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[NOTE: Items A, B, C, and D are identical to your Page 2 on your Annual Report for CAPR. Please simply cut and paste from there. Item E is unique to the CLASS FACT Project.]

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with a M.A. in Multimedia from California State University East Bay will

1. Demonstrate competency in digital imaging, and interactive, web, video, and audio production.

2. Research and critically assess new developments in the field of multimedia at both the cultural and the technical level.

3. Show an understanding of the effects of media and the evolution of information across a variety of media types.

4. Produce an interactive thesis project that demonstrates a novel and/or creative use of a single or combination of interactive technologies, with written documentation of a professional standard, by working within a collaborative team.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome Assessed

3. Show an understanding of the effects of media and the evolution of information across a variety of media types.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

As the program is small and cohort-based, we assessed all first year graduate students enrolled in MM 6120 - Tech II: Multimedia Network and Hardware Development during final Spring quarter. Additionally all graduate students (first and second year) were invited to self assess their absolute and value added achievements relative to the same program student learning outcome.

The instructor for MM 6120 was supplied with an evaluation form / rubric for assessment of three key aspects of the PLO. All graduate students were emailed a link to an online google form, set up for anonymous input, in their final weeks of study. Along with ranking their self-perception of capability, students also entered comments on the level of contribution of different graduate classes to their sense of progress and achievement in response to the same PLO assessment criteria.

1. Knowledge and Understanding of Media Types — a) Concepts and effects & b) Evolution of information across a variety of media types,

2. Critical Thinking and Problem Solving — a) Analysis of media type choices & b) Concept / Content development,


The degree of student capability ranges from inadequate, via developing, to proficient, skilled and exceptional. The results were mapped according to the three areas of capability assessment.
D. Summary of Assessment Results

MM 6120 data

Results submitted by the faculty instructor for MM 6120 predominantly positioned student capability in all key areas of assessment as skilled and exceptional. All findings were largely balanced between these two categories, except for 1a) Concepts & Effects and 3a) Software / Code where skilled, rather than exceptional, was the dominant capability.

First and Second Year Student self-assessment data

Less than half of the first and second year graduate cohorts submitted their anonymous self assessment input. This is an ongoing challenge for analyzing sufficient representative student self-assessment feedback. Informal comments by students suggest there is some confusion for the difference between this request and the formal university faculty / class evaluation sessions conducted at a similar time.

From those returned, first year graduate students rated their capability higher than those received from graduating second year students. First year student self-assessment input also differs slightly from that observed by their instructor in MM 6120. All areas include rankings of exceptional, followed by skilled in most and concur with assessment in MM 6120 for areas that are less strong, 1a) Concepts & Effects and 3a) Software / Code. In contrast though, students list developing and proficient capability to 2a) Analysis of Media Type Choices, 2b) Concept / Content Development and 3a) Software / Code.

Second year graduate students predominantly ranked all areas of assessment evenly between developing, proficient and skilled, except for a higher ranking of exceptional / skilled for 1b) Evolution of Media across a variety of Media Types. Differences between findings for both first and second year students might be attributed to assessment timing and their position in the graduate program. First year students confidence in envisaging and commencing their year long thesis project work and second year students at the completion of their projects and self-realization of what they had been able to achieve.

Students specifically commented on the contributions of MM 6110 Tech 2: Multimedia Network and Hardware Development taught by Gwynn Rhybyt, MM 6120 Tech 3: Multimedia Software Development taught by Rhonda Holberton, MM 6860: Introduction to Multimedia Project Development taught by Ian Pollock and MM 6600: Interactive Content Development taught by Kalman Spelletich. “These two classes [Tech 2 & 3] had the greatest impact and influence on knowledge and understanding of what can be achieved with skills in coding and electronics. Kal’s class was very good for bringing all skills together.” “MM 6120 good class for integration of all acquired skills”. “Knowledge and understanding increased significantly with Tech 2 hardware, Tech 3 software, the ability to collect, display and manipulate data in different forms. Have a wider breadth of understanding and different methods for collecting data. An introduction to programs never used before, but now able to work with as new tools for thesis project and new found practices.” “Critical thinking. MM 6860 the development process of team building and proposal presentation. Helping to organize and analyze thoughts to create the right project idea.” “Ian’s lectures helped explain what is an artist, how to be an artist and ways of thinking about an art piece.”

figure 1a - MM 6120 data

1a. Concepts & effects

- Inadequate
- Developing
- Proficient
- Skilled
- Exceptional
2a. Analysis of media type choices

Inadequate: 0%
Developing: 14%
Proficient: 29%
Skilled: 57%
Exceptional: 0%

2a. Analysis of media type choices

Inadequate: 0%
Developing: 25%
Proficient: 25%
Skilled: 0%
Exceptional: 50%

2b. Concept / Content development

Inadequate: 0%
Developing: 43%
Proficient: 29%
Skilled: 33%
Exceptional: 0%
figure 2b - Year 1 graduate self assessment  
2b. Concept / Content development

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 0%
- Proficient: 50%
- Skilled: 50%
- Exceptional: 0%

figure 2b - Year 2 graduate self assessment  
2b. Concept / Content development

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 0%
- Proficient: 33%
- Skilled: 33%
- Exceptional: 33%

figure 3a - MM 6120 data

3a. Software / Code

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 0%
- Proficient: 86%
- Skilled: 0%
- Exceptional: 14%

figure 3a - Year 1 graduate self assessment  
3a. Software / Code

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 25%
- Proficient: 50%
- Skilled: 25%
- Exceptional: 0%

figure 3a - Year 2 graduate self assessment  
3a. Software / Code

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 33%
- Proficient: 34%
- Skilled: 33%
- Exceptional: 33%
figure 3b - MM 6120 data

3b. Hardware / Electronics

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 16%
- Proficient: 17%
- Skilled: 67%
- Exceptional: 0%

figure 3b - Year 1 graduate self assessment

3b. Hardware / Electronics

- Inadequate: 25%
- Developing: 75%

figure 3b - Year 2 graduate self assessment

3b. Hardware / Electronics

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 34%
- Proficient: 33%
- Skilled: 33%
- Exceptional: 0%

figure 3c - MM 6120 data

3c. Materials / Tools

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 14%
- Proficient: 43%
- Skilled: 43%
- Exceptional: 0%
3c. Materials / Tools

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 25%
- Proficient: 0%
- Skilled: 50%
- Exceptional: 25%

3c. Materials / Tools

- Inadequate: 0%
- Developing: 33%
- Proficient: 34%
- Skilled: 33%
- Exceptional: 33%