

Digital Literacy

Palomar College
Learning Outcomes Council
Spring 2016

Table of Contents

GE/ILO Assessment Process	3
Assessment Timeline & Process	3
Feedback from Faculty	4
Result Summary	5
Workgroup Recommendations	5
Results Tables	6

GE/ILO Assessment Process

In April 2010, Palomar College identified a set of general education/institutional learning outcomes (GE/ILOs), which represent the overall set of abilities and qualities a student graduating from Palomar should possess. These were adopted from the American Association of Colleges and Universities' LEAP framework, and modified by the faculty of the college to reflect Palomar's particular set of values. The college's Learning Outcomes Council, hereinafter referred to as LOC, directs GE/ILO assessment planning and implementation.

During the spring of 2016, the college assessed one subset of the personal and social responsibility GE/ILO: Digital Literacy. A total of 30 randomly selected courses participated in the assessment. In order to get feedback about the assessment method and process, the instructors of the randomly selected courses completed an online survey. Additionally, a group made up of some of the participating instructors participated in a focus group. Upon completion of the project requirements, the instructors received a \$50 stipend. In January, 2017 a workgroup met to review the assessment results and to recommend action to LOC.

Assessment Timeline & Process:

In Fall 2014, LOC agreed to assess digital literacy. The purpose of this assessment was to assess the level of digital literacy in Palomar College students. During spring 2015, Lillian Payne, Academic Technology Coordinator, presented research the Academic Technology Committee had completed regarding digital literacy assessment to LOC. The Academic Technology committee researched several different assessment instruments and decided that the Northstar online digital literacy assessment instrument was the best. Several members of the Academic Technology Committee tested the assessment with their classes. LOC members also tested the Northstar digital literacy assessment instrument. LOC agreed to use the Northstar digital literacy assessment instrument for the ILO assessment. A small workgroup made up LOC and Academic Technology members met during the fall of 2015 to determine the procedures of the assessment (who, when, how and which modules).

Digital Literacy Assessment Process:

- Palomar College paid \$1200 for a one-year Northstar membership.
- The workgroup selected three modules: Basic Computer, World Wide Web and MS Word
- On-campus credit classes were randomly selected for participation, and all students in the recurred classes were asked to participate.
- Courses did not need to be mapped to digital literacy.

Digital Literacy Assessment Report -- DRAFT

- The SLO Coordinator contacted faculty members on the randomly selected course list to recruit them to participate in the assessment.
- The SLO Coordinator secured computer labs for the assessment.
- Assessment dates were scheduled with participating faculty.
- Faculty teaching in computer labs had the option of using their classroom lab or using the assessment lab in the library.
- The SLO Coordinator hired student workers (currently working in writing labs) to help proctor assessments.
- The proctors were trained and used a script during the assessments.
- Assessments took place during a 4-week period.
- There were some technology problems with Northstar related to browsers. These problems were quickly resolved.
- The assessment results from Northstar were matched to the census enrollment file at Palomar.
- A total of 485 students enrolled at census completed at least one of the modules.
- Participating faculty participated in an online survey.
- Faculty were paid \$50 for participating in the assessment.
- Ten faculty participants participated in a focus group to discuss the assessment and digital literacy.

Feedback from faculty participating in assessment (survey or focus group)

- All faculty believed that digital literacy skills are important for their students.
- Most agreed or strongly agreed that using digital technology skills in the classroom helps their students
- Most agreed or strongly agreed that using digital technologies is critical to their work as teachers.
- Most agreed or strongly agreed that using technology can improve their ability to teach.
- Most agreed that they need more time to integrate technology into their curriculum.
- Many agreed that they wanted more options for professional development in the areas of technology.
- Many believed that students need more support with using Blackboard.

Results Summary

- Study participants tended to be younger than the overall student population and more likely to be full-time students.
- The overall average percent correct was 88.9% on Basic Computer module
- The overall average percent correct was 88.0% on World Wide Web module
- The overall average percent correct was 81.9% on MS Word module
- There was little variation in the average percent correct by the demographic characteristics examine, though for all three modules the Asian students had a slightly lower percent correct than did white students.

Workgroup Recommendations:

- Make Northstar Digital Literacy assessment instrument available for all of our students for self-assessment. Students could go through the modules, see their results and consider going to a workshop or taking a class in areas where they are weak. Consider testing this self-assessment during this summer during FYE.
- Provide more workshops through the TLC for students. Put together an advisory group who could oversee the workshops and possibly provide speakers (CSIT, Library, Media Studies, Graphics, Business, Sciences).
- Consider using Northstar assessment instrument for different employee groups on campus (assessment results would be anonymous).
- Make the Northstar assessment instrument available for all programs on campus for assessment of students.
- Provide workshops on Blackboard/Canvas for students.

Results tables:

- The demographics section provides a demographic profile of those who participated in the digital literacy assessment as well as those who did not.
- The results sections for each module summarize (1) the average percent of points the students got correct in the module, and (2) the percent of students who passed the assessment by getting 85% correct. These statistics are also broken down by demographics categories.

Demographics of Participants (Tables 1-5)**Table 1. Gender of Students Who Took Digital Literacy Assessment in Spring, 2015-16**

Gender	Took Digital Literacy Assessment					
	No		Yes		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Female	11,323	48.5%	255	52.6%	11,578	48.6%
Male	11,842	50.8%	227	46.8%	12,069	50.7%
Unknown	163	0.7%	3	0.6%	166	0.7%
Total	23,328	100.0%	485	100.0%	23,813	100.0%

Table 2. Ethnicity of Students Who Took Digital Literacy Assessment in Spring, 2015-16

Ethnicity	Took Digital Literacy Assessment					
	No		Yes		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
African American	709	3.0%	12	2.5%	721	3.0%
Asian	1,123	4.8%	43	8.9%	1,166	4.9%
Filipino	607	2.6%	14	2.9%	621	2.6%
Hispanic	10,065	43.1%	204	42.1%	10,269	43.1%
Multi Ethnic	1,018	4.4%	22	4.5%	1,040	4.4%
Native American	151	0.6%	3	0.6%	154	0.6%
Pacific Islander	114	0.5%	2	0.4%	116	0.5%
White	8,780	37.6%	169	34.8%	8,949	37.6%
Unknown	761	3.3%	16	3.3%	777	3.3%
Total	23,328	100.0%	485	100.0%	23,813	100.0%

Table 3. Age of Students Who Took Digital Literacy Assessment in Spring, 2015-16

Age Group	Took Digital Literacy Assessment					
	No		Yes		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
17 & Under	726	3.1%	8	1.6%	734	3.1%
18-20	7,783	33.4%	212	43.7%	7,995	33.6%
21-24	6,201	26.6%	146	30.1%	6,347	26.7%
25-29	3,105	13.3%	55	11.3%	3,160	13.3%
30-34	1,531	6.6%	33	6.8%	1,564	6.6%
35 & Older	3,978	17.1%	31	6.4%	4,009	16.8%
Unknown	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.0%
Total	23,328	100.0%	485	100.0%	23,813	100.0%

Table 4. Attendance Time of Students Who Took Digital Literacy Assessment in Spring, 2015-16

Attendance Time	Took Digital Literacy Assessment					
	No		Yes		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Day	13,794	59.1%	304	62.7%	14,098	59.2%
Eve	4,108	17.6%	40	8.2%	4,148	17.4%
D/E	5,425	23.3%	141	29.1%	5,566	23.4%
Unknown	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
Total	23,328	100.0%	485	100.0%	23,813	100.0%

Table 5. Load of Students Who Took Digital Literacy Assessment in Spring, 2015-16

Load	Took Digital Literacy Assessment					
	No		Yes		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Light: Less Than 6 Units	8,286	35.5%	52	10.7%	8,338	35.0%
Medium: 6 to Less Than 12 Units	8,202	35.2%	170	35.1%	8,372	35.2%
Full: 12 or More Units	6,840	29.3%	263	54.2%	7,103	29.8%
Total	23,328	100.0%	485	100.0%	23,813	100.0%

Module 1 – Basic Computer (Tables 6-11)

Table 6. Overall Performance of Students Who Took Module 1: Basic Computer in Spring, 2015-16

Number	M1 Score	M1 Possible Score	Average Percent	% Passed Module 1
483	16,001	18,000	88.9%	76.4%

Table 7. Performance of Students Who Took Module 1: Basic Computer by Gender in Spring, 2015-16

Gender	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 1
Female	255	86.8%	67.5%
Male	225	91.2%	86.2%
Unknown	3	88.0%	100.0%
Total	483	88.9%	76.4%

Table 8. Performance of Students Who Took Module 1: Basic Computer by Ethnicity in Spring, 2015-16

Ethnicity	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 1
African American	12	85.9%	66.7%
Asian	41	85.5%	58.5%
Filipino	14	90.0%	71.4%
Hispanic	204	88.3%	73.5%
Multi Ethnic	22	89.5%	86.4%
Native American	3	89.8%	100.0%
Pacific Islander	2	90.1%	50.0%
White	169	90.6%	84.6%
Unknown	16	87.1%	68.8%
Total	483	88.9%	76.4%

Table 9. Performance of Students Who Took Module 1: Basic Computer by Age in Spring, 2015-16

Age	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 1
17 & Under	8	85.1%	75.0%
18-20	212	88.2%	73.1%
21-24	145	90.1%	83.4%
25-29	54	89.3%	75.9%
30-34	33	89.6%	75.8%
35 & Older	31	87.6%	67.7%
Total	483	88.9%	76.4%

Table 10. Performance of Students Who Took Module 1: Basic Computer by Attendance Time in Spring, 2015-16

Attendance Time	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 1
Day	303	88.9%	76.9%
Eve	40	85.9%	67.5%
D/E	140	89.7%	77.9%
Total	483	88.9%	76.4%

Table 11. Performance of Students Who Took Module 1: Basic Computer by Load in Spring, 2015-16

Load	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 1
Light: Less Than 6 Units	52	87.5%	71.2%
Medium: 6 to Less Than 12 Units	169	89.3%	76.9%
Full: 12 or More Units	262	88.9%	77.1%
Total	483	88.9%	76.4%

Module 2 – World Wide Web (Tables 12-17)**Table 12. Overall Performance of Students Who Took Module 2: World Wide Web in Spring, 2015-16**

Number	M2 Score	M2 Possible Score	Average Percent	% Passed Module 2
480	15,848	18,000	88.0%	73.5%

Table 13. Performance of Students Who Took Module 2: World Wide Web by Gender in Spring, 2015-16

Gender	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 2
Female	251	87.5%	70.1%
Male	226	88.7%	77.4%
Unknown	3	86.4%	66.7%
Total	480	88.0%	73.5%

Table 14. Performance of Students Who Took Module 2: World Wide Web by Ethnicity in Spring, 2015-16

Ethnicity	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 2
African American	12	81.4%	41.7%
Asian	43	80.6%	51.2%
Filipino	14	93.1%	100.0%
Hispanic	200	87.9%	70.0%
Multi Ethnic	22	89.1%	72.7%
Native American	3	89.8%	66.7%
Pacific Islander	2	91.7%	100.0%
White	168	89.9%	83.3%
Unknown	16	88.5%	75.0%
Total	480	88.0%	73.5%

Table 15. Performance of Students Who Took Module 2: World Wide Web by Age in Spring, 2015-16

Age	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 2
17 & Under	8	89.8%	75.0%
18-20	211	87.0%	66.8%
21-24	145	88.9%	78.6%
25-29	55	88.0%	76.4%
30-34	32	89.5%	81.3%
35 & Older	29	89.4%	82.8%
Total	480	88.0%	73.5%

Table 16. Performance of Students Who Took Module 2: World Wide Web by Attendance Time in Spring, 2015-16

Attendance Time	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 2
Day	301	87.4%	71.1%
Eve	38	89.4%	84.2%
D/E	141	89.2%	75.9%
Total	480	88.0%	73.5%

Table 17. Performance of Students Who Took Module 2: World Wide Web by Load in Spring, 2015-16

Load	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 2
Light: Less Than 6 Units	50	88.7%	82.0%
Medium: 6 to Less Than 12 Units	168	88.3%	72.0%
Full: 12 or More Units	262	87.7%	72.9%
Total	480	88.0%	73.5%

Module 3 – MS Word (Tables 18-23)**Table 18. Overall Performance of Students Who Took Module 5: Microsoft Word in Spring, 2015-16**

Number	M5 Score	M5 Possible Score	Average Percent	% Passed Module 2
476	13,107	16,000	81.9%	51.3%

Table 19. Performance of Students Who Took Module 5: Microsoft Word by Gender in Spring, 2015-16

Gender	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 5
Female	251	82.2%	55.0%
Male	222	81.6%	46.8%
Unknown	3	81.8%	66.7%
Total	476	81.9%	51.3%

Table 20. Performance of Students Who Took Module 5: Microsoft Word by Ethnicity in Spring, 2015-16

Ethnicity	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 5
African American	12	76.5%	25.0%
Asian	43	75.2%	23.3%
Filipino	14	86.6%	57.1%
Hispanic	200	81.5%	49.0%
Multi Ethnic	22	85.1%	63.6%
Native American	3	83.2%	66.7%
Pacific Islander	2	82.6%	0.0%
White	164	83.5%	61.0%
Unknown	16	83.4%	56.3%
Total	476	81.9%	51.3%

Table 21. Performance of Students Who Took Module 5: Microsoft Word by Age in Spring, 2015-16

Age	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 5
17 & Under	8	80.4%	25.0%
18-20	208	81.6%	50.5%
21-24	145	83.6%	55.2%
25-29	54	80.7%	46.3%
30-34	32	83.6%	53.1%
35 & Older	29	76.8%	51.7%
Total	476	81.9%	51.3%

Table 22. Performance of Students Who Took Module 5: Microsoft Word by Attendance Time in Spring, 2015-16

Attendance Time	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 5
Day	298	81.1%	47.7%
Eve	38	82.6%	63.2%
D/E	140	83.5%	55.7%
Total	476	81.9%	51.3%

Table 23. Performance of Students Who Took Module 5: Microsoft Word by Load in Spring, 2015-16

Load	Number	Average Percentage	% Passed Module 5
Light: Less Than 6 Units	50	81.4%	56.0%
Medium: 6 to Less Than 12 Units	165	81.3%	48.5%
Full: 12 or More Units	261	82.4%	52.1%
Total	476	81.9%	51.3%