

Capstone Assessment 2015–2016 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin

Dr. David Hendricks



Background

This report communicates the results from the second assessment of capstone papers. The assessment outcomes are those from the academic year 2015–2016.

The assessment team consisted of six faculty members. Dr. David Hendricks (Mathematics), Rodney Ashlock (Bible, Missions and Ministry), Dana Mayhall (Teacher Education), Don Pope (Management Sciences), Shelly Sanders (Language and Literature), and Tracy Shilcutt (History and Global Studies) assessed the capstone papers.

During summer 2013, a *Pursuit* Institute was conducted with 19 faculty participants in attendance. The focus of the institute was on the development of assignments and assessments for Capstone Experiences. A rubric was developed by participants to use in the assessment of Capstone papers by Assessment Team IV. An informational meeting was held in the Adams Center to share the rubric developed by faculty and to collect suggestions for change. Wording on the rubric was adjusted in spring 2016 before the Year 5 assessment to clarify some of the ambiguous language.

During the summer, fall, and spring semesters, the university had 46 sections of courses that departments had designated as a capstone experience and 46 of these sections submitted capstone papers. There were a total of 787 students enrolled and 643 papers, or roughly 82%, were submitted to the Pursuit Office. A simple random sample of 60 papers was assessed from the 643 papers submitted.

Two members of the assessment team rated each paper. The scores from the first and second raters were averaged for each paper in the sample. These scores were used to calculate the average score for each Student Learn Outcome (SLO) objective, the number of papers meeting the acceptable and ideal targets for each SLO objective, and the composite score for each SLO.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

- 2.1.A Students will demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through writing.
- 2.1.B Students will apply information to planning and creation of a product or performance.
- 2.1.C Students will demonstrate critical thinking as they develop, produce, and evaluate product or performance.

The assessment team used a rubric with six categories to assess these learning outcomes with two categories for each learning outcome:

- Use of Sources to Answer Question (2.1.A)
- Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources (2.1.A)
- Organization or Structure (2.1.B)
- Mechanics (2.1.B)
- Purpose of Project (2.1.C)
- Integrative Learning (2.1.C)

Results

SLO Objective 2.1.A – Students will demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through writing.

Use of Sources to Answer Question

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2015–2016 assessment, 78.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 45.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 50.0% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 5% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015	QEP Year 5 2015–2016
Use of Sources to Answer Question	Score \geq 2.5	43.3%	78.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Not met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Not met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	2.1	2.9

Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2015–2016 assessment, 76.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was quite good for this objective with 60.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 36.7% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 3.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015	QEP Year 5 2015–2016
Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources	Score \geq 2.5	50.0%	76.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Not met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Not met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	2.1	2.9

SLO Objective 2.1.B – Students will apply information to planning and creation of a product or performance.

Organization or Structure

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2015–2016 assessment, 88.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 50.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 48.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 1.7% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015	QEP Year 5 2015–2016
Organization or Structure	Score \geq 2.5	83.3%	88.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching	Met
	Average of Samples	2.7	3.11

Mechanics

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2015–2016 assessment, 88.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was quite good for this objective with 60.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 38.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 1.7% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015	QEP Year 5 2015–2016
Mechanics	Score \geq 2.5	83.3%	88.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching	Met
	Average of Samples	2.7	2.96

SLO Objective 2.1.C – Students will demonstrate critical thinking as they develop, produce, and evaluate product or performance.

Purpose of Project

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2015–2016 assessment, 91.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was quite good for this objective with 63.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 33.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 3.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015	QEP Year 5 2015–2016
Purpose of Project	Score \geq 2.5	80%	91.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching	Met
	Average of Samples	2.7	3.12

Integrative Learning

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers be scored at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2015–2016 assessment, 71.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was fair for this objective with 38.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 51.7% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 10.0% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	QEP Year 4 2014–2015	QEP Year 5 2015–2016
Integrative Learning	Score \geq 2.5	46.7%	71.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Not met	Approaching
	Ideal Target (85%)	Not met	Not met
	Average of Samples	2.3	2.69

Commendations and Recommendations

- Departments and Capstone faculty are to be commended for their work with students.
- The capstone assessment results are significantly better this year than in our first year of assessment. All student learning outcomes of the assessment rubric showed significant improvements from the first year results.
- Dan Brannan, Stephen Baldrige, Suzie Macaluso, Sarah Lee, Nancy Jordan, Rodney Ashlock, Brenda Bender, and Denise Barnett are to be commended for developing a rubric that the committee could use to assess the first round of Capstone papers.
- Many of the faculty teaching the Capstone Experiences came in October 2015 to hear 2014–2015 assessment results and discuss ways to improve the Capstone papers.
- Based on comments of the 2014–2015 Assessment Team, the rubric was refined to improve consistency in the language.
- Capstone faculty need to emphasize to their students what is meant by Integrative Learning, one of the outcomes for the Capstone Experience. This outcome states that students should demonstrate habits of mind that foster integrative thinking between the liberal arts core curriculum and their major field of study.
- Capstone faculty need to emphasize that students are to include the proper citation of a minimum of five appropriate sources that support the research presented in the Capstone paper.
- Each college/division should have a minimum number of papers assessed.