Expected Outcome 1: Application—Document Design
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.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 0 “acceptable”
- 3 “good”
- 1 between “good” and “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 3.5 (between good and excellent), with a mean rating of 3.1, a slight drop from the previous year’s 3.5. All portfolios were rated good to excellent.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The graduate studies committee was generally satisfied with this result; the committee, in striving for programmatic excellence, recommends that MTPC faculty discuss the best way to encourage excellence in this outcome for all portfolios.

Additional Comments
Expected Outcome 2: Application—Editing
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.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 0 “acceptable”
- 2 “good”
- 2 between “good” and “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 3.5 (between good and excellent), with a mean rating of 2.25; this score is a slight drop from the high scores from 2011 to 2013 (3.5, 3.4, and 3.5, respectively).

How did you use findings for improvement?
The graduate studies committee was generally satisfied with this result. The graduate studies assessment committee recommends that MTPC faculty work with students during the portfolio building process to ensure that their samples meet the highest standards for editing and reflect the development of their materials (at least through comparison of initial products and final products).

Additional Comments
Expected Outcome 3: Application—Publication and Project Management
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.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 1 between “acceptable” and “good”
- 1 “good”
- 2 between “good” and “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 2.5 (between acceptable and good), to 3.5 (between good and excellent), with a mean rating of 3.1, a drop from the previous year’s 3.4 but a higher rating than in years 2010 to 2012.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The graduate studies committee was generally satisfied with this result. The graduate studies assessment committee recommends that MTPC faculty work with students during the portfolio building process to ensure that their samples provide evidence of publication and project management.

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 4: Application—Usability and Accessibility
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.
Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 0 “acceptable”
- 1 between “acceptable” and “good”
- 2 “good”
- 1 between “good” and “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 2.5 (between acceptable and good), to 3.5 (between good and excellent), with a mean rating of 3.0, a slight drop from the previous year’s 3.4.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The graduate studies committee was generally satisfied with this result; the committee, in striving for programmatic excellence, recommends that MTPC faculty discuss the best way to encourage excellence in this outcome for all portfolios.

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 5: Ethics
Uses academic prose to discuss the ethical considerations (e.g., constraints, scenarios, and uses) addressed by scholars and practitioners of TPC.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:
Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 2 (acceptable), to 4 (excellent), with a mean rating of 2.6, a slight rise from the previous year’s 2.1.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Because of the mean rating for this outcome, the graduate studies assessment committee recommends that MTPC faculty review the expected portfolio outcomes for the use of theories of ethics in their writing and ensure that a higher percentage of students can demonstrate proficiency in this area.

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 6: Theory
Uses academic prose to discuss major theoretical approaches to TPC.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 1 “acceptable”
- 2 “good”
- 1 “excellent”
Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 2 (acceptable), to 4 (excellent), with a mean score of 3.0, a moderate drop from the previous year’s 3.5.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The mean for this year’s assessment was good but is a drop from last year’s mean. The graduate studies assessment committee recommends that MTPC faculty review the expected portfolio outcomes for the use of theory in their writing and ensure that a higher percentage of students can demonstrate proficiency in this area.

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 7: Theory/Research--Document Design
Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 0 “acceptable”
- 3 “good”
- 1 “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 4 (excellent), with a mean rating of 3.3, consistent with the previous year’s 3.3. All portfolios were rated good to excellent.
How did you use findings for improvement?
The graduate studies committee was generally satisfied with this result; the committee, in striving for programmatic excellence, recommends that MTPC faculty discuss the best way to encourage excellence in this outcome for all portfolios.

Additional Comments

---

Expected Outcome 8: Theory/Research--Editing
Uses academic prose to discuss best practices derived from research relevant to the following components of print and/or online document production.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 2 “acceptable”
- 2 “good”
- 0 “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 2 (acceptable), to 3 (good), with a mean rating of 2.5, a slight drop from the previous year’s 2.9.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The mean for this year’s assessment was acceptable but is a drop from last year’s mean. The graduate studies assessment committee recommends that MTPC faculty review the expected portfolio outcomes for the use of theories of editing in their writing and ensure that a higher percentage of students can demonstrate proficiency in this area because students tend to rely on basic course readings for portfolio citations.
Expected Outcome 9: Theory/Research--Multicultural

Uses academic prose to discuss the needs, preferences, and/or expectations of multicultural and global audiences.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 2 “not acceptable”
- 1 “acceptable”
- 1 between “acceptable” and “good”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 1 (not acceptable), to 2.5 (between acceptable and good), with a mean rating of 1.6, a slight rise from the previous year’s 1.4.

How did you use findings for improvement?
This outcome was found to be unacceptable. Portfolio themes and the audiences that particular selections address affect the extent to which portfolios address multicultural issues. The graduate studies committee recommends that MTPC faculty review the expected portfolio outcomes for research and ensure that they’re including the kind of material that can demonstrate these outcomes. The committee also recommends reviewing curriculum to ensure that key courses have multicultural components.

Additional Comments
Expected Outcome 10: Theory/Research--Publication Project Management

Uses academic prose to discuss expert-recommended best practices relevant to the following component of print and/or online document production.

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 2 “acceptable”
- 2 “good”
- 0 “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 2 (acceptable), to 3 (good), with a mean rating of 2.5, a slight drop from the previous year’s 2.8.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The mean for this year’s assessment was acceptable. It is a slight drop from last year’s mean but an improvement on the means between 2010 and 2012. The graduate studies assessment committee recommends that MTPC faculty continue to expand discussion of documentation management to all applicable classes.

Additional Comments
Expected Outcome 11: Theory/Research--Usability and Accessibility

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

Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Assessment Method Description
In 2014, the two primary members of each MTPC portfolio committee independently rated the portfolio submitted half the students (randomly selected), 4 students in total. The portfolios were rated on each outcome according to a 4-point scale, with the following results:

- 0 “not acceptable”
- 0 “acceptable”
- 3 “good”
- 1 “excellent”

Findings
Four portfolios were rated. The range was from 3 (good), to 4 (excellent), with a mean rating of 3.3, a rise from the previous year’s 2.7, and the best mean yet since the rubric was developed in 2010. All portfolios were rated good to excellent.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The graduate studies committee was generally satisfied with this result; the MTPC faculty will be advised to continue the kinds of instruction that led to this outstanding evaluation.

Additional Comments