

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Web Design and Development	213	WEB 213 12/11/2020-Web User Experience II
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts (new)	Jason Withrow
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		11/14/2016

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes

The course was last assessed in October 2016.

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

The previous assessment report found that student performance was meeting course outcomes. There was one recommended change, to expand the scope of the Style Guide deliverable.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

There was one recommended change, to expand the scope of the Style Guide deliverable. That change was implemented the next time the course was offered and has been in place since that time.

II. 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)
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: All sections

- Number students to be assessed: All students
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- 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)
2020, 2019		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
17	17

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.

Data for Fall 2019 and Fall 2020 were used.

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.

All students were included.

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

A departmentally-developed rubric was used; this is the rubric used in the course to score the assignment so students know how they are being graded. The rubric is attached to this report. The assessment plan for this outcome calls for a score of 3 out of 5 on a rubric, and for this deliverable the rubric is out of 100 points, so that mapped to 60 out of 100. Students worked in teams of 2-3 on these assignments, so there was a total of 8 groups (4 for Fall 2019, 4 for Fall 2020) and each member of a group received the same grade, unless their individual effort was insufficient. In those instances, the grade given to the highest-performing student was used for this assessment. Such cases are rare.

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
All 8 teams met the standard of success, as all teams achieved a 60% or higher on the rubric. Only one team was below 70%. The average was 78.25%. If a more stringent standard of 70% is used, then 88% of the teams would still meet this outcome.

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

Students are meeting this outcome. They benefit from working in teams, and this is the first deliverable, so they are still learning how to write reports, etc. Their performance tends to improve over the course of the semester.

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.

Current classroom practices around this deliverable are successful. It's always going to be a growth experience for the students, as they learn a lot from this initial assignment. No changes are recommended.

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

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Deliverables (reports)
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
 - Number students to be assessed: All students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - 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)
2020, 2019		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
17	17

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.

Data for Fall 2019 and Fall 2020 were used.

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.

All students were included.

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

A departmentally-developed rubric was used; this is the rubric used in the course to score the assignment so students know how they are being graded. The rubric is attached to this report. The task analysis is one part of the rubric, comprising 20 points. Since that is the most focused look at this particular skill, that score was used for the assessment. The assessment plan for this outcome calls for a score of 3 out of 5, so that maps to 12 out of 20. Students worked in teams of 2-3 on these assignments, so there was a total of 8 groups (4 for Fall 2019, 4 for Fall 2020) and each member of a group received the same grade, unless their individual effort was insufficient. In those instances, the grade given to the highest-performing student was used for this assessment. Such cases are rare.

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
 All teams met this outcome at the 60% threshold. The average score was 14.38. If a more stringent scoring threshold is used (70% rather than 60% on the rubric item), then only 75% of the teams meet the outcome.

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

Students are meeting this outcome; they are able to analyze and redesign tasks. There is room for improvement, but they are performing at or above the target level.

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.

Task analysis is the weakest area of the three. One path forward here is more lab experiences with creating / doing task analysis.

Outcome 3: Develop a website style guide, addressing a comprehensive set of interface design, content design, and interaction design guidelines.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Deliverable (style guide)
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2019
 - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
 - Number students to be assessed: All students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - 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)
2020, 2019		

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
17	17

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.

Data for Fall 2019 and Fall 2020 were used.

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.

All students were included.

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

A departmentally-developed rubric was used; this is the rubric used in the course to score the assignment so students know how they are being graded. The rubric is attached to this report. The style guide is one part of the rubric, comprising 20 points. Since that is the most focused look at this particular skill, that score was used for the assessment. The assessment plan for this outcome calls for a score of 3 out of 5, so that maps to 12 out of 20. Students worked in teams of 2-3 on these assignments, so there was a total of 8 groups (4 for Fall 2019, 4 for Fall 2020) and each member of a group received the same grade, unless their individual effort was insufficient. In those instances, the grade given to the highest-performing student was used for this assessment. Such cases are rare.

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

All teams met this outcome at the 60% score threshold. The average was 15.25. Even if a more stringent standard of 70% is used for the target rubric score, 88% of the teams still met the outcome.

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

Students are meeting this outcome. There is a good amount of variability in student scores, but that is to be expected.

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 style guide is part of a larger deliverable and often is done last, so that impacts the quality of the student work. Yet splitting this off into its own assignment (so that it stands alone) means that it is too small to be equivalent to other deliverables. Students are warned that time management is going to be a factor with this, and that's a valuable skill (and challenge) that students need to experience. For that reason, leaving this as part of a larger deliverable is preferred.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

The changes to the style guide, as recommended in the last assessment report, seem to have been a positive change. The style guides continue to meet the standard of success.

2. 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 is a challenging course. Students often struggle with the amount of work, but being in teams can make that more manageable. They also report back, after the class is over, about how invaluable it was to work with others and to add more deliverables to their portfolio. Employers in the UX field look to this course as the standard; they won't hire a student from the WEB program unless they have successfully completed WEB 213 (WEB 113 is not enough).

3. 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.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	Assessment language will be revised to no longer reference 3 out of 5 and the threshold will be raised, so that it is 70% or	Rubrics (and individual parts of a rubric) will vary in the points allocated, so the assessment tool language should allow for	2021

	higher on whatever scale is used by the rubric (or the relevant part of the rubric).	that flexibility. Raising the score threshold to 70% is more reflective of skill attainment than an employer would expect.	
Course Assignments	Add more lab experiences involving task analysis.	This will build student skills prior to doing that work in a deliverable.	2021

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

6.

III. Attached Files

[Assessment Raw Data](#)
[Outcome 1 Rubric](#)
[Outcomes 2 and 3 Rubric](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Jason Withrow **Date:** 12/11/2020
Department Chair: Jason Withrow **Date:** 12/11/2020
Dean: Eva Samulski **Date:** 12/15/2020
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 01/27/2021

**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