To: Interim Dean, Kathleen Rountree, College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences
From: Rafael Hernandez, Chair, Department of Music
Subject: Multimedia Graduate Program Annual Report

**I. Self-study**
a. Progress with Departmental Planning and Review
During AY 2011-10, Multimedia Graduate Program faculty have been involved in continued work towards revising the M.A. in Multimedia and perhaps even changing the name of the degree program. Being oriented around contemporary technology, the program will always be faced with the problem of the pace of technological change outpacing the maximum speed of institutional change. For example, the term *multimedia* is now more descriptive of the use of audio and video with narrative that finds its final place within broadcast and other similar media contexts. The problem here is that the Multimedia Graduate Program is decidedly not a broadcast media or journalism program. Instead, it is a program that focuses on producing interactive *things*. These *things* can vary from room-sized installations that one would find in museums to completely screen-based software applications that run in a web browser. Knowing that this is the thrust that the current faculty want to pursue and that it fits well within the needs of a workforce now well past the initial explorative phase of the tech industry in the late 90's, it is more important than ever to revise the Multimedia Graduate Program curriculum and even consider its renaming to something more specific and meaningful.

For the past two academic years, the Chair of the Department of Communication, Gale Young, and the Multimedia Graduate Program Director, Rafael Hernandez, have had very informal talks about perhaps merging the Multimedia Graduate Program with the graduate program in Communication. Initial talks were quite tepid with Communication being resistant to such an idea. As such, the Multimedia Graduate Program has lost interest in this idea but is still willing to entertain conversation about it. At the core of the problem is that students from the two programs do two, very different courses of study that result in two, very different capstones. Multimedia Graduate Program students work on an applied technology thesis that is in production for 5 quarters (4 of which are academic credit bearing). Most coursework is geared towards gaining skills to complete this work. Discussed at length with program faculty, this is something that is strongly desired to remain as it is excellent training for the kinds of work graduates seek (long term, collaborative, interactive projects). Again, the Multimedia Graduate Program is open to discussion, especially in times of very tight budget dollars.

b. Program assessment processes
The cornerstone of the Multimedia Graduate Program is assessment by committee. As horrible as that may initially sound, it is actually quite effective at providing assessment and guidance of collaborative teamwork. Over the past two academic years programmatic assessment has lead to a number of changes:
- Thesis reviews are now on a predictable cycle with each point within the cycle being clear in expectations and outcomes

- The MUS 6805 Forum course has been slightly changed in order to more effectively serve the following SLO:
  - *have an understanding of the effects of media and the evolution of information across a variety of media types*
- Advising of thesis projects has moved to a *round-robin* style of advising where members of the Multimedia Graduate Program Committee rotate through thesis groups and provide guidance and assessment weekly with different teams.
  - The prior model was an assignment of an advisor to a specific team.

c. Fulfilling programmatic needs

Funding from the Instructionally Related Equipment fund has been a real blessing in that the program has been able to incorporate some cutting-edge contemporary technology into the classroom. This includes the use of a 3D printer and the recent acquisition of a Red Scarlet digital film camera. Additionally, the first year lab (AE 1227) received a computer refresh. This refresh has helped the curriculum in that the lab went from a mixed-platform, Mac/PC lab to an all-Mac lab and that has provided more continuity of experience for the students when working at difference stations.

## II. Assessment report
Summary of assessment results

The two major assessment points in the Multimedia Graduate Program are the *advancement to candidacy* and the *successful thesis project completion*. In order to proceed to the team formation stage of the thesis project, individual students must be advanced to candidacy. Below are figures for both AY 10-11 and 11-12 for advancement to candidacy with the SLO given:

SLOs assessed in *solo-project presentations* (the means for assessing advancement to candidacy)

1. Be proficient in digital imaging, interactive production, and audio production
2. Be familiar with current trends in multimedia
3. Understand the relationship between Interactive design and learning theories
4. Have an understanding of the effects of media and the evolution of information across a variety of media types

AY 10-11

| Advanced | Not advanced |
|----------|--------------|
| 12       | 2            |

AY 11-12

| Advanced | Not advanced |
|----------|--------------|
| 11       | 0            |

For AY 10-11, all thesis projects were successfully completed with all students graduating in Spring 2011.

SLOs assessed in thesis projects
1. Have the ability to produce work in a team-based environment
2. Produce an interactive thesis project that demonstrates a novel and/or creative use of a single or combination of interactive technologies within a team
3. Create written documentation of the Thesis Project that conforms to the guidelines of the department

a. Reflection upon progress made
The Multimedia Graduate Program continually reflects on the solo-project assessment that determines advancement to candidacy. Throughout its history, this assessment has been rather severe in that failure to be advanced meant that a student's academic progress was halted one calendar year. Given that the program is team-based, this makes sense, as there is only one window for entry in the thesis year each year. However, it can seem like a very hard slap to the face, if you will, when a student is making satisfactory academic progress and is then found severely wanting in the solo-project assessment. So, in order to tighten up and make more consistent assessment across the program that

eventually leads to this point, the Director has encouraged the faculty of the program to be much more rigorous in their assessments in order for the solo-project assessment to be more reflective of a students ability at that time relative to all coursework taken in the program. In AY 2011-12, no student was denied candidacy and that it is believe that that was a result of more stringent assessment at every single point of coursework, not just at a single point towards the end of the first year.

b. Summary of changes, activities and results of SLO
MM 6805 is now formatted so that each quarter the is a specific topic of study
Fall: Basic research
Winter: Presentations
Spring: Visiting talks by industry professionals

The innovations of Fall and Winter quarter have especially helped the solo-project assessments.

**III. Research data**

Save for student demographics (which aren't current), the webpage at
http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/index.html is woefully inadequate at providing data
requested.

a. Student demographics (recent of 2011-2012 as collected by the program)

| M.A. Multimedia | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| Race/ethnicity unknown | 3 | 5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 2 | 3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 0 | 1 |
| White | 5 | 7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0 |
| Nonresident alien | 1 | 4 |
| Multiple ethnicity | 0 | 0 |
| M.A. Music Total | 13 | 20 |

b. Student level
The Department requests further clarification on what data is required here.

c. Faculty and academic allocation

| | Headcount | FTEF | WTU |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tenured/Track | 5 | 2 | 24 |
| Lecturer | 1 | .4 | 6 |

d. Course data
The Department requests further clarification on what data is required here.