



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CLASS
Department	Multimedia Graduate Program
Program Unit	Multimedia Graduate Program
Reporting for Academic Year	2012-2013
Department Chair	Gwyan Rhabyt
Date Submitted	6/28/2013

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

The current five-year plan (2009-2014) focuses on re-visioning and re-positioning the Program.

1. Realigning the administration of the Program, moving it from the Office of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies to CLASS
2. Instituting a three-tiered admission process (students admitted regularly without provision; admitted provisionally, but needing to take a limited set of classes to prepare for the program's demands; or admitted for a preparatory one year, to take a prescribed series of classes to increase their skills)
3. Expanding enrollment to 40 students in the regular 2-year program
4. Increasing the number of appropriate faculty in the Departments of Art and Music (as the Graduate Program has no dedicated faculty of its own) to support the programs curricular needs.
5. Increasing funding for hardware and software, especially consumable materials for students to create cutting edge projects and prototypes.
6. An increase in funding for guest lecturers to enable the Program to draw on the expertise of the local technology industry.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

Most of these goals have been achieved, but some have proved difficult.

1. The Program has been smoothly and successfully transitioned from OAPGS to CLASS
2. The three-tiered admission process has been implemented and has successfully addressed the strains on the Program from uneven skills in matriculating students.
3. The Program has not been able to achieve its goal of enrolling 40 students in the regular 2-year program while maintaining the current high standards. There are a number of issues, many of which will be addressed by the coming merger with the Art Department (see Section C. below). The major loss of institutional knowledge of recruitment with the departure of both the Director and the Administrative Assistant (with 15 years experience in the Program) in the Summer of 2012 has also had a negative impact. A new positioning and marketing strategy will

be developed in Fall 2013 and rolled out in Winter and Spring 2014.

4. Owing to budgetary constraints, no new faculty have been hired in the Art Department in the last five years. This drought is coming to an end with the approval for a search for a new interactive design hire which will support the program. But with the retirement of Professor James Petrillo, the Program's founder, and the promotion of Rafael Hernandez, the only technologically-focused professor in the Music Department, to administration, the pool of Tenure Track instructors has declined.

5. Funding for hardware, software, and technology supplies has been addressed with the implementation of the A2E2 fee and funding system. It has been a great relief to see faculty able to teach the full range of skills necessary in the program because equipment and materials are available.

6. A2E2 funding has also provided for an expansion of our guest lecturer program, which has been met with enthusiasm from both the Multimedia Graduate students and undergraduate students in Art and Music.

C. Program Changes and Needs

With the Five-year Review now four years old, there are a number of new issues that have arisen. The leading one has been that the previous balance in the Program between the Art Department and the Music Department has seen a serious shift. Currently all instructors in the program are Art Department faculty and none are from the Music Department. This has also meant that 95% of the elective and preparatory courses are taught in the Art Department. As this looks likely to continue for the foreseeable future, and in order to maintain offerings in the face of continued staffing cuts, the Program has requested a merger with the Art Department.

In the 2013-14 year, the focus will be on making this transition smooth and efficient.

A second issue that has been difficult for the Program has been the simultaneous departure of the Program Director and the Administrative Assistant. Over the Summer of 2012, much of the Program's institutional knowledge was lost, and has only been reconstructed with great effort.

Many initiatives, particularly around curriculum revision, were put on hold and will only be addressed in the coming year. As of June, recruitment yields are still unclear for the coming year, but it is likely that these will have also suffered.

The primary focus in terms of curriculum modification will be a rebalancing of student workload between courses and integration of the Program's curricular goals with those of the Art Department.

Resource needs have fallen in two radically different directions: equipment and supplies have been generously funded through the new A2E2 programs (IREE and ECL); but staffing has been cut, with the former fulltime Administrative Assistant cut from full to half time, and Director assigned time cut. The resolution of the under-staffing problem will be significantly impacted by the merger with the Art Department, but given the difficulties that have emerged during the last year, some increase is called for.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

On graduating with a M.A. in Multimedia from CSU East Bay, students will be able to:

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.

The curriculum map is attached

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

This year the second Program SLO was assessed:

On graduating with a M.A. in Multimedia from CSU East Bay, students will be able to:
Research and critically assess new developments in the field of multimedia at both the cultural and the technical level

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Because the Program is small and cohort-based, we were able to assess all graduating students. All students completed their thesis project with an accompanying 40-50 page thesis document as part of the course MM6899 in Spring Quarter. Each thesis had a required literature review and critical assessment of related technology in addition to a focused contextualization of the students' projects; this maps very closely to the Program SLO. Each thesis was read by three faculty members of the Multimedia Graduate Committee, who scored this part of the thesis on a rubric covering eight key aspects of the SLO.

An indirect assessment of the students' self perceptions of progress on each element of the SLO across the curriculum was also sent to all graduating students.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

According to the tallied rubrics, all students produced work that demonstrated that they had achieved the Learning Outcome. However it was clear that while most students were strong in researching and critiquing other projects and developments, there was a repeated weakness in doing so systematically. Often key relevant works were omitted from reviews or multiple works were seen in isolation rather than synthesized to themes. In response, adjustments will be made in lectures and assignments in four courses: MM6100, MM6101, MM6110, and MM6860, to correct these shortcomings. Overall both the direct assessment results and the assessment process was successful. A similar process will be followed next year.

The indirect assessment was less successful. It was distributed late in the quarter and most students failed to fill it out. Because the Program is already small, the results were neither representative nor significant. The pressure in the final weeks of the year is great and this was

not prioritized. Next year, indirect assessments will be administered earlier and follow-up will be more systematic.

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

a) Student demographics of majors (most recent available)

California State University, East Bay

Multimedia		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
		Degree Level	TOTAL								
		Master		Master		Master		Master		Master	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic	2	2	1	1	1	1			2	2
	Asian	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	1
	Hispanic	4	4	6	6	3	3	2	2		
	White	1	1	4	4	5	5	6	6	5	5
	Multiple ethnicity							1	1	2	2
	Race/ethnicity unknown	4	4			2	2	2	2		
	Nonresident aliens	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1
Male	Black, non-Hispanic			1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
	Asian	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	3
	Hispanic			2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
	White	4	4	4	4	4	4	8	8	7	7
	Multiple ethnicity							1	1	1	1
	Race/ethnicity unknown	6	6	5	5	5	5	3	3	1	1
	Nonresident aliens	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	4
Total	Black, non-Hispanic	2	2	2	2	4	4	1	1	3	3
	Asian	4	4	3	3	6	6	4	4	4	4
	Hispanic	4	4	8	8	5	5	3	3	1	1
	White	5	5	8	8	9	9	14	14	12	12
	Multiple ethnicity							2	2	3	3
	Race/ethnicity unknown	10	10	5	5	7	7	5	5	1	1
	Nonresident aliens	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	5

b) SFRs, FTES, and academic allocation (most recent available)

		Total SCU					term_ftes					term_ftef					term_sfr					
		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	
MM	Tenured & Tenure Track	95.0	104.0	144.0	196.0	92.0	6.33	6.93	9.60	13.07	6.13	0.56	0.53	0.54	0.75	0.59	11.33	13.16	17.68	17.35	10.36	
	Lecturer	48.0	70.0	84.0	24.0	132.0	3.20	4.67	5.60	1.60	8.80	0.28	0.33	0.33	0.07	0.36	11.31	13.97	16.77	23.88	24.51	
	Lower Division
	Upper Division
	Graduate	143.0	174.0	228.0	220.0	224.0	9.53	11.60	15.20	14.67	14.93	0.84	0.86	0.88	0.82	0.95	11.32	13.47	17.33	17.89	15.70	
	Total	143.0	174.0	228.0	220.0	224.0	9.53	11.60	15.20	14.67	14.93	0.84	0.86	0.88	0.82	0.95	11.32	13.47	17.33	17.89	15.70	

c) Student and Program Statistics, including student levels, degrees awarded, and course data (most recent available)

Multimedia					
Item	Fall Quarter				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	28	33	31	29	28
4. Total Number of Majors	28	33	31	29	28
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	13	14	12	13	10
3. Total	13	14	12	13	10
Fall Quarter					
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	0	0	0	0	0
3b. % Tenure Track	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	2	2	3	0	1
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	2	2	3	0	1
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	2	2	3	0	1
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.6
9. Lecturer FTEF	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.4
10. Total Instructional FTEF	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.0
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	6.3	6.9	9.6	13.1	6.1
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	58.4%	63.4%	66.4%	59.7%	63.2%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	3.2	4.7	5.6	1.6	8.8
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	41.6%	36.6%	33.6%	40.3%	36.8%
13. Total FTES taught	9.5	11.6	15.2	14.7	14.9
14. Total SCU taught	143.0	174.0	228.0	220.0	224.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	11.3	13.2	17.7	17.4	10.4
2. Lecturer	11.3	14.0	16.8	23.9	24.5
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	11.3	13.5	17.3	17.9	15.7
4. Lower Division
5. Upper Division
6. Graduate	11.3	13.5	17.3	17.9	15.7
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	8.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	6.0
2. Average Section Size	13.0	14.3	18.0	18.7	20.7
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for GD	13.0	14.3	18.0	18.7	20.7
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	6	3	4	6	3
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	2	2	2	1	3

Curriculum Map for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, CSU East Bay

Degree:	M.A. in Multimedia				Dept:	MM							
Levels:	I=Introduced; P=Practiced; M=Mastered (terms adopted from WASC recommendations)												
Indicators	A=Assignments; E=Essays; R=Research Project/Papers; T=Objective Tests;												
Symbols:	X=Exams of Mixed Types (tests, short answers, essays); O=Other Types of Work V=Variable (may vary from different sections or instructors) e.g., T50=The indicator is an Objective Test, which constitutes 50% of the course evaluation												
Instructions:	<p>1) Enter a course ONLY if that course is part of the requirement of the relevant major (either core, option requirement, or elective). Enter the course according to the course number, from smallest to the largest numbers).</p> <p>2) For each course, for the course line (see example 01), use the pull down list (click the cell, and the downward arrow will show) to indicate at what level the material is addressed for each SLO. For the Indicators line, enter the symbols, such as T50, O35, etc., to indicate the type of work and the % of its weight of the course evaluation (Round to every 5%, e.g., 15, 20, 25, etc.)</p> <p>3) If the SLO maps to any ILO, enter the same values under that ILO for the same course (see example 01). Map ALL relevant ILOs when appropriate.</p> <p>Reveal SLO/ILO text: Mouse over each SLO or ILO, the full text of that SLO/ILO will show on the screen.</p>												
Serial #	Course Prefix	Course #	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	ILO1	ILO2	ILO3	ILO4	ILO5	ILO6	Note
01	MM	6100		I	I		I	I		I		I	
	Indicators			R20 X2	R20 X25 O5		R10 X2	R5 X5		O10		R25 X25	
02	MM	6101		P	P		P	P		P		P	
	Indicators			R50	R50		R20	R20		R10		R50	
03	MM	6102	P	P	P		P	P	I	P	I	P	
	Indicators		A5 R15	A5 R15	A5 R15		A10 R1	A5 R10	A5	A5 R10	A5	R40	
04	MM	6103		P	P		P	P	I	P	I	P	
	Indicators			A5 R35	A5 R5 O5		A10 R1	A5 R10	A5	A5 R10	A5	R40	
05	MM	6110	I	P			P	P		P		P	
	Indicators		A20 R1	R25 X5 O5			A5 X5	A5 X5		A10		R20 X25 O5	
06	MM	6120	P	P			P			P		P	
	Indicators		A5 R5	R55 O5			R10 X10 O5			R10		A5 R40 X15 O5	
07	MM	6805		P	P		P	P		P		P	
	Indicators			V	V		V	V		V		V	
08	MM	6860	M	M	P	I	M	M		P		P	
	Indicators		R30	R30	R20	R20	R30	R20		R10		R40	
09	MM	6870		M	P	P	P	P		P		P	
	Indicators			R50	R10	R40	R20	R20		R20		R40	
10	MM	6880		M	P	P	P	P		M		M	
	Indicators			R30	R10	R60	R20	R20		R20		R40	
11	MM	6899			M	M	M	M		M		M	
	Indicators				R10	R90	R20	R20		R20		R40	
12													
	Indicators												