

CORE 110 Assessment

2016-17 Report

Dr. Laura Carroll

Background

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A¹, 1.1B², and 1.1C³ from the QEP document, the Cornerstone (CORE 110) research artifact – annotated bibliography -- was collected. A simple random sample was used to select 93 papers for assessment.

The same assessment team met for the fifth year and consisted of 5 faculty members from across the university – Dr. Stephen Baldrige (Social Work), Dr. Laura Carroll, (Language and Literature), Dr. Houston Heflin (Bible, Missions, and Ministry), Dr. Susan Lewis (Vice Provost), Dawne Swearingen Meeks (Theatre) – who have now served for 6 years.

Results

Outcome 1.1.A

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher, and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2016-17, 89.1% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; **the acceptable target for 1.1.A was met this year.**

ONE	Obj. 1.1.A	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
	Determine Information Needed	Score > 2.5	61%	56%	61.1%	84.8%	74.4%	89.1%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	MET	Not met	MET
		Average of all samples	2.45	2.55	2.69	2.96	2.87	3.05

¹ Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.

² Access the needed information effectively and efficiently

³ Students will use information ethically and legally.

Outcome 1.1.B

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher, and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2016-17 78.3% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; **the acceptable target for 1.1.B was met this year.**

TWO	Obj. 1.1.B	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
	Access and Use Information	Score > 2.5	No assessment	67%	70.5%	84.8%	81.1%	78.3%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	No assessment	Minimally Met	MET	MET	MET	MET
		Ideal Target (80%)	No assessment	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	Not Met
		Average of all samples	No assessment	2.52	2.62	2.89	2.77	2.85

Outcome 1.1.C

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher, and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2016-17, 76.09% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; **the acceptable target for 1.1.C was met this year.**

THREE	Obj. 1.1.C	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
	Information Use Strategies	Score > 2.5	40%	55%	80%	90.9%	91.1%	76.09%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET	MET
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET	Not met
		Average of all samples	2.01	2.49	2.82	3.04	3.06	2.84

Composite

The composite score, while not prescribed in the original QEP, was calculated to provide an overview of the Cornerstone assessment. To be consistent with the language for individual outcomes, CORE 210, and BCOR 310, an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 7.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples.

COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.1	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
		Score > 7.5	56% (5)	50.51%	66.32%	83.8%	80%	74.73
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	Minimally met	MET	MET	MET
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	Not met
		Average of all samples	3.76 (5)	7.72	8.121	8.89	8.7	8.63

Recommendations and Findings

The CORE 110 assignment, rubric and assessment are working well to teach and assess students' understandings of information literacy. Over five years, we have worked to (1) revise the assignment, (2) refine the rubric, and (3) train teachers.

As a result, we have met the acceptable targets and ideal targets on 1.1.A and were very close on 1.1B.

During 2016-2017, school year the professional development sessions was held, where the assessment team focused on helping students (a) address target audience in the introduction to the bibliography, and (b) refine and revise their research question based on their findings. The sessions affected the 1.1.A scores positively.

In the 2015-2016 report, we said "MLA published their 8th edition style guide, which considerably revises citation styles. The next few years of assessment may result in lower scores as students and faculty transition between the editions." This assumption was true for the 2016-2017 1.1.C results.

In the past, the assessment team has emphasized the following reminders to the faculty:

- a. Implement consistent formatting for the document across all sections
- b. Understand correct MLA citation.
- c. Address target audience in the introduction to the bibliography.
- d. Refine and revise their research question based on their findings
- e. Insure the students address questions rather than arguments.
- f. Distinguish between social sciences and humanities.
- g. Prohibit using the Bible as a source.

It is suggested by the assessment team to continue with the emphasis from previous years, but to focus on the following main ideas:

1. Address the target audience in the introduction to the bibliography.
2. Refine and revise the research question based on the findings.
3. Reconsider the CRAP model for evaluation of sources
4. Emphasize changes in citation styles

Commendations

Faculty have done an excellent job in teaching the students the characteristics of an annotated bibliography. Scores each year have increased, showing learning outcomes are being met. In addition, the embedded librarians have been a great help to faculty as the students develop the information literacy skills. It is believed that the embedded librarians give first-year students a connection to a librarian that may continue through the student's years at ACU.