mentioned other challenges:

I think that the technology sometimes hurts us because we are trying to keep on top of this technology, and our assessment tools have to constantly be changing. It's a lot of work, especially when you're teaching three-plus courses and you've got multiple, multiple students. It affects the standard, or the method that we may be using to assess is changing semester to semester, so that is a challenge, staying on top of it and keeping current and relevant. (personal communication, September 2016)

The subjectivity of the field as an art form was another challenge that P9 expressed. According to P9:

Some of these things that we're trying to assess are not as black and white. When you're using a rubric, when you're assessing a skill that is more black and white, say a technical skill, that's a little bit easier, in my opinion. Then when you start trying to assess creativity or you start trying to assess the storytelling, creative aspect of what the film is that you're putting together, there's subjectivity in that. How do you get your own taste and your own perspective out of the assessment when you should be trying to help that student, he or she, just get through the process and make sense of it to them? Obviously, if it's something that I don't quite understand, and it might be for a different audience, I have to take that into consideration, but I can also tell

them, "Hey, these are really nice projects, but you might not be able to make a living doing this." Art is a hard thing, at times, to assess because of that subjectivity. (personal communication, September 2016)

A success that P9 has experienced with assessment is in relation to their own description of their teaching. *"I guess, the success for me is I believe that I've become a better teacher because of it, and I think that I make the department stronger because of it"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 further explained:

> *I've been doing this now 15 years. When you start, you don't have a lot of guidance on how to teach. I came out of industry. I have an MFA in film production, but I was never taught how to teach. I was hired as a teacher mainly because of my experience in the field, and, of course, I have a terminal degree. I went in the classroom, and, all of a sudden, I'm supposed to be able to put assignments together that make sense, and they build upon each other to hit a goal. When you start talking about goals and outcomes and all that stuff, my head was spinning when I first started.*

P9 continued:

> *Assessment forces you to break it down into parts that you can assess, and that makes a lot of sense to the student, instead of throwing the whole big picture at them all at once. Of course, they're not going to get it. It's complicated. It's complex, and there's many different ways to achieve the outcome of a film or a video. Part of our goal in the classroom is really just to allow them the opportunity to craft their own process.* (personal communication, September 2016).

The transformation that P9 described has improved the overall teaching experience for them. According to P9, *"As I've moved along and matured as a professor, I firmly believe that my understanding of assessment has allowed me to become more confident in my skills and also not just confidence; there's proof"* (personal communication, September 2016).

P10 spoke about one specific challenge surrounding the topic of assessment—the relationship of classroom assessment and institutional assessment. P10 stated, *"In terms of classroom and formative assessment, the challenges are not as dramatic as they are with*

assessment on a college-wide level" (personal communication, September 2016).

Documentation is the challenge P10 perceived inhibits the process and can produce an

unfavorable attitude towards the term assessment. P10 suggested:

> *Just the documentation of and recording of and reflecting on is more problematic than the actual assessment of whether or not they're learning things in the classroom. It's the documentation of that because I feel totally comfortable that my students are learning the things that are in our course goals and whatnot. Do I have concrete evidence of all of those things if I were called to present it, not necessarily so but, in a formative fashion, I'm totally confident.* (personal communication, September 2016)

Conducting classroom assessment and collecting assessment data that links to

institutional outcomes are challenges that P10 described. These challenges were elaborated

by P10:

> *Definitely there are things I have concrete evidence on and there are definitely things I don't have concrete evidence on. I have formative and anecdotal evidence. That's a challenge. I don't know that it's our charge to document everything and have hard evidence on everything, but I think on the major goals of the course, we probably should have something that addresses that. The difficulty is in a video class or in a multimedia class, a project may hit on four or five of the course objectives, or even the program objectives, all within one project. Can you use that piece to satisfy multiple course objectives or program objectives, and then where do you store that? How do you present that if someone were to call upon you to do that?* (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 pointed out the development and implementation of rubrics as a success that they

have experienced with assessment. The specific usage of rubrics has affected the value of

this instrument for P10. P10 explained:

> *I think the classes where I create a good rubric and have clear-cut criteria in the students' hands in advance or with the assignments as they go out and discuss those and then review them in the class as a group later and discuss it strictly in terms of the rubric, I think are probably the best examples. They know what their expectations are and they've got them on a piece of paper, I think that that's ... Because I've used online rubrics and I don't think they're*

as effective with the students, particularly in art classes at this level. (personal communication, September 2016)

Each of the participants placed value on the assessment process and offered examples of challenges and success. The follow-up question to explore each of their individual experiences with assessment was: How have you improved your assessment? This question was intended on allowing the participants to offer examples of trial and error processes that have produced positive learning for their students.

P1 spoke about the positive effects that developing the departmental assessment criteria has had on the faculty. There has been a movement towards acceptance and understanding of the value of assessment that has in turn improved P1's overall assessment. P1 described this evolution:

> *A couple of things that we've done are some of what I've already mentioned, and that is developing the assessment criteria for our majors together, collaboratively, so that we're identifying any deficiencies or oversights within the general, the fine arts curriculum, and our major curriculum. Doing that together is, really improves. We've improved that process quite a lot, because it used to be where somebody would come up with it and say, "It's your turn to write the assessment rubric or criteria," and then somebody would write it out. Then it would be really cumbersome, so that's been definitely a success. I'd say, in terms of modifying, again, course content, to correspond with the criteria, has been also really useful, and has improved over ... As longer I've been teaching, that's become a better process.* (personal communication, August 2016)

The improvement has been specifically a departmental process; however, P1's inclusion in this process has improved their overall assessment of student work as well.

P2's outlook on their improvement was very much individualist and focused on refining their own teaching skills. The ability to become a clear communicator to students and providing structure were two aspects that P2 felt they have improved within their own assessment experiences. *"I think, in terms of improving my assessment process, a lot of it has*

just been to be clearer with students and to really put a description of the assignment and a description of the key things I'm looking for in each assignment" (personal communication, August 2016). P2 offered:

> *When I first started teaching, a lot of it was trial and error. I think the first couple years I was kind of- I don't want to say I was winging it but I was just gaining experience. You are kind of winging it, you know? A lot of it was like why don't you just turn stuff in and I'll figure it out once I see it. Now I think once you've taught a class a couple of times, you're sort of like, okay, now I wrapped my head around this is the most likely thing that will have. You always get outliers, some student that does something I never expected, good and bad. I think now, just having- like I said, trying to find that balance between providing enough structure so they don't feel overwhelmed but not so much structure that they feel constrained. (personal communication, August 2016)*

This trial and error process has led to clearer ways of communicating without disrupting a student's personal learning style and exploration within the realm of film production. P2 described how this improvement has manifested itself within their teaching practices. *"I think just being clear with students has been something that I've tried to improve on over time. Even if I've said to students, this is a judgment call on your part."* (P2, personal communication, August 2016). P2 continued:

> *Just even saying that to students, this is a judgment call, use your best judgment. I'm going to critique you on your judgment using my own experience in production. Just saying that to them and giving them just that as their parameters, use your judgment, then we can go from there. Rather than saying, do whatever you want, it's your project, you have to figure it out. Kind of focusing on the fact that they need to think critically and use their judgment. Sometimes just saying that gets them thinking better. (personal communication, August 2016)*

P3 elaborated on how assessment has been a great tool for them improve their own teaching as well. This thought parallels the experiences that P2 described. P3 offered this description of their own experience:

When I began teaching, I had more of an intuitive sense of assessment. I would try out a teaching technique, or try out a project, and see if it was useful in terms of students, I would normally poll students, things like that. Then I realized that academic life, you get caught up in crisis after crisis, and you don't take that time to step back and look at this. (personal communication, July 2016)

This experience with learning how to offer more relevant presentations of materials to students has been one of the ways P3 felt they have not only used assessment effectively, but also how they have improved their own assessment process. P3 stated, *"…it [assessment] is a construct to force me to stop and reflect, and think about how I could be doing things better or differently"* (personal communication, July 2016). P3 explained that over the years this evaluation of one's own teaching has directly affected their ability to teach as well as provide meaningful assessment to students. P3 added:

The assessment gives me a tool to use to evaluate my own teaching. I can have a perception of how my class is going, and that perception could be accurate, or it could be inaccurate, and the assessment, for as flawed as any data might be, it gives me some sort of external measure of, is this really working the way I intended it to work? (personal communication, July 2016)

P4's improvement with the assessment process has come in the form of communicating more clearly to students. This communication has dealt primarily with providing students with well defined expectations for assignments. P4 explained this in greater detail:

I will say, what I have done to improve is I have added rubrics. I've physical hard copy rubrics that goes back to the student. I used to just vocally go through and tell them what areas of improvement, what they did good. However, I have found that giving them the hard copy rubric gives them something to reflect on, allows me to refer back to that to say, "Okay this is what we talked about in class. This is how I was assessing it and this is why you got the grades you got." The rubrics have really been the improvement to my assessment over time. (personal communication, July 2016)

The development of rubrics has been an ongoing process that has forced P4 to take many

outside variables into consideration. P4 explained*, "Then of course as I see in the classroom,*

the technology changing then I may update those rubrics and make changes to those rubrics.

Just monitoring, keeping a pulse on the video production process and what's coming into the

classroom" (personal communication, July 2016).

P5's improvement with the assessment process echoed the experience of P4.

However, P5 not only explained the importance of clear communication to students, but also

went on to explain the value this communication of expectations has to the instructor. P5

offered the following:

> *I think the way I have improved it most has been through the development and*
> *the refinement of rubrics for each specific assignment. This is an original idea*
> *of mine. I was inspired to do this by taking workshops in improving evaluation*
> *at my university. It's like the old saw about supposedly what a Supreme Court*
> *justice said about pornography. She didn't know what it was, but knew when*
> *she saw it. I think anybody who teaches any subject over a period of years and*
> *anybody who comes to their subject with real-world experience, which I did,*
> *is its sort of like that when we start. You might not be able to articulate what*
> *good work is again in a subject with a certain amount of subjectivity like my*
> *own, but you know it when you see it. Developing rubric has really helped me*
> *to know it when I see it and articulate it, articulate why I know it when I see it.*
> (personal communication, August 2016)

P5 went on to explain the process and value of using rubrics with specific illustrations then

described how first time writing students usually offer excellent beginnings to stories but,

often times, lack developing a three act structure.

> *Putting that in a rubric form where I can look and say, "You've done act 1.*
> *There's no act 2 and no act 3 and here's why," that has been a real help in*
> *not just clarifying my own teaching, but making it clear to the student where*
> *they can look and go, "Oh yeah. You're right. You're right. I didn't tell what I*
> *thought I was going to tell. Rubrics really work in my humble opinion.* (P5,
> personal communication, August 2016)

In order to effectively communicate these expectations to the students, P5 believes that the rubrics need to be explicit and offered to the student before they begin the assignment. *"All of my rubrics are visible before the student undertakes the assignment. I go over the instructions with them, but if they care to go on Blackboard, they can look at the rubrics. All of the points of the rubrics are covered in my instructions"* (personal communication, August 2016). This clear communication is done with purpose. *"I never believe in playing guessing games with the student. "Am I giving [P5] what they want or am I not giving [P5] what they want? How do I know? I won't know until I get the paper back." I don't believe in that"* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). The purposeful articulation of expectations in the form of a rubrics is where P5 believes they have grown in the assessment process over the years.

When asked the question of how they have improved their assessment, P6 highlighted areas that they have struggle with in the assessment process. The point P6 made by doing this is to magnify the importance of taking on the challenges of assessment in a subjective area. P6 offered the following illustration:

> *I guess what I do appreciate about assessment I think is when conscious thinking of assessment and trying to really deeply ask the question, "How could we do what we're doing better?" If collaboration is a goal, just taking that as an example again, then how can I measure- I think this is one of the big challenges in production and in the arts or anything that's, especially something that's subjective in the area of quality, like collaboration or any artistic outcomes. It's how do we measure what success is? I think what I appreciate about grappling with that question is we can try and fail, and I think that the important thing is to keep trying to find ways to do it. I ended up one semester trying to lead an emotional intelligence sort of assessment at the beginning, middle, and end of a capstone class, just encouraged the students to do it and then talk about what was interesting to you about your assessment and/or areas that you thought you would want to work on in this area of emotional intelligence? It completely bombed because they weren't into it. They didn't really connect to what they were doing that directly. I felt*

like it was kind of in the right realm but I was sort of grasping at straws and the students just couldn't really make the connection between why are we doing this and how does it really relate to how we're working with each other? (personal communication, September 2016)

The improvement by P6's assessment process is not always about successes but, rather, purposeful thinking and actions with the intention to improve student learning and program effectiveness.

Another illustration of P6's experience in regards to improving their assessment process dealt with the challenge of assessing collaboration. *"I've spent a lot of time thinking about is how do we assess collaboration. I don't know that I've gotten that right"* (personal communication, September 2016). The following description of their experience offers a glimpse into what P6 learned from taking on this challenge. P6 also highlighted the ramifications that the assessment process has on student learning. P6 suggested:

> *I feel like a lot of the things that we assess have some more straightforward ways of being able to assess them and collaboration has been one that I've struggled with for a long time. I know other people do this, but I got to a point where I've basically had students peer evaluate each other for their collaboration on larger group projects, especially things that involve four or more people working in a group on a production. Each of those people probably has a specialized role, so it's director of photography, an editor, sound, directing, producers, and it was just impossible as- not being there with them through the whole process to be able to really assess what stories are true or what perspectives are the most valid coming back from set.*
>
> *When I had students assess each other that way, there would be a lot of congruence in the way that a crew would sort of see each other's contributions. I wouldn't get a lot of variations in scores for the same person. If it was low for somebody, it was almost like everybody was probably rating that person low. I think that one of the things that I moved towards was trying to find a way to get that feedback to the students earlier so they'd have an opportunity to correct it. When I first started doing it, it was just a summation at the end. It was like, okay we finished the class now let's have the peer evaluations for collaborations. It was meant to be an incentive to try to help them understand you're going to be evaluated on this so you need to make sure that you're contributing in a way that meets the guidelines for what your role was.*

I guess over time I started to realize that that feedback needed to come to the student earlier than at the end of the semester because it was too late. Now I'm not teaching courses that have large numbers of students working together like that. I think that perhaps my next step is trying to help students understand how they are or are not collaborating well by finding a way to get that feedback to them during the process and make collaboration more of a conversation during the course of the semester, instead of just advocating for it at the beginning and then hoping it goes well. (personal communication, September 2016)

This approach to modifying the structure of how and when students receive feedback has been a byproduct of P6's conscious decision to engage with trial and error of assessment practices.

P7 communicated the importance of developing rubrics with clear expectations as an area that they have experienced improvement with assessment. P7 stated, *"…over the years I have sort of become a convert to the idea of rubrics"* (personal communication, September 2016), and then confided:

The truth of the matter is I think it's a really good thing. It's clear communications and I think a lot of times students get lost in the weeds when they don't understand what's expected of them, and so I've found that I really do like that, and it also is very helpful. I really haven't had anything that's ever progressed to the level of the school getting involved in a grade that I've given, but I have had students who have asked me to sort of break down how they got the grade, and the rubric is an incredible document for that. I would say, the last thing I would add to that is on my syllabus I give a sort of here's how you can get an A, here's how you can get a B, here's kind of C sort of thing. A is meets all expectations, and B is met most expectations. C is met, I guess, I don't remember exactly, met an average amount of expectations. D is met few expectations, and F is met almost no expectations. (personal communication, September 2016)

Not only did P7 believe they had improved their practice with expressing clear expectations to students, but they had also improved the structure regarding when they are offering feedback to students. This improvement stems from P7's personal educational:

I mean I think a lot of the classes that I took, you didn't get a lot of feedback or a lot of attention to early projects because they were very much just start. You were expected not to have everything clicking on those, and I guess what I've found is giving the same structure to those projects, the same amount but close to the same amount of feedback, because at the end the feedback is largely useless. In a feature writing class, journalism class I gave students at the end the opportunity to rewrite and it's during the sort of final period of the semester you could rewrite your project and regain half the points that you'd lost with the draft that you turned into me. Because if you already had an A, they didn't have any incentive to learn from those comments that I'd given them. Versus the people who had B's, and C's, and D's were very motivated to go ahead and do that work. (personal communication, September 2016)

P8 elaborated on many unique experiences that touched on how they have improved their assessment process. These experiences have been structured by P8 as the instructor within the context of the classroom, however the learning is directly attributed to the students. At times, P8 admitted that they did not know how to evaluate specific happening in the classroom; however, P8 recognized the importance of the experience the students were engaged with was an important process:

I make a really strong conscious effort to have a diverse group of students. I think too diversity education and studies that I've read about this it works best especially for these kids it's a really important age, 18-21. They're forming ideas about who you are in the world and what kind of social animal are you going to be after you leave college. It's pretty easy to stay inside of a niche group if you want. We don't really learn a lot about this stuff from reading books about it. You do learn some but having this encounter where you have to work on this thing together with somebody. I don't know how you measure that. I've seen it work. I've seen it not work, which is also valuable as a learning experience. I think that's an important thing at least in my own work, figuring out a way to highlight those aspects of this kind of teaching preference. (personal communication, August 2016)

P8's structure and teaching philosophy of engaging in meaningful conversations with students is one way P8 expressed this type of positive engagement. A way that P8 articulated this structure was, *"To talk about what the expectation are for a group member at the beginning of the quarter and just leave an open invitation to come have a chat with me"*

(personal communication, August 2016). This is one example of how P8 set expectations and opened up an avenue for meaningful dialogue.

Adjusting from industry work to the classroom required a steep learning curve for P9. This adjustment was worth it, as P9 stated: *"...just working my way through the process of assessment to coming out on the other end and being like, yeah, this is important; this works"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 spoke about the embracement of assessment as the first step in their overall improvement of the process. Assessment was not just an activity that was done because they were required to do it by the administration: *"An embracement of assessment really triggered my own thought process as a teacher and allowed me to really think about what it is that I'm doing in the classroom and how I'm going to build my assignments and structure my classroom to give those students the knowledge and the experience and the skills and the ability to think once they graduate and hopefully get into industry"* (personal communication, September 2016).

P9 pointed out that the development of rubrics for technical skills was another moment that helped them progress to an embracement of assessment. *"I figured out this tool communicates an expectation to my student, allows me to assess something with great speed and accuracy"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 continued, *"Defining and articulating why some work might be better than some others, it takes some time, and that's a definite skill that instructors are probably ... at least in my case, that I was struggling with. The rubric helped me define those things"* (personal communication, September 2016).

P10 highlighted their development of useful rubrics as an area that they have improved their assessment the most. *"The development and the fine-tuning of the rubrics I think is the biggest improvement"* (personal communication, September 2016). In order to

express this improvement, P10 reflected on their initial experience as an instructor in higher

education. P10 reflected:

> *When I first started at the college, I didn't even know what a rubric was. As I*
> *was instructed in various teaching courses developed good rubrics for a*
> *variety of different assignments, and then just fine-tune those rubrics as I've*
> *gone. For instance, I have a rubric in one class that has 25 points of*
> *emphasis. I've got it developed in such a way that I can click through it either*
> *on SpeedGrader online or with a highlighter. I can go, "Boom, boom, boom,*
> *boom, boom," and assess 25 different factors in a matter of minutes or a*
> *matter of a minute maybe even because my eye is honed enough to see*
> *whether or not they've met those things at a glance.* (personal communication,
> September 2016)

Liberal arts assessment

The general area and act of assessment was discussed and illustrated in the first line

of questioning. Again, this area was deemed foundational in order to open a dialogue in

regards to each participant's experience with assessment. The next area of questioning was

focused specifically on each participant's perceptions and experiences with the act of

assessing specific skills linked to liberal arts outcomes. This area of questioning was

intended to answer the second of the three research questions:

RQ2: How do instructors describe the assessment strategies used to address liberal arts
based outcomes while teaching film/video production?

In order to answer RQ2, pointed questions were asked of each participant dealing

with specific outcomes that are associated with intended liberal arts outcomes. These areas

were identified through the literature review conducted and formally presented in Chapter 2.

Areas of questioning included the following:

1. Written and Oral Communication
2. Leadership
3. Teamwork
4. Ethical Reasoning

5. Life Long Learning

Each of the participants were asked to explain how they assess these domains and to describe

courses or assignments that may lend itself to this type of assessment.

Written and oral communication

P1 pointed out the program's required capstone course as a way that they assess

written communication. In this class students *"...create a portfolio that has video and audio*

production samples, writing samples, an organizational sample, basically a production book,

and ... Oh, they have to do a mock interview, which they're evaluated on, and then résumé

and cover letter" (P1, personal communication, August 2016). This portfolio offers many

areas for student assessment to occur. P1 stated, *"...it's a way for us to see how well they've*

performed" (personal communication, August 2016). The assessment of written and oral

communication can be found in student-selected writing samples that are submitted and the

oral interview process. In regards to the writing samples, P1 evaluated these artifacts with a

rubric:

> *We assess written communication by having the students submit, in their*
> *capstone class, they submit a sample of writing, and they just submit three*
> *samples. They can be term papers, research projects, TV spots, radio spots,*
> *screenplays, anything that's discipline-specific. Then we look at those as a*
> *group, and follow the evaluation rubric, and the criteria on those were*
> *grammar, spelling, composition, organization, all that ... Logic, all that stuff.*
> *That's how we do it, in terms of writing.* (personal communication, August
> 2016)

P2's explanation of how they assess this domain was based on what the assignment is

and what the goal of the assignment may be: *"In terms of written communication, it depends*

on what type of writing it is. If it's like more creative writing, if it's more research based

writing" (Personal communication, August 2016). The difference between these two identified types of writing guide P2's assessment process.

P2 teaches scriptwriting courses which differ from the expectation of a traditional writing assignment within a college classroom. In P2's classes, the traditional research style of writing is assessed in a way that holds the student to a standard of college level technical expectations. According to P2, the assessment standard is *"...kind of the basics. Things like spelling, grammar, is it clear? Just good basic college level writing skills, is there evidence of college level writing skills?"* (personal communication, August 2016). However, when the assessment turns to scriptwriting, the assessment begins to become more specific to how P2 is guiding the student to the final draft. *"For scripts I try to approach it from a building block- I take a building block approach"* (P2, personal communication, August 2016). P2 explained, *"If it's a script, I would be assessing it based on story components, good dialogue, things like that"* (personal communication, August 2016). This building block approach is described in the following:

> *Like I said, I do a lot of drafts of different things, so each writing assignment has a specific purpose. Did it meet its purpose? If it's a character description, did you describe all the aspects of a character you are asked to? If you're writing a treatment, is the plot explained in the detail it was asked to be? Usually I do one page treatments. Could you explain the entire plot in one page?*

P2 continued:

> *They come in with three ideas and I don't grade the ideas. I don't think you can grade an idea. But they get credit for turning it in. Then they select an idea and they write a one page treatment, just kind of fleshing out beginning, middle, end. They do character description. It's not a biography, I always talk about that, I always say you don't need to know a lengthy history of your character because we write short films. We need to know the here and the now. Who is your character? From there, they do a beat sheet, they'll break things down scene by scene. They do a draft which I don't grade, then they do*

a full draft. In that final draft, in that class I want to say it's like fifteen percent of the final grade, so all of these little assignments are five and ten percent. Actually mostly five. That final draft is fifteen percent of the grade and I'm looking for all of those things in the final draft. I'm looking for plot, I'm looking for character, dialogue, well written action. All of those things but they've had these smaller assignments that have allowed them to practice it. It's their second go at each part of what a script is. (personal communication, August 2016)

P3 echoed the process of assessing student produced scripts as the artifact used to evaluate the domain of written communication. These artifacts are used in a structured process involving assessments which provides feedback to the student as they are producing the script. P3 uses industry standards as guidelines for students to follow:

As far as written and oral communication, I give feedback on scripts, so students will come up with treatment stories, and then in the content part of the course, we'll talk about story structure, different ways of structuring stories, and the idea of character arts, and three act structure. Then we'll have them go through some exercises in plotting out scripts, then we'll have them do short thirty second scripts which employ the three act structure. Then we give them examples in different types of commercials and PSAs that employ that, and then they try recreate something with a similar structure, and then they move on. At those stages, I give them feedback on their scripts, what they're putting together, their treatments. They also put together production bibles, where at the end of their major products, they're also submitting a set of paperwork that they would normally submit as a producer, documenting different parts of the production. They have the cost of the production, and not only the story and the content of the production, but also all the production relays and elements. I'd rate that as to how clear and concise that all is. (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 looks for structure when assessing both written and oral communication. They focus on the structure of both types of commination as a way to gauge if they are processing information and clearly communicating information back to an audience. Specifically, P4 stated they are looking for *"…structure, professionalism, grammatical spelling, vocabulary, those are the key things. Do they know what they're talking about, do they write about it and can they verbally present that?"* (personal communication, July 2016).

The students are expected to structure both types of communications with professional use of terminology and presentation standards. Both written and oral communication are similar when P4 is engaged in the assessment of these skills. *"I'm looking for structure, I'm looking for anything that is grammatically wrong or spelling errors. In terms of the oral, again I'm looking for structure. I'm looking for timeliness. I'm looking for professionalism in terms of the vocabulary that they use. These are the things that I'm assessing in the written and oral"* (P4, personal communication, July 2016).

Once again, scriptwriting became the focus for how P5 assesses written communication. P5 said that they do oral assessments when students are pitching their ideas in class; however, P5's role in the department is the screenwriting expert. P5 spent most of their discussion focused on the assessment of written commination. P5 pointed out the importance of clarifying the goals of technical writing to students in relation to industry standards. Technical standards reflect what P5 refers to as professionalism. *"You give a producer a sitcom-length script, 30 pages, a feature-length script, 90 pages, anything in between, they're not going to throw it back at you because there's a typo on page 17. That's not the level that I'm looking at, but they will throw it back at you if there's two typos on page one, because they're not going to wade through that level of carelessness frankly through an entire script"* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). P5 explained this process:

> *One of the things that I also have to do is I have to include a certain amount of points, for lack of a better term, better assigned to grammar and proofreading. I tell them. I say, "This is not an English class. I expect you to come in with a college-level grasp of grammar and spelling. If you don't have it, here is the contact information for our undergraduate writing centers. They can't help you on the script writing. They'll be more than happy to help you with your spelling and your grammar." I also say, "I'm not doing this*

because I'm a spelling fascist or a grammar fascist. I'm doing this because it is a mark of professionalism to hand a producer a script that is as clean as possible." (personal communication, August 2016)

This type of professionalism that P5 stresses to students is clarified to first time writers who may not have previously written a screenplay. *"It is very much a professionalism because I also point out to them there's a difference between good academic essay writing and good screenwriting"* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). The intended purpose of a script would be to capture its essences on camera by actors interpreting the words in production. This position was illustrated by P5:

> *There's a difference between good academic essay writing and good screenwriting. Some of the things that you do in academic writing or at least what you're taught to do in academic writing, where you're crafting beautiful, compound, complex sentences and paragraphs that go on for pages, etc., you don't do that in screenwriting. You write simply: subject, verb and if necessary object, and one of each to a sentence. You keep your sentences short. If you're expecting people to read or perform your dialog, you might not even get that complicated.* (personal communication, August 2016)

This difference in writing that P5 described manifests itself in their assessment and teaching philosophy. P5 explains to students that their ability to use critical thinking as well as their ability to apply appropriate professional levels of writing are expectations that they will use in the industry. This is highlighted in the way P5 described assessing screenplays. The assessment of dialogue versus scene descriptions require two different professional standards in writing. According to P5:

> *What I explain to them is I'm not going to apply the same standards in reading your creative dialog that I am going to apply to reading your scene descriptions. Your creative dialog is okay if your character speaks ungrammatically. It's okay if they have sentence fragments. In fact, it's natural, but your scene descriptions, I am going to look at for proofing. I am going to look at it for complete sentences because that's what a producer would be looking for if she or he loved your script. You literally are going to*

have to switch gears between one part and the other. (personal communication, August 2016)

This example highlighted the intentional shift in assessment standard. 5P explained, *"there's a completely different set of standards, but they're all still professional standards. It's not 'just academic'."* (personal communication, August 2016).

P6 suggested that assessment of written and oral communication is not a focus when they are teaching a production course. *"In my production courses I don't do that as much, assessment of written and oral communication. Most of my production courses we're starting with screenplays, but that's just the starting point for story. Then what I really assess more is how the story gets developed through production"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). The screenplay is used in the assessment process as a way to set expectations of the story that is being produced. *"I really see the screenplay only serves the purpose of being the sort of starting point and it's used for comparative purposes to what we end up with"* (personal communication, September 2016).

In regards to non-production courses found within the film/video major, P6 employs a rubric based assessment. The process of using this assessment tool is described in the following:

> *I'm teaching an Intro to Media class and I do have a significant number of writing assignments in there. The assessment I use for that is a pretty straightforward rubric of, I think there are about four different kinds of points that I want the students to make sure that they cover and then I give a certain amount of points relative to each of those four areas. I give them that rubric ahead of time just to make sure they're covering the certain areas I want to have addressed and then I give scores for the degree to which they accomplished those four things.* (P6, personal communication, September 2016)

P7 does not usually engage in assessing oral communication within their specific course load. However, the coming semester P7 was assigned to teach a television program development course where the students will be required present oral pitches in class. Until this happens, P7 does not believe they assess oral communication. *"I don't know that I assess oral communication directly in any way"* (P7, personal communication, September 2016). However, in regards to written communication, P7 engages in many different type of assessments. The variety of assessments in this area are due to P7's variation of courses and delivery formats. Within each of these courses P7 believes that expectations need to be clear for assessment to yield student growth. P7 elaborated:

> *I try to tell my students when written communication is going to be graded in and of itself, so I teach online film history and appreciation as well as face-to-face sections. In the discussion section for those for the online class they're not graded for spelling and grammar and so forth. Then I make it very clear for the essay portion that they are, and I try to just say, "Minus one for grammar problem." I try to give them a couple of examples of what was going wrong and tell them the best way to tackle their problems, whether it's they need to proofread it or read it out loud or have somebody else read it, or because of the system we work with, Blackboard, it's possible for them to type their essays directly into Blackboard but it doesn't really have a grammar check or spell check function, so I highly encourage them to write it outside of Blackboard and then upload it.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 provided individual assessment in regards to written assessment. The intention is to identify areas the student need to improve on as well as areas that they are succeeded.

P8 described their assessment of written and oral communication as a process that includes variations of assignments requiring different types of assessments. P8 explained this process:

> *Different ways in different classes but in general I'll have them write a rough draft of the film for the final project they're going to do. They're kind of learning through these basic media production assignments and they have to craft almost like a grant proposal, a really tiny one. I give them a little*

template. I have introductory paragraphs, paragraph doing a lit review kind of a thing, several body paragraphs where you sort of say what the film is going to look like and why this is important at the end. Usually a four-page thing. They do a rough draft of that and I'll evaluate and give written comments. I'll grade those. I give a grade on those kind of quickly so they have a sense about what's expected. Then they turn in a final draft several weeks later. (personal communication, August 2016)

This type of assessment requires P8 to provide feedback that guides the student to the final draft and the expectation provided for the final draft. The improvement or lack of improvement helps clarify the assessment process. P8 stated, *"...they do two drafts....The first one is usually not great and the second one is usually a bit sharper"* (personal communication, August 2016).

Another written communication assessment that P8 uses are written reflection papers. The purpose of these documents are for students to reflect on the process they have gone through. In turn, this provides P8 with information not directly observed in the process and opens the door conversations to clarify any area the student may be struggling in. As far as the assessment of these reflection pieces, P8 is more concerned with the student's ability to fairly assess and communicate the process went through producing the film as opposed to technical writing expertise. P8 offered an example of this type of written reflection and its purpose:

That's one writing assignment and the second thing they have to do is just reflection evaluation. I encourage them to screen it for other people and kind of do almost like a mini reception analysis of the film that they've made based on the feedback that they get. Sometimes the feedback that I get from them is that they try to get some people to come see it and it didn't work. Oh my god, why wouldn't anybody come see my film. That's a good teachable moment too that gosh, you have to work to get people to come see your film after you finish it. I've had students that were really well tapped into networks already and kind of blew me away. We had a film that was about undocumented persons convicted of minor crimes and the sorts of discriminations that they faced subsequently. A really powerful film and they were able to screen this in

a predominately Latino neighborhood at this community center. They had 80 people there. They had a discussion afterward. They did a whole selfie cam thing. One of the students was a grad student, she ended up writing an article about that experience. I can't teach that. (personal communication, August 2016)

Classroom discussions are the main activities that P8 uses to assess oral communication. However, P8 pointed out areas that oral communication may not be assessed, but carries value to the process of filmmaking. P8 explained:

Oral communication is just like those class discussions. Also, for 18-year-olds like calling an adult is really hard. I do make them do that. I help but I don't think that you would evaluate that in oral communication but I will say I've definitely known those filmmakers that can't write or speak and they make amazing films. These haunting, dystopian landscape films or whatever. To do this collaborative work, it's very key. (personal communication, August 2016)

P9 described how their students participate in an oral presentation by pitching their ideas to the entire class. The assessment of these oral presentation was offered by P9:

The first time they give a pitch, just get up there and do it. I don't expect too much. I give them the format, the things that should be included in a good pitch. I'll give them the structure. Really, what I'm doing is I'm looking for the structure of the pitch. Did you apply what we spoke about in class?

P9 continued:

The second time around, when they start pitching, I expect that the structure is there, so that's a formality. They'll be graded upon that structure. Was it solid? Was it tight? Did it work? The second go at a pitch is how are they now processing that information and making it their own? That's where that creativity starts to come in, bleed in there. I'm trying to figure out how are they making this part of their own personality, or what's the creative twist they're putting on it? Is this something we haven't seen before? How are they getting us excited? Is the presentation itself creative? (personal communication, September 2016)

P9 uses rubrics to assess some of the more technical areas of the pitch process, but leaves room for discussion and reflection by the students to move forward to a more polished pitch later in the course. The value of communication is expressed by P9 to students. P9

stated, *"If you can't articulate what it is that you want to see on the screen, it's going to be real tough to get it to show up on the screen"* (personal communication, September 2016). The domain of oral and written communication is assessed in activities that are specific to the process of filmmaking. The quality of the writing and presentation skills are not always the focus of the assignment. P9 summarized:

> *The bare bones of it, I would say, is structure. I'm not an English teacher. I am not a speech teacher. I'm a video production instructor, so it's something that's difficult. I expect college-level writing, and if you're having trouble with that, I will point them to the resources on campus that can help them out with that.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 highlighted the pitching process as the activity that oral communication is assessed. However, this particular domain is not emphasized within program classes due to the fact that the program requires classes in oral communication and composition as specific classes that focus on these aspects. According to P10:

> *Communication, is one of the institutional outcomes. We would assess that maybe in a class where we were to ask our students to pitch a project in front of the class so we could assess their oral communication capabilities there and then assess their written capabilities as well with the paperwork they would have to turn in for that. That is an institutional outcome though, as opposed to a program or a class outcome, so yes, we have to assess communication somewhere along the line, but again, it's maybe once a semester, one class.* (personal communication, September 2016)

Leadership

In regards to assessing leadership, P1 stated, *"We don't assess leadership"* (personal communication, August 2016). P1 continued, *"we never discussed that [leadership]"* in regards to the entire department the P1 works within" (personal communication, August 2016)

The lack of attention to leadership that P1 suggested is also present in how P2 described their experience assessing this domain. However, P2 explained that not all roles on a film crew require that same amount of leadership: *"...it's not the same kind of role as producer or director, which are clear leadership positions. There are elements of leadership in those, say, editor, sound, production designer, but it's not the primary"* (personal communication, August 2016). P2 described how this plays out in their advance film production class:

> *They work in crews of eight to ten students. In terms of leadership, it's really kind of dependent on the individual crew role. The student that's a producer for the crew, I would be looking at their leadership in kind of specific ways. Did they keep the team together? Were they instrumental in facilitating information as it needed to happen, disseminating information? In terms of the director, kind of same thing, did they have the ability to answer each person's questions as it came up? I think I teach and some of the other crew roles, things like being editor or sound, to be honest, I don't assess leadership quite as much.* (personal communication, August 2016)

The assessment that the student receives is based on the leadership capacity of the role that they are assigned. *"I think that's the most fair way to do it, is to look at what a student's actually doing and grade them based on that role"* (P2, personal communication, August 2016).

The expectation of leadership is discussed and more present in a course P2 teaches dealing with directing. P2 stated, *"We talk about the idea that a director is responsible for basically setting the tone, both with the crew and their cast. That they don't have to do everything on set, but they have to answer every question that comes up"* (personal communication, August 2016). Leadership that is present within this specific role is a focus within this course. The following description offered by P2 illustrates the expectations of the student directors and how they are assessed:

They have to facilitate the work of everyone else. That is something that I do assess in that class. A lot of times it's really more of a self-assessment kind of thing because what happens is the students are responsible for finding their own crews and their own casts. There's an acting for the camera class that's run by the theater department that we work closely with, but the directors have to pull it all together. A lot of times it's really evident, based on the footage that comes back. The other thing that I do, and I don't know that this is exactly answering your question but, in that class, the directing class, I have them film their rehearsals. They have to screen it in front of class. A lot of times they'll film it on a cell phone or computer or something like that and they come in and they have to screen five to ten minutes of their rehearsal. I look at the interaction between the director and the actors. That's when we have a conversation about how they were working with their actors. In that sense, again, it's not necessarily specific leadership. It's more along the lines of how are you working with your actors? How are you conducting yourself as a professional? Are you really directing? How are you establishing rapport with your actors as a director? Are you over doing it or under doing it? Because it happens both ways. Sometimes directors kind of like, they'll give line readings and they'll say no, no, do it this way. I want them to collaborate with the actors and give the actors a little bit of leeway to come in with suggestions. Because sometimes actors are thinking about the role in a way that the director isn't, or the director's distracted by oh I have to do this with the camera, I've got this other cast member. They have this actor that's totally dedicated to the role. You want to hear what that person has to say. That's a tool that I use. It's scary for the students, a little bit, because they have to do it in front of their classmates. (personal communication, August 2016)

P3 reorganized their course due to the lack of their assessment the domain of leadership. P3 used to have student work on solo project, but has since structured the coursework to include more group projects. The tools used to assess leadership are a questionnaire and an interview. P3 explained:

At the end of that process [filmmaking], I had each of the students report, both in a structured questionnaire, as well as allowing them to elaborate in any part of how that process went. From that I can understand their relationship as far as teamwork is concerned, as well as who took on leadership roles within this group, who was able to hear feedback from other people, who was able to solve problems when they came up within a production, who took the lead on guiding the production to make sure it was complete. I'll gather that from those questionnaires, and also from brief interviews with each of the students. (personal communication, July 2016)

In a capstone production course, P4 identifies leadership qualities in students and builds the student film crews based on these assessments. P4 described the assessment of leadership as it pertains to this capstone course:

> *I teach a capstone course and I don't necessarily have a leadership grade. The way I would put people in their teams based on their leadership, I assess how they communicate to their team, how they support their team and those that step up. When I'm assessing leadership, I'm looking for someone who is willing to go the extra mile, who's a good communicator and supportive of their teammates.* (personal communication, July 2016)

No assessment tool other than observation was identified by P4.

The term "responsibility" was how P5 described a major consideration of what they are looking for when assessing leadership. Once again, a capstone course was identified by P5 as a way to examine leadership in the context of a student production crew:

> *When I taught production, one of the things that I taught was a capstone course where the idea was they brought together everything that they had learned previously in one final class. They were allowed in that class to petition to be either the producer or the director or the director of photography or the editor. In those classes, the number one goal for the two leadership positions of producer and director was for the producer, one of the things that I hammered home was it's the job of the director to make the picture. It's the job of the producer to make the picture happen.*

P5 continued:

> *Part of their leadership that they had to develop was, one, keeping everybody motivated and, two, making sure that the schedule was held to. On the other hand, the director, of course, they were responsible for all the artistic decisions. Sometimes that works out and sometimes not.* (personal communication, August 2016)

The leadership philosophy that P5 espoused to students was to take responsibility for the production. *"Leadership to me is when something goes right, 'We did it;' and when something goes wrong in so far as you can say, 'I did it' if you're going to have the leadership position, you're going to be a producer, if you're to be director"* (personal

communication, August 2016). However, this is not always true in the industry. P5

responded:

> *I know through sad personal experience that there are a lot of people in business who don't operate like that, but I'm trying to teach my students better. For me, that's what I always hammered on as the leadership component in every production class that I taught, in every part of every production class I taught. Take responsibility, take responsibility, take responsibility. You will never be as bad off in my class if you say, "P5, I screwed up. Help me," or, "This is how, and I know I won't do it again," than you will if you try to wiggle out of it. Heaven help you if you lie to me. That's my sermon on leadership.* (personal communication, August 2016)

Methods that P5 spoke about in regards to assessing leadership were student

evaluation logs and observation. The evaluation process is described in the following:

> *One thing, I had everyone on the production keep a log of their experience. They had to start with evaluating themselves. Then they had to evaluate the other people on the group. I told them, I said, "What you're saying about other people is not going to affect your grade. It's not going to affect their grade. I'm not letting you grade each other, but I can observe what you're doing in the final mix." You need to tell me what you did to get to that final thing.* (personal communication, August 2016)

The process that P5 used for observation of these groups was also explained:

> *That was one thing. The other thing that I did, going back to the role of the producer in the scheduling is before they rolled frame one on any project… I had them give me a schedule of when and where they would be shooting and when and where they would be editing after they shot. I would show up unannounced on the set for, depending on how long they were shooting, maybe the whole shoot, maybe the first part of the shoot, maybe the last part of the shoot. The point is that it was kind of a pop quiz. They never knew when I, as the executive producer, would be showing up to see what they were producing in my name. That gave me an opportunity to see first hand how things were really going. Of course, the very fact that I was there … I wasn't in disguise or observing through a telephoto lens or anything. I showed up. The fact of observation changes the thing being observed and I realize that, but it was a pretty useful tool because on the sets that were truly dysfunctional … Thank the Lord, I did not have very many of these. I had one that became legendary for a lot of reasons, but on the dysfunctional set, if you're observing closely, even though everybody is on your best behavior, you see where the problems are. I did those two things to again get some first hand observation*

of the leadership process in action as well as the final product. (personal communication, August 2016)

The examination of leadership in the progress of a course was less explicit for P6. *"I don't think I have any assessment for leadership"* (personal communication, September 2016). They see this domain being assessed through the more explicit action of assessing collaboration. In regards to the leadership assessment of a student, P6 stated, *"their teamwork, at times require them to be in leadership positions or service positions working for someone else who's leading a project"* (personal communication, September 2016). Leadership assessment for P6 does not happened independently of the collaboration or teamwork assessment. *"If it's being assessed, that's actually happening within more of that collaboration assessment"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016).

P7 identified a television producing workshop that specifically incorporates leadership skills as intended outcomes. The prep work for the course called into question the leadership skillset specific to a television producer. P7 stated, *"…there was a lot of questions of making sure that the producers hit the right tone as far as how to make sure the set was running smoothly and on schedule without aggravating the people who are being creative in the moment, which were the directors"* (personal communication, September 2016). However, the assessment of leadership was unclear. P7 elaborated the assessment process:

> *As far as assessing leadership, it was out there and it was definitely a part of that class. I can't say that I put together a rubric for them about how they would be graded on it, and probably I let that slide more than anything else in the class because it's such a squishy, difficult and hard thing to assess. Because in essence it would have required the directing students to maybe do a, you know, some paper work at the end of like, "How did you feel about this person?" Because they were the ones who were receiving the leadership. I think that because things went pretty smoothly on this, there really wasn't a*

lot at all in that particular semester for the students to have to take control of something that was spinning out of control. I guess I would say I have not really thought that one through as probably as thoroughly as I should. (personal communication, September 2016)

P8 spoke about the actions of students in relation to assessing leadership. Actions such as *"...participation in class, making contact with external groups when students have to shoot, that's a big one. Showing up on time to meetings, that's really important. I don't know if you'd call it leadership, it's accountability"* (personal communication, August 2016).

Strategies that P8 has used to structure leadership assessment in a course are as follows:

The last class I taught I actually assigned a producer to kind of embody that role from the beginning. That worked pretty well. They really did take that seriously. Probably ended up doing a bit more work, at first I was kind of suspicious of it. Sometimes that worked great and sometimes it was a mess because you'd have one or two students that would do everything and the other students would fade away. I found with the producer role, all of the students inside of the group were kind of accountable to the mission of the project. Then at the end of the quarter screening, being able to say something in a relatively brief amount of time, having the presence to communicate that. I evaluate student performance and then also being able to listen to people in the audience. That's a really important part of having a good class dynamic or having leaders who don't talk all the time. They talk enough but they don't dominate. That's its own kind of blind spot. (personal communication, August 2016)

One way that P8 highlighted as a means to assess leadership or the lack there of, was through the regular screening of student work. P8 described this experience and its value:

There are confrontations sometimes. I intervene when I have to and you can tell. I think it's part of the value of doing those regular screenings of student work and screening your cut here. You know because there's a quality of work and then suddenly there's a drop off and you can see it on screen and it's because somebody got made at somebody else and the thing that they were good at they said, "I'm not doing that for you" and it shows up in a film. Those are the times that I'll have that group stay after class and kind of talk about it and work through whatever those issues are. (personal communication, August 2016)

P9 suggested that leadership is not assessed until students have a firm grasp on technical skills. *"Leadership is something that we probably don't necessarily address until the advanced courses, just because the first year or so is just getting through",* explained P9 (personal communication, September 2016). *"It's a process. They're getting caught up on technical aspects, just formatting, just the technical skills, the processes that are basic in this whole complex activity of film making, video production"* (P9, personal communication, September 2016). The difficulty of assessing leadership is that not all of the students assume leadership roles within the process of filmmaking. According to P9:

> *Leadership comes in lots of different forms. You've got a director. You've got a leader in a department, like a gaffer, director of photography. There's the producer. You've got leadership roles, so there is that organizational hierarchy of a film crew that provides leadership position. Not everyone's going to be in a leadership position.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P9 articulated the process of assessing leadership through a variety of methods. *"I assess it through watching them work. We do peer evaluations, peer-to-peer evaluations, so I can determine what's happening within those groups"* (personal communication, September 2016). However, with further reflection P9 suggested that the peer evaluation do not specifically address leadership as a separate entity. P9 reflected:

> *I probably should put that in there somehow because what happens is I hear about it. I hear about how the leadership broke down or communication broke down, and those are all aspects of leadership. I've got something for communication, collaboration, willingness to hear other ideas from other people. All of those things are part of leadership aspects.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 expressed that leadership is not a program outcome at their particular school. However, leadership is observed and noted at times throughout coursework in the program. "Occasionally I will assign different leaders so that at some point in the semester everybody

is in the leadership role, then it's just watching and documenting how the groups interact and

how the progress goes" (personal communication, September 2016). This being said, the

active pursuit of this domain's assessment not a primary concern.

Teamwork

Falling in line with the leadership domain, P1's department does not have a formal

assessment of teamwork, however P1 does assess this domain in their own courses. This

offering by P1 illustrates how they are not only assessing teamwork, but leadership

assessment was included as well. The following is how P1 described this assessment:

> *I have the students in the production classes, I have them do self-evaluations,*
> *and then group performance evaluations, so they have to then evaluate*
> *everyone in their production crew anonymously, right? Then in my advanced*
> *production class, they'll do interviews with me where they can't just write*
> *down, "Jimmy was great. A+." I sit down and ask them, we do some intensive*
> *interviewing, and I ask them follow-up questions, and I pin them down and try*
> *to find out what the group dynamic was and who displayed what types of*
> *leadership qualities.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P2 places high value on teamwork skills for their students. *"I think teamwork is one*

of those things that's really essential for film students to learn and to start to get really good

at, even in difficult situations" (P2, personal communication, August 2016). The assessment

of this domain has been conducted by P2 many different ways. Some of these methods are

highlighted in the following:

> *At advanced cinema production, the thing I talked about yesterday, I have*
> *students do peer evaluations. That's something that I came up with that's new*
> *for me. Previously, I had students write self-assessments and essentially they*
> *would talk about what they did on a production and then they would talk*
> *about what each member of their crew did. That would be how I would assess*
> *teamwork. Now, I'm kind of shifting to more a peer evaluation model where*
> *they each do- each crew member does a peer evaluation for every other*
> *member of their crew. So each student is writing a peer evaluation of each*
> *other. I consolidate, summarize that feedback and give that to them.*

P2 added:

> *I think it's easy to be part of a team when everybody's friends and*
> *everybody's- they have the job that they want, you know? But it's really hard*
> *when you have a crew of eight people and everybody wanted to be the director*
> *and only one person got the chance to do it. Everybody else has to learn how*
> *to deal with the reality of that and still function as a team.* (personal
> communication, August 2016)

The use of the peer evaluation tool that P2 has implemented has yielded some

successes. However, this process has some challenges. *"It's really time consuming. This is*

one of the things I think I could tweak or try to do better, is find a way to automate some of

it" (P2, personal communication, August 2016). P2 added, *"I would look to find ways to*

save time on the computational aspect of it. I think the reading student's comments and kind

of giving them feedback, I don't really know if there's a short cut for that" (personal

communication, August 2016). P2 closed the teamwork domain with this final thought:

> *I think, it's funny, every time you think you've come up with a solution, then*
> *you have another class and you're like yeah that didn't work. Like I said, I*
> *think I'm going to stick with this for a little while. I'm just going to try and do*
> *it better and focus more on the comments part of it and find a way to automate*
> *the averaging part of it.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P3 uses the same questionnaire format that they use to assess leadership when they

are examining teamwork. *"Again, with those group productions and that same assessment*

tool, I'll get a sense of how much did each of the group members listen to each other, how

much did they try to incorporate each other's idea, who stepped up to help in a production,

who was constructive in helping to solve problems that came up in a production" (P3,

personal communication, July 2016). P3 described how some of the typical problems that

are detected from these questionnaires:

> *There's always classic teamwork problems that crop up; so and so isn't*
> *showing up, or so and so won't listen to any of our ideas. Those are the things*

that both during the process and at the end of the process I'm looking to see, how did they solve these conflicts, and do they do it in constructive ways, or at there areas where they need to think about these issues. (personal communication, July 2016)

A different method of gathering information specific to assessing teamwork was then offered by P3:

As far as the later projects are concerned, I'll talk to the client and have a brief conversation with them about their observation about the shoot, and what happened during the shoot. I, most of the time, am not at the shoot that the students are at. I'll work with them on exercises in the classroom and they're learning each of these skills. But when it's time to go and do the projects, students are scheduling shoots off-campus or in other locations on-campus at different times, so I'm not there to observe directly as they're working on the production. (personal communication, July 2016)

Both P4 and P5 felt that their assessment descriptions in regards to leadership closely paralleled their process of assessing teamwork. P4 offered an additional comment in regards to teamwork. The action of collaboration is at the heart of how P4 described assessing teamwork. According to P4, *"With teamwork, I think I'm looking for people who are collaborating and not coming into it with a single minded idea. I want to see people that are open minded and willing to let go of some of their ideas and take on someone else's idea with passion as if it they were their own"* (personal communication, July 2016). According to P5, *"production is such a team experience that if you have a successful production, you pretty much had a successful team no matter how much you hate each other at the end of it"* (personal communication, August 2016)

The domain of teamwork falls into the process of how P6 assesses collaboration. *"I don't really break out beyond collaboration or any collaboration assessments I use"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). However, P6 uses a several different methods and tools to assess the teamwork students are engaging with, but P6 is mostly concerned with

the collaboration that is taking place within the team. Peer evaluations are employed as well

as reflection papers that are produced during the production. P6 described the processes:

> *I try to gather feedback from students along the way as they're in production and I require them to write reflections about how their collaboration is going either with their partners or with their team along the way. Then what I end up doing is use that as an opportunity for potential for some kind of mentorship if I identify that there's a problem or ways that they can be encouraged to continue to do well. Then really it's that collaboration score, it's the peer assessment at the end that is more of how they end up with an actual grade for that.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 has a rubric developed for collaboration and explained this tool:

> *I guess the rubric I give the students is it's not about the quality of the work that they're doing in the lull. I'm not asking them to rate their cinematographer on how well they lit the project. It's more about, did your cinematographer show up on time and do the work that was expected? Were they committed to the project? Less about how talented were they in the execution of what they were doing.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 followed up this thought by stating, *"The only other way I can assess what's going*

on in teamwork is, like I said, those in-progress reflections where I can step in and maybe

mentor a group if they are needing extra help in figuring out how to work with each other"

(personal communication, September 2016). These ongoing reflection papers offer P6 a

glimpse of the group dynamic that is taking place. The intention is to provide guidance to

teams and reinforcement of positive group work in a film crew environment. According to

P6, *"It's more like coaching I guess in that way and just trying to get some immediate*

feedback of what's going on and then being able to intervene to try to help with it" (personal

communication, September 2016).

Another method that P6 has used in the past is structuring the students to develop

their own rubric in regards to teamwork. P6 explained, *"...it's not really an assessment. It*

was more of an exercise to try to get them to come up with their own rubric for how they

wanted to deal with teamwork" (personal communication, September 2016). The process of

developing this rubric highlighted in the following:

> *I started to have students in larger groups come up with team charters. At the beginning of the process, I had a series of talks with them where they would have to talk about basically how often are we going to meet, where are we going to meet, who's going to run our meeting. A lot of it was about group communication and if someone doesn't do their job how will we hold them accountable, how will we confront that person. They had to think through ahead of time, as a group, how they wanted to treat the group. I left it to them to come up with their own system. Basically, they had to come up with their own rubric about how they would treat teamwork.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 continued by offering the mixed results of this process:

> *I think it helped the producers the most. I think the rest of the crew didn't care as much, but I think the producers realized- that comes back a little bit to the leadership question. This is your job, the people kind of have to hold everyone else accountable and we have to make sure everyone's getting the communication when they need it. So I think it may have helped the leaders of the team realize what they needed to do to communicate a little bit more. Compared to projects that they had done prior with smaller groups, where it's mainly just two or three of them working together, now that they have eight or ten students the producers really had to make sure they were getting information from everybody and disseminating information to everyone on a pretty regular basis.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 articulates the importance of teamwork to students. *"Video is a*

collaborative art form, and I stress this with students early on in those types of

classes. Like you're going to have to work with people" (P7, personal

communication, September 2016). However, the importance of teamwork in the real

world setting is a challenge to assessment, as P7 explained:

> *I think that teamwork is not something that's always really spelled out on a rubric, but it is something that probably is the thing that goes wrong more often than anything else. It's certainly the thing that goes wrong interpersonally. When things go wrong with like somebody is like, "Can't think of an idea. I can't think of," you know,*

they get writer's block or whatever. There's a way to deal with that. The interpersonal stuff is always the hardest. I grade people on participation which the institutions that I've worked for definitely puts a high premium on that, and in fact most places now are requiring attendance which I find a little strange in the college setting. (personal communication, September 2016)

The act of grading based on participation is set as an expectation to P7's students. *"I always put a premium on participation and showing up, and I typically tell my students, 'Participation is not just showing up. It's actually actively participating.' They know that they're being graded on that"* (P7, personal communication, September 2016).

P8's experience with assessing teamwork bleeds into the domain of ethical reasoning. P8 structures group and teams to emphasis diversity in order to reflect a real world work environment. This strategy produces learning opportunities that are worked through in a team setting. P8 offered this example:

> *Another area is communicating inside of a team. Usually, there are four students that are coming from two or three different majors that are working on one project. Different socioeconomic backgrounds, transfer students that come into these classes, students of color working with white students. Having them negotiate those kinds of hard, difficult boundaries to move a project forward is really important. Those I assess from their presence in class, those kinds of tacit things you feel every now and then. When you work them outside of class as well as their self-evaluations at the end of the quarter about what it was like working. I give them a series of questions they have to address in those self-evaluations. Those are two to four pages, depending. They have to say what they did and they have to say what it was like working in their group and reflect on any tensions you might have had or things that you learned from your group members. I get some good insight from that. (personal communication, August 2016)*

The process of self reflection for students as well as an open door policy offered by P8 promote students to check in when group dynamics are failing. This information has the opportunity to create more teamwork struggles if not handled properly. P8 explained:

> *Sometimes I'll have one or two group members come and say, this person isn't pulling their weight but we don't want you to call them out specifically*

because that would make us look bad and I get that. I'll make general announcements about you know, please remember, you've got to show up on time to these things and this and that but you know, kind of check in. (personal communication, August 2016)

P9 defined the difference between assessing teamwork and leadership. Assessing

teamwork reflects what P9 believes is the true industry environment. P9 suggested:

Teamwork happens all the way through this process. Leadership, a leader will usually emerge from a team. Sometimes you're assigned a role that is a leadership role, but I have the students, from day one, after they get through basic technical skills, are working on team projects because that's how you're going to do things in the real world. (personal communication, September 2016)

The assessment conducted by P9 in regards to teamwork is done by observation and

peer evaluation. *"The teamwork itself, I would have to say it's more observational than*

anything" (P9, personal communication, September 2016). P9 continued, *"I will have them*

do peer-to-peer evaluations, but that also gives me an idea of what I'm observing, what is

actually correct. It's crosschecking each other here" (personal communication, September

2016). Stressing the importance of teamwork to student happens early in P9's classroom.

The reasoning was explained in the following:

I start with this really early, and I hope by the time they get to be in those advanced courses, when they're up, junior, senior status, that they can work and function as a team, team dynamics. Then we get into more of those leadership qualities. (personal communication, September 2016)

At P10's institution, teamwork is not a specific learning outcome that is expressed as

a learning outcome. According to P10:

Teamwork is assessed. Again, it's not one of our course outcomes or program outcomes necessarily. It's on a case by case, almost formative assessment of small group work which is common in just about every course I teach. There is occasionally a peer to peer document that I have them fill out about their colleagues. Not a lot of formal assessment of teamwork. (personal communication, September 2016)

Ethical reasoning

P1's department does not have an ethical reasoning standard that is applied throughout the program. This is accurate for P1's classroom assessment as well. P1 stated, *"...we don't do that in our major"* (personal communication, August 2016). The closest aspect that P1 thought was in line with this specific domain was in regards to course work in media law. *"We cover the law, and we have a media law class, and in all my production classes we talk about trademark and copyright and what's cool and what's not, but I don't ever assess it in any way"* (P1, personal communication, August 2016). The topic of ethics is spoken about in general terms during some coursework; nevertheless, a direct assessment is lacking in this domain.

P2 discussed the use of their peer evaluation for as the tool that gauges ethical reasoning. However, the term integrity is used to identify ethical behavior. Prior to the implementation of this peer evaluation document, P2 did not believe this domain was being explicitly assessed in their classroom. P2 outlined some of the findings that the peer evaluations have produced:

> *I haven't had a major problem where students have been doing really grossly negligible, negligent things, but a lot of it's along the lines of they don't accept responsibility for mistakes, they blame other people, they make excuses in ways they that they shouldn't, for things they shouldn't be making excuses for. A lot of it was kind of, again, a lot of it was more a hearsay kind of thing. That's, I think, part of the reason why I think this peer evaluation, it cuts through some of that and it sets an expectation that students will be trustworthy. It also gets that value into their mind. One of the things on the little sheet it says admits when they make a mistake. That is the hardest thing for a student to do is to admit when they make a mistake, to their crew, because they're concerned about the backlash. They're concerned with their crew backlash, they're concerned about what I'm going to- what kind of penalty I might inflict on them. If you kind of set it up in the beginning as when you make a mistake, admit to it.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P3's institution requires students within the major to complete a course on ethics in communication before they can proceed into their chosen concentration. This course carries the most explicit assessments of ethical reasoning within the program. P3 does broach this topic and reinforces ethical consideration within classroom lectures and explanations. However, this reinforcement is not explicitly assessed within production courses the P3 is teaching. P3 once again pointed to the assessment tool of questionnaires and observation as methods that carry implicit measures of ethical reasoning:

> *I think that there's maybe a continuous argument that there is some implicit assessment of that [ethical reasoning] in the questionnaires and the observations about how the production went, and everybody kind of quarters up, that sort of a thing. We do have conversations about safe production practices, when you're misleading audiences versus telling the story that your subject has experienced as opposed to one you're actively constructing that might differ from their experience. We have conversations like that. I have to say, I don't think I have any explicit assessment tools to measure that in my production courses.* (personal communication, July 2016)

The decision making process is where P4 looks for opportunities to assessment ethical reasoning. P4 explained this concept in the following:

> *I will say that when we are talking about ethics, to me it's a case by case basis. In terms of assessing it I'm looking for someone that can understand the holistic situation and is able to come out with a decision that is going to be best for everyone. That keeps anyone from being harmed. It's just someone that's in it for the betterment of the community, the betterment of everyone involved, the stakeholders and minimizing harm.* (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 makes this type of assessment based on verbal discussion with a student or team. This highlights the ethical considerations that are ultimately applied to making a decision within the process of producing a film. P4 highlighted this debriefing process:

> *I would have to say it is based on how the student is able to justify their decision. It would be all verbal. Then it goes back to the discussion, we have a discussion of what the ethical situation is and then we discuss the pros and*

*the cons of whatever the decisions or options for the decision making would
be. When I'm listening to students go through this process, I'm looking for
students that can justify their reasoning behind the choices that they make.*
(personal communication, July 2016)

Once again, the main course load that P5 is responsible for teaching is in the area of

scriptwriting. P5 does not see plagiarism as a huge problem in these classes. *"Obviously in*

my script writing classes, I asked you to make something up. Most people can make up their

own stuff" (P5, personal communication, August 2016).

Specific in the domain of ethical reasoning, P5's institution requires a course in media

industry ethics for program majors. This course is the foundation and introduction to

industry specific ethical reasoning. *"In that class, we spend an overwhelming amount of time*

talking about. This is the way the business works" (P5, personal communication, August

2016). One challenge that P5 explained was making the information as relevant to the

student within the time restraints of a semester. *"As you can imagine, just the complexities of*

following the money trail can take easily six weeks out of a semester just for either features

or series, but we began with the foundation of the golden moral" (P5, personal

communication, August 2016). P5 described one of the course's general themes:

> *The rest of the semester is ... Given that we really do teach, "Do unto others
> as you would have them do unto you." How does that practically apply in this
> business where literally millions of dollars change hands on the whims of the
> audience and furthermore where you have things like the freedom guaranteed
> by the Constitution and the First Amendment ... I won't forget the
> responsibilities laid down by libel and slander laws. How do you balance that
> freedom and that responsibility from that ethical perspective?* (personal
> communication, August 2016)

Explicit assessments of students are conducted in this course and were explained by P5:

> *That's the ethical foundation. That class and that idea is the ethical
> foundation of pretty much everything that I try to communicate ethically in my
> class. How do you evaluate that? How do you assess that? Short of putting*

them in a situation where they have the opportunity to hose each other and seeing if they do it or not, which amazingly enough the administration has formally discouraged us from doing ... It's the darndest thing. The only way I can do that is by asking them to write about it. I could ask them to stand up and present about it in class, but if they're writing and they know that I'm the only audience, they're just going to be more open and more honest in their responses. (personal communication, August 2016)

P5 uses this class to link to the student's true aspiration with the industry. This strategy provides buy in by student and illustrates how ethical reasoning may be relevant to them in the future. P5 starts this exercise by asking, *"What's your ideal job when you graduate, your dream job?"* (personal communication, August 2016). P5 continued by describing the process of the exercise and the assessment in the following:

Given that, as we go through the semester, as we talk about the ethical foundation, as we talk about the First Amendment, I have to do a series of writing assignments. I said, "Now that we've talked about the First Amendment specifically applied to what you want to do in the real world ... "Then their culminating assignment in that class is they have to write a summary essay after they have talked to somebody in the "real world" and also after they have done a very basic literature review of current both trade magazine and academic articles about their field. "Now that you know all this stuff, let's take another look at your dream job and let's take another look at these concepts that we talked about in the class. How have they affected each other? How has what you've learned affected your view of your dream job and how you're going to apply these ethical concepts?" That's how I assess how they've done. At the risk of sounding immodest, it seems to be fairly successful because what they write is generally pretty thoughtful. It's not just like, "I'm going to be nice to people because I want them to be nice to me." It's like, "Wow, I've really thought about I want to be a reporter, but what am I going to say when I have to interview somebody who just experienced a tragedy? How am I going to approach that? How am I going to do my job in a way that I would want my job done to me?" That's how I assess that.
(personal communication, August 2016)

P6 uses written student reflection papers as one tool to examine and assess ethical reasoning. Within this process P6 challenges student to think about ethics in two different ways. According to P6, *"I would ask them to respond to the ethical, or think about the*

ethical implications of the story that they've told. Then also the ethical implications of how

they worked with the other people involved in their project" (personal communication,

September 2016). These pointed questions force the students to think not only about the

artifact they have produced, but the collaboration process of producing the artifact. These

reflections are structured to happen half way through the production process and yet again at

the end of the production process.

P6 described how ethical consideration manifest themselves in the collaborative

experience of filmmaking. In order to assess ethics in this manner, collaboration is

examined:

> *On the collaboration side, I always have them write a collaboration*
> *assessment after their first weekend out on production. They tend to shoot on*
> *weekends so that's how I refer to it. Once they've completed their first*
> *production experience together, I always ask them to turn in a collaboration*
> *reflection. Then for collaboration it's usually just one more at the end of the*
> *project to sort of look back on everything that occurred. There's a certain*
> *amount of ethical reasoning and questioning that's going on in that reflection.*
> *Then also on the larger- their project and the potential ethical implications of*
> *their story and all of that, that I ask just at the end of the project.* (personal
> communication, September 2016)

P7 described the struggle to incorporate this domain into courses that are not

specifically designed to encompass ethics intentionally. P7 suggested, *"I think that it's*

probably something that does not get pushed to the forefront as much as maybe a school

wide focus or a college or university-wide focus. It sounds like a great thing to say that we're

teaching students, but when you're in the weeds of trying to teach them how to white balance

a camera, this is a very hard and direct skill, some of the other soft skills that would be

fantastic to have along the way sometimes take a backseat to that" (personal communication,

September 2016). The lack of clarity pertaining to this domain is a specific challenge

expressed by P7:

> *I mean it's an interesting thing for the kind of classes I teach. I mean that term*
> *[ethics] could be used in a bunch of different ways. It could be used from a*
> *point of view of you're writing fictional scripts, and how do you deal with the*
> *ethics of taking things from your own life or the world around you. The other*
> *point would be if you're working in the non-fiction realm how to know what*
> *responsibilities do you have. Then entertainment as opposed to journalism,*
> *which I've taught both, and how you deal with that. I think that for those*
> *different scenarios some of the best things is just dealing with sort of case,*
> *looking at case scenarios and talking through.* (personal communication,
> September 2016)

P7 then went on to explain actions that they specifically look for in regards to student

behavior that are linked to this domain. The explicit assessment of these actions is not

something that is being assessed by P7, but the conversation is valuable to a student's

understanding of industry expectation. P7 offered this illustration:

> *I would say there are a couple of things that come in pretty clearly in those*
> *entry level production classes, is talking about two things. One, when you say*
> *you're going to volunteer and you're going to show up, you show up, and*
> *talking about that fairly extensively. The other one has just escaped me for a*
> *moment. The other one is mistakes. You're going to make mistakes. There's*
> *not anybody on the planet that doesn't make mistakes, and so I always talk*
> *with my students that in this business especially it's not about whether you*
> *make a mistake, it's how you deal with the mistake that's been made that is*
> *more, to me, the proof of a person, of whether I want to continue to work with*
> *them or not. We do talk about those things. I would say it's not baked into the*
> *graded part of the curriculum. It's much more sort of a life lesson kind of*
> *aspect to it.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P8 views this domain as one of the core pieces that they are teaching. P8 stated, *"I*

think it's the most important part of the class" (personal communication, August 2016). P8

is primarily teaching documentary production where topics are situated around social issues.

P8 explained that there are three main areas that ethical reasoning is being considered and

assessed within their classroom. *"First, is whether or not they can get what the group or*

nonprofit they're following is up to. That isn't always a given, it takes time" (P8, personal communication, August 2016). P8 continued, *"To make a documentary film that has a sense of ethics, you have to, the very least, understand what your subject is about. Why are they doing what they're doing?"* (personal communication, August 2016). The assessment of this is done by reviewing the footage and debriefing verbally with students to see where they are taking their project.

The second way that P8 views ethical reasoning in their classroom is the work that is being conducted within the team. This type of work is assessed by reflection papers that produces insight into the group dynamic for P8. What P8 is looking for in this matter is not just group functions, but ethical decision making. The following description illustrates what P8 has observed through discussions:

> *The other part of ethical thinking though is there is, I guess it comes out in class discussions. You can't go and do the documentary work without having a conversation about what it means to go into a place with a camera. I think a lot of those things they come out in the moment though. If somebody comes back from a shoot and they did a surreptitious shot of a homeless guy, you have a teachable moment that emerges in class.*

P8 continued:

> *I could ten little units about ethics and documentary just from the things that come up almost every class. That's one of them, surreptitious filming of somebody. More often than not, it's somebody who is vulnerable. A homeless person they didn't want to go up to, I didn't want to bother him. I wanted to be ethical and just keep my distance from that person. You say, oh no, that doesn't work that way. You probably wouldn't want somebody doing that to you and we have the golden rule conversation. There's kind of a default sense in some of these introductory students that they want to do something important and homelessness is important and it's also spectacular. It's a visual spectacle on the street for you to turn into a great model. When people do that, you let it play out. I always let the students have the first say in those discussions but I'll come in kind of hard on that one. The power dynamic between somebody behind the camera and somebody in front of it, it's a really important ethical discussion and it's not always one way. If you're filming*

somebody powerful, they often have a great deal of control over your access. That's a different sort of circumstance. (personal communication, August 2016)

The third area that P8 expressed as relevant to the assessment of ethical reasoning was the relationship between the filmmaker and the funding source. The assessment of this area was not explicit, however the incorporation of this topic into the course is a way that P8 believes can ground the filmmaker with integrity to the subject matter. P8 summed up this domain and its importance to student filmmakers by stating, "*Don't do it because I want you to, you have to have a sense of self-confidence about what you're doing. You have a responsibility to audiences, responsibility to subjects, and responsibility to yourself. Those are the three ethical cores that we try to teach*" (personal communication, August 2016).

P9 stated, "*I don't have a true assessment of ethical behavior*" (personal communication, September 2016). Ethics are a topic of class discussion, but not something that is explicitly assessed. "*I don't know if I'm necessarily really assessing it other than, if it comes up in the classroom as something that I need to point out and mentor a student or a group*" (P9, personal communication, September 2016). Within the context of a production course P9 found it difficult to articulate an assessment for ethical reasoning. P9 suggested:

> *I don't know, without having a specific course, which we don't on ethical reasoning, ethical behavior, just media ethics or something like that…We have a media law course, but that's just what the law tells you to do. Interpretation of the law, that depends on what your ethics are, I suppose, so that's not necessarily the greatest example.* (personal communication, September 2016)

The lack of specific coursework hampers the assessment process of ethics according to P9. However, the importance of ethical behavior is an aspect that is pointed out and

illustrated in their classroom. This process lacks a formal assessment, but is further

illustrated in the following example:

> *I could say this. It's something about mistakes. Everybody makes mistakes.*
> *Professional crew members make mistakes, and it happens. Students get to*
> *that point where, if they make a mistake, my goodness, "I'm going to fail".*
> *It's not like that. At least, I try to tell them, in my class, it's not like that*
> *because mistakes are part of it. Mistakes usually offer some of the best*
> *learning opportunities, so let's embrace these mistakes. I'm actually really*
> *interested in how they handle the mistake because if they blame someone or*
> *they blame a process or the every blame the equipment or they blame the*
> *software or they blame something else, it really chaps me because, ultimately,*
> *if you miss a deadline in the industry, they don't care. They don't want to hear*
> *the excuses, but taking responsibility for your own mistakes. The camera*
> *didn't work, batteries weren't charged. Who didn't charge them? Who didn't*
> *do a camera test? Who didn't test their workflow?* (P9, personal
> communication, September 2016)

P10 assesses ethical reasoning by using case studies within the class to spark group

discussion over an ethical topic. Students are required to pick a side of an argument and

orally defend their position. P10 described the assessment of this activity:

> *The evaluation is observational. They are scored on it, but it's not necessarily,*
> *"Did they do great at it or poorly at it?" It's, "Did they understand the*
> *concepts?" Assessment-wise, it's observation, but it might be a 20 point*
> *exercise in a class period.* (personal communication, September 2016)

Life long learning

P1 does not engage in and active assessment of life long learning. The topic is

approached in the senior seminar as P1 explained, *"We deal with it a little bit in the senior*

seminar in terms of thinking about basic competencies and skills that you need to survive in

the professional world" (personal communication, August 2016). P1 continued, *"I also do it*

in my advanced video class in terms of behavior and actions and things like that, that they

can use for the rest of their career" (personal communication, August 2016). P1 explained

this rationale:

> *In the advanced class, it's because usually there are upperclassmen, and there
> ... Well, there's that, the upperclassmen are getting ready to, going to be
> heading out before too long. Number two, I think that's so important,
> personally, to success. I tell them all the time, I say, "You're ... This is just the
> beginning." You know what I mean as a production guy, "This is just the
> beginning. This is kindergarten." "You're going to learn so much more in the
> field than you ever learned here, but you have to know this stuff to learn that
> stuff."* (personal communication, August 2016)

P2 expressed the challenge of assessing this domain. *"I think that's really hard to*

assess. Because we only see them for four years" (P2, personal communication, August

2016). This being said, P2 identified the degree required internship that student undertake in

their last semester as their best assessment of this domain. *"In terms of life-long learning, I*

guess we would say that the internship program is really assessing where students are at by

the time they graduate and if they have those skills, both technical and personal, to allow

them to be successful going forward" (P2, personal communication, August 2016). This

assessment was described by P2:

> *The major assessment tool for our program, in terms of are we actually
> reaching, meeting our outcomes as we state them, is how our students do on
> their internship. We have a questionnaire that their internship sites fill out.
> We see- Do they have the technical skills that they should at that point, when
> they're prepared to graduate. Some of the questions I actually pulled from the
> peer evaluation, I actually pulled from our internship. That's how I kind of
> came up with a lot of them was from this internship questionnaire we ask our
> internship sites. So they are being assessed on things like integrity, problem
> solving, reaction to stress. Those are things that are part of our internship,
> too.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P3 does not feel that they do and explicit assessment of this domain. They confirmed

the absence of this domain within their institutions stated outcomes. *"We don't really*

explicitly tackle that question of life-long learning; it's not explicit in our own core

competencies" (P3, personal communication, July 2016). However, P3 reflected, *"I'm*

thinking about how my production courses implicitly cover them, but how I'm not necessarily

and separately assessing those outcomes" (personal communication, July 2016).

P3 signaled out their internships as activity that would best be examined to implement

this type of assessment. P3 highlighted the structure of the internship process:

> *We also have internships in the program where they're going off and working*
> *for production companies and broadcast outlets. We have three meetings*
> *during the semester with the students during their internships. We do a site*
> *visit, the students keep a journal about their internship experience. Every time*
> *that they go to the internship site, they're supposed to write up what they did*
> *that day, and what their experience was. At the end, they write a research*
> *paper connecting their internship experience with some external research in*
> *the industry in which they were interning. We're touching on those topics of*
> *life-long learning, but I'm realizing that we don't have an explicit assessment*
> *tool to assess ... how do you measure that, right?* (personal communication,
> July 2016)

P4 engages in discussion as a way to assess this domain. These discussions are

intended for P4 to check the understanding and awareness of the student perceptions about

their future goals. P4 also identified the internship process as an activity that is best suited to

assess life long learning. The constructive dialogue around the topic of career, based on the

internship process has allowed P4 to check in with a student for understanding. P4

articulated this process:

> *I would have to say, I think there's two ways. One is through conversations*
> *again. I like the whole conversation about what students want to do with the*
> *skills they're learning. Whatever the skill is. Do they have a lifelong plan for*
> *that? Do they have a career plan for that? I'm also an internship coordinator*
> *so I am assessing students with internships along the way. I'm assessing*
> *students who are coming through the internship course which I also teach.*
> *Are they seeking out career opportunities of the skill set that I taught them in*
> *class? The assessment tends to happen after the class. If we were talking*
> *about assessment within a class based on a particular skill set then that goes*
> *back to the discussion that we hold. Are they able to verbally explain to me*
> *that the skill set that they are learning in the class, is something that they*

would be using down the line at a news station, at a video production department or even beyond video? Are they able to use these skills in terms of organization and structure for another particular job? Are they able to hold that discussion and explain to me? That's how I would determine whether or not the skill sets that they are learning is something that they would continue to want to develop based on where they're going in the future. (personal communication, July 2016)

P5 described assessing life long learning as a real challenge in the academic setting. *"How do you assess life long learning? I know that has become one of the buzzwords. The short answer is we can't in a university environment"* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). P5 believes the challenge is due to the limited time spent with the student which negates this type of assessment. According to P5, *"...sometimes I may have them for two classes. I might get to assess semester-long work. That's all I can say about that"* (personal communication, August 2016). Nevertheless, over P5's career they were able to point out two specific examples of change within student perceptions that has since carried with those students into their career. The assessment of this change was not an intentional process for P5, it was more observational in nature.

P6 highlighted a program learning outcome as a way to identify the process of assessing life long learning. The learning outcome requires students to *"...design and produce activities, projects, and portfolios suitable for professional careers"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). P6 suggested, *"That covers a little more of a sort of forward-looking outcome in things that are like internships, sometimes portfolios, sometimes business plans, and then also mission statements"* (personal communication, September 2016). One student produced artifact that P6 pointed out was a *"...career and life mission statement that they [students] have developed and comes from the sort of summation of their*

learning within the program, but then forward-looking. How do you want to apply this once

you graduate?" (personal communication, September 2016).

The use of the artifact described above in the assessment for life long learning has yet

to be implemented. P6 described the process of its use in assessment:

> *That's new, that's something that we've just put into place and we actually*
> *haven't had any students go through that yet. That's one place where I think*
> *we might have some artifacts that sort of address the life long learning.*
> *Possibilities in trying to get students to see the connections between what*
> *you're learning now and how do you want this to play out over your life. Then*
> *in terms of coming to develop an appreciation for learning as a life goal, I*
> *don't know if there's something that we're using to assess that that I'm aware*
> *of.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 expressed the value of life long learning to the overall process of filmmaking in

the following:

> *I think that I've written this in some documents in the past about my love for*
> *the liberal arts, and how important it is, and definitely in classes that lend to*
> *this, these being sort of classes where students are going to be generating*
> *ideas for scripts or stories, they definitely talk about read everything you can*
> *get your hands on. Read all kinds of things. Watch all different kinds of things.*
> *Don't ever put yourself in a pigeonhole of, "I just listen to this kind of music*
> *or just watch these kind of movies." The more you know, the more you're*
> *going to be able to, it's going to help you in multiple ways. It's going help you*
> *be a better generator of ideas. You're going to come across more things.   You*
> *will have your own fresh take on those things that other people don't have, but*
> *it also allows you to be able to engage with people, so coming back to the*
> *teamwork aspect of it. The more you know and the broader your breadth of*
> *information, the better you're able to connect with other people.* (personal
> communication, September 2016).

The act of life long learning is espoused to P7's students in both general discussions

and in much more specific communication. The latter type of discussion is done with

intentionality to spur students to think broadly examine the world around them with curious

minds. This process was explained by P7:

As far as life long learning outside of those classes where we're specifically taking about how do you generate ideas and how do you research and how do you be successful in that realm, going back to the sort of straightforward film history and appreciation type class, I stress very much to my students at the beginning of that class that this is sort of a look into a world that they already inherently understand. They speak the language of visual arts fluently, and we're just, through the course of that semester, going to put names and labels on things that are already ... They understand when a camera does a slow push to somebody who is getting ready to have a tear run down their cheek.

P7 continued:

It's funny, because what happens to the students in that class happened to me when I started studying this, is all of a sudden the art of films gets stripped away and it's like you've opened up the clock and you can see all the gears working. Almost every semester I have students say, "I'm not enjoying films anymore because I see all the insides and how it's working." Then I promise them that eventually that will recede into the background and they'll be able to enjoy them again. Part of the reason why I spend that time with them is this is sort of opening up a world that you didn't know how the movies landed fully formed on your doorstep, and so I encourage them that almost every industry or everything around them has all those working parts, and if they're interested they can look into that as well. (personal communication, September 2016)

The value of life long learning is an area that P7 believes will help student move forward in their careers. This is evident in how P7 described this domain; however, the assessment of life long learning within P7's classroom was not addressed.

P8's described the experience with assessing life long learning as *"...hard to do two years out from the program, but I've had a lot of students that come back and tell me what they're up to"* (personal communication, August 2016). This informal gathering of information about former students led to discussion and detailed descriptions highlighting behavior modification, student achievements as well as career opportunities. *"For me, that's the goal to get students that they don't want to be the next Quentin Tarantino, they want to have a role in a community that's committed in some way"* (P8, personal communication,

August 2016). The assessment of this domain was unclear, but again the value to P8's goals

for students and their teaching philosophy are present in their expression of this domain. P8

summarized their perception of reality when in comes to assessing life long learning:

> *I think all of those things are things that point to outcomes outside of the*
> *class, the extension outside of the end of the semester. I think the life long*
> *learning outcomes, I can't measure that. That stuff disappears to the four*
> *winds so you kind of leave it to the better angels of your faith or something.*
> *Something that happens inside of your class that matters.* (personal
> communication, August 2016)

P9 singled out the capstone class as the best example of evaluating life long learning.

According to P9, *"Our capstone class is more of a finishing class. It's this seminar on how*

the industry works, what you need to be prepared for" (personal communication, September

2016). This course sets the students up with a client based project and the students are

developing a portfolio as well. *"Really, what we're doing right now is just seeing if they're*

ready for industry" (P9, personal communication, September 2016). The capstone

experience and the assessment process was elaborated further:

> *The idea is they are applying everything that they've learned. We are*
> *checking in. We have clients' evaluation forms. There's a debriefing that*
> *happens with their supervisor, myself or whoever's the instructor for that*
> *particular capstone experience and the student. They're talking through this.*
> *They're talking about where their weaknesses are, where their strengths are,*
> *what's next. It's about projecting and listening in discussion about career,*
> *about how they see career and how what they're about to take out into the*
> *world is valid or maybe to tamper some of the fears that they might have.*
> *That's our life long learning assessment process. There's no rubric on it.*
> *There's a process they're going through, and it's more checks and balances*
> *through discussion, observation and the evaluation forms from client and*
> *reflection pieces, written reflections from the students themselves. What I*
> *would really like is to have that pre-statement, post-statement because I think*
> *that would be a good way to do those types of things.* (personal
> communication, September 2016)

The idea that P9 suggested about a pre and post statement is highlighted in the following:

> *What I've been arguing for is I think we need to have a pre-statement, post-statement type thing. When they come in as a first year, they need to say this is what my expectations are, and this is what I want to do in industry, and this is how I'm going to achieve it, and all of those things. Have them write maybe after the first semester. That stays with them. In that capstone, then they reflect upon that to be like, this is what I thought, and now I've got all this knowledge. What I thought was totally different, or it was spot on, and I can't wait to get out there, and I've learned so much more, or now I'm confused, I don't know. Whatever the process is because you've got four years of maturity, four years of exposure to other thoughts and people and diversity and all of the stuff that happens in the college setting. I think that should somehow be gauged. That's what I've been arguing for to happen.* (personal communication, September 2016)

In regards to life long learning, P10 stresses to the students to understand their own learning preferences. P10 does not conduct a formal assessment of life long learning, but feels that the subject is covered and purposely structured into their courses. *"I don't know that I assess life long learning. What I tend to do is assess learning and to stress to students to give them the resources to learn on their own and monitor that as we go through"* (P10, personal communication, September 2016). The method that P10 uses to assess this domain is observation. P10 stated, *"There's no documentation. There's no assessment tool that I use per say for that"* (personal communication, September 2016). The process is implicit and built into their teaching philosophy.

4C's assessment

The final area of questioning was in regards to what has been coined the "4C's". More specifically, the domains are: Critical thinking, Communication, Collaboration, and Creativity. These skills have been identified as crucial for meeting the needs of the twenty first century work environment. Each participant was asked to explain how they assess these

individual domains. The participants were also asked to describe courses or assignments that may lend itself to this type of assessment.

Critical thinking and problem solving

P1 does an assessment of critical thinking with an essay assignment. This assessment artifact is a written document.   In regards to problem solving, P1 stated, *"I don't do an active assessment of those in my classes"* (personal communication, August 2016).

P2 assesses both critical thinking and problem solving through the production process. *"That's what production is, is problem solving. It's about solving one problem from the next, to the next, to the next"* (P2, personal communication, August 2016). P2 uses peer evaluation as well as review of production artifacts as ways to assess this domain. *"In terms of critical thinking and problem solving, a lot of it's the production materials that students turn in at the end of the semester"* (P2, personal communication, August 2016). P2 also uses observation as the method of assessing problem solving and critical thinking. P2 described this process:

> *I build in assignments that allow them to test things along the way so, for example, in production classes we have either camera tests or sometimes just a full workload test. Depends on the complexity of the workflow that they're working with. If it's just a camera test, it's pretty simple. They go out, they shoot footage. We look at it and we sort of break down what they did, the different problems that they may have had. With workflow tests there's usually some glitch along the way, either from the image acquisition to try and get it into post-production. The advance class, they shoot on Blackmagic cameras so they've got to apply DaVinci resolve, they've got to get it out of there and get it into Avid. They've got to put together a timeline, and they've got to get that out of Avid, back into Resolve and do some color correction. Inevitably there's a problem. Just having them walk through, step by step, with some of these tests and kind of see how they're thinking and see how they're solving problems.* (personal communication, August 2016)

According to P3, the assessment of this domain is built into the production process.

P2 is aware that students are engaging in activities that require problem solving and critical

thinking, however explicit assessments that reward students in the form of points or letter

grades are not given in this area. P3 explained:

> *Again, critical thinking becomes more of an implicit measure than something that I'm singling out as something to measure in production courses. I think it comes out in the narrative of the production itself, the forms that are filled out, the creative solutions to the problems presented in the idea of the story versus the limitations of what they have available to realize that story in a visual form. I don't have a explicit way to measure and assess critical thinking in and of itself within a production course.* (personal communication, July 2016)

Observation is the method that P4 uses to assess this domain. P4 described the

problem solving that is present in performing editing functions. This example was described

by P4:

> *Maybe I'll walk them through, this is how you make this happen, how you make this cut or how you make this transition. Then I'm able to assess how they're able to do it by going through and watching them individually work through those projects on a computer. I can determine who is a little bit better at knowing where those plugins are or how to find certain functions versus those that are quick to raise their hand and ask for that help. I'm really assessing their critical thinking and their problem solving by watching them work.* (personal communication, July 2016)

Once again, P5 illustrated the production process as a major problem solving activity.

"Can you solve the problems that come up on a production? Sometimes can you solve the

problems that you yourselves create or does somebody else have to step in and solve them for

you?" (P5, personal communication, August 2016). Observation is used as one method of

assessment. However, the major assessment that P5 is looking for is, *"Do you drag the*

production across the finish line in a semester" (personal communication, August 2016). P5

continued, *"That's my number one requirement for problem solving"* (personal

communication, August 2016).

P6 uses a few different methods to assess this domain. Reflection journals are written

by student with the intention of critically analyzing the work that they are producing.

According to P6, purpose of this assignment is to assess to what extent they believe *"...they*

hit their technical targets or story targets" (personal communication, September 2016). P6

ramps this technique up in a cinematic design course. The assessment in this course is

primarily developed by the student. This rubric development was detailed in the following:

> *Then in a more specific, sort of problem-solving sense I teach a course in*
> *cinematic design. That's another one where the students basically come up*
> *with- They have to tell the story, a short film, and then they have to come up*
> *with a visual plan for that short film and they design the visual plan to hit*
> *certain areas that they're going to control throughout the production. So they*
> *are basically designing, once again, their own rubric of "here's what we're*
> *going to do." Then they go out, they have to execute that, they bring it back*
> *and then we sort of check the actual project against what they had designed*
> *as certain aesthetic things they were going to do in the areas of space or*
> *color or rhythm or movement. I see that one as very much- it becomes this*
> *hybrid between creative thinking and critical thinking because they give*
> *themselves the problem of "we want it to look like X" and then they have to*
> *find ways that they're going to hit that mark and actually bring that back, in*
> *ways that can be quantified a little bit more than a lot of the other creative*
> *things can. I think that project in particular does a good job with those*
> *critical and creative skills.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 uses one on one conversation as means to offer feedback and spur a student's

critical thinking. The purpose of this is to allow the student to identify areas that they are

aware are in need of improvement or areas that they decide are acceptable. *"I think at the*

end when I ask them to assess their own projects it's much more about how they feel about

what they did and think about how they would do it differently. That's what I'm looking for at

the end of a large project" (P7, personal communication, September 2016). This assessment

is not necessary graded or factored into a concrete measurement. *"I think that it's something that I'm hoping to give to them as a way to move forward and not necessarily grading what they're thinking about"* (P7, personal communication, September 2016).

P8 looks into the overall production process that students engage in when it comes to problem solving and critical thinking. Critical thinking is present in how P8 assesses some of the prior domains. The decision making process that was described as how P8 assesses ethical reasoning pointed out their attention to the choices students are making. Observation is not always possible in this type of assessment. P8 relies on verbal discussion and reflections papers to have a better understanding of the problem solving that has taken place in the production of the student films.

P9 offered their own perspective on the importance of this domain when working in the professional industry. *"I think that production is just one big algebra equation, and you've got to figure out the problem. You've got all these variables in production, and we've got to work our way through those"* (P9, personal communication, September 2016). This connection to industry is the impetus of how P9 develops assignment with anticipation of assessment. P9 suggested:

> *When you've got parameters and expectations communicated to a student,*
> *they've got to figure it out. They've got to figure out that problem and solve it.*
> *Part of my assessment of that is designing assignments that are assessable, if*
> *that makes any sense. I've got to be able to access the problem solving that*
> *happens within a student, and that all happens in that design or the structure*
> *of the assignments. I think that's one of those keys for myself to really, really*
> *help the assessment process in some of these areas like problem solving.*
> (personal communication, September 2016)

P9's assessment process of this domain varies depending upon the assignment at hand. P9 provided the following insight into evaluating problem solving in the editing process:

> *A lot of it has to do in editing because editing, again, talking about algebra, there's different variables. You've got your duration, juxtaposition. You've got selection of the data that you're looking at. Those three variables can be put together in multiple different ways, and it's going to communicate different things. Looking at how a student is putting that information, that data, together to communicate to an audience ... Now if they put a bunch of quick cuts together, I'd talk to them and say, "Why did you do that?". A lot of this assessment happens when we're screening, screening these individual projects. It happens early on in the process too. This is something that, again, I will talk about and give examples and make sure that there's an expectation, a clear expectation to the students about I'm going to be asking you these questions about why are you doing some of these things. When you're in the act of it, make sure that you're making choices for a reason. Make sure there's a rationale behind the choice. Why did you put this clip ahead of this clip, and why was it only three seconds as opposed to five seconds? Those are all of the critical analysis and critical thinking that an editor needs to be able to do.* (personal communication, September 2016)

According to P10, *"Critical thinking and problem solving are assessed formally in our classes"* (personal communication, September 2016). This domain is a stated learning outcome for the program and data are collected and stored for institutional assessment needs. P10 described this process:

> *Generally, either with project work, but more primarily with quizzes and tests and standard assessment tools, then that is all recorded and measured and documented and reflected upon based on what the course objectives were. That one is a formal assessment. Generally, not summative, certainly not at the end of the semester, but throughout the course, so maybe quizzes or tests periodically throughout the semester.* (personal communication, September 2016)

Communication

P1's department requires students to take a course in public speaking from the general education pool of classes. The intention of this new requirement is *"...hoping that they'll*

improve their verbal and oral communication a little bit" (P1, personal communication,

August 2016). In regards to assessing communication in their classroom, P1 explained, *"I'll*

flip the classroom, and I'll have them teach one day or two days, and they go in and they

have to teach. I'll do that, but when they're doing that, I'm more assessing their content

knowledge, rather than their ability to communicate" (personal communication, August

2016). This technique requires student to process information and communicate if clearly to

an audience, which P1 believes is a very challenging proposition for students. P1 suggested,

"Some people would rather write me a term paper than to have to stand up there in front of

the entire class. It's like death for them, and so ... I think that's a complicating factor"

(personal communication, August 2016).

P2 spoke in detail about the communication expectations that are set within their

classroom. However, this assessment is not as formal as some of their other assessment

processes. *"It's a really informal, but I expect my students to be in regular communication*

with me on how their projects are coming along. I do that in class, I set aside the first twenty

minutes just to have that back and forth" (P2, personal communication, August 2016). P2

elaborated on this process:

> *I have them do weekly updates. Each week the crew will come in and they will*
> *update me verbally on what has happened over the last week. They'll come in*
> *with any questions or problems. I usually encourage them to share what other*
> *problems they're having, because if they're having a problem, chances are the*
> *other crew or other students in the class are experiencing the same problem.*
> *That's basically a lot of back and forth, and I expect them to tell me what the*
> *problems are so we can deal with them.* (personal communication, August
> 2016)

P2 assesses this communication process by assigning participation points to the

student's willingness and readiness to engage in this activity. P2 described this assessment:

*Yeah with that communication, I have some very pointed questions and if
they're not able to answer me ... Part of it is I have a participation grade and
usually it's ten or fifteen percent which correlates to roughly the number of
classes we have. Sometimes I'll just mark them down on like you really didn't
participate today, you didn't come prepared to participate today. I think that's
probably the way I do it. But it's informal. It's not really codified in that way.*
(personal communication, August 2016)

P3 explained the process that they use to assess this domain. The feedback provided

throughout this process is not only in regards to the communication performance by the

student. The students are describing there intended film projects and the feedback can

address many technical aspects or represent other domains. P3 highlighted this activity and

the corresponding assessment:

*When students are coming up with the ideas for their projects, and they've
written up a short treatment on what it's going to be, and this is before the
script writing stage, I'll have what's called network meeting, where I'll have
each group come up to the front of the room, and I play the network chief and
the rest of the class is the staff at the network, and we'll have them pitch to us
a concept. It is the oral presentation in that sense, where they have to not only
have to get us excited about the concept, but also particularly communicate
the central message. What is the theme that they're getting across with this
production? How are they going to realize this vision with the production
restraints that they have? They have to do it concisely and an in an energetic
way that will make us want to fund their project, essentially. Then we offer
feedback to that pitch. I can think of actually a few occasions where we've
encouraged them to go back and rework their concept, especially when ethical
issues come up. "We're going to use a secret camera to videotape
something!" Then we talk about specific ethical issues as part of those
sessions. They're certainly engaging in oral communication, and I'm not
providing them feedback in the form of a grade at that point, but we are giving
them constructive feedback as they develop their projects from that result.*
(personal communication, July 2016)

P4 uses the *"Think, Feel, Do"* model when assessing communication. P4 used this

description to outline its use:

*When they are bringing up their project to show off the choices that they've
made, I'm assessing them based on what they have pulled together. What do
they want their audience to think? What do they want their audience to feel*

and what do they want their audience to do? They will provide all that information prior to the actual project in a written pitch that they send to me and they also fully pitch that. I am assessing whether or not they are able to target the audience that they say they're targeting and are they providing content that is going to get that target audience to think about the subject matter, to feel about that subject matter and or to do something about that subject matter. (personal communication, July 2016)

In addition, P4 expressed the overall importance of communication as a key skill to entering the workforce. This concept in relation to P4's assessment process was explained:

I will correct them if they aren't using the correct terms or I will come back with more questions or try to restate what I think they're saying so that there is clarification and we are on the same page, based on whatever the topic is. Absolutely, communication is very important I think in terms of assessment. If they can't communicate and justify the choices that they've made using the proper technologies or the proper vocabulary then we need to go back and discus what a jump cut is, what a match cut is, what are the elements of a camera. Those are the things that are going to help them be successful in the industry. If they go on to the industry without having that knowledge and not being able to communicate that on set then they're not going to be able to hold this job. Absolutely, when they're doing their verbal, when they're doing their written and in oral conversations, they have to be able to communicate what it is that they're trying to discuss based around particular jargon that goes with the video world. (personal communication, July 2016)

P5 assesses artifacts in regards to communication. The artifacts in question reflect those that are specific to industry. Professional use of these artifacts as well and technical formatting are at the center of this assessment. According to P5:

Sometimes I'm looking for, again, artifacts of the communication process. I want to see director's notes, logs of takes, so forth and so on. I want to see call sheets for the actors, all of that. Communication in a screen writing class, again, goes back to can you tell me a story that has a clear protagonist, a clear antagonist and a beginning, a middle and an end? If you can do that, then that's the essence of communication in that particular subject. (personal communication, August 2016)

P6 felt that they had covered communication in the prior conversation concerning the liberal arts domain of written and oral communication. *"I think what we've talked about so*

far pretty much covers what I do" (P6, personal communication, September 2016). They did

not feel that they had more to offer in this particular domain.

P7 places a high value on the ability to communicate. *"I think that communication is*

one of the most vital things. Like I say, this is called a communication industry to a certain

degree" (P7, personal communication, September 2016). P7 continued, *"I think that is*

interesting to me because there's so many forms of communication" (personal

communication, September 2016). According to P7, *"The ability to communicate very*

clearly is an incredibly wonderful skill to develop and you can't do it all the time. You're

never going to be able to do it right all the time, but knowing that it is something that's not

just to be taken for granted I think is so important" (personal communication, September

2016). This thought provides structure to how P7 builds communication assessment into

their classroom. P7 stated, *"You're always trying to refine and take a little step and then a*

medium step and then a large step, so you can build the muscles up as far as being competent

in what you're communicating" (personal communication, September 2016).

P7 suggested assessing student communication in two separate areas. *"I mean in one*

sense there's a very big picture version for me and then sort of a very Devil on the details

version" (P7, personal communication, September 2016). The following is how P7

described this process:

> *The master workshop in producing, after we got through the initial weeks*
> *where we were setting the creative on its course, the rest of that course for*
> *those students was about communication. Where should everybody show up?*
> *What time? Who should show up? What should they show up with? I think*
> *there is always a learning curve. You never know how to do something until*
> *you've already done it, and so trying to give those students a very real world*
> *sense of ownership of how they communicated with the rest of their class was*
> *really important because I know over the years of working with people who*
> *are just starting out in the industry and you try to communicate with them,*

"Here's exactly how we have to log footage." Until they've gone through a project and realize why those things are vital, it's very, very hard to make them understand. Later, this is going to be sorted alphabetically and if you don't put the right number of spaces in it's not going to work. (personal communication, September 2016)

P8 felt that they had covered communication in the prior conversation concerning the liberal arts domain of written and oral communication. They did not feel that they had more to offer in this particular domain.

P9 separated this communication domain from the earlier domain of written and oral communication by specifically looking at the final output of the film. In this process P9 described the many artifacts that are required to be produced as written and oral communication artifacts, however when view the final output assessment differs. In this process of assessment P9 includes the student to develop some of the standards and projected outcomes that will ultimately be used in the evaluation process. P9 offered these thoughts on the subject:

Communication, ultimately, what you're trying to get on the screen is the direct communication of a thought, a vision, an idea on that screen to an audience. In this section right here, I'm going to focus on that viewing and screening. I don't have a rubric, per say, about communication when I'm looking at the final output, but what I do look at is how ... Again, I look at how they pitched this, how they pitched the vision, because that's where the student sets their own standard or develops their own rubric. They've got to tell me how it's going to look. They're going to tell me it's a comedy. They're going to tell me this is a thriller. Now was it a thriller? Or did it end up being a comedy? I've seen student projects that are like that. They're like, "You know what. We thought it was going to be scary, and when we saw it, it looked hilarious, so we kind of missed the mark, so we turned it into comedy." Those things happen, so that's some problem solving, but you missed your objective, your final communication that you're trying to put out there to an audience. That's one aspect, one large aspect I say that I would look at in communication. (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 explained the communication is an institutional outcome. This domain is also highly valued in their particular program. P10 stated, *"We understand in our field that sometimes you make it or break it on how well you can communicate something"* (personal communication, September 2016). Accessing communication for assessment in P10's classroom comes in many forms depending upon the course content. P10 described one way of assessing communication in the following example:

> *We're asked to assess it and I think it's important for our program that students should really be able to communicate well. Part of our assessment of an oral presentation would be, "How was their communication style? How clear were they? Did they, excuse me, did they have a clear-cut path when they started? Did they get to all their points? Did they communicate properly in terms of just addressing the audience, and looking left and right and talking to different people in the audience and whatnot?" That's all, again in a rubric that they've had a chance to look at in advance. It's all documented and a formal score given to that and then the reflection based on how they did.*
> (personal communication, September 2016)

Collaboration

P1 assesses collaboration in their advanced production course work. This is due to larger group projects requiring more crew members as well as an increase in equipment demands. Collaboration is a reflection of industry realities. According to P1, *"The nature of the business, where you just, you really need to be working in a group, because that's the way it's done"* (personal communication, August 2016). P1 uses what they referred to as a *"group performance evaluation form"* to assess the collaboration happening within the production team. *"I'll have them rate each other, and write about each other's role, working in a team, on a production, and that's a nice way, I think, to measure that, or to assess that"* (P1, personal communication, August 2016).

This type of evaluation method needs to be used in conjunction with observation in order to find the true collaborative experience that the students are reporting back. P1 explained, *"You can't pay too much attention to the outliers, but at the same time, they're all going to ... Most of the time, they give each other inflated grades, and so, I kind of have to read between the lines sometimes"* (personal communication, August 2016). P1 continued, *"If I notice a consistence, pattern, that Sally keeps getting dinged by every person in the group, that's going to confirm what's usually my suspicion"* (personal communication, August 2016).

P2 spoke about separating the assessment process into two areas of collaboration, interpersonal skills and artistic collaboration. P2 justified this approach:

> *There is that element of collaboration in terms of students, how their interpersonal skills, like how they're actually getting along with one another. There's actually the end products, the project that they're actually turning in, because that is a collaboration, sort of how each, aesthetically each part of those things are working together. In some ways in terms of collaboration, you just separate them out. Those interpersonal skills versus the artistic collaboration that's happened. Your DP, your editor, your sound person. Did they actually fit something together that makes sense artistically?* (personal communication, August 2016)

Once again, P2 employs a peer evaluation to gather information to assess the interpersonal skills displayed in the collaboration. The final product, such as a film, is then assessed to make the assessment in terms of artistic collaboration.

P3 spoke about collaboration as a process that the students are feeling their way through. *"I would definitely say it's a process. It's many times more work to be together as a team, and sometimes it can be really heart wrenching, and difficult for some students to either give up control, or to help someone else's vision become a reality"* (P3, personal communication, July 2016). P3 believes that when students work through this process they

tend to see the value of collaboration. *"Usually, students are much happier at the end of the*

process, because they see a piece of work that is greater than any one of them could've

produced on their own, that any one of them could've thought up on their own, and they

realize that it's harder work during the process, but it ultimately ends up in a better product

at the end" (P3, personal communication, July 2016).

P4 felt that they had already covered many of their own assessment processes in this

domain when the spoke about leadership and teamwork from the liberal art outcomes

questions. However, they did offer the following insight in regards to collaboration

assessment:

> *I think we've kind of covered this, but you know, the tools that I use to measure how well they worked together in groups, that each person has their own vision of this concept that they've developed together, and it might've been an initial idea from someone, or it might've been a combination of elements from each of the members. How do you do the "Yes, and" construct as opposed to say "No, but." You know, that sort of thing. How do you not shoot down ideas but help strengthen them, and offer and add to the idea, make it a stronger idea as opposed to saying, "No, this is my project, and you're all going to do what I say." I'm actively looking for those elements when I'm evaluating their reports to me on how performed and also what I hear from the clients, which might be sometimes a different narrative than what the students are presenting to me.* (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 offered observations of how a student's educational maturity affects their

understanding of the collaborative experience in production. According to P4:

> *I tend to think about students individually and not necessarily collectively unless something stands out. I can say that the majority of the students coming in are I guess not really excited about teamwork. By the time they get to their senior year and they come into the capstone class, then they realize that if they can do one thing really well and everybody on their team does their one thing really well, then collaboration is going to make some really great things happen. When they first come into the majors, they think, "How are we all going to get this done?" They all feel like they all have to be in charge. Absolutely, there's definitely a change.* (personal communication, July 2016)

The assessment process that P4 uses to gauge this change in perception comes in the form of peer evaluations as well as assessing the student's ability to clearly communicate how collaboration is going to be achieved. The latter activity is found in the Capstone course where students are required to pitch a project that is client based. A requirement of the pitch is for students to not only communicate the vision of the project, but to detail how this vision is going to be achieved. Collaboration is being assessed by P4 in this format. P4 explained:

> *That to me is how I would evaluate whether or not someone's plans that they are pitching, incorporates collaboration. Are they able to identify a particular project and explain how other people would be involved in that, down to details, down to what everybody's job would be? Those are the kinds of things that I'm looking for when we talk about collaboration.* (personal communication, July 2016)

P5 described their experience with assessment as using multiple methods. They use peer evaluations as well as observation. However, not every class the P5 teaches is structured to appropriately gauge collaboration. P5 offered the following:

> *Again, collaboration goes back to the nature of the particular class. If you're in one of my basic screen writing classes, then you don't have to collaborate too much because you're doing your own individual work. Again, in the production classes, I will look at your logs, I will look at what your classmates said about you, what you said about yourself. I found that students tend to be harder on themselves than their classmates are on them. I've also found that there tends to be an agreement amongst the other three or four members of a team about the fifth person. It's not really common that I had something that was a complete haywire. Everybody was pretty open, pretty honest and pretty much in line with what I observed when I showed up on set. I guess that's both communication and collaboration in work.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P6 had already spoken in great detail about their assessment process of this domain when addressing their own improvement of assessment, leadership and teamwork assessment, and ethical reasoning assessment.

P7 had already spoken in great detail about their assessment process of this domain when addressing leadership, teamwork and communication assessment. However, P7 highlighted a specific challenge when creating collaborative excises for assessment in the classroom:

> *In the real world I can quit or I can get somebody, there's somebody in the food chain above me that I can appeal to, whereas in an educational setting you're somewhat stuck. Collaboration is always a challenge in an educational setting because as much as we would like it to be indicative of the real world, it's missing some pretty vital parts of the real world. You pay to do this collaboration as opposed to somebody paying you to do this collaboration, and so while I try to make it as real world as possible, and it's always in the back of my mind that I'm still responsible to give as many people a good experience as possible.* (personal communication, September 2016)

This challenge of structuring meaningful collaborative experiences does not negate the value that P7 expresses to their students when it come to collaboration. P7 further explained:

> *Collaboration, I mean I think especially for the video part is we talk about it quite a bit because it's a collaborative art. I mean there is no, historically there's really no making your own film yourself or making your own TV how yourself or even making your own video art yourself. It's very, very unusual for that to be a single person. Trying to understand that give and take and where it can be a synergy that's ... The finished piece is greater than any one person, and talking about how that can work really well, but it's also, on a student level, it's very hard.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P8 explained the collaboration domain in their process of examining leadership, teamwork and ethical reasoning. Once again, P8 described their assessment methods as observations, discussions, reflection papers and student evaluations. P8 stated, *"By the end of a quarter, I'm looking for several things from students. I get them from student evaluations. They have to do a reflection paper on the process of taking the class and then they have a screening of the film so you see the film itself and see how they work with people"* (personal communication, August 2016).

P8 referred to Lev Vygotsky's theory of the Zone of Proximal Development.   This

theory suggests that there is a difference between what a learner can achieve without help

and what a learner can achieve with help. This is an important foundation in P8's classroom

structure. The approach allows P8 to capitalize on collaborative learning. According to P8:

> *There's this level of development, there's this level of development or you can work collaboratively with somebody. If you're an expert in a particular field, that student will be able to do more with you than they will be able to do by themselves. Those become opportunities for growth for that student. Peer-to-peer learning is really important for that, both amongst themselves and there are varying ranges of success there but I also I'll sit down with all those groups at the end of the quarter and we'll go through kind of shot by shot in the editing. That's really where their learning kind of ramps up in terms of thinking about film.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P9 began by defining what they believe is the difference between teamwork and

collaboration. P9 suggested:

> *Collaboration, to me, is a little bit different because teamwork is basically team dynamic. How are people getting along? Those interpersonal skills. How are we progressing as a team? Are you actually functioning as a team? There's always a growing period and figuring out who's good at what and where people have weaknesses. Collaboration, I think, has to do with the sharing of ideas to actually be able to produce something that is more unique or stronger than you would as an individual. Yes, you do need that team dynamic for that, and you probably need some leadership for that to have some structure.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P9 went on to describe collaboration in the context of filmmaking as a melding of

technical skills and interpersonal skill used to produce an artifact. According to P9, it's

"...not just the interpersonal skills, but the understanding of those technical skills that

they've learned throughout this process, and applying them in a way to actually make an

artifact or film or what have you but a stronger piece because of that" (personal

communication, September 2016). Collaboration in the classroom has created challenges for

P9. "Collaboration, it's messy, and it's hard, and people end up hating each other at the end

of the process. If you can learn to collaborate, part of the messiness is that you've got

different skill sets, and not everyone's going to have the same skill set and knowledge" (P9,

personal communication, September 2016). The assessment of collaboration was described

by P9:

> *How am I assessing that? Again, there's some observation, those peer-to-peer*
> *evaluations, peer evaluations at the end of the process. What I started doing*
> *as well is I started giving it to them in the middle of the process just to check*
> *in. One, I thought, gosh, I need to check in earlier to find out because if*
> *something's going wrong, I've got to step in and get this corrected. What I*
> *found was the feedback I gave them in the middle of the process was more*
> *valuable than when I gave it to them at the end because by the end they're*
> *like, "It's turned in, whatever. Let's get on to the next project." I get that. I*
> *was a student long enough to understand that.* (personal communication,
> September 2016)

P9 also suggested screenings as a way to evaluate the collaboration that took place

when developing the film. *"When we screen the stuff and are able to see it on the screen and*

we have discussions about 'why'd you do this,' 'why'd you do that,' a lot of those processes

are revealed. That comes back to mistakes, and it comes back to having people justify their

rationale and actually articulate it" (P9, personal communication, September 2016).

P10 described the difference between teamwork and collaboration:

> *I think teamwork is, we're given a project with X amount of tasks and we*
> *divide those tasks up and we accomplish those tasks, and maybe at some point*
> *we work together on a task and we accomplish it. Collaboration to me more*
> *implies you have some concepts maybe or some ideas that you have to take*
> *and flesh out to a higher level of thinking or production. That's when the*
> *intellectual powers come in and the collaboration takes place intellectually as*
> *opposed to production level, so you're talking about nuances versus rote*
> *execution of processes.* (personal communication, September 2016)

Collaboration presents problems when assessing in the classroom. P10 uses peer to

peer evaluation as well as observational techniques to get at the heart of the collaboration

happening within the classroom setting. However, P10 suggested, *"I think collaboration is a*

very, very difficult thing to assess without being involved in the groups intimately" (personal

communication, September 2016). Collaboration is examined as one of the key areas within

a project in P10's classroom. P10 offered the following illustration of this assessment:

> *Again, this is more of an observational basis, and not so much a written*
> *document type of thing. It might be one of the criteria on a rubric of, maybe*
> *we'll say six items for a project. Collaboration may be one of the criteria.*
> *More often than not, that is peer to peer and then as we then look at their ...*
> *After they have done their peer to peer reviews, I might look at those and then*
> *make comments on the paperwork that goes back to them saying, "All your*
> *peers said X, I observed Y." This is something you might know to look for, but*
> *it's not really ... It's assessed as a small portion of a larger project.* (personal
> communication, September 2016)

Creativity and innovation

P1 described the challenge that comes with assessing this particular domain. *"I'm*

observing that, I'm aware of that, but I don't have any systematic way, and, like you know,

it's a moving target, so it's difficult to assess" (P1, personal communication, August 2016).

This challenge was further explained by P1:

> *That's a tough one, because my screenwriting class, where there is a good*
> *deal of creative thought that should be taking place, it's difficult. What I've*
> *decided, just, to do after ten years of teaching that is to assess them on the*
> *technical aspects, and the workload, and just to try, throughout the semester,*
> *to push them to be a little bit more creative, but I don't assess it in any active*
> *way. Thinking with the video courses, same basic idea, with the exception that*
> *I will act as a gatekeeper, I say, "Look, I'm the executive producer, I get veto*
> *power on anything," and I will try to steer them in towards something that's*
> *more creative, but I don't actively assess it.* (personal communication, August
> 2016)

The mentorship that P1 provides in regards to this domain was described:

> *It's not in the evaluation at all. I'm always observing it, because like you, I'm*
> *really tuned into that from experience. What I, the best I do is to really reward*
> *it when it happens, encourage it. Point it out, reward it, praise it, say, "This*
> *is great. Good job. This is exactly what you want to be doing," or the other's*

*the flip side, say, "Well, why didn't you just do something else? (personal
communication, August 2016)*

P1 began to question how incorporating an assessment may look like in their current

classroom activities. P1 stated, *"It's organic, it's often spontaneous, it's difficult to track,*

but I think it's interesting to think about tracking that in a classroom" (personal

communication, August 2016). P1's thought process yielded the following:

> *Maybe, I'm just thinking out loud here. They could, I could have them,
> because I have them do daily production reports, so every time they shoot,
> they have to do a log. "Who was there?" "What camera, what equipment did
> you use?" "What did you get done?" They start to just kind of get used to
> daily logs. I could easily put in there, "What obstacles did you face and how
> did you overcome them," or something like that, or "What problems came
> up", and then that would be a ... Because they have to turn those in to me.*
> (personal communication, August 2016)

P2 expressed the challenge of assessing this domain. P2 stated, *"This is a question I*

have asked myself repeatedly. I've done other panels on this and how to assess creativity.

The answer is I don't fully know" (personal communication, August 2016). One assessment

technique that P2 has used is allowing students to set their own parameters that will later be

assessed against. This process was outlined by P2:

> *What they do is they submit an artist statement to me prior to shooting their
> project. At the end of the project, what they do is they submit a reflection
> paper on how close they came to their goal. Like, what was the project going
> to be? What were their goals for the project? Then a reflection on the things
> that they tried and did they accomplish their goal? One of the things I tell
> them is that it's okay if you didn't reach your goal. I want you to understand
> why. So I don't expect perfection, I expect progress. I really want to see your
> progress as a director. It's okay to try and fail, but I need you to show that
> you really tried and you didn't half-ass it, for lack of a better word. That
> you're demonstrating that you are learning creatively, or creativity, I don't
> know. Proving your creative work. That's something I've tried. It works in
> that class but that class is kind of set up for it anyway. Other classes, I think a
> lot of it is just grading the final project, you know? How unique is it? How
> innovative, how original? I do think you can give points to students for
> originality. As long as they understand what they're trying, and again, with
> these self-assessments that I do at the end where they hand in a written*

statement, that's also something that I want to see it, I want to understand their thought process. Which is hard to quantify. The directing assignment works well because there's a pre and a post statement from the student. That's a little easier to measure. But outside of the directing class, a lot of it's just the final project. How original was it? (personal communication, August 2016)

P3 echoed the challenging process of assessing this domain. P3 stated, *"That's the most difficult one, right? "Well, how creative is your project?"* (personal communication, July 2016). According to P3, *"Breaking this down into elements really helps with that element of assessment"* (personal communication, July 2016). P3 went on to describe assessing creativity and innovation by examining the way students solve problems in production. P3 explained this process:

"Well, how creative is the video?" Well, anyone can make their own judgments on that, but if you look at each one of the elements in each one of the production stages, you can see that there are problems that are presented with getting this production done, or having your original vision translated into something that's actually doable within the semester and the limited resources that you have. How do you solve those problems? How do you indicate something by means of a sound effect as opposed to showing something that would've really expensive to set up? Or how do you get around a production problem in editing, maybe there's that crucial shot that you don't really have, so how do you cut around that? Those are the elements that I'm looking for when assessing creativity, "How did you solve these problems in new and different ways?" I'm always surprised when somebody will put something together, I'm like, "I would have never thought of that." As we screen them together as a class, the students are like, "Oh that is amazing! How did you figure that out?" That's points for creativity. (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 described assessing creativity and innovation as a multi-faceted activity that requires them to examine many aspects of the student's work. *"Assessing creativity I think, takes many different forms. Where the students started when they came into the course as well as the technology and their overall presentation, how they've pulled everything together*

to make a statement" (P4, personal communication, July 2016). P4 provided this summary

of their assessment in this domain:

> *In terms of assessment of creativity, I'm looking for how students are telling the story. I think that's probably the key. If they can tell a story that's not boring, that keeps an audience engaged, draws out some sort of emotion, I think those are all the things that help me identify whether or not something is creative. Now, the other thing that I also look for is for innovation, I'm looking more in terms of the technical sense, what kind of technology did they use to create what they've put together. Did they use the basic editing software that we have or did they beyond and add other things making it a creative works for them? Again, creativity is subjective, so I think one student coming in that was unable to accomplish something at the beginning of the semester, to later then create something that's more entertaining or of value or informative or persuasive towards the end of the semester, based on their skill set, I could see part of that as their ability to produce something creative.* (personal communication, July 2016)

P5 focused on the storytelling aspects when measuring creativity and innovation. P5

stated, *"Let's put it this way. I have read over 1,000 students' scripts. If when I finish yours, I*

have the urge to reread it again, that's an A in the creativity" (personal communication,

August 2016). This point illustrated P5 process of identifying creativity within a script.

"What have you done that makes it stand out? Have you done anything that makes it stand

out?" (P5, personal communication, August 2016). In regards to innovation P5 specified,

"Are you doing a twist? Are you even doing a new twist on a familiar genre, a familiar

show?" (personal communication, August 2016). P5 has structured assignments that lack

dynamic plotlines and require the students to use the same information in order to push them

to apply creativity and innovation. The following is the P5 described this particular

assignment:

> *One of the assignments that I give my students is they have to write a promotional video in which they explain to themselves, but to an audience of students, what a new scholarship at the university is and how they can apply for it and get it if they earn it. The one thing that I tell them in advance ...*

Everybody gets the same scholarship. Everybody gets the same basic facts. The one thing I tell them in advance is, "I do not want a narrator doing voiceover while you show stills or even moving images of people doing the steps in the procedure or seeing the parts in the scholarship. I want you to do something that tells a story." They attempt that with greater or lesser success. (personal communication, August 2016)

P5 used the following analogy to illustrate how they urge their students to apply creativity in the area of scriptwriting:

What I tell students is you've got to begin to think of yourself as a writer in the same way that people who compose music think of themselves as writers of music. There's only 8 notes. They can be sharper. They can be flatter. They can be whole notes. They can be 16th note. They could be trebles. They could be bases, but there's only 8 notes. Your job is to find a new way to mix up those 8 notes and give the world a new mix of the same 8 basic principles. (personal communication, August 2016)

To what extent do P5's students incorporated this philosophy is one of the ways students are assessed in creativity and innovation.

P6 spoke in detail about the complexity of assessing of creativity and innovation. P6 stated, *"I guess the assessing of creativity is we're often assessing the quality of how well you've taken an idea and been able to express it through creative means of using sound and light and color and all those things"* (personal communication, September 2016). This is just one aspect of the technical process P6 is looking for in this domain. P6 explained the connection between creativity and critical thinking:

This is kind of my own thing, I find the more and more that I teach that the differences between creative and critical thinking are probably much less than we initially realize. I think what ties them both together is problem solving, at least in my own mind. A lot of creativity is often about- If you're starting with a vision or some kind of hunch, which even within other areas, even within the sciences, you kind of have to have a hypothesis and an idea that you're going to go test. I think that for those of us who work in creative fields, particularly in storytelling, there's some kernel of an idea, whether it's a theme or a character or something which is kind of the art equivalent of a hypothesis, or something that we want go test, where we're coming up with a way of trying

to get at truth that's more through a kind of mythos than empiricism. (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 articulated how they separately define critical thinking and creative thinking in regards to their assessment process of student work. P6 explained, *"I guess I see critical thinking as more of reactive to something that already exists and it's sort of the analytical side, which is very important. I think a big part of creative thinking is really just, are you generating something that's new?"* (personal communication, September 2016).

P6 examines creative choices by students to make assessments in the area of creativity. This process enables P6 to identify technical application that are intended to support a creative choice. According to P6:

> *The way I try to assess creativity in the production and storytelling process is where the creative choices, or particularly things that are more technique, like lighting or camera or editing or music, is it clear that they were story-driven? That there was something from that character or story that warranted or sort of explained the reason that this creative choice was made. It's always trying to get the more technical aspects to come back to something that actually has a more creative origin.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 made the following summation of assessing creative work by students:

> *I think in a way assessing creativity just comes from "Did you make something?" If you make something that wasn't purely derivative and in some way is actually new, and that there's a value that comes in in the taking on the challenge of just creating something that's new for other people to react to as a motive, communicating with an audience.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 stressed the process that students and professional alike need to go through in order to reach a creative space. P7 described this process in the following:

> *I know that when I was in film school half of my classmates thought that they were the next Scorsese or Spielberg, or later on Tarantino. God bless if you are, if you're just magically talented. For most of the rest of us we have to work very, very, very hard, and thinking they can skip over those points that*

are the grunt work to getting to creative work, where you want to be, is to me sort of a sign of either a genius, and I very much hope you remember me in your Academy Award speech.

P7 continued:

For the vast, vast majority of us, it's hard work and it's the people who are really willing to do the hard work that tend to succeed. That sounds kind of counter intuitive in a creative setting, but it's not. It's the people who have the discipline to do the things that they know they need to do to get to that creative place, or revisions. I mean everybody hates rewriting. Everybody hates reediting. It's not fun until you get done with it and you're able to develop those skills to know, "Hey, that is better." I think that's something that I really try to stress, and over the course and depending on what kind of class it is, there are things that that's got to be redone because it is not good enough. (personal communication, September 2016)

This process is stressed to P7's students. The concept helps guide P7 when identifying creativity in student work. This also helps encourage application creativity and innovation by offing feedback and building on prior attempts. However, a clear assessment instrument outside of this process was not discussed.

P8 described their assessment process as identifying many aspects of the process that students are going through. One of these aspects that is being assessed is the final artifact that is projected onto the screen. *"My approach to thinking about creativity comes out of that tradition of practice. I'm looking for formal innovation inside of these films. Give me a spark of something that makes me go, hmm, I haven't see that, I haven't thought about that before, I haven't seen this kind of thing"* (P8, personal communication, August 2016). P8 suggested, *"We're all looking for kind of compelling stories, I think. Some of them maybe they're not super creative in terms of form, in terms of creativity I'm usually thinking about form but identifying important under represented subjects is its own kind of creative act"* (personal communication, August 2016).

P8 also identified technical use of tools and technology, which directly relate to creative form, as an assessable area in regards to this domain. P8 described this aspect:

Formal creativity I think especially with the Go Pros I had students do really interesting stuff there. Throwing a Go Pro under a sink and turning the faucet on so it kind of gets covered in water, these kind of clever sorts of shots. I've always kind of been a sucker for those. I had one student that did a portrait of his face. He kind of did the stairway and kind of up and down, turned the camera upside down, he cut all these things together with this 1960s political radio broadcast. It has this kind of interesting dynamic between image and sound. I look for little sparks of things. In ten weeks you're not going to get a Jeanne Dielman out of these students or something like that. You look for sparks. (personal communication, August 2016).

P9 spoke about the subjective nature of creativity as a challenge to the assessment process. However, as an instructor, P9 offered the following insight into ways to access creativity for assessment:

The main thing I'd like to say about creativity is there are ways to assess it; there's ways to view it, but to be able to say this is creativity, this is a creative piece, is a bit subjective. What I'm saying is you've got to be able to structure those assignments to be able to assess certain aspects of an assignment or the process of filmmaking to be like, look, I'm assessing your creativity here on how you used the camera or how you used the location or how you used your actor or how you wrote this particular script. Those are all different ways I would be calling creativity an assessable skill or an assessable aspect of the process. (personal communication, September 2016)

The challenge to creating a structure to assess creativity was elaborated on by P9:

Problem solving, creativity, it all blurs the line, but what I will say is creativity ... There's a bunch of different aspects of creativity. One is that problem solving, critical thinking, creativity. How are we going to accomplish this? The next part is just the creative story, the creative idea, actually creating something on the screen. (personal communication, September 2016)

The challenge of prior knowledge is present in how P9 describes assessing creativity. The strategy of individual assessment is used in this case to provide valid feedback to the student. This process is explained as follows:

Because a student comes in with no prior knowledge, no experience with this at all and they're actually able to put up a video about their grandfather who served time in the war or something and they put that up there. The creative act of actually putting these pieces together to communicate to an audience, that act is creativity. It's a baseline, and hopefully the next project will be better. Sometimes it's worse, and then it gets better. This process is tough. We can't all just show up and be able to start producing stuff that's going to be picked up by Warner Bros. You've got to accept some growing pains in your students, especially in creativity. (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 expressed the challenge of assessing creativity. *"Creativity and innovation, probably one of the toughest things to assess."* (P10, personal communication, September 2016). P10 continued, *"That's a tough one to answer. How do we assess creativity?"* (personal communication, September 2016). The challenge of assessing this domain is explained by P10:

We do assess it as an institutional outcome. We're working currently on a rubric for it. Look at things like, again kind of the ... It's an element on a rubric for the one class that I might use it in ... I look at things that I haven't seen... "Has the person showed me things in a way I haven't seen them before or that they have never used before?" I think that's part of it, is just, are they making progress as a creative individual or are they relying on the same tricks that they've had used in the past? That's all on a rubric for an assignment, so the criteria is there. (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 then went on to illustrate this practice of assessment:

At a certain point during each semester, I say, "Okay, you know you've done this, you've done this, you've done that. Now the next level of producing this piece of work is showing me something that you haven't done yet, in a way you haven't done it yet." That's kind of how I look at assessing creativity. (personal communication, September 2016)

General tips, tools, and final thoughts

This section of the "Findings" reflects some of the additional remarks and perceptions that the participants offered during the interview process. As part of the formal questioning

participants were asked to provide any other information in regards to the stated domains that may help clarify their process of assessing these domains. In this section they were also allowed to offer any other information that they felt would be relevant to the study. The following are the participant's responses.

Participant 1

P1 offered:

One thing I will say, and I don't know if this will be useful or not, I'm really a big fan of peer evaluation. I use peer evaluation in my screenwriting class all throughout the semester, so we do two to three rounds of peer evaluation where they have to read each others' work, and they have to follow the same rubric for each time, and so, I'm able that way to see some progress from their peers' perspective, in terms of how, their progression. I do that. I don't know if that would be useful, and then I do the same thing in video production, in the advanced production, they do a lot of peer evaluation. The downside is, they don't know what they're doing. They're still learning [production] as they're evaluating, but the upside is, is that it inspires a little bit more, I think, creative and critical thinking when they're looking at each other's work. (personal communication, August 2016)

Participant 2

P2 suggested the following in regards to the topic of assessment:

Just that I don't think anybody really has the answers. I think this is a really tough field to do assessment in because it encompasses both the technical and the creative. I think when you have assignments that you have both of those components mixed in there, it gets really complicated. I have conversations, hallway conversations, with my colleagues all the time. What do I do about this? What do I do about this? This kid turned in this crazy assignment, how am I supposed to come up with a grade? I think it's just tough. (personal communication, August 2016)

P2 expressed the following in regards to liberal art assessment:

When I first started teaching, one of the things I was thinking about was ... I didn't really know what I was doing, so I figured that other people had a better idea. One of the books that I read was "What the Best College Teachers Do." I think the guy's name is Ken Bain. He's- I want to say it's New York? Some school in New York. Maybe it was NYU. So he's at a center for teaching and learning. I read that book and it talked about one of the specific things I

took from that was how to put together a syllabus. He talked about what the best college teachers do, and he talked about how specific students read a syllabus, what kinds of things should be in a syllabus, and those kinds of things. I tried it and it seemed really simple. I was like, oh whatever, I'll try it and it worked. It was really good advice. That book, I refer to it from time to time still. I thought that was really helpful. Then there's other centers for teaching and learning around the country. We have one at our school, which is pretty small, but there's some that have bigger ones. I don't know if you're aware of that. They have a big centers for teaching and learning. I read their articles every once in a while. There's a woman at my school in the English department. She's got this newspaper, like an electronic newspaper, she sends out that you can subscribe. Basically it's a feed of different news stories. She's got all kinds of blogs like that. That's a tool, I could forward that to you if you were interested. That's a tool. She's one of the co-chairs of the center for teaching and learning at my institution. She's got this daily newspaper, electronic newspaper with different articles. It pulls things from inside higher education, The Chronicle, Rice University has this blogs, and just sort of random stuff like that. That has been really helpful, just as a tool, and again just to kind of keep like assessment and various things going on in higher education sort of at the forefront because we all say that we're going to read The Chronicle every day- Of course, life gets away from us. When they have it sitting right there in your email box, all you have to do is click one thing and you're like look at this. (personal communication, August 2016)

Participant 3

P3 explained the following in regards to how they produced their assessment tools:

I believe in simulation exercises in production courses. I try to mimic as much as I can within a safe environment what students are going to face when they go into production environments. We go through the tools, we work with tools, we do exercises to make sure that they master the tools, and then I put them into environments in which eventually they're working in as close as possible a relationship and real client-production dyad, and so they're working together with the groups, and I will develop measures for how well do you work in a group. I sometimes will go out to standardized measures like that, well, I'm trying to think of what I've used in the past for measuring group work and teamwork, and some sort of a survey that each one of the students will fill out about- I don't remember where I got that from. (personal communication, July 2016)

P3 offered the following in regards to liberal arts assessment:

I would say that the key for a useful assessment of production, is to do exactly what other rubrics in non-production classes do, and that is break down the

elements of what was produced, so that you're not grading the video and giving a grade for a video that a student submits, and they're not just turning in a video and saying, "That's my project." That's the one thing that I learned from production is that, you're deliverable, the core thing that you're doing, is the video, or the movie, or the TV show that you're making. That's what people are going to experience. When you deliver something, that's only one small part of everything you have to deliver. You have to deliver all this paperwork, you have to deliver all your dailies, you have to essentially give over the entire process in the production to your distribution company or the network of clients that you're working for. All those become elements that you can't assess, and you can actually see the trace of the entire production from the germination of the idea through the locking down that idea in the form of a treatment, and a script, the scheduling of the production, thinking about art direction and casting. All those elements I think, are much more easily accessible than just looking at their video as the whole, or looking at the production as a hole. I think a lot of people get caught up in this idea of, "Well how do I grade a project when it's really art, and art is subjective, and the eye beholder? How can I be fair about this?" When you break it down into those little elements, it becomes much easier to part; you can see where someone might have produced a really inspirational piece of work. It's high marks for creativity, but it was a really shoddily planned production, and didn't take into account that input from other members of the group. You could still say, "Hey, that's a great video," but the course as laid out in the syllabus, these benches are about mastering all these different concepts. I think that's where assessment can really come and help students learn about the process. (personal communication, July 2016)

P3 suggested the following in regards to assessing the 4C's:

When I give grades back for projects, I always do it on a form where I break down each of these individual elements. I don't just simply assign a grade, or even just a series of grades, but I'll provide some written feedback. The elements of pre-production, the elements of the crew report and forming teamwork, the elements of scheduling of casting, of art direction, of sound, of video, the technical elements of production. I give them a breakdown of each one of those elements so that they can have a more detailed picture of what seemed to work well, and what didn't. What I find really interesting is that, in just informal conversations with students, they pretty much have a sense of what their grade is going to be before I hand back those sheets, because they've had that same experience; they've seen what went well, what worked well, and what didn't work as well. I think those classroom conversations help as much as my providing them my feedback to them. I keep emphasizing that they will learn with every production that they do; there will be some mistakes that they will make, and everyone makes mistakes in their first sets of production, even as they become professionals, and it's a lot better to make

those mistakes cheaply than to spend a hundred thousand dollars and make all those beginning mistakes, and lose a lot of money. That's a constant process of doing more production and learning from each one of those elements. The assessment process is not just me giving the feedback to the students. I want the students as much engaged in assessing their own performance, and the performance of their teammates as I'm doing it as well. I'm guiding them along, and giving them my experienced feedback, but they will only become better producers if they learn how to learn from their production mistakes. (personal communication, July 2016)

Participant 4

P4 expressed the following in regards to assessing liberal arts:

I guess I could add, to me liberal arts is really about all the various different mentalities that can come together in terms of collaboration. I'm very open-minded when it comes to types of projects that students work on and where they're trying to go. For me the assessment really comes into their technical skills and their overall presentation and package as they put it together. (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 suggested the following in regards to using rubrics:

For me it's really the rubric. Seeing it on paper that I can go through and say, "Was the introduction appropriate? Did it provide everything that I was looking for? Does the message target an audience?" When I can go through that rubric and say, "Yes, they did that very well." Or, "No, that needs some improvement." It's really the rubrics that I have right now. I've gotten to the point where if I don't have a rubric I create one. It's really for my own sanity. No, it's not just for me, it's for them because I know that I'm going to have a conversation with them about what they did well and what they didn't do so well. This piece of paper allows me to make sure that I've checked all the things that I'm looking for. Sometimes it could be a matter of 10 different items that I need to remember that that's what I want to critic. Then when we can sit down and we can say, "No. you didn't do so well in this area let's take a look at why then we can put the project back up and go back to it." Then we can discuss what the rubric means if there's any clarification that needs to happen. I feel like the rubrics are invaluable really, I think well written and describe what I'm looking for as I'm assessing their projects. (personal communication, July 2016)

P4 offered the following in regards to assessment:

I will say before I became the assessment coordinator, when I first started teaching 10 years ago, I was told that … This is coming out of a master's

program in education. I knew a little bit about how to conduct assessment and how to assess outcomes and things like that. When I started teaching, I read through the three to five outcomes knowing that, "Okay, I need to make sure that this is covered in the class." That was really all that was ever pushed on me, we never really came back. We didn't have an assessment plan in our department. In the last five years since, I've become the department assessment coordinator ... Our whole university is going through this. They want us to have assessment plans and be able to provide to data to how we're assessing things in our department. I have become ... God, I don't want to say the assessment police. I got to everybody saying, "Don't forget we have outcomes and their not just ... We need to be talking about this in class, but we need to be assessing those and what does that mean and how is that going to help our department?" I do strongly believe that if we know what it is that we need to improve upon we can assess that and then we can better our particular program, our course, our department based on what we're learning. The whole assessment just in our department in our university, has really been something that's been a hot topic the last five years at our university. (personal communication, July 2016)

Participant 5

P5 offered the following in regards to assessing liberal arts:

If I had to summarize my approach to liberal arts assessment, the tip I would give is just one of making it relatable to the students or understandable by the students. Sadly, the idea of pure liberal arts has taken something of a beating in the last few years. There's almost a distrust of anything that is too "theoretical." The thing I would tell any instructor in our field, as they are assessing a liberal arts skill, is always point it back to the real world. Always point it back to the profession, whatever part of the profession you're dealing with. That's my tip. (personal communication, August 2016)

Participant 6

P6 did not have additional comments in this area.

Participant 7

P7 described the following strategy to encourage collaboration and teamwork:

I think the only thing that I would add, the classes, production classes, though the writing classes tend to be smaller, and I think over the course of time, not that I don't try to get to know my students in larger film history and appreciation classes, but for the things that people are going to be more creative in I've tried to make an effort to get to know people better, or to plan

projects that reveal something about them self personally pretty early in the semester. When I started teaching digital video there was an interview project that really came sort of sixty percent into the semester, and I just found that we were learning such interesting, you know, here's a veteran who served in Afghanistan. Here's somebody who lost their father. They were really wonderful portals into who this person was. I eventually said, you know what, I'm going to move that project up to fifteen or twenty percent into the semester because it just created a camaraderie in a classroom where people were going to have to work together anyway in order to, in video, to achieve a project. It just really relaxed people in a way, because I mean they only reveal the stuff they want to reveal, and that created a level of camaraderie, so I'd say that's something that I have just structurally built in. (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 explained the following process to encourage some of the liberal arts skills:

For students and trying to encourage them to look at the world around them I have in the past in the first couple of weeks of class given a sort of current events quiz or something like that, just to sort of remind them of how much they know and how much they don't know, and these are certainly not graded. Sometimes I'll ask, depending on what the class is, I'll ask them to bring in a written piece. For the television programs development class they're going to keep a journal for the first half of the semester, writing about things that they watch to kind of make them look at it a little bit. I think they're already looking at it critically because these are junior and senior level students, but having them sort of go through the process where you have to verbalize your critique, which I think is an interesting thing in this kind of real world setting. At one point I was editing my own project and that's when I was on staff at a company, and then I went to being a freelancer, and I had to go back to working with an editor, and I had to tell them what I wanted, and it was such a hard transition to go back from just doing to talking about it, and so I think that that's stuck with me over the years, that when you make people talk about things that they intuitively know that they want that it can really help the process as far as learning what it is that you do actually want. (personal communication, September 2016)

P7 suggested the following in regards to educational resources regarding liberal arts

assessment:

When I started teaching I read quite a bit on fact-based assessment, and challenges and best practices in that and really tried to refine my tests over the course of a couple of semesters as I got up and running, because I don't have an education degree. I have a filmmaking degree, and I have since moved out of just teaching those general and introductory classes, and I kind

of just have been feeling my way through it. It's not something that I think that I come across in any of the higher education journals that I don't always read cover to cover, but I do try to glance at them and read articles that catch my attention or various other things. It would be really nice to know some best practices and just some things to chew on as far as ways to improve and be more thoughtful or more deliberate. That's the word I'm looking for. Being more deliberate about those realms, because they are squishy. (personal communication, September 2016)

Participant 8

P8 offered the following in regards structuring assignment to spur creativity:

They did portrait of a space, but they had to pick a space that made them angry or made them feel something and then they had to write a voiceover to it later like a letter to the space.

P8 continued:

All the students in it were, I had some really smart students in that class actually, but they gravitated to that assignment. It was kind of coming out of these diasporic tradition of filmmaking. It's not an industry tradition, it's like independent kind of experimental films from the '80s and early '90s. People living diasporas and trying to make sense of memories in these banal US cities. This woman I was telling you about, she did this really creative thing where she made a portrait of this kind of backyard, like junked up backyard with all kinds of rusty artifacts and then pulled quotes from this website called post secrets, where people post anonymous secrets collectively, all just posted these secrets up there. She picked out 10 or 12 of these things and just had several different people read them and that was the soundtrack to this film. It was almost like these little objects in the back space started to kind of embody these secrets that people would tell. Really kind of quirky stuff. She picked out things that weren't too outrageous, just like subtle. We got a bunch of interesting stuff out of that, people writing poetry and letters to statues and all kinds of stuff. In terms of interviewing, she was quite good at that. Again, I don't know how you assess something like that, you just sort of see it in the footage. I sort of feel like, watch the footage and you'll kind of get it, you know? (personal communication, August 2016)

Participant 9

P9 described the following in regards to the overall process of assessing these domains:

The one thing I would like to add to this is this is a tough, tough area to be assessing, and especially for people with my background, they're going to

want to be looking at form. They're going to want to be looking at the processes, the technical capabilities of a student. When you start getting into these higher-level thinking aspects, it becomes really difficult if you just look at it as how do I do this. My big suggestion would be to break the process down into smaller assessments that build upon each other to be able to not only ... It helps your teacher, but it also helps you to be able to assess, or it can give students feedback that works, feedback that helps, feedback that's thought about prior to actually the process happening. The daunting task of looking at something subjective like creativity or critical thinking, it's possible, but you can't just put it on a line and say I'm going to assess ... I'm going to assess? I'm going to assess creativity, because then that subjectivity just leaps right in. Now if you can be clear about parameters, about what you're assessing in that creative aspect, that helps the instruction. It helps the student, and it helps the process because a student can then really grab onto that final feedback that they get at the end of the semester and take it with them into the next class. This assessment thing, I was talking about at the beginning being a process. Film makers know that this is a process, so that's something they should be able to accept. It's a process we're not used to dealing with, assessment, unless you've been in the academic setting for quite some time. Really making your assessments and your communication, your feedback and all of that stuff done within the parameters of the process of assessment will help not only the student, but it will help you as the instructor. (personal communication, September 2016)

Participant 10

P10 expressed the following:

Again, I think the rubrics are very valuable. I think looking at it from the assessment point backwards is very helpful. If you want to measure whether or not they learned teamwork, you got to define what teamwork looks like to you, and then decide how you're going to figure out how to measure and work backwards from that. Both the assessment tool, the rubric ... The students have it in their hands in advance so they know what they're being, I would say judged on. Understand that a lot of these things you need to do formally and the paper still has a place for some things, but that a lot of assessment goes on formatively. You really as a teacher have to be tuned in to that, make notes for yourself from semester to semester say, "Okay, this worked this way, and this worked as well," as you're assessing your teaching styles and what you're doing right and wrong in the classroom. You can obviously measure tests and look at videos and say, "This group was better than this," but the question is why and, "Was it something I did as a teacher?" Assessing what you're doing as a teacher I think is important as well, because from group to group, the talent pool could very widely and sometimes you have to look at how you're

teaching it and if it's getting learned. (personal communication, September 2016)

P10 offered this final insight:

> *I think assessment is underrated maybe. As a teacher, if you're open to the benefits of it, it's fantastic. I think if you think of it in terms of, "If I was the student, did I learn what I was supposed to learn," and, "Was I being taught what I was supposed to be, you know, was the teacher addressing the things that they were supposed to address, doing it in such a way that I actually learned the material and the other people in the classroom as well across learning styles and whatnot?" I think incumbent upon us as instructors to make sure that's happening for as many students as possible, and that we're reflecting and working at it. Assessment should drive learning frankly.*
> (personal communication, September 2016)

Internal Documents

Internal documents were gathered as a data set to represent the participants' materials they use in classroom assessment. Materials that were collected and examined in this data set were: syllabi, course outlines, rubrics, peer to peer evaluation forms, client evaluation forms, course assignment sheets and articles produced by participant explaining their assessment process. These data were provided as a means to cross reference the information provided by the participants in the interview process as well as the external documents in order to provide trustworthiness to the data.

P1. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. P1's documents included course syllabi, assignments, written tests as well as rubrics. The syllabi covered courses in film history as well as screenwriting. Overall, the Domains of Communication and Critical Thinking are the primary focus of the documents. Teamwork was eluded to in the terms of group work, however the main learning objectives were absent of explicit terminology of Collaboration

and Teamwork. There is an implicit expectation set as students are required to offer critiques as feedback. The inclusion of this type of feedback may suggest collaboration on a screenplay, however this terminology and direct description of this process was not present in the documents. The course in Screenwriting reflected many types of expectation communicated to students. The expectations were in the areas of technical writing as well as technical formatting.

The student learning outcomes explicitly stated the Critical Thinking was a goal by not only including the direct words within the outcomes, but also describing actions and processes that are goals such as "recognize", "incorporate" and "understand". These terms suggested that critical examination of the process of screenwriting is a common goal within the course.

In regards to the film history course, Critical Thinking was, again, explicitly communicated as a stated learning goals. However, Life Long Learning was implicitly addressed as a goal for students to "integrate knowledge" leading to deeper understanding. A byproduct of this learning process was explained to inform the students own decision making process. This goal implicitly addresses the Domain of Problem Solving.

Stated Evaluation. P1's syllabi contained direct links to assessments in regards to stated learning outcomes. Exams, papers and critiques were stated as the assessments used to examine. However, P1 also offered other assessment tools that were used in their classroom evaluation process. Rubrics were one of these other tools. The rubrics provided reflected professional standards as a key expectation for the evaluation. Rubrics were offered for both academic writing and screenwriting. Technical formatting was expressed as a key evaluation standard in both cases.

Other stated evaluations were the student review process of screenplays that happened three specific times throughout the writing process. This encompassed students filling out a rubric and providing specific written feedback in a peer review format. The instructor also engaged in this process and conduct one on one evaluations of the student's work.

The final tool provided was a group performance evaluation. This document as specific in the design to address Teamwork, group dynamics and individual responsibility. The evaluation form is open for students to voice concern over a variety of areas, however no specific criteria is communicated as a standard or expectation.

Key Insights. One of the key insights highlighted in the review of these documents were the explicit linking of student learning outcomes to assessment measures. This published description allows for students to understand the value and process of evaluation from instructors to the department and then to the institution. Another key insight was the illustration of a scaffolding approach to teaching and learning that is reflected in the scriptwriting review process. Three reviews of student work by peers and the instructor are scheduled. The screenplay drafts are graded with an increase in expectation as the student progresses. This evaluation process is described as being "graded more and more stringently" (P1, document review, 2017) every round of submissions. This approach of building technical skills and then infusing the writing with a student's own storytelling is taught and evaluated as a process. Each step in the process is evaluated and guided by the expectation of a professional standard.

P2. Documents

  Stated Outcomes/Goals. P2 communicates the expectations to students through

documents. Domains such as Communication, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving are

clearly positioned into the course description that was provided. Creativity was also loosely

reflected. The projected schedule that is offered suggests the process oriented activity of

filmmaking with assignments that build on each other. The assignment "Reflective Paper" is

linked to Life Long Learning. The assignment sets a standard of where the student comes

from and where they are projecting that they are going. The syllabi provided clearly state

assignments and communicate the purpose. Areas that were highlighted in these documents

are: communication, critical thinking, creation, problem solving, collaboration and

professional industry standards.

  Stated Evaluation. The evaluations that are stated within the documents provided

reflect observation, artifact review and critique, as well as peer evaluations. The peer

evaluation form provided reflects the following areas of examination: technical skills,

teamwork, work ethic, communication, problem solving and integrity.

  Key Insights. The key insight provided by the documents provided by P2 are that

clear expectations are provided to the students through the syllabus. Assignments are

provided with the purpose stated for the student to analyze and reflect upon. The process of

evaluation is projected through the documents as well. P2 includes students in the process by

allowing them to have their perspective valued with the peer evaluation. Many of the

domains are implicit in the documents. The more explicit assessments and the domains

found within these documents are within these topics: Communication, Teamwork, Problem

Solving, Critical Thinking. The following topics are more implicit within the documents:

Creativity, Leadership, Life Long Learning. Ethics is not a topic directly laid out in the documents, however from the interview discussion the term Integrity is how P2 drew some comparisons.

P3. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. The syllabi provided illustrated how the domains of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Teamwork and Collaboration progressed from the "Intro Class" to the more "Advanced Class". The Intro reflected a much more foundational approach with technical skills emphasized. Both syllabi expressed the Domains of Problem Solving, Critical Thinking, Communication and Collaboration as learning objectives in the Intro Class. The Advanced class progressed into the stated objectives of Ethical Reasoning and expanded on the Domain of Collaboration. Another area that is reflected in the document are the linked to professional industry suggesting professional standards are being applied as expectations. . Leadership does not seem to be addressed in the syllabi.

Stated Evaluation. The evaluation documents that were provided by P3 are open for interpretation by the instructor. It is unclear if this is a regular practice by P3. The evaluation documents suggests that there is individual assessment of students conducted in the process and expectations are set accordingly. Also, there is an effort to incorporate a lot of written feedback during the stages of each assignment. One of the evaluation documents provided was the client review forms. This document lacks a clearly defined process to how the expectations are set for the client or the instructor to gauge success of achievement. However, the expectations that are reflected within this document are that students need to act professional, be prepared and accountable for their actions.

Key Insights.   The key insight provided by the documents that P3 submitted are that there is a value to professional standards within the assessment process. The documents reflect a clear process that students take part in while progressing through the coursework. Many of the domains are implicit in the documents. The more explicit assessments and the domains found within these documents are within these topics: Communication, Teamwork, Problem Solving, Critical Thinking. The following topics are more implicit within the documents: Ethics, Creativity, Life Long Learning. Leadership is not communicated through the documents provided.

P4. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals.   The course objective listed in the syllabus are direct wording from the program goals. Also, the wording used in the syllabus expresses time management and logistics that will be applied in the coursework. This sets the expectation to the student in this case. Teamwork expectation are embedded in the syllabus as are future assignments that deal with teamwork. The value of this Domain is present in this particular document. Other areas that are hinted at in regards to the Domains in question are: Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Communication and Life Long Learning.

Stated Evaluation.   The documents provided by P4 offered a lean towards technical skills refinement and assessment. However, some areas of the non-technical skills are presented in a way that suggests students are graded on actions and demonstrated skills that are derived from a concept or lecture spoken specifically in a class. This assumption was confirmed by P4 in member check process. Critical Thinking is implicit in this process. Overall it appears that P4's documents set clear expectations and define the role and responsibility of the student. This plays out in the evaluation documents that were provided

by P4. The descriptions and purpose of each assignment is clear, however there is some disconnect in the assessment documents as to how certain Domains are addressed. The framing of more subjective Domains such as Creativity is an area that P4 delivers key concepts discussed in class. This explained the disconnect within the materials reviewed. Application of such areas are valued within the rubric and which makes direct connections to the assignment. This illustrates the process that P4 uses for assessment and provides structure to this activity.

Peer evaluation were also provided by P4. Within this documents the following Domains were highlighted explicitly: Problem Solving and Critical Thinking, Teamwork and Collaboration. Other areas such as professionalism and responsibility were expressed. Domains that were implicit in these documents were: Creativity, Ethics and Life Long Learning. Leadership was not clearly expressed in the evaluation tools provided.

Key Insights. During the member check process P4 explained more details about the commercial assignment that was provided. Within this assignment a "Call to Action" by the audience was used to describe the goal of the communication artifact that was being produced. In order to produce a "Call to Action", P4 explained higher order thinking skills would need to be used in conjunction with technical skills. This process clarified the process and how assessment is being used to gauge the entire process of filmmaking with the final artifact.

P5. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. P5 provided documents that included an emphasis on professional industry standards. The syllabus examined was for an ethics course so the the Domain of Ethical Reasoning is a focus of that documents. Ethics is the most explicit

assessment that is being conducted in this particular document. There are many implicit

linkages to the liberal arts Domains, including: Communication, Critical Thinking, and Life

Long Learning.

Stated Evaluation. The stated evaluation within the documents that were provided

are conducted with student reflection papers. Technical writing is assessed but the purpose

of the assignment sheets are to build the student critical analysis skills in regards to their own

career aspirations. Professionalism, application of knowledge and research skills are

emphasized in the documents.

Key Insights. The examination of one's own behavior is used to draw out many

implicit assessments in P5 process. Critical Thinking is present in the document and set the

expectation of personal awareness in regards to career and Life Long Learning. The nature

of the course offering in ethics allows the topic of Ethical Reasoning to be explicitly

addressed. Also, P5's institution is of religious affiliation. This aspect is present and guides

expectations within the documents. Finally, professionalism and industry standards are

emphasized throughout these documents. These topics are used to set measures included in

the assessment that is taken place. The illustration of these areas in regards to value to the

student are set as expectation for career readiness.

P6. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. P6 provided documents that set expectations and

communicated them to students. Specifically, within the syllabus provided, P6 explains not

only the assignments, but the purpose of those assignments. The learning outcomes that are

stated in regards to a specific course are explicit and provide details such as "Idea

Objectives" and the "Assessments" that will take place in the course. This inclusion and

transparency with assessment is explicit in the document in the following Domains: Problem Solving, Critical Thinking and Communication. The following Domains are present in the documents, however more implicit: Teamwork and Collaboration, Life Long Learning and Creativity. Professional behavior is also present in the documents and sets the expectation of students in regards to the practice of professionalism as a value. The Domains of Leadership and Ethical Reasoning are not specifically present in the documents provided.

Stated Evaluation. P6 presented a scenario of including students in the assessment process. In a specific course students are required to develop their own stated objective in regards to their work. In the coursework, cinematic design theories and concepts are presented early in the classroom. These design elements are then suggested by the student as outcomes. P6 explained that the students are then developing their own criteria to be judged against instead of a rubric that may be more generalized around the topic. The student developed criteria is then tested within the student produced projects. This process links the Domains of Critical Thinking, Communication, Problem Solving and creative decision making to the process of filmmaking. The process checks knowledge and understanding while setting the expectation level of successful completion of visual design layout. The system creates a way to value creative form and decision making process in the production of the film.

Key Insights. The key insight provided by P6 was in regards to transparency and inclusion of the students in the assessment process. This is illustrated in the above process of students developing the outcomes for their own assignments. This also begins the life long learning process as student are critically analyzing how their work may have met or not met their own stated outcomes.

P7. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. P7 supplied documents that aligned with industry standards. These standards set expectations that are communicated through the document to students. The variety of paperwork that was offered covered introductory course work to more advanced classes. The intro level coursework is slanted towards technical skill evaluation. The Advanced coursework incorporated more assignment and assessments of higher order thinking skills. Domains that are explicit in the documents in regards to assessment are: Collaboration, Communication, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Implicit assessment was reflected in the Domains: Creativity, Life Long Learning. Leadership and Ethical Reasoning are not present in the documents; however the Narrative Producing course reflects areas that are linked to Leadership.

Stated Evaluation. The documents suggest that many evaluations are aimed at reaching a professional standard in the assessment process. Writing skills are valued and expectation are set within the documents to the assessment process. Once again, professional standards are the primary gauge of this Domain. Objectives are stated within the document. Rubrics of technical skills include words such as: Demonstrate, Understand, Analyze. Stated assessments are offered in group assignments in regards to Collaboration.

Key Insights. P7 provided both introductory course paperwork and advance course paperwork. These two pieces of data supplied contrast and linkage to the process oriented activity of filmmaking. Within the process, P7's documents have a defined structure that reflect processes that build to a final project. These projects required students to conduct critical thinking in both the introductory and advanced coursework.

P8. Documents

    Stated Outcomes/Goals. The stated outcomes that are communicated through P8's documents are in two areas. The first, is for students to acquire basic proficiency in film/video production technical skills. The second area builds upon the application of the technical skills for students to engage in course content and produce communication artifacts focused social issues. The second area of focus used language that suggests Ethical Reasoning, Leadership and Critical Thinking are the primary Domains that intentionally structured into the course. The courses examined build with attention to specific course content and of ethics and social issues, and at the same time introductory production skills are being taught.   This process leads student to the final project that incorporates both of these stated goals. Along the way, the documents suggested that Communication, Collaboration, Teamwork and Creativity are examined in the process. There is additionally, implicit suggestions that Leadership comes into play in the group process, however explicit wording and description is not present in the documents provided.

    Stated Evaluation. The stated evaluations that are present in the documents are in relation to communication, both oral and written. There was repeated use of the term "discuss" and "discussion". Usually, this term was used in conjunction with screenings of student work. These discussions are not explicit as to how they are used in the assessment process through the documents. However, there is evidence of repetition of screening and discussion throughout the courses structure. Other stated assessment activities reflected in the documents were in the form of written documents. Reflection pieces submitted by the student as well as treatments and proposals are examined within the course.

The assessments that described within the documents are explained by P8. This communication from instructor to students demonstrated expectations in regards to the Domains of Communication, Critical Thinking, Ethical Reasoning, and Collaboration/Teamwork. The assessment of these technical skills were in regards to Critical Thinking. Student are expected to justify choices made in production. Ultimately the documents suggested that communication is valued and examined as a means to explore ethics, diversity, social awareness and change. Through this process, Leadership and Life Long Learning are implicitly described within the documents, however there is no explicit wording included to the extent of these areas being assessed.

Key Insights. The key insight uncovered by the review of these materials was the intentional structure that P8 has built. The simultaneous introduction of technical production skills and the course content that focuses on ethical consideration and communication builds to a final project. As a student progresses through the course, basic skills are assessed with exercises and assignments that use specific parameters and conditions. The instructor communicated that the intention of this process is for students to focus on basic application. This build block approach prepares students for the final projects were higher order thinking skills are employed and set as expectations from the instructor. The assessments that are described in the documents place high value on observation and discussions that serve as a way to check student understanding, group dynamics, progression through course content and development of a final artifact.

P9. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. The stated goals and outcomes that are present in the documents provided by P9 stressed the technical side of filmmaking. However, the Domain

of Critical Thinking is communicated to the students in the syllabus as well as the rubrics and assignment sheets. Professional standards and linkage to industry are another emphasis in the documents. The process of filmmaking is laid out as the structure of the course as assignments build on one another. The rubrics reflect the build block approach to filmmaking as the more complex assignments incorporates higher order thinking skills. Finally, the word "create" and "creation" are both used throughout the documents, inferring the base level of a creative act, however creativity is not explicit in the syllabus. Assessments of the following Domains are explicit in the documents: Creativity, Problem Solving and Critical Thinking. Implicit assessments are found in the Domain of Communication. There is an absence of the following Domains in the documents provided: Leadership, Ethics, Teamwork, Collaboration and Life Long Learning.

Stated Evaluation. The syllabus stated that the use of observation, quizzes and short papers are to be used in the evaluation process. The rubrics provided by P9 reflected the evaluation of technical skills as well as higher order thinking skills. Creativity is expressed in the rubric as not only an area of evaluation, but is present in other evaluated categories such as: Problem Solving, Critical Thinking and the use of technical skills to produce the artifact in judgment. The artifact as well as the process of producing the artifact are both evaluated. There is no mention to how group discussion played a role in the evaluation process in the documents provided.

Key Insights. One key insight is the use of enforcing parameters on the student within the assignments. The rubric suggests that these parameters are used to measure specific skills that are being addressed within the assignment. The parameters are also being

enforced to examine how the student uses problem solving to meet the challenges that they create.

Another key insight provided by P9's documents is the presence of creativity in technical application as well as its presence in other specific categories. Creativity is present in the technical skills assessment by viewing the application decisions as "creative choices". Problem Solving and Critical Thinking assessments are also made by evaluating the creative choices students make. As the coursework moves through the sequence of P9's curriculum, the rubrics reflect technical skills as the baseline. Then progression to the evaluation of higher order thinking skills are present in the advanced coursework rubrics.

P10. Documents

Stated Outcomes/Goals. P10's documents reflected very explicit student learning outcomes within the supplied syllabi. One of the course syllabi was that of an introductory course. This course document reflected an emphasis on technical capabilities as student outcomes. However, the domains of Critical Thinking and Communication were also to be explicitly addressed. Within this introductory course there were also course goals that were listed. Once again, there was a considerable amount of technical skills being emphasized. Creativity was implicitly addressed as a goal. Artistic considerations were framed as a foundation to produce informed choices or creative choices in production. However the term creativity was not explicitly used to address this type of activity. Another area that was expressed as a value in this document was the expectation of meeting professional standards.

The other syllabi supplied by P10 was that of a more advanced course. Competency of technical skills was again expressed as an expectation of student outcomes. However, a greater emphasis was given to domains such as Critical Thinking, Problem Solving,

Communication, Collaboration, Teamwork and Creativity. Explicit terminology of

teamwork was used to explain intended assignment. Many of the domains mentioned held

implicit value found in the four major assignments of the class. Creativity, again, was an

area that was described without direct use of the word. Written communication was

expressed as a value in this course as professional artifacts such as treatments, proposals and

shot lists were listed as artifacts that carried value. Ethics was not discussed outside a school

wide integrity and cheating policy. The Domains that were absent from the stated outcomes

and goals were: Leadership and Ethical Reasoning.

     Stated Evaluation. The evaluation tool that P10 provided came in the form of a

rubric. This rubric reflected the evaluation of the Domains: Creativity, Critical Thinking, and

Communication. The rubric was broken into four areas of concern. The first being technical.

This area was an emphasis of camera operations. The second area was artistic. Once again,

this area pointed to technical capabilities that were applied to produce images. In this area

the application of these technical skills called for critical thinking and decision making

produce a creative choice that was then evaluated upon the techniques that were applied. The

third area was aesthetics. This area was judged with attention given to critical thinking. Like

creativity, which was being evaluated in the earlier concern of the artistic arena, aesthetics

evaluation was build on application of choices. These choices were made with critical

thinking as the main activity being enacted. Within the rubric there was dedicated space for

students to reflected upon areas that they felt they did not preform well on and what they

would do differently next time. This area of the rubric reflected that critical analysis of ones

work and places the expectation of improvement by mistakes or underachievement in

production.

Key Insights. The key insight provided by P10's documents were that there was major attention placed on basic technical skills in the introductory course. This compared to the advanced course where technical skills were still of value, but higher order thinking skills were more present as an expectation. There was evidence that suggested creativity was being evaluated by breaking this domain down to the foundation of technical skills. This provided access to assessing creativity as well as defining basic foundational skills that provided structure to a student engaging with creative decision making.

External Documents

External documents were gathered as a data set that represents the institution's materials that reflect the stated learning outcomes. These outcomes were deemed as influential to the participant's classroom assessment. Materials that were collected and examined in this data set were: institutional mission statement, program mission statements, stated learning goals and outcome, program description, course descriptions and promotional materials produced for the institution and/or program. These data were provided as a means to cross reference the information provided by the participants in the interview process as well as the internal documents.

P1. Institutional Documents

The documents that have been published by P1's institution expressed guidance to faculty while conducting assessment. The institution offered the primary reason for assessing student learning as way to improve not only the instruction within the department, but to strengthen the program curriculum and improve the resource allocation process.

Institutionally published guidelines for assessment require programs to take responsibility for assessment within their area of study. This requirement suggested that faculty members engage in multiple methods of assessment when gauging student learning objectives. The stated learning objectives had implicit references to observation, testing and discussion as methods of assessment. Explicitly that institution has published the Domains of Critical Thinking or Creative Thinking and Communication as areas of assessment that are required by all programs.

The Domains of Creativity and Life Long Learning are expressed in the vision and mission statement of the institution. Also, the Domains of Life Long Learning, Critical Thinking, Creativity, Collaboration, Ethics and Leadership are areas that are reflected upon in the school's statement of values. Life Long Learning and Ethics Domains were frequently expressed throughout the published documents. Throughout all of the published materials that were found, guidelines and value are expressed by the assessment of student learning. However, at this level of instructional communication, no suggestion of how to assess these area of value was made.

Key Insight. The key insight into the documents of P1's institution were the value and communication of the assessment process from the institution to the faculty. Many of the documents that were reviewed expressed the overall goals of student learning to the institution, as well as the value to the individual programs. The explicit reference to Critical Thinking and Communication as areas the "must" be assessed was also insightful. The contrast to the overall themes of Ethics and Life Long Learning that are projected in many of the documents would suggest that these are of value to the institution. However, no explicit measurements are required in these Domains.

P2. Institutional Documents

The document that was reviewed in regards to P2's institution was in regards to stated program objectives. The published objectives made reference to professional practices and standards as expectations of the program. Technically based activities such as production and design are also expressed. The term "evaluation" is used as a link to the Domain of Critical Thinking. In addition, the implicit reference to Life Long Learning is implied within the document.

Key Insight. Accessing specific documents in regards to institution learning objectives to gain further insight was difficult in regards to this institution. At this time the program objectives were the only offering of published documents that were reviewed. Until more data is discovered, formulating a key insight may not be beneficial to the study.

P3. Institutional Documents

The mission of P3's institution reflected a distinct value to Life Long Learning, Leadership and Ethical Reasoning. These Domains are further expressed in multiple documents regarding historical information, curriculum, requirements and student learning. The documents that were reviewed contained explicit reference to the following Domains: Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Communication, Leadership, Life Long Learning, Collaboration and Teamwork. The inclusion of these terms and activities surrounding these Domains are not only stated, but explanation to the learning processes are offered. An example of this wording was, "Develop critical reasoning and analytical skill through an intensive study of…."(website, 2017). Creativity was the only Domain not present in the documents reviewed.

Key Insights. The abundance of information available to a general audience was a key insight into P3's institution. Retrieval of this information was easy to access and the information provided by the institution was embedded with multiple references to the liberal arts skills in question. The goal of Life Long Learning is overwhelming present in these documents. This overarching goal of the institution presented difficulty for assessment in the classroom by many of the participants in this study. The document published by P3's institution suggested that Life Long Learning is the result of all the other Domains working in conjunction with one another. The data that was reviewed expressed the value of liberal arts domains to the institution's mission and goals, but do not provide guidance or explicit reference to how assessment is conducted other than setting the expectation that this needs to be done.

P4. Institutional Documents

The mission of P4's department is embedded with references to Life Long Learning, Communication, and Critical Thinking. The act of creation is referenced by the use of the term "producing". The suggestion of creation as a baseline for creativity infers that Creativity is implicitly referenced as well. The program goals suggested that the Domains of Critical Thinking, Communication, Leadership, Ethical Reasoning and Life Long Learning are of value by the department and institution. No reference was made to Teamwork, Collaboration or Problem Solving in the documents that were reviewed. However, it should be noted that Problem Solving may fall under the category of Critical Thinking depending on the institutional interpretation.

Key Insight. The data that were examined from the institutional perspective offered insight into the goal of Life Long Learning. Once again, this institutional value produced

challenges to many of the participants in this study as an area of assessment. Also, the written words that are communicated through these documents suggested clear goals in regards to Critical Thinking Communication and Ethic Reasoning. The topic of leadership is embedded into these goals in relation to ethical behavior and transparency. However, this linkage is subtle. The projection of Leadership as a value and goal can also be found in the expressed goals of communication. The departmental goals not only suggest professional application of technology as a means to communicate, but the added goal of responsibility in communicating to local and/or global audience.

P5. Institutional Documents

The data set provided by P5 reflected professional standards and industry competencies as goals for the program. The stated program learning outcomes offered explicit terminology reflecting Communication, Critical Thinking and Ethical Reasoning. The act of creation is referenced in the data. The suggestion of creation as a baseline for creativity infers that Creativity is implicitly referenced as well. Areas absent from the data reviewed were the Domains: Leadership, Teamwork, Collaboration, and Life Long Learning.

Key Insight. The key insight into the documents of P5's institution was in regards to the goal of industry readiness. Terminology such as "professionally produced" and "marketplace" suggested the expectation of professional practices in regards to the film industry. Also, the specific wording in relation to Domains such as Communication are in reference to activities and artifacts specific to industry. Terms such as "storytelling", "films", "moviemaking" and "visual content of the story" are are used as examples of what is being produced and ultimately assessed throughout the program. These artifacts are based on technical skills, however the terminology used when describing the intended outcomes

suggested higher order thinking skills such as critical thinking and ethical reasoning. Words such as "Integrate", "Determine", "Evaluate" and "Justify" are all present in the documents and point towards the assessment of student learning.

P6. Institutional Documents

P6's program learning outcomes were examined. The explicit communication of Domains such as Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Communication, Ethical Reasoning and Life Long Learning are expressed in this data. Critical Thinking and Problem Solving dominated this data set. The intended learning outcomes and the value of these two specific Domains are present in multiple objective statements. The program and institution's communication or these values are explicit. The Domain of Life Long Learning is expressed in the goal of acquiring knowledge and research skills, and the ability to apply those appropriately. The program's implicit value to this domain suggested a presence in the learning objectives, but offers vague insight into an already challenging Domain to assess. Domains that were not present in the documents reviewed were: Leadership, Teamwork and Collaboration and Creativity.

Key Insight. The key insight into P6's institutional data was the terminology used that expressed a pending assessment within each of the outcomes. The term "Demonstrate" was used as a key word when communicating the learning outcomes. The use of this term and the stated outcomes that followed, suggested that students would be applying technical skill in conjunction with higher order thinking skill to meet the intended outcome. The relationship between the word "Demonstrate" and the instructor's assessment process is then left open to the instructor. Gauging the progress toward many of the complex outcomes that

are communicated sets the expectation to the assessment process. However, suggested

methods of assessment in regards to these outcomes are not clear in this data.

P7. Institutional Documents

The institutional and program data reviewed from P7's school emphasized the value

of many of the liberal arts Domains in question. The Domains of Collaboration,

Communication and Critical Thinking are expressed as highly valued by this institution.

Other areas of explicit value within the documents were Ethical Reasoning and

Creativity/Innovation. Ethical behavior was also reflected as value in the form of

Leadership, however communication of this connection was implicit. The Domain absent

from the documents reviewed was Life Long Learning. However, expression of value to

career was present in the communication by the institution. This may suggest linkage to Life

Long Learning, but an explicit outcome or goal was not available in the data reviewed.

Key Insight. P7's institutional data set produced the key insight into the value of the

Domain of Communication. The offered information in regards to the program suggested

that Communication is highly valued. This Domain is expressed as vital to the process of

producing the necessary artifacts within the program. Not only is Communication expressed

as a key to production of the artifacts, but the overall intention of the program is also based

around communicating to an audience. "Artists and communicators" (P7, institutional

website, 2017) is phrasing used to describe current and potential students in the program.

This framing of communication is built of the skills found in the variety of Domains

expressed as value to program such as: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving,

Collaboration, Creativity and Ethics. These Domains are imbedded in the communication

process and artifacts produced by students and set expectations of assessments to be conducted.

P8. Institutional Documents

P8's institution expressed the Domains of Creativity, Communication and Leadership within their mission statement. The value that is expressed by the institution in regards to these Domains is intended on producing and fostering Innovation and Life Long Learning. The documents that were reviewed included explicit statements of value to all of the Domains examined in this study; Communication, Leadership, Teamwork/Collaboration, Critical Thinking/Problem Solving, Creativity/Innovation, Ethical Reasoning and Life Long Learning. Specific to P8's department, the Domains of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Ethical Reasoning and Teamwork are explicitly addressed.

Key Insight. The key insight provided by P8's institutional documents revealed explicit communication addressing all of the liberal arts skill and the 4C's. This was the only institution that offered this all inclusive view of these Domains within the published materials. This view focused primarily on higher order thinking skills with little reference to technical competencies. However, terms such as "apply" and "capable" are used in the departmental materials that suggest a combination of technical skills and higher order thinking.

P9. Institutional Documents

The materials that were reviewed from P9's institution placed a high value on the Domain of Life Long Learning. The mission statement reflected values that emphasized teaching, learning and scholarship. The intention of this focus was explained to a pathway to yielding students that "lead lives of learning". The Domains that are explicitly referenced

within the published materials were: Life Long Learning, Collaboration, Communication, Leadership, Ethical Reasoning, Critical Thinking/Problem Solving and Creativity. The Domain of Teamwork is implicitly reflected in reference to collaboration, however the exact wording to this Domain is not present. Exact terminology is used in regards to Creativity, Ethics, Communication, Leadership, Collaboration, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving.

Key Insight. The key insight that was uncovered by reviewing institutionally published documents of P9's school was the deliberate and conscious recognition most all of the liberal arts Domains examined in this study. This institution did not only state that these Domains were of value in the documents, but explanations of why the value is important to their student population were offered. The application of these skills were illustrated as instrumental in students developing a life of learning and production to society.

Another key insight was the projection of a culture that embraced mistakes as a value to the learning process. The terms "curiosity", "risk-taking", and "courage" were all used to describe institutional values. The final insight was that this was one of the two institutions that explicitly referred to Leadership as a student outcome within the documents that were examined. P8's institution was the other.

P10. Institutional Documents

P10's institutional documents that were reviewed explained the goals of the institution as the responsibilities that it plays in higher education, the community and on a global perspective. Other documents reflected the institutional goals in regards to student learning outcomes. The descriptions that were offered in regards to the institutional goals specified life long learning as the intentional byproduct of the educational process delivered by the school. In addition, Leadership and Ethics were communicated as Domains that were

specific goals the school used to describe the role of the institution. In regards to institutional

learning outcomes the explicit reference to the Domains of Communication, Critical

Thinking and Problem Solving, Ethical Reasoning, Creativity and Life Long Learning were

all expressed. Implicitly the Domain of Teamwork was referred to as well.

Key Insight. The key insight offered by P10's institutional documents was in regards

to the separation of the school's defined roles and responsibilities. The first role that was

described was the responsibility the institution plays in the academic world as well as the

local and global communities. The second was the role and responsibilities that were

projected to the student population. This came in the form of the institution learning

outcomes. The separation of these two areas communicates two specific values to instructors

as they structure classroom activities and assessment. These values are student centered with

an emphasis on preparation for responsible productive work in their chosen fields of study

and their communities.

Summary of Results by Research Question/Sub Questions

This study was conducted to address the question: *How do instructors embed the*

goals of a liberal arts education into the assessment of student work produced in film/video

production coursework? The results indicated that many of the intended outcomes

associated with a liberal arts education are addressed by instruction and assessment within

film/video production coursework. Areas that have revealed a strong structure to the

assessment process within these courses are in regards to Communication, Collaboration,

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. It should be noted that Creativity is addressed in

many different ways in these courses. Results of assessing Creativity yielded a variety of

levels of success. Instructors also indicated that areas such as Ethical Reasoning, Life Long

Learning and Leadership are in further need of refinement in the practice of assessment in

this field.

Further results are summarized according to each of the three sub-questions that were

asked to answer the central research question:

1. *How do instructors describe the experience of assessing liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production coursework?* The results indicated that instructors experience assessment aversion as a norm when entering the academy as a novice instructor. After becoming educated on the topic and structure of assessment, the process is extremely beneficial to the success of students, instruction, program management, and administrative duties. It should be noted that the acceptance of assessment as an ongoing process is a key to its utility. Specific to the topic of liberal arts assessment, it was found that not all liberal arts learning outcomes are addressed consistently throughout the curriculums that were examined.

2. *How do instructors describe the assessment tools used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production and how they were produced?* The results indicated that the use of rubrics are employed when assessing technical capabilities of students. However, when students begin to master technical skills and move toward higher order thinking skills, many other tools are called upon in order to assess student achievement. Tools such as observation, peer to peer reviews, reflection papers, client surveys, film/video screenings and group discussions are a few of the often used assessment measures used to gain insight into student understanding.

3. *How do instructors describe the assessment strategies used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production?* The results indicated that clear communication with the students is a key to spurring positive assessment in the classroom. Clear communication sets expectations as well as engages the student in productive work towards achieving stated goals. Rubrics were again indicated as one way that reflects this strategy. Other strategies such as including students in the assessment process, providing early feedback in the filmmaking process and a scaffold approach to instruction and assessment were also suggested as a few of the strategies that are being used to gage liberal arts outcomes specifically.

The findings will be discussed in greater detail in the Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore assessment strategies that address liberal arts educational outcomes for students studying film/video production. The intention of the researcher was to uncover emerging themes in assessment to serve students with respect to learner needs as well as industry demands and requirements. The methods employed in this research produced rich, thick descriptive data sets that were presented in Chapter 4. These data reflect key insights into how these outcomes are being put into action by the participants. The underlying goal of the overall study was to reveal deeper insights of the processes instructors use when framing their classroom activities to reflect intended outcomes of a liberal arts education. Keeping this theme of discovery at the forefront of data analysis helped guide the researcher to provide structure to the key findings. The structuring of the data provided answers to the central question of this study. Nevertheless, in order to reach these conclusions, further discussion and analysis is necessary.

The central question of this study was: How do instructors embed the goals of a liberal arts education into the assessment of student work produced in film/video production coursework? The process of answering this question was divided into three areas of concern. These areas were foundational information of assessment, assessment of liberal arts domains and assessment of the "4C's".   Three research questions were asked in order to answer the central research question. Each question addressed these areas of concern:

1. How do instructors describe the experience of assessing liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production coursework?

2. How do instructors describe the assessment tools used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production and how they were produced?

3. How do instructors describe the assessment strategies used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production?

Emerging Themes

The following sections highlight what has been determined as the major themes that were derived from the data collection and analysis stages of this study. The researcher was able to read though the transcripts, as well as listen to the audio recordings multiple times, in order to become familiar with the data at hand. Throughout these multiple passes of the data, the researcher began to code areas of the discussions or processes that were of interest specific to the individual participant's experiences with assessment. Three separate coding passes were conducted with the individual participant's data sets before analysis of the entire unit was assembled for analysis. The data were then grouped by questions and responses in order to analyze the perceptions of each participant's experience in context to the stated questions. Themes were then identified and grouped. Three major categories were assigned to the themes that emerged from this process: Experience, Methods, and Strategies. The categories directly reflect the research questions of this study, which provided structure to identify the emergent themes.

Experience

The first of these three emergent theme categories is "Experience". This theme category was derived from the *Research Question 1: How do instructors describe the experience of assessing liberal arts based outcomes while teaching a film/video production*

coursework? The data collected from the participants suggested the following emergent *sub themes* related to this category: Assessment Aversion, Assessment Embracement, Assessment Challenges. Along with the emergent sub themes, *key insights* were identified as specific actions, descriptions and explanations that participants offered from their lived experience with the topic at hand.

Assessment Aversion

A general sub theme that was identified from the participants was the sense that new faculty in the field of film and video production experience challenges and confusion with assessment that can lead to negative experiences. These challenges and experiences produce what has been categorized as assessment aversion. This was described by P3 in the following:

> *There is such good research in philosophy of education and pedagogy, and yet, I'm only conjecturing here, because this research takes place in close-term environments in schools of education, separate from other academic divisions or institutions, there's this vocabulary that has emerged in the educational administration that sometimes seems foreign to faculty members. When they hear the words, all of a sudden, they get this glazed over look in their eyes, and they think, "Oh my goodness, we're going down the route of standardized testing." They attach to it the worst stereotypes that they can think of when it comes to educational administration.* (personal communication, July 2016)

This feeling by faculty was suggested to be present due to their background and education prior to entering the academic setting. P4 explained*, "I think assessment is subjective. I think it depends on our training as a professor, as a faculty"* (personal communication, July, 2016). *"When I started at the college, I didn't even know what a rubric was"* stated P10 (personal communication, September 2016). P9 offered the following perspective:

When you start, you don't have a lot of guidance on how to teach. I came out of industry. I have an MFA in film production, but I was never taught how to teach. I was hired as a teacher mainly because of my experience in the field, and, of course, I have a terminal degree. I went in the classroom, and, all of a sudden, I'm supposed to be able to put assignments together that make sense, and they build upon each other to hit a goal. When you start talking about goals and outcomes and all that stuff, my head was spinning when I first started. (personal communication, September 2016)

According to P9, most instructors in this field are non-experts in the field of education and have been selected to teach in a film/video production program based on expertise within that field (personal communication, September 2016). P2 also explained, *"One of the big things when I first started teaching which was pointed out to me, and it made me feel so much better, was that faculty are experts in their subject area, they're not necessarily experts on how to teach"* (personal communication, August 2016). P6 enforced this thought by stating, *"When I started out teaching, I think the need for assessment was very- I really wanted to get as much feedback as I could to try to figure out how to teach because I wasn't really taught how to teach"* (personal communication, September 2016). Transforming an instructor's expert knowledge of film/video production into meaningful educational opportunities that are accessible to the assessment process requires time and intentionality.

One strategy that participants identified as an avenue for pushing through assessment aversion was educating themselves on the topic of assessment. Participants spoke about their experience with institutional training as a way to start this change in attitude. P3 became more comfortable with assessment as they engaged in committee work centered on the assessment process (personal communication, July 2016). However, other participants combated this proposed idea citing the challenges of organizational change. *"Some of the*

senior faculty will not see the point of this since they have been teaching for years without the need to ramp up their assessment practices" (P6, personal communication, September 2016). Others spoke about their initial encounters with assessment as an activity they were being required to do according to institutional demands. This required work oftentimes felt like piling more work onto the instructors' already busy schedule (P3, personal communication, July, 2016).

P6 believed that the conversation of assessment needs to happen more regularly in order for the aversion to be lifted. *"I think that assessment doesn't really come up as a topic until it's time to do it because you're required to."* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). P6 continued, *"I think that when you're dealing with existing programs that weren't necessarily designed with assessment in mind, sometimes the assessment process feels a little bit more like it's just something that has to be done in order to meet accreditation guidelines, rather than something that can really be used to improve your teaching or your program"* (personal communication, September 2016).

Those who looked to educate themselves on the process of assessment searched out professionals in the educational sphere of the academy. This was explained by P2 who stated, "*When I first started teaching, one of the things I was thinking about was ... I didn't really know what I was doing, so I figured that other people had a better idea"* (personal communication, August 2016). Personal interactions with education faculty, reviewing of journal articles and books, usage of centers for learning and examining educational research were a few of the activities that participants identified as positive influences on their experience with assessment.

The participants pointed out that this process of self-educational in regards to assessment takes time. Oftentimes trial and error is required to test new avenues of assessment within their own classrooms (P9, personal communication, August 2016). As it pertains to assessing educational outcomes, P6 asked: *"How do we measure what success is? I think what I appreciate about grappling with that question is we can try and fail, and I think that the important thing is to keep trying to find ways to do it"* (personal communication, September 2016). The time dedicated to learning more about assessment can lead to a better understanding and development of methods to achieve more accurate results (P5, personal communication, September 2016).

Participants identified the action of accepting assessment is indeed a "process", much like filmmaking is a process. P9 explained:

> *This assessment thing, I was talking about at the beginning, being a process. Filmmakers know that making a film is a process, so that's something they should be able to accept. However, assessment is a process we're not used to dealing with unless you've been in the academic setting for quite some time. Really making your assessments and your communication, your feedback and all of that stuff done within the parameters of the process of assessment will help not only the student, but it will help you as the instructor.* (personal communication, September 2016)

This parallel analogy is a way to gain acceptance and understanding of the term assessment. P2 suggested, *"It's really more than just a grade. I think in a semester context, when you're looking at your courses, where we have to assign a grade, but more importantly, how are they growing, how are they developing? That's really how I would look as assessment"* (personal communication, August 2016). Once the assessment process is better understood by those outside the professional study of educational practices, assessment can be fully embraced.

The embracement of assessment leads to valuing the process and using it to improve not only the student/faculty interaction, but the program as a whole. According to P9, *"As I've moved along and matured as a professor, I firmly believe that my understanding of assessment has allowed me to become more confident in my skills and also not just confidence; there's proof"* (personal communication, September 2016). P3 stated, *"As I got involved in the process, I started seeing there's actual benefits to going through this"* (personal communication, July 2016). The realization of how valuable this information is and how it fits into the process of educating their students has been a positive byproduct of fully engaging in assessment. P3 summed up this thought in the following:

> *It's actually pretty useful to have this moment where you collect real information, rather than everyone just saying, "Oh, we're doing a great job here, we're doing a great job," and having that echo chamber, to collect some external information and seriously take a look and say, "Okay, what's working, and what is surprising you about this?" That's been probably the most useful transformation that I've gone through in doing this process, probably over the last seven years.* (personal communication, July 2016)

A student centered approach was identified as one way that may encourage the acceptance of assessment. P9 stated, *"My teaching philosophy is very student-centered, meaning that I'm teaching to the classroom"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 went on and explained, *"How assessment plays a role in my teaching philosophy is that it's not a one size fits all. That means I have multiple assessment tools and methods that I'm using for multiple types of assignments"* (personal communication, September 2016). P2 described a similar experience with keeping students as a central focus of their teaching. A time of reflection on their own assessment process has motivated P2 to improve not only their assessment process, but their instructional techniques as well (personal communication, August 2016).

When actively pursuing assessment with a student centered approach, participants were able to see the benefits of this activity. Successes with assessment instead of struggles illustrated many of these benefits. P4 stated, *"The successes I would have to say would be the credibility that students gain from the assessment. Their ability to push themselves to do things that are a little more challenging"* (personal communication, July 2016). P4 added, *"The successes are really about the improvements that are made over time once they receive that feedback"* (personal communication, July 2016).

Assessment Embracement

Another emergent sub theme from the interview process was that of embracing assessment. This was touched on in the prior section; however, within this key insight, participants identified many positive byproducts that became apparent to them once the process of assessment was embraced and valued. P9 explained:

> *An embracement of assessment really triggered my own thought process as a teacher and allowed me to really think about what it is that I'm doing in the classroom and how I'm going to build my assignments and structure my classroom to give those students the knowledge and the experience and the skills and the ability to think once they graduate and hopefully get into industry.* (personal communication, September 2016)

P3 offered the following:

> *I embraced assessment as a way of creating a moment of reflection, and every semester stepping back and seeing, is there something that I can do different to improve this, or have conditions changed, or have student's cultural concerns changed, in which a project that may have worked for the students in the past, is not working as well now. What can I do differently to improve it?* (personal communication, September 2016)

One of the key insights was the value that assessment had to a program or department. The ability to make decisions or judgments that affect the program now have a

data source to rely on (P1, personal communication, August 2016). Participants suggested

that decisions such as adding faculty, courses, equipment, facilities and budget concerns were

areas that were affected by the embracement of assessment.

The direct connection to student learning was also identified as an area that was

improved by committing to the process of assessment. P3 stated, *"Are students learning*

what we say that we're expecting them to learn, and, if not, what can we do differently to

help improve that process? Assessment is a part of that whole process" (personal

communication, July 2016). P10 offered the following insight:

> *I think assessment is underrated maybe. As a teacher, if you're open to the*
> *benefits of it, it's fantastic. I think if you think of it in terms of, "If I was the*
> *student, did I learn what I was supposed to learn," and, "Was I being taught*
> *what I was supposed to be, you know, was the teacher addressing the things*
> *that they were supposed to address, doing it in such a way that I actually*
> *learned the material and the other people in the classroom as well across*
> *learning styles.* (personal communication, September 2016)

This commitment to assessment allowed participants to see gaps in student learning or

processes that are deemed essential for industry success (P1, personal communication,

August 2016).

The connection to student learning and assessment was also pointed out as a time for

reflection upon one's own teaching (P6, personal communication September 2016). In

regards to ensuring that assessment is happening P10 stated, *"I think incumbent upon us as*

instructors to make sure that's happening for as many students as possible, and that we're

reflecting and working at it. Assessment should drive learning frankly" (personal

communication, September 2016).

The feedback that assessment yields is a two-way street for instructors to check in

with students and also discern areas in instruction that need to be improved (P7, personal

communication, September 2016). P4 articulated, *"I think it's very important that students understand that there's a level of expectation, and whether or not they met that expectation. If they did meet that expectation, there's still room for improvement. What is that improvement? If they didn't meet that level of expectation, why didn't they do that and provide them that feedback"* (personal communication, July 2016).

Finally, the area of clarifying theory to practice was identified as a key insight. It was revealed that the act of assessment highlights a connection to professional practice. P5 stated, *"All of my classes, I connect back to the real world. I'm constantly drawing the subject back to where the students are going to be when they graduate"* (personal communication, August 2016). In order to better prepare students, as well as structure assignments for more accessible assessment, participants stated that film/video production exercises needed to be broken down into smaller activities. P3 explained*, "I would say that the key for a useful assessment of production, is to do exactly what other rubrics in non-production classes do, and that is break down the elements of what was produced, so that you're not grading the video"* (personal communication, July 2016). This strategy requires the instructor to design assignments that reflect professional practices, as well as illustrate the link of theory to practice and practice to theory (P9, personal communication, September 2016). This insight clarifies the intended outcomes for students and instructors alike.

Assessment Challenges

The final emergent sub theme from the category of "Experience" was *Assessment Challenges*. Moving from assessment aversion to embracing the act of assessment does not come easily. Challenges come in many forms throughout this transition. The challenges that

are offered in this emergent sub theme can be linked directly to areas that correlate to

Assessment Aversion. For example, assessment aversion has already been discussed and

stems from the lack of education and familiarity with this topic. This was highlighted by

experiences that participants described dealing with assessment in a negative way. *"I think a*

lot of people feel like it's something we just have to do. It's one more thing that we have to do

in order to check a box, rather than seeing it as something like how can we make use of this

thing as an avenue to make use of assessment as something that would be valuable for us to

learn from" (P6, personal communication, September 2016). P3 expressed the challenge of

professional educational studies being foreign to those outside this academic pursuit. P3 was

able to sum up this major challenge with the assessment process by pointing out the negative

connotations associated with the term assessment (personal communication, July 2016). P8

also highlighted the term assessment as an area that suggests limitations. *"Assessment is this*

word that always makes me think of quantitative metrics on things and I just don't do that"

(P8, personal communication, August 2016).

Participants also suggested that these challenges are due to more specific skills or

domains that are challenging to assess in the first place. This challenge within the

participants' assessment processes was pointed out as an area that slows the acceptance and

understanding of assessment on an individual basis. At times assessment produced

uncertainty and confusion around specific domains. P10 expressed this challenge:

> *The documentation of and recording of and reflecting on is more problematic*
> *than the actual assessment of whether or not they're learning things in the*
> *classroom. It's the documentation of that because I feel totally comfortable*
> *that my students are learning the things that are in our course goals and*
> *whatnot. Do I have concrete evidence of all of those things if I were called to*
> *present it; not necessarily.* (personal communication, September 2016)

The key insights in this section categorized as *Assessment Challenges* are linked to the

inherent challenge of assessing these identified liberal arts domains within the field of

film/video production courses.

The first challenge that participants identified was in regards to assessing life long

learning. The concept of this domain and the assessment was not well defined from

participant to participant. The following are responses that participants offered when asked

to describe how they assess life long learning:

> *I think that's really hard to assess. Because we only see them for four years.* (P2,
> personal communication, August 2016)

> *We're touching on those topics of life-long learning, but I'm realizing that we don't
> have an explicit assessment tool to assess ... how do you measure that, right?* (P3,
> personal communication, July 2016)

> *How do you assess life long learning? I know that has become one of the buzzwords.
> The short answer is we can't in a university environment.* (P5, personal
> communication, August 2016).

> *Hard to do two years out from the program, but I've had a lot of students that come
> back and tell me what they're up to".* P8 continued, *"I think all of those things are
> things that point to outcomes outside of the class, the extension outside of the end of
> the semester. I think the life long learning outcomes, I can't measure that. That stuff
> disappears to the four winds so you kind of leave it to the better angels of your faith
> or something.* (P8, personal communication, August 2016)

> *Really, what we're doing right now is just seeing if they're ready for industry.* (P9,
> personal communication, September 2016)

> *I don't know that I assess life long learning. What I tend to do is assess
> learning and to stress to students to give them the resources to learn on their
> own and monitor that as we go through.* (P10, personal communication,
> September 2016)

The analysis of the data found that the assessment of life long learning creates

confusion of defining the domain. The perceptions of what life long learning is and how the

domain was assessed differed from participant to participant. These differences produced

data that not only support this thematic category, but also imply that the participants value this domain. In addition, no clear path of procedures emerged to assess the domain when viewing the collective responses.

The next key insight identified as a challenge was the assessment of ethical reasoning. Again, participants found value to this intended outcome, but few offered concrete insights into assessing this domain within the classroom. P1 stated, *"We don't do that in our major"* (personal communication, August 2016). The closest aspect that P1 thought was in line with this specific domain was in regards to coursework in media law. *"We cover the law, and we have a media law class, and in all my production classes we talk about trademark and copyright and what's cool and what's not, but I don't ever assess it in any way"* (P1, personal communication, August 2016). P7 offered the following explanation of this challenge:

> I mean it's an interesting thing for the kind of classes I teach. I mean that term [ethics] could be used in a bunch of different ways. It could be used from a point of view of you're writing fictional scripts, and how do you deal with the ethics of taking things from your own life or the world around you. The other point would be if you're working in the non-fiction realm how to know what responsibilities you do have. Then entertainment as opposed to journalism, which I've taught both, and how you deal with that. (personal communication, September 2016)

P2 used different words to describe ethical reasoning with their production class assessments. The term integrity is used to identify ethical behavior. Prior to the implementation of their use of a peer evaluation document that includes this word, P2 did not believe this domain was being explicitly assessed in their classroom.

P8 views ethical reasoning as one of the core pieces that they are teaching. P8 stated, *"I think it's the most important part of the class"* (personal communication, August 2016).

P8 is primarily teaching documentary production where topics are situated around social issues. P8 was able to point out specific areas where this domain is evaluated. P8 pointed to documentary films as an area that spurs the conversation of ethical behavior and reasoning. *"To make a documentary film that has a sense of ethics, you have to a the very least understand what your subject is about. Why are they doing what they're doing?"* (P8, personal communication, August 2016).

Two of the instructors worked for institutions that require a media ethics course within their curriculums. This offered the clearest path to foundational instruction on the topic of ethical reason. P3's institution requires students within the major to complete a course on ethics in communication before they can proceed into their chosen concentration. This being the case, P3 still expressed challenges with assessment in this domain. *"I have to say, I don't think I have any explicit assessment tools to measure that in my production courses"* (P3, personal communication, July 2016). P5's institution requires a course in media industry ethics for program majors. This course is the foundation and introduction to industry specific ethical reasoning. *"In that class, we spend an overwhelming amount of time talking about, "This is the way the business works""* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). The course offers students the opportunity to examine real-life scenarios and apply their own ethical reasoning to situations that can arise in the workplace.

The methods of measuring this outcome came in a variety of formats including student evaluations, student reflections, class discussions, observations and the screenings of films. The participants placed high value on the feedback they offered to students in this domain. However, assessing student progression towards a stated goal produced incongruences among the participants' experiences. After further analysis, this discrepancy

may have stemmed from a variety of influences such as institutional requirements, teaching philosophies, interpretation of ethical reasoning and appropriate activities suggested to measure this domain. Analyses of the data collected in this area revealed that ethical reasoning supported this thematic category caused by the wide range of responses to this assessment.

Leadership was found to be another assessment challenge within the participants' classrooms. In regards to assessing leadership, P1 stated, *"We don't assess leadership"* (personal communication, August 2016). P1 continued, *"We never discussed that [leadership]"* in regards to the entire department that P1 works within (personal communication, August 2016). P10 reflected, *"Occasionally I will assign different leaders so that at some point in the semester everybody is in the leadership role"* (personal communication, September 2016).

For those who do actively assess leadership, a challenge was found in how the domain was defined and interpreted. Many terms and activities were used to describe assessing this domain such as integrity, communication, accountability, responsibility, inclusive and motivational. This highlighted that not all definitions of leadership were consistent, nor were the participant's interpretations. P5 stated, *"Leadership to me is when something goes right, 'We did it,' and when something goes wrong in so far as you can, 'I did it' if you're going to have the leadership position, you're going to be a producer, if you're to be director"* (personal communication, August 2016). P4 described assessing leadership by stating, *"I don't necessarily have a leadership grade. The way I would put people in their teams based on their leadership, I assess how they communicate to their team, how they support their team and those that step up"* (personal communication, July 2016).

Not having a direct assessment of the domain did not suggest that the participants devalued this domain. P6 explained, *"I don't think I have any assessment for leadership"* (personal communication, September 2016). P6 continued, *"If it's being assessed, that's actually happening within more of that collaboration assessment"* (personal communication, September 2016). Once again, this points to the idea that not all participants define or interpret leadership in a common way.

Another challenge to assessing the domain of leadership was that not all coursework within a production curriculum lends itself to this type of assessment. The make-up of a film crew is often times a top-down hierarchal structure where student crew members may not always be in a leadership role. P2 explained that not all roles on a film crew require the same amount of leadership. P2 said, *"It's not the same kind of role as producer or director, which are clear leadership positions. There are elements of leadership in those, say, editor, sound, production designer, but it's not the primary"* (personal communication, August 2016). P9 offered a similar viewpoint in the following:

> *Leadership comes in lots of different forms. You've got a director. You've got a leader in a department, like a gaffer, director of photography. There's the producer. You've got leadership roles, so there is that organizational hierarchy of a film crew that provides leadership position. Not everyone's going to be in a leadership position.* (personal communication, September 2016)

The assessment of leadership tended to be a student to student assessment and the goals of this intended outcome were not as clear as they were in more technical based processes. Specific courses such as producing or directing lend themselves to the assessment of leadership (P7, personal communication, September 2016). Courses such as scriptwriting and editing lack substantial opportunities for assessment of leadership to take place (P5,

personal communication, September 2106). Once again, participants valued the skill and

domain of leadership as a professional advantage in the workplace, but the assessment of this

skill remained a challenge in most cases.

The topic of subjectivity was identified as a challenge to the assessment process by

the participants. P2 found, *"That's when it gets tough. The more artistic, the more*

subjective" (personal communication, August 2016). P6 said, *"I think this is one of the big*

challenges in production and in the arts or anything that's, especially something that's

subjective in the area of quality, like collaboration or any artistic outcomes. It's how do we

measure what success is" (personal communication, September 2016).

There was much discussion around the assessment of creativity as a domain that

encompasses a degree of subjectivity. P9 said, *"The main thing I'd like to say about*

creativity is there are ways to assess it; there's ways to view it, but to be able to say this is

creativity, this is a creative piece, is a bit subjective" (personal communication, September

2016). P4 suggested this challenge requires individual evaluation:

> *Again, creativity is subjective, so I think one student coming in that was*
> *unable to accomplish something at the beginning of the semester, to later then*
> *create something that's more entertaining or of value or informative or*
> *persuasive towards the end of the semester, based on their skill set, I could see*
> *part of that as their ability to produce something creative.* (personal
> communication, July 2016)

P5 expressed the challenge of subjectivity in the following:

> *Obviously the biggest challenge in assessing something like script writing is,*
> *while there are a lot of objective things that students need to learn to do such*
> *as breaking a story down into themes, proper formatting and the like, there's*
> *always going to be a certain subjectivity involved in evaluating another*
> *person's creative work. The biggest challenge for me is just that, to not*
> *eliminate the subjectivity, but bring to students' attention the fact that, "Yes, I*
> *am giving you a certain amount of my opinion of what your work is, but I've*
> *also shown you these real-world examples. That's something that you're*

either coming closer to or not coming closer to. That's the challenge.
(personal communication, August 2016)

These challenges with subjectivity and assessing creativity produced strategies that will be addressed in greater detail later in this chapter. At this point, framing subjectivity as a challenge to the assessment process is a key insight that was apparent from the participants' experiences.

To add to this challenge of subjectivity, the domain of Creativity itself came in many forms such as creative thinking, creative use of tools and technology, creative storytelling, creative interview techniques and creative distribution techniques (P8, personal communication, August 2016). Creative choices made within the process of production behind the scenes or more objectified on the screen were also areas of concern to the assessment process (P6, personal communication, September 2016). Sorting through these acts of creativity and then making them accessible to assessment without inhibiting the student's learning process are all challenges within this domain. P2 expressed this concern, *"...in a creative field you have to kind of strike that balance between providing some kind of structure, limitations, so that they have a place to start, but you can't provide too much structure, too many limitations, because then it starts to become ... It just limits creativity"* (personal communication, August 2016).

The final area that emerged as a key insight into the thematic category of "Challenges" was in regards to *Implicit* measures versus *Explicit* measures by the participants. When participants were questioned about their individual experiences with assessment, the strategy of clearly stating intended outcomes to students emerged as a way to be more effective with assessment overall (P7, personal communication, July 2016).

However, when participants were questioned on the act of assessing liberal arts domains and

the 4C's, participants offered many variations of measurements that reflected a disconnect of

sorts. P10 articulated this challenge:

> *Definitely there are things I have concrete evidence on and there are*
> *definitely things I don't have concrete evidence on. I have formative and*
> *anecdotal evidence. That's a challenge. I don't know that it's our charge to*
> *document everything and have hard evidence on everything, but I think on the*
> *major goals of the course, we probably should have something that addresses*
> *that. The difficulty is in a video class or in a multimedia class, a project may*
> *hit on four or five of the course objectives, or even the program objectives, all*
> *within one project. Can you use that piece to satisfy multiple course objectives*
> *or program objectives, and then where do you store that? How do you present*
> *that if someone were to call upon you to do that?* (personal communication,
> September 2016)

This challenge was not only offered by P10. In some domains, more concrete

assessments were also described versus other domains that were less intentionally structured

for assessment. The terms *Implicit* and *Explicit* emerged from the participants as ways to

categorize these type of assessment. For example, when asked during the interview about a

specific domain, P3 reflected, *"I'm thinking about how my production courses implicitly*

cover them, but how I'm not necessarily and separately assessing those outcomes" (personal

communication, July 2016). P3 later stated, *"We don't really explicitly tackle that question*

of life-long learning; it's not explicit in our own core competencies" (personal

communication, July 2016). This terminology was also specifically used by both P9 and

P10.

Regardless of the exact words being used by the participants, the all perceptions that

were offered reflected the idea of implicit and explicit assessments measures. *Implicit*

meaning the participant is fully aware of the domain being present in an assignment or

classroom activity, but a less active or clarified assessment is being applied to the outcome of

the assignment. *Explicit* meaning the participant is fully aware of the domain being present

in an assignment or classroom activity, and an active or clearly stated assessment is being

applied to the outcome of the assignment. The challenge of implicit and explicit

measurements was a common theme throughout the acquired data.

Methods

The second of the three emergent theme categories is "Methods". This theme

category is directly derived from *Research Question 2: How do instructors describe the*

assessment tools used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video

production and how they were produced? The data collected from the participants suggested

the following emergent sub themes related to this category: Rubrics Limited to Technical

Assessment, Various Evaluations Needed, Challenged Areas of Assessment.

Rubrics limited to technical assessment

Rubrics were identified as an assessment tool that all the participants have had

experience using. In regards to the use of this tool P4 found, *"...rubrics have really been the*

improvement to my assessment over time" (personal communication, July 2016).   P4

expressed, *"I've gotten to the point where if I don't have a rubric I create one. It's really for*

my own sanity. No, it's not just for me, it's for them (the students) because I know that I'm

going to have a conversation with them about what they did well and what they didn't do so

well." P4 continued, *"I feel like the rubrics are invaluable really, I think well written and*

describe what I'm looking for as I'm assessing their projects" (personal communication, July

2016). P5 echoed this positive experience with rubrics by stating, *"Rubrics really work in*

my humble opinion" (personal communication, August 2016). However, not all of the

participants expressed the same level of usefulness of this tool. P8 found that rubrics *"...help for grading student papers. Some assignments they help. I don't feel that they're all that productive for the kind of class that I teach"* (personal communication, August 2016). This statement guided the research to examine themes as to how the participants used this tool and what the benefits are from this use.

A key insight that arose from the use of rubrics was the benefit they provide when trying to communicate expectations to their students. P10 suggested, *"They (students) know what their expectations are and they've got them on a piece of paper* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 said, *"I figured out this tool communicates an expectation to my student, allows me to assess something with great speed and accuracy"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 continued, *"Defining and articulating why some work might be better than some others, it takes some time, and that's a definite skill that instructors are probably ... at least in my case, that I was struggling with. The rubric helped me define those things"* (personal communication, September 2016).

However, it was pointed out that the use of a rubric may inhibit students to push boundaries of creative work due to producing work that will score well when this instrument is applied. P2 offered the following explanation:

> *I'm not a huge fan of rubrics, I feel like they can be very limiting, but at the same time they provide a certain amount of structure, which I think is helpful for students. I think once they know what their expectations are, they understand how they're going to be graded, I think that can be very helpful. I think at times they can limit thinking. Students are only hitting the things that are listed in the rubric.* (P2, personal communication, August 2106)

It was in agreement that technical skills were the best served by using rubrics as the assessment tool. This sub theme emerged out of descriptions by participants that aligned

with the general thought that technical skills in film/video production have clearer aspects of measurement. P2 stated, *"I think technical assignments in film production are easier to grade, you know, especially when they're learning say a camera. Go out and do a camera test and we're going to talk about exposure and focus and things like that. These are easily measurable outcomes"* (personal communication, August 2016). P9 agreed by stating, *"Some of these things that we're trying to assess are not as black and white. When you're using a rubric, when you're assessing a skill that is more black and white, say a technical skill, that's a little bit easier, in my opinion"* (personal communication, September 2016). Activities such as script formatting, color balancing, exposure, basic software manipulations, camera controls and even technical writing are being measured by using rubrics.

The analysis of the *Internal* documents found that many of the rubrics reflect a projected outcome and communicated varying degrees of meeting that projected outcome. When appropriate, the outcomes were a direct reflection of industry standards. P6 explained this rationale:

> *I think that it's a pretty competitive field that we're in, but I think for almost any field, for anything that you want to do to achieve excellence, you have to constantly be taking stock of at what level are you performing right now and are there areas that if you were to give them a little more focus, you would get more of a competitive edge.* (personal communication, September 2016)

Artifacts such as camera logs, call sheets, shot lists, script breakdowns and script formatting were some of the artifacts assessed by participants in this study using rubrics.

Various methods needed

A departure from the use of rubrics to measure outcomes emerged as a common act by the participants. Various evaluation methods were identified as ways to assess some of

the more challenging domains to measure. This theme was in congruence with how P3

described assessment. *"We measure through various means, through various methodologies,*

whether it's quantitative, qualitative, whether it's written or performance based; some way of

measuring to see if they have learned what the course objectives were, what the learning

objectives were" (P3, personal communication, July 2016). The key factor that participants

identified as a reason for this departure from a rubric was the consensus that this tool was not

always appropriate when attempting to gauge some of these areas (P8, personal

communication, August 2016). This thought leaves instructors looking for a variety of

alternative methods of assessment.

The strategy of employing alternative measurement tools to rubrics links back to the

prior discussion pertaining to the emergent theme of "Challenges". It was identified that Life

Long Learning, Ethical Reasoning, Leadership and Creativity were challenging areas for

participants to assess. In addition, Teamwork, Collaboration and Problem Solving were

other areas that presented their own challenges. P6 stated, *"I feel like a lot of the things that*

we assess have some more straightforward ways of being able to assess them and

collaboration has been one that I've struggled with for a long time" (personal

communication, September 2016).

Participants identified that Teamwork, Collaboration and Problem Solving are often

offshoots of the prior domains of Leadership, Creativity and Critical Thinking. For example,

at times there is not clear delineation between how to separately assess Leadership,

Teamwork and Collaboration or Creativity, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. P9 said:

> *Problem solving, creativity, it all blurs the line, but what I will say is*
> *creativity ... There's a bunch of different aspects of creativity. One is that*
> *problem solving, critical thinking, creativity. How are we going to*

accomplish this? The next part is just the creative story, the creative idea, actually creating something on the screen. (personal communication, September 2016)

P6 conducts assessments that combine some of these domains. P6 stated, *"...their teamwork, at times requires them to be in leadership positions or service positions working for someone else who's leading a project"* (personal communication, September 2016). Leadership assessment for P6 does not happen independently of the collaboration or teamwork assessment. *"If it's being assessed, that's actually happening within more of that collaboration assessment"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). This creates a formality in the assessment process; however, the engaged act of assessing these domains was found as a useful activity by the participants regardless of the terminology.

In regards to these challenging domains, it was found that participants use peer-to-peer evaluation to gauge Teamwork, Collaboration, Leadership, Ethical Reasoning, Problem Solving and Leadership. P10 illustrated the use of peer-to-peer evaluations, as well as observational techniques to get at the heart of the collaboration happening within the classroom setting. P10 suggested, *"I think collaboration is a very, very difficult thing to assess without being involved in the groups intimately"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 also explained evaluating groups with this method of examination (personal communication, September 2016). Even though this domain presents challenges to assessment, it remains necessary for instructors to gauge. According to P1, *"...the nature of the business, where you just, you really need to be working in a group, because that's the way it's done"* (personal communication, August 2016).

Additional methods such as reflection papers and daily logs submitted by students were identified as useful tools to evaluate these domains (P1, personal communication,

August 2016; P2 personal communication, August 2016; P8, personal communication, August 2016). A negative to the use of these types of tools is the amount of time it takes to implement, analyze data and produce feedback for the students. *"It's really time consuming. This is one of the things I think I could tweak or try to do better, is find a way to automate some of it"* (P2, personal communication, August 2016). Streamlining this process was suggested as a way to make this process more useful for instructional use. P2 added, *"I would look to find ways to save time on the computational aspect of it. I think that reading student's comments and kind of giving them feedback, I don't really know if there's a short cut for that"* (personal communication, August 2016). It was also suggested that this type of method produces a higher accuracy to an often times unobserved process by the instructor (P1, personal communication, 2016).

The observations that instructors do partake in, in regards to the challenging areas of interpersonal skills and leadership assessment, allow the instructor to gather information and make assumptions of the process that students are going through. P5 explained, *"...if you're observing closely, even though everybody is on your best behavior, you see where the problems are"* (personal communication, July 2016). This data set is then cross referenced with the written documents, such as student reflections and peer evaluations, as a way to check for trustworthiness of the information.

P1 described the process of using observation and other methods for assessment. P1 observes the activities and behaviors of students. In addition, P1 uses what they referred to as a *"group performance evaluation form"* to assess the collaboration happening within the production team. *"I'll have them rate each other, and write about each other's role, working*

in a team, on a production, and that's a nice way, I think, to measure that, or to assess that"

(P1, personal communication, August 2016).

This type of evaluation method needs to be used in conjunction with observation in

order to find the true collaborative experience that the students are reporting back. P1

explained, *"You can't pay too much attention to the outliers, but at the same time, they're all*

going to ... Most of the time, they give each other inflated grades, and so, I kind of have to

read between the lines sometimes" (personal communication, August 2016). P1 continued,

"...if I notice a consistence, pattern, that "Sally" keeps getting dinged by every person in the

group, that's going to confirm what's usually my suspicion" (personal communication,

August 2016).

P9 articulated the process of assessing leadership through a variety of methods. *"I*

assess it through watching them work. We do peer evaluations, peer-to-peer evaluations, so

I can determine what's happening within those groups" (P9, personal communication,

September 2016). However, with further reflection P9 suggested that their peer evaluation

do not specifically address leadership as a separate entity. P9 reflected:

> *I probably should put that in there somehow because what happens is I hear*
> *about it. I hear about how the leadership broke down or communication*
> *broke down, and those are all aspects of leadership. I've got something for*
> *communication, collaboration, willingness to hear other ideas from other*
> *people. All of those things are part of leadership aspects.* (personal
> communication, September 2016)

When a student is engaged in a project that involves an outside party, a client survey

was identified as a way to obtain information. *"We have client evaluation forms. There's a*

debriefing that happens with their supervisor, myself or whoever's the instructor for that

particular capstone experience and the student" (P9, personal communication, September

2016). These types of surveys included assessments of technical skills, but the challenging

areas of assessment when students are working in the field are what the participants

identified as the critical aspects of this type of method (P3, personal communication, July

2016; P4, personal communication, July 2016; P9, personal communication, September

2016). The 3rd party data set again can be cross-referenced to prior observations, reflections

and peer evaluation to produce trustworthiness to the feedback to the student and the

instructor. P9 explained, *"…it's more checks and balances through discussion, observation*

and the evaluation forms from client and reflection pieces, written reflections from the

students themselves" (personal communication, September 2016).

The final methods that produced key insights in the assessment of challenging areas

to gauge were in the form of *verbal discussions*. One-on-one discussion as well as group

discussion were identified as methods that produced useful information used for this type of

assessment. P8 explained, *"The other part of ethical thinking though is there is, I guess it*

comes out in class discussions. You can't go and do the documentary work without having a

conversation about what it means to go into a place with a camera" (personal

communication, August 2016). P7 uses one-on-one conversations as means to offer feedback

and spur a student's critical thinking. *"I think at the end when I ask them to assess their own*

projects it's much more about how they feel about what they did and think about how they

would do it differently. That's what I'm looking for at the end of a large project" (P7,

personal communication, September 2016).

The context of these types of discussion came in many forms, ranging from structured

discussion lead by the instructor to more organic discussion derived from student led verbal

exchanges. P4 explained how they planned conversations with purpose. *"I like the whole*

conversation about what students want to do with the skills they're learning. Whatever the

skill is. Do they have a lifelong plan for that? Do they have a career plan for that?" (P4,

personal communication, July 2016). These discussions were initiated through a variety of

situations relevant to the courses and came in the forms of group critiques of work, reflection

of processes as well pre-visualization exercises to stimulate idea creation, just to name a few.

Collaboration, Communication, Leadership, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving and

Ethical Reasoning were all topics that participants felt were more accessible through

discussions and conversations as the assessment method. However, the measurement of

these areas was not clearly defined. P3 stated, *"I think those classroom conversations help*

as much as my providing them my feedback to them" (personal communication, July 2016).

P7 spoke about how they viewed the importance of these types of conversations. P7

explained, *"I think that it's something that I'm hoping to give to them as a way to move*

forward and not necessarily grading what they're thinking about" (personal communication,

September 2016). Data are gained through these exchanges, but clear measurement is still a

challenge the participants identified when examining multiple perspectives.

Participants pointed to a variety of methods to specifically assess Life Long Learning,

Creativity, Problem Solving and Ethics. As previously discussed, creativity is accompanied

by the challenge of subjectivity. According to P9, *"When you start trying to assess creativity*

or you start trying to assess the storytelling, creative aspect of what the film is that you're

putting together, there's subjectivity in that" (P9, personal communication, September 2016).

P9 continued:

> *The daunting task of looking at something subjective like creativity or critical*
> *thinking, it's possible, but you can't just put it on a line and say I'm going to*
> *assess ... I'm going assess... I'm going to assess creativity, because then that*

subjectivity just leaps right in. Now if you can be clear about parameters, about what you're assessing in that creative aspect, that helps the instruction. It helps the student, and it helps the process because a student can then really grab onto that final feedback that they get at the end of the semester and take it with them into the next class. (personal communication, September 2016)

The common key insights that emerged around these domains were assessments that focused on student produced artifacts, student portfolios and screenings of student work. Within these types of assessment methods participants also suggested that student competency of skills were examined.

Technical skills are a direct area where rubrics can be applied. According to P7, *"...in an introductory level course there's some things that are easier. Is it in focus? Did you white balance? There's some very skillset things. Then I think it becomes difficult as maybe the semester progresses or in a higher level class where you're starting to try to push the person to reach a professional level"* (personal communication, September 2016). When participants are measuring artifacts such as scripts, script breakdowns, budgets, talent releases and other such documents specific to industry, formatting is a primary concern. The relationship of these artifacts to the process of film production are examined as ways to illustrate the movement toward the final goal of creating a film.

The movement away from the technical skills and into a higher order thinking process requires the participants to use other methods of examination. P9 suggested that Leadership is not assessed until students have a firm grasp on technical skills. *"Leadership is something that we probably don't necessarily address until the advanced courses, just because the first year or so is just getting through,"* explained P9 (personal communication, September 2016). *"It's a process. They're getting caught up on technical aspects, just formatting, just the*

technical skills, the processes that are basic in this whole complex activity of filmmaking,

video production" (P9, personal communication, September 2016).

The methods used when assessing higher order thinking skills in student-produced artifacts were described as group discussions, reflection papers, observations and peer-to-peer assessments. P6 offered an example of how they use written student reflection papers as one tool to examine and assess Ethical Reasoning. Within this process P6 challenges students to think about ethics in two different ways. According to P6, *"I would ask them to respond to the ethical, or think about the ethical implications of the story that they've told. Then also the ethical implications of how they worked with the other people involved in their project"* (personal communication, September 2016). These pointed questions force the students to think not only about the artifact they have produced, but the collaboration process of producing the artifact. These reflections are structured to happen halfway through the production process and yet again at the end of the production process.

P6 described how ethical considerations manifest themselves in the collaborative experience of filmmaking. In order to assess ethics in this manner, collaboration is examined:

> *On the collaboration side, I always have them write a collaboration assessment after their first weekend out on production. They tend to shoot on weekends so that's how I refer to it. Once they've completed their first production experience together, I always ask them to turn in a collaboration reflection. Then for collaboration it's usually just one more at the end of the project to sort of look back on everything that occurred. There's a certain amount of ethical reasoning and questioning that's going on in that reflection. Then also on the larger- their project and the potential ethical implications of their story and all of that, that I ask just at the end of the project.* (personal communication, September 2016)

This detailed process offered by P6 was just one example. Other participants suggested items such as scripts, script breakdowns, budgets, talent releases, films, and design plans to be assessed with multiple methods in order to tap into the higher order thinking skills students are using to produce these artifacts. However, this process is not employed until students have progressed through an examination of technical skills.

The artifacts in question are at times produced for and evaluated in student portfolios. Portfolios are suggested to contain a students' best work throughout their time in a program. For example, P1 highlighted a capstone course where the students produce such portfolios. The students *"...create a portfolio that has video and audio production samples, writing samples, an organizational sample, basically a production book, and ... Oh, they have to do a mock interview, which they're evaluated on, and then résumé and cover letter"* (P1, personal communication, August 2016). This portfolio offers many areas for student assessment to occur and is often a summative evaluation. P1 stated, *"it's a way for us to see how well they've performed"* (personal communication, August 2016).

A professional industry standard is the goal for student work in this format. P6 highlighted a program learning outcome as a way to identify the process of assessing life long learning through student portfolio work. The learning outcome requires students to *"...design and produce activities, projects, and portfolios suitable for professional careers"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016). P6 suggested, *"That covers a little more of a sort of forward-looking outcome in things that are like internships, sometimes portfolios, sometimes business plans, and then also mission statements"* (personal communication, September 2016). One student produced artifact that P6 pointed out was a *"...career and life mission statement that they [the students] have developed and comes from the sort of*

summation of their learning within the program, but then forward-looking. How do you want

to apply this once you graduate?" (personal communication, September 2016).

A variety of methods were suggested in order to assess this type of portfolio work.

Team evaluations were one way that was described, consisting of a mix of faculty members

and/or industry professionals participating in the assessment (P9, personal communication).

Rubrics are used by some of the participants (P1, personal communication, August 2016).

More informal assessment tools such as one-on-one discussions and written feedback by the

individual instructor on record were also suggested.

The domains that are examined with this type of review are not only technical, but a

demonstration of higher order skills such as Creativity and Problem Solving. The liberal arts

goal of Life Long Learning is also examined in this process, yet few concrete descriptions

were offered to how this is assessed. The clearest explanations of Life Long Learning were

along the lines of a student's expression of forward thinking in relationship to career (P5,

personal communication, August 2016; P6 personal communication, September 2016). For

example, P4 described how they assess Life Long Learning through discussions built into an

internship course. These discussions are intended for P4 to check the understanding and

awareness of the student perceptions about their future goals. The constructive dialogue

around the topic of career, based on the internship process, has allowed P4 to check in with a

student for understanding. P4 articulated this process:

> *I'm also an internship coordinator so I am assessing students with internships
> along the way. I'm assessing students who are coming through the internship
> course which I also teach. Are they seeking out career opportunities of the
> skill set that I taught them in class? The assessment tends to happen after the
> class. If we were talking about assessment within a class based on a
> particular skill set then that goes back to the discussion that we hold. Are
> they able to verbally explain to me that the skill set that they are learning in*

the class, is something that they would be using down the line at a news station, at a video production department or even beyond video? Are they able to use these skills in terms of organization and structure for another particular job? Are they able to hold that discussion and explain to me? That's how I would determine whether or not the skill sets that they are learning is something that they would continue to want to develop based on where they're going in the future. (personal communication, July 2016)

Screenings are a method used by all of the participants as a way to access many challenging domains. The process of constant screenings to evoke critical analysis of work provides the instructor with data to assess individual growth, understanding and application of skills. When assessing Problem Solving, P9 explained, *"A lot of this assessment happens when we're screening, screening these individual projects"* (personal communication, September 2016). Screenings are valued as a direct link to providing feedback to the instructor reflecting student progress. These screenings are sometimes used in conjunction with other types of methods. P8 stated, *"…by the end of a quarter, I'm looking for several things from students. I get them from student evaluations. They have to do a reflection paper on the process of taking the class and then they have a screening of the film so you see the film itself and see how they work with people"* (personal communication, August 2016).

In order to access this type of data through a screening, a rubric is usually on the peripherals of the process. The rubric can serve as a way to start a conversation about a gap in knowledge or success in an area; however, participants expressed that in-depth conversations about what was viewed on the screen allows for richer data to emerge. For example, P9 suggested screenings as a way to evaluate the collaboration that took place when developing the film. *"When we screen the stuff and are able to see it on the screen and we have discussions about why'd you do this; why'd you do that, a lot of those processes are*

revealed. That comes back to mistakes, and it comes back to having people justify their rationale and actually articulate it" (P9, personal communication, September 2016).

Ethics was an area that was specifically identified in documentary production coursework. In regards to ethics when teaching documentary filmmaking, P8 stated, *"I think it's the most important part of the class"* (personal communication, August 2016). P8 continued, *"To make a documentary film that has a sense of ethics, you have to, at the very least, understand what your subject is about. Why are they doing what they're doing?"* (personal communication, August 2016). The power dynamic between content producers, subject, clients and funding organizations were topics specific to documentary production. The action of screening dailies or final projects allows conversation to happen where a student sees the illustration of an ethical consideration of the story on the screen (P6, personal communication, September 2016; P8 personal communication, August 2016). The instructor can then review future material as a way to check for understanding and application of this type of ethical consideration.

Other conversations that are derived from the screening of student work are Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, as well as Teamwork, Collaboration and Leadership. The justification of choices made in production are expressed in this forum, as well as the examination of group processes. P3 explained, *"As we screen them together as a class, the students are like, "Oh that is amazing! How did you figure that out? That's points for creativity"* (personal communication, July 2016). P8 highlighted screenings as a way to assess teamwork in the following:

> *I think it's part of the value of doing those regular screenings of student work and screening your cut here. You know because there's a quality of work and then suddenly there's a drop off and you can see it on screen and it's because*

somebody got mad at somebody else and the thing that they were good at they said, "I'm not doing that for you" and it shows up in a film. (personal communication, August 2016)

This type of assessment process for participants was not linked to a rubric or standard. In many cases, professional experience was highlighted as a gauge to student success in the areas being examined. This allows the instructor to illustrate these topics in relation to a real-world scenario. The ability to provide an explicit measurement, as well as concrete evidence for assessment is a challenge in this process. However, the value expressed by the participants to the screening of work is extremely important to the development and learning in the classroom. Instructors are left to offer explanation, illustration and discussion to gain data and provide feedback to students. However, not until follow up screenings or more observation will the instructor be able to check for understanding and measurement of the prior discussed topics. Thus, creating a challenge to the assessment process.

Strategies

The final emergent theme category that was produced by this study is "Strategies". This emergent theme category consists of the strategies and specific applications of assessment in regards to liberal arts outcomes offered by the participants in this study. The data obtained in relation to this emergent theme category was derived from *Research Question 3: How do instructors describe the assessment strategies used to address liberal arts based outcomes while teaching film/video production?* The sub themes that emerged from this area are: Strategies for Assessment Acceptance, Clear Communication to Student in the Process of Assessment, Classroom Strategies for Assessment.

Strategies for assessment acceptance

In the previous sections it has been pointed out that, in some cases, the term "assessment" has held negative connotations. In others, the process of assessing certain domains was challenging or not attempted at all. However, a sub theme in regards to "Strategies" was produced from the data that participants offered pertaining to their personal experiences of accepting assessment. There has also been prior discussion of the value that participants associated with the process once they fully embraced assessment. To illustrate this acceptance, participants offered details of how they had grown to a point of embracing assessment as not only a required step in the process of education, but also a valuable tool for improvement (P9, personal communication, September 2016). Multiple strategies were offered as ways that enhanced their experience with assessment and sparked them to embrace this as a needed process.

The first of these offerings was to embrace both filmmaking and assessment as a process. Filmmakers and video production professionals have an understanding that content is produced in a structured process. P7 stressed the process that students and professionals alike need to go through in order to reach a creative space. P7 described this process in the following:

> *I know that when I was in film school half of my classmates thought that they were the next Scorsese or Spielberg, or later on Tarantino. God bless if you are, if you're just magically talented. For most of the rest of us we have to work very, very, very hard, and thinking they can skip over those points that are the grunt work to getting to creative work, where you want to be, is to me sort of a sign of either a genius, and I very much hope you remember me in your Academy Award speech.*

P7 continued:

> *For the vast, vast majority of us, it's hard work and it's the people who are really willing to do the hard work that tend to succeed. That sounds kind of counter intuitive in a creative setting, but it's not. It's the people who have the discipline to do the things that they know they need to do to get to that creative place.* (personal communication, September 2016)

In the education profession, assessment is also a structured process (Lattuca & Stark, 2009). The acceptance of assessment as a process was a theme that arose as a means to help those struggling with assessment. Not unlike the challenging process of filmmaking that P7 illustrated, assessment comes with its own set of challenges and natural progression. This is highlighted by the evidence that suggests most instructors in film/video production are not formally trained in this area of the educational process. The idea of accepting assessment as a process can offer instructors of film/video production comfort while transitioning to acceptance.

When assessment is better understood as a process, instructors can then look to the multiple applications of assessment in the field they are looking to evaluate. In regards to film/video production assessment, the process offers accessible moments by applying tools and methods in multiple areas of the process for refinement (P6, personal communication, September 2016). This suggestion follows the idea of scaffolding information to build from one skill to the next. P2 explained:

> *It took me a while to figure this out, but basically I have to break it down- it's their first attempt at screenwriting- so I break it down into smaller pieces. Each week they have a writing assignment, they turn in their writing assignment to me, I give it back to them the next week with comments and feedback. We kind of build the script from there.* (personal communication, August 2016)

The process of filmmaking is made up of many different activities, so the need of a variety of

measurements is essential for the student and the instructor. P9 suggested:

> *Assessment forces you to break it (filmmaking) down into parts that you can*
> *assess, and that makes a lot of sense to the student, instead of throwing the*
> *whole big picture at them all at once. Of course, they're not going to get it.*
> *It's complicated. It's complex, and there's many different ways to achieve the*
> *outcome of a film or a video. Part of our goal in the classroom is really just*
> *to allow them the opportunity to craft their own process.* (personal
> communication, September 2016).

Scaffolding allows the instructor to have the ability to break a complex method into

smaller more measurable units. During these smaller units or activities, students will most

likely be set up to fail at some point. An emerging strategy that these instructors placed

value on was encouraging mistakes and experimentation. P2 offered the following:

> *The more artistic, the more subjective, the more wanting kids to just kind of*
> *experiment and make mistakes without penalty. Because I think that's a big*
> *thing is to let kids just experiment with different things. I mean failure is just*
> *part of creativity in general. I think you have to encourage it the right way*
> *and sort of take that sense of penalty away.* (personal communication, August
> 2016)

Mistakes present an opportunity for learning and should be embraced. P9 stated,

"...mistakes are part of it. Mistakes usually offer some of the best learning opportunities, so

let's embrace these mistakes. I'm actually really interested in how they (students) handle the

mistake" (personal communication, September 2016). P3 said, *"I'm guiding them along,*

and giving them my experienced feedback, but they will only become better producers if they

learn how to learn from their production mistakes" (personal communication, July 2016).

Other offerings around mistakes were the behaviors displayed around making a

mistake. P7 stated*, "I always talk with my students that in this business especially it's not*

about whether you make a mistake; it's how you deal with the mistake that's been made that

is more, to me, the proof of a person" (personal communication, September 2016).

Leadership, Problem Solving, Critical Thinking, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning and

Collaboration were all identified as domains that are accessible through mistakes.

Participants explained that encouraging mistakes in the classroom, as well as experimentation

were all ways to access certain skills and domains.

A key insight into accepting assessment as a process is the challenge of finding the

right tool for the right assignment. P2 explained, *"So that's been a big challenge for me is*

finding the right assessment tool at the right time. To be honest, I change it from class to

class and sometimes even from assignment to assignment" (personal communication, August

2016). Developing the many types of assignments that are required to examine the complex

process of filmmaking and video production, the instructor is left to build equally as many

assessment tools.

The findings highlight the key insight that once the use of a rubric has been exhausted

and technical skills are acceptable, students engage in higher order thinking skills. This

requires multiple methods of examination that do not always translate to accuracy when

gauging some of the liberal arts domains. However, more challenging is the process of

adapting and trying new assessment tools with a variety of results. P2 explained:

> *That's the biggest challenge for the assessment. What's the right tool for each*
> *assignment? Trying to find a way that makes sense to me, but also makes*
> *sense to the students. If you're changing up your grading from assignment to*
> *assignment to assignment, in every class, each individual class, then it seems*
> *kind of random to them, it seems like ... what's this professor doing? Trying*
> *to strike that balance between customizing how I'm going to assess a*
> *particular assignment and being consistent so that they don't feel completely*
> *lost.* (personal communication, August 2016)

Individualized assessment is one strategy that has emerged as a way to combat the challenge of finding the right assessment tool at the right time. P9 suggested, *"You have to get to know your students and get to know what they're capable of to perform a proper assessment at times"* (personal communication, September 2016). In regards to assessing collaboration, P4 stated, *"I tend to think about students individually and not necessarily collectively unless something stands out"* (personal communication, July 2016). The challenge of prior knowledge of individual students was identified as a common thread by the participants. P9 explained:

> *I think that you need multiple methods and tools to assess multiple types of assessments. Also, in this day and age, you've got students coming in with experience and some coming in with no experience in this particular field, so it's almost an individual assessment at times. When I've got a student that comes in with a few years of high school work in a media department, I'll probably hold them to a different standard than I would if a student came in and they'd never turned on an editing software or never had turned on a camera, which happens. To hold the entire class to a specific standard all the time probably doesn't benefit, really, anyone.* (personal communication, September 2016)

The access to technology has equipped students with knowledge and skills that widen the gap in the collective classroom. Applying appropriate standards for students can help the instructor provide valuable feedback to students in the assessment process. However, this strategy does create challenges of it own in regards to time management and expectation levels of the individual instructors.

Clear communication to student in the process of assessment

The participants in this study offered key insights into their own experiences within the classroom and highlighted ways to improve the output of data in regards to assessing skills. Rubrics were highlighted as a key communication device to set expectations for the

students. P7 explained, *"...over the years I have sort of become a convert to the idea of rubrics"* (personal communication, September 2016). P7 continued, *"The truth of the matter is I think it's a really good thing. It's clear communications and I think a lot of times students get lost in the weeds when they don't understand what's expected of them, and so I've found that I really do like that, and it also is very helpful"* (personal communication, September 2016).

Making sure that the rubrics were available before students proceeded with specific assignments produced improved communication for participants. *"All of my rubrics are visible before the student undertakes the assignment"* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). P4 described how the use of a rubric clarified communication to students in the following:

> *I've physical hard copy rubrics that goes back to the student. I used to just vocally go through and tell them what areas of improvement, what they did good. However, I have found that giving them the hard copy rubric gives them something to reflect on, allows me to refer back to that to say, "Okay this is what we talked about in class. This is how I was assessing it and this is why you got the grades you got." The rubrics have really been the improvement to my assessment over time.* (P4, personal communication, July 2016)

It was also suggested that instructors need to work on their ability to articulate objectives, assignment expectations and the specific processes of assessment to their students. P2 stated, *"I think, in terms of improving my assessment process, a lot of it has just been to be clearer with students and to really put a description of the assignment and a description of the key things I'm looking for in each assignment"* (personal communication, August 2016). P5 pointed to the act of employing rubrics as a way to help articulation.

"Developing rubrics has really helped me to know it when I see it and articulate it, articulate why I know it when I see it" (P5, personal communication, August 2016.

P10 suggested backwards design as a process to increase clarity for the instructor themselves. P10 stated, *"I think looking at it from the assessment point backwards is very helpful. If you want to measure whether or not they learned teamwork, you got to define what teamwork looks like to you, and then decide how you're going to figure out how to measure and work backwards from that"* (personal communication, September 2016). Once a clearer way of communicating these items is accomplished, the instructors can tap into alternative ways to exploit the assessment process in addition to rubrics.

Basic communication from the instructor to the student stems from what is found in the syllabus (P2, personal communication, August 2016). This communication was referenced as a key way to frame the expectations of the course. Moving from this document, it was suggested that clearly stating goals of individual assignments and activities initiates that inclusion of students in the process of assessment. P3 stated, *"The assessment process is not just me giving the feedback to the students. I want the students as much engaged in assessing their own performance, and the performance of their teammates as I'm doing it as well"* (personal communication, July 2016). A key takeaway in this example is that students are part of the assessment process and should be informed about the process. P4 stated, *"For myself in terms of assessment and my teaching philosophy, I think it's very important that students understand that there's a level of expectation, and whether or not they met that expectation. If they did meet that expectation, there's still room for improvement. What is that improvement? If they didn't meet that level of expectation, why didn't they do that and provide them that feedback"* (personal communication, July 2016).

The process is not only to clarify and improve instructional techniques, but to relay the benefits of assessment to those being assessed.

The process of assessment should be ongoing during the activities that students are engaged with and not only offered at the end of a project or assignment. This key insight emerged out of the participants describing that students need feedback early and often. P6 suggested, *"I guess over time I started to realize that that feedback needed to come to the student earlier than at the end of the semester because it was too late."* P7 has given a lot of thought to how and when assessment will be most impactful for a student's learning. *"Again, what I've learned is that the feedback early on and the quality of it needs in a way to be higher than the feedback that they get on their final project because we're all human, and once you've clicked that box, you've moved on"* (P7, personal communication, September 2016). At the end of the process it is too late as students tend to check out of the activity and move on to the next problem that is given to them to solve.

Through this process it was also highlighted that assigned grades in foundational skills exercises may not carry as much weight in the overall process. P7 expressed, *"...giving a clear communication of what I want and what I expect to the students so that they can, and do similar things early on in the course of the semester or course"* (personal communication, September 2016). P7 continued, *"What I guess I've figured out is that the more you can do early on at fairly low stakes, but with the same structure in place helps them figure out expectations"* (personal communication, September 2016). P9 explained this when evaluating the pitching process:

> *The first time they give a pitch, just get up there and do it. I don't expect too much. I give them the format, the things that should be included in a good*

pitch. I'll give them the structure. Really, what I'm doing is I'm looking for the structure of the pitch. Did you apply what we spoke about in class?

P9 continued:

The second time around, when they start pitching, I expect that the structure is there, so that's a formality. They'll be graded upon that structure. Was it solid? Was it tight? Did it work? The second go at a pitch is how are they now processing that information and making it their own? That's where that creativity starts to come in, bleed in there. I'm trying to figure out how are they making this part of their own personality, or what's the creative twist they're putting on it? Is this something we haven't seen before? How are they getting us excited? Is the presentation itself creative? (personal communication, September 2016)

This is due to the students' lack of experience in the field. As the students progress to more complex assignments, grades and overall incentives are appropriately attached and heightened.

Other strategies that emerged as key insights were in the area of connecting content to the expectations or standards of the professional industry. P5 offered this perspective on the evaluation of written communication. *"It is very much a professionalism because I also point out to them there's a difference between good academic essay writing and good screenwriting"* (P5, personal communication, August 2016). P5 continued, *"I also say, "I'm not doing this because I'm a spelling fascist or a grammar fascist. I'm doing this because it is a mark of professionalism to hand a producer a script that is as clean as possible."* (personal communication, August 2016). This strategy allows instructors to illustrate the importance of the scaffold work that is being conducted to the overall process of filmmaking and video production. These activities that are examined are reflected in the rubrics offered by participants and are often times using professional standards as the intended outcome.

This creates more value to the student feedback, as well as increases the ability of the instructor to articulate clear goals and expectations of an assignment or exercise.

Classroom strategies

The final sub theme that emerged in relation to the theme category of "Strategies" were classroom techniques and structures that produce more assessable work. The challenge of assessing creativity was highlighted due to the subjectivity that the act suggests. P2 described this challenge in the following:

> *When you talk about the aesthetics of something, why did you make a certain choice, why did you deviate from what might be considered classical cinematic grammar? Why did you frame something in an unusual way? Is it because you didn't notice or you didn't care? Or because you were actually trying to do something new? That's when it gets tough.* (personal communication, August 2016)

One way that participants tackle this challenge is placing value on creative acts. P8 suggested, *"We're all looking for kind of compelling stories, I think. Some of them maybe they're not super creative in terms of form, in terms of creativity I'm usually thinking about form but identifying important under represented subjects is its own kind of creative act"* (personal communication, August 2016). The baseline of creativity can be marked as creation itself. *"I think in a way assessing creativity just comes from "Did you make something?" If you make something that wasn't purely derivative and in some way is actually new, and that there's a value that comes in in the taking on the challenge of just creating something that's new for other people to react to as a motive, communicating with an audience"* (P6, personal communication, September 2016).

One key insight in this area was to frame the creative choices made by students as just that, a choice. P6 examines creative choices by students to make assessments in the area of

creativity. This process allows P6 to identify technical applications that are intended to

support a creative choice. According to P6:

> *The way I try to assess creativity in the production and storytelling process is where the creative choices, or particularly things that are more technique, like lighting or camera or editing or music, is it clear that they were story-driven? That there was something from that character or story that warranted or sort of explained the reason that this creative choice was made. It's always trying to get the more technical aspects to come back to something that actually has a more creative origin.* (personal communication, September 2016)

A choice suggests justification of a decision or process made to achieve an outcome.

P9 described how they use this decision making as a point of evaluation. The following is

how P9 explained what is expressed to students in the classroom:

> *When you're in the act of it, make sure that you're making choices for a reason. Make sure there's a rationale behind the choice. Why did you put this clip ahead of this clip, and why was it only three seconds as opposed to five seconds? Those are all of the critical analysis and critical thinking that an editor needs to be able to do"* (personal communication, September 2016).

This strategy allows for a clearer definition of creativity. The creative choice can

then be examined through multiple methods of assessment. As previously stated, on a basic

level a student who simply engages in the act of producing something can be categorized as

creative. However, employing the strategies of individualized assessment allows instructors

to access the act of creation on different levels of achievement. P9 suggested that individual

assessment of creative acts are part of this process:

> *Because a student comes in with no prior knowledge, no experience with this at all and they're actually able to put up a video about their grandfather who served time in the war or something and they put that up there. The creative act of actually putting these pieces together to communicate to an audience, that act is creativity. It's a baseline, and hopefully the next project will be better. Sometimes it's worse, and then it gets better. This process is tough. We can't all just show up and be able to start producing stuff that's going to be picked up by Warner Bros. You've got to accept some growing pains in*

your students, especially in creativity. (personal communication, September 2016)

The challenge of this type of individual assessment comes into play when overall class size is examined. Participants suggested that smaller class sizes allowed for more in-depth investigation and measurements of students as they progress through a challenging domain such as creativity.

Small class sizes allow for students and instructors to become more familiar with one another. It was pointed out that this familiarity with classmates within a student production team allows for collaboration and teamwork to be produced at a higher level. This key insight has inspired participants to develop exercises and activities early in the classroom setting to promote camaraderie within the classroom. P7 explained, *"I've tried to make an effort to get to know people better, or to plan projects that reveal something about themself personally pretty early in the semester"* (personal communication, September 2016). P8 spoke about the topic of diversity and how it plays in the forming and preforming of groups:

> *Usually, there are four students that are coming from two or three different majors that are working on one project. Different socioeconomic backgrounds, transfer students that come into these classes, students of color working with white students. Having them negotiate those kinds of hard, difficult boundaries to move a project forward is really important.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P7 has developed a small video project exercise that involves students to filming each other, telling individual stories of one another. This project has helped students come together and break down walls more quickly. P7 reflected:

> *I'm going to move that project up to fifteen or twenty percent into the semester because it just created a camaraderie in a classroom where people were going to have to work together anyway in order to, in video, to achieve a project. It just really relaxed people in a way, because I mean they only reveal the stuff they want to reveal, and that created a level of camaraderie,*

so I'd say that's something that I have just structurally built in. (personal communication, September 2016)

Structuring projects and activities that allow students the opportunity to become familiar with other classmates, as well as learn basic skills that are relevant to student success allows a more multi-faceted classroom to exist. This action provides the instructor a more advantageous environment to assess Teamwork, Leadership and Collaboration.

Another key insight into classroom structure emerged from the strategy of involving the students in the process. Instructors explained that using tactics such as team charters and student contracts are ways not only to set expectation for a group's work to be completed, but clarified what is to be assessed by instructors. P6 explained:

> *I started to have students in larger groups come up with team charters. At the beginning of the process, I had a series of talks with them where they would have to talk about basically how often are we going to meet, where are we going to meet, who's going to run our meeting. A lot of it was about group communication and if someone doesn't do their job how will we hold them accountable, how will we confront that person. They had to think through ahead of time, as a group, how they wanted to treat the group. I left it to them to come up with their own system. Basically, they had to come up with their own rubric about how they would treat teamwork.* (personal communication, September 2016)

The act of including students in the process has already been discussed as a way to improve communication about assessment to students. The act of allowing students the ability to set their own expectations and outcomes for a project offers the instructor an assessment tool to judge the student against during the process and after completion. *"I look at how they pitched this, how they pitched the vision, because that's where the student sets their own standard or develops their own rubric. They've got to tell me how it's going to look"* (P9, personal communication, September 2016). P6 uses a variety of different methods to assess the domain of Critical Thinking. Reflection journals are written by

students with the intention of critically analyzing the work that they are producing in relation to the standards that they themselves have projected to the instructor. According to P6, the purpose of this assignment is to assess to what extent they believe *"...they [the students] hit their technical targets or story targets"* (personal communication, September 2016). P6 ramps this technique up in a cinematic design course. The assessment in this course is primarily developed by the student. This rubric development was detailed in the following:

> *Then in a more specific, sort of problem-solving sense I teach a course in cinematic design. That's another one where the students basically come up with- They have to tell the story, a short film, and then they have to come up with a visual plan for that short film and they design the visual plan to hit certain areas that they're going to control throughout the production. So they are basically designing, once again, their own rubric of "here's what we're going to do." Then they go out, they have to execute that, they bring it back and then we sort of check the actual project against what they had designed as certain aesthetic things they were going to do in the areas of space or color or rhythm or movement. I see that one as very much- it becomes this hybrid between creative thinking and critical thinking because they give themselves the problem of "we want it to look like X" and then they have to find ways that they're going to hit that mark and actually bring that back, in ways that can be quantified a little bit more than a lot of the other creative things can. I think that project in particular does a good job with those critical and creative skills.* (personal communication, September 2016)

The process of including students in the development of the assessment tool also provides feedback to the instructor about student understanding, application and process. This suggests Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Creativity and Collaboration can be accessed.

The classroom structures and tactics are not the only key insights that came from the participants' offerings. The final area of "Classroom Strategies" suggests that program and curriculum requirements play a role in the assessment of certain domains. Some of the schools the participants worked at offered specific classes such as media ethic, oral communication or media law. In regards to a media ethics class taught by P5, they

suggested, *"That's the ethical foundation. That class and that idea is the ethical foundation of pretty much everything that I try to communicate ethically in my class. How do you evaluate that? How do you assess that?"* (personal communication, August 2016). This statement suggests that the class is a major component to incorporating Ethical Reasoning into a production curriculum; however, the assessment of this domain is a challenge. P5 suggested the following as a strategy to assess this domain:

> *Short of putting them in a situation where they have the opportunity to hose each other and seeing if they do it or not, which amazingly enough the administration has formally discouraged us from doing ... It's the darnedest thing. The only way I can do that is by asking them to write about it. I could ask them to stand up and present about it in class, but if they're writing and they know that I'm the only audience, they're just going to be more open and more honest in their responses.* (personal communication, August 2016)

These classes in areas such as media ethics and media law take the lead when providing intentional instruction and assessments of specific domains. Some of the production curriculums situated in traditional liberal arts educational settings required coursework in oral communication, written communication, as well as other fringe coursework such as psychology and sociology that touches on human behavior and group dynamics. Otherwise, direct instruction and assessment of some of theses domains were not offered or focused on in the production coursework.

When teaching film/video production some of these topics are a challenge to cover explicitly. P7 described the struggle to incorporate the specific domain of Ethical Reasoning into courses that are not specifically designed to encompass ethics intentionally. P7 suggested:

> *I think that it's probably something that does not get pushed to the forefront as much as maybe a school wide focus or a college or university-wide focus. It sounds like a great thing to say that we're teaching students, but when*

you're in the weeds of trying to teach them how to white balance a camera,
this is a very hard and direct skill, some of the other soft skills that would be
fantastic to have along the way sometimes take a backseat to that. (personal
communication, September 2016)

Other classes in program curriculums are set up to be more in line with assessing

certain domains. Classes such as producing and directing are in line with Leadership,

Teamwork and Collaboration (P2, personal communication, August 2016; P4 personal

communication, July, 2016; P7 personal communication, September 2016; P9, personal

communication, September 2016). However, P7 described the inherent challenge of

assessing leadership in such a class: *"As far as assessing leadership, it was out there and it*

was definitely a part of that class. I can't say that I put together a rubric for them about how

they would be graded on it, and probably I let that slide more than anything else in the class

because it's such a squishy, difficult and hard thing to assess" (personal communication,

September 2016). P4 pointed out ethical considerations that were an access point to

assessing Teamwork and Collaboration:

> *I would have to say it is based on how the student is able to justify their*
> *decision. It would be all verbal. Then it goes back to the discussion, we have*
> *a discussion of what the ethical situation is and then we discuss the pros and*
> *the cons of whatever the decisions or options for the decision making would*
> *be. When I'm listening to students go through this process, I'm looking for*
> *students that can justify their reasoning behind the choices that they make.*
> (personal communication, July 2016)

A class such as screenwriting falls into the Written and Oral Communication realm,

and Critical Thinking will be more present in an editing course (P3, personal communication,

July 2016; P5, personal communication, August 2016; P9, personal communication,

September 2016; P10, personal communication, September 2016). The sequences and course

offerings suggest that these courses play a role in the overall assessment and ability to access

each of the domains on their own. It was revealed that no classes are being offered specific

to leadership in the creative industry or group dynamics in the creative industry.

The key insight in this matter is that course offerings play a role in the assessment of

these domains. This was apparent when participants pointed to advanced courses such as

capstone experiences and senior seminar as the only places that were intentionally assessing

Life Long Learning. P1 explained, *"We deal with it a little bit in the senior seminar in terms*

of thinking about basic competencies and skills that you need to survive in the professional

world" (personal communication, August 2016). P1 continued, *"I also do it in my advanced*

video class in terms of behavior and actions and things like that, that they can use for the rest

of their career" (personal communication, August 2016). P1 explained this rationale:

> *In the advanced class, it's because usually they're are upperclassmen, and*
> *they're ... Well, there's that, the upperclassmen are getting ready to, going to*
> *be heading out before too long. Number two, I think that's so important,*
> *personally, to success. I tell them all the time, I say, "You're ... This is just*
> *the beginning." You know what I mean as a production guy, "This is just the*
> *beginning. This is kindergarten." "You're going to learn so much more in the*
> *field than you ever learned here, but you have to know this stuff to learn that*
> *stuff.* (personal communication, August 2016)

P9 singled out the capstone class as the best example of evaluating Life Long Learning.

According to P9, *"...our capstone class is more of a finishing class. It's this seminar on how*

the industry works, what you need to be prepared for" (personal communication, September

2016). This key insight was highlighted as the only place career preparedness and leadership

are touched on. A possible rationale for this strategy was suggested by P4 when they pointed

out the effects of academic maturity when assessing collaboration. P4 stated:

> *By the time they get to their senior year and they come into the capstone class,*
> *then they realize that if they can do one thing really well and everybody on*
> *their team does their one thing really well, then collaboration is going to*
> *make some really great things happen. When they first come into the majors,*

they think, "How are we all going to get this done?" They all feel like they all have to be in charge. Absolutely, there's definitely a change. (personal communication, July 2016)

This strategy suggests that students need time to process and understand information and technical skills before applying evaluations methods of higher order thinking skills. The assessment of such domains also remained implicit to the classroom instruction and vague to the actual process of the assessment being conducted.

Application of Bloom's Taxonomy Revised

The data collected from the participants in this study yielded a variety of emergent theme categories, sub themes and key insights. In order to clarify the information that has been discussed prior to this section, it was determined that a structure needed to be applied to these findings to refine the categories. This action was intended to offer greater understanding of the information that was expressed by the unit involved in the study. *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (Krathwohl & Anderson, 2001) was selected as the theoretical framework to be applied to the findings due to the topic of assessment in the specific field of film and video production education.

The application of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001) helped to yield more defined descriptions of this collective group's experience with assessment. The information was filtered and condensed into statements reflecting how participants described the assessment process in each of the categories or levels of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001): Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyze, Evaluate and Create. The results of this application are presented in the theoretical framework shown in Figure 1.

Create	Meld the talents and resources present in the filmmaking process to create a communication artifact based on capturing light, sound and story to recreate the human condition or mediate an emotional experience for an audience.
Evaluate	Determine what possible solutions may exist in order to navigate problems and challenges. Produce informed options to set forth on a chosen course of action that will best serve the creative vision of the filmmaking process.
Analyze	Critically examine information while performing within the filmmaking process in order to operate and understand more complex situations as the filmmaking process begins to build and challenges become present.
Apply	Perform technical operations within the context of a film/video crew within the filmmaking process.
Understand	Link technical operation to industry standards within the stages of the filmmaking processes (Production Cycles) – Specific to Crew positions, duties and responsibilities.
Remember	Operate technical equipment and software, and format materials and artifacts.

Figure 1. Theoretical framework for teaching and evaluating filmmaking/video production as a process (*Bloom's Taxonomy Revised*, 2001)

These statements are a synthesis of the entire unit's experience with classroom assessment in a film and video production classroom. The participants' descriptions are what is believed to be reflected in the descriptions presented in Figure 1. The categories are briefly illustrated in Figure 2 and include methods and tools that instructors use to gain access within each of the categories of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001).

The application of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001) resulted in a clarification of how instructional assessment is being conducted as students move from technical based assignments to more complex work. In addition, this application signaled out the Methods and Tools being used to gather data in each category suggested by *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001). In order to refine this information for use in this study, a mapping exercise was conducted. This was done as a way to better understand the processes and indicators

Create	Peer-to-peer evaluation Student reflections Observation Student produced outcomes or rubric Discussion, group, and one-on-one Critique of artifacts being introduced (i.e., Screenings)
Evaluate	Peer-to-peer evaluation Student reflections Observation Student produced outcomes or rubric Discussion, group, and one-on-one Critique of artifacts being introduced (i.e., Screenings)
Analyze	Peer-to-peer evaluation Student reflections Observation Student produced outcomes or rubric Discussion, group, and one-on-one Critique of artifacts being introduced (i.e., Screenings) Rubrics
Apply	Peer-to-peer evaluation Observation Student Reflections Discussion, group, and one-on-one Critique of artifacts being introduced (i.e., Screenings) Rubrics
Understand	Peer-to-peer evaluation Observation Student Reflections Discussion, group, and one-on-one Critique of artifacts being introduced (i.e., Screenings) Rubrics
Remember	Observation Discussion, group, and one-on-one Critique of artifacts being introduced (i.e., Screenings) Rubrics

Figure 2.   Methods and tools used to gain access to assessment in film/video
production coursework (*Bloom's Taxonomy Revised*, 2001)

that the participants suggested as to how they were gaining access to specific domains of

liberal arts skills. Figure 3 illustrates the domains that were examined in this study and the

results of the mapping exercise. Further explanation of each heading is provided to clarify

the results shown in this figure.

Domains	Assessment Keys	Evaluation Categories
Communication	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Client Work and Review	Behavior, Performance
	Discussions	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Observations	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Internships	Artifacts, Performance, Behavior
	Pitches	Artifacts, Performance
Problem Solving	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Screenings	Artifacts, Performance
	Client Work and Review	Behavior, Performance
	Observations	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Internships	Artifacts, Performance Behavior
Leadership	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Client Work and Review	Behavior, Performance
	Discussion	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Observations	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Screenings	Artifacts, Performance
Creativity/Innovation	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Discussions	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Observations	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
Critical Thinking/Problem Solving	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Discussions	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Observations	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
Life Long Learning	Client work and Review	Behavior, Performance
	Portfolio	Artifacts, Performance
	Internships	Artifacts, Performance, Behavior
	Screenings	Artifacts, Performance
Ethical Reasoning	Discussions	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Power Dynamic Discussion	Artifacts, Performance, Behavior
	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Observations	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
Collaboration/Teamwork	Mistakes	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Discussion	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance
	Observation	Process, Artifacts, Behavior, Performance

KEY: *Domains*: The identified liberal arts outcome being assessed; *Assessment Keys*: Techniques, methods, experiences or indicators used by instructors to uncover and gain access to measurable aspects within the specific "Domain"; *Evaluation Categories*: Activities and key aspects that are used by instructors in the assessment process reflecting actions, objects and overall student competencies that are derived and directly used to gauge the linked "Assessment Key".

Figure 3. Instructor assessment model for liberal arts outcomes in film/video
            production coursework

Domains, Assessment Keys, and Emergent Themes

The heading titled "Domains" identifies the liberal arts outcome that is being linked to the following information found in "Assessment Keys" and "Emerging Categories". The Domains are inclusive of the liberal arts outcomes and the 4C's: Communication, Problem Solving, Leadership, Creativity and Innovation, Critical Thinking, Life Long Learning, Ethical Reasoning, Collaboration and Teamwork.

The heading titled "Assessment Keys" encompasses the techniques, methods, experiences or indicators that the instructors use to uncover and gain access to measurable aspects within the specific "Domain". For instance, instructors identified "Mistakes" as an *Assessment Key* providing access to the "Domains" of Communication, Problem Solving, Leadership, Creativity and Innovation, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Ethical Reasoning, Collaboration and Teamwork. *Assessment Keys* are not subject to actions such as the term "Mistakes" suggests. The experience of "Internships" emerged as an *Assessment Key,* allowing the instructors access to gauge the "Domains" Communication, Problem Solving and Life Long Learning.

Finally, the heading of "Evaluation Categories" describes separate categories that emerged as activities and key aspects instructors are using in the assessment process. The evaluation categories reflect four specific areas that instructors are examining when they are assessing student work. These categories are made up of actions, objects and overall student competency that are derived and directly linked to the prior indicated "Assessment Keys". The evaluation categories are defined as follows:

Evaluation Categories

- *Process:* The student's process of filmmaking is examined as they make their way through multiple stages of the production cycle leading to professional standards. This process is multi-faceted and complex as the student's knowledge and skills grow, starting with basic technical skills moving towards creation (see Figure 2: *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised (2001) in relation to suggested Methods and Tools used to gain access to assessment in film/video production coursework*). At times rubrics are useful in early stages of the examination of processes.

- *Artifacts*: The Artifacts that are produced by the student within the courses are examined: Scripts, Films, Breakdowns, Pitch Packets, Storyboards, Production Reports etc. On the base level, rubrics are used to assess these artifacts for technical formatting and performance. As the student moves forward in a program or course, more discussions and justification of decision making processes are examined while getting to the heart of how the artifact was produced.

- *Behavior*: The behavior of the student is examined through actions and modification to self, attitude and academic/emotional maturity.

- *Performance:* The performance of the student is examined in context of the role that they are assuming at the time. In many cases, this is technically based, as this is the foundation of industry standards. As the student proceeds to mastery of these skills, deeper reflection and examination by both the instructor and student are called upon to reinforce the evolution of performance to artistic creation. (See Figure 2: *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised (2001) in relation to suggested Methods and Tools used to gain access to assessment in film/video production coursework*).

As shown in Figure 3, the application and interpretation is explained using the following example. When examining Problem Solving (*Domain*), the participants suggested that Mistakes, Screenings, Client Work and Review, Discussion, Observation and Internships (*Assessment Keys*) provided access to assessing this "Domain". When furthering the examination of how the participant used Observations (*Assessment Key*) linked to Problem Solving (*Domain*), Figure 3 indicates that the *Evaluation Categories* of Process, Artifacts, Behavior, and Performance are used to produce an assessment.

Summary

In summary, emergent themes were initially divided into three categories: Experience, Methods and Strategies. Within each of these categories, sub themes were then identified and discussed. The category of Experience was comprised of sub themes titled Assessment Aversion, Assessment Embracement and Assessment Challenges.

The sub theme of Assessment Aversion was derived from data that suggested a lack of education with assessment and steep learning curves experienced by participants implementing instructional techniques and assessment practices. Participants suggested looking to educational professionals for advice and structure to overcome this aversion. A student-centered approach to teaching and assessment was also identified as a means to overcome this aversion.

The sub theme of Assessment Embracement was illustrated by the participants' experiences with overcoming assessment aversion which yielded an array of useful benefits. Once participants embraced assessment, value was highlighted in the areas of program management and development, course effectiveness, instructional techniques and departmental goals and actions. Benefits were suggested to be in relation to student learning, as well as clarifying theory to practice and practice to theory. Reflection on one's own assessment was suggested as a way to strengthen the idea of reaching comfort with embracement of assessment.

The final sub theme in regards to the theme category of "Experience" was Assessment Challenges. This sub theme consisted of specific areas that caused incongruence in the acts of assessment in relation to specific domains. The domains that emerged as areas that produced the most challenges with assessment were Life Long Learning, Ethical

Reasoning, Leadership and Creativity. Life Long Learning's specific challenge stemmed

from an unclear definition and understanding of this institutional outcome. Assessment of

Ethical Reasoning and Leadership was challenging due to lack of formal education in these

areas leaving these domains left up to interpretation and definition from instructor to

instructor. Creativity was suggested to amplify the challenge of subjectivity in the

assessment process. However, the participants suggested reframing assessments to

incorporate artistic choices and decision making as a means to access creativity. Mistakes

were also highlighted as an area that was key to assessing creative acts within the production

process. The final area uncovered as evidence of the sub theme of Assessment Challenges

was in regards to *Implicit* and *Explicit* assessments of domains - implicit, meaning a less

structured assessment taking place, versus Explicit, meaning a more intentional action of

assessment is taking place. These two assessment techniques create a challenge of providing

substantial evidence and feedback to the students, yet both are helpful to the instruction

within the classroom.

The theme category of "Methods" was comprised of the sub themes of Rubrics

Limited to Technical Assessment, Various Evaluations Needed and Challenged Areas of

Assessment. The sub theme of Rubrics Limited to Technical Assessment was produced by

data that suggested that rubrics were useful for assessing technical skills. As a student

progresses through a program, higher order thinking skills are then assessed in relation to

some of the suggested domains found in this study. Rubrics tend to lose their utility when

evaluating some of the higher order thinking skills, so the participants turn to alternative

evaluation methods.

The sub theme of Various Evaluations Needed was derived from the movement away from the use of rubrics. These methods of evaluation highlighted from the data were in the form of peer-to-peer evaluations, student-produced reflection papers, client surveys, observations and one-on-one and group discussions. These methods were found useful when assessing domains such as Teamwork, Collaboration, Problem Solving, Creativity and Ethical Reasoning.

The final sub theme in the category of "Methods" was Challenged Areas of Assessment. This sub theme was found to be supported by data that highlighted specific areas participants identified as challenging to assess. This offered key insights into methods used by participants to produce valid assessments. The areas identified as challenging areas of assessment were Creativity, Ethical Reasoning, Life Long Learning and Problem Solving. Participants suggested specific artifacts be examined that produced insight into these domains in question. Portfolio reviews and screenings were also highlighted as activities used in the assessment of these domains.

The final theme category was "Strategies". This category was comprised of the sub themes of Strategies for Assessment Acceptance, Clear Communication to Student in the Process of Assessment and Classroom Strategies for Assessment. Strategies for Assessment Acceptance was a sub theme that was yielded from data that described how participants became more comfortable with the process of assessment. Transformation from previously discussed assessment aversion to full embracement was described in this section. Strategies that were suggested by participants were framing the term "assessment" as a process, due to the comfort level filmmakers have with process-oriented act of producing a film. This embracement of the term as a process was identified as participants described breaking down

complex action in the filmmaking process to individual acts. This scaffold approach to assessment produces more accessibility to assessment and helps create comfort when moving from aversion to acceptance as an instructor. Mistakes were also highlighted as learning opportunities for students in the assessment process.

Clear Communication to Students in the Process of Assessment was a sub theme that was derived from the data. Clear communication was valued in the assessment process, starting with the syllabus. Clear statements with the purpose of assessments can be linked to industry practices, thus creating value to student learning. Learning to articulate assessments clearly to students strengthens the feedback provided to the student.

The final sub theme in regards to "Strategies" was Classroom Strategies for Assessment. The data analyzed in this area suggested that strategies such as starting to provide feedback early in the process as opposed to only upon finished products is more effective for student learning. Strategies such as student contracts, team charters and student-produced rubrics are ways to include the students in the process of assessment. Challenges identified in this emergent category came in the form of having the right assessment tool at the right time, individualized assessments, student's prior knowledge and class size. Other areas of concern in regards to classroom strategies were the lack of specific coursework in areas such as Ethical Reasoning and Leadership, which caused incongruence in evaluation.

In order to clarify the theme categories, sub themes and key insights that were produced by the data, *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001) was applied as a lens to refine the emergent findings. This action was intended to offer greater understanding of the information that was expressed by the unit involved in the study. The application of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001) as a Theoretical Framework yielded more defined descriptions of

this collective group's experience with assessment (see Figure 1). The information was filtered and condensed into statements reflecting how participants described the assessment process in each of the categories of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001): Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyze, Evaluate and Create.

The next step in this refinement was conducted by developing a chart (see Figure 2) that reflects the Methods and Tools that instructors are using to gain access to assessment within each of the categories of *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001). This step resulted in a clarification of how instructional assessment is being conducted as students move from technical-based assignments to more complex work. In addition, this application specified the Methods and Tools being used to gather data in each category suggested by *Bloom's Taxonomy Revised* (2001).

In order to utilize this information to answer the central question of this study, further refinement was conducted. This analysis produced a figure that illustrates the Domains being examined in this study (see Figure 3). Within each Domain, "Assessment Keys" were identified and defined as the techniques, methods, experiences or indicators that the instructors used to uncover and gain access to measurable aspects within the specific Domain. "Evaluation Categories" were found and described in four separate categories: Process, Artifacts, Behaviors and Performance. These "Evaluation Categories" are activities and key aspects that are used in the assessment process reflecting actions, objects and overall student competencies that are derived from and directly used to gauge the linked "Assessment Key".

Implications for Practice

The purpose of this study was to explore assessment strategies that address liberal arts educational outcomes for students studying film and video production. This section illustrates and offers how some of the findings may be implemented to improve the overall education of students in this field of study.

The implications for practice are described in three main areas: (a) implications for administrative leadership; (b) educational experience of instructors in the field; and (c) classroom instruction. It should be pointed out that the results of this study are not meant to be generalized. The findings are specific to the collective unit being studied in this case; however, these instructors' experiences can be used to gain a deeper understanding of the realities instructors engage with from their lived experience with assessment, thus providing a starting point to further the discussion regarding these topics, leading to future studies to be discussed later in this chapter. At this point, it is important to suggest how the data offered by the participants might be interpreted for practice.

Administrative Leadership

The first area cited as an implication for practice is regarding administrative leadership. The implications the study provided in this area suggested that the leadership of programs, departments and institutions need to be aware and possibly implement strategies to improve the culture of assessment. In addition, providing clarity to the expectation of assessment for instructors needs to be implemented by leadership. These implications for administrative practices are critical to the overall effectiveness of the other implications for practice found in this section. The suggested implications for practice from an administrative

perspective are in the form of institutional education opportunities, clarifying goals and outcomes and an awareness of the specific struggles of assessment in this field of study.

Educational workshops and organizational training are ways that participants described they learned about the topic of assessment. Educational leaders need to be aware of the lack of formal training that many of the professionals in this field are equipped with prior to entering the academy. This gap in formal training was pointed out by participants as a key influencer yielding assessment aversion. Institutional leadership may need to incorporate strategies to include fields outside of educational studies in the process of institutional education or trainings. Reframing traditional education concepts to strike a chord with faculty may be a way of lessening the steep learning curve for those lacking this formal education. New wording and highlighting the parallel process of assessment to the film and video industry were a few of the ways that participants suggested to make assessment relevant and useful to novice educators in this field.

Leadership within the institution may also need to reexamine the projected goals and outcomes offered by programs, departments and schools. The data gathered in this collective case study implied that not all institutional goals and outcomes are relevant to courses, programs or departments. In order to alleviate this disconnect from administration to the faculty who are preforming the assessment of such goals and projected outcomes, leadership may need to clarify the definition of these goals. Life Long Learning, Ethical Reasoning, Creativity and Leadership were all indicated as areas that produced confusion and incongruence of the participants' experience with assessment. Administration may need to clarify what the goals of these intended outcomes are or offer more clear definition of these and other domains in context of a liberal arts education.

The final area of implications of practice for administrative leadership is regarding a clearer understanding of the struggles of assessment within this specific field. The study indicated a variety of challenges that exist for education in the area of film and video production. By examining the collective experiences of these participants, educational leaders may gain a better understanding of the specific challenges in the realm of film and video production assessment such as subjectivity and technological advancement, as well as a deeper understanding of professional practices. A clearer understanding of these challenges may help guide leaders when developing solutions at the administrative level.

Educational Experience of Instructors in the Field

The second area of implications for practice is in the area of formal education of the faculty who are teaching in this field of study. The participants in this particular study had a variety of backgrounds regarding education. One of the predominant themes that emerged from this study was the lack of formal education that these faculty members had when it came to the field of educational instruction and assessment. Participants suggested that they were experts in the field of film and video production, but struggled when entering the academy due to a lack of formal education, experience in higher education and the process of acclimating to the classroom environment. This theme was the impetus that spurred the assessment-averse attitude that the data suggested.

This specific implication for practice deals with the formal education of professional educators in the field. Programs that are educating not only industry professionals, but those who also find their way into higher education need to examine how they are teaching these potential instructional professionals. The inclusion of coursework on instructional techniques, assessment, higher educational foundations and program evaluation may have

positive effects on those choosing to enter the academy. Implementing educational offerings in film and video graduate degree programs should be considered. This type of coursework could address and structure film and video education on the assessment process specifically.

This specific study provides evidence that the initial struggle with assessment is lessened by a self-educational process. Potential benefits of this type of coursework being built into a program that is preparing instructors for the classroom would include areas such as student learning, instructional effectiveness and efficiency, as well as departmental success. These potential benefits are applicable and relevant in all three areas of formal education in this field: CTE programs, professional program and liberal arts institutions.

Classroom Instruction

The final area cited as an implication for practice is how this information can be utilized to inform classroom instruction. This inquiry was embedded in the study of assessment of liberal arts outcomes; however, this should not exclude CTE, MFA or professional programs of study in the field of film and video production. The examination of liberal arts in this study was not meant to limit the data. The findings revealed that instructors involved in this study valued the intended outcomes regardless of the type of institution in which they were teaching. However, it should be noted that the institutional goals of CTE or professional programs may not include the goals and outcomes specific to a liberal arts education. This institutional influence may cause a disconnect, or confusion, when interpreting these data in relation to purpose and mission of instruction. Thus, the implications of classroom instruction from this study are in the form of strategies, embracement, and improvement.

Strategies that were found in this study may inform instructional efforts in the classroom. Several tips and techniques for uncovering outcomes challenging to gauge were offered by participants. Suggestions ranged from including the student in the assessment to seeking out professional mentorships and educational opportunities in the area of assessment. Techniques such as recording rehearsals for critiques, weekly reports, reflections and student produced public screenings were a few strategies offered that instructors in this field may find of use when engaging with instruction and assessment.

Embracement of assessment from the point of view of the participants may be useful to instructors who are struggling to make sense of this reality in higher education. The perspectives and experiences that participants offered as they progressed from assessment aversion to embracement also highlighted the usefulness of assessment as a whole. These data can be used to provide a map for others who are struggling with assessment practices. It can also provide assurance that the benefits of assessment, in the case of these participants, outweighed the struggle of finding comfort in the process of assessment.

The final implication of practice for classroom instruction is the overall benefit and opportunity assessment provides for improvement. The findings provided in this study indicated that assessment offers a time for reflection on one's own teaching. Improving of teaching strategies, increasing communication, designing assignments and providing useable feedback were a few of the benefits that participants cited as ways that assessment has affected their teaching. This obviously can affect the learning experience of the students. Participants suggested that a student-centered teaching philosophy not only helped the transformation from assessment aversion to embracement, but also positively affected their own improvement in classroom instruction.

Recommendations for Future Research

The data accessed in this study offer a unique perspective to the assessment process of professional educators in the field of film and video production education. The lack of specific research in the area of film and video production education was highlighted as a rationale for embarking on this research study. As this inquiry has concluded, it has been found that this specific examination has produced new areas of interest. The analysis of the data and discussion sections highlight many areas that are in need of further inquiry. The study of education which focuses narrowly on film and video production in higher education is in its infancy. In order to spur on improvement for student learning in this sphere of education the following areas for future study are being offered.

Instructor Education

As highlighted in the implications for practice, the education of instructors in this field has produced challenges to the overall process of effectiveness and efficiency. This suggests that a study which examines how instructors are being prepared to enter higher education is appropriate. Findings within this type of study may offer insight into strategies to streamline the education process of new faculty. Ultimately, this recommended study would benefit students being educated in film and video production programs by offering data that can help produce more effective and prepared educators in the collegiate environment.

Student Perceptions

This specific study focused on the perceptions of instructors engaging with the assessment of projected liberal arts educational outcomes. This study was focused on those providing instruction and assessment. This only highlights one variable in the exchange of

information. In order to produce a more in depth understanding of the process of assessment

in this field, further investigation needs to be focused on the students receiving this

instruction and assessment. A future longitudinal study of student perceptions as they make

their way through a film and video production program may produce greater understanding

of key educational points in this process. This study suggested that students accept

collaboration and higher order thinking skills assessment with more value as they become

more academically mature. In a future study, this phenomenon could be investigated along

with many other key moments of the students' perceptions and experiences with film and

video production education.

Outcome Production

A study focusing on the process of developing learning outcomes in this field may

produce key insights into clarifying these objectives to the faculty. This study indicated

some confusion and incongruences in assessments produced by specific outcomes being

measured. A further examination of how these outcomes are produced may alleviate some of

this lack of clarity, thus providing more effective and efficient assessment practices for

faculty in the field.

Industry Standards in Relation to Outcomes

A future study which focuses on industry professionals is recommended to provide

structure and relevance to the educational process being offered to students. Relevancy in

terms of skills and competencies in technical areas, as well as the specific relevance of liberal

arts outcomes in the professional field. The reality of industry standards was evident in how

participants expressed their assessment practices. Once removed from industry, instructors

are left to recall specific industry standards from their experiences. Technological changes,

globalization and 21st century industry realities need to be considered when developing and reexamining programs. The inclusion of an industry professional's perspective may offer a more defined checks-and-balances, revealing gaps in the educational process as it pertains to industry, as well highlighting programs' ability to capitalize on existing strengths.

Geographic Setting

Muir's (2013) study suggested that the closer an educational program is situated to an industry epicenter, the more specialized a program's offerings become. The farther away from such industry relevant cities such as New York and Los Angeles, the more programs reflect a generalist educational experience. This geographic influence may affect assessment practices. The replication of this study conducted with limiting factors grouped by geographic setting may provide further data to examine in the realm of assessment. Using geography as a key variable to separate the data sets would give the research a structure for comparison. Findings may suggest not only geographic findings, but industry influences to the assessment process as well.

Leadership and Ethical Reasoning

The final recommended study that this research points to is further investigation of the assessment of Leadership and Ethical Reasoning within the field of film and video production. The findings of this study suggest that participants highly value these domains; however, clarity to the assessment process of these domains was not always present. Ethical Reasoning was more prevalent in institutions that offered specific required coursework in ethics. The inclusion of such coursework offered a foundational experience and educational opportunity for students to better understand ethics as a whole. This type of coursework also offered instructors a starting point for the discussion of the topic of ethics. Again, only two

of the 10 participants worked in programs that required such classes. The other participants were left to implement foundational information and assessments on their own accord.

Leadership was not always assessed by participants. It was found that none of the participants' programs offered nor required coursework in the area of Leadership. This required instructors to make judgments on leadership actions, activities and behaviors based on their own knowledge and interpretation of leadership.

These gaps in the assessment of both Ethical Reasoning and Leadership require further investigation in order to strengthen these areas of assessment. Possible findings may suggest a need for an increase in instructor education on the topics, implementation of ethics and leadership coursework into production programs, or bridging other such gaps in the assessment of these topics. Without further investigation into these topics this is only speculation. However, these areas were highlighted by this study as challenged areas of assessment indicating further investigation is appropriate.

Conclusion

There is a lack of research dedicated to the topic of film and video production education. As technology advances and the cost of equipment recedes, educational programs in film and video production will experience growth, transformation and population. Expanded markets for educated professionals in this field are being sought outside the motion picture industry. Local and globally focused businesses are searching out film and video production specialists with capabilities of branding and telling the story of such organizations. It has been suggested that film and video production consists of the complex processes that incorporate higher order thinking skills. The attainment and refinement of

these types of skills are found in what has been defined as a liberal arts education. With this in mind, it was important to explore the process of how these moving image content producers are being educated with respect to liberal arts educational outcomes.

This specific research was conducted to offer a better understanding of how students are being educated in this field of study. The research focused on the assessment process of instructors measuring specific liberal arts educational outcomes. Challenges and successes with this process were identified from the data. This examination and interpretation of the findings offer a step in the direction of improvement to the learning environment of students studying film and video production. It is important that this research serves as an initial movement for secondary studies to be conducted. As the world becomes more complex and the challenges of the 21st century workplace become a reality, students deserve and require the most relevant educational experiences possible. This charge is not only a goal within the sphere of academic practices, but can be argued that it is the sole purpose.

REFERENCES

Alyesworth, A. (2008). Improving case discussions with an improv mind set. *Journal of Marketing Education, 30*(2), 106-115.

Amer, A. (2006). Reflections on Bloom's revised taxonomy. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, *4*(1), 213-230.

American Colleges and University website. (2015). https://www.aacu.org/leap/what-is-a-liberal-education

Anderson, L.W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.), (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Complete edition). New York, NY: Longman.

Assess. (n.d.). *In Oxford Living Dictionaries online: English*. Retrieved from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/assess

Assessment. (n.d.). *In Oxford living dictionaries online: English*. Retrieved from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/assessment

Barry, A. M. (1997). *Visual intelligence: Perception, image, and manipulation in visual communication.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bennis, W. (2004, March 1). Share the power. *CIO Insight*, Retrieved from: http://www.cioinsight.com/c/a/Past-Opinions/Warren-Bennis-Share-the-Power

Bennis, W., & O'Toole, J. (2005, May 1). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/2005/05/how-business-schools-lost-their-way

Benson, M. (2015, August 13). Liberal arts education: Transferable skills. *Hanford Sentinel*. Retrieved from: http://hanfordsentinel.com/news/opinion/columnists/liberal-arts-education-transferable-skills/article_d5590be8-7e60-5c21-a29c-eb263537b2b2.html)

Berberet, J., & Wong, F. F. (1995). The new American college: A model for liberal learning. *Liberal Education, 81*(1), 48-52.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2011). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook 1: Cognitive domain. New York, NY: David McKay Company.

Bruckman, A., & Caine, K., & Luther, K., & Ziegler K. (Eds.). (2010). Proceedings from the 16th ACM international conference on supporting group work pages 1-10, 2010: *Why it works (when it works): Success factors in online creative collaboration*. New York, NY: ACM Publications.

Bruckman, A., & Luther, K. (Eds.). (2008). Proceedings from the 2008 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work pages 343-352, 2008: *Leadership in online creative collaboration*. New York, NY: ACM Publications.

Brutus, S., Aguinis, H., & Wassmer, U**.** (2013). Self-reported limitations and future directions in scholarly reports: Analysis and recommendations. *Journal of Management, 39,* 48-75.

Churches, A. (2008). Bloom's taxonomy blooms digitally. *Tech & Learning*, *1*, 1-6.

Cieply, M. (2011, July 4). For film graduates: An altered job picture. *New York Times*. p. 1. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/05/movies/film-school-graduates-job-prospects-at-usc-nyu-ucla.html?_r=0

Clinton, G., & Hokanson, B. (2012). Creativity in the training and practice of instructional designers: The Design/Creativity Loops model. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *60*(1), 111-130. doi:10.1007/s11423-011-9216-3

Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (2004). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. J. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London, U.K: Sage.

DeCusatis, C. (2008). Creating, growing and sustaining efficient innovation teams. *Creativity and innovation management, 17*(2), 155-164. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8691.2008.00478.x

Domik, G. (2012). Fostering Collaboration and Self-Motivated Learning: *Best practices in a one-semester visualization course. IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications, 32*(1), 87-91.

Drucker, P. F. (2008). *Management Rev Ed*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Drucker, P. F. (2009). *Managing in a time of great change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Dunhill, M., & O'Brien, T. (2004, April, 1). Collaborative art practice and the fine art curriculum. Retrieved from http://collabarts.org/?p=205

Erikssona, P., & Swenberga, T. (2012). Creative space in contemporary Swedish moving image production. *Journal of Integrated Design & Process Science*, *16*(4), 55-72. doi: 10.3233/jid-2012-0003

Esterberg, K. G. (2002). *Qualitative methods in social research.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Eteläpelto, A., & Lahti, J. (2008). The resources and obstacles of creative collaboration in a long-term learning community. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 3*(3), 226–240.

Forsyth, D. (2006). *Group dynamics.* Belmont, CA: Thomas Higher Education.

Forehand, M. (2010). Bloom's taxonomy. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology* (pp. *41*-47). Zurich, Switzerland: Jacobs Foundation, The Global Text Project. Retrieved from http://www.palieducationsociety.org/images/ebooks%20(13).pdf

Fort, A. (2011). Learning about learning outcomes: A liberal arts professor assesses. *Liberal Education, 97*(1). Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/publicationsresearch/ periodicals/learning-about-learning-outcomes-liberal-arts-professor-assesses

Friend, J. (2013). UCEA 2012 Convention Film Festival dialogue: Three big ideas for utilizing video in educational leadership preparation programs. UCEA Review, 54(1), 43-44.

The Glossary of Educational Reform website. (2016). Retrieved from http://edglossary.org/assessment/

Grace, N. M., Andereck, B., & Ford, T. (2008). Assessing creative and critical thinking pedagogy in the liberal arts. *A Collection of Papers on Self-Study and Institutional Improvement, 2*(3). Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.515.7722&rep=rep1&type =pdf

Gray, D. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Grasgreen, A. (December 13, 2013). Aggie Journalism Revival. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/13/ten-years-after-cutting-it-texas-am-will-revive-journalism-program

Glyer, D., & Weeks, D. L. (1998). Liberal education: Initiating the conversation. In D. Glyer & D. L. Weeks (Eds.), *The liberal arts in higher education* (pp. ix-xxix). New York, NY: University Press of America, Inc.

Weeks, P. (2009). Designing and implementing a PBL course on educational digital video production: lessons learned from a design-based research. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 57*(2), 211-228. doi:10.1007/s11423-007-9039-4

Hakkarainen, P., Saarelainen, T., & Ruokamo, H. (2007). Towards meaningful learning through digital video-supported case-based teaching. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 23*(1), 87-109.

Hardin, T. (2009). Notes on collaboration: Assessing student behaviors. *Journal of Film &Video*, 61(1), pp. 31-50.

Hart Research Associates. (2013). *It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success. An online survey among employers conducted on behalf of The Association of American Colleges and Universities.* Washington, DC: Author.

Hilton, G. (2007). Students representing mathematical knowledge through digital filmmaking. In *Mathematics: Essential Research, Essential Practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 382-391). Adelaide, Australia: MERGA, Inc.

Hobbs, R. (2005) Strengthening media education in the twenty-first Century: Opportunities for the State of Pennsylvania. *Arts Education Policy Review, 106*(4), 13-23, doi:10.3200/AEPR.106.4.13-24

Hodge, C. (2009). Film collaboration and creative conflict. *Journal of Film & Video, 61*(1), 18-30.

Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hu, S., Scheuch, K., Schwartz, R. A., Gayles, J. G., & Li, S. (2008). *Reinventing undergraduate education: engaging college students in research and creative activities.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1002/aehe.3304

Hung, V. H. K., Keppell, M., & Jong, M. S. Y. (2004). Learners as producers: Using project based learning to enhance meaningful learning through digital video production (Electronic version). In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer, & R. Phillips (Eds.), Beyond the comfort zone: *Proceedings of the 21st ASCILITE conference* (pp. 428-436). Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education.

Huitt, W. (2011). Bloom et al.'s taxonomy of the cognitive domain. *Educational Psychology Interactive.* Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/cognition/bloom.html

Johnson, T. (1991). Double-edged diploma. *American Film, 16*(7), 36.

Jones, C., & DeFillippi, R. J. (1996). Back to the future in film: Combining industry and self-knowledge to meet the career challenges of the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive, 10*(4), 89-103.

Kearney, M., Roberts, L., & Jones, G. (2012). An emerging learning design for student-generated "iVideos". *Teaching English with Technology, 2*, 103. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10453/19396

Kearney, M. (2011). A learning design for student-generated digital storytelling. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *36*(2), 169-188. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17439884.2011.553623

King, P. M., Brown, M. K., Lindsay, N. K., & Vanhecke, J. R. (2007). Liberal arts student learning outcomes: An integrated approach. *About Campus, 12*: 2–9. doi:10.1002/abc.222

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41*(4), 212-218.

Lattuca, L., & Stark J. (2009). *Shaping the college curriculum*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lehrer, J. (2011, October 7) Steve Jobs: "Technology Alone Is Not Enough." Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/steve-jobs-technology-alone-is-not-enough

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1994). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. In J. S. Stark & A. Thomas (Eds.), Assessment and program evaluation: An Ashe reader. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Maki, P. (2002). Developing an assessment plan to learn about student learning. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 28,* 8-13.

Marshall, C. (1990). Goodness-criteria: Are they objective judgement calls? In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 188-197). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McNutt, M. (2014, September 14). There is value in liberal arts education, employers say: Return on investment may be less obvious, but hiring managers seek liberal arts-related skills. *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved from: http://www.usnews.com/news/college-of-tomorrow/articles/2014/09/22/there-is-value-in-liberal-arts-education-employers-say?page=2

Merriam, S. B., & Associates (Ed.). (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 1-19.

Muir, P. (2013). *From script to screen to syllabus: The path to curriculum design for undergraduate film production programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Lansing: Western Michigan University.

Mynatt, E. D., Nakakoji, K., Terry, M.A., & Yamamoto, Y. (2004): Variation in element and action: supporting simultaneous development of alternative soluti. In: Dykstra-Erickson, Elizabeth, Tscheligi, Manfred (eds.) Proceedings of ACM CHI 2004 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems April 24-29, 2004, Vienna, Austria. pp. 711-718. http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/985692.985782

National Commission on the Future of Higher Education. (2006). A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Noble, T. (2004). Integrating the revised Bloom's taxonomy with multiple intelligences: A planning tool for curriculum differentiation. *Teachers College Record*, *106*(1), 193-211.

Pawlak, D.A. (2011). Bringing up Oscar: The story of the men and women who founded the academy. New York, NY: Pegasus Books.

Pickard, M. J. (2007). The new Bloom's taxonomy: An overview for family and consumer sciences. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, *25*(1), 45-55.

P21: Partnership for 21st Century Learning website. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.p21.org

Runco, M. A. (2010). Divergent thinking, creativity, and ideation. *Cambridge handbook of creativity*, 414-446.

Sabal, R. (2001). Teaching media. *Journal of Film and Media, 53*(1), 3.

Spanbroek, N. (2010). Strategic teaching: Student learning through working the process. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, *29*(2), 111-120.

Speck, B. (2003, Fall). Fostering collaboration among students in problem-based learning. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 95, 59-65.

Svitil, T. (1990). Pop quiz. *American Film, 15*(11), 38.

Tatebe, N. (2011). *What's sex got to do with it? Gender and collaborative learning in digital filmmaking projects* (Master's thesis), Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Concordia University). Retrieved from http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/7627/

Theodosakis, N. (2002). How digital filmmaking develops higher-order thinking skills. *Virginia Society for Technology in Education Journal*, *16*(2), 21-24.

Thomas, E. & Magilvy, J. K. (2011). Qualitative rigor or research validity in qualitative research. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing, 16,* 151-155.

Tomasulo, F. P. (2008). You can play mathematical equations on the violin!: Quantifying artistic learning outcomes for assessment purposes. *Journal of Film and Video*, *60*(3-4), 115-121.

Wagner, T. (2012, April). Calling all innovators. *Educational Leadership,* 69(7), 66-69.

Wagner, D. L. (1983). The seven liberal arts and classical scholarship. In D. Wagner (Ed.), *The seven liberal arts in the middle ages* (pp. 1-31). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

APPENDIX A. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPROVAL

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Institutional Review Board
Office for Responsible Research
Vice President for Research
1138 Pearson Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2207
515 294-4566
FAX 515 294-4267

DATE: **6/24/2016**

TO: Troy McKay   CC: Dr. Robert D Reason
4325 Woodland St   N243 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, IA, 50014

FROM: Office for Responsible Research

TITLE: A Liberal Arts Education In Film Production: A study of instructional assessment of student film projects

IRB ID: **16-171**

Approval Date:	6/23/2016	**Date for Continuing Review:**	6/22/2-18
Submission Type:	New	**Review Type:**	Expedited

The project referenced above has received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University according to the dates shown above. Please refer to the IRB ID number shown above in all correspondence regarding this study.

To ensure compliance with federal regulations in (45 CFR 46 & 21 CFR 56), please be sure to:

- **Use only the approved study materials in your research, including the recruitment materials and informed consent documents that have the IRB approval stamp**.

- **Retain signed informed consent documents for 3 years after the close of the study**, when documented consent is required.

- **Obtain IRB approval prior to implementing <u>any</u> changes** to the study by submitting a Modification Form for Non-Exempt Research or Amendment for Personnel Changes form, as necessary.

- **Immediately inform the IRB of (1) all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences** involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) **any other unanticipated problems involving risks** to subjects or others.

- **Stop all research activity if IRB approval lapses**, unless continuation is necessary to prevent harm to research participants. Research activity can resume once IRB approval is reestablished.

- **Complete a new continuing review form** at least three to four weeks prior to the **date for continuing review** as noted above to provide sufficient time for the IRB to review and approve continuation of the study. We will send a courtesy reminder as this date approaches.

Please be aware that IRB approval means that you have met the requirements of federal regulation and ISU policies governing human subjects research. **Approval from other entities may also be needed.** For example, access to data from private records (e.g. student, medical, or employment records, etc.) that are by FERPA, HIPAA, or other confidentiality policies requires permission from the holders of those records. Similarly, for research conducted in institutions other than ISU (e.g., schools, other colleges or universities, medical facilities, companies, etc.), investigators must obtain permission from the institution(s) as required by their policies. **IRB approval in no way implies or guarantees that permission from these other entities will be granted.**

Upon completion of the project, please submit a Project Closure Form to the Office for Responsible Research, 202 Kingland, to officially close the project.

Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have questions or concerns at 515-294-4566 or IRB@iastate.edu.

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL AND PROMPTS

Interview Protocols

A Liberal Arts Education in Film Production: A study of instructional assessment of student film projects

---

Interview #1

The first interview is also the first official meeting (via Skype, FaceTime etc) between the researcher and the participant. The purpose of the interview is to gain trust and establish a relationship between the participant and the researcher.   Information will also be acquired regarding their perceptions of their experience with assessment of liberal arts outcomes of film/video production students. The conversation will focus on three main areas of inquiry. These areas are Foundations, Liberal Arts, and the 4C's (Critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity). During this interview, participants will be asked to provide the researcher with personal documents used in the assessment process such as; Rubrics, Syllabi, Course Outlines and Assignment Sheets.

Foundations:

The first line of questioning will be considered foundational. The goal in the foundational questioning is to gain insight into the participant's perceptions and experiences with the act of assessment in a professional capacity.

Questions:

1. How do you define assessment?
2. What role does assessment play in your teaching philosophy?
3. Describe the challenges you face with assessment?
4. Describe the successes you have experienced with assessment?
5. How have you improved your assessment process?

Prompts:

Prompt participants to elicit explanation of their relationship with assessment as an educator, focusing on how they plan to engage in assessment, and how they value assessment. How do they describe what worked in successful assessments? Are there specific processes that they have built upon to improve their assessment? And are there gaps or hindrances that nullify their assessment practices?

Liberal Arts:

The second area of questioning will focus specifically on participant's perceptions and experiences with the act of assessing specific skills linked to liberal arts outcomes.

Questions:

6. Explain how you assess written and oral communication?
7. Explain how you assess leadership?

8. Explain how you assess teamwork?
9. Explain how you assess ethical reasoning?
10. Explain how you assess life long learning?

Prompts:

Prompt participants to explain their relationship with assessment as an educator, detailing how they engage in assessment, and how they value assessment in the specific context of the questions. How do they describe what worked in successful assessments? Are there specific processes that they have built upon to improve their assessment? What are their challenges in this contextual assessment? And are there gaps or hindrances that nullify their assessment practices?

4C's

The third area of questioning will focus on what has been coined the "4C's". Critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity. These skills have been identified as crucial for meeting the needs of the 21st Century work environment.

Questions:

1. Explain how you assess critical thinking and problem solving?
2. Explain how you assess communication?
3. Explain how you assess collaboration?
4. Explain how you assess creativity and innovation?
5. What tips and/or tools can you provide to help better understand your process with assessing these domains?

Prompts:

Prompt participants to explain of their relationship with assessment as an educator, focusing on how they determine the strategies to follow as they engage in assessment, and how they value assessment in the specific context of the questions. How do they describe what worked in successful assessments? Are there specific processes that they have used to improve their assessment? What are their challenges in this contextual assessment? And are there gaps or hindrances that nullify their assessment practices?

Interview #2

The purpose of the second interview is to allow the participants to further explain their thinking, reasoning, and rationale from the previous interview. Conversation will focus on the participant's responses from the initial interview and clarifying any misinterpretations of what they have provided as responses. This interview will also serve as a time for gathering any information the participants would like to add as a follow up to the initial interview. This will give participants a chance to add to their initial responses after they have had additional time to reflect upon the first interview.

Questions:

1. In our first interview you stated _____ in regards to _____. Would you please elaborate on this?
2. After having some time to reflect upon our first interview, is there anything you would like to add to your responses?
3. Is there is new information you would like to add to the record of your responses?

Prompt:

Prompt participants to provide additional information about their relationship with assessment as an educator. Prompt participants to offer reflection of their initials responses and clarify any misinterpretations. Focus on the process used to engage in assessment and how they value assessment in the specific context of liberal arts outcomes. How do they describe what worked in successful assessments? Are there specific processes that they have built upon to improve their assessment? What are their challenges in this contextual assessment? And are there gaps or hindrances that nullify their assessment practices?

Closing:

Thank the participants for their work and insights provided for this study. Discuss next steps to the study and ask the participant if they have any questions about the next step. Encourage the participant to be in contact by email or phone if they have any questions or concerns.

APPENDIX C. INFORMED CONSENT AND PARTICIPANT COMMUNICATION

Informed Consent Document

Title of Study: A Liberal Arts Education in Film Production: A study of instructional assessment of student film projects

Investigators: Troy McKay, School of Education, Iowa State University

This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Robert Reason.

This form describes a research project. It has information to help you decide whether you wish to participate. This research study will only include people who choose to take part—your participation is completely voluntary. Please discuss any questions you have about the study or about this form with the project staff before deciding to participate.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to identify assessment strategies that address liberal arts educational outcomes for students in digital film and video production programs.   This study will discover emerging themes in assessment to serve the education of digital film and video production students with respect to learner needs as well as industry demands and requirements.

You are being invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as a professional educator of film/video production students in an institution of higher education. Your expertise with assessing student work in this specific field is beneficial to the central purpose of this study. Your expertise will provide the data to better understand how assessing student work related to liberal arts outcomes is being conducted. You should not participate if under the age of 18 and/or you are not assessing liberal arts outcomes in film/video production students.

Description of Procedures

If you agree to participate in this study, you may be selected to participant in two individual interviews.

1. *Interview one* will focus on exploring your experiences with assessing film and video production students, how liberal arts outcomes are being assessed in your students, and specifically how you are assessing creativity, collaboration and leadership skills in your students. The first interview will last no longer than one (1) hour and 30 minutes. During this interview you may be asked to provide documents that you use in the assessment process. Documents may include assessment tools, rubrics, syllabi, assignment sheets etc.

2. *Interview two* will focus on clarifying your initial responses and gathering any information you would like to add as a follow up to the initial interview. This will give you a chance to add to your initial responses after you have had more time to reflect upon the first interview. The second interview will last no longer than one (1) hour and 30 minutes.

   Each of these interviews will be digitally recorded for the purpose of transcription. The interviews, transcription and documents analysis will be confidential. None of the

transcriptions, recorded interviews or collected documents will be made available to anyone other than the investigator or contracted transcriptions services. All contracted transcription services have signed a confidentiality agreement. All materials will be coded with terms, names and titles that will protect the identity of the participant. For further information on confidentiality, please refer to the Confidentiality section in this document.

I understand that participation in this study includes initial screening questions with the possibility of being selected for two individual interviews. I also understand that I may be asked to share personal assessment tools and documents used in the student assessment process.

Risks or Discomforts

There are minimal personal risks by participating in this study. You may encounter discomfort when answering questions regarding your personal assessment procedures. You may feel that certain topics or domains are not being properly evaluated. The purpose of this study is not to make judgments, but have a better understanding of how assessment is being conducted in your classroom. If you feel discomfort with certain questions you may skip the questions that are causing the discomfort. Also, you may stop the questioning at any time. You may also ask me to omit certain information if you disclose information that you feel may put you at risk or cause future discomfort. If you are selected to participate in the interview process, you will have the option to read and edit your transcribed interviews after data collection is completed.

Benefits

There is no cost involved for participating in this study. There will be no compensation to you directly for your participation. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will generally benefit higher education, and specifically film/video production education. These benefits will be derived from providing information to educators on the role of assessment of liberal arts outcomes in the educational process.

Costs and Compensation

There are no costs involved to the participants in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Participant Rights

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. You may choose to withhold any sensitive documents that may be requested of you during this study. If you have any questions *about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury*, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

Confidentiality

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory

agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy study records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: Communication with participants will take place via email using the Principle Investigator (PI), Troy McKay's Iowa State email account. Participants will be provided with both the PI's Iowa State email address as well as his personal cell number via the informed consent document. Both the email account and cell phone are password protected and only accessible by the PI. Original copies of the informed consent will be kept in the PI's home office in a locked filing cabinet.

The individual interviews will take place via a mutually agreed upon technology (phone, skype, facetime). If at anytime the participant feels uncomfortable with the location of the interview, we will stop the interview immediately.

Data (transcriptions, field notes, research memos, etc.) will be stripped of any identifying information and stored: (1) in hard copy in a locked home filing cabinet that only the PI has access to; (2) in electronic copy on an encrypted hard drive protected by password and stored in the same locked filing cabinet in the researcher's home that only the PI has access to.

The transcriptionists employed for this study, Rev.com, will have temporary access to the inteview data via the audio recordings. The PI will upload the audio recordings to the Rev.com website. All data files are securely stored and transmitted using 128-bit SSL encryption (the highest level of security available). Once Rev.com has transcribed the data, an electronic version of the transcription will be available for download from the Rev.com site using the same 128-bit SSL encryption. The PI will then store the electronic version of the transcription on their personal password protected hardrive. Once the electronic version of the transcriptions have been stored by the PI, the PI will email Rev.com and ask that all files be deleted.

When the results are published, the PI will not use your real name, the name of your courses, department, institution, or assignment being assessed. The PI will use pseudonyms instead.

Please note that while I will take measures to protect your identity as a participant in this study, it is possible that someone may be able to determine your identity through a description of the study context, setting or responses.

Questions

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information *about the study,* contact Troy McKay at tdmckay@iastate.edu or (818) 634-8756. Or Dr. Robert Reason at rreason@iastate.edu.

Consent and Authorization Provisions

After reading this document and continuing with the screening portion of this study, you are agreeing to voluntarily participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. Your continued participation in this study will act as your informed consent. Please keep a copy of this informed consent document for your records.

1ˢᵗ Recruitment Email

Liberal Arts Film and Video Production Dissertation Project, Iowa State University

Dear_____,

My name is Troy McKay, and I am a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Iowa State University (ISU).

I am conducting a study to understand how assessment of liberal arts outcomes is being conducted in a university or college film/video production program. This study has been approved by ISU's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The purpose of this email it to recruit participants for this study. Since this project deals with the instructional assessment process, it is extremely important to collect information from instructors.

I have attached a document under the titled of "Informed Consent Form". It details everything about the research I will be conducting. Both the risks and benefits of participation in the study are discussed.

After reading the "Informed Consent Document", please decide if you are willing to participate in this study. If you are willing to participate, please email be back so I can send you more information about the study and process.

Also, if for any reason you would like to communicate through an alternative email address, please provide it with your response. I will continue to be communicating with you by email throughout the project.

Thank you for your consideration and participation in this research. If you have any questions or concerns about the study, please email me at tdmckay@iastate.edu, or call me at 818-634-8756. Please know I will keep your questions or concerns confidential.

Please email within one (1) week so I can address any issues in a timely fashion.

Within two (2) weeks I will be contacting a group of selected participants to ask for further participation in this study. At that time more specific details about participation will be outlined.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Troy McKay
Iowa State University
tdmckay@iastate.edu

2ⁿᵈ Interview Letter

Dear _____,

I hope you are having or had a great Thanksgiving break.

I am writing to you in order to schedule the second of our two interviews for my dissertation research. As a reminder this interview will likely require less time than the first interview. I am estimating at most, a total 45 minutes of your time will be required.

The purpose of this interview is to clarify any statements, emerging themes or new questions that our first interview has produced. It is also a chance for you to add any information that you may like to the topic of assessing liberal arts outcomes. Or you may strike any comment or information from our initial discussion.

I have attached the transcripts of our initial conversation for your review.

Again, the purpose of this final interview is to gain clarification on existing information or gain any new insights that you may have to offer since our last discussion.

Once this process is complete and this new data is coded I will be able to start uncovering the findings and begin writing the final chapters of this research project. I'm very excited about the rich data that you and the other participants have provided. My goal is to have these interview completed by the end of the 2016 calendar year. I realize that finals and Christmas break will snowball into this deadline, however I can be very flexible on being available for times that work for you.

Can you please email me with a few dates and times that will work for you to conduct this follow up interview?

Thanks again for your active participation in this project. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Troy McKay
Iowa State University

Clarification of Terms

First of all, I would like to thank you again for your time and dedication to this particular project. I am very excited to speak with you in regards to the specific topic of instructional assessment of liberal arts outcomes within the context of a film/video production curriculum.

Before we get started with the interview portion of the study, I feel it necessary to establish a clear understanding of two specific terms that are central to the line of questioning. These terms are "assessment" and "liberal arts outcomes".

Clarification of terms will provide more consistency to the study. It is also important for you to understand the nature of the questions to better inform your answers. The data that I will be collecting from you is instrumental to this study. If there are any further clarifications you may need with any terminology or processes, please do not hesitate to contact me at tdmckay@iastate.edu or 818-634-8756.

Assessment

The first term that needs to be clarified is "assessment". There are many reasons why we assess in higher education. These reasons tend to drive the definition of assessment within specific contexts. This, in turn, produces many different definitions and understandings of the word. At this point, I am not providing a definition of assessment, as my intention is to extract your own perceptions about assessment in the specific context of film/video production curriculums. However, I will offer clarification about the nature of assessment framed by this study.

This particular research project finds itself rooted in the context of curriculum development. Lisa Lattuca and Joan Stark (2009) have written extensively on the topic of curriculum development and its relationship with assessing student outcomes. These researchers have developed the following rationale behind this type of assessment:

TABLE 8.1 REASONS FOR ASSESSING STUDENT OUTCOMES
- To guide student progress
- To improve course planning, program planning, and teaching
- To provide a vehicle for faculty dialogue
- To help students understand the purpose of their educational activities
- To demonstrate accountability
- To enhance public relations
- To reward (or not reward) instructors
- To gain theoretical understanding about how students change and develop
(p. 253)

The Process of Assessment Clarified

Now that the reasons for assessing have been established, the *process* of assessment needs to be clarified. For this project, I want your own experiences and understanding of assessment to be

present within the data. However, I would like to clarify the specific process of assessment when applied to assessing outcomes. My intention of this clarification is to better frame our conversation and ensure we are indeed speaking about the process of assessment in the same context from participant to participant.

For this reason, Latucca and Stark's (2009) definition of Assessment (Goal-Focused Evaluation) will be used to define the *process* of assessment.

"Assessment is a four-step empirical method of determining the demonstrable intended outcomes of student learning. It includes: (a) establishing clear objectives, (b) developing assessment tools, (c) obtaining the desired information, and (d) interpreting the congruence between achievement and objectives" (Latucca and Stark, 2009, p. 234).

Clarification of Liberal Arts Outcomes
The reasons to assess and the process of assessment have now been established. Next, I need to clarify specifically what we are looking to explore within our interview session. Liberal arts outcomes are usually defined at the organizational level in higher education. These outcomes can differ from institution to institution. During our interview sessions, you will be questioned on areas that have been linked to my current literature review of this topic. These areas are:

- Written and Oral Communication
- Leadership
- Teamwork
- Ethical Reasoning
- Life Long Learning

The 4 C's
The second area of questioning in regards to liberal arts outcomes is derived from the work completed by the P21: The Partnership for 21st Century Learning. This organization has coined the phrase the "4 C's", referring to specific skills that have been identified as crucial for meeting the needs of the 21st century work environment. These areas are:

- Critical thinking
- Communication
- Collaboration
- Creativity

This concludes the areas of clarification of terms. Please contact me if you are in need of further clarification. I am very eager to speak with you and to begin gathering data on this specific topic. The interview session will consist of open ended question in regards to these areas of interest. I am excited to tap into your own experience in regards to assessment with these specific outcomes. Again, I thank you for your time and look forward to our conversation.

Sincerely,
Troy McKay