

Digital Game Creation MIT

Educate professionals in digital game development.

Mission Statement (Full Description):

This program's mission is to educate and train professional and future leaders in digital game development.

Does your program offer courses at an off-campus instructional site (not at SMU Dallas campus)?:

No

Does your program offer courses through distance education technology (e.g., asynchronous, synchronous, or both)?:

No

During which academic year were students first enrolled in this program?:

AY2023-2024

Progress:

Complete

MIT - Digital Game Creation

Step 1A: SLO Number:

1

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Student will be able to create a digital game.

Step 2A: Measure:

PLO #1 Measure: The digital game is assessed at the end of Semester 4 with the Capstone course game submission.

Work Ethic (Individual)	1	2	3	4	5
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Commented [SS1]: Very good report. It could benefit from adding more details to the SLOs, integrating the elements described in the measures and targets into the SLO definitions. And integrating the information from the SLO in the mission Statement

Commented [SS2]: Strengths
Focus on Professional and Leadership Training: The mission statement highlights an emphasis on preparing “professional and future leaders,” indicating a focus on career and leadership readiness.
Clear Industry Focus: The statement’s focus on “digital game development” provides clarity about the specific industry alignment of the program.

Suggestions for Improvement
1.Specify Learning Objectives: Adding specific skills or knowledge areas related to digital game development (e.g., design, programming, production) would make the mission more robust.
2.Mention Program Structure or Approach: Highlight unique program elements, like hands-on projects, access to industry-standard technology, or industry partnerships, to distinguish the program’s educational approach.
3.Incorporate Broader Goals or Industry Impact: Including broader goals such as fostering innovation, promoting ethical practices, or contributing to the gaming industry’s development would add depth and align with institutional and professional values.

Mission Statement Template:
The mission of the Master of Interactive Technology (MIT) in Digital Game Creation is to educate and train professionals and future leaders in digital game development. Through [unique program structure or approach, e.g., project-based learning, partnerships with leading gaming studios, hands-on experience with industry-standard technology], students will gain expertise in [specific skills or competencies, e.g., game design, programming, project management, and user experience]. The program also emphasizes [broader goals or values, e.g., fostering innovation, promoting ethical responsibility, and contributing to the advancement of the digital gaming industry].

Commented [SS3]: Suggested Template
Students will demonstrate [proficiency or expertise] in [specific focus area, e.g., game design, programming, visual storytelling, project management, user experience] by [key tasks or activities, e.g., using industry-standard tools, solving complex problems, collaborating with peers, iterating based on feedback]. This will prepare them to [intended outcome, e.g., meet industry standards, contribute effectively to game development projects, or succeed in professional roles].

Focuses on the task and what needs to be done. Very self-directed.	Very seldom	Seldom	Neutral	Usually	Always
--	-------------	--------	---------	---------	--------

Work Quality (Individual)	1	2	3	4	5
Work reflects this student's best efforts.	Very seldom	Seldom	Neutral	Usually	Always

Game Enjoyment (Final Product)	1	2	3	4	5
Game is enjoyable.	No enjoyment	Lacking much enjoyment	Equal parts of enjoyment and no enjoyment	Mostly enjoyable	Very enjoyable

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):

Capstone project, Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

PLO #1 Target: 80% of students should score a 3 or greater on the contribution and the cross-disciplinary team game quality on a five-point Likert scale.

Note: If the number of students enrolled in the program is under 5 students, "no more than 1 student should score below a 3".

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Cohort:	C32	Fall	2023	Date:	6/5/24
	Ethic	Quality	Game		AVERAGE
Average:	4.5	4.4	3.7		4.2
Target Threshold:	3.0	3.0	3.0		
# below target:	0.0	0.0	0.0		
% below target	0%	0%	0%		

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Methodology:

Ethic and Quality are compiled from the average corresponding peer eval categories scores, respectively, earned by each student over the course of the semester. Game score is the average of each faculty's subjective score based on the 1-5 metrics described in the rubric

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

No students fell below targets. Faculty will continue methodology of speaking with each student periodically throughout the semester to go over these metrics and other teamwork feedback. We will continue to monitor, coach, and guide the teams towards delivering fun, commercial quality games for their capstones through the iterative development process.

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Notes from IE meeting Fall2023 and May 2024 attached

Attached Files

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

This is a new measure and therefore will have improvements moving forward.

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

No previous records. Newly created Rubric for 2024.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

Fully implemented

Progress:

Complete

MIT - Thesis Defense

Step 1A: SLO Number:

2

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Students will be able to successfully defend their thesis to earn a master's degree.

Step 2A: Measure:

PLO #2 Measure: The thesis artifact is assessed at the end of Semester 5 with the Thesis IV course public **defense**.

Proposal and Context	1	2	3	4	5
Is the Thesis question, hypothesis, background review and importance to the industry presented clearly and succinctly?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Artifact	1	2	3	4	5
Was the student prepared to show his artifact? Does the artifact adequately test the hypothesis presented?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Data and Conclusions	1	2	3	4	5
Is the data formatted clearly? Is the data appropriate to the thesis question? Are the conclusions presented clearly? Does the data support the conclusions?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Mastery	1	2	3	4	5
Did the student demonstrate mastery of the subject matter? Could they verbally debate issues when presented with difficult questions? Did they acknowledge issues when they arose? Were there any holes in their knowledge base on their thesis topic?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):
Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:
Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

PLO #2 Target: 70% of students complete the MIT degree requirements by graduation.

Note: If the number of students enrolled in the program is under 5 students, “no more than 1 student should fail to pass the defense”.

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:
Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Art:

Defense Scoring

Proposal and Context Average Artifact Average Data and Conclusion Average Mastery Average TOTAL AVERAGE

Students < Target 0

Total AC Students 7

% Students > Target 100.0%

Target Hit

Target: 3.0 to Pass Defense. *=Did not defend

MIT Completion

Completion: By Graduation

Completion: 1-Semester

Not Complete	Percent Complete	Percent Complete	Hit/Miss	Not Complete	Percent Complete	Hit/Miss
0.0	7.0	100%	Hit		0%	Missed

Level Design:

Cohort: 32 Semester: 5 Date: 5/9/2024

Masters Semester 5 DFS2

	Aesthetics	Technical	Gameplay	Docum.	Average
Average	3.60	3.88	3.69	3.69	3.72
Students < Target	1	0	0	0	0
Total LD Students	13	13	13	13	13
% Students > Target	92.31%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target	Hit	Hit	Hit	Hit	Hit

Software:

	Proposal and Context	Artifact	Data and Conclusions	Mastery	Average
Average	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8
Number of students < target					0
Total number of SD students					13
% of students reaching threshold					100.0%
Target is	Hit	Hit	Hit	Hit	Hit

Production:

Defense Scoring

Student Name	Proposal and Context Average	Artifact Average	Data and Conclusion Average	Mastery Average	TOTAL AVERAGE
-----------------	---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	---------------

Students < Target 0

Total PM Students 4

% Students > 100.0%
Target

Target Hit

Target: 3.0 to Pass Defense.

MIT Completion

Completion: By Graduation

Not		Percent	
Complete	Complete	Complete	Hit/Miss
0.0	1.0	100%	Hit

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Target hit. See action items for detail.

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

Art:

Semester 5, we hit our target, however, throughout the year, we lost a total of 6 students (45.5% loss). We gained 2 students from previous cohorts bringing an overall drop to 66%, which would be a missed target.

Some of the reasons were because of high stress and burn out, in some cases tuition costs and the desire to Intern / Start working were also factors.

We have made various curriculum changes as a reaction to this and will monitor if these changes will improve retention.

Level Design:

Action Plan: All 13 students met the overall expected target for the Directed Focus Study II: Level Design course. Regarding Aesthetics, one student did not meet the target. Based on past IE related to Aesthetics, art/aesthetic components have been added to the end of the Level Design: Special Topics course (summer term), with an emphasis on lighting and composition. The faculty will continue to monitor the overall Aesthetics progress for future cohorts. While the students met the overall target for Documentation, this is a skill where students have struggled early in the curriculum. In the Level Design I and Level Design II courses, the faculty plan to place additional emphasis on documentation and the level planning process to reinforce this skill. Additionally, the design faculty will encourage the students to make use of the Moody Graduate Writing Center – which is an available resource for tutoring and writing help – in earlier LD courses. Currently, this resource tends to get the most emphasis in relation to Thesis in the 3rd semester.

Software:

13 students were admitted and 13 successfully defended. However, some of he passes were barely passing, at least in part due to some underprepared students being admitted to the program. In addition to any admissions changes, these underprepared students could benefit from more advisor attention earlier in the process.

Production:

Seek external industry advisory board for 5-year curriculum review to review journal submission data and determine if we continue to submit to scholarly journals. We've added SMU library support with SMU Scholar as an option to publish the theses papers if we do remove the journal requirement.

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Curriculum revision,Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

IE meeting notes from May 2024 attached. Faculty discussion within specialization concluding with scoring not recorded.

Art Rubric:

Proposal and Context	1	2	3	4	5
Are the mastery pillars and research topics as well as their relevance and importance to the industry presented clearly and succinctly? Was the research broad and deep enough to achieve mastery?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
Artifact	1	2	3	4	5
Was the student prepared to show their artifact? Does the artifact adequately portray mastery of the subject	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

matter. Is the Artifact using the best practices and industry standards.

Methodologies and Outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
Is the artifact development presented clearly? Does the data support the conclusions? Do the methodologies work and is the process outlined clearly?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Mastery	1	2	3	4	5
Did the student demonstrate mastery of the subject matter? Could they verbally debate issues when presented with difficult questions? Did they acknowledge issues when they arose? Were there any holes in their knowledge base on their thesis topic?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

LD Rubric:

Level Design Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes Rubric - Masters

Proposal and Context	1	2	3	4	5
Is the Thesis question, hypothesis, background review and importance to the industry presented clearly and succinctly?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Artifact	1	2	3	4	5
Was the student prepared to show his artifact? Does the artifact adequately test the hypothesis presented?	Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent

Data and Conclusions	1	2	3	4	5
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Is the data formatted clearly? Is the data appropriate to the thesis question? Are the conclusions presented clearly? Does the data support the conclusions?

Very
Poor

Poor

AcceptableGood

Excellent

Mastery

1

2

3

4

5

Did the student demonstrate mastery of the subject matter? Could they verbally debate issues when presented with difficult questions? Did they acknowledge issues when they arose? Were there any holes in their knowledge base on their thesis topic?

Very
Poor

Poor

AcceptableGood

Excellent

SD Rubric: not noted.

Production rubric recorded in PLO 6& &7.

Attached Files

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

None noted other than above.

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

Previous Action Plan: Incorporate more graduate writing services outreach and participation checks.

Report on above Action Plan: The new Moody School included Guildhall in the graduate writing services offered to graduate students. 50% of the C32 students used these services to improve

their writing quality and meet the class assignment deadlines. 1 student was also paired with a post-doc to co-author a journal submission based on some of the thesis data.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

MIT - Art Design

Step 1A: SLO Number:

3

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Students will be able to show expertise in digital game art skills at a professional quality level.

Step 2A: Measure:

PLO #3 Measure: The digital game level design artifacts are assessed at the end of Semester 3 with the Directed Focus Study I artifact(s) and the end of Semester 5 with the Directed Focus II artifact(s).

- 1.2D Art – Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on 2D Art including drawing and painting, matte painting, texturing, animation, ability to observe details in artifacts and digitally paint.
- 2.Modeling – Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on Model Construction including 3D art understanding, creation, and usage of topology in models.
- 3.Materials – Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on Materials, including PBR and non-PBR shader types, use of lighting and area to show material properties.
- 4.Tools – Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on Tools, including Photoshop, 3dsmax, Mudbox, Game Engines and use of tools in a pipeline.

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):

Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

PLO #3 Target: 80% of students should score a 3 or greater on the level design portfolio on a five-point Likert scale.

Note: If the number of students enrolled in the program is under 5 students, "no more than 1 student should score below a 3".

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Semester 3 results:

9 students	Game Engines	Asset Creation	Tools
% of students reaching threshold	100.0%	92.3%	92.3%
Target	Hit	Hit	Hit

Semester 5 results reflected in PLO#2

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Target hit, action plan noted below.

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

Semester 3: Target hit, no action plan at this time.

Semester 5: Recorded in PLO#2

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Notes from IE meeting Fall 2023 attached.

Rubric reviewed in specialization meetings.

Attached Files

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

None Noted

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

None noted.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

MIT - Level Design

Step 1A: SLO Number:

4

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Students will be able to show expertise in level design skills at a professional quality level.

Step 2A: Measure:

Students will be able to show expertise in level design skills. – Semester 3 Directed Focus Study I Artifact(s) and Semester 5 Directed Focus II Artifact(s)

1. Aesthetics - Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on aesthetic skill including visual quality, decorative placement, clutter, lighting, audio design (matches game),

impressiveness, and engagement.

2. Technical - Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on technical skill including scripting,

artificial intelligence (AI) movement and behavior, navmesh, cover, scripted events, construction, implementation (e.g. no gaps or floating

objects), audio work, optimization, layers, streaming, collaboration tool use, comments, visgroups and groups.

3. Gameplay- Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on gameplay including flow,

conveyance, communication, pacing, balance, engagement, and creativity.

4. Documentation - Assess student digital portfolio artifacts based on documentation including preplanning, conciseness, clarity, completeness, usefulness, and updates.

Semester 5 recorded under PLO#2

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):

Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

A five-point Likert Scale:

Students will be able to show expertise in level design skills. – 80% of students should score a 3 or greater.

- If the number of students enrolled in the program is under 5 students, “no more than 1 student should score below a 3

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

15 students	Aesthetics	Technical	Gameplay	Documentation
-------------	------------	-----------	----------	---------------

% of students reaching threshold	73.33%	93.33%	100%	86.67%
Target	Missed	hit	Hit	Hit

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Semester 3: Emphasize lighting for conveyance and the use of shadows. Reinforce and remind them/redirect them to the resources more often so they remember they had these lectures in the past. Reinforce the contact sheet and emphasize what it does for the student. Add more lighting maybe history of lighting to art for LD1.

Semester 5: Action Plan: Recorded under PLO#2

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

Emphasize lighting for conveyance and the use of shadows. Reinforce and remind them/redirect them to the resources more often so they remember they had these lectures in the past. Reinforce the contact sheet and emphasize what it does for the student. Add more lighting maybe history of lighting to art for LD1.

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

IE meeting notes from Fall 2023 and June 2024 attached

LD Rubric:

Level Design Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes Rubric - Common

Aesthetics	1	2	3	4	5
Assess student portfolios based on aesthetic skill including visual quality, decorative placement, clutter, lighting, audio design (matches game), immersiveness, and engagement.	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Technical	1	2	3	4	5
Assess student portfolios based on technical skill including scripting, artificial intelligence (AI) movement and behavior, navmesh, cover, scripted events, construction, implementation (e.g. no gaps or floating objects), audio work, optimization, layers, streaming, collaboration tool use, comments, visgroups and groups.	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Gameplay	1	2	3	4	5
Assess student portfolios based on gameplay including flow, conveyance, communication, pacing, balance, engagement, and creativity.	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Documentation	1	2	3	4	5
Assess student portfolios based on documentation including pre-planning, conciseness, clarity, completeness, usefulness, and updates.	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent

Attached Files

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

None noted

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

None Noted.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

MIT- Software Development

Step 1A: SLO Number:

5

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Students will be able to show expertise in game programming skills at a professional quality level.

Step 2A: Measure:

Measure: The digital game programming artifacts are assessed at the end of Semester 3 with the Directed Focus Study I artifact(s) and the end of Semester 5 with the Directed Focus II artifact(s).)

- 1.Math Fluency – Assess student portfolios based on math fluency including a general understanding of mathematics used for games and the ability to create game software using math and physics knowledge.
- 2.C++ Fluency – Assess student portfolios based on C++ fluency including the ability to solve problems in C++ in a timely manner and understand the pros and cons of common C++ constructs.
- 3.System Architecture – Assess student portfolios based on system architecture including the ability to design and create efficient and maintainable code-bases of any size as well as the ability to break down a game engine into its underlying systems and describe how they fit together.
- 4.Engine Systems Programming – Assess student portfolios based on engine systems programming including competency implementing one or more engine systems, such as physics, rendering, networking, audio, or AI.
- 5.Gameplay Programming – Assess student portfolios based on gameplay programming including the ability to use an existing game engine to create prototypes and games as well as sensitivity to game feel and ability to craft compelling user experiences.

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):

Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

PLO #5 Target: 80% of students should score a 3 or greater on the game programming portfolio on a five-point Likert scale.

Note: If the number of students enrolled in the program is under 5 students, “no more than 1 student should score below a 3”.

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

13 students	Math Fluency	C++ Fluency	System Architecture	Engine Systems Programming	Gameplay Programming
% of students reaching threshold	69.2%	69.2%	76.9%	76.9%	76.9%
Target	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Semester 3: Target missed. This cohort has a very high percentage of students who came in under prepared. We either need to change admissions policy, lower the bar for all students. And/or fail out the below average performers early in the program.

Semester 5; recorded under PLO#2

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

We need to either change admissions policy, lower the bar for all students. And/or fail out the below average performers early in the program.

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Notes from IE meeting fall 2023 and June 2024 attached. Discussions on scoring take place in specialization meetings.

Attached Files

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

None Noted

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

None Noted.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

MIT Production - Leadership Skills

Step 1A: SLO Number:

6

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Students will develop and demonstrate leadership skills.

Step 2A: Measure:

The leadership skills are assessed at the end of Semester 5 with the Production Major II course evaluators.

- 1.Team Trust - Students will develop and demonstrate team trust.
- 2.Influence - Students will develop a positive effect on the team.
- 3.Mentoring - Students will model appropriate behavior and instill good practices in others.
- 4.Professionalism - Students will conduct oneself through communication, presentation, and professional behavior.

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):

Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

No more than 1 student should score below a 3 on a five-point Likert scale.

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

There were 4 production specialization students in 2024 and all hit the targets for team trust, influence, mentorship, and professionalism.

2024 (C32)	Trust	Influence	Mentor	Professional
Total PM Students	4	4	4	4
% Students > Target	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hit/Miss	Hit	Hit	Hit	Hit

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

- For 2024, our leadership action plan is to invite more industry leaders to share their stories and provide diverse perspectives on the everyday problems Producers encounter. Students in the last semester are focused on securing a job in the industry, and any additional support that can provide mentorship opportunities to help them mature their leadership skills.

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

- For 2024, our leadership action plan is to invite more industry leaders to share their stories and provide diverse perspectives on the everyday problems Producers encounter. Students in the last semester are focused on securing a job in the industry, and any additional support that can provide mentorship opportunities to help them mature their leadership skills.

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Meeting notes from fall 2023 and June 2024 IE meeting attached.

Production Leadership rubric:

Production Management Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes Rubric

Leadership Skills

Team Trust	1	2	3	4	5
If team members approach and rely upon the producer with faith that the producer will protect and reinforce the team.	Poor	Average		Good	Excellent
Influence	1	2	3	4	5
Does the producer have a positive, negative, or lack of effect on the team?	Inappropriate	Below average		Good	Excellent
Vision	1	2	3	4	5
Producer's ability to take up the vision of the team and maintain it.	Poor	Below average		Good	Excellent
Mentoring	1	2	3	4	5
Producer's ability to model appropriate behavior and instill good practices in others.	Poor	Below average		Good	Excellent
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5
Producer's communication, presentation, and generally professional behavior.	Poor	Below average		Good	Excellent

Attached Files

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Notes from IE meeting Fall 2023 and June 2024 attached.

Attached Files

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

2023 Action Plan

- Capture more grades in the production classes to assess each topic's learning outcomes.

Report on 2023 Action Plan

- We have created multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate leadership through the mentorship component of the lab, where they were paired with junior cohort producers.
- We have also included a thought leadership component in their final presentation, where they had to write a blog guiding readers through how their experiences at Guildhall overlap with what they encounter in the industry.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

MIT Production - Organizational Skills

Step 1A: SLO Number:

7

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

Students will develop and demonstrate organizational skills.

Step 2A: Measure:

The organizational skills are assessed at the end of Semester 5 with the Directed Focus Study II course evaluators.

- 1.Planning - Students will be able to map measurable goals and milestones.
- 2.Adaptability - Students will be able to demonstrate accommodation of unexpected issues and still reach goals.

Achievement - Students will be able to finish products at an acceptable level of quality

Step 2B: Type of Measure (check all that apply):

Rubric

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

No more than 1 student should score below a 3 on a five-point Likert scale.

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

There were 4 production specialization students in 2024 and all hit the targets for planning, adaptability, and achievement.

2024	Plan	Adapt	Achieve
Total PM Students	4	4	4
% Students > Target	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hit/Miss	Hit	Hit	Hit

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

2024 Action Plan

- For 2024, the faculty made a substantial change from the previous cohort to incorporate not only coaching and mentoring (covered in Leadership), but also having the senior producers (measured here) substantially aiding the junior producers with organizing a second team game project. On these metrics per the rubric, all four students hit the objectives.

For the future, we will incorporate the feedback from the students to add a wiki entry post with best practices learned from the experience to augment the pedagogy in an effort to continually improve the student learning outcomes by passing down knowledge

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

2024 Action Plan

- For 2024, the faculty made a substantial change from the previous cohort to incorporate not only coaching and mentoring (covered in Leadership), but also having the senior producers (measured here) substantially aiding the junior producers with organizing a second team game project. On these metrics per the rubric, all four students hit the objectives.

For the future, we will incorporate the feedback from the students to add a wiki entry post with best practices learned from the experience to augment the pedagogy in an effort to continually improve the student learning outcomes by passing down knowledge

Step 5B: Type of Action:

New course developed/proposed,Program leadership involvement ,Faculty involvement

Step 5C: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Meeting notes from Fall 2023 and June 2024 IE meeting attached.

Production Organizational Rubric:

Production Management Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes Rubric

Organizational Skills

Planning	1	2	3	4	5
Producer’s ability to map out measurable goals and milestones.	Poor	Below average		Good	Excellent
Adaptability	1	2	3	4	5
Producer’s ability to deal with unexpected hurdles to reaching goals.	Poor	Below average		Good	Excellent
Achievement	1	2	3	4	5
Do products get finished at an acceptable level of quality?	Poor	Below average		Good	Excellent

Attached Files

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

Step 5E: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

For the future, we will incorporate the feedback from the students to add a wiki entry post with best practices learned from the experience to augment the pedagogy in an effort to continually improve the student learning outcomes by passing down knowledge

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

2023 Action Plan

- The planning skills were not formalized by semester 5. The faculty will add more rigor in writing Epics, Conditions of Satisfaction, and making Sprint Boards based on these; and more rigor in Retrospectives and Reviews as it feeds back into Sprint Planning.

Report on 2023 Action Plan

- To address the students' inability to demonstrate effective use of Epics, User Stories, Conditions of Satisfaction (COS), and inability to create Sprint Boards (as part of the Agile with Scrum methodology), the Production Management I (PMI) curriculum was updated accordingly. The faculty of record presented three lengthy lectures covering the topics of Agile Development, Scrum Methodology, Sprint Planning, Risk Management, and User Stories/Epics/COS. The students are then reinforced in their understanding through a "Scrum simulation exercise" in which the students must create a physical paper artifact following the Scrum process (creating Epics, User Stories, and COS). To test the students' "mastery," midway through the Spring semester, the students are presented with a midterm exam. This midterm asks students to create Scrum Boards based on the Team Game Production I game products. The students must create Epics, create User Stories, create Conditions of Satisfaction, and level the estimated hours versus the actual available work time. By semester's end, all four students demonstrated a deeper understanding of the outlined concepts.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

Admissions Cohort Size - Common - Across all disciplines

Step 1A: PG Number:

1

Step 1C: PG Statement (Full Description):

We are aiming for recruitment of 45 students per Cohort.

Step 2A: Measure:

PO#1 Aim for Cohort size of 45 or higher

Step 2B: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

PO#1 Aim for Cohort size of 45 or higher

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Cohort Size C33 = 45 students

Cohort Size C34 = 57 students

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Recruitment efforts, domestic and internationally, resulted in successful targets.

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

Continue recruitment current efforts and expand in person recruitment events. Continue to use EAB resources for undergrads identification.

Step 5B: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Other

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:

Notes from Fall 2023 attached.

Attached Files

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

Step 5D: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Enhanced recruitment effort

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):

None noted in May 2024 IE meeting notes. meeting notes from Fall 2023 attached

Attached Files

[2023 Semester 3 C31 meeting notes.docx](#)

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

None noted in May 2024 IE meeting notes.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):
Fully implemented

Progress:
Complete

Admission Score - Common - Across all disciplines

Step 1A: PG Number:
2

Step 1C: PG Statement (Full Description):

PO#2 An admission score on a Likert Scale of 3.75 out of 5 for all entering students across all specializations., MIT or certificate.

Step 2A: Measure:

PO#2 An admission score on a Likert Scale of 3.75 out of 5 for all entering students across all specializations., MIT or certificate.

Step 2B: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

PO#2 An admission score on a Likert Scale of 3.75 out of 5 for all entering students across all specializations., MIT or certificate.

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Not Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

C33 admitted students score was a 3.45 out of 5.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Consider re-evaluating and adjusting the admissions scoring.

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

Consider re-evaluating and adjusting the admissions scoring.

Step 5B: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Faculty, Staff

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:

None noted in May 2024 IE meeting

Step 5D: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Enhanced recruitment effort

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):

None noted in May 2024 IE meeting notes

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

None noted in May 2024 IE meeting notes.

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete

Placement - Common - Across all disciplines

Step 1A: PG Number:

3

Step 1C: PG Statement (Full Description):

PO#3 Reach placement goals at 3 and 6 months post-graduation

Step 2A: Measure:

- 55% placement at 3 months after graduation
- 75% placement at 6 months after graduation

Step 2B: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Indirect

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

- 55% placement at 3 months after graduation
- 75% placement at 6 months after graduation

Step 4A: Was the target met for this Measure?:

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Cohort tracking resulted in the following job placements.

3 month placement = 57%

6 month placement = 73%

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

3 months placement target met. 6 month placement target not met

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):

Cohort 32 faced challenges beyond their control when searching for job placement. The industry has been facing hardship with unprecedented amounts of layoffs, saturating the market with developers that have more years of experience than our graduates. Our cohort has been competing against their seniors for roles as studios prioritized finding placement for those affected by layoffs over those trying to enter industry. Being 2.5% short of target placement for 6 months after graduation in the current market is an exemplary performance for our graduates and does not reflect poorly on their preparation. Alumni career support should continue as it has been.

Also considering tracking not just placement but type of position, ie... Management positions, director level, etc.

Step 5B: Dialogue Participants (check all that apply):

Staff

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:

Initial discussion noted in Fall 2023 and May 2024 meeting notes. Addition comments and numbers voted in via email.

Attached Files

[IE report Semester 5 2024-final.docx](#)

Step 5D: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply):

Improved efficiency by incorporating technology and automation

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Access to Stepping Blocks has given ways to track and start making more progress on initiative. This access allows exploring titles that alumni hold without having to track each individual alumnus manually. Reports can be generated by current titles and filtered searches for those in managerial roles.

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

In progress

Step 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s):

In progress

Progress:

Complete