

Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: B.S. in Game Design/Communications Media
 Department Chair: Mary Baker
 Department Assessment Committee Contact: Randy Howe

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NECHE requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by **May 31** each academic year.*

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I. List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
Game Design students will be exposed to and attain competency in the following concepts, practices, and skills:			
1.	Analytical understanding of games, gameplay, and game elements	Formative assessments for each PLO occur in individual courses. A summative assessment occurs in each student’s 4 th year, during portfolio review.	Spring 2019
2.	A historical and critical perspective of games and design		
3.	Experience working in a player-focused iterative design process		
4.	Proficiency in several digital 2D and 3D & level design engines		
5.	Principles of computer programming and logic		
6.	Proficiency with several programming/scripting languages		
7.	Team-based planning & production process		
8.	Foundation in traditional art as well as 2D and 3D art & visual design for games		
9.	Games as media of communication and as aesthetic expression		
10.	The theory and practice of serious games – as a means of pedagogy, learning games, game for change, persuasive games		

II. PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the “loop closed”?
1, 7, 9	Portfolio review with rubric.	4 th year	All	An average rating of “Acceptable” or higher.	All students must present a portfolio of their work and meet the target set for the PLO in order to be approved to register for their capstone course: COMM 4880 Internship or GAME 4100 Game Studio. Students who do not meet the PLO target must revise their portfolio and repeat their portfolio review. Some students may be advised to take additional course work before repeating their portfolio review.

III. Summary of Findings: Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you “closing the loop”?

<p>Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</p>	<p>Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)</p>	<p>What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)</p>
<p>The B.S. in Game Design uses a portfolio review in the semester prior to each student’s required 12-credit capstone course: COMM 4880 Internship or GAME 4100 Game Studio</p>	<p>Student portfolios are reviewed by at least one Game Design faculty member and the Internship Director.</p>	<p>Feedback from portfolio reviews can provide important data used to revise and update the curriculum.</p>
<p>For Game Design students who opt to take COMM 4880 Internship as their capstone, each student’s on-site supervisor completes the Internship Appraisal Form to evaluate the student’s knowledge, technical skills, and written and oral communication appropriate to the profession.</p>	<p>The Internship Director compiles the results of the Internship Appraisal Form and shares the data with the department.</p>	<p>Feedback from internship sites can provide important data used to review and update the curriculum.</p>
<p>GAME 4100 Game Studio was recently developed in response to the lack of internships available in the game design industry. Assessment tools for this course are currently in development. This course ran only once in AY19, in the Spring semester.</p>	<p>In development.</p>	<p>In development.</p>

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

- I. Insert the program or department Assessment Plan
The Game Design program currently uses the portfolio defense its program assessment. Additional program assessments are in development.
- II. Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success.
- III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?
 Yes

University Data

I. SSC Data

Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.

Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
This year, the Communications Media department focused on three Student Success Performance Measures for the Communications Media major, but none for the Game Design major. It should be noted Institutional Reports in SSC are available for students first enrolled in Fall 2002 – Fall 2012. The Game Design major was approved as a new major in AY12 and began enrolling students in Fall 2013. The Institutional Reports in SSC do not contain data for the Game Design major at this time.		

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?*

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Using the SSC Advanced Search function at the end of the Spring 2019 semester 22 students or approximately 12% of students in the Game Design major were identified as having a High Predictive Risk level.	Predictive risk level is an indicator of student success as well as student retention.	The department will monitor high risk students. As each student’s needs are different, the department will implement interventions on a case-by-case basis.	Approximately 12% of students in the Game Design major were identified as having a High Predictive Risk level at the end of the Spring 2019 semester. The department will work to decrease the overall percentage of students at this risk level.	No. The Game Design major will undergo its first program review in 2020-2021.

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

II. Trend Data

Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement. Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
<p>This year, the Communications Media department focused on two Department Performance Measures for the Communications Media major related to low enrollment in the Photography concentration and graduating the last the Interactive Media students. Interactive Media was discontinued as a concentration in the COMM major in AY15. The Game Design major began enrolling students in Fall 2013 and has continued to grow as expected, so the department did not plan to implement a performance measure intervention for this major in AY19.</p>		

b. What will be the focus next year?*

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
<p>The Game Design major has recently experienced an increase in transfer students. The department will monitor the number</p>	<p>Transfer students often have the expectation of graduating in fewer semesters than may be possible given the</p>	<p>Department Trend Data reports the total number of incoming transfer students for the department. It does not break down this number</p>	<p>There is not a specific target score the department is looking to</p>	<p>No. The Game Design major will undergo its first program review in 2020-2021.</p>

March 2019

<p>of incoming transfer students over the next year.</p>	<p>requirements of the Game Design major. At this time, academic advisers work with individual transfer students to guide them through the program and submit course substitutions or waive prerequisites as needed. The Game Design faculty have discussed developing better and more consistent policies to assist transfer students in graduating a timely manner.</p>	<p>by major. The department will work with the OIRP and/or Admissions to get additional data.</p>	<p>achieve in terms of the number of incoming transfer students for the Game Design major, as enrollment has been steadily growing. This information will help the department to better serve transfer students in graduating in a timely manner.</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I. Programs that fall under Program Review: N/A. The Game Design major will undergo its first program review in 2020-2021.

- i. Date of most recent Review:
- ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year

iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

Yes

II. Programs with external Accreditation: N/A. The Game Design major does not have external accreditation.

- i. Accreditor:
- ii. Date of last review:
- iii. Date of next review and type of review:
- iv. List key performance indicators:

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.

March 2019

Campus Climate

Each department was asked to review the Campus Climate Survey information distributed by the Leading for Change Committee and determine what your department has been doing to contribute to the positive outcomes identified.

The survey data may be found through this link: <https://www.fitchburgstate.edu/offices-services-directory/institutional-research-and-planning/office-of-assessment/campus-climate-survey/>

Please list the feedback and recommendations that your department provided to the Leading for Change Committee, along with any additional plans that you might have to further explore this data.

The Communications Media department discussed the Campus Climate Survey at its faculty meeting in May 2019. The department is planning to continue its discussion during the Fall 2019 semester. While the department recognizes the importance of the Campus Climate Survey and the work being done by the Leading for Change Committee, several faculty members suggested collecting additional data as the overall number of respondents to the survey was low. For example, only two Game Design students responded to the survey. Additional data would be helpful to the department in identifying specific actions it can take to create more a welcoming and inclusive environment for students.

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</i>	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
<i>Expected Timing of Assessment</i>	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
<i>Assessment Tool Quality</i>	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
<i>PLO Assessment</i>	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assessed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but	Criteria for student success not provided.	

			not clearly stated or is not appropriate.		
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	
Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Department or Program Assessment Plan</i>	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
<i>Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan</i>	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	
University Data					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>SSC Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one SSC data	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

			point. No plan implemented.		
<i>SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Only for those under Program Review Annual Reflection on Program Review</i>	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for	

				progress discussed.	
<i>Only for those under External Accreditation Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i>	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.