

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO**  
**ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Date: 20 September 2016  
**Due: 9/30/2016**

**I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

**1. Name and Contact Information of Program Assessment Coordinator:**

**Computer Animation and Game Development**  
**Clarke Steinback**  
**csteinback@csuchico.edu**

**2. Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Recognize and evaluate critical and aesthetic issues within computer graphics and the mixed media. (Issues)
2. Apply aesthetic judgments and critical thinking skills to art and graphics related issues. (Aesthetics)
3. Demonstrate mastery of specific technical, conceptual and critical abilities within computer graphics and the mixed media. (Abilities)
4. Demonstrate proficiency with industrial applications to visual communication related technologies. (Proficiency)
5. Communicate effectively in written format on research and creative issues. (Written)
6. Communicate effectively in oral format on research and creative issues. (Oral)
7. Apply critical thinking and aesthetic judgments in critiquing mixed media and computer graphics productions. (Critiquing)
8. Function on multi-disciplinary teams. (Teams)
9. Work collaboratively and individually with an understanding of the production process utilized in industry-standard studios. (Process)
10. Demonstrate professionalism through creative and intellectual independence. (Professionalism)

### 3. Course Alignment Matrix:

#### Mapping CAGD Courses to Program Outcomes

Course Title	Course	Program Outcome									
		Issues	Aesthetic	Abilities	Proficiency	Written	Oral	Critiquing	Teams	Process	Professionalism
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Computer-Assisted Art	110	I	I	I	I	I				I	
Digital Photography	112	I	P	P	P	I		I		I	
Concept Design & Storyboarding	117	I	P	P	P	P	P	I	I	I	
Video Game Design	170	I	P	P	P	P	P	I		I	I
Digital Modeling	230	I	P	P	P	P	P	I		I	
Digital Animation	240	I	P	P	P		P	I		I	
3-D Computer Modeling	330	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	I
3-D Character Modeling	331	P	P	P	P		P	P		P	P
Computer Animation	340	P	P	P	D			P		P	P
Advanced Animation Pre-Prod	345	P	P	P	P	D	D	D	P	P	P
Advanced Animation Production	445	D	D	D	D		D	D	D	D	
Senior Portfolio	493	D	D	D	D		D	D		D	D
Advanced Animation Post-Prod	545	D	D	D	D		D	D	D	D	D
Motion Capture for Game	298		P	P						P	
Game Asset Production	398			P	P						
Digital Lighting and Texturing	420		D	D						D	
3-D Character Rigging	432		D	D						D	

I = Introduced, P = Practiced with Feedback, D = Demonstrated at the Mastery Level

Assessed AY 2015-2016

The collection of courses that provided assessment data in this cycle include courses from the core of the Program as well as required courses in each of the options (Animation Production and Game Development) and CAGD electives. The data covers eight of the ten Program Outcomes at a variety of levels.

### 4. Learning Outcome(s) Assessed in AY 2015-16:

Which SLOs were assessed this year?

- 2 Aesthetics
- 3 Abilities
- 4 Proficiency
- 5 Written
- 6 Oral
- 7 Critiquing
- 9 Process
- 10 Professionalism

## 5. Assessment Methodology Used:

What kinds of assessment methods were used: embedded assessment of student work in a particular course? Type of assignment? Performance on standardized or other exams? Sample size? Sampling strategy? Who evaluated student performance? How was successful performance measured? Etc.

Embedded assessments were used in assignments for all courses submitting assessment data. CAGD 110, 112, 117, 170, 230 and 345 are core CAGD courses for the entire Program; CAGD 493 and 545 are required in the Animation Production Option; , CAGD 298, 330, 398 and 432 are electives for the students graduating in this cycle. All assessed projects and assignments in these courses have rubrics associated with each element in the rubric linking back to a Program Outcome. The rubrics utilized a three (3) point scale – 0, 1, 2 or 3 for evaluating each element in the rubric.

The ECC Graduating Senior Survey (Appendix C) was administered to graduating seniors in December 2015 and again in May 2016. The survey contains elements pertaining to Educational Satisfaction and Preparation. The Program had 50 graduates in AY 2015 – 2016 and 32 completed online surveys from seniors. The survey is an online instrument intended for students in their final semester; the Program endeavors to solicit student participation in senior course (CAGD 493 *Senior Portfolio* and CAGD 495 *Advanced Production*).

## 6. Assessment Results:

Please describe outcomes of assessment. How well did students perform on the assessment task? Feel free to use the table below to report results, adapting the table as necessary, or provide narrative describing the assessment results.

In Academic Year 2015 – 2016, eight (8) of the ten (10) Program Outcomes were assessed in 12 different courses in the Program from each academic level – freshman, sophomore, junior and senior. Appendix A provides a summary of the results from the embedded rubrics for each course in which the rubric was used for AY 2015 – 2016. The Program Outcomes for Issues and Teams were not measured in this assessment cycle. The assessment of each measured Program Outcome is derived from rubrics embedded in grading and critiquing assignments in each assessed course. The aggregate assessment outcome averages (See Table 6.1) indicate that the percentage of students achieving the target valued of 2.0 was more than 70% in all eight (8) measured Program Outcome with the Program goal being 70%. Seven (7) of the Program Outcomes averaged above 80% of the students achieving the target value in the aggregated data. The average target goal for each Program Outcome was 2.0 and the aggregate assessment data indicates that the Program achieved this goal in seven (7) of the Program Outcomes. A single Program Outcome (Critiquing) averaged 1.9 falling just short of the average of 2.0 or higher on the 3-point scale, yet reached the goal of 70% of students achieving the target. All the results displayed in the table are from embedded assessment rubrics associated with assignments in a mixture of Program core, Option required and CAGD elective courses. Results for each rubric element in each course are listed in Appendix A with rubric elements used in the assessment tools listed in Appendix B.

Table 6.1 – AY 2015 – 2016 Program Outcome Assessment Aggregates

Student Learning Outcome	Sample and Sample Size	Measure	Average – Scale 0 – 3 Target 2	Percent of Students Achieving Target
2 Aesthetics	6,862	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.1	80.4%
3 Abilities	3,737	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.3	84.5%
4 Proficiency	863	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.5	95.1%
5 Written	1,463	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.6	95.3%
6 Oral	9,765	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.2	86.8%
7 Critiquing	275	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	1.9	70.8%
9 Process	3,780	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.5	89.2%
10 Professionalism	477	Embedded course rubrics in course assignments.	2.4	87.1%

The comparison of the aggregate averages between AY 2014 – 2015 and AY 2015 – 2016 (See Table 6.2) shows little change in average target values for each of the measured Program Outcomes other than a deflection in Critiquing and an inflection in Proficiency. The Percentage of Students Achieving Targets does show some fluctuation between the two years with all the current year’s percentages at or above the target of 70%, though Critiquing show a decline in average score dropping slightly below the target of 2.0 on the three (3) point scale.

Table 6.2 – Comparison AY 2014 – 2015 and AY 2015 – 2016

Student Learning Outcome	AY 2014 - 2015			AY 2015 - 2016			Change	
	Sample and Sample Size	Average – Scale 0 – 3 Target 2	Percent of Students Achieving Target	Sample and Sample Size	Average – Scale 0 – 3 Target 2	Percent of Students Achieving Target	Average	Percent of Students Achieving Target
2 Aesthetics	7,705	1.9	73.9%	6,862	2.1	80.4%	0.2	6.5%
3 Abilities	3,868	2.0	79.7%	3,868	2.3	84.5%	0.3	4.8%
4 Proficiency	622	1.9	74.9%	863	2.5	95.1%	0.6	20.2%
5 Written	77	2.7	93.6%	1,463	2.6	95.3%	-0.1	1.7%
6 Oral	12,703	2.3	87.2%	9,765	2.2	86.8%	-0.1	-0.4%
7 Critiquing	190	2.3	81.0%	275	1.9	70.8%	-0.4	-10.2%
9 Process	3,348	2.6	91.0%	3,780	2.5	89.2%	-0.1	-1.8%
10 Professionalism	920	2.5	93.1%	477	2.4	87.1%	-0.1	-6.0%

Appendix A provides a summary of the responses to the ECC Graduating Senior Survey for the Educational Satisfaction and Preparation questions for both AY 2014 – 2015 and AY 2015 – 2016.

The survey queried the respondents about “Educational Satisfaction” in questions 1 through 16, 30 and 45 with the results summarized in Table 6.3. The survey scale ranged from a score of “1 = Very Dissatisfied” to “5 = Very Satisfied” with the score of 3 being interpreted as “neutral” or “neither.” The responses of satisfied are desirable with responses of neutral being considered positive while scores of dissatisfied reflecting a degree of discontent with the corresponding aspect of the student education. The responses to the Educational Satisfaction questions show that the graduates are fairly well satisfied with their education at Chico State. There appears to be a trend towards neutral in many areas between AY 2014 – 2015 and AY 2015 – 2016 with an decrease in both Dissatisfied and Satisfied. After many years of negative trending (decreasing Satisfaction and increasing Dissatisfaction) in Quality of laboratories and equipment and Quality of computer facilities, this year's survey shows a substantial increase in the Satisfied percentage and decrease in the Dissatisfied percentage. Also observed was an increase in Satisfaction with availability of courses in your department and Satisfaction with quality of courses in your department as well as a continued decline in Satisfaction with quality of General Education courses. This year's data also shows a decline in satisfaction in Satisfaction with academic advising from your major adviser though having a 87% Neutral or Satisfied rating.

Table 6.3 – Educational Satisfaction Responses Distribution for AY 2014-2015 and AY 2015-2016

Educational Satisfaction Responses		AY 2014-2015		AY 2015-2016		Change	
		Dissatisfied 1+2	Satisfied 4+5	Dissatisfied 1+2	Satisfied 4+5	Dissatisfied	Satisfied
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared							
Q_1	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by faculty in your department.	0.0%	86.4%	6.3%	93.8%	6.3%	7.4%
Q_2	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by other faculty.	4.5%	72.7%	0.0%	65.6%	-4.5%	-7.1%
Q_3	Satisfaction with access to faculty in your department.	4.5%	86.4%	3.1%	81.3%	-1.4%	-5.1%
Q_4	Satisfaction with availability of courses in your department.	9.1%	59.1%	12.5%	78.1%	3.4%	19.0%
Q_5	Satisfaction with quality of courses in your department.	4.5%	72.7%	0.0%	87.5%	-4.5%	14.8%
Q_6	Satisfaction with access to laboratory facilities and equipment.	0.0%	77.3%	0.0%	93.8%	0.0%	16.5%
Q_7	Satisfaction with quality of laboratories and equipment.	22.7%	50.0%	3.1%	75.0%	-19.6%	25.0%
Q_8	Satisfaction with access to computer facilities.	0.0%	72.7%	0.0%	93.8%	0.0%	21.0%
Q_9	Satisfaction with quality of computer facilities.	27.3%	50.0%	6.3%	68.8%	-21.0%	18.8%
Q10	Satisfaction with academic advising from your major adviser.	0.0%	86.4%	12.9%	61.3%	12.9%	-25.1%
Q11	Satisfaction with academic advising from the University Advising Office.	9.1%	59.1%	3.2%	54.8%	-5.9%	-4.3%
Q12	Satisfaction with career information from your department.	13.6%	63.6%	9.4%	65.6%	-4.3%	2.0%
Q13	Satisfaction with availability of General Education courses.	13.6%	63.6%	9.4%	68.8%	-4.3%	5.1%
Q14	Satisfaction with quality of General Education courses.	13.6%	63.6%	3.1%	40.6%	-10.5%	-23.0%
Q15	Satisfaction with overall quality of your education.	0.0%	77.3%	3.1%	84.4%	3.1%	7.1%
Q16	Satisfaction with your overall experience at Chico State.	0.0%	77.3%	0.0%	87.5%	0.0%	10.2%
Q30	I would recommend my major program at CSU, Chico to others.	4.5%	86.4%	0.0%	90.6%	-4.5%	4.3%
Q45	How satisfied are you with the department support you received while enrolled at Chico State?	13.0%	73.9%	6.3%	71.9%	-6.8%	-2.0%

Table 6.4 show the Educational Satisfaction elements with the highest average satisfaction values; all averages for these questions were above 87% Satisfied with only one (1) of these questions having any Dissatisfied rating resulting in Neutral or Satisfied of over 93% and the remaining five (5) having 0% Dissatisfied indicating a Neutral or Satisfied average of 100%. These positive ratings involve the program (quality of courses and teaching in the Program, access to facilities and computers, recommending the Program to others, and the overall experience at Chico State). Table 6.5 lists the questions with the lowest average Satisfied percentage. The two (2) least questions with the lowest Satisfied ratings dealt with quality of General Education and university advising and even though the Satisfied ratings were low there was not a corresponding high Dissatisfied for these two (2) questions. No Educational Satisfaction question directly related to the CAGD Program had lower than 60% Satisfied rating. Table 6.6 indicates which Educational Satisfaction questions which had the highest average Dissatisfied rankings – greater than 10% Dissatisfied yet none less than 87% Neutral or Satisfied. These questions involved major advising and availability or courses in the major.

Table 6.4 – Educational Satisfaction Questions with Highest Ratings

Educational Satisfaction Questions with Highest Ratings		AY 2015-2016	
Scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied 5=Very Satisfied		Dissatisfied 1+2	Satisfied 4+5
Q_1	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by faculty in your department.	6.3%	93.8%
Q_6	Satisfaction with access to laboratory facilities and equipment.	0.0%	93.8%
Q_8	Satisfaction with access to computer facilities.	0.0%	93.8%
Q30	I would recommend my major program at CSU, Chico to others.	0.0%	90.6%
Q_5	Satisfaction with quality of courses in your department.	0.0%	87.5%
Q16	Satisfaction with your overall experience at Chico State.	0.0%	87.5%

Table 6.5 – Educational Satisfaction Questions with Lowest Average Satisfied Ratings

Educational Satisfaction Questions with Lowest Satisfied Ratings		AY 2015-2016	
Scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied 5=Very Satisfied		Dissatisfied 1+2	Satisfied 4+5
Q14	Satisfaction with quality of General Education courses.	3.1%	40.6%
Q11	Satisfaction with academic advising from the University Advising Office.	3.2%	54.8%

Table 6.6 – Educational Satisfaction Questions with Highest Average Dissatisfied Ratings

Educational Satisfaction Questions with Highest Average Dissatisfied Ratings		AY 2015-2016	
Scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied 5=Very Satisfied		Dissatisfied 1+2	Satisfied 4+5
Q10	Satisfaction with academic advising from your major adviser.	12.9%	61.3%
Q_4	Satisfaction with availability of courses in your department.	12.5%	78.1%

The survey queried the respondents about “Preparation” in questions 17 through 29 with the results summarized in Table 6.7 for both AY 2014 – 2015 and AY 2015 – 2016. The survey scale ranged from a score of “1 = Unprepared” to “5 = Very Well Prepared” with the score of 3 being neutral. The responses of Prepared are desirable with responses of Neutral being considered positive while scores of Unprepared reflecting a degree of concern with the corresponding aspect of the student preparedness. The responses to the Preparation questions provide some gauge as to how well the graduates feel prepared as they leave their undergraduate studies and enter the workforce or continue on with higher education. The responses to the Preparation questions show that the graduates feel fairly well prepared as they exit their undergraduate studies with all combined Prepared and Neutral percentages for all the questions above 90% and averaging less than 6% Unprepared and over 80% Prepared. Between this year and the prior year, the Preparation responses shows two (2) questions exhibiting a decrease of over 20% in the feeling of Prepared involving technical problems and teams with both of these elements having over 65% feeling Prepared and over 94% expressing Neutral or Prepared

Table 6.7 – Preparation Responses Distribution for AY 2014-2015 and AY 2015-2016

Senior Exit Survey - Educational Satisfaction Responses		AY 2014-2015		AY 2015-2016		Change	
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared		Unprepared 1+2	Prepared 4+5	Unprepared 1+2	Prepared 4+5	Unprepared	Prepared
Q17	Perceived preparedness to apply knowledge of math, science, engineering, or technology to solve problems.	0.0%	81.8%	0.0%	78.1%	0.0%	-3.7%
Q18	Perceived preparedness to design and execute test procedures (for equipment/hardware components or software).	13.6%	77.3%	3.1%	62.5%	-10.5%	-14.8%
Q19	Perceived preparedness to analyze, assess, and interpret data/results from test procedures.	4.5%	63.6%	6.3%	53.1%	1.7%	-10.5%
Q20	Perceived preparedness to design a component or system to meet desired needs.	4.5%	72.7%	6.3%	62.5%	1.7%	-10.2%
Q21	Perceived preparedness to function in a multidisciplinary team.	0.0%	95.5%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	-20.5%
Q22	Perceived preparedness to identify, formulate and solve technical problems.	0.0%	86.4%	6.3%	65.6%	6.3%	-20.7%
Q23	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters in writing.	0.0%	77.3%	9.4%	59.4%	9.4%	-17.9%
Q24	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters orally.	0.0%	81.8%	3.1%	75.0%	3.1%	-6.8%
Q25	Perceived preparedness to understand and apply professional and ethical principles ?	0.0%	90.9%	6.3%	84.4%	6.3%	-6.5%
Q26	Perceived preparedness to understand contemporary issues facing society.	4.5%	86.4%	3.1%	75.0%	-1.4%	-11.4%
Q27	Perceived preparedness to use modern tools and technology.	0.0%	90.9%	3.1%	90.6%	3.1%	-0.3%
Q28	Perceived preparedness to appreciate impact of your solutions on society and environment.	0.0%	90.9%	6.3%	75.0%	6.3%	-15.9%
Q29	Perceived preparedness to continue learning.	0.0%	90.5%	0.0%	93.8%	0.0%	3.3%

Table 6.8 show the Preparation elements with the highest average prepared values; all averages for these questions were nearly 85% or above Prepared with less than 7% Unprepared indicating a Neutral or Prepared of 93% of the respondents. As shown in Table 6.9, only two questions had lower than 60% Prepared responses involving interpreting data and technical writing both of which have less than 10% Unprepared rating resulting in a Neutral or Prepared rating of over 90%. Table 6.10 indicates the single Preparation question having the highest average Unprepared ranking of nearing 10% involving technical writing with all other questions having results of less than 7% Unprepared and the corresponding .

Table 6.8 – Preparation Questions with Highest Ratings

Senior Exit Survey - Preparation Responses		AY 2015-2016	
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared		Unprepared 1+2	Prepared 4+5
Q29	Perceived preparedness to continue learning.	0.0%	93.8%
Q27	Perceived preparedness to use modern tools and technology.	3.1%	90.6%
Q25	Perceived preparedness to understand and apply professional and ethical principles.	6.3%	84.4%

Table 6.9 – – Preparation Questions with Lowest Average Satisfied Ratings

Senior Exit Survey - Preparation Responses		AY 2015-2016	
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared		Unprepared 1+2	Prepared 4+5
Q19	Perceived preparedness to analyze, assess, and interpret data/results from test procedures.	6.3%	53.1%
Q23	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters in writing.	9.4%	59.4%

Table 6.10 – Preparation Questions with Highest Average Unprepared Ratings

Senior Exit Survey - Preparation Responses		AY 2015-2016	
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared		Unprepared 1+2	Prepared 4+5
Q23	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters in writing.	9.4%	59.4%

## 7. Analysis / Interpretation of Results

How do the assessment data you have collected and evaluated inform your understanding of student learning?  
How were the results shared with faculty, students, and/or other stakeholders?

Overall the aggregate assessment results demonstrate the achievement of the Program Outcomes within the courses and assignments assessed. The aggregated averages for each of the measured outcomes achieved the target of 2.0 or higher on the 3-point scale for all but a single measured outcome with that one dropping just shy of the target value. Using the objective of 70% of the students achieving the targeted 2.0-level, each of the measured Program Outcomes achieved this goal. These aggregate assessment results show the Program as a whole achieving the targets and goals for the eight (8) measured Program Outcomes with a minor drop below the average target value for Critiquing while still achieving the target percentage of students achieving the goal for all measured Program Outcomes.

Although the embedded assessment data does show the Program attaining the goals with considerations to improve the minor variations observed this year, the Program's continued forced reliance on low-paid part-time faculty with very high workloads does create concern for the Program. Maintaining motivation by the faculty for the next assessment cycle will be a challenge in the current environment. The Faculty's investment and buy-in to the Program and assessment are critical, and the faculty and Program need to be valued to assist in not only assessment but also the continued quality of teaching.

As in prior years the ECC Graduating Senior Survey, the overall Educational Satisfaction is good though overall satisfaction and low dissatisfaction in AY 2015 – 2016 even with the continued crowded classrooms, significantly overworked faculty, single tenure-track faculty responsible advising over 250 majors and all committees as well as all duties for the Program influencing the quality of education. The cohort surveyed in AY 2015 – 2016 experienced very large lab-classroom (50 - 80 seat labs) for all of their time in the Program as well as the near constant business-hour booking of these two (2) lab-classroom spaces leaving little time to utilize the equipment outside of course time.

The positive inflection in Satisfaction regarding the Program's facilities and computers is a welcome change from the prior years' continued negative view by the students. Even with the continuing lack of recourses and support from the college, the Program was able to obtain external funding from the Provost and from Student Learning Fees to implement a major upgrade in the two lab-classrooms. One of the lab-classrooms had six year-old computers originally funded by the Provost with no resources provided to upgraded or maintain this computers – during the six years of use; the second lab-classroom had enjoyed a minor renovation in the past year upgrading from 14 year-old computers unable to run our software, to seven (7) year old library cast-off computers barely able to cope with the demands of the software tools and needs of the students. Obtaining the non-college funding permitted the Program to significantly update the one lab-classroom, making it viable for

several more years, and to replace the cast-off computers in the other lab-classroom with high-end workstations. The improvements in the quality of the computers were reflected in the level of satisfaction in the facilities by the students.

The specific elements which had the lowest satisfaction levels and the highest dissatisfaction levels continue to be focused on quality of GE courses. The quality of GE courses is outside of the control of the Program. The drop in satisfaction for major advising noted with Neutral and Satisfied still above 87% is a change from prior years. The Program having a single tenure-track faculty working overloads responsible for all advising and with the Program not having any staff support (ASC) for over three months most likely influenced this decline in satisfaction by the students. With the single tenure-track faculty and the temporary faculty with highest SFR in the college bringing into the college via FTES twice what it costs, the Program and its students continue to endure the underfunding and resulting conditions. The money via FTES that the Program does bring to the college helps provide resources to the under-performing units, lowering their faculty workloads and perhaps providing sufficient faculty resources for them have acceptable advising loads.

In the area of Preparation, the exit survey showed no surveyed area with more than 10% Unprepared. Some minor changes in Prepared were observed but no category had less than 90% Neutral or Prepared.

Overall the results of the embedded Program Outcome assessment data and the Senior Exit Survey show the program is meeting the targets and goals, and the seniors have a positive experience and overall feel prepared to move forward in their careers.

The results of the assessment is distributed to and discussed with the faculty in faculty meetings. Other stakeholders (students, alumni and employers) will be provided the data through web publications.

#### **8. Planned Program Improvement Actions Resulting from Outcomes (if applicable)**

How will the assessment data and their evaluation be used to improve the program? Possible actions might include revising pedagogy, courses, curricula, or other learning support mechanisms.

With the limited resources of the Program is provided, the high workload of the faculty, and the temporary and mostly part-time nature of the faculty, the Program needs to carefully consider what actions to undertake in the upcoming assessment cycle.

Although no Program Outcome clearly exhibited results indicated the significant need for change, the single Program Outcomes slightly below the target value (Critiquing) will be considered for improvement. The faculty will investigate means to provide students with more timely feedback to students as well as observing trends within the course and between semesters in this outcome. The ongoing issue of the large class sizes and high workloads of all faculty will impact the implementation of possible improvements and we will look for means to assist the faculty such as requesting funding for graders and expanding the peer mentoring system the Program uses.

The adoption of the new degree name (Computer Animation and Game Development) did not alter the courses in the curriculum, but did arrange the courses differently and change the required courses. These changes along with the continued growth have again added to the workload of the faculty and expanded the assessment collection to more courses. Maintaining faculty participation and enthusiasm for assessment continues to be a challenge with their high workloads and with the continued administration refusal to allow the Program to hire tenure-track faculty or full-time faculty. In this current assessment cycle revealed some decrease by some faculty in participating effectively in assessment even with embedded assignments rubrics and many reminders. The high workloads, the low-pay and clear lack of support for the Program (even noted in last-year's APR) contribute to a negative environment felt by the faculty. With the addition of new part-time faculty and the needed expansion of assessment to additional courses, the Program Director will continue to work with the

faculty to roll out embedded assessment tools in stages this year and continue to be supportive of the Program faculty even without the level of resources other programs may have.

To attempt to mitigate the workload issued that normally falls upon tenure-track faculty, but within the Program must be conducted by temporary faculty without compensation, the Program Director has and will continue to ask for AWTU release for the up-to-now uncompensated work. It is hope that providing some workload relief and well as acknowledgement of the long running contributions to the program, the requested AWTU will help the faculty and thus the students and the Program improve assessment data collection.

With the new course-set for the degree, the faculty will update the course and Program Outcome mapping. The faculty will begin rolling out additional embedded assessment data collection into several additional courses this year with the overall plan to include embedded assessment rubrics in most courses in the program. Also with reassignment of courses to different faculty, the Program will be able to capture data from critical classes that were absent this cycle.

The faculty continue to develop resources and tools to assist the burden of high SFR workloads with assessment. We have expanded use of free tools such as Google Drive and we have successfully experimented with the newer version of Blackboard Learn, although it is cumbersome and far less complete and less robust than other tools available to the University. We continue to expand the usage of these tools to assist in gathering more data from more classes in a less burdensome manner for the faculty. This year we have requested funding for paid course graders and will look to expand the volunteer peer mentor system to assist in feedback and assessment. The faculty will continue to explore procedures to help streamline the gathering and analysis of the assessment data with the goal of reducing the burden on the over-worked faculty.

#### **9. Planned Revision of Measures or Metrics (if applicable)**

A possible revision of a measure might be to recommend a change in the assignments that are evaluated for program assessment, or the number of assignments examined, and by whom. A metric revision might be for program faculty to decide to change the “bar” for acceptable performance.

The current assessment results show achievement of the targets and goals, and although no significant change is currently planned for the metrics or measures, the faculty will review the courses assessed and consider expanding the courses for which assessment data will be collected in light of the updated curriculum. In this effort, the assessment coordinator will for with various faculty to address learning outcomes in prerequisite courses to help better articulate the Program Outcomes throughout the Program. We will consider reviewing the student learning outcomes and assessment rubrics in several freshmen-level courses (*i.e.* CAGD 112 and CAGD 117) from the perspective of the need of the follow-on courses with the PO in mind. The faculty, as a whole, will help consider and implement the tools for gathering the additional assessment data in all courses as well as assisting the assessment coordinator in implementing an online rubric library to assist in creating new assessment rubrics from existing rubric elements as well as creating a tool to assist in developing both common usage elements and new elements for assessment.

We will again in this current assessment cycle endeavor to look at ways to connect with alumni and industry. The limited resources, extreme workloads and the single overloaded tenured faculty will look at gathering additional assessment data from alumni and industry through online tools such as surveys.

#### **10. Planned Revisions to Program Objectives or Learning Outcomes (if applicable)**

After examining the assessment data it might be appropriate to revise one or more of the Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes.

Keeping in mind the overloaded faculty with significantly high SFR, the faculty will consider new rubrics and expand the assessment to additional classes based on the updated curriculum. They will review the course to Program Outcome matrix based on the updated curriculum.

#### **11. Changes to Assessment Schedule (if applicable)**

Do the results create a need for change in your assessment schedule? If so, please describe.

No change to the assessment schedule is planned.

#### **12. Information for Next Year**

What learning outcome(s) are you examining next year and who will be the contact person?

We plan to continue to examine outcomes 2 through 10 and plan to expand the collection of assessment data to additional required CAGD courses and initiate use of rubrics to assess PO 1 - Issues. If financial and time resources are available we will also expand assessment elements to alumni and industry through online tools. The Program Director, Clarke Steinback – the single tenure-tracked faculty in the program already responsible for all advising for the over 250 majors, charting the need for courses in the program, program committee work, and attempting to develop and guide the vision of the Program, will continue to be the lead agent for assessment related implementations and developments.

II. Appendices (please include any of the following that are applicable to your program)

A. Assessment Data Summaries (Details that elaborate on item 6, above.)

Data Summaries for embedded rubrics

Course	PO	Element	Average	STD	N	Percent of Students Achieving
CAGD 298	2	Animation	1.9	.83	40	60.0%
CAGD 432	2	Animation	2.3	.46	19	100.0%
CAGD 432	2	Animation Ready	2.0	.85	62	75.8%
CAGD 117	2	Atmospheric Perspective	1.8	.58	192	76.6%
CAGD 432	2	Body Rigging	1.3	0.55	22	27.3%
CAGD 110	2	Color/Value	1.9	0.67	918	75.1%
CAGD 117	2	Color/Value	1.7	0.65	181	69.1%
CAGD 110	2	Composition	2.1	0.76	417	79.9%
CAGD 117	2	Composition	1.7	0.67	89	61.8%
CAGD 331	2	Concept Design	2.0	1.06	74	78.4%
CAGD 432	2	Control Curves Setup	2.4	0.49	20	100.0%
CAGD 330	2	Critical Thinking	2.8	0.77	58	93.1%
CAGD 230	2	Critical Thinking - Aesthetics and Creativity	2.6	0.55	59	96.6%
CAGD 330	2	Critical Thinking - Aesthetics and Creativity	2.3	0.64	52	90.4%
CAGD 432	2	Critical Thinking - Aesthetics and Creativity	1.9	0.66	40	72.5%
CAGD 117	2	Design	1.9	0.76	92	76.1%
CAGD 112	2	Exposure	2.3	0.68	158	88.0%
CAGD 432	2	Frame Rigging	2.0	0.95	21	57.1%
CAGD 298	2	Key Poses	2.1	0.44	20	95.0%
CAGD 112	2	Lighting and Exposure	2.6	0.53	127	98.4%
CAGD 545	2	Performance/Animation	1.6	0.48	27	63.0%
CAGD 298	2	Personality	2.7	0.46	20	100.0%
CAGD 112	2	Posing -Expression and Body Language	2.6	0.53	84	97.6%
CAGD 230	2	Rendering	2.6	0.57	116	97.4%
CAGD 117	2	Scale	1.5	0.73	193	54.9%
CAGD 110	2	Sharpness	2.4	0.68	919	90.9%
CAGD 117	2	Sharpness	1.8	0.61	180	72.2%
CAGD 112	2	Source Images	2.5	0.54	43	97.7%
CAGD 545	2	Staging & Composition	2.5	0.50	27	100.0%
CAGD 117	2	Staging Composition	1.8	0.57	189	72.5%
CAGD 110	2	Story	2.6	0.65	418	93.5%
CAGD 117	2	Story	1.8	0.73	187	66.3%
CAGD 545	2	Story Edit	2.4	0.50	27	100.0%
CAGD 110	2	Texture	1.9	0.65	920	78.9%
CAGD 117	2	Texture	1.8	0.73	180	71.7%
CAGD 230	2	Texturing	2.3	0.72	137	87.6%
CAGD 330	2	Texturing	2.0	0.80	48	81.3%
CAGD 331	2	Texturing	1.8	0.94	146	66.4%
CAGD 110	2	Timing/Spacing	1.7	0.64	208	66.3%
CAGD 331	2	Turntable and Wireframe Animation	2.0	1.20	111	70.3%
CAGD 432	2	Video Demo Reel	2.7	0.56	21	95.2%
<b>2 Average</b>			2.1	0.67	6,862	80.4%
CAGD 345	3	Audio	2.2	0.40	15	100.0%
CAGD 112	3	Blending Images Together	2.3	0.59	43	93.0%
CAGD 345	3	Camera Angles and Movement	2.3	0.46	56	100.0%

CAGD	298	3	Camera Composition	1.9	0.95	40	62.5%
CAGD	345	3	Camera Shot	2.7	0.63	40	90.0%
CAGD	345	3	Camera Shot	2.9	0.27	26	100.0%
CAGD	112	3	Digital Darkroom	2.1	0.68	360	83.9%
CAGD	432	3	Facial Rigging	1.9	0.95	22	68.2%
CAGD	331	3	Form and Proportions	2.2	0.81	111	83.8%
CAGD	432	3	Functionality of the Rig	2.0	0.86	39	64.1%
CAGD	330	3	High-Poly Modeling	2.5	0.70	50	96.0%
CAGD	331	3	High-Poly Modeling	1.9	1.12	74	60.8%
CAGD	432	3	IK Setup	2.1	1.12	20	70.0%
CAGD	432	3	Joint Placement	2.8	0.52	19	94.7%
CAGD	230	3	Lighting	2.4	0.55	116	96.6%
CAGD	330	3	Lighting	2.1	0.81	52	88.5%
CAGD	432	3	Lighting	2.0	0.88	41	68.3%
CAGD	330	3	Low-Poly Modeling	2.4	0.60	51	98.0%
CAGD	330	3	Map Baking	2.1	0.78	49	87.8%
CAGD	112	3	Merging Images	2.0	0.90	76	81.6%
CAGD	298	3	Mocap Animation	2.4	0.58	20	95.0%
CAGD	230	3	Modeling & Overall Geometry	2.4	0.68	131	88.5%
CAGD	330	3	Modeling & Overall Geometry	2.3	0.78	86	88.4%
CAGD	398	3	Modeling & Overall Geometry	2.3	0.84	121	74.4%
CAGD	331	3	Overall Geometry	1.8	1.21	37	51.4%
CAGD	117	3	Perspective	1.8	0.64	276	75.0%
CAGD	345	3	Storyboard Language	2.4	0.80	40	90.0%
CAGD	345	3	Storyboard Language	2.3	0.47	28	100.0%
CAGD	298	3	Technical Import	2.3	0.54	20	95.0%
CAGD	398	3	Terrain	2.7	0.53	23	95.7%
CAGD	398	3	Texture Creation and Baking	2.4	0.91	121	89.3%
CAGD	345	3	Theme	2.8	0.59	25	92.0%
CAGD	345	3	Theme	2.7	0.55	22	95.5%
CAGD	345	3	Timing	2.6	0.84	80	90.0%
CAGD	345	3	Timing	3.0	0.13	54	100.0%
CAGD	110	3	Translation	2.3	0.77	708	84.3%
CAGD	330	3	Tutorial: Followed the Tutorial	2.5	0.57	26	96.2%
CAGD	230	3	UV Mapping	2.5	0.66	195	91.8%
CAGD	330	3	UV Mapping	1.9	0.85	51	66.7%
CAGD	331	3	UV Mapping	1.7	0.83	148	60.8%
CAGD	398	3	UV Mapping	2.4	0.75	74	89.2%
CAGD	432	3	UV Mapping	1.5	1.15	41	53.7%
CAGD	398	3	UV Mapping and Texture Atlasing	2.1	0.62	47	87.2%
CAGD	432	3	Weighting	2.2	0.70	63	82.5%
		<b>3</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>3,737</b>	<b>84.5%</b>
CAGD	345	4	Completeness	2.6	0.65	45	95.6%
CAGD	398	4	Completeness	2.6	0.65	117	90.6%
CAGD	345	4	Continuity	2.3	0.47	42	100.0%
CAGD	345	4	Document Consistency	2.3	0.64	42	90.5%
CAGD	330	4	Rendering	2.4		51	84.3%
					0.85		
CAGD	398	4	Scene Cohesiveness	3.0	-	23	100.0%
CAGD	345	4	Storytelling	2.7	0.55	49	95.9%
CAGD	398	4	Unity Scene Construction & Interaction	2.9	0.28	23	100.0%
CAGD	345	4	Visually Communicates Story	2.3	0.50	42	97.6%
CAGD	112	4	Visually Compelling	2.1	0.59	361	86.1%
CAGD	345	4	Visually tells the Story	2.3	0.46	40	100.0%
CAGD	345	4	Visually tells the Story	2.4	0.49	28	100.0%

<b>4 Average</b>				2.5	0.51	863	95.1%
CAGD	345	5	Beats	2.6	0.53	43	97.7%
CAGD	345	5	Character and Character Goal	2.8	0.48	29	96.6%
CAGD	345	5	Compelling Mental Picture	2.6	0.50	29	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Compelling Mental Picture	2.7	0.45	25	100.0%
CAGD	170	5	Content	2.2	0.63	268	88.8%
CAGD	230	5	Content	2.6	0.62	59	93.2%
CAGD	345	5	Content	2.3	0.60	40	92.5%
CAGD	345	5	Content	2.5	0.50	52	100.0%
CAGD	230	5	Description	2.6	0.59	20	95.0%
CAGD	345	5	Description	1.9	1.08	45	73.3%
CAGD	170	5	Formatting, Grammar, and Spelling	2.9	0.22	305	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Formatting, Grammar, and spelling	2.2	0.74	47	85.1%
CAGD	345	5	Formatting, Grammar, and Spelling	2.7	0.48	103	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Irony	2.5	0.50	29	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Irony	2.5	0.50	25	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Killer Title	2.7	0.47	25	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Logline Compatibility	2.1	0.95	25	76.0%
CAGD	345	5	Plot Summary	2.8	0.37	43	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Showing vs. Telling	2.6	0.57	46	95.7%
CAGD	345	5	Showing vs. Telling	2.2	0.60	26	96.2%
CAGD	345	5	Spelling and Grammar	2.9	0.34	46	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Spelling and Organization	2.7	0.46	43	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Story Development	2.7	0.58	46	93.5%
CAGD	345	5	Story Elements	2.8	0.42	22	100.0%
CAGD	345	5	Title, Logline, Genre	3.0	0.21	22	100.0%

<b>5 Average</b>				2.6	0.54	1,463	95.3%
CAGD	170	6	Body language	2.1	0.63	104	84.6%
CAGD	230	6	Body language	1.6	0.77	82	50.0%
CAGD	345	6	Body language	2.1	0.61	42	85.7%
CAGD	493	6	Body language	2.3	0.74	40	87.5%
CAGD	493	6	Body Language and Poise	2.1	0.54	1,085	91.6%
CAGD	493	6	Content & Knowledge	2.2	0.67	1,085	89.4%
CAGD	545	6	Content & Knowledge	2.4	0.60	54	94.4%
CAGD	170	6	Distracting mannerisms	3.0	0.21	104	100.0%
CAGD	230	6	Distracting mannerisms	2.8	0.66	82	95.1%
CAGD	345	6	Distracting mannerisms	3.0	0.15	42	100.0%
CAGD	170	6	Hesitations, other voice habits	2.2	0.42	104	100.0%
CAGD	230	6	Hesitations, other voice habits	1.9	0.48	82	91.5%
CAGD	331	6	Hesitations, other voice habits	1.4	1.05	80	50.0%
CAGD	345	6	Hesitations, other voice habits	2.6	0.49	42	100.0%
CAGD	493	6	Hesitations, other voice habits	1.6	0.84	40	52.5%
CAGD	170	6	Maintaining eye contact	2.8	0.45	104	97.1%
CAGD	230	6	Maintaining eye contact	2.0	0.70	82	82.9%
CAGD	331	6	Maintaining eye contact	1.6	1.02	80	58.8%
CAGD	345	6	Maintaining eye contact	2.3	0.81	42	83.3%
CAGD	493	6	Maintaining eye contact	2.1	0.61	1,125	87.8%
CAGD	331	6	Organization & Structure	2.2	1.19	80	76.3%
CAGD	493	6	Organization & Structure	2.4	0.56	1,125	96.6%
CAGD	545	6	Organization & Structure	2.5	0.60	54	94.4%
CAGD	493	6	Overall Rating	2.3	0.59	1,085	93.8%
CAGD	170	6	Poise	2.2	0.44	104	99.0%
CAGD	230	6	Poise	2.1	0.62	82	93.9%
CAGD	345	6	Poise	2.1	0.29	42	100.0%

CAGD	331	6	Presentation Length	2.3	1.21	80	77.5%
CAGD	493	6	Presentation Length	2.9	0.51	40	97.5%
CAGD	493	6	Quality of Work	2.2	0.63	1,085	89.8%
CAGD	493	6	Speaking	2.2	0.62	1,085	90.3%
CAGD	170	6	Voice volume, enunciation & speed	2.4	0.62	104	92.3%
CAGD	230	6	Voice volume, enunciation & speed	2.1	0.72	82	86.6%
CAGD	331	6	Voice volume, enunciation & speed	2.0	1.15	80	73.8%
CAGD	345	6	Voice Volume, Enunciation & Speed	2.9	0.29	42	100.0%
CAGD	493	6	Voice Volume, Enunciation & Speed	2.0	0.82	40	72.5%
CAGD	545	6	Voice Volume, Enunciation & Speed	2.2	0.54	54	94.4%
<b>6 Average</b>				2.2	0.64	9,765	86.8%
CAGD	230	7	Commentary	2.1	0.85	63	84.1%
CAGD	331		Commentary	1.9	0.94	107	71.0%
	7						
CAGD	493	7	Critique and Feedback	1.7	1.23	105	57.1%
<b>7 Average</b>				1.9	1.00	275	70.8%
CAGD	298	9	Camera & Rendering	2.4	0.77	40	82.5%
CAGD	432	9	Camera & Rendering	2.2	0.79	41	82.9%
CAGD	345	9	Document Submission	2.7	0.60	42	92.9%
CAGD	432	9	File Organization and Formats	2.8	0.55	61	95.1%
CAGD	112	9	File Structure	2.8	0.49	317	97.2%
CAGD	170	9	File Structure	2.9	0.59	122	95.9%
CAGD	112	9	File Structure & Layer Organization	2.8	0.42	43	100.0%
CAGD	298	9	File Structures and Formats	2.7	0.71	60	88.3%
CAGD	330	9	File Structures and Formats	2.8	0.58	163	95.7%
CAGD	432	9	File Structures and Formats	2.6	0.79	61	83.6%
CAGD	110	9	File Submission	2.9	0.43	1,129	96.9%
CAGD	117	9	File Submission	2.9	0.48	371	95.1%
CAGD	545	9	File Submission	3.0	-	27	100.0%
CAGD	432	9	Outliner Organized	2.2	0.60	20	90.0%
CAGD	112	9	Project Guidelines	1.9	0.32	361	92.5%
CAGD	493	9	Quality of Work	2.0	0.92	74	75.7%
CAGD	330	9	Scene Organization	2.4	0.89	162	80.2%
CAGD	432	9	Scene Organization and File Formats	3.0	-	21	100.0%
CAGD	345	9	Script Execution and Formatting	1.9	0.70	46	73.9%
CAGD	110	9	Task Management	2.0	0.57	28	82.1%
CAGD	117	9	Task Management	1.8	0.70	192	69.8%
CAGD	545	9	Task Management	2.4	0.71	81	86.4%
CAGD	112	9	Webpage	2.8	0.54	318	95.9%
<b>9 Average</b>				2.5	0.57	3,780	89.2%
CAGD	545	10	Art Direction	2.3	0.77	27	81.5%
CAGD	493	10	Content - Professional	1.9	0.89	74	70.3%
CAGD	170	10	Organization	2.8	0.41	257	98.4%
CAGD	493	10	Organization - Professional	2.4	0.83	74	85.1%
CAGD	345	10	Professionalism - Blog	2.7	0.44	45	100.0%
<b>10 Average</b>				2.4	0.67	477	87.1%
<b>Grand Average</b>				2.3	0.64	27,222	86.6%

### Data Summaries for ECC Graduating Senior Survey

Senior Exit Survey - Educational Satisfaction Responses AY 2015-2016							
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared			Dissatisfied 1+2	Neither 3	Satisfied 4+5	Total	Average STDEV
Q_1	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by faculty in your department.	Count %	2 6.3%	0 0.0%	30 93.8%	32 100.0%	4.41 0.78
Q_2	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by other faculty.	Count %	0 0.0%	11 34.4%	21 65.6%	32 100.0%	3.72 0.57
Q_3	Satisfaction with access to faculty in your department.	Count %	1 3.1%	5 15.6%	26 81.3%	32 100.0%	4.22 0.82
Q_4	Satisfaction with availability of courses in your department.	Count %	4 12.5%	3 9.4%	25 78.1%	32 100.0%	3.97 0.95
Q_5	Satisfaction with quality of courses in your department.	Count %	0 0.0%	4 12.5%	28 87.5%	32 100.0%	4.41 0.70
Q_6	Satisfaction with access to laboratory facilities and equipment.	Count %	0 0.0%	2 6.3%	30 93.8%	32 100.0%	4.72 0.57
Q_7	Satisfaction with quality of laboratories and equipment.	Count %	1 3.1%	7 21.9%	24 75.0%	32 100.0%	4.06 0.83
Q_8	Satisfaction with access to computer facilities.	Count %	0 0.0%	2 6.3%	30 93.8%	32 100.0%	4.56 0.61
Q_9	Satisfaction with quality of computer facilities.	Count %	2 6.3%	8 25.0%	22 68.8%	32 100.0%	4.03 0.95
Q10	Satisfaction with academic advising from your major adviser.	Count %	4 12.9%	8 25.8%	19 61.3%	31 100.0%	3.84 1.22
Q11	Satisfaction with academic advising from the University Advising Office.	Count %	1 3.2%	13 41.9%	17 54.8%	31 100.0%	3.71 0.81
Q12	Satisfaction with career information from your department.	Count %	3 9.4%	8 25.0%	21 65.6%	32 100.0%	3.78 1.08
Q13	Satisfaction with availability of General Education courses.	Count %	3 9.4%	7 21.9%	22 68.8%	32 100.0%	3.81 0.88
Q14	Satisfaction with quality of General Education courses.	Count %	1 3.1%	18 56.3%	13 40.6%	32 100.0%	3.47 0.71
Q15	Satisfaction with overall quality of your education.	Count %	1 3.1%	4 12.5%	27 84.4%	32 100.0%	4.25 0.79
Q16	Satisfaction with your overall experience at Chico State.	Count %	0 0.0%	4 12.5%	28 87.5%	32 100.0%	4.31 0.68
Q30	I would recommend my major program at CSU, Chico to others.	Count %	0 0.0%	3 9.4%	29 90.6%	32 100.0%	4.50 0.66
Q45	How satisfied are you with the department support you received while enrolled at Chico State?	Count %	2 6.3%	7 21.9%	23 71.9%	32 100.0%	4.03 1.10

Senior Exit Survey - Preparation Responses AY 2015-2016							
Scale: 1=Very Unprepared 5=Very Well Prepared			Unprepared 1+2	Neither 3	Prepared 4+5	Total	Average STDEV
Q17	Perceived preparedness to apply knowledge of math, science, engineering, or technology to solve problems.	Count %	0 0.0%	7 21.9%	25 78.1%	32 100.0%	4.00 0.66
Q18	Perceived preparedness to design and execute test procedures (for equipment/hardware components or software).	Count %	1 3.1%	11 34.4%	20 62.5%	32 100.0%	3.88 0.96
Q19	Perceived preparedness to analyze, assess, and interpret data/results from test procedures.	Count %	2 6.3%	13 40.6%	17 53.1%	32 100.0%	3.63 1.02
Q20	Perceived preparedness to design a component or system to meet desired needs.	Count %	2 6.3%	10 31.3%	20 62.5%	32 100.0%	3.72 1.01
Q21	Perceived preparedness to function in a multidisciplinary team.	Count %	0 0.0%	8 25.0%	24 75.0%	32 100.0%	4.16 0.79
Q22	Perceived preparedness to identify, formulate and solve technical problems.	Count %	2 6.3%	9 28.1%	21 65.6%	32 100.0%	3.91 1.10
Q23	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters in writing.	Count %	3 9.4%	10 31.3%	19 59.4%	32 100.0%	3.66 1.13
Q24	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters orally.	Count %	1 3.1%	7 21.9%	24 75.0%	32 100.0%	4.09 0.95
Q25	Perceived preparedness to understand and apply professional and ethical principles.	Count %	2 6.3%	3 9.4%	27 84.4%	32 100.0%	4.16 1.03
Q26	Perceived preparedness to understand contemporary issues facing society.	Count %	1 3.1%	7 21.9%	24 75.0%	32 100.0%	4.06 0.93
Q27	Perceived preparedness to use modern tools and technology.	Count %	1 3.1%	2 6.3%	29 90.6%	32 100.0%	4.47 0.87
Q28	Perceived preparedness to appreciate impact of your solutions on society and environment.	Count %	2 6.3%	6 18.8%	24 75.0%	32 100.0%	4.09 1.10
Q29	Perceived preparedness to continue learning.	Count %	0 0.0%	2 6.3%	30 93.8%	32 100.0%	4.69 0.58

**B. Measurement Standards (Rubrics, etc.)**

**Outcome #2 Apply aesthetic judgments and critical thinking skills to art and graphics related issues. (Aesthetic)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
2	Animation	Simple animation that shows off the basic functionality of the rig.	Had no animation.	Animation had minor problem. Animation was hard to understand.	Animation was good. Shows off functionality.	Animation was great. Shows off functionality perfectly	298 432
2	Animation Ready	The proper animation controls and attributes are ready for the animator.	Didn't lock and hide unwanted controls and attributes. Didn't use display layers to hide blendshapes.	Locked and hid some unwanted controls and attributes.. Didn't use display layers to hide blendshapes.	Forgot to Lock and hide one or two unwanted controls and attributes.	The proper animation controls and attributes are ready for the animator.	432
2	Atmospheric Perspective	Do the values accurately convey a sense of depth and atmospheric presence in your image?	Values do not seem to deliver any sense of depth or atmospheric presence in the image.	Values may have trouble keeping spatial awareness and atmosphere balanced.	Values show a clear sense of depth and atmospheric presence.	Depth and atmosphere harmonize artistically to create a story driving world.	117
2	Body Rigging	Is the functionality easy to use and readable by an animator?	Holy cow! did you even pay attention in class!	The body rig contains many problems and issues with its functionality.	The body rig contains minor problems and issues with its functionality.	Functionality of the body Rig is understandable to animator.	432
2	Color/Value	Is their enough variety of color and value in your image to create a feeling of dimensionality ?	Color is applied thoughtlessly, flat, and/or is distracting from the image.	Color is explored but may seem minimal, blotchy or distracting.	Color enhances dimensionality and readability of the scene with little to no issues.	Color application is clear and intuitive, successfully enhancing illusion as well as mood.	110 117

2	Composition	Did the student utilize composition principles to create the scene?	Little to no consideration for determining an appropriate composition for the scene.	Seemingly aware of the arrangement of subject matter within image.	Placement of subject matter and camera supports the overall composition of the scene.	Placement of subject matter and camera clearly and effectively supports the construct of the scene as well as energizes the conceptual meaning.	110 117
2	Concept Design	Did the student utilize concept design appropriately for the 3D model?	Little to no consideration for determining an appropriate design of the 3D model.	Followed the basic concept design for the 3D model. ( Followed tutorial only)	Followed the basic concept design with some unique design characteristics for the 3d model.	Used a unique or Exceptional concept design to facilitate a 3D model.	331
2	Control Curves Setup	The proper animation controls and attributes are ready for the animator.	Didn't lock and hide unwanted controls and attributes. Didn't use display layers	Locked and hid some unwanted controls and attributes.. Didn't use display layers	Forgot to Lock and hide one or two unwanted controls and attributes.	The proper animation controls and attributes are ready for the animator.	432
2	Critical Thinking	Did the student consider use of learned modeling tools when choosing reference for the 3D model?	Little to no consideration for determining an appropriate design for the 3D model.	The model falls short of the assignment, shows a lack of planning and little evidence of overall aesthetics. Model is too simplified and needs more detail.	Basic use of learned tools with unique design characteristics for the 3d model, but lacking elements that would make it stand out from the rest.	Well considered 3D model - accurate use of learned modeling tools and careful planning were utilized.	330

2	Critical Thinking - Aesthetics and Creativity	Did the student utilize concept design appropriately for the 3D model?	Little to no consideration for determining an appropriate design of the 3D model.	The model falls short of the assignment, shows a lack of planning and little evidence of overall aesthetics. Overall model is too simplified and needed more detail.	Basic concept design with some unique design characteristics for the 3d model, but lacking elements that would make it stand out from the rest.	Overall design and attention to detail to facilitate a great looking 3D model	230 330 432
2	Design		Lack of effort to produce a visually stimulating composition	An attempt to generate a visually stimulating composition	Design was executed appropriately, enhancing the composition	A superior exhibition of design	117
2	Exposure	Did students consider and utilize value appropriately for their subject matter?	Did not take value into consideration.	Value implemented incorrectly or value should have been utilized better.	Value was considered and implemented appropriately.	Superior - careful attention to detail, value well executed.	112
2	Frame Rigging	Is the functionality easy to use and readable by an animator?	Holy cow! did you even pay attention in class!	The body rig contains many problems and issues with its functionality.	The body rig contains minor problems and issues with its functionality.	Functionality of the body Rig is understandable to animator.	432
2	Key Poses		Few poses, no clear understanding to what the character is thinking/doing.	Some attention to silhouette but poses are difficult to read.	Poses are strong but need further refinement.	Solid poses, movements reads well.	298
2	Lighting and Exposure	Did they consider and utilize lighting and value appropriately for their subject matter?	Did not take lighting into consideration.	Lighting implemented incorrectly or lighting should have been used.	Lighting was considered and implemented appropriately with no or few errors.	Superior - lighting well executed.	112

2	Performance /Animation	Are the keys reading clear? Does the style of the performance reinforce the story.	Too few poses, no clear understanding to what the characters are thinking/doing.	Poses show evidence of intent and story but are still difficult to read in areas of performance.	Poses read well but may need further refinement or more poses for scene to read clearly.	Poses are solid enhancing the readability of the overall scene.	545
2	Personality	Effectively performance of personality.	incoherent performance.	Some actions of the character are overall still vague. Little to no thought put into motives/subtext.	Clear understanding of personality, could use a bit more thought into subtext/secondary action.	Convincing performance.	298
2	Posing - Expression and Body Language	Does the pose make a powerful statement about attitude and personality of the subject.	No consideration to characterization of subject	Unable to effectively present characterization of subject.	Characterization was considered and implemented appropriately of subject .	Characterization of subject was well executed.	112
2	Rendering	How well and skillfully was camera & rendering tools used?	Did you even pay attention in class?	Did not use production render settings. The render shows limited use or knowledge of render setting tools.	The scene shows an awareness of using rendering tools but has one error.	Rendering settings are well executed. Proper resolutions and antialiasing settings.	230
2	Scale	Did you utilize unique devices in your composition to keep the audience aware of their POV.	Nothing unique in the composition to reinforce any spatial awareness.	A sense of scale is considered but feels inaccurate or poorly supported.	Environmental and/or Narrative devices show a clear sense of spatial awareness.	Narrative devices are utilized artistically throughout the piece to deliver a dynamic sense of cinematography.	117

2	Sharpness	How well is your brushing technique? Are the edges blurry and out of focus or sharp and dynamic?	Brushing is muddled and/or blurry. Objects and textures are indistinguishable.	Brushing is satisfactory with considerable errors or blurriness.	Image is cleanly painted with little to no blurry areas.	An ode to airbrushing, every component is rendered clearly and accurately.	110 117
2	Source Images	Images that are effectively used in the final composition. Exposure, lighting and composition.	None of the source images are not implemented correctly.	Exposure, lighting and composition was not well considered or executed.	Exposure, lighting and composition was considered and implemented appropriately with no or few errors.	Superior - careful attention to detail, well executed.	112
2	Staging & Composition	Is the camera used to capture the action from the most effective angles? Is the camera motion reinforcing the development of the story or is it distracting?	Camera choices feel random or distracting from the action taking place many scenes.	Camera choices follow the action in the scene but may have distracting mannerisms or compositional issues.	Camera successfully captures the performance area but could explore more dynamic choices as well.	Camera aids in keeping the audience engaged and adds to the entertainment value of the overall performance.	545
2	Staging Composition	How well did you think of the overall subject placement in your image?	Composition is distracting and/or draws attention away from subject matter.	Composition offers satisfactory results but space is minimally explored.	Composition is well thought out, balancing space and subject equally.	A defiantly successful breaking of all the rules, a composition Picasso would	117
2	Story	Does the subject matter in your image bring together a cohesive story or do they feel random and unassociated.	composition does not seem to make any effort towards maintaining a narrative.	Subject matter delivers subtle evidence of association and thus an effort towards a narrative.	A narrative is clear expressed in the selection and presentation of the subject matter.	Subject matter and composition work together in a successful union to create an image worthy of a children's book.	110 117

2	Story Edit	Does the piece deliver a cohesive story or does it feel random and unassociated.	Story development does not seem to make any effort towards maintaining a narrative.	Story delivers evidence of a cohesive development but may read as rushed, slow, jumpy or scattered.	A narrative is clearly expressed in the selection and presentation of the shots delivered.	Subject matter and composition work together in a successful union to create an exceptional storytelling experience.	545
2	Texture	Did you research and apply appropriate textures to your objects?	No textures or textures are distracting from the objects that they surface.	Textures are missing in portions of the image or have considerable inconsistencies .	Textures reinforce all components of the image with little to no distortion.	A superior exhibition of texturing that is compliant with lighting as well as perspective.	110 117
2	Texturing	Did the student consider and utilize textures appropriately for scene? Color, specular, reflection, bump, normal and/or displacement.	Did not take textures into consideration or poorly executed	Textures implemented incorrectly or alternative textures should have been used.	Adequate textures were considered and implemented appropriately.	Superior - all textures well executed.	230 330 331
2	Timing/Spacing	Does your subject move smoothly or do frames feel choppy and/or left out making the performance difficult to read?	Timing & spacing are choppy or have blank/bad key frames unattended to. Performance is unreadable.	Timing & spacing feel smooth but with performance inconsistencies .	Timing & spacing are well thought and placed yielding a clear, readable performance.	Timing & spacing deliver a completely natural performance absorbing the viewers in the reality of the world created.	110

2	Turntable and Wireframe Animation	Was the final animation constructed effectively?	Either or both the wireframe and turntable animation was missing.	Wireframe and turntable animation was executed ineffectively or Bad video quality.	The animation turns properly and shows the wireframe adequately. With one or few errors - Render and wireframe don't lineup in final composite.	Both the wireframe and turntable animation was executed effectively.	331
2	Video Demo Reel	Created a video showing the functionality of the rig.	"Poorly showed the functionality of the rig in the video or didn't create a video."	Partially (70%) showed the functionality of the rig in the video.	Showed 90% of the functionality of the rig in the video.	Showed all of the functionality of the rig in the video.	432

**Outcome #3 Demonstrate mastery of specific technical, conceptual and critical abilities within computer graphics and the mixed media. (Abilities)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
3	Audio		Little or no attempt to add and time the audio correctly.	Audio is considered, but poorly accomplished or timed.	The audio track matches the scenes and shots well.	The audio track is well accomplished and timed, adding to the story and the emotional impact on the audience.	345
3	Blending Images Together	Blending of visual elements together in a seamless blend.	Blending of visual elements together was not achieved.	Blending of visual elements together ineffectually achieved, allot of inconsistent errors.	Appropriately blending of visual elements together with no or few errors.	Superior - careful attention to detail, well executed.	112
3	Camera Angles and Movement	Are camera angles, shot, and movements used appropriately to effectively communicate the story?	Camera angle and type of shot required is unacceptable to communicate story effectively.	Camera angle and type of shot required is poorly communicated and needs significant improvement.	Camera angle and type of shot required to communicate story is acceptable but could use improvement.	Camera angle and type of shot required to communicate story is well established.	345

3	Camera Composition	Did the student utilize composition principles to create the scene?	Little to no consideration for determining an appropriate composition for the scene.	Seemingly aware of the arrangement of subject matter within image.	Placement of subject matter and camera supports the overall composition of the scene.	Placement of subject matter and camera clearly and effectively supports the construct of the scene as well as energizes the conceptual meaning.	298
3	Camera Shot		Camera shots were not addressed sufficiently.	Several camera shots were missing and/or not described/doc umented correctly.	Most camera shots were well thought-out, described, and documented.	Camera shots were well thought-out, described, and documented.	345
3	Digital Darkroom	Did students consider and utilize the tools and techniques in Photoshop appropriately for their project.	Did not use Photoshop techniques in project.	Implemented incorrectly or only one Photoshop technique significantly.	Photoshop techniques was considered and implemented appropriately with no or few errors.	Superior - Photoshop techniques well executed.	112
3	Facial Rigging	Did students follow instructions in saving their project and images.	Holy cow! did you even pay attention in class!	The facial rig contains many problems and issues with its functionality.	The facial rig contains minor problems and issues with its functionality.	Functionality of the facial rig is understandable to animator.	432
3	Form and Proportions	Does the model present basic proportional and body volume relationships appropriately for its subject matter.	Did not take proportions & body volume into consideration. (Model looks nothing like the completed tutorial)	Collaboration of proportions & body volume implemented incorrectly. (Model barely meets the same proportions & volume as the tutorial)	Collaboration of proportions & body volume implemented appropriately. (Model closely mimics the tutorial)	Superior implementation of collaboration of proportions & body volume. (Model goes beyond the tutorial and does it efficiently)	331

3	Functionality of the Rig	Was the tutorial followed? Is the functionality readable by an animator?	Holy cow! did you even pay attention in class!	The Rig contains many problems and issues with its functionality.	The Rig contains minor problems and issues with its functionality.	Functionality of the Rig is understandable.	432
3	High-Poly Modeling	Did students model in quads and used topology flow efficiently.	Too many errors in topology flow. Did you even pay attention in class? Overall models are too simplified, needed to add more detail to the models.	Errors in topology flow. Broken edges, didn't delete unwanted vertexes. Used too many triangles and/or ngons.	Appropriately modeled in quads with a few errors in topology flow with bad surface pitching. Had several triangles and ngons on the models.	Well considered topology flow - modeled in quads and used edge loops perfectly.	330 331
3	IK Setup	Was the proper IK Setup used for the legs?	The wrong IK Setup used on all the legs. Needed to use Spring IK	Used some of wrong IK Setup on the legs. Needed to use Spring IK	Missed one wrong IK Setup on the legs and arms	Used the correct IK Setup for the legs and arms	432
3	Joint Placement	Was the proper Joint Placement and joint orientation was used?	Holy cow! did you even pay attention in class!	Proper Joint Placement, but incorrect joint orientation was used.	one incorrect Joint Placement, or incorrect joint orientation was used.	Proper Joint Placement and joint orientation was used on the character.	432
3	Lighting		Lighting is completely inaccurate and/or inconsistent with the scene.	Lighting is accomplished with considerable inaccuracies and/or lacking shadows.	Lighting and shading is clear and natural with little to no inconsistencies .	A bold use of lighting that reinforces the mood, dynamic and focal point of the image.	230 330 432

3	Low-Poly Modeling	Did students provide enough detail to show overall form, from the original high poly model with good topology.	Too many errors in topology flow and form the original high poly model. Did you even pay attention in class? Overall models are too simplified, needed to add more detail to the models.	Errors in topology flow and doesn't provide enough detail to show overall form. Broken edges, didn't delete unwanted vertices. Used too many triangles and/or ngons.	Appropriately modeled in quads and triangles with a few errors in topology flow and overall form. Had a few ngons on the models.	Well considered topology flow - modeled in quads and triangles perfectly. Provided enough detail to show overall form, from the original high poly model.	330
3	Map Baking	How well and skillfully was map Baking tools used? Creating a Mesh ID, normal, AO, curvature, and position maps.	No mapping skills are evident on the 3D object.	Missing maps. Or maps appear to have been constructed with lots of errors from the UVs.	The maps are well executed and appropriate for objects with a few errors or a missing map.	The maps are exceedingly well created and functional for the all the 3D objects.	330
3	Merging Images	Merging images together in a seamless blend	Did not use layer masks.	Implemented layer masks inappropriately	Used layer masks appropriately with no or few errors.	Superior - careful attention to detail, layer masks well executed.	112
3	Mocap Animation	Did the student consider and utilize mocap animation appropriately for the movement?	Not original mocap or mocap that is very messy.	Mocap with noticeable foot-slides and pops. Mocap had noticeable pops and bumps to the movements.	Mocap is technically proficient, blended well without noticeable foot slides. Blended well with little noticeable pops and bumps to the movements.	Mocap is creative and clean, adding substance to the piece.	298
3	Modeling & Overall Geometry	How well and skillfully was the modeling tools and geometry used in the scene?	Basic modeling skills were not evident in the scene.	Models appear to have been inefficiently constructed with inadequate geometry	The models are well executed with the proper amount of geometry.	The models are efficiently constructed and appropriate for the scene.	230 330 398

3	Overall Geometry	Did students model in quads and used edge loops efficiently.	Did not appropriately model in quads (only 80% of the model is in quads) and used edge loops incorrectly.	Appropriately model in quads (only 90% of the model is in quads) and/or used edge loops insignificantly.	Appropriately modeled in quads (95 to 99% of the model is in quads) and used edge loops efficiently.	Well considered and well executed - modeled in quads (100% of the model is in quads) and used edge loops perfectly.	331
3	Perspective		Perspective is distorted and inconsistent.	Perspective is accurate with relative inconsistencies resulting in some distortion.	Perspective is accurate with little to no distortion.	A masterful rendering of space... thus transporting us into a new dimension.	117
3	Storyboard Language	Action is properly described along with appropriate scene and shot numbers for each panel.	Content for action and/or scene and shot numbers for panels was insufficient.	Lacking most content for action and/or scene and shot numbers for panels.	Lacking some content for action and/or scene and shot numbers for each panel.	Content for action was properly described along with appropriate scene and shot numbers for each panel.	345
3	Technical Import	Placement of animations into a game engine.	All animation has not placed into the game engine correctly.	Animation has placed into the game engine correctly with technical problems.	Animation has placed into the game engine correctly with some technical problems.	All animation has placed into the game engine correctly with no technical problems.	298
3	Terrain	Was terrain created appropriately for the scene?	Terrain was severely inadequate for the scene and/or not present in the scene.	Terrain was created for the scene but requires significant improvement.	Terrain was created for the scene but could have used some improvement.	Terrain was appropriately and well created for the scene with minimal errors.	398
3	Texture Creation and Baking	Were the requested maps baked with minimal errors?	Several of the maps were missing.	One of the maps was missing.	The requested maps were created but some contained several errors.	The requested maps were baked with minimal errors.	398

3	Theme	Did the student successfully repurpose a fable, maintaining the original them?	The original theme was no longer present in the repurposed fable.	Portions of the original theme are present but not carried through to completion.	The original theme is still present but the way it is conveyed could be improved.	The original theme is clear and expressed in a creative manner.	345
3	Timing	Was timing properly established: shown on each panel and totaling no more than 60 seconds in length?	Timing was insufficiently established.	Several of the shots do not have timing, and or fall outside of the timing parameters as detailed in the assignment.	Some timing is not properly shown and/or does not fall with the timing parameters detailed in the assignment.	Timing is properly established for each shot and falls within the parameters of the assignment.	345
3	Translation		Images have no resemblance to tutorial.	Composition is attended to but brushing is inaccurate or lacks texture.	Image is a definite visual resemblance of source material with little to no errors.	Image not only matches the source but exceeds its overall execution.	110
3	Tutorial: Followed the Tutorial	How well were the instructions in the tutorial followed?	The instructions in the tutorial were not followed.	The tutorial instructions were partially followed, with few related tools used in the scene.	The textures is constructed well according to tutorial instructions. However, some errors are evident.	The textures was well constructed. Tools used in the tutorial were clearly used in the scene.	330
3	UV Mapping	How well and skillfully was UV tools used?	No uv mapping skills are evident in the in the scene.	UV maps appear to have been constructed with lots of errors on many objects. Too much overlapping UV's. UVs are not scaled properly to use the 0 to 1 space efficiently.	The UV maps are well executed and appropriate for objects with errors on a few objects. Overlapping UV's or UVs not scaled properly to use the 0 to 1 space efficiently.	The UV maps are exceedingly well created and functional for the all the objects in the scene.	230 330 331 398 432

3	UV Mapping and Texture Aliasing	How well and skillfully were the UV tools used?	Minimal to no UV mapping skills are evident in the scene.	UV maps are constructed with several errors containing overlapping UVs; incorrect scale or outside of 0 to 1 space and/or incorrect resolution for layout and minimal aliasing demonstrated.	The UV maps are mostly well executed with some errors such as overlapping UV's, improper scale, outside of 0 to 1 space, and/or incorrect resolution for layout or missing some aliasing.	The UV maps are well created, functional for all of the objects in the scene, arranged to efficiently use UV space, and maintain the assigned map size(s) and aliasing guidelines, possibly containing a few negligible errors.	398
3	Weighting	How well done was skinning and paint weighting for the character.	Holy cow! did you even pay attention in class!	Weighting of the Geo to the correct joints is incorrect. Other unwanted joints still effect incorrect areas.	Did a decent job painting weights but, slight movement can be seen in the Geo from unwanted joints.	Skinning and weighting of Geo to joints was executed perfectly.	432
<b>Outcome #4</b>		<b>Demonstrate proficiency with industrial applications to visual communication related technologies. (Proficiency)</b>					
	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
4	Completeness	Were all details and components of the blog assignment completed?	Instructions for the blog assignment were not followed.	Minimal completeness of the blog assignment was displayed.	Blog assignment was nearly completed but lacking some detailed components.	Full completion of the blog assignment was demonstrated showing all necessary components per assignment instructions.	345 398

4	Continuity		The story's continuity is unclear and sometimes confusing; there are confusing breaks in time, many jump cuts or incongruities in between shots or scenes.	The idea of the story comes across but in terms of continuity, it could have been executed better; there are a few breaks in continuity and some jump cuts.	Continuity is executed well, but there were a few missed opportunities in this regard to make it more effective or there are incongruities between shots or scenes.	Overall, the continuity is executed well; the action is clear, coherent and presented effectively without jump cuts or incongruities.	345
4	Document Consistency	Were the documents organized efficiently and demonstrate consistency among revisions?	Most components of the project were not properly revised to efficiently communicate the story consistently.	Many components of the project were not properly revised to efficiently communicate the story consistently.	Most components of the project were properly revised to efficiently communicate the story consistently but some components of the project were lacking somewhat in revision.	All components of the project were properly revised to efficiently communicate the story consistently (logline, beat sheet, plot summary, script, shot list, storyboards, and animatic).	345
4	Scene Cohesiveness	Are all objects in the scene appropriate for the concept resulting in a cohesive scene?	Scene is not cohesive	Minimal relative proportionality and artistic concept, creating an environment that is minimally cohesive.	Most objects in the scene are proportional and follow the same artistic concept with few inconsistencies.	All objects in the scene are proportional, follow the same artistic concept and are arranged to create a cohesive environment fitting with the overall game concept.	398

4	Storytelling		No broad entertainment value.	Several confusing parts; plot is unclear; communication of story lacks focus or energy.	Some mistakes in plot line but mistakes are minor; some parts of the story lack focus.	The storyline of the product is interesting and entertaining; plot is communicated effectively; all elements of story are present.	345
4	Unity Scene Construction & Interaction	Are the models arranged in Unity to demonstrate a communicated meaning and composition and contain a first or third person controller to navigate within the scene?	Scene is severely lacking in composition, does not support the game concept and lacks a character controller.	Scene composition minimally communicates a story and a likeness to the game concept and contains several inconsistencies/errors along with no character controller.	Scene composition communicates a story and a likeness to the game concept with a few inconsistencies/errors and/or a character controller is not placed properly in the scene.	Scene composition communicates a story and a likeness to the game concept and contains an appropriate character controller to navigate the scene.	398
4	Visually Communicates Story	Did the final sketched shots effectively visually communicate the story?	Sketches are ineffective in communicating the story effectively.	Sketches need significant improvement to effectively communicate story such as facial expressions, clarity of content, and familiar visual cues.	Sketches need some improvement to effectively communicate story such as facial expressions, clarity of content, and familiar visual cues.	Sketches are conveyed in such a manner as to clearly communicate story visually and emotionally.	345
4	Visually Compelling	Does the image work overall. Choices of principles of composition used to create the image.	Did not take visual elements or principles of composition into consideration.	Utilized 1 or 2 of the principles of composition or visual elements, but not well considered or executed.	Collaboration of visual elements and principles of composition implemented appropriately with no or few errors.	Superior implementation of collaboration of principles of composition and visual elements.	112

4	Visually tells the Story	Is the action in each panel drawn well enough to effectively communicate the story?	Visual elements of the storyboard are insufficient to effectively communicate a cohesive story.	Several visual elements of the storyboard are not effectively communicated to tell a cohesive story.	Most visual elements of the storyboard are effectively communicated to tell a cohesive story.	Visual elements of the storyboard are effectively communicated to tell a cohesive story.	345
---	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--	-----

**Outcome #5 Communicate effectively in written format on research and creative issues. (Written)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
5	Beats	Does the beat sheet accurately portray the structure of the story and effectively communicate the story?	Beats are not appropriate for the story and the story does not go anywhere and/or the beat sheet is not included in the document.	Several beats are not appropriate for the story and/or missing too many beats. Needs significant improvement to propelling the story forward and keeping reader interest.	Most beats are appropriate but could use some improvement in propelling the story forward and keeping reader interest.	The beats provided are appropriate for the story and propel the story forward while keeping reader interest.	345
5	Character and Character Goal		No character and/or character goal.	The character and/or character goal are not well described.	The character and/or character goal are present but could have been described in better detail.	The character and character goal are well described and established.	345
5	Compelling Mental Picture		Does not create a compelling mental picture.	A minimal mental picture is created but not compelling.	A mental picture is sufficiently created but could use some improvement.	A compelling mental pictures is effectively communicated .	345
5	Content		Content was insufficient for composition, lighting, shot selection, dialog and story element.	Majority of content was lacking for composition, lighting, shot selection, dialog and story element.	Some content was lacking for composition, lighting, shot selection, dialog and story element.	Content for composition, lighting, shot selection, dialog and story element was detailed and descriptive.	170 230 345

5	Description	Did the blog contain a detailed description of the assignment and what was learned?	No description.	Description too brief.	Adequate description of assignment but lacking detail and insight.	Excellent description of the assignment provided, going above and beyond assignment instructions.	230 345
5	Formatting, Grammar, and Spelling	Were correct formatting, spelling, and grammar demonstrated throughout the story?	Formatting, grammar, or spelling errors were predominant and unacceptable..	Formatting, grammar or spelling errors were significant and somewhat distracting to the reader.	A few negligible formatting, grammar, spelling errors.	No formatting, spelling or grammar errors are present in the document.	170 345
5	Irony		The logline contains no irony.	A possibility of irony is displayed but it is not compelling.	Irony is present but could be communicated more effectively.	Irony is well developed and articulated, effectively capturing the reader's attention.	345
5	Killer Title		The title does not effectively communicate the story and has no hook that generates curiosity and interest.	The title conveys an idea but is not intriguing and needs a hook that generates more curiosity and interest.	The title creates an acceptable headline but could more effectively communicate what the story is about and/or have a hook that generates more curiosity and interest.	The title is clearly the headline and effectively communicates what the story is about and/or has a hook that generates curiosity and interest.	345
5	Logline Compatibility	Does the logline previously created still match the repurposed story?	The logline and repurposed fable are minimally representative of each other.	The logline and repurposed fable are only vaguely representative of each other.	The logline and repurposed fable are nearly compatible but could use some improvement to be better representative of each other.	The logline and repurposed fable are compatible and it is clear that one is representative of the other.	345

5	Plot Summary	Does the plot summary communicate the major plot lines of the story without giving away the ending?	No plot summary included.	The plot summary is too sparse, communicating little about the story. Please revise.	The plot summary contains plot lines integral to the story but also contains plot lines that are not as essential to the story.	The most important plot lines of the story are communicated, creating curiosity and interest in the story without giving away the ending.	345
5	Showing vs. Telling	Are the descriptions in the Action portion of the script are told through showing as opposed to telling?	Descriptions in the Action portion of the script are not told through showing as opposed to telling.	Descriptions in the Action portion of the script are minimally told through showing as opposed to telling.	Descriptions in the Action portion of the script are mostly told through showing as opposed to telling but could be improved.	Descriptions in the Action portion of the script are told through showing as opposed to telling.	345
5	Spelling and Grammar	Were correct grammar and spelling demonstrated?	Grammar and/or spelling errors were predominant and unacceptable.	Grammar and/or spelling errors were significant.	A few negligible grammar and/or spelling errors.	No grammar or spelling errors.	345
5	Spelling and Organization	Are spelling and grammar used efficiently and is the document organized and communicating an effective story structure?	Too many spelling errors, and/or unacceptable context for too many of the beats. Beat sheet is unorganized and story structure is absent.	Several spelling errors and/or insufficient context for most beats, not functional for story and quite lacking in story structure.	Some spelling errors and/or minimal context to some beats, not functional for story or in the wrong place. The story structure could be improved.	No spelling errors and the elements of the story are functional and communicate an effective story structure.	345

5	Story Development	Does the story depicted in the script follow a story structure that provides for an introduction, rising action, and conclusion?	The story does not provide for an appropriate introduction, rising action, and conclusion. The story is not effectively communicated to the audience.	The story minimally provides for an appropriate introduction, rising action, and conclusion. Needs significant improvement to communicate the story effectively to the audience.	The story mostly provides for an appropriate introduction, rising action, and conclusion, but needs some improvement to communicate the story effectively to the audience.	The story provides for an appropriate introduction, rising action, and conclusion.	345
5	Story Elements	Did the student successfully repurpose a fable, maintaining the original them?	More than one or all of the story elements are missing and/or are minimally clarified and expressed.	Either theme, characters, goal, and resolution are missing and/or need to be clarified and improved.	Theme, characters, goal, and resolution are present but the way they are conveyed could be improved.	Theme, characters, goal, and resolution are clear and expressed in a creative manner.	345
5	Title, Logline, Genre	Are the title, logline, and genre present and are they compatible and representative of each other?	More than one of these required elements are missing and/or are severely incompatible	Either the title, logline, or genre are missing from the document and/or they are not accurately representative of each other	The title, logline, and genre are all present and nearly compatible but could use some improvement to be better representative of each other.	The title, logline, and genre are all present and compatible. It is clear that each is representative of the other.	345

**Outcome #6 Communicate effectively in oral format on research and creative issues. (Oral)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
6	Body language		Immobile, hands in pockets, or blocked screen	Did not always indicate how material on the screen was related to presentation	Consistently used gestures to coordinate oral and visual presentation	Excellent use gestures to provide emphasis	170 230 345 493

6	Body Language and Poise		Immobile, hands in pockets, or blocked screen. Clearly unsure, nervous, confused.	Did not always indicate how material on the screen was related to presentation. At times appears unsure nervous, confused.	Consistently used gestures to coordinate oral and visual presentation. Composed at all times.	Excellent use gestures to provide emphasis. Exudes/convey confidence.	493
6	Content & Knowledge		No grasp of information. Unable to answer questions about the subject.	Uncomfortable with information. Capable only of answering rudimentary questions.	At ease with content and able to elaborate and explain to some degree.	Demonstration of full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration.	493 545
6	Distracting mannerisms		Presentation full of distracting mannerisms such as giggling or chewing gum	Some distracting mannerisms	No distracting mannerisms	Superior presentation	170 230 345
6	Hesitations, other voice habits		Presentation full of hesitations, ums, ahs, etc.	Some hesitations, ums, ahs, etc.	Clear, continuous presentation, perhaps a few ums, ahs, etc.	Superior presentation, free of ums, ahs, etc.	170 230 331 345 493
6	Maintaining eye contact		No eye contact with audience at all	Poor eye contact, looking down or at screen significant portion of time	Maintained eye contact other than quick glances at screen	Maintained eye contact with all segments of the audience	170 230 331 345 493
6	Organization & Structure		Not possible to understand presentation due to absence of structure.	Difficult to follow presentation due to erratic topical shifts and jumps.	Most information presented in logical order which is easy to follow	All information is presented in a logical, interesting, and novel sequence, which is easily followed.	331 493 545
6	Overall Rating		Unacceptable.	Marginal.	Acceptable.	Exceptional.	493

6	Poise		Clearly unsure, nervous, confused	At times appears unsure nervous, confused	Composed at all times	Exudes/convey confidence	170 230 345
6	Presentation Length		Far too short or too long.	Somewhat too short or too long.	Acceptable length.	Presentation meets specifications exactly.	331 493
6	Quality of Work	Does the work achieve a level of integrity parallel to industry standards?	Quality of work is subpar or that of a beginning level class.	Work is readable but is evident that more practice is necessary.	Work shows evidence of growth, understanding and development.	Work displays symptoms and/or characteristics synonymous with industry standards.	493
6	Speaking	Are you easy to understand when you speak? Was the presentation full of hesitations, ums, ahs, etc.	Voice is difficult to understand, hear or follow. Excessive hesitations.	Voice may be too fast or nervous or a substantial amount of hesitations occurred.	Voice is clear with little to no difficulties. Minimal hesitations.	Voice is confident, clear, expressive and engaging.	493
6	Voice volume, enunciation & speed	How well spoken the presentation was executed?	Unintelligible.	Voice hard to hear, words slurred or voice trails off, spoke too slow or too fast, monotone with little emphasis.	Voice clearly heard, words clearly enunciated, did not speak too slowly or too rapidly	Voice projected very well, clear enunciation, did not speak too slowly or rapidly	170 230 331 345 493 545

**Outcome #7 Apply critical thinking and aesthetic judgments in critiquing mixed media and computer graphics productions. (Critiquing)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
7	Commentary	Did the student meet the requirements for the critique responses?	Most if not all of the critique responses were either missing or inadequate.	Several of the critique responses were lacking in detail and insight, falling short of requirements.	Detailed and insightful commentary on most critique but lacking in a few responses.	Detailed and insightful commentary on all critiques per assignment instructions.	230 331

7	Critique and Feedback		Provides no feedback/critiques in class.	Rarely or sporadically provides feedback/critiques in class.	Sometimes provides feedback/critique in class with merit to the subject matter.	Provides great feedback/critique in class with merit to the subject matter.	493
---	-----------------------	--	--	--	---	---	-----

**Outcome #9 Work collaboratively and individually with an understanding of the production process utilized in industry-standard studios. (Process)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
9	Camera & Rendering	How well and skillfully was camera, lighting effects, & rendering tools used?	The render shows no or limited use or knowledge of tools. The scene appears to be thrown together.	Basic skills are evident from the render including some anti-aliasing, and lighting and camera effects.	Tools were used well to produce a quality render of the scene, including appropriate anti-aliasing, and lighting and camera effects.	Tools were used flawlessly to produce a superior render of the scene with clear planning and skillful used of all appropriate tools.	298 432
9	Document Submission	Were all components of the project submitted and submitted with the correct file naming?	Many components of the project were not submitted according to assignment instructions; incorrect file naming and/or missing more than one document.	More than one component of the project was not submitted according to assignment instructions: incorrect file naming and/or missing a document.	Some components of the project were not submitted according to assignment instructions: incorrect file naming.	All components of the project were submitted according to assignment instructions: documents and correct file naming.	345
9	File Organization and Formats	Did students follow instructions in saving their project and images.	Did not follow instructions or file structure. Only one working file.	Partially followed instructions and file structure. Partially working files	Partially followed instructions file and structure. All work files work appropriately.	Instructions and file structure implemented appropriately. All files and images work appropriately.	432

9	File Structure	Implementation of file naming & directory formats.	File naming & directory format was implemented incorrectly.	File naming & directory format was followed correctly. But contained more file needed for the assignment.	File naming & directory format was followed correctly with only one error.	File naming & directory format was followed correctly.	112 170
9	File Structure & Layer Organization	Implementation of file naming & file structure. Naming layers properly.	Both file naming & structure and naming layers was implemented incorrectly.	Implemented 1 of the file naming & structures or naming layers properly was followed with errors.	One or both file naming & structure and naming layers was correctly followed with few errors.	Both file naming & structure and naming layers was correctly followed.	112
9	File Structures and Formats	Did students follow instructions in saving their project and images.	Did not follow instructions or file structure. Only one working file.	Partially followed instructions and file structure. Partially working files.	Partially followed instructions file and structure. All work files work appropriately.	Instructions and file structure implemented appropriately. All work files work appropriately.	298 330 432
9	File Submission	Did you turn in the requested type of file in the right place and were the compression settings and file name correct?	File submitted in incorrect format or in incorrect folder.	File submitted in correct format and location but with incorrect compression settings.	File submitted correctly but with incorrect filename.	File submitted with all the desired settings accounted to.	110 117 545
9	Outliner Organized	Is the rig organized inside the outliner.	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	432
9	Project Guidelines	Followed the rules of the assignment for the final image.	Did not follow the rules of the assignment.	Implemented the rules of the assignment poorly or incorrectly.	Follow the rules of the assignment correctly with no or few errors.	Exceeded the rules of the assignment.	112

9	Scene Organization	Was the scene organized properly in the Outliner and Attribute Editor including naming and grouping of models and materials/text ures?	Little to no scene organization implemented and/or missing several required models for the scene.	Minimal scene organization implemented: Didn't name several objects and/or materials/text ures. Didn't group enough objects to produce a cleaner scene. Missing more than one model in scene.	Most scene organization elements implemented: Didn't name some objects and/or materials/text ures. Could've grouped more objects to produce a cleaner scene. Missing a required a model for the scene.	All scene organization elements implemented: Named all objects and/or materials/text ures. Grouped all necessary objects to produce a cleaner scene, all required models in scene.	330
9	Scene Organization and File Formats	Did students follow instructions in saving their project and images.	Did not follow instructions or file structure. Only one working file.	Partially followed instructions and file structure. Partially working files	Partially followed instructions file and structure. All work files work appropriately.	Instructions and file structure implemented appropriately. All files and images work appropriately.	432
9	Script Execution and Formatting	Were the proper script formatting rules applied for a silent film?	The script does not follow the proper formatting requirements.	The script has several errors, needing significant improvement in script formatting.	The script is well written, needing minimal improvement in script formatting.	The script is well written following all of the rules and formatting for a script.	345
9	Task Management	Is a solid workflow evident? Does the assignment feel complete with sufficient time devoted to its execution?	Project is clearly incomplete.	Work is evident but piece still clearly needs more time for completion.	Successful workflow is apparent. Project feels complete but refinements could still be made.	Assignment looks like a completely finalized piece. All the I's are dotted and T's are crossed.	110 117 545

9	Webpage	Implementation of the web gallery with good naming conventions. The correct number images taken of the assignment.	Web gallery structure was implemented incorrectly.	Web gallery structure was followed correctly. But contained more images needed for the assignment.	Web gallery structure was followed correctly with only one error	Web gallery structure was followed correctly.	112
---	---------	--	--	--	--	---	-----

**Outcome #10 Demonstrate professionalism through creative and intellectual independence. (Professionalism)**

	Attributes	Description	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exceptional	Course
		Value	0	1	2	3	
10	Art Direction	How well thought out is the look or style of the animation?	Lack of effort to produce a visually unified or stunning piece.	Art direction shows evidence of a developed style but may not feel fully unified or particular to the story.	Art direction is well executed, unifying the entire piece and dispositional to the story.	Art direction is unique and well crafted elevating the story to a new level of entertainment.	545
10	Content - Professional	Does the amount of content justify the amount of time allocated?	Very little work exhibited compared to the amount of time allocated.	Amount of work seems acceptable but with an excessive amount of unfinished projects.	A solid bulk of finished work with minimal unfinished pieces.	It is evident that time was spent above and beyond that allocated to create an impressive amount of finished pieces.	493
10	Organization		The sequence of information is not logical; paths to information are not evident; the user must backtrack to navigate the site.	The sequence of information is somewhat logical; paths are confusing and flawed; the user need backtrack to navigate to other portions of the site.	The sequence of information is logical; paths to most information are clear and direct; the user can navigate most anywhere on the site without needing to backtrack.	The sequence of information is logical and intuitive; menus and paths to all information are clear and direct; the user is able to navigate to anywhere in the site without having to backtrack.	170

10	Organization - Professional	Is your content organized and easy to sift through for a recruiter? Does it quickly display your trade, reel and intent?	Blog is difficult to navigate. Content is sporadic with no reasonable chronology.	Blog exhibits a basic structure but seems to jump around.	The blog is well organized and easy to navigate.	The blog gives the immediate impression of who you are, what you do, and makes your reel readily available in the beginning.	493
10	Professionalism - Blog	Did the blog post exhibit a professional appearance and contain professional content?	The blog post contained content irrelevant to research and problem-solving, exhibiting a high level of unprofessionalism.	The blog post was quite lacking in professionalism, containing a large amount of textual content that did not exhibit research and problem-solving efforts.	The blog post was mostly professional, but contained some textual content that did not exhibit research and problem-solving efforts.	The blog post was professional, containing documents/images indicative of progress and textual explanation of possible problems encountered and appropriate solutions.	345

### C. Survey Instruments

Number	Question	Scale				
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Q 1	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by faculty in your department.					
Q 2	Satisfaction with quality of teaching by other faculty.					
Q 3	Satisfaction with access to faculty in your department.					
Q 4	Satisfaction with availability of courses in your department.					
Q 5	Satisfaction with quality of courses in your department.					
Q 6	Satisfaction with access to laboratory facilities and equipment.					
Q 7	Satisfaction with quality of laboratories and equipment.					
Q 8	Satisfaction with access to computer facilities.					
Q 9	Satisfaction with quality of computer facilities.					
Q10	Satisfaction with academic advising from your major adviser.					
Q11	Satisfaction with academic advising from the University Advising Office.					
Q12	Satisfaction with career information from your department.					
Q13	Satisfaction with availability of General Education courses.					
Q14	Satisfaction with quality of General Education courses.					
Q15	Satisfaction with overall quality of your education.					
Q16	Satisfaction with your overall experience at Chico State.					

Q17	Perceived preparedness to apply knowledge of math, science, engineering, or technology to solve problems.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q18	Perceived preparedness to design and execute test procedures (for equipment/hardware components or software).	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q19	Perceived preparedness to analyze, assess, and interpret data/results from test procedures.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q20	Perceived preparedness to design a component or system to meet desired needs.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q21	Perceived preparedness to function in a multidisciplinary team.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q22	Perceived preparedness to identify, formulate and solve technical problems.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q23	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters in writing.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q24	Perceived preparedness to communicate technical matters orally.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q25	Perceived preparedness to understand and apply professional and ethical principles.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q26	Perceived preparedness to understand contemporary issues facing society.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q27	Perceived preparedness to use modern tools and technology.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q28	Perceived preparedness to appreciate impact of your solutions on society and environment.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	
Q29	Perceived preparedness to continue learning.	Very Prepared	Prepared	Neutral	Unprepared	

Q30	I would recommend my major program at CSU, Chico to others.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q36	If you had an internship, co-op, or job related to your major while in school, how valuable was the experience?	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
Q37	If you were involved in any student/professional society, activities, or clubs, how valuable was the experience?	Not valuable	Not in societies, activities, clubs	Valuable	Somewhat valuable	Very valuable
Q45	How satisfied are you with the department support you received while enrolled at Chico State?	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
Q46	How often did you meet with someone in the University Advising Office?	More than once a semester	Once a semester	Once a year	Occasionally	Never
Q47	How often did you meet with your major (departmental) advisor?	Never	Occasionally	Once a year	Once a semester	More than once a semester
Q48	How has the quality of your educational experience varied over the time period you were enrolled at Chico State?	Quality declined significantly	Quality declined somewhat	Quality has stayed fairly consistent	Quality has improved somewhat	Quality has improved significantly
CAGD_Q1	Do you feel you are prepared to pursue a career in the Computer Graphics industry?	Very unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat prepared	Very prepared
CAGD_Q2	Do you feel the CAGD faculty stressed the importance of preparing a professional portfolio?	Yes	No			
CAGD_Q3	How well do you feel the CAGD faculty did in preparing you for a career in the Computer Graphics industry?	Not at all	Minimally acceptable	Neutral	Acceptable	Exceptional
CAGD_Q4	How do you feel about the overall instruction in the CAGD Program?	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
CAGD_Q5	Do you feel the CAGD Program helped you with career placement?	Yes	No			

CAGD_Q6	How satisfied are you with the CAGD Program's support in obtaining an industrial internship?	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
CAGD_Q7	Did you have sufficient laboratory time to complete your projects?	Yes	No			