Learning Outcome #1 (on rubric in Appendix A): Theory-Ethics

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

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 1 (not acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 2.13; while two portfolios achieved excellence, three were rated not acceptable in this use of academic prose to discuss ethics in TPC.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to enhance the focus on ethics in TPC. The faculty agreed to focus this work in the annual offering of Issues and Approaches in Technical and Professional Communication.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #2 (on rubric in Appendix A): Theory-Approaches

Students will be able to use academic prose to discuss major theoretical approaches to Technical and Professional Communication.

**Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review**

**Assessment Method Description**

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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings.

**Findings**

Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 2 (acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 3.50; most students achieved excellence, with one student rated acceptable in the use of academic prose to discuss major theoretical approaches to technical and professional communication.

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

Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to clarify for all students the linkage between theory and practice in TPC. While this linkage is crucial to all TPC graduate courses, the faculty agreed to focus this work in the class, Issues and Approaches in Technical and Professional Communication, offered every year.

**Additional Comments**

None.
Learning Outcome #3 (on rubric in Appendix A):
Theory-Multiculturalism

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

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 1 (not acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 1.44; only one portfolio was uniformly rated good; most were rated not acceptable.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to intensify student focus on research and theory regarding global and multicultural audiences. The faculty agreed to incorporate discussion of the needs and expectations of multicultural audiences in all courses; also, as noted in the past two assessments, we will make sure that students reflect on the readings and classroom discussion of multiculturalism as they construct their portfolios. Portfolio themes and the audiences of particular portfolio documents have tended to limit the extent to which portfolios address multicultural issues.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #4 (on rubric in Appendix A): Theory-Document Design

Students will be able to use academic prose to discuss best practices from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: document design.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. Raters looked to see whether portfolios cited secondary sources other than textbooks and guides (e.g., Williams’s design books). Portfolios that cited only textbooks and guides (basic course readings) were “acceptable” as opposed to “good.” The raters met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 2 (acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 3.25; three students achieved excellence, but most received a rating of good in their discussion of document design.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to intensify student focus on research and theory regarding document design. The faculty agreed to use the annual Document Design class to expand discussion of empirical research on document design. They also agreed to make sure students reflect on secondary research beyond basic course texts as they construct their portfolios.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #5 (on rubric in Appendix A):
Theory-Usability and Accessibility

Students will be able to use 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 Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. 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.”

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 1 (not acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 2.69; two portfolios achieved excellence, but most received ratings of acceptable or good in their discussion of usability and accessibility, or uneven ratings due to strong student focus on usability (but not accessibility).

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to intensify student focus on research and theory regarding usability and accessibility. The faculty agreed to expand discussion of empirical research on both usability and accessibility in the annual Web Development class and make sure students reflect on secondary research beyond basic course texts as they construct their portfolios. The faculty also agreed to extend discussions of accessibility to other classes and guide students to discuss it in their portfolios.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #6 (on rubric in Appendix A):
Theory-Editing
Students will be able to use academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: editing

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. 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.” They met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 2 (acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 2.88; a few students achieved excellence, but most received a rating of good in their discussion of editing.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to intensify student focus on research and theory regarding document design. The faculty agreed to expand discussion and analysis of empirical research on editing of nonnative speakers’ texts and cognitive processing of texts (especially in the annual Editing course) and make sure students reflect on secondary research beyond basic course texts as they construct their portfolios.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #7 (on rubric in Appendix A):
Theory-Publication project management

Students will be able to use 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 Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. 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.” The raters met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 1 (acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 2.75; a majority of portfolios were rated good or excellent but a substantial number rated only acceptable, and one was uniformly rated not acceptable.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to intensify student focus on research and theory regarding document design. The faculty agreed to expand discussion of project planning, team-member roles, content specification, and so on in all classes, and will continue to target the biannual Practicum course in particular for increased attention to this outcome.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #8 (on rubric in Appendix A): Application-Document design

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

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 2 (acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 3.50, indicating that students consistently use standard tools and apply best practices in document design to create usable, attractive, research-driven documents.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to encourage continuing rigor in their teaching of Document Design.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #9 (on rubric in Appendix A):
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 Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. Raters looked to see whether most portfolio documents manifested usable, standards-driven, and heuristics-driven design and coding. They met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 2 (acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 3.44; while three portfolios achieved excellence, most student application of standard tools and best practices in usability and accessibility was rated good.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to sharpen their teaching of usability and accessibility. The faculty agreed to focus on these issues by increasing student awareness of Departmental usability labs, and intensified instruction in accessibility and usability in the annual Web Development course and in preparation of the portfolio.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #10 (on rubric in Appendix A):
Application-Editing
Students will be able to use standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) and apply best practices to the following component of print and/or online document production: editing

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. 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. They met after to discuss their ratings.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 1 (not acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 3.50; while most portfolios demonstrated high consistency with application of standard tools and best practices in editing, one portfolio was rated not acceptable.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to encourage continuing rigor in their teaching of the annual Editing course, and particularly the importance of ensuring that all students receive full instruction and coaching on principles of editing and the use of style sheets.

Additional Comments
None.
Learning Outcome #11 (on rubric in Appendix A):
Application-Publication project management

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

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review
Assessment Method Description
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 2012-2013, two MTPC faculty independently rated eight (100%) of the MTPC graduates’ portfolios. They met after to discuss their ratings. Raters looked to see whether portfolios reflected application of students’ knowledge about project management and document production.

Findings
Eight student portfolios were reviewed for this outcome; the range ran from 1 (not acceptable) to 4 (excellent), with a mean of 3.44; while two portfolios demonstrated excellence, there was some inconsistency in student application of standard tools and best practices in project management.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Faculty teaching in MTPC courses received these data and discussed ways to revise and strengthen their teaching of publication project management. The central issue for assessment is that student portfolios typically do not contain project-planning documents (although students do create them during their classes). For assessment, the faculty agreed to require documents such as timelines and Gantt charts in the portfolio, and to enhance teaching of public project management through lessons on timelines, Gantt charts, and other scheduling documents in all courses, particularly in the biannual Practicum and Grant Writing courses.

Additional Comments
None.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Category</th>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1 Not acceptable</th>
<th>2 Acceptable</th>
<th>3 Good</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss the ethical considerations (e.g., constraints, scenarios, and uses) addressed by scholars and practitioners of TPC.</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Discusses ethical considerations inaccurately or vaguely; cites few, no, or irrelevant secondary sources; cites sources inaccurately.</td>
<td>Discusses ethical considerations accurately and with some specificity; cites somewhat relevant secondary sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses ethical considerations accurately and with specificity; supports claims with relevant secondary sources; cites secondary sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses ethical considerations accurately, elegantly, and with specificity; supports claims with relevant secondary sources and explicates source material; cites secondary sources accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss major theoretical approaches to TPC.</td>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td>Discusses theory inaccurately or vaguely; cites few (or no) secondary sources; cites sources inaccurately.</td>
<td>Discusses theory accurately and with some specificity; cites secondary sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses theory accurately and with specificity; supports claims with multiple secondary sources; cites secondary sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses theory accurately, elegantly, and with specificity; supports claims with multiple secondary sources; cites secondary sources accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Research</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss the needs, preferences, and/or expectations of multicultural and global audiences.</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>Discusses needs, preferences, or expectations of multicultural and global audiences inaccurately; cites no secondary sources.</td>
<td>Discusses needs, preferences, or expectations of multicultural and global audiences accurately; cites one or two secondary sources.</td>
<td>Discusses needs, preferences, or expectations of multicultural and global audiences accurately and with specificity; cites one or two secondary sources.</td>
<td>Discusses needs, preferences, or expectations of multicultural and global audiences accurately and with specificity; cites three or more secondary sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Research</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: Document design</td>
<td>Document design</td>
<td>Discusses best practices inaccurately or vaguely; cites few, no, or irrelevant secondary sources; cites sources inaccurately.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately and with some specificity; cites somewhat relevant secondary sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately and with specificity; cites relevant secondary sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately and with specificity; cites relevant secondary sources accurately and explicates source material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Research</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following components of print and/or online document production: Usability and accessibility</td>
<td>Usability and accessibility</td>
<td>Discusses usability heuristics and accessibility standards inaccurately; cites no secondary sources.</td>
<td>Discusses usability heuristics and accessibility standards accurately; cites course texts.</td>
<td>Discusses usability heuristics and accessibility standards accurately; cites one or two sources other than course texts.</td>
<td>Discusses usability heuristics and accessibility standards accurately and in detail; cites one or two sources other than course texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Research</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production: Editing</td>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Discusses best practices inaccurately; cites no secondary sources.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately; cites the editing-course texts.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately; cites some sources other than course texts.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately; discusses best practices in detail; cites some sources other than course texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Category</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>1 Not acceptable</td>
<td>2 Acceptable</td>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>4 Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Research</td>
<td>Uses academic prose to discuss expert-recommended best practices relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production:</td>
<td>Publication project management</td>
<td>Discusses best practices inaccurately or vaguely; cites few (or no) secondary sources; cites sources inaccurately.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately and with some specificity; discusses best practices derived from course texts; cites sources accurately.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately and with specificity; discusses some sources from the appropriate scholarly literature; cites sources accurately and begins to integrate them into portfolio documents.</td>
<td>Discusses best practices accurately and expertly; discusses a substantial number of sources from the appropriate scholarly literature; cites sources accurately and integrates them cohesively into portfolio documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applies best practices and uses standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) to the following component of print and/or online document production:</td>
<td>Document design</td>
<td>Portfolio components are either not functional or unattractive: documents largely fail to exhibit knowledge of standard design and usability criteria.</td>
<td>Most portfolio components are functional and attractive: components exhibit knowledge of standard design and usability criteria.</td>
<td>All portfolio components are functional and attractive: documents exhibit thorough knowledge of standard design and usability criteria.</td>
<td>Portfolio components are beautiful and highly functional: documents exhibit thorough knowledge of standard design and usability criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applies best practices and uses standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) to the following components of print and/or online document production:</td>
<td>Usability and accessibility</td>
<td>Portfolio components do not adhere to appropriate usability heuristics and accessibility standards.</td>
<td>Portfolio components adhere somewhat to appropriate usability heuristics and accessibility standards.</td>
<td>Portfolio components adhere mostly to appropriate usability heuristics and accessibility standards.</td>
<td>Portfolio components adhere fully to appropriate usability heuristics and all accessibility standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applies best practices and uses standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) to the following component of print and/or online document production:</td>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Overall, portfolio components are not edited for accuracy, correctness, completeness, and consistency.</td>
<td>Some portfolio components are edited for accuracy, correctness, completeness, and consistency.</td>
<td>Most portfolio components are edited for accuracy, correctness, completeness, and consistency, including figures, tables, and reference lists.</td>
<td>Most portfolio documents are edited for accuracy, correctness, completeness, and consistency, including figures, tables, and reference lists. Appropriate portfolio documents include document style sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applies best practices and uses standard tools (e.g., InDesign, Adobe Acrobat Pro, Word) to the following component of print and/or online document production:</td>
<td>Publication project management</td>
<td>Portfolio components fail to discuss or exhibit knowledge of audience needs analysis, content specification, scheduling, evaluation, or other publication management.</td>
<td>Portfolio components discuss or exhibit some knowledge of audience needs analysis, content specification, scheduling, evaluation, or other project management.</td>
<td>Portfolio components discuss or exhibit proficient knowledge of audience needs analysis, content specification, scheduling, evaluation, or other project management.</td>
<td>Portfolio components discuss or exhibit expert knowledge of audience needs analysis, content specification, scheduling, evaluation, or other publication project management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>