UNIT REPORT

Digital Game Creation MIT - 01 - Academic Program Rubric Review (IPE)

Generated: 10/9/25, 10:53 AM

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?: Prior to AY2023-2024

Progress: Complete

1 MIT - Digital Game Creation

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
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:

Results:

Cohort:	C33	Fall	2023	Date:	6/5/24
Student 43	**Ethic**	**Quality**	**Game**		**AVERAGE**
Average:	*4.3*	*4.2*	*3.0*		***3.9***

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:

Target met.

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

In Fall 2024, no capstone students (43) 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: Faculty involvement

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Mike Porter and Corey Clark

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Mike Porter, Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

In Fall 2024, no capstone students (43) 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.

Methodology:

Ethic and Quality are compiled from the average of 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 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):

In Fall 2024, no capstone students (43) 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 6B: Status Update on Previously Identified Action Plan(s): In progress

Progress: Complete

2 MIT - Thesis Defense

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?: Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Results:

ART:

Total ART Students	8	8	8	8
% Students > Target	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**

LD:

Total LD Students	15	15	15	15
% Students > Target	**93.33%**	**93.33%**	**86.67%**	**86.67%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**

SD:

Total SD Students	13	13	13	13	13
% Students > Target	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**76.9%**	**100%**	**84.6%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Missed**	**Hit**	**Missed**

Production results are reflected in PLO 6 & 7

Action items recorded in each specialization.

Attached Files
- C33 2025 Production Program SLO Rubric Semester 5- defense.xlsx
- C33 2025 Production Program SLO Rubric Semester 5- organization.xlsx
- C33 2025 Production Program SLO Rubric Semester 5.xlsx
- C33 Art Creation Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 2025.xlsx
- C32 Art Creation Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 2024.xlsx
- C31 Art Creation Program SLO Rubric Summer Semester 3.xlsx
- LD MIT Program SLO Rubric Semester 3 C34.xlsx
- LD MIT Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 C33- defense.xlsx
- LD MIT Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 C33.xlsx
- SD Combined SLO Semester 5 C33.xlsx

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Action items recorded in each specialization

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

action items recorded in each specialization

Step 5B: Type of Action: Additional emphasis or time on content
Faculty involvement

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Mike Porter and Corey Clark

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Mike Porter, Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh

Attached Files
- IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Further detail in each specialization

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

Reflected in each specialization

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

Progress: Complete

3 MIT - Art Design

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:

Total ART Students	8	8	8	6
% Students > Target	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**

Attached Files

C33 Art Creation Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 2025.xlsx

AC Program SLO Rubric Summer Semester 3 C34.xlsx

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Targets hit.

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

2024 – Regarding Semester 5, we hit out 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 reaction to this and will monitor if these changes will improve retention.

2025- Plan to proceed as before but further adding/repeating details throughout documentation. Holding student accountable for not hitting milestones, or trying to hack the proposal period via interim in thesis 1 helped keep things clear going forward

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

Step 5B: Type of Action: Course redesign

Faculty involvement

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Boris Fisher and Corey Clark

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Joowon McDowell, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Jeff Cavitt, and Carl Steiner

Attached Files
IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

2024 – Regarding Semester 5, we hit out 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 reaction to this and will monitor if these changes will improve retention.

2025- Plan to proceed as before but further adding/repeating details throughout documentation. Holding student accountable for not hitting milestones, or trying to hack the proposal period via interim in thesis 1 helped keep things clear going forward

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

2024 – Regarding Semester 5, we hit out 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 reaction to this and will monitor if these changes will improve retention.

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

Progress: Complete

4 MIT - Level Design

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?: Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

LD:

Total LD Students	15	15	15	15
% Students > Target	**93.33%**	**93.33%**	**86.67%**	**86.67%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**

2024: While all categories hit their corresponding targets, the faculty recognize that the Gameplay and Documentation categories are lower than ideal. Students often waste time on ideas or undeveloped concepts, which they then have to abandon in later milestones. Students also do not include enough context9 either with their maps or write ups) in their planning documentation for others to understand their vision and plan. The faculty will stress the importance of pre-production in early Level Design courses (ex. Level Design 01) and consider developing assignments/activities related to good time management and planning.

Report of 2025 Action Plan:

The faulty introduced a new art/aesthetic focus in the Level Design; Special Topics (summer term) course. The students improved in their Aesthetic scores when compared to the Summer Term IE values. This result indicates that the Special Topics course as helpful to some extent. As for the Documentation aspect of the previous Action Plan, the faculty encouraged students to make use of the Moody Graduate Writing during Thesis and pointed to additional pre-planning sources. However, the Writing Center does not provide grammatical support (therefore was less helpful to students). Students did not end up really using this resource.

2025 Action item for 2026:

Note: The number of students differ between DFS2 and Defense. Two thesis students (one currently enrolled in Thesis 02 and one currently enrolled in Thesis 03/040did not defend. As a result, they cannot be evaluated on the Defense scoring.

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

LD MIT Program SLO Rubric Semester 3 C34.xlsx

LD MIT Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 C33- defense.xlsx

LD MIT Program SLO Rubric Semester 5 C33.xlsx

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

The faulty introduced a new art/aesthetic focus in the Level Design; Special Topics (summer term) course. The students improved in their Aesthetic scores when compared to the Summer Term IE values. This result indicates that the Special Topics course as helpful to some extent. As for the Documentation aspect of the previous Action Plan, the faculty encouraged students to make use of the Moody Graduate Writing during Thesis and pointed to additional pre-planning sources. However, the Writing Center does not provide grammatical support (therefore was less helpful to students). Students did not end up really using this resource.

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

Report of 2025 Action Plan:

The faulty introduced a new art/aesthetic focus in the Level Design; Special Topics (summer term) course. The students improved in their Aesthetic scores when compared to the Summer Term IE values. This result indicates that the Special Topics course as helpful to some extent. As for the Documentation aspect of the previous Action Plan, the faculty encouraged students to make use of the Moody Graduate Writing during Thesis and pointed to additional pre-planning sources. However, the Writing Center does not provide grammatical support (therefore was less helpful to students). Students did not end up really using this resource.

2025 Action item for 2026:

Note: The number of students differ between DFS2 and Defense. Two thesis students (one currently enrolled in Thesis 02 and one currently enrolled in Thesis 03/040did not defend. As a result, they cannot be evaluated on the Defense scoring.

Step 5B: Type of Action: Additional emphasis or time on content
Additional activities or assignments
Faculty involvement

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Steve Stringer and Corey Clark

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Joowon McDowell, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Jeff Cavitt, and Carl Steiner

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

The faulty introduced a new art/aesthetic focus in the Level Design; Special Topics (summer term) course. The students improved in their Aesthetic scores when compared to the Summer Term IE values. This result indicates that the Special Topics course as helpful to some extent. As for the Documentation aspect of the previous Action Plan, the faculty encouraged students to make use of the Moody Graduate Writing during Thesis and pointed to additional pre-planning sources. However, the Writing Center does not provide grammatical support (therefore was less helpful to students). Students did not end up really using this resource.

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

2024: While all categories hit their corresponding targets, the faculty recognize that the Gameplay and Documentation categories are lower than ideal. Students often waste time on ideas or undeveloped concepts, which they then have to abandon in later milestones. Students also do not include enough context9 either with their maps or write ups) in their planning documentation for others to understand their vision and plan. The faculty will stress the importance of pre-production in early Level Design courses (ex. Level Design 01) and consider developing assignments/activities related to good time management and planning.

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

Progress: Complete

5 MIT- Software Development

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?: Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Total PM Students	13	13	13	13	13
% Students > Target	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**76.9%**	**100.0%**	**84.6%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Missed**	**Hit**	**Missed**

Attached Files

SD Combined SLO Semester 5 C33.xlsx

SD Combined SLO Semester 3 C33.xlsx

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Target partially hit

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

Action Plan:

We need to do more architecture & deconstruction exercises in all SD courses (they get a little at the very start of SD1 and a little at the very end of SD4 – could use a lot more).

This has been a weakness for some time, even with cohorts who technically haven't had a hard miss on IE really not being where they need to be on this.

2025: Missed on architecture. Several folks in this group really struggled breaking down games into features, features into tasks, tasks selection, class design, prioritization, and picking the right battles and the right solutions that actually solve their problems at the right scale and level of scope and generality.

2026 plan:

We need to do more architecture & deconstruction exercises in all SD courses (they get a little at the very start of SD1 and a little at the very end of SD4 – could use a lot more).

This has been a weakness for some time, even with cohorts who technically haven't had a hard miss on IE really not being where they need to be on this.

Step 5B: Type of Action: Additional activities or assignments

Faculty involvement

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Squirrel Eiserloh and Matt Butler

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Joowon McDowell, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Jeff Cavitt, and Carl Steiner

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

We need to do more architecture & deconstruction exercises in all SD courses (they get a little at the very start of SD1 and a little at the very end of SD4 – could use a lot more).

This has been a weakness for some time, even with cohorts who technically haven't had a hard miss on IE really not being where they need to be on this.

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

We need to do more architecture & deconstruction exercises in all SD courses (they get a little at the very start of SD1 and a little at the very end of SD4 – could use a lot more).

This has been a weakness for some time, even with cohorts who technically haven't had a hard miss on IE really not being where they need to be on this.

Admissions being reviewed by committee i spring 2025. See notes in admissions section.

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

Progress: Complete

6 MIT Production - Leadership Skills

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:

PLO #6:

Total PM Students	4	4	4	4	4
% Students > Target	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**

Attached Files

C33 2025 Production Program SLO Rubric Semester 5.xlsx

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Target hit

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

·Previous 2024 Action Plan

·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'd added SMU library support with SMU Scholar as an option to publish the thesis papers if we do remove the journal requirement.

.

·Report on 2024 action:

Conducted the industry review and determined to move from being rejected by scholarly journals and submit only to SMU Scholar library of thesis and dissertations for publishing

Step 5B: Type of Action: Redesign of activities or assignments

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to accept and 2nd: Corey Clark and Carl Steiner

Voted in: Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Joowon McDowell, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Jeff Cavitt, and Carl Steiner

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

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'd added SMU library support with SMU Scholar as an option to publish the thesis papers if we do remove the journal requirement.

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

·Report on 2024 action:

Conducted the industry review and determined to move from being rejected by scholarly journals and submit only to SMU Scholar library of thesis and dissertations for publishing

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

Progress: Complete

7 MIT Production - Organizational Skills

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:

Total PM Students	4	4	4
% Students > Target	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Target	**Hit**	**Hit**	**Hit**

Attached Files

C33 2025 Production Program SLO Rubric Semester 5.xlsx

C33 2025 Production Program SLO Rubric Semester 5- defense.xlsx

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Target Hit

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

· By semester's end, all four students demonstrated a deeper understanding of the outlined concepts.

2025 Action Plan for 2026:75% of these students did not complete the final draft at 6 weeks and needed class and office hour feedback on their result, Discussion, and Conclusions section every week to get to final by the SMU Scholar submission deadline the last day of class. While this is sustainable with 4 students and 1 fulltime faculty advisor, a 2025 hiring of another fulltime faculty dedicated to production thesis to be at the 2nd advisor should be sufficient to support future cohort specialization cohort numbers.

Step 5B: Type of Action: Program leadership involvement
Faculty involvement

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

Step 5D: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to accept and 2nd: Corey Clark and Carl Steiner

Voted in: Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Joowon McDowell, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Jeff Cavitt, and Carl Steiner

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

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

Step 5F: Other Improvements (Full Description):

2025 Action Plan for 2026:75% of these students did not complete the final draft at 6 weeks and needed class and office hour feedback on their result, Discussion, and Conclusions section every week to get to final by the SMU Scholar submission deadline the last day of class. While this is sustainable with 4 students and 1 fulltime faculty advisor, a 2025 hiring of another fulltime faculty dedicated to production thesis to be at the 2nd advisor should be sufficient to support future cohort specialization cohort numbers

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

By semester's end, all four students demonstrated a deeper understanding of the outlined concepts.

2025 hiring of another fulltime faculty dedicated to production thesis to be at the 2nd advisor should be sufficient to support future cohort specialization cohort numbers

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

Progress: Complete

1 Admissions Cohort Size - Common - Across all disciplines

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:

C34 had 54 students enrolled

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Form committee to review and discuss increase in enrollment target to 60. Include: Steve Stringer, Gary Brubaker, Joowon McDowell, Katie Clark, Myque Ouellette, Rene Archambault and Jaynell Dalby

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

2025-2026:

Committee met and suggested the following changes.

Changes were voted in via email on 5/18/25. Approved and past by Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Jeff Cavitt, Mark Leon, Elizabeth Stringer, Karl Steiner, Myque Ouellette, Steve Stringer, Squirrel Eiserloh, Katie Wood Clark, Brandon Stephens, Matt butler.

Target Change: 60 students instead of 45

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

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Jeff Cavitt and Carl Steiner

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Mike Porter, Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Carl Steiner, and Jeff Cavitt

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

IE certificate report Semester 3 2024-final.docx

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

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):

Faculty initiative to "spread the word" to undergraduate schools at SMU.

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

Target increased to 60 for 2025 - 2026.

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

Progress: Complete

2 Admission Score - Common - Across all disciplines

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?: Direct

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?: Partially Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

3.6 average score across all specializations.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

One section hit in admissions scoring – Production
Review potential change in scoring from 3.75
Data gathering challenges due to new Slate implementation
Form committee to review: Steve, Gary, Joowon, Katie, Myque.

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

Committee met and suggested the following changes.

Keep 3.75 as the average admission score and start reporting by specialization for IE purposes.

Changes were voted in via email on 5/18/25. Approved and past by Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Jeff Cavitt, Mark Leon, Elizabeth Stringer, Karl Steiner, Myque Ouellette, Steve Stringer, Squirrel Eiserloh, Katie Wood Clark, Brandon Stephens, Matt butler.

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

IE certificate report Semester 3 2024-final.docx

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

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:

Motion to Accept and 2nd: Jeff Cavitt and Carl Steiner

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Mike Porter, Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Carl Steiner, and Jeff Cavitt

Step 5D: Type of other Improvements (check all that apply): Advertising and marketing campaigns
Other

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):

2025-2026:
Committee met and suggested the following changes.

Changes were voted in via email on 5/18/25. Approved and past by Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Jeff Cavitt, Mark Leon, Elizabeth Stringer, Karl Steiner, Myque Ouellette, Steve Stringer, Squirrel Eiserloh, Katie Wood Clark, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler.

target: keep 3.75 as the average admission score and start reporting by specialization

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

Implemented as of 2025-2026

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

Progress: Complete

3 Placement - Common - Across all disciplines

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?: Not Met

Step 4B: Results and Findings for this Measure:

Cohort 32 tracking resulted in the following job placements.

3 month placement = 45%%

6 month placement = 67%

Target missed.

Step 4C: Interpretation of Results:

Target Missed

Step 5A: Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):
Causes: Reduction in work force

Low Career Fair attendance

Market influence

Career services remains strong

2nd highest starting salary amongst SMU graduates (law school is first)

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

Step 5C: Evidence of Dialogue:
Motion to Accept and 2nd: Jeff Cavitt and Carl Steiner

Voted in: Elizabeth Stringer, Steve Stringer, Corey Clark, Mike Porter, Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Myque Ouellette, Brandon Stephens, Matt Butler, Gary Brubaker, Katie Clark, Mark Leon, Boris Fisher, Squirrel Eiserloh, Carl Steiner, and Jeff Cavitt

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

Step 5E: Other Improvements (Full Description):
2025-2026:

Committee met and suggested the following changes.

Target Change: Add in reporting 12 months. Continue with 9 months but for internal tracking only

Changes were voted in via email on 5/18/25. Approved and past by Joowon McDowell, Martin Sawkins, Jeff Cavitt, Mark Leon, Elizabeth Stringer, Karl Steiner, Myque Ouellette, Steve Stringer, Squirrel Eiserloh, Katie Wood Clark, Brandon Stephens, Matt butler.

Attached Files

IE report Semester 5 2025-final.docx

IE certificate report Semester 3 2024-final.docx

Step 6A: Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle (Full Description):
2024- 2025:

Establish committee to discuss adding 9 and/or 12 month to our reporting.

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

Progress: Complete

Program: **Digital Game Creation MIT**
Reviewer: **Academic Program Assessment Report Review Assist**
Review Date: **December 17, 2025**

Academic Program Assessment Rubric Review Table

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
Location	**No**. Program does not offer courses at an off-campus instructional site.
Distance Education	**No**. Program does not offer courses through distance education technology.
Mission Score	**3 – Good**
Mission Comments	**Highlights:** The program mission, "educate and train professional and future leaders in digital game development," is concise and clearly oriented toward preparation for professional practice in games. It aligns in broad terms with SMU's focus on preparing graduates who "excel in their professions in a global society." **Areas for improvement:** The mission does not describe specific knowledge, skills, or types of roles graduates are prepared for, nor does it reference key elements such as creative practice, collaboration, ethical practice, or innovation that are central to both the program and the institutional mission. It also does not restate location or modality, so readers must rely on other fields to understand where and how the program is offered. **Suggested mission rewrite (model):** "The Digital Game Creation MIT program prepares graduates to design, develop, and deliver professional-quality digital games by integrating advanced game programming, art, level design, and production leadership. Based on the SMU Dallas campus, the program cultivates creative collaboration, ethical practice, and industry-ready skills so graduates can lead and innovate in global game and interactive media industries."
SLOs Score	**3 – Good**

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
SLOs Comments	**Highlights:** The program lists **seven** program-level outcomes (game creation, thesis defense, art, level design, software development, leadership, organizational skills), which exceeds the minimum requirement and covers both technical and professional capacities. All SLOs are associated with clear culminating experiences (capstone, thesis defense, Directed Focus Study, Production courses), which makes them assessable. Timeframe is implied at the end of the program. **Areas for improvement:** Several SLOs use broad phrases such as "show expertise" or "develop and demonstrate leadership skills," which make the expected performance level and observable behaviors less explicit. Some outcomes combine multiple constructs (for example, "develop and demonstrate" leadership, or multiple professional skills in one statement), which can make interpretation and mapping to measures less precise. To reach "Exemplary," each SLO should have a single, observable verb and clearly state what students can do by graduation, independent of measurement tools or numeric thresholds. **Suggested SLO rewrites (models):** 1) *Game Creation:* "By graduation, students will create a fully playable digital game that demonstrates core principles of game design, usability, and technical stability, as evaluated by the program capstone rubric." 2) *Thesis Defense:* "By graduation, students will present and defend a thesis that clearly articulates a research question, methods, results, and implications for the game industry in a public defense." 3) *Art Design:* "By graduation, students will produce a digital art portfolio for games that demonstrates professional-quality 2D and 3D work, materials, and use of industry tools." 4) *Level Design:* "By graduation, students will design game levels that demonstrate professional standards of aesthetics, gameplay flow, technical implementation, and documentation." 5) *Software Development:* "By graduation, students will develop game software that demonstrates fluency in C++, sound system architecture, and implementation of engine and gameplay systems." 6) *Leadership:* "By graduation, students will demonstrate effective team leadership in game projects through team trust, positive influence, mentoring, and professional communication." 7) *Organizational Skills:* "By graduation, students will plan, monitor,

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
	and complete complex game production milestones, adapting to unexpected issues while maintaining scope, quality, and deadlines."
PGs Score	**3 – Good**
PGs Comments	**Highlights:** The program includes at least three program goals: cohort size, admission score, and post-graduation placement rates. Each is measurable and clearly linked to student success and program health. The goals align well with institutional priorities around access, quality, and career outcomes. **Areas for improvement:** The PG statements often blend the goal, the measure, and the target into one sentence. For example, the admissions goal repeats the Likert value and implies the target rather than stating a broader goal (such as maintaining a high-quality incoming cohort). The placement goal states "reach placement goals," then immediately embeds the specific threshold. Separating the descriptive goal from its measure and target would make the plan easier to read and maintain over time. **Suggested PG rewrites (models):** 1) *Cohort Size:* "The program will maintain a sustainable and diverse entering cohort size that supports a vibrant learning community and efficient use of resources." 2) *Admission Score:* "The program will recruit and admit applicants who demonstrate strong creative, technical, and collaborative potential for success in the Digital Game Creation MIT and certificates." 3) *Placement:* "The program will support graduates in securing timely employment or advancement in game and interactive media industries within the first six months after graduation."
Measures Score	**4 – Exemplary**
Measures Comments	**Highlights:** Every SLO is assessed with at least one **direct** measure that uses program rubrics tied to authentic artifacts: capstone game submissions (PLO 1), thesis defense (PLO 2), Directed Focus Study artifacts in art, level design, and software development (PLOs 3–5), and production-course evaluations for leadership and organizational skills (PLOs 6–7). Measures clearly specify when in the curriculum the assessment occurs (Semester 3, Semester 4, Semester 5) and

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
	list rubric dimensions such as work ethic, work quality, enjoyment, aesthetics, technical quality, gameplay, documentation, math fluency, system architecture, leadership behaviors, and planning. This gives a strong, discipline-appropriate picture of student performance. Program goals likewise have clear measures (cohort count, average admission score, placement percentages). **Suggestions for continued strengthening (no score impact):** 1) For SLO 2 (thesis defense) and SLO 5 (software development), consider explicitly naming the SLO in the measure description to make the linkage more obvious for external readers. 2) For placement and admissions measures, a brief note on data source (e.g., alumni survey, Slate reports, career services data) would further clarify evidence.
Targets Score	**3 – Good**
Targets Comments	**Highlights:** Targets are consistently quantifiable and clearly stated: for example, "80% of students should score a 3 or greater on a five-point Likert scale," "no more than 1 student should score below a 3," "70% of students complete the MIT degree requirements by graduation," "55% placement at 3 months and 75% at 6 months," and an average admission score of 3.75 out of 5. These thresholds are appropriate and set reasonable expectations for graduate-level performance. Program goals also include explicit numerical thresholds for cohort size and admissions scores. **Areas for improvement:** Most targets do not include a brief rationale rooted in historical performance, benchmark programs, or accreditation expectations. The rubric for an "Exemplary" rating calls for explicit justification of targets or evidence that they are periodically revisited in light of trends. Including even one sentence on why 80% or 70% were selected would strengthen the documentation. **Suggested target rewrites (models):** 1) *Game Creation SLO:* "At least 80% of students will score 3 or higher on each capstone rubric dimension (work ethic, work quality, game enjoyment) at the end of Semester 4, with no more than one student scoring below 3 in any category; this reflects our historical performance and expectation of strong mastery at graduation." 2) *Thesis Defense SLO:* "At least 70% of

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
	students will successfully complete all thesis defense rubric criteria at 'acceptable' (3) or above by graduation, with no more than one student failing the defense in small cohorts." 3) *Placement PG:* "At least 55% of graduates will be placed in relevant positions within 3 months and 75% within 6 months, based on alumni employment data, with targets reviewed every three years against industry trends."
Results & Findings Score	**3 – Good**
Results Comments	**Highlights:** The report provides clear numeric results for most measures. For example, the capstone game creation SLO shows average rubric scores (Ethic 4.3, Quality 4.2, Game Enjoyment 3.0) with 0% of students below the threshold. Thesis defense and specialization-specific SLOs report total numbers of students and percentages above targets across cohorts (ART, LD, SD, PM), with indications of where targets were hit or missed. Program goals include specific cohort size (54 students for C34), average admission score (3.6 vs 3.75 target), and placement rates (45% at 3 months, 67% at 6 months). Several sections offer useful narrative interpretation, such as identifying architecture as a persistent weakness in software development, lower than ideal gameplay and documentation scores in level design, and high stress, burnout, and cost concerns affecting retention in art. **Areas for improvement:** 1) Some "Results and Findings" sections simply restate "targets hit" or "action items recorded" without summarizing distributions or patterns in the text. 2) Trend analysis across cohorts is described in some places (art and level design) but is missing in others, even when multi-year data are available. 3) Equity considerations (for example, comparing outcomes across specializations or cohorts) are only implied and not explicitly discussed. **Suggestions:** For each SLO and PG, include in the narrative: (a) N and % at or above target, (b) whether the target was met, (c) a short description of notable patterns (e.g., particular rubric dimensions where students are weaker), and (d) a brief comparison to prior year(s) when possible.

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
	This will move the section toward a more fully interpretive, reflective profile of student learning and program performance.
Action Plans Score	**4 – Exemplary**
Action Plan Comments	**Highlights:** The program demonstrates a consistent habit of using assessment data to inform action. Examples include: continuing individualized capstone coaching as long as all students meet targets; revising curriculum and documentation expectations in art in response to retention concerns; adding an art/aesthetic emphasis in a Level Design Special Topics course and encouraging better pre-production and time management; increasing architecture and deconstruction exercises across software development courses; revising thesis publication expectations from scholarly journals to SMU Scholar; and using admissions and placement data to revise cohort targets and reporting by specialization. These are clear examples of data-driven improvement. **Areas for improvement:** Many action plan narratives lack explicit structure. They rarely name a responsible party, a specific implementation timeline, or a concrete reassessment plan, which are required for a top score. Some action plans, such as those for thesis defense and placement, are described at a high level (for example, “action items recorded in each specialization” or listing causes for lower placement) without specific, actionable steps. **Suggestions for strengthening action plans:** For each SLO or PG, document at least one concrete action with four elements: (1) the change, (2) who is responsible, (3) when it will be implemented, and (4) when and how it will be reassessed. For example: “Because documentation scores in Level Design remain lower than aesthetics, the Level Design faculty will introduce a required documentation checklist starting in Level Design 01 in Fall 2026 (Lead: Steve Stringer). Documentation rubric scores will be reassessed in DFS I and DFS II in AY 2026–27 to evaluate impact.”

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
Status Update Score (Steps 6A/6B)	**4 - Exemplary**
Status Update Comments	**Highlights:** The report provides status updates and 6B codes (In progress or Fully implemented) for each action cluster. For instance, the art SLO notes ongoing monitoring of curriculum changes aimed at improving retention; level design describes the implemented Special Topics course and observed improvement in aesthetic scores; software development acknowledges persistent architecture issues and the need to expand exercises; the production leadership and organizational SLOs report the industry review of thesis publication expectations and hiring of an additional full-time faculty member to support thesis advising; and the admissions PGs document committee meetings and implemented changes to cohort size targets and specialization-level reporting. **Areas for improvement:** Many status updates repeat action plan language rather than summarizing what actually happened and how it affected outcomes. Evidence of impact is mentioned indirectly (for example, improved aesthetic scores) but not systematically linked to the original target or trend. **Suggestions:** For each major action from the prior cycle, add a brief, structured update: (1) what was implemented, (2) when it was implemented, (3) what evidence you have so far about its impact (even preliminary), and (4) what the next step will be. For example: “The Special Topics course with an aesthetics emphasis was first offered in Summer 2025; average Aesthetic rubric scores increased from 3.4 (Summer 2024) to 3.8 (Summer 2025). We will continue the course and monitor whether gains persist over the next two cohorts.”
Overall Rating	**3 – Good**
Revision Level	**Minor**
Overall Summary	**Highlights:** The Digital Game Creation MIT program has a mature, multi-year assessment practice anchored in authentic, discipline-specific artifacts and robust rubrics. SLO coverage is broad, spanning

Criterion	Score / Narrative Feedback
	technical, creative, scholarly, and leadership skills. Measures are direct and clearly embedded in the curriculum at key milestones. The program regularly uses data to inform tangible decisions about curriculum (e.g., level design and software development), student support (retention, documentation, faculty hiring), and program operations (admissions, cohort size, placement). Faculty dialogue is well documented through motions and votes. **Key recommendations:** To progress from strong to exemplary, focus on (1) refining SLO and PG wording to be more specific and single-focused, (2) adding brief rationales for key numeric targets and revisiting them periodically, (3) expanding the narrative depth of Results & Findings to include clearer trends and equity considerations, and (4) structuring Action Plans and Status Updates with explicit actions, responsible parties, timelines, and reassessment plans. These are largely documentation enhancements that will make your already thoughtful practice more transparent and easier to sustain over time.

Quality Control Checklist (SMU Expectations)

- **SLO count:**
    - Degree program lists **7** SLOs (≥ 4 required). ✓
    - Includes non-writing but discipline-appropriate outcomes in technical, design, and leadership domains.
- **Assessment cadence:**
    - Multiple SLOs assessed in this cycle (game creation, thesis, art, level design, software development, leadership, organizational skills) at Semesters 3–5. ✓
    - Evidence suggests recurring assessment, though a five-year map is not shown in this report; program should confirm that all SLOs are assessed at least twice in 5 years in internal documentation.
- **Program Goals:**

    - At least **three** PGs documented (cohort size, admission score, placement). ✓

- **Direct evidence:**
    - Every SLO has at least one **direct** measure (capstone, thesis defense, DFS artifacts, production evaluations). ✓
    - Program goals appropriately mix direct and indirect evidence (e.g., enrollment counts, admission rubrics, placement data).
- **Targets:**
    - All measures have quantifiable targets (percent at or above rubric level, numeric cohort size, admission Likert average, placement percentages). ✓
    - Improvement needed: add brief rationales or benchmark references for major thresholds.
- **Results & Interpretation:**
    - Numeric results, Ns, and percentages are reported for most measures, with some interpretation and identification of strengths/weaknesses. ✓
    - Improvement needed: more consistent trend analysis across years and clearer connection between numbers and narrative for each SLO and PG.
- **Action Plan:**
    - Multiple data-driven action plans are present (curriculum changes, new special topics course, architecture exercises, thesis publication changes, admissions and placement decisions). ✓
    - Improvement needed: ensure each action plan includes the action, responsible party, timeline, and specific reassessment plan.
- **Status Update (Steps 6A/6B):**
    - Status updates provided for all SLOs and PGs, with “In progress” or “Fully implemented” codes. ✓
    - Improvement needed: deepen discussion of impact and link clearly to original action plans.
- **Numerical data integrity:**

- Review is based solely on the numbers reported in the narrative tables and fields and does not alter or reinterpret any values.