Expected Outcomes: Application—document design

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

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

General Comments about Method: In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated one (the only) GCTC graduate portfolio. (In 2012, we graduated our first GCTC student.) Raters used MTPC outcomes 8 to 11 to assess the GCTC. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty met to discuss their ratings. The GCTC portfolio contains three documents from students’ coursework.

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:

Raters assessed this GCTC outcome as they did outcome 8 for the MTPC. For this outcome and outcomes 9 and 10, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past (when assessing the MTPC). 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.” The raters assessed the GCTC portfolio as "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 components of print and/or online document production: usability and accessibility

Assessment methods

Method: Portfolio review

General Comments about Method: In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated one (the only) GCTC graduate portfolio. (In 2012, we graduated our first GCTC student.) Raters used MTPC...
outcomes 8 to 11 to assess the GCTC. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty met to discuss their ratings. The GCTC portfolio contains three documents from students’ coursework. General Comments about Findings: (1) As with the MTPC assessment, the MTPC faculty will revise the GCTC 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?

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:

Raters assessed this GCTC outcome as they did outcome 9 for the MTPC. For this outcome and outcomes 8 and 10, raters evaluated more stringently than in the past (when assessing the MTPC). 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.” The raters assessed the GCTC portfolio as “acceptable.”

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

General Comments about Method: In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated one (the only) GCTC graduate portfolio. (In 2012, we graduated our first GCTC student.) Raters used MTPC outcomes 8 to 11 to assess the GCTC. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty met to discuss their ratings. The GCTC portfolio contains three documents from students’ coursework. General Comments about Findings: (1) As with the MTPC assessment, the MTPC faculty will revise the GCTC 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 editing course and in students’ graduate committee meetings, we
will continue to help students edit their document productions to achieve higher standards.

Additional comments:
Raters assessed this GCTC outcome as they did outcome 10 for the MTPC. For this outcome, raters evaluated slightly more stringently than in the past (when assessing the MTPC). 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. The raters assessed the GCTC portfolio as “good.”

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

General Comments about Method: In 2012, two MTPC faculty independently rated one (the only) GCTC graduate portfolio. (In 2012, we graduated our first GCTC student.) Raters used MTPC outcomes 8 to 11 to assess the GCTC. The rubric measures outcomes on a 1 to 4 scale (1 = not acceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent). MTPC faculty met to discuss their ratings. The GCTC portfolio contains three documents from students’ coursework. General Comments about Findings: (1) As with the MTPC assessment, the MTPC faculty will revise the GCTC 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?

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 assessed this GCTC outcome as they did outcome 11 for the MTPC. 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). The raters assessed the GCTC portfolio as “acceptable.” For assessment in 2013, 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.