

Technology Literacy Assessment

Spring 2016

Methods

Twenty-five courses were selected for assessment of Technology Literacy. Six of these courses included classes with blended online and classroom options. Only the blended class sections were included in the assessment, as the classroom-only sections did not incorporate sufficient use of technology for assessment of technology literacy. All assessed courses are listed in Table 1. These courses comprised a total of 149 individual class sections. Three students were randomly selected by a Banner selection tool from each section, resulting in 447 students.

Instructors for the chosen courses were sent a link to an online survey to complete for the three selected students for each of their class sections. The survey consisted of an item to indicate whether work from the student was available for assessment, and selection options to indicate why the work may be unavailable. If student work was available for assessment, the survey continued on to the assessment rubric. The analytic rubric assessed students on three dimensions; project management, creation, and communication. These dimensions were comprised of nine individual criteria to be rated on a five-point scale, ranging from 0, no proficiency, to 4, expert proficiency. The survey also included an option to mark any criterion as not applicable if the student work did not contain any elements that could be assessed for that criterion.

Table 1. Courses selected for assessment of Technology Literacy

Course	Number of Classes
ART 109	1
ART 115	3
AOS 101	1
AOS 202	2
WEB 101	3
MATH 114	3

CPS 121	4
PLGL 104	3
RADT 103	7
DH 111	1
PSYC 241	2
GIS 141	2
ENGL 104	17
COMM 101	78
ACCT 215	2
CNT 120	6
CJ 208	2
GEOL 102	2
ENGR 102	4
Blended Courses	
AH 140	1
AH 213	1
FRCH 102	1
CHEM 100	1
METR 101	1
PHIL 101	1

Results

Survey rubrics were completed for 194 students (43.4%). For an additional 48 students (10.7%), the assignment selected for assessment was indicated to be missing due to the student withdrawing from the course, not completing the assignment, or various other reasons. The remaining students (45.9%) were not accounted for in the survey. Scores for assessed students are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Rubric scores for assessed students

	4-Expert Proficiency	3-Proficiency	2-Some Proficiency	1-Limited Proficiency	0-No Proficiency	Mean (SD)
Project Management						
Technology is appropriate for purpose	84(34.1%)	87(35.4%)	12(4.9%)	8(3.3%)	1(.4%)	3.28(.80)
File saved in correct format	107(43.5%)	70(28.5%)	8(3.3%)	5(2.0%)	1(.4%)	3.45(.74)
Creation						
Assignment uses features appropriately	90(36.6%)	79(32.1%)	16(6.5%)	5(2.0%)	2(.8%)	3.30(.81)
Formatting is consistent, correct...	88(35.8%)	77(31.3%)	21(8.5%)	3(1.2%)	2(.8%)	3.29(.81)
Layout and/or visual theme is consistent	79(32.1%)	87(35.4%)	17(6.9%)	7(2.8%)	1(.4%)	3.24(.80)
Hardware is used appropriately	93(37.8%)	76(30.9%)	11(4.5%)	4(1.6%)	1(.4%)	3.38(.74)
Communication						
Electronic communication is clear and appropriate	89(36.2%)	79(32.1%)	6(2.4%)	1(.4%)	2(.8%)	3.42(.70)
Assignment is transmitted correctly	102(41.5%)	73(29.7%)	4(1.6%)	1(.4%)	1(.4%)	3.51(.63)
Correctly communicates interaction with technology	87(35.4%)	79(32.1%)	7(2.8%)	1(.4%)	1(.4%)	3.43(.66)

Note: Percentages do not total to one hundred because missing responses and responses of “NA” are not included in table

These results show that means for all criteria fell between the “proficiency” and “advanced proficiency” scale ratings. In addition, the modes for all criteria were either a 3 or a 4; the “proficiency” or “advanced proficiency” ratings. There is little variance between the criteria scores. Finally, scores for the three main dimensions were calculated by averaging the scores for the criteria included under those dimensions. The dimension scores are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Dimension scores

Dimension	Average Score
Project Management	3.36(.74)
Creation	3.30(.74)
Communication	3.45(.63)