

Capstone Assessment 2016–17 Report

Dr. David Hendricks

Background

This report communicates the results from the third assessment of capstone papers.

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

During the summer, fall, and spring semesters, the university had 32 sections of courses that departments had designated as a capstone experience and 31 of these sections submitted capstone papers. A total of 621 papers were submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. A simple random sample of 60 papers was.

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 Learn 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 2016–2017 assessment, 90.0% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was quite good for this objective with 55.0% of the papers receiving the same score, 45.0% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 0% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2016–2017	QEP Year 5 2015–2016	QEP Year 4 2014–15
Use of Sources to Answer Question	Score $\geq$ 2.5	90.0%	78.3%	43.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Approaching	Not met
	Average of Samples	3.4	2.9	2.1

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 2016–2017 assessment, 90.0% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was quite good for this objective with 51.7% of the papers receiving the same score, 48.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 0.0% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2016–17	QEP Year 5 2015–16	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources	Score $\geq$ 2.5	90.0%	76.7%	50.0%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Approaching	Not met
	Average of Samples	3.2	2.9	2.1

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 2016–2017 assessment, 93.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 43.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 51.7% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 5.0% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2016–17	QEP Year 5 2015–16	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Organization or Structure	Score $\geq$ 2.5	93.3%	88.3%	83.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	3.0	3.11	2.7

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 2016–2017 assessment, 95.0% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was quite good for this objective with 38.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 58.3% 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	2016–17	QEP Year 5 2015–16	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Mechanics	Score $\geq$ 2.5	95.0%	88.3%	83.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	3.2	2.96	2.7

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 2016–2017 assessment, 96.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 46.7% of the papers receiving the same score, 50.0% 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	2016–17	QEP Year 5 2015–16	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Purpose of Project	Score $\geq$ 2.5	96.7	91.7%	80%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	3.2	3.12	2.7

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 2016–2017 assessment, 95% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was fair for this objective with 43.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 48.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 8.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2016–17	QEP Year 5 2015–16	QEP Year 4 2014–2015
Integrative Learning	Score $\geq$ 2.5	95.0%	71.7%	46.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Not met	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Not met	Not met
	Average of Samples	3.2	2.69	2.3

Commendations and Recommendations

1. Departments and Capstone faculty are to be commended for their work with students.
2. The capstone assessment results are significantly better this year than in our first two years of assessment. All student learning outcomes of the assessment rubric showed significant improvement, and ideal targets for each learning outcomes have been reached.
3. 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.
4. Capstone faculty need to continue 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.
5. Capstone faculty need to emphasize that students are to include proper citation of a minimum of five appropriate sources that support the research presented in the Capstone paper.
6. The Capstone Assessment team wondered whether some papers should have had IRB approval. No notations were included on papers that included research on human subjects. As a reminder, research that involves human participants must follow Federal Regulations.
<http://www.acu.edu/community/offices/academic/orsp/human-research/overview.html>