Context

Date	2023-2024 Academic Year	**Time**	6 ECTS course distributed in 15 weeks (150 h). · On-site teaching: 40 h. · Self-directed work: 80 h. · Mentoring: 30 h.
Faculty	Faculty of Information & Audiovisual Media	**Educational programme**	BA in Audio-visual Communication Studies
Course	Audio-visual Project	**Cohort**	N/A
No. participants on location	N/A	**No. participants online**	N/A
Teacher(s) (incl. TA etc.) needed	4		
Room	On-campus		

Lesson plan

Subject of the lesson
Re-designing an existing course to transform it into Challenge-Based Learning (CBL). A practical experience already carried out at UB within the BA in Audio-visual Communication Studies (Faculty of Information & Audiovisual Media).
Targetgroup(s)
University teachers interested in boosting in-classroom pedagogy.
Learning outcomes
Through this practical example, readers would be able to: · Understand and apply CBL transformation to existing courses within educational programmes they are involved in.   · Design and facilitate CBL projects.   · Develop assessment strategies to measure student learning and progress in CBL courses.   · Introduce a transdisciplinary approach to their courses.   **Context**   BA in Audio-visual Communication Studies (Faculty of Information & Audiovisual Media, UB). Course: Audio-visual Project.   Usually taken by students in the 4th year's 1st semester. 6 ECTS, distributed in 15 weeks. Originally, undertaken as a self-guided course in which groups of students develop an audio-visual project of their choice, guided by a mentor. Students' evaluation suggested that a transformation was needed, towards a course that helps students develop professional skills, working with real cases closer to social stakeholders.

Re-designing the Course

The course is re-designed in 2022-2023 and transformed into CBL. New course is launched in the 2023-2024 academic year.

Re-definition of the course follows the principles below:

· Students should work on real challenges suggested by social stakeholders.
· Social stakeholders should be non-profit stakeholders: mainly Civil Society Organisations.
· Students, through their work with the social stakeholder, should improve their negotiation, mediation, and public presentation skills.
· Students should work in groups formed according to their skills and not their personal preferences, simulating a professional context.
· Teaching methods should combine on-site teaching with self-directed work and mentoring.

New course main structure:

· 40 hours of on-site teaching (distributed in 10 sessions of 4 hours, consisting on practical workshops that guided students in the process of reaching stakeholders, defining challenges with them, transforming challenges into an audio-visual project, and the execution of the project).
· 80 hours of self-directed work.
· 30 hours of mentoring.

New course detailed schedule:

· Week 1: CBL methodology presentation, group formation according to skills.
· Week 2: How to communicate and negotiate with customers and Civil Society Organisation (CSO), conflict resolution.
· Week 3: From challenge to project: how to write a professional dossier.
· *Week 4 and 5: groups of students look for CSO and define challenges.*
· Week 6: From challenge to script: how to translate ideas into an audio-visual piece.
· Week 7: Legal aspects of audio-visual production for CSOs.
· Week 8: Technical aspects of audio-visual production.
· Week 9: Pre-production aspects: budgeting, personnel costs and shooting locations.
· *Week 10, 11, 12: Production, shootings, and first edition cuts.*
· Week 13: Post-production aspects.
· Week 14: Dissemination and marketing issues for CSOs.
· Week 15: Oral communication skills to pitch audio-visual projects.

Assessing the Students

The course is evaluated by an independent assessment committee composed of four teachers who follow the groups and provide feedback on their outputs.

Main Outputs:
- **Professional Dossier**: Students submit this in two stages—after defining the challenge and upon delivering the audio-visual product.
- **Audio-Visual Piece**
- **Final Pitch**: At the end of the course, groups present their audio-visual outputs. Each output has a specific weight in the final score:
  - Dossier and Pitch: 30%
  - Audio-Visual Output: 40%

Course Evaluation after First Experience

Course ran from September 2023 to January 2024. In March 2024, once the students' assessment period finalised, the group of teachers made an evaluation workshop to analyse: final scores, satisfaction surveys, their own experiences teaching the course.

Evaluation process main results:

· *Did the formation of groups work well? Difficulties? What worked better and what worse?*
Group of students that have been working together for 4 years, so not letting them make the groups but assigning them to a group according to their skills was a bit challenging at first, but then all the groups worked very well. The fact of not being "friends" makes them take the group work more seriously and in a professional way.

· *Did the distribution of classes work well? Any arrangements for next year?*
Hard for the teachers to follow the projects if they only guided the students in their workshop. Should include an extra session in which groups pitch their challenges to which all the teachers and assessors attend. This way, all teachers will know better the challenges and there is no need to explain every workshop the challenges and projects. Need to remove one workshop to introduce this mid-term pitch.

· *Did the students contact NGOs in a satisfactory way? Were the challenges they collected suitable for the course? How did we help them to adapt the challenges to the needs of the course?*
The work with NGOs and the groups was quite close and they had to negotiate with them. This is positive because learning objectives of the course include those students learn how to deal with real case scenarios.

· *Did the final audiovisual projects respond to the needs of the challenges suggested? How was the final presentation of the projects?*
In the final pitch, the groups explained how the challenge is reflected in the final audiovisual project, and they also explained the adaptation process in the dossier. But we need also to know the perspective from the NGOs. The general feeling is students were nervous and little natural. For the pitch, not all the members presented, but only 2: they could choose 1 member, and the other was assigned randomly.

· *How did the assessment committee work? Did they have the feeling of being independent?*
The audiovisual project should be assessed according to the objectives that the NGO's challenge requested, not only regarding visual quality. The committee should re-define the rubrics they use to assess the audio-visual pieces. The committee also believes that somehow the NGOs should be part of the evaluation process. Knowing that it might be difficult for them to read the dossiers or make them attend the final pitch, a questionnaire could be prepared for them to fill out with a brief evaluation of the group. The committee thinks that the evaluation scores should be reevaluated: dossier should be 35%, 40% the audiovisual piece, 25% pitch.

· *General evaluation/feedback/comments received by the students?*
Some groups complain because they don't have the same conditions as the challenges are very different. Some instructions (minimum and maximum length, format, etc.) should be given so that all groups are in similar conditions.

Assessment criteria	Assessment instruments
N/A	N/A

Participant activities
N/A

Teacher activities
N/A