Expected Outcomes: Theory-Approaches

Students will be able to use academic prose to discuss major theoretical approaches to TPC.

Assessment methods

**Method**: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates' portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios

**Findings:**

mean = 2.83

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

Continue to increase discussion of ethics in all courses (which we started after last year's assessment). We can discuss ethics in different ways depending on the class (e.g., accessibility, advocacy). The classes we have targeted for more intensive discussion of ethics are these: document design, web development, and issues and approaches to TPC.

**Additional comments:**

None

Expected Outcomes: Theory-Ethics

Students will be able to use academic prose to discuss the ethical considerations (e.g., constraints, scenarios, and uses) addressed by scholars and practitioners of TPC.

Assessment methods

**Method**: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates' portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for
faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios.

Findings:
mean = 3.08

How did you use findings for improvement?

Continue to discuss theory in all courses to ground discussion of theory and best practices. The class we have targeted for more intensive discussion of theory is issues and approaches to TPC.

Additional comments:
None

Expected Outcomes: Theory-Multiculturalism

Students will be able to use academic prose to discuss the needs, preferences, and/or expectations of multicultural and global audiences.

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios.

Findings:
mean = 2.00

How did you use findings for improvement?

Continue to incorporate discussion of the needs and expectations of multicultural audiences in all courses; also, as noted in last year’s assessment, make sure that students reflect on the readings and classroom discussion of multiculturalism as they construct their portfolios.

Additional comments:
None

Expected Outcomes: Theory-Document design

Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: document design.
Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios.

Findings:

mean = 2.83

How did you use findings for improvement?

For improvement, in the document design class, we will expand discussion of empirical research on document design and make sure students reflect on secondary research beyond basic course texts as they construct their portfolios.

Additional comments:

For this outcome and outcomes 5 and 6, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past. Raters looked to see whether portfolios cited secondary sources other than textbooks and guides (e.g., Williams’s design books). Portfolios that cited textbooks and guides (basic course readings) this year were “acceptable” as opposed to “good.”

Expected Outcomes: Theory-Usability and accessibility

Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: usability and accessibility

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios.

Findings:

mean = 2.50
How did you use findings for improvement?

For improvement, we will expand discussion of empirical research on both usability and accessibility in web development class and make sure students reflect on secondary research beyond basic course texts as they construct their portfolios.

Additional comments:

For this outcome and outcomes 4 and 6, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past. Raters looked to see whether portfolios cited secondary sources other than textbooks and guides (e.g., Krug’s usability book). Portfolios that cited textbooks and guides (basic course readings) this year were “acceptable” as opposed to “good.”

Expected Outcomes: Theory-Editing

Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: editing

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios

Findings:

mean = 2.91

How did you use findings for improvement?

For improvement, we will expand discussion and analysis of empirical research on editing of nonnative speakers’ texts and cognitive processing of texts and make sure students reflect on secondary research beyond basic course texts as they construct their portfolios.

Additional comments:

For this outcome and outcomes 4 and 5, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past. Raters looked to see whether portfolios cited secondary sources other than textbooks and guides (e.g., Rude and Eaton’s editing book). Portfolios that cited textbooks and guides (basic course readings) this year were “acceptable” as opposed to “good.”

Expected Outcomes: Theory-Publication project management

Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: publication project management

Assessment methods
Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings.  

1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012;  

2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied);  

3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios

Findings:

mean = 1.83

How did you use findings for improvement?

To improve, we will expand discussion of project planning, team-member roles, content specification, and so on in all classes, but we will target the practicum course in particular for increased attention to this outcome.

Additional comments:

Raters looked to see whether portfolios reflected basic secondary sources on project management and document production. Portfolios that cited one or two sources were rated as “acceptable.”

Expected Outcomes: Application-document design

Students will be able to use standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) and to apply best practices to the following component of print and/or online document production: document design

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings.  

1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012;  

2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied);  

3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios

Findings:

mean = 3.00

How did you use findings for improvement?

For improvement, in our document design course and in students’ graduate committee
meetings, we will continue to help students revise their document productions to achieve higher standards.

Additional comments:

For this outcome and outcomes 9 and 10, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past. Raters looked to see whether most portfolio documents manifested usable, attractive, research-driven design, but they raised the standard of what they meant by “most documents.” Portfolios that did not manifest these qualities on nearly all documents were rated as “acceptable” opposed to “good.”

Expected Outcomes: Application-usability and accessibility

Students will be able to use standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) and to apply best practices to the following component of print and/or online document production: usability and accessibility

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was “good” in previous years is now “acceptable.” These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios

Findings:

mean = 3.08

How did you use findings for improvement?

For improvement, in our web development course and in students’ graduate committee meetings, we will continue to help students revise their web development projects to achieve higher standards.

Additional comments:

For this outcome and outcomes 8 and 10, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past. Raters looked to see whether most portfolio documents manifested usable, standards-driven, and heuristics-driven design and coding, but they raised the standard of what they meant by “most documents.” Portfolios that did not manifest these qualities on nearly all documents were rated as “acceptable” opposed to “good.”

Expected Outcomes: Application-editing

Students will be able to use standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) and to apply best practices to the following component of print and/or online document production: editing

Assessment methods
Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates' portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was "good" in previous years is now "acceptable." These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios.

Findings:

mean = 3.41

How did you use findings for improvement?

For improvement, in our editing course and in students' graduate committee meetings, we will continue to help students edit their document productions to achieve higher standards.

Additional comments:

For this outcome, raters evaluated slightly more stringently than in the past. Raters looked to see whether portfolio documents manifested clear, correct, consistent writing across document elements—including figures, tables, reference lists, captions, and so on. Raters also looked for document style sheets.

Expected Outcomes: Application-publication project management

Students will be able to use standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) and to apply best practices to the following component of print and/or online document production: publication project management

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

The assessment rubric is unchanged from 2010 and 2011. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty normed ratings in 2010. In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated six (50%) of the MTPC graduates' portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. (1) This year (2012), raters held the program (via portfolios) to a higher standard. What was "good" in previous years is now "acceptable." These higher standards for measuring our outcomes require that we revise the rubric during this academic year to be ready for assessment next year. The MTPC director will start this process for faculty input in fall 2012; (2) We (MTPC faculty) need to modify the portfolio requirements so that we can better assess outcomes, particularly publication project management (applied); (3) We should give students the assessment rubric to use as a formative tool for constructing their portfolios.

Findings:

mean = 2.16

How did you use findings for improvement?
For improvement, we will give more attention via lessons on timelines, Gantt charts, and other scheduling documents in all of our courses, particularly in our practicum course.

Additional comments:

Raters looked to see whether portfolios reflected application of students’ knowledge about project management and document production. As noted in last year’s assessment, portfolios typically do not contain project-planning documents (although students do indeed create them during their classes). For assessment, we need to see documents such as timelines and Gantt charts. We will revise the requirements of the portfolio so that students include such planning documents.