**2013-2014 CLASS FACT Assessment Year End Report, June, 2014**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name(s)** | **FACT Faculty Fellow** | **Program Director** |
| **Multimedia** | **Gwyan Rhabyt** | **Gwyan Rhabyt** |

[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**

|  |
| --- |
| 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 production2. Research and critically assess new developments in the field of multimedia at both the cultural and the technical level3. Show an understanding of the effects of media and the evolution of information across a variety of media types4. 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 1st SLO was assessed.On graduating with a M.A. in Multimedia from CSU East Bay, students will be able to:Demonstrate competency in digital imaging, and interactive, web, video, and audio production |

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

|  |
| --- |
| Because the natural time of assessment of most of the Program’s SLOs is the very end of Spring quarter, there is no time to act on the results. So, starting this year, we are splitting the data collection and the analysis and closing the loop into different years. So this years SLO will be measured in late Spring 2014 but analyzed and acted on in Fall 2014 and Winter 2015.Because the Program is small and cohort-based, we were able to assess all graduating students. All students completed their first, or competency year, with the courses Introduction to Thesis (MM6860) and Multimedia Software Design (MM6120). Three assignments were chosen from these two classes and the four-member faculty graduate committee assessed their output on a custom rubric to address the SLO. Within each area of the rubric, the student was given the highest score they had received between the three assignments (because each assignment had different emphases).An indirect assessment of the students’ self perceptions of progress on each element of the SLO across the curriculum was also sent to all graduate students.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**

|  |
| --- |
| Fully tallied rubrics and student assessments are not available at the time of this report (see section C). The only conclusion from this year’s assessment is that the current process seems less effective than it should be. A number of other graduate programs in CLASS use an alternate process in which students are required to assemble a “competency portfolio” for assessment, in which they can directly address the requirements of the SLO. It is likely that the Multimedia Graduate Program will shift to this method of assessment and employ it annually. The final decision will be made after all results are gathered from this round.We should note further work taken to close the loop on last year’s SLO assessment. The SLO for 2013 was “Research and critically assess new developments in the field of multimedia at both the cultural and the technical level”. From rubric tallies and comments, 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 were be made in lectures and assignments in four courses: MM6101, MM6110, MM6120, and MM6860, to correct these shortcomings. Overall both the direct assessment results and the assessment process was successful. 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. Further questioning revealed that student were pressured by their upcoming final assignments, and by the lack on anonymity in the process. In response, a fully anonymized submission system was devised and dedicated class time was provided to filling out the evaluation form. As a result, the response rate has quadrupled. Although specific data from the 2014 indirect assessment has not yet been tallied, we expect it to provide valuable insight into improving the Program. |

**E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future**

|  |
| --- |
| A process that is more spread out over the year would help. Not more meetings, but more time to implement assessments between meetings. |

Thank you for your hard work for the past year, and have a Great Summer!