**To:** Linda Elliott-Nelson, Division Chairs

**Cc:** GECC

**Re:** Digital Literacy Assessment Report

**Date:** February 27, 2017

**Overview:** In the Fall of 2012 and Spring of 2013, following the establishment of the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECC), the GECC revamped the AWC GE purpose & philosophy statements, expanded GE Focus Areas from four to five (adding Civic Discourse), and created student learning outcomes for each of the Focus Areas. In Fall 2013 Division faculty matched Focus Area outcomes to courses, and the Curriculum & Articulation Office added identified Focus Area outcomes to GE course syllabi effective Spring 2014. The GECC then worked to update ACRES forms, identify assessment opportunities (Spring 2014 was the 1st year the Student Showcase became a GE-organized event), and create occasions to promote the GE curriculum to students (sunglasses, cups, beach balls, lanyards).

**Assessment Design:** Beginning academic year 2015/16, the GECC designated a GE Focus Area for promotion and Assessment (*attached*). Additionally, each year WI is assessed by members of the Writing Curriculum Committee and WI faculty. Digital Literacy is the focus for 2016/17, and has not been assessed before.To facilitate assessment,theGECC

* requested 10% random sample of DL students through IR
* Requested faculty of those students submit:
* assignment & rubric
* student performance indicator
* brief evaluation of assignment effectiveness

Once the GECC received these artifacts (78), we created a Rubric to evaluate Digital Literacy artifacts (*attached*). GECC members met Fri, 2/10, to norm the rubric & evaluate artifacts (56/78 met the request for submission).

**Process:** What became clear during our norming session, prior to any evaluation of artifacts, was that our rubric, and thus SLOs, had some redundancies, and also at least 1 unmeasurable outcome. There was rich discussion about what we would be looking for as evidence of student learning, and what then also became painfully clear was that we needed actual student work to evaluate, not just the assignments, rubrics, performance indicators, and comments from the instructor. While the time was well spent in terms of what we learned, the preponderance of completed assessment rubrics indicate “unable to determine” due to the lack of student artifacts, so any report beyond recommendations would provide skewed data. To address this, the GECC has agreed that:

* Digital Literacy SLOs need to be revisited
* All Focus Areas need explanation & context for faculty & students
* Faculty need the rubric when we request artifacts
* We must request specific student artifacts
* Include students in the assessment request

**Conclusion:** Assessment is a messy process, not a spotless product. The GECC has agreed to revisit both outcomes & identified courses for all Focus Areas, providing faculty the opportunity to make sure their designations are appropriate. The GECC held a workshop during PDD and attendees were supportive of having GECC members go into Division meetings to discuss the GE Focus Areas and SLOs, and explain our assessment expectation. This is our plan for Fall 2017, following our revision of Focus Area outcomes.

**Addendum:**

Although we were unable to assess student artifacts, we were able in many cases to assess the quality of Digital Literacy assignments and rubrics. Amending our rubric to include examples of each category (i.e., webportfolio as an example of Exceeds) should help faculty determine not just if their assignment is developing Digital Literacy, but to what extent. The table below reflects how the *assignments* scored.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeds | Meets | Needs Improvement | Unable to Determine |
| Digital Literacy assignment components and expectations | **3%** | **27%** | **33%** | **34%** |

**Sample Reviewer Comments:**

**Exceeds**

“This assignment has multiple levels of DL—creating a webportfolio that includes a Prezi, buttons/links, and video”

**Meets**

“Video assignment—great example of how to move assignment from paper to digital, consider audience, etc.”

“Varies in DL: blog, video, Prezi…assignment is high-level DL”

“Creating an Excel spreadsheet—if students are required to do this instead of encouraged for extra credit, this would be an excellent DL assignment”

**Needs Improvement**

“Low-level DL—only required a powerpoint presentation assembled as a group project”

“Only DL component is reading an online article and analyzing in the BB Discussion Board”

“Writing an essay that includes peer-reviewed literature is not meeting DL outcomes”

“Rubric has nothing do with Digital component. DL seems to be an afterthought”

“The assignment requires students to watch a video and click answers in an online software program—this does not engage students in DL”

“Just using a photo enhancing program is probably not enough to meet DL”