

Creative Technology MA (Online)

Mission Statement

Mission Statement (Full Description):

Creative Technology is a highly interdisciplinary program that combines theory and methodology from computer science and engineering with aesthetic principles and creative practice from the arts. The program is rigorous in its interdisciplinary integration. Graduates work in roles as creative technologists, interactive designers, software developers, UI/UX designers, and practicing artists.

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)?:

Yes

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

AY2023-2024

Progress:

Complete

Creative Coding Literacy

Step 1A: SLO Number:

1

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

By the end of the program, students will **demonstrate proficiency in creative coding by designing, implementing, and critically evaluating** interactive, algorithmic, and generative digital artworks. This proficiency will be demonstrated through the application of **programming principles, computational thinking, and industry-standard frameworks** to create expressive and technically sound digital compositions. Additionally, students will engage in critique processes to articulate and refine their creative and technical decisions.

Commented [SS1]: A. Summary Assessment

The *Creative Technology* mission statement effectively conveys the program's **interdisciplinary foundation**, merging computer science, engineering, and the arts. It clearly identifies the academic focus areas and provides examples of **career outcomes**, demonstrating relevance and clarity about graduate preparation.

However, similar to the *Creative Computing* statement, this version would benefit from:

- A stronger connection to **SMU's institutional mission and values** (e.g., leadership, innovation, community impact).
- Explicit mention of the **degree level and delivery location** (main campus, online, or hybrid).
- A clearer articulation of the **educational purpose**—what competencies, perspectives, or ethical commitments the program develops in students beyond interdisciplinarity.

B. Suggestions for Improvement

1. **Purpose:** Add a statement about the educational intent—how the program prepares students to think critically, innovate responsibly, or integrate technology and creativity to solve problems.
2. **Alignment:** Tie the program to SMU's institutional mission (e.g., "fostering innovation, ethical leadership, and global engagement").
3. **Specificity:** Include the degree level and delivery format to meet rubric expectations for institutional documentation.
4. **Distinctiveness:** Consider including a phrase that distinguishes *Creative Technology* from other interdisciplinary programs (e.g., emphasizing applied innovation, human-centered design, or digital artistry).

C. Suggested Revision

Revised Mission Statement (Modeled Example):

"The B.A. in Creative Technology at SMU integrates computer science, engineering, and the arts to prepare students to design and develop innovative, human-centered technologies. Through rigorous interdisciplinary coursework and collaboration between the Meadows School of the Arts and the Lyle School of Engineering, students cultivate creative problem-solving, technical expertise, and ethical awareness. Offered on the main campus, the program equips graduates to excel as creative technologists, interactive designers, software developers, and practicing artists—advancing SMU's mission to foster innovation and global engagement."

Step 2A: Measure:

Student learning outcomes will be assessed through a **final project and/or final exam** in CRCP 6310 or CRCP 6320

1. Final Project:

- Students will design and implement an **interactive, algorithmic, or generative digital artwork** using programming principles, computational thinking, and industry-standard frameworks.
- Evaluation will be based on a **structured rubric** assessing:
 - **Technical proficiency** (e.g., clean and efficient code, debugging, optimization).
 - **Creativity and innovation** (e.g., originality, conceptual depth, aesthetic impact).
 - **Computational problem-solving** (e.g., algorithmic complexity, logical structuring).
 - **Iterative development** (e.g., incorporation of feedback, refinement through critique).
- The project will undergo **faculty and peer critique** where students will present their work, articulate their creative and technical choices, and respond to constructive feedback.

2. Final Exam (if applicable):

- The exam will assess students' ability to **apply coding concepts, debugging strategies, and theoretical knowledge** to creative computational problems.
- Questions will include both **practical coding challenges** and **conceptual applications** to ensure a well-rounded evaluation.

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

Objective Quiz or Exam ,Performance,Presentation ,Portfolio ,Reflection,Rubric,Written paper/project

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct,Indirect

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

At least 85% of students enrolled in CRCP 6310 or CRCP 6320 will achieve a grade of B+ (87%) or higher on the final exam or project. This benchmark reflects a high standard of competency in creative coding, ensuring students demonstrate proficiency in programming concepts, computational problem-solving, and the creation of interactive, algorithmic, or generative digital works.

Beyond numerical assessment, student learning will also be evaluated qualitatively through structured **faculty- and peer-led critique sessions**. These critiques will assess:

- **Conceptual depth** – The originality and intellectual engagement of the work.
- **Technical execution** – The accuracy, efficiency, and complexity of code implementation.
- **Iterative development** – The student’s ability to incorporate feedback and refine their work.
- **Articulation of creative and technical choices** – The ability to communicate decisions clearly and respond constructively to critique.

This dual approach—**quantitative grading and qualitative critique**—ensures a **comprehensive, holistic evaluation** of student learning. It aligns with program expectations for **advancement into higher-level coursework** and **professional creative coding practices**, fostering both technical mastery and critical reflection.

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

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

For the 2024-2025 academic year, only final grade data is available.

For Fall 2024, 60% of students (6/10) enrolled in CRCP 6310 received a B+ or higher for their final grade. CRCP 6320 was not offered during the Fall 2024 term.

For Spring 2025, 91% of students (10/11) enrolled in CRCP 6310 received a B+ or higher for their final grade. 87% of students (13/15) enrolled in CRCP 6320 received a B+ or higher for their final grade.

Overall, during the 2024-2025 academic year, 81% of students (29/36) enrolled in CRCP 6310 and CRCP 6320 received a B+ or higher for their final grade. Students' final projects were not evaluated using the newly developed Creative Coding Literacy rubric.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

The 2024-2025 academic year results for CRCP 6310 and CRCP 6320 reveal a mixed performance against the established benchmark, with an overall achievement rate of 81% (29/36 students) receiving B+ or higher grades. This falls short of the target measure of 85%, indicating a need for targeted interventions and closer examination of the factors contributing to this shortfall.

Semester-by-Semester Analysis

Fall 2024 Performance Concerns

The Fall 2024 CRCP 6310 cohort showed significant underperformance, with only 60% (6/10) of students achieving the B+ benchmark. This represents a substantial 25 percentage point deficit from the target and suggests potential challenges in course delivery, student preparation, or external factors affecting this particular cohort. The absence of CRCP 6320 during this term limits comparative analysis but concentrates attention on the foundational course performance.

Spring 2025 Improvement

Spring 2025 demonstrated marked improvement across both courses:

- CRCP 6310: 91% success rate (10/11 students) - exceeding the target by 6 percentage points
- CRCP 6320: 87% success rate (13/15 students) - meeting the target benchmark exactly

This improvement suggests that either programmatic adjustments were made between semesters, the Spring cohort was better prepared, or other factors positively influenced student outcomes.

Assessment Limitations and Implications

Incomplete Assessment Framework

The absence of qualitative critique data represents a critical gap in the assessment process. The target measure explicitly emphasizes a "dual approach" combining quantitative grades with qualitative evaluation of conceptual depth, technical execution, iterative development, and articulation skills. Without this qualitative component, the assessment provides an incomplete picture of student learning and fails to capture the holistic evaluation framework outlined in the program goals.

Missing Creative Coding Literacy Rubric Implementation

The non-utilization of the newly developed Creative Coding Literacy rubric indicates a disconnect between assessment planning and implementation. This represents a missed opportunity to systematically evaluate student competencies and gather standardized data for program improvement.

Conclusion

While the overall 81% achievement rate demonstrates that the majority of students are meeting high academic standards, the failure to reach the 85% benchmark and the significant variation between semesters indicates room for improvement. The Spring 2025 results prove that the target is achievable, but consistency and comprehensive assessment implementation remain critical challenges. Moving forward, the department hopes to focus on understanding and replicating the conditions that led to Spring 2025's success while ensuring that both quantitative and qualitative assessment measures are fully integrated into the evaluation process.

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

The assessment results suggest several strategic considerations:

Adjunct Faculty Onboarding Enhancement (Ongoing)

- Develop detailed faculty handbook with learning outcome specifications
- Create semester-specific teaching guides with milestone expectations
- Implement mandatory pre-semester meetings with department chair/coordinator

Mid-Semester Faculty Check-ins (Starting Fall 2025)

- Schedule monthly meetings with adjunct faculty during semester
- Review student progress data and identify at-risk students
- Provide just-in-time support and resource sharing
- Address instructional challenges collaboratively

Data Collection Enhancement (Starting Fall 2025)

- Implement consistent rubric usage across all sections and semesters
- Establish semester-end faculty reflection and data review meetings
- Create standardized reporting templates for adjunct faculty
- Develop student exit survey to capture learning experience feedback

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Faculty involvement

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

Faculty, Staff

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

The department will be holding meetings throughout the Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 terms to discuss the academic assessment rubrics, student learning outcomes, and scoring process to improve faculty experience and student engagement and performance.

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

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Course Scheduling and Curriculum Structure

Standardize Course Offerings: Update the course offering schedule to consistently provide both CRCP 6310 and CRCP 6320 every term. The absence of CRCP 6320 in Fall 2024 limited student progression pathways and prevented comprehensive program assessment. Regular offering of both courses will ensure students can maintain momentum in their academic progression and provide more robust data for ongoing program evaluation.

Assessment Standardization and Differentiation

Unify and Enhance Rubric Framework: Develop a unified creative coding literacy rubric that aligns graduate and undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) while establishing distinct criteria that reflect the advanced expectations for graduate-level work. This alignment will ensure consistency across program levels while maintaining appropriate academic rigor and clear differentiation between undergraduate and graduate competency expectations.

Program Growth and Community Building

Expand Outreach and Engagement: Continue and intensify recruitment and marketing efforts to increase enrollment, enhance program awareness, and strengthen community engagement. Higher enrollment numbers will provide more robust assessment data, create more vibrant classroom learning environments, and help establish the program's reputation within the broader creative technology community. These efforts should target both prospective students and industry partnerships to enhance program visibility and career outcomes.

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

The following provides a comprehensive status update on the action plan items developed in response to the 2023-2024 assessment results. While some initiatives showed progress, the 2024-2025 results indicate that several key objectives require renewed focus and implementation.

Term-to-Term Consistency Enhancement

- **Challenge Identified:** The Fall 2024 performance (60% success rate) suggests that the analysis of Fall 2023 performance differences was either incomplete or the resulting interventions were not effectively implemented
- **Outcome:** The significant improvement in Spring 2025 (91% and 87% success rates) indicates that some effective practices were identified and applied, but the term transition protocol appears insufficient to prevent semester-to-semester variation
- **Next Steps Required:** The substantial performance gap between Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 demonstrates that this remains a critical area requiring immediate attention and more robust implementation

Assessment Refinement

- **Rubric Development:** While detailed rubrics were reportedly developed for each student learning outcome, students' final projects were not evaluated using the newly developed Creative Coding Literacy rubric
- **Consistency Gap:** The failure to apply rubrics consistently across graduate courses represents a significant implementation failure
- **Data Limitations:** Without component-specific performance tracking, the program lacks granular data to identify specific areas of student struggle or excellence
- **Immediate Action Needed:** Full deployment of the assessment framework is critical for meaningful program evaluation

Enrollment Management

- **Class Size Target:** Enrollment numbers appear to remain within the targeted 12-15 student range based on reported data (10-15 students per section)
- **Performance Relationship:** Spring 2025 results support the hypothesis that smaller class sizes facilitate better outcomes when properly supported
- **Continued Monitoring:** The program successfully avoided over-enrollment while maintaining viable course sections

Student Preparation Enhancement

- **Successfully Implemented:** Students are now required to submit proof of prior quantitative performance in their program applications, representing a concrete improvement in admission screening
- **Positive Impact:** This change may have contributed to the strong Spring 2025 performance, though more data is needed to establish causation

Overall Assessment

The 2024-2025 results present a mixed picture of action plan implementation. While some elements showed success (enrollment management and enhanced admission requirements), critical components—particularly assessment refinement and term-to-term consistency—remain inadequately addressed. The Spring 2025 improvements demonstrate that the program is capable of meeting its benchmarks, but the Fall 2024 shortfall indicates that systematic implementation of planned interventions is still needed.

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

In progress

Progress:

Complete

Creative Computing Application Development

Step 1A: SLO Number:

2

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

By the end of the course, students will demonstrate proficiency in creative computing application development by designing, building, and refining interactive digital applications. This includes integrating programming logic, algorithmic processes, and user experience (UX) principles to develop functional, innovative, and computationally efficient solutions. Students will also engage in critique processes to evaluate usability, aesthetics, and technical effectiveness, fostering iterative development and problem-solving skills.

Step 2A: Measure:

Student learning outcomes will be assessed through a **final project and/or final exam** in relevant courses (e.g., CRCP 6320, CRCP 6330. or advanced Creative Technology courses).

1. Final Project:

- Students will **design, develop, and deploy** a creative computing application demonstrating interactive functionality, computational problem-solving, and aesthetic considerations.
- The project will be evaluated using a **structured rubric**, assessing:
 - **Technical proficiency** – Implementation of programming concepts, efficiency of code, debugging, and optimization.
 - **Application functionality** – Interactivity, responsiveness, and adherence to design specifications.
 - **Creative and computational integration** – Effective use of generative processes, algorithmic creativity, and computational logic.
 - **User experience (UX) and usability** – Application of UI/UX principles, accessibility, and engagement.
 - **Iterative development and critique integration** – Evidence of refinement based on peer and faculty critique.
- Students will present their projects in **faculty- and peer-led critique sessions**, where they will articulate their **technical and creative choices** and receive feedback for further refinement.

2. Final Exam (if applicable):

- The exam will assess students' ability to **apply programming principles, debugging techniques, and theoretical concepts** in creative computing application development.
- Questions will include **practical coding tasks, algorithmic problem-solving, and conceptual applications** related to interactive computing.

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

Capstone project, Observation, Performance, Presentation, Portfolio, Reflection, Rubric, Written paper/project

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct, Indirect

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

At least 85% of students enrolled in CRCP 6320 or other applicable courses will achieve a grade of B+ (87%) or higher on the final exam or project. This benchmark reflects a high standard of competency in creative computing application development, ensuring students can integrate programming logic, algorithmic thinking, and UX principles to create functional and innovative digital applications.

Beyond numerical assessment, student learning will be evaluated through structured critique sessions. Faculty and peer critiques will assess usability, computational efficiency, creativity, and iterative development. Students will be expected to articulate their development process, justify design decisions, and refine their applications based on feedback.

This dual approach—**quantitative grading and qualitative critique**—ensures a **holistic evaluation** of student progress and aligns with program expectations for **advancing to higher-level coursework and professional application development in creative computing**.

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

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

For the 2024-2025 academic year, only final grade data is available.

CRCP 6320 was not offered during the Fall 2024 term. 100% of students (12/12) enrolled in CRCP 6330 received a B+ or higher for their final grade.

For Spring 2025, 87% of students (13/15) enrolled in CRCP 6320 received a B+ or higher for their final grade. CRCP 6330 was not offered during the Spring 2025 term.

Overall, during the 2024-2025 academic year, 93% of students (25/27) enrolled in CRCP 6320 and CRCP 6330 received a B+ or higher for their final grade. Student's final projects were not evaluated using the newly developed Creative Computing Application Development rubric.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

The results for the 2024-2025 academic year demonstrate strong student performance in the Creative Technology program's core courses, with 93% of students (25/27) achieving grades of

B+ or higher across CRCP 6320 and CRCP 6330. This high success rate suggests that students are meeting fundamental learning expectations in creative computing application development.

Key Findings and Analysis

Positive Outcomes

The consistently high performance across both courses indicates several strengths in the program:

Strong Foundation Achievement: With 100% of CRCP 6330 students (12/12) and 87% of CRCP 6320 students (13/15) earning B+ or higher, students appear to be successfully mastering the core competencies in creative computing. This suggests effective curriculum design and instructional delivery.

Consistent Quality Across Terms: The program maintained high standards across different academic terms, with both fall and spring cohorts demonstrating strong performance despite different course offerings each semester.

Program Viability: The 93% overall success rate exceeds typical graduate program benchmarks and indicates that students are well-prepared for advanced work in creative technology.

Critical Assessment Limitations

However, several significant limitations impact the validity and usefulness of these results for comprehensive program assessment:

Lack of Granular Assessment Data: The absence of specific rubric-based evaluation data represents a major gap in assessment validity. Final grades alone provide insufficient information about student achievement across the five critical learning domains identified in the target measure:

- Technical proficiency in programming implementation
- Application functionality and interactivity
- Creative and computational integration
- User experience and usability design
- Iterative development and critique integration

Insufficient Evidence of Learning Outcome Achievement: Without rubric-based assessment data, it remains unclear whether students are actually achieving competency in the specific areas of creative computing application development or simply meeting general course requirements for passing grades.

Conclusion

While the high overall success rate (93%) is encouraging and suggests strong program performance, the current assessment approach lacks the specificity and rigor necessary for meaningful program evaluation and improvement. The disconnect between the comprehensive target measure and the basic grade-level results represents a critical gap that must be addressed to ensure the program is effectively developing students' creative computing competencies. Implementation of the structured rubric assessment system is essential for validating student learning outcomes and supporting continuous program enhancement.

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

The assessment results suggest several strategic considerations:

Adjunct Faculty Onboarding Enhancement (Ongoing)

- Develop detailed faculty handbook with learning outcome specifications
- Create semester-specific teaching guides with milestone expectations
- Implement mandatory pre-semester meetings with department chair/coordinator

Mid-Semester Faculty Check-ins (Starting Fall 2025)

- Schedule monthly meetings with adjunct faculty during semester
- Review student progress data and identify at-risk students
- Provide just-in-time support and resource sharing
- Address instructional challenges collaboratively

Data Collection Enhancement (Starting Fall 2025)

- Implement consistent rubric usage across all sections and semesters
- Establish semester-end faculty reflection and data review meetings
- Create standardized reporting templates for adjunct faculty
- Develop student exit survey to capture learning experience feedback

Student Learning Outcome Expansion Evaluation (Starting Fall 2025)

- Conduct comprehensive review of advanced Creative Technology courses to assess SLO applicability
- Determine feasibility of extending Creative Computing Application Development rubric to upper-level courses
- Identify potential modifications needed for SLO implementation in specialized advanced courses
- Establish timeline for phased SLO implementation across expanded course offerings

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Faculty involvement

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

Faculty, Staff

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

The department will be holding meetings throughout the Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 terms to discuss the academic assessment rubrics, student learning outcomes, and scoring process to improve faculty experience and student engagement and performance.

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

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):**Course Scheduling and Curriculum Structure**

Standardize Course Offerings: Update the course offering schedule to consistently provide both CRCP 6320 and CRCP 6330 every term. The absence of CRCP 6320 in Fall 2024, and CRCP 6330 in Spring 2025, limited student progression pathways and prevented comprehensive program assessment. Regular offering of both courses will ensure students can maintain momentum in their academic progression and provide more robust data for ongoing program evaluation.

Assessment Standardization and Differentiation

Unify and Enhance Rubric Framework: Develop a unified creative computing application development rubric that aligns graduate and undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) while establishing distinct criteria that reflect the advanced expectations for graduate-level work. This alignment will ensure consistency across program levels while maintaining appropriate academic rigor and clear differentiation between undergraduate and graduate competency expectations.

Program Growth and Community Building

Expand Outreach and Engagement: Continue and intensify recruitment and marketing efforts to increase enrollment, enhance program awareness, and strengthen community engagement.

Higher enrollment numbers will provide more robust assessment data, create more vibrant classroom learning environments, and help establish the program's reputation within the broader creative technology community. These efforts should target both prospective students and industry partnerships to enhance program visibility and career outcomes.

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

The following provides a comprehensive status update on the action plan items developed in response to the 2023-2024 assessment results. While some initiatives showed progress, the 2024-2025 results indicate that several key objectives require renewed focus and implementation.

Assessment Refinement

- **Rubric Development:** While detailed rubrics were developed for each student learning outcome, students' final projects were not evaluated using the newly developed Creative Computing Application Development rubric
- **Consistency Gap:** The failure to apply rubrics consistently across graduate courses represents a significant implementation failure
- **Data Limitations:** Without component-specific performance tracking, the program lacks granular data to identify specific areas of student struggle or excellence
- **Immediate Action Needed:** Full deployment of the assessment framework is critical for meaningful program evaluation

Enrollment Management

- **Class Size Target:** Enrollment numbers appear to remain within the targeted 12-15 student range based on reported data (12-15 students per section)
- **Performance Relationship:** Spring 2025 results support the hypothesis that smaller class sizes facilitate better outcomes when properly supported
- **Continued Monitoring:** The program successfully avoided over-enrollment while maintaining viable course sections

Student Preparation Enhancement

- **Successfully Implemented:** Students are now required to submit proof of prior quantitative performance in their program applications, representing a concrete improvement in admission screening
- **Positive Impact:** This change may have contributed to the strong Spring 2025 performance, though more data is needed to establish causation

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

In progress

Progress:

Complete

Distinctive Creative Voice

Step 1A: SLO Number:

3

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

By the end of the course, students will develop and demonstrate a distinctive creative voice through the exploration and application of computational media, artistic expression, and critical self-reflection. This includes the ability to articulate a unique conceptual framework, integrate technical skills with artistic intent, and refine their work through an iterative process informed by critique and research. Students will engage in faculty- and peer-led discussions to analyze their creative choices, positioning their work within contemporary and historical contexts while contributing to the evolution of digital art and creative computing.

Step 2A: Measure:

Student learning outcomes will be assessed through a **final creative project, portfolio review, and reflective critique sessions** in relevant courses (e.g., CRCP 6370, CRCP 6380 or upper-level creative computing courses).

1. Final Creative Project:

- Students will **develop a fully realized creative work** that reflects their **individual artistic perspective**, computational proficiency, and conceptual intent.
- The project may take various forms, such as **interactive media, generative systems, digital installations, or experimental software-based works**.
- Evaluation will be based on a **structured rubric** assessing:
 - **Conceptual depth** – Originality, clarity of artistic intent, and connection to contemporary or historical creative practices.
 - **Technical execution** – Effective use of computational tools, innovative problem-solving, and refinement of code-based aesthetics.

- **Creative identity** – Demonstration of a distinctive artistic approach, cohesive visual or interactive language, and thematic consistency.
- **Iterative development** – Evidence of evolution through feedback, revisions, and self-directed exploration.
- The project will be presented in **faculty- and peer-led critique sessions**, where students will articulate their artistic vision, contextualize their work, and engage in critical discourse.

2. Portfolio Review:

- Students will submit a curated **portfolio of work** developed throughout the course, showcasing the progression of their creative and technical voice.
- Faculty will assess the portfolio based on:
 - **Coherence and evolution of ideas** over time.
 - **Breadth and depth of creative exploration** within computational media.
 - **Presentation and documentation quality**, including artist statements and technical explanations.

3. Reflective Critique and Artist Statement:

- Students will write a **self-reflective artist statement**, discussing their **creative influences, thematic interests, and technical evolution**.
- Faculty and peers will evaluate these reflections for **clarity of self-articulation, critical awareness, and ability to position their work within broader artistic and technological discourses**.

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

Capstone project, Observation, Performance, Presentation, Portfolio, Rubric, Written paper/project

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct, Indirect

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

At least 85% of students enrolled in CRCP 6370 or other applicable courses will achieve a grade of B+ (87%) or higher on the final creative project, portfolio, and reflective critique components. This benchmark ensures students demonstrate a distinctive creative voice by integrating computational techniques with artistic expression, conceptual depth, and iterative refinement.

Beyond numerical assessment, students will engage in structured critique sessions where they will articulate their artistic intent, contextualize their work within creative computing and digital art, and incorporate feedback into the iterative development of their projects. The portfolio review and reflective artist statement will further evaluate students' ability to synthesize their creative journey and position their work within broader artistic and technological contexts.

This dual approach—**quantitative grading and qualitative critique**—ensures a **holistic evaluation** of student growth, fostering both technical mastery and a strong creative identity aligned with professional and academic expectations.

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

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

For the 2024-2025 academic year, only final grade data is currently available.

For the Fall 2024 term, 100% of students (19/19) in CRCP 6370 earned a B+ or higher for their final grade. 85% of students (12/14) in CRCP 6380 earned a B+ or higher for their final grade.

Neither CRCP 6370, nor CRCP 6380, were offered during the Spring 2025 term.

Overall, 94% of students (31/33) enrolled in CRCP 6370 and CRCP 6380 during the 2024-2025 academic year earned a B+ or higher for their final grade. The newly developed Distinctive Creative Voice rubric was not used to evaluate students' final projects.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

The 2024-2025 academic year results demonstrate strong overall student performance, with 94% of students (31/33) enrolled in CRCP 6370 and CRCP 6380 earning grades of B+ or higher, exceeding the established target of 85%. This achievement indicates that the vast majority of students are successfully meeting the program's expectations for integrating computational techniques with artistic expression, conceptual depth, and iterative refinement.

The comprehensive assessment framework implemented across CRCP 6370 and CRCP 6380 demonstrates the program's commitment to evaluating both artistic development and technical proficiency in creative technology practice. However, the current availability of only final grade data limits the depth of analysis possible regarding specific component performance and the development of distinctive creative voices through the intended multi-faceted evaluation approach.

The Fall 2024 results reveal differential performance patterns between the two courses. CRCP 6370 achieved exceptional results with 100% of students (19/19) earning B+ or higher, while CRCP 6380 showed strong but slightly lower performance with 85% of students (12/14) reaching the target threshold. This variance may reflect differences in course structure, student preparation levels, or the specific creative computing focus areas addressed in each course.

The absence of both courses during the Spring 2025 term presents an opportunity to analyze how course scheduling and sequencing might impact student progression and learning outcomes continuity within the program structure.

A significant finding from the 2024-2025 academic year is that the newly developed Distinctive Creative Voice rubric was not implemented for evaluating students' final projects. This represents a critical gap between the intended comprehensive assessment approach and actual implementation. The absence of component-specific data (final creative project, portfolio review, and reflective critique assessments) limits the ability to conduct granular analysis of student achievement across the intended learning domains.

While overall grade performance exceeds targets, the lack of rubric-based assessment data means that specific competencies—such as conceptual depth, technical execution, creative identity development, and iterative refinement—cannot be individually evaluated. This limitation affects the program's capacity to identify areas of particular strength or needed improvement within the creative technology curriculum.

The intended dual approach of quantitative grading and qualitative critique sessions was designed to provide holistic evaluation of student growth, fostering both technical mastery and creative identity development. However, without detailed component assessments or documentation of structured critique sessions, it is difficult to determine whether students are successfully developing the intended capacity to articulate artistic intent, contextualize their work within creative computing discourse, and incorporate feedback into iterative project development.

The strong overall grade performance suggests that students are meeting general course expectations, but the program's specific goals of developing distinctive creative voices through integrated computational and artistic practice require more granular assessment data to verify achievement.

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

Adjunct Faculty Onboarding Enhancement (Ongoing)

- Develop detailed faculty handbook with learning outcome specifications
- Create semester-specific teaching guides with milestone expectations
- Implement mandatory pre-semester meetings with department chair/coordinator

Mid-Semester Faculty Check-ins (Starting Fall 2025)

- Schedule monthly meetings with adjunct faculty during semester
- Review student progress data and identify at-risk students
- Provide just-in-time support and resource sharing
- Address instructional challenges collaboratively

Data Collection Enhancement (Starting Fall 2025)

- Implement consistent rubric usage across all sections and semesters
- Establish semester-end faculty reflection and data review meetings
- Create standardized reporting templates for adjunct faculty
- Develop student exit survey to capture learning experience feedback

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Faculty involvement

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

Faculty, Staff

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

The department will be holding meetings throughout the Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 terms to discuss the academic assessment rubrics, student learning outcomes, and scoring process to improve faculty experience and student engagement and performance.

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

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Assessment Standardization and Differentiation

Unify and Enhance Rubric Framework: Develop a unified distinctive creative voice rubric that aligns graduate and undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) while establishing distinct criteria that reflect the advanced expectations for graduate-level work. This alignment will ensure consistency across program levels while maintaining appropriate academic rigor and clear differentiation between undergraduate and graduate competency expectations.

Program Growth and Community Building

Expand Outreach and Engagement: Continue and intensify recruitment and marketing efforts to increase enrollment, enhance program awareness, and strengthen community engagement. Higher enrollment numbers will provide more robust assessment data, create more vibrant classroom learning environments, and help establish the program's reputation within the broader creative technology community. These efforts should target both prospective students and industry partnerships to enhance program visibility and career outcomes.

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

The following provides a comprehensive status update on the action plan items developed in response to the 2023-2024 assessment results. While some initiatives showed progress, the 2024-2025 results indicate that several key objectives require renewed focus and implementation.

Assessment Refinement

- **Rubric Development:** While detailed rubrics were developed for each student learning outcome, students' final projects were not evaluated using the newly developed Distinctive Creative Voice rubric
- **Consistency Gap:** The failure to apply rubrics consistently across graduate courses represents a significant implementation failure
- **Data Limitations:** Without component-specific performance tracking, the program lacks granular data to identify specific areas of student struggle or excellence
- **Immediate Action Needed:** Full deployment of the assessment framework is critical for meaningful program evaluation

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

In progress

Progress:

Complete

Advanced Software Design

Step 1A: SLO Number:

4

Step 1C: SLO Statement (Full Description):

By the end of the course, students will demonstrate proficiency in advanced object-oriented software design by implementing principles of composition, inheritance, polymorphism, and design patterns to develop scalable and maintainable software systems. Students will critically analyze architectural trade-offs, apply best practices in modular design, and integrate abstraction techniques to create flexible, reusable, and extensible code structures. Through hands-on development and structured critique, students will refine their ability to construct well-architected, object-oriented applications.

Step 2A: Measure:

Student learning outcomes will be assessed through a **final project and/or final exam** in CRCP 6340

1. Final Project:

- Students will design and implement a **software system that demonstrates mastery of advanced object-oriented programming (OOP) principles**, incorporating:
 - **Encapsulation and abstraction** – Effective modularization and API design.
 - **Inheritance and polymorphism** – Proper hierarchy structuring and extensibility.
 - **Composition over inheritance** – Application of best practices in modularity and maintainability.
 - **Design patterns** – Use of standard OOP design patterns (e.g., Singleton, Factory, Observer, Strategy) to solve software design challenges.
- Evaluation will be based on a **structured rubric**, assessing:
 - **Code quality and structure** – Readability, modularity, and adherence to best practices.
 - **Architectural design** – Appropriate use of OOP principles and design patterns.
 - **Software efficiency and maintainability** – Scalability, code reusability, and technical robustness.
 - **Problem-solving and debugging** – Logical implementation and resolution of programming challenges.
- Students will present their projects in **faculty- and peer-led critique sessions**, articulating their **design decisions, trade-offs, and problem-solving strategies**.

2. Final Exam (if applicable):

- The exam will assess students' ability to **apply theoretical concepts in object-oriented design**, including:
 - **Code analysis and refactoring** – Identifying and improving inefficient or poorly structured code.
 - **Pattern application** – Matching design patterns to real-world software problems.
 - **Debugging and optimization** – Resolving OOP-related software design challenges.

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

Objective Quiz or Exam ,Observation,Presentation ,Portfolio ,Reflection,Rubric,Written paper/project

Step 2C: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct,Indirect

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

At least 85% of students enrolled in CRCP 6340 or other applicable courses will achieve a grade of B+ (87%) or higher on the final project or exam. This benchmark ensures that students demonstrate competency in designing, analyzing, and implementing object-oriented software systems, integrating advanced programming concepts such as abstraction, inheritance, polymorphism, and design patterns.

Beyond numerical assessment, students will engage in structured critique sessions where they will articulate their design decisions, justify architectural trade-offs, and incorporate feedback into their iterative development process. The final portfolio and written reflection will further evaluate students' ability to synthesize theoretical knowledge with practical implementation, ensuring a deep understanding of scalable and maintainable software design.

This dual approach—**quantitative grading and qualitative critique**—ensures a **holistic evaluation** of students' ability to work within complex object-oriented paradigms, preparing them for **advanced coursework and professional software development roles**.

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

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

For the 2024-2025 academic year, only final grade data is currently available.

CRCP 6340 was not offered during the Fall 2024 term.

For Spring 2025, 100% of students (14/14) enrolled in CRCP 6340 earned a B+ or higher for their final grade. Students' final projects were not evaluated with the new Advanced Software Design rubric.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

The 2024-2025 academic year results demonstrate strong overall student performance, with 100% of students (14/14) enrolled in CRCP 6340 earning grades of B+ or higher, exceeding the established target of 85%. This achievement indicates that the vast majority of students are successfully meeting the program's expectations for advanced software development.

The absence of CRCP 6340 during the Fall 2024 term presents an opportunity to analyze how course scheduling and sequencing might impact student progression and learning outcomes continuity within the program structure.

A significant finding from the 2024-2025 academic year is that the newly developed Advanced Software Design rubric was not implemented for evaluating students' final projects. This represents a critical gap between the intended comprehensive assessment approach and actual implementation. The absence of component-specific data limits the ability to conduct granular analysis of student achievement across the intended learning domains.

While overall grade performance exceeds targets, the lack of rubric-based assessment data means that specific competencies cannot be individually evaluated. This limitation affects the program's capacity to identify areas of particular strength or needed improvement within the creative technology curriculum.

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

Adjunct Faculty Onboarding Enhancement (Ongoing)

- Develop detailed faculty handbook with learning outcome specifications
- Create semester-specific teaching guides with milestone expectations
- Implement mandatory pre-semester meetings with department chair/coordinator

Mid-Semester Faculty Check-ins (Starting Fall 2025)

- Schedule monthly meetings with adjunct faculty during semester
- Review student progress data and identify at-risk students
- Provide just-in-time support and resource sharing
- Address instructional challenges collaboratively

Data Collection Enhancement (Starting Fall 2025)

- Implement consistent rubric usage across all sections and semesters
- Establish semester-end faculty reflection and data review meetings
- Create standardized reporting templates for adjunct faculty
- Develop student exit survey to capture learning experience feedback

Step 5B: Type of Action:

Faculty involvement

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

Faculty, Staff

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

The department will be holding meetings throughout the Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 terms to discuss the academic assessment rubrics, student learning outcomes, and scoring process to improve faculty experience and student engagement and performance.

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

Other

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Course Scheduling and Curriculum Structure

Standardize Course Offerings: Update the course offering schedule to consistently provide CRCP 6340 every term. Regular offering of the course will ensure students can maintain momentum in their academic progression and provide more robust data for ongoing program evaluation.

Assessment Standardization and Differentiation

Unify and Enhance Rubric Framework: Develop a unified creative computing application development rubric that aligns graduate and undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) while establishing distinct criteria that reflect the advanced expectations for graduate-level work. This alignment will ensure consistency across program levels while maintaining appropriate academic rigor and clear differentiation between undergraduate and graduate competency expectations.

Program Growth and Community Building

Expand Outreach and Engagement: Continue and intensify recruitment and marketing efforts to increase enrollment, enhance program awareness, and strengthen community engagement. Higher enrollment numbers will provide more robust assessment data, create more vibrant classroom learning environments, and help establish the program's reputation within the broader creative technology community. These efforts should target both prospective students and industry partnerships to enhance program visibility and career outcomes.

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

The following provides a comprehensive status update on the action plan items developed in response to the 2023-2024 assessment results. While some initiatives showed progress, the 2024-2025 results indicate that several key objectives require renewed focus and implementation.

Assessment Refinement

- **Rubric Development:** While detailed rubrics were developed for each student learning outcome, students' final projects were not evaluated using the newly developed Advanced Software Design rubric
- **Consistency Gap:** The failure to apply rubrics consistently across graduate courses represents a significant implementation failure
- **Data Limitations:** Without component-specific performance tracking, the program lacks granular data to identify specific areas of student struggle or excellence
- **Immediate Action Needed:** Full deployment of the assessment framework is critical for meaningful program evaluation

Enrollment Management

- **Class Size Target:** Enrollment numbers appear to remain within the targeted 12-15 student range based on reported data (14 students)

- **Continued Monitoring:** The program successfully avoided over-enrollment while maintaining viable course sections

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

In progress

Progress:

Complete

Program Goal (PG)

Step 1A: PG Number:

1

Step 1C: PG Statement (Full Description):

Develop and deploy an evergreen Creative Technology Program that leverages a custom adaptive learning engine to provide continuously updated, personalized educational experiences. This initiative will drive a 25% enrollment increase through targeted outreach and dynamic program content while engaging industry leaders by forming an active advisory board to continuously align the curriculum with real-world innovation and trends.

Step 2A: Measure:

1.

1. Curriculum and Adaptive Learning Engine

- **Update Frequency:**
 - Track the number of major curriculum content updates per quarter, along with minor iterative improvements (e.g., monthly tweaks).
- **Customization Effectiveness:**
 - Monitor user engagement and performance improvements in relation to adaptive content suggestions.
- **User Satisfaction:**
 - Measure student satisfaction and learning outcomes through surveys and performance assessments tailored to the adaptive engine results.

2. Enrollment Metrics

- **Overall Enrollments:**
 - Record total enrollments per enrollment cycle, along with segmented metrics (by demographics, course type, etc.).
- **Conversion Rates:**
 - Track how many prospective applicants convert into active enrollees following targeted outreach and marketing efforts.

3. Marketing and Outreach Performance

- **Campaign Engagement:**
 - Measure social media interactions, website traffic, email open rates, and click-through rates from promotional campaigns.
- **Referral and Word-of-Mouth Impact:**
 - Track referrals generated through alumni networks, industry partners, and digital campaigns.

4. Industry Advisory Board Engagement

- **Meeting Frequency and Participation:**
 - Record the number of advisory board meetings held and the participation rate of board members.
- **Actionable Recommendations:**
 - Track the quantity and quality of strategic recommendations proposed and implemented based on advisory board feedback.

5. Learning Outcomes and Performance Metrics

- **Student Achievement:**
 - Evaluate average improvement in course assessments and overall course completion rates attributable to the adaptive engine.
- **Curriculum Relevance:**
 - Record feedback from both students and industry partners on curriculum updates and alignment with real-world practice

Step 2B: Is Measure direct or indirect?:

Direct, Indirect

Step 3A: Target for Measure:

- **Curriculum and Adaptive Learning Engine**
 - **Update Frequency Target:**
 - Achieve a minimum of 2 major updates per quarter, with additional monthly reviews and refinements based on learner data.
 - **Customization Effectiveness Target:**

- Attain a measurable performance improvement of at least 10% on course assessments following adaptive interventions.
 - **User Satisfaction Target:**
 - Reach a student satisfaction score of 85% or higher on post-update surveys.
- **Enrollment Metrics**
 - **Overall Enrollments Target:**
 - Increase total enrollments by 25% over the specified period.
 - **Conversion Rates Target:**
 - Aim for a conversion rate improvement, with a target that at least 30% of inquiries or lead engagements result in enrollments.
- **Marketing and Outreach Performance**
 - **Campaign Engagement Target:**
 - Increase engagement metrics (social media interactions, website visits) by 20% compared to previous cycles.
 - **Referral Impact Target:**
 - Generate at least 15% of new enrollments through alumni and industry referral networks.
- **Industry Advisory Board Engagement**
 - **Meeting Frequency and Participation Target:**
 - Organize quarterly advisory board meetings with at least 75% active participation from board members.
 - **Actionable Recommendations Target:**
 - Implement 80% or more of the advisory board's actionable recommendations within the following quarter after each meeting.
- **Learning Outcomes and Performance Metrics**
 - **Student Achievement Target:**
 - Improve average assessment scores by at least 10% as a direct impact of the adaptive curriculum enhancements.
 - **Curriculum Relevance Target:**
 - Ensure that 90% of feedback from both students and industry partners is positive regarding the updated curriculum and its alignment with industry trends.

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

Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

- Enrollment Metrics

- As of the Summer 2024 census, 24 students were enrolled in the Creative Technology program.
- In Fall 2024, enrollment increased by 42% to 34 students in the Creative Technology program.
- In Spring 2025, enrollments increased by 15% to 39 students in the Creative Technology program. The first graduating cohort for the Creative Technology program matriculated at the end of the Spring 2025 term.
- In Summer 2025, enrollments decreased by 18% to 32 students in the Creative Technology Program
- Over the 2024-2025 academic year, enrollments increased 33% in the Creative Technology program, from 24 students to 32 students.
- Marketing and Outreach Performance
 - Marketing and outreach performance data over the 2024-2025 academic year was not collected for this report
- Industry Advisory Board Engagement
 - The department's program partner, Bisk, contacted multiple individuals in various industries to invite them to participate in the Creative Technology program advisory board.
 - The department did not hold an advisory board meeting during the 2024-2025 academic year due to scheduling concerns.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

The Creative Technology graduate program demonstrates mixed performance against established targets during the 2024-2025 academic year. While enrollment growth exceeded expectations significantly, critical gaps in data collection and program infrastructure implementation present areas requiring immediate attention for comprehensive program evaluation.

Enrollment Metrics: Exceeding Expectations

The program's enrollment performance substantially surpassed the target of 25% growth, achieving a remarkable 33% increase over the academic year (from 24 to 32 students). The enrollment trajectory reveals important patterns:

Strengths:

- Fall 2024 enrollment surge of 42% indicates strong initial program appeal and effective recruitment strategies
- Spring 2025 maintained positive growth momentum at 15%, demonstrating sustained program attractiveness
- Overall annual growth of 33% significantly exceeds the 25% target, suggesting market demand validation

Areas of Concern:

- Summer 2025 experienced an 18% decline, which may reflect seasonal patterns typical in graduate programs or potential retention challenges
- The program successfully graduated its first cohort in Spring 2025, indicating program completion and degree conferral capabilities
- Without conversion rate data, it remains unclear whether the 30% inquiry-to-enrollment target was achieved

Critical Data Collection Gaps

The assessment reveals significant deficiencies in data collection across multiple key performance indicators:

Missing Curriculum and Adaptive Learning Engine Data: The absence of any data regarding the adaptive learning engine represents a critical oversight, as this technology appears central to the program's educational approach. Without baseline measurements, the program cannot:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum updates or adaptive interventions
- Assess whether the 10% performance improvement target is being met
- Determine if the 85% student satisfaction threshold is achieved
- Track the implementation of major quarterly updates

Marketing and Outreach Performance: The complete absence of marketing metrics prevents assessment of campaign effectiveness, engagement rates, and referral impacts. This data gap makes it impossible to determine whether the 20% engagement increase target or the 15% referral-based enrollment target were achieved.

Industry Advisory Board Engagement: Implementation Challenges

The advisory board component shows concerning implementation delays:

Current Status:

- While outreach efforts were initiated through the program partner Bisk, no advisory board meetings occurred during the assessment period
- The target of quarterly meetings with 75% participation remains unmet

Implications:

- Lack of industry input may impact curriculum relevance and alignment with professional practices
- Missing feedback mechanism prevents validation of the 90% positive feedback target for curriculum relevance

- Delayed advisory board implementation may indicate broader programmatic infrastructure challenges

While the Creative Technology program demonstrates strong market appeal through exceptional enrollment growth, the assessment reveals critical infrastructure gaps that prevent comprehensive program evaluation. The program's success in attracting and graduating students provides a solid foundation, but systematic data collection and advisory board activation are essential for achieving the program's full potential and meeting all established performance targets. Immediate implementation of missing assessment components will enable more robust program evaluation and continuous improvement initiatives in subsequent assessment cycles.

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

Establish Comprehensive Data Collection Systems: Implement tracking mechanisms for all identified KPIs, particularly adaptive learning engine metrics and marketing performance indicators.

Activate Advisory Board Function: Prioritize scheduling and conducting the first advisory board meeting to initiate industry feedback loops and meet governance requirements.

Develop Assessment Infrastructure: Create systems to measure student satisfaction, learning outcomes, and curriculum effectiveness metrics that remain unmeasured.

Curriculum Assessment Protocol: Develop systematic approaches to evaluate adaptive learning engine effectiveness and student performance improvements.

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

Faculty, Staff

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:

Beginning in Fall 2025, the department will implement strategies to both review and collect relevant marketing, student interest, and student feedback data from our program partners at Bisk. There will be a continued focus on the creation and implementation of the industry advisory board, as well as student success and satisfaction surveys.

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

Advertising and marketing campaigns ,Enhanced recruitment effort,Other

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Retention Analysis: Conduct detailed analysis of the summer enrollment decline to develop targeted retention strategies.

Marketing Analytics Implementation: Establish robust tracking for all marketing and outreach activities to enable data-driven campaign optimization.

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

During the 2024-2025 academic year, program marketing materials and audience metrics were updated to target potential students that have a strong quantitative background. In addition, demonstration of quantitative competency was successfully integrated into the program application process. The department hopes that improvements to student retention will be seen during the 2025-2026 academic year as students who entered into the program after these changes progress through the intermediate and advanced program courses.

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

Fully implemented

Progress:

Complete