Discipline	Course Number	Title
Animation	190	ANI 190 04/24/2023- History of Game Design
College	Division	Department
Business and Computer Technologies	Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts (new)
Faculty Preparer		Randy Van Wagnen
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

   No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

   3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

   5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major milestones in the history of video game development.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Outcome-related questions on final exam
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2021
    - Course section(s)/other population: All
    - Number students to be assessed: All
    - How the assessment will be scored: Answer key

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 70% or higher

- o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2022, 2021	2022	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
59	48

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Drops, withdrawals, or did not submit the final exam.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All modalities offered in the last few years were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This outcome was assessed using the final exam (via Goals Tool).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

91.6% of students (44/48) scored above a 70% on this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The students scored particularly well on this outcome, which is the broadest and most varied of the three outcomes. Students were able to identify most of the key figures and games that were discussed in the course.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Interestingly, students struggled within a few key areas -- the evolution of the original "2.5-dimensional" first person shooters and the early career of Shigeru Miyamoto. This is probably best solved at the course level: we pick up ID Software really heavily with a deep dive into the development of Quake, but could use more on their earlier work in class. The same goes for Miyamoto, who is probably the most closely studied designer in the whole course. We need to buttress our study of his early design work with a deeper dive instead of concentrating so much on the larger Nintendo story. It's also notable that the language here does not include "people", just milestones, when so much of the class is about the actual designers and artists.

Outcome 2: Identify and explain the evolution of gaming hardware and the subsequent effect on game design.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Outcome-related questions on final exam

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2021

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

    o Number students to be assessed: All

    o How the assessment will be scored: Answer key and rubric

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 70% or higher

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2022, 2021	2022	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
59	48

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Drops, withdrawals, or did not submit the final exam.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All modalities offered in the last few years were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This outcome was assessed using the final exam (via Goals Tool).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

66.6% of students (32/48) scored a 70% or higher on this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students did well with the questions about later consoles and hardware development.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students really struggled with the early PC/Apple releases, as well as the importance of the humble computer monitor technology to the careers of two of the three most notable video game pioneers. There are two tactics that we plan on pursuing to improve this: 1) We need more materials in class and an emphasis on some of the earlier technology. We are actually buying some of this hardware so that students can examine and use it to better familiarize themselves with it. 2) We need to improve the breadth of our assessment on this outcome. 3) I actually think a more consistent presentation of some of the hardware milestones both in the course organization and in our course shell design would be very helpful.

Outcome 3: Identify major genres of video games and their key design aspects.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Outcome-related questions on final exam

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2021

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

    o Number students to be assessed: All

    o How the assessment will be scored: Answer key

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 70% or higher

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2022, 2021	2022	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
59	48

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Drops, withdrawals, or did not submit the final exam.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All modalities offered in the last few years were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This outcome was assessed using the final exam (via Goals Tool).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>
97.9% of students (47/48) scored a 70% or higher on this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

This was our highest achieving outcome. Almost every student who took the course was able to differentiate between the various major genres and their defining characteristics.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The assessment tools could be more robust. We are going to add a second instrument to the master syllabus.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

There was no previous assessment.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

This class is a popular one that has been evolving rapidly to better meet student needs. We were very surprised to see the relatively low achievement on the technology scores, and look forward to the challenge of improving those scores. Most of the changes that need to occur are in the classroom and not master-syllabus related.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

The results will be shared with the departmental faculty

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Various fixes to outcome/objective language.	Some of these are poorly written or unclear.	2024
Assessment Tool	Addition of an "outcome-based discussion board" to outcome 3.	We would like to analyze student learning with a greater variety of instruments for our next assessment cycle.	2024
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Add materials in class to place more emphasis on some of the earlier technology covered in the course (Outcome 2).	The current assessment showed students really struggled with the early PC/Apple releases, as well as the importance of the humble computer monitor technology to the careers of two of the three most notable video game pioneers.	2024
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Add more material in class related to the earlier design work for ID software and Shigeru Miyamoto.	The current assessment demonstrated students struggled with the evolution of the original "2.5-dimensional" first person shooters and the early career of Shigeru Miyamoto.	2024

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

> 6.

III. Attached Files

[Assessment Data](#)

Faculty/Preparer:	Randy Van Wagnen	**Date:** 05/12/2023
Department Chair:	Jason Withrow	**Date:** 05/15/2023
Dean:	Eva Samulski	**Date:** 05/17/2023
Assessment Committee Chair:	Jessica Hale	**Date:** 02/26/2024