

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Web Design and Development	213	WEB 213 10/14/2016-Web User Experience II
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts	Jason Withrow
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Plan and conduct user testing to determine accessibility, performance and functionality in industry standard deliverables.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Deliverables (reports) will be assessed using a departmentally-developed rubric provided to external evaluators.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: Minimum of 2 sections
 - Number students to be assessed: All students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric used by external evaluators
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: A minimum of 80% of students must score an average of 3 or more (out of 5) on the deliverable rubric.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: WEB full-time faculty will score and analyze the data.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016, 2015	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Each winter term there is one section of WEB 213. All students were included in the assessment from Winter 2015 and Winter 2016.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students worked in teams of 2-3 to complete a User Test and documented their findings in a formal report. These reports were provided to two external evaluators with years of industry experience who scored them using a six-item rubric. Each item on the rubric was scored from 1 (strongly disagree/poor quality) to 5 (strongly agree/professional level of quality).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The standard of success was met for this outcome. The Winter 2015 section had 5 teams (5 reports) and the Winter 2016 section had 9 teams (9 reports).

For Winter 2015 all 5 teams were above the target score of 60%, constituting a success rate of 100%.

For Winter 2016 one of the teams fell below the target score of 60% (89% success rate).

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Areas of strength were the structure of the reports and their recommended solutions, which were consistent with industry best practices and targeted the issues identified.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students met the standard of success, but working on communicating clearly and effectively will always be a focus in this course.

Outcome 2: Perform task analysis for a transactional website, reconstructing the tasks and storyboarding the revised process.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Deliverables (reports) will be assessed using a departmentally-developed rubric provided to external evaluators.
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: Minimum of 2 sections
 - Number students to be assessed: All students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric used by external evaluators
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: A minimum of 80% of students must score an average of 3 or more (out of 5) on the deliverable rubric.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: WEB full-time faculty will score and analyze the data.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016, 2015	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Each winter term there is one section of WEB 213. All students were included in the assessment from Winter 2015 and Winter 2016.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students worked in teams of 2-3 to complete a Task Analysis, Storyboards, and Style Guide assignment. Their work culminated in a formal report. These reports were provided to two external evaluators with years of industry experience who scored them using a six-item rubric. Each item on the rubric was scored from 1 (strongly disagree/poor quality) to 5 (strongly agree/professional level of quality).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The standard of success was met for this outcome. The Winter 2015 section had 5 teams (5 reports) and the Winter 2016 section had 9 teams (9 reports). In each class only one of the teams fell below the target score of 60%, constituting an 80% success rate for winter 2015 and an 89% success rate for winter 2016.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students overall did a good job with the content of the task analyses, which were reflected in high scores in those areas of the rubric.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

While the standard of success was met, the visual presentation of the task analyses was cited as an area for improvement.

Outcome 3: Develop a website style guide, containing numerous interface and interaction guidelines.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Deliverable (style guide) will be assessed using a departmentally-developed rubric provided to external evaluators.
- Assessment Date: Fall 2014
- Course section(s)/other population: Minimum of 2 sections
- Number students to be assessed: All students
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric used by external evaluators
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: A minimum of 80% of students must score an average of 3 or more (out of 5) on the deliverable rubric.
- Who will score and analyze the data: WEB full-time faculty will score and analyze the data.

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016, 2015	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Each winter term there is one section of WEB 213. All students were included in the assessment from Winter 2015 and Winter 2016.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students worked in teams of 2-3 to complete a Task Analysis, Storyboards, and Style Guide assignment. Their work culminated in a formal report. These reports were provided to two external evaluators with years of industry experience who

scored them using a six-item rubric. Each item on the rubric was scored from 1 (strongly disagree/poor quality) to 5 (strongly agree/professional level of quality).

The same reports were used to evaluate this outcome as well as the task analysis outcome.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The standard of success was met for this outcome. The Winter 2015 section had 5 teams (5 reports) and the Winter 2016 section had 9 teams (9 reports). In each class only one of the teams fell below the target score of 60%, constituting an 80% success rate for winter 2015 and an 89% success rate for winter 2016.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students overall did a good job with the content of the style guide, which was reflected in high scores in those areas of the rubric.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The standard of success was met. However, the evaluators did suggest expanding the style guides to address more aspects of the websites.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

This course is meeting student needs. The scoring and comments from the evaluators were not surprising.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

This will be shared with the other WEB faculty once the assessment report is approved. An electronic copy will be emailed to them.

3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Assignments	The scope of the Style Guide component will be expanded to address more aspects of the website.	Evaluators noted the somewhat narrow scope of the style guide in their scoring.	2017

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[Assessment Data](#)
[Assessment Rubric](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Jason Withrow **Date:** 10/14/2016
Department Chair: Jason Withrow **Date:** 10/14/2016
Dean: Kimberly Hurns **Date:** 10/23/2016
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 11/14/2016