

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY



Annual Report Year 2: 2012-2013



A Quality Enhancement Plan developed as part of the
University's SACSCOC 2011 Reaffirmation

Prepared by Dr. Phyllis B. Bolin
Director of *Pursuit*

A special thanks to Rachael Hubbard from the Office of Alumni Relations for the cover photograph.

Happy students are

Mathew Molina ('16)

Callie Kerbo ('17)

John Alan Archer ('14)

OVERVIEW OF YEAR 2

Year 2 of Pursuit concludes with the completion of the following accomplishments:

- Second assessment for CORE 110 by Assessment Team I led by Dr. Laura Carroll;
- Initial assessment for CORE 210 by Assessment Team II led by Dr. Brenda Bender;
- Selection of 11 *Pursuit* Research Fellows;
- Pursuit Travel Funds provided monies for 25 faculty and 28 student researchers to travel to conferences for verbal and poster presentations of their research and creative projects; and
- *Pursuit* Institute for work writing of new course proposals, work on Capstone assignments, and creation of a Capstone rubric.

An overview of Pursuit Goals and Learning Outcomes can be found in Appendix A. Appendix B includes two reports: *Actions to be Implemented* and *Summary Goals, Outcomes, and Assessments*.

WORKING TEAMS

Pursuit Implementation Team (PIT): Faculty, staff, and alumni members include the following:

- Phyllis Bolin (Director of *Pursuit*, Chair, CAS, Mathematics),
- Timothy Head (CAS, Physics),
- Glenn Pemberton (CBS, Bible, Missions and Ministry),
- Alan Lipps (CEHS, School of Social Work),
- Mark McCallon (Library),
- Jason Morris (Associate Dean for Honors),
- Alfa Nyandoro (COBA, SITC),
- Rick Piersall (CAS, Music),
- Kay Price-Hawkins (Alumnus).
- Ex Officio: Autumn Sutherlin (Office of Undergraduate Research) and Nancy Shankle Jordan (General Education).

Information Literacy Team (IL:) Faculty members include the following:

- Phyllis Bolin (Director of *Pursuit*, Chair, Chair, CAS, Mathematics),
- Karen Cukrowski (Cornerstone and General Education),
- Pat Hernandez (Biology and CORE),
- Shan Martinez (Library),
- Karen Hendrick (Library),
- Laura Baker (Library).
- Ex Officio: Nancy Shankle Jordan (General Education).

Assessment Team I—CORE 110--Cornerstone: The assessment team was formed during Year 1 to assess CORE 110 artifacts. The team continues to work together during Year 2. Assessment Team I assessed CORE 110 annotated bibliographies and will continue to assess CORE 110 artifacts for the duration of the QEP in order to have a consistency of assessment. Faculty members include the following:

- Laura Carroll (Chair, CAS, Language and Literature),
- Stephen Baldrige (CEHS, School of Social Work),
- Houston Heflin (CBS, Bible, Missions and Ministry, General Education),
- Susan Lewis (Vice Provost, formerly in CAS, Journalism and Mass Communications), and
- Dawne Swearingen Meeks (CAS, Theater).

A report detailing results and recommendations can be found in Appendix C along with the *EXPLORE 110* Rubric used in the assessment process.

Assessment Team II—CORE 210: Assessment Team II was formed this year for the first year of the assessment of CORE 210 artifacts—position papers. The team will remain together for the duration of the QEP in order to provide consistency of assessments. Faculty members include the following:

- Brenda Bender (Chair, CEHS, Communication Sciences and Disorders),
- Josh Brokaw (CAS, Biology),
- Jason Holland (CAS, Mathematics),
- Scott Self (CORE, University Access Programs), and
- Jeanine Varner (CAS, Language and Literature),

A report detailing results and recommendations can be found in Appendix D along with the *EXPLORE II* Rubric used in the assessment process.

TASKS COMPLETED

PIT Tasks for 2012-2013: The PIT group met regularly each month and completed the following tasks:

- Revised the common grant application for *Pursuit* and all ACU internal grants, providing for a broad spectrum of research and creative endeavors;
- Examined all *Pursuit* Research Grant requests and, using the criteria for *Pursuit* Research Grants, selected 11 faculty recipients and notified them of the award;
- Revised reports for assessment of *Pursuit* Research Grants, including Faculty Assessment of Project Report, Final Expense Report, Student Self-Assessment of Project Report, and Student Reflective Journal.
- Examined *Pursuit* Travel Grant requests and awarded \$20,000 funding for faculty and student travel to conferences.

IL Team Tasks for 2012-2013: The IL Team planned and implemented the *Pursuit* Institute, selecting the focus for the institute, the choice of consultant, and

planning the agenda. This year's institute brought Joan Hawthorne, noted general education consultant and author, from the University of North Dakota to work with faculty on Capstone signature assignments.

Pursuit Research Grants

Improvement in format and location of ACU Internal Grants: The *Pursuit* Director worked with the Director of Cullen and Math/Science (Susan Lewis) to further improve the grant application process for internal grants across campus and the rubric for evaluation of the applications. The work culminated in November in an Adams Center informational presentation to faculty. Information for each grant, grant process, and the application form were revised and centrally located on the ACU website.

2013-2014 Pursuit Grant Fellows: The second cycle of *Pursuit* Research Grants funded \$80,000 for eleven grant projects:

- Josh Brokaw \$8,000 (Biology),
- Sheila Delony \$7,550 (Education),
- Timothy Head \$8,000 (Physics and Engineering),
- Andrew Huddleston \$7,038 (Education),
- Jennifer Huddleston \$7,500 (Biology),
- Ryan Jessup \$8,000 (School of Information Technology and Computing),
- Sheila Jones \$1,912 (Exercise Science and Nutrition),
- Cynthia Powell \$8,000 (Chemistry and Biochemistry),
- Gregory Powell \$8,000 (Chemistry and Biochemistry),
- Jennifer Shewmaker \$8,000 (Psychology), and
- Qiang Xu \$8,000 (Biology).

Twenty-two undergraduate students will work with the faculty on the projects during the grant cycle for Academic Year 2013-2014. Interim assessment reports for the projects are due January 17, 2014; final assessment reports are due May 16, 2014.

Pursuit Institute

Joan Hawthorne, nationally recognized author and general education consultant from University of North Dakota, facilitated the second annual *Pursuit* Institute focused on student learning outcomes and signature assessments for capstone courses. All faculty, especially faculty teaching capstone courses, were invited to attend; fourteen faculty attended the 1½ day institute. Participants commented that the institute was beneficial to them in the the following ways:

- Spending time with colleagues from across campus to discuss discipline specific research practices and the expected outcomes that a student graduating from ACU should have;
- Sharing and discussing best practices for teaching the capstone courses;
- Discussion of use of rubrics for the evaluation of student work;
- Healthy collaborative process [as we created the rubric for assessment of capstone signature assignments];

- Revisiting the concept of backward design for course planning in all areas of teaching;
- Gave me specific strategies with revising my own syllabus to achieve goals for the capstone as well as other courses;
- Gained a better understanding of the “big picture” of Pursuit and how individual classes contributed to it;
- Am able to conceptualize our direction to improve research literacy and develop concrete tools for immediate use in courses;
- Very practical focus in addition to theoretical one;

One participant summed up the institute by saying,

Faculty really seemed to appreciate the opportunity to brainstorm, to discuss, and to collaborate on shared problems. Perhaps this role of equipping faculty can be a primary focus of *Pursuit* in the upcoming semesters. *Pursuit* is not the QEP watchdog that imposes additional criteria on courses. Rather, it can be the program that highlights tools, creates discussion opportunities, and arranges practical work sessions that enable faculty to do what the QEP is asking for. The future focus is on equipping. *Pursuit* helps faculty do what we need to do.

Closing the Loop—Adjustments made to Pursuit Institute 2013 because of recommendations after 2012 Pursuit Institute:

1. One participant wished to have a better idea of the focus and outcomes planned for the institute. The planning committees worked with the facilitator to provide an agenda that include purposes for the institute and expected outcomes. These were provided in hardcopy the first day of the institute to all participants.
2. Adams Center staff planned a workshop for faculty during the entire week after the school semester was completed. To avoid conflict with the times and the workshop, the Pursuit Institute was held in June.

Recommendations:

1. Several faculty conveyed interest in seeing capstone syllabi from other disciplines. The *Pursuit* office should work with departments across campus to post as many syllabi as possible to the *Pursuit* blogsite.
2. The final product of the institute was a rubric for Assessment Team IV to use in assessment of all capstone artifacts beginning in Fall 2014. The initial draft of the rubric needs to be available across campus. A location on the *Pursuit* blogsite will allow for discussion, comments, and revisions.
3. Meetings for all *Pursuit* Institute participants and all other capstone faculty and department chairs need to be held in the Adams Center during the fall semester for input about possible revisions to the capstone rubric.

The *Pursuit* Institute Report for 2012-2013 can be found in Appendix E.

ASSESSMENTS

During the second year of implementation, *Pursuit* focused on collecting data and assessments from CORE 110 (Cornerstone) and CORE 210 classes, including artifacts from each course, and SAILS data for benchmarking as pre-test information.

SAILS

(Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills developed by Kent State University): All students enrolled in CORE 110 completed SAILS early in Fall 2012. In the total enrollment of 974 students, 695 students (71%) took the assessment; of those enrolled in CORE 110, there were 687 freshman (98.8%) and 8 other students. Results will be used as a pre-test for benchmark comparison with SAILS results from students enrolled during their capstone experience (taken during one of the final three semesters).

Detailed results of the SAILS Skill Sets are found in Appendix F.

SLO 1.1 Students will understand and appropriately use scholarly sources.

Objective 1.1.A. Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.

Measurement: SAILS sections ONE through FOUR.

Objective 1.1.B. Students will access needed information effectively and efficiently.

Measurement: SAILS sections FIVE and SIX.

Objective 1.1.C. Students will use information ethically and legally.

Measurement: SAILS sections SEVEN and EIGHT.

Results: Note: the incoming students who take SAILS are not expected to have understanding and knowledge on use of scholarly sources. This test is used as a pre-test for comparison purposes with the post-test to be given during student's last year at ACU in Capstone.

Preliminary results show that students scored worse than the institution-type benchmark on all 8 skills sets. It should be noted that scores for skills sets in which students performed worse than institution-type benchmarks, the range of scores were significantly lower than institutions of the same type as ACU. Analysis of post-test results will assist in determination of successful acquisition of information literacy competencies. It is anticipated that scores will increase from the pretest to the posttest. Students who took SAILS were primarily entering

freshmen (98.8%). All were enrolled in CORE 110 where Outcome 1.1.A, 1.1.B, and 1.1.C are taught.

Information on the SAILS results is provided to CORE 110 faculty who teach information literacy skills for SLO 1.1. SAILS Summary Information for Fall 2012 can be found in Appendix F.

CORE 110 (Cornerstone)



The Cornerstone research artifact was collected from a set of 1007 students, 934 papers were collected (93%). This is a significant improvement from 77% last year. With the recommendations and assistance of Dr. Mark Riggs, Chair of Department of Mathematics and Statistical Consultant, a simple random sample of 100 papers were selected for assessment.

SLO 1.1 Students will understand and appropriately use scholarly sources.

Objective 1.1.A. Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.

Measurement: *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM ONE “determine the extent of information needed.” CORE 110 requires each student research and write an annotated bibliography meeting specific requirements. This annotated bibliography is scored using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric**.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the samples scored by Assessment Team 1 using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM ONE will average 2.5 or higher.

Ideal Target: 80% of the samples scored by Assessment Team 1 using Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM ONE will average 2.5 or higher.

Results: In 2012-2013, 56% of samples scored 2.5 or higher (down slightly from last year); the average score of all samples was 2.5 (up slightly from last year).

Obj 1.1.A	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent \geq 2.5	61%	56%			
Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met			
Avg of all samples	2.48	2.5			

Objective 1.1.B. Students will access needed information effectively and efficiently.

Measurement: Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM TWO “Assess the needed information.” CORE 110 requires each student write an annotated bibliography meeting specific requirements. This essay is scored using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric**.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 1 using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM TWO will average 2.5 or higher.

Ideal Target: 80% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 1 using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM TWO will average 2.5 or higher.

Results: In 2011-2012, this objective was unable to be assessed on the evaluative essays but due to revision of the assignment to annotated bibliographies and subsequent revision of the rubric, this objective was assessed in 2012-2013. In Year 2, 67% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.6.

Obj 1.1.B	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent \geq 2.5	-	67%			
Met Acceptable Target (70%)	--	Not met			
Avg of all samples	-	2.6			

Objective 1.1.C. Students will use information ethically and legally.

Measurement: Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM THREE “Assess and use the information ethically and legally.” CORE 110 requires each student write an annotated bibliography meeting specific requirements. This essay is scored using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric**.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 1 using the Revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM THREE will average 2.5 or higher.

Ideal Target: 80% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 1 using revised *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* ITEM THREE will average 2.5 or higher.

Results: In 2012-2013, 55% of samples scored 2.5 or higher (up significantly from the previous year); the average score of all samples was 2.4 (up significantly from the previous year).

Obj 1.1.C	Year 1	Year 2*	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent \geq 2.5	40%	55%			
Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met			
Avg of all samples	2.01	2.4			

*The assessment artifact and rubric changed after Year 1 from an evaluative essay (research paper) to an annotated bibliography due to Assessment Team I recommendations in order to close the loop. See recommendations from Year 1 in Appendix C for further detail.

Assessment Team I met with CORE 110 Director Cliff Barbarick and Assistant Provost for General Education Nancy Jordan to discuss recommendations. A two-day presentation in the Adams Center was provided for CORE 110 and CORE 210 faculty.

Closing the Loop--Recommendations for CORE 110:

1. Based on recommendations from the 2011-2012 report, continue to use the flash drive system to collect papers. This year 100% of faculty members submitted papers, and we collected papers from 93% of students enrolled (up from 77%).
2. Based on recommendations from the 2011-2012 report, the assignment was adapted to better reflect *EXPLORE* goals. The new assignment, an annotated bibliography, better taught information literacy. As we continue to help CORE 110 instructors teach information literacy more effectively, the following strategies are recommended:
 - 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.

In the weeks leading up to the Informational Literacy assignment, the assessment team and English faculty will hold professional development

sessions for CORE 110 instructors in the Adams Center. These sessions will allow time for the assessment team to discuss findings and recommendations for teaching the assignment and for the instructors to ask questions.

3. Continue to refine the Explore rubric to allow for the gathering more specific information:
 - a. Split 1.1.A into two categories
 - i. Defining the scope of the question
 - ii. Determining the types of information
 - b. Split 1.1.C
 - i. Using correct citations
 - ii. Using information ethically

The CORE 110 Assessment Report for 2012-2013 is included in Appendix C.

CORE 210

The CORE 210 research artifact was collected from an enrollment of 383 students, 366 papers were collected (95.6%). With the recommendations and assistance of Dr. Mark Riggs, Chair of Department of Mathematics and statistical consultant, a simple random sample of 60 papers was collected for assessment.

SLO 1.1 Students will understand and appropriately use scholarly sources.

Objective 1.1.A. Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.



Measurement: *EXPLORE II Rubric ITEMS ONE, TWO, and THREE.* CORE 210 requires each student write a position paper guided by assigned components. This paper is evaluated by trained faculty on Assessment Team 2 utilizing the *EXPLORE II Rubric*.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 2 using the Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM ONE will average 3.0 or above on each of the seven components of the rubric AND 70% will have a composite score of 21.0 or higher.

Ideal Target: 85% of the students will score 3.0 or above on each of the seven components AND 85% will have a composite score of 21.0 or higher.

Objective 1.1.B. Students will access needed information effectively and efficiently.

Measurement: Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM TWO “Assess the needed information.” CORE 210 requires each student write a position paper meeting specific requirements. This essay is scored using the Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric*.*

Acceptable Target: 70% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 2 using the Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM TWO will average 2.5 or higher.

Ideal Target: 80% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 2 using the Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM TWO will average 2.5 or higher.

Objective 1.1.C. Students will use information ethically and legally.

Measurement: Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM THREE “Assess and use the information ethically and legally.” CORE 210 requires each student write a position paper guided by assigned components. This essay is scored using the Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric*.*

Acceptable Target: 70% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 2 using the Revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM THREE will average 2.5 or higher.

Ideal Target: 80% of the samples scored by faculty Assessment Team 2 using revised *EXPLORE II Rubric* ITEM THREE will average 2.5 or higher.

ONE	Obj. 1.1.A	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	2.67			
TWO	Obj. 1.1.B	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	Not Assessed			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not Assessed			
	Average of all samples	Not Assessed			

THREE	Obj. 1.1.C	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	70.45%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	MET			
	Average of all samples	2.63			
COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 5.0	63.64%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	5.29			

Results:

Objective 1.1.A: In Year 2 (the first year for this assessment), 63.64% of samples scored 2.5 or higher on rubric ITEM ONE; the average score of all samples was 2.67. While the sample scores for this objective did not meet the 70% Acceptable Target, the average for all samples was 2.67, which is higher than the 2.5 Acceptable Target.

Objective 1.1.B: In Year 2 (the first year for this assessment), samples were assessed using EXPLORE II Rubric. This rubric did not include ITEM TWO. Objective 1.1.B was unable to be assessed on the evaluative essays. The *EXPLORE II* Rubric used on this assessment has been revised to allow Assessment Team II to score Objective 1.1.B in subsequent years.

Objective 1.1.C: In Year 2 (the first year for this assessment), over 70% of samples scored 2.5 or higher on rubric ITEM THREE; the average score of all samples was greater than the acceptable target of 2.5.

Composite: In Year 2 (the first year for this assessment), 63.64% of the sample papers scored 2.5 or higher on rubric items ONE and THREE. The average for all samples was higher than the 5.0 total for the two items.

SLO 1.2 Students will integrate knowledge to frame researchable questions and to develop strategies to seek answers.*

Objective 1.2.A. Students will be able to describe major theories in the field relevant to a particular case, problem, or solution.

Measurement: A research artifact is assigned and collected in CORE 210 and assessed using the *EXPLORE II* Rubric ITEM FOUR.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the research artifacts (ITEM FOUR) will have an average score of 2.5 or higher.

Ideal Target: 85% of the research articles will have an average score of 2.5 or higher.

Objective 1.2.B. Students will be able to describe findings and interpretations in the field relevant to a particular case, problem, or solution.

Measurement: The course’s assigned position paper is collected in CORE 210 and assessed using the *EXPLORE II* Rubric on ITEM FIVE.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the research papers will have an average score of 2.5 or higher on ITEM FIVE.

Ideal Target: 85% of the research articles will have an average score of 2.5 or higher across these items.

FOUR	Obj. 1.2.A	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	2.5			
FIVE	Obj. 1.2.B	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	2.53			
COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.2	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 5.0	59.10%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	5.03			

Results: In Year 2 (the first year for this assessment), 63.64% of samples scored 2.5 or higher on rubric ITEM FOUR and FIVE and, thus, did not meet the Acceptable Target percentage; however, the average score of all samples for these items were at or greater than the acceptable target of 2.5.

In addition, Composite Scores did not meet the Acceptable Target for individual results, but exceeded the Acceptable Target on the average of all samples.

*Note: The *EXPLORE II* Rubric was revised to group ITEMS FOUR and FIVE and calculate a composite score for the two items. Because ITEM SEVEN was included in SLO 1.3, it was deleted from SLO 1.2. Assessment Team II felt the descriptors for ITEMS FOUR and FIVE had a better fit for SLO 1.2 and SLO 1.3.

SLO 1.3 Students will analyze, interpret, and/or evaluate information and make and implement research informed decisions.

Objective 1.3.A. Students will evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into their knowledge base and value system.

Measurement: A research paper will be collected in CORE 210 and assessed using the *EXPLORE II* Rubric ITEM SIX.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the research artifacts (ITEM FOUR) will have an average score of 3.0 or higher on ITEM SIX.

Ideal Target: 80% of the research papers will have an average score of 3.0 or higher on ITEM SIX.

Objective 1.3.B. Students will use multiple sources effectively to accomplish a specific purpose/assignment.

Measurement: The assigned research paper is assessed using the *EXPLORE II* Rubric on ITEMS SEVEN.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the research papers will have an average score of 3.0 or higher on ITEM SEVEN.

Ideal Target: 80% of the research papers will have an average score of 3.0 or higher on ITEM SEVEN of the rubric.

SIX	Obj. 1.3.A	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	50%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	2.27			
SEVEN	Obj. 1.3B	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 2.5	65.91%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	2.67			
COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.3	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Percent > 5.0	50%			
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met			
	Average of all samples	4.94			

Results: In Year 2 (the first year for this assessment), 50% of samples scored 2.5 or higher on rubric ITEM SIX, not reaching the Acceptable Target; 65.9% of samples scored 2.5 or higher on ITEM SEVEN and, thus, did not meet the Acceptable Target; however, the average score of all samples on ITEM SIX was below the Acceptable Target of 2.5; average score for all samples on ITEM SEVEN were greater than the Acceptable Target of 2.5.

In addition, Composite scores were below the Acceptable Target of 5.0 and the average of all samples was below 5.0.

Closing the Loop—Recommendations for CORE 210:

1. Adjust the rubric language to be more general to better fit the variety of topics selected in the writing assignment:
 - a. Specifically refine the language “in the field” and “major theories”. The readers found these terms were too prescriptive for assessing the common assignment.
 - b. Provide a scaffold for readers on SLO 1.1.C – Students will use information ethically and legally. The 4 aspects assessed in this SLO are inter-related and a scaffold will assist readers in assessing this SLO more consistently.

2. Select additional samples if not all submitted papers follow the common writing assignment. Two sections submitted annotated bibliographies instead of the writing assignment.
3. Clarify the common writing assignment requirements across all sections of CORE 210.
 - a. Provide specific expectations for
 - i. Formatting (e.g., page numbers, font type and size, margins)
 - ii. Citation style – MLA was the most frequently used
 - iii. Writing style – some students employed a creative writing style that was difficult to assess
 - b. Complete the assignment earlier in the semester to allow time to provide feedback to the students
 - c. Provide feedback to students on topic choice; narrowing the topic to facilitate a more focused paper
 - d. Provide EXPLORE rubric to teachers and students for an understanding of skills being assessed by the assignment.
4. Ensure students meet the course pre-requisites for CORE 210, specifically ENGL 112.

ASSESSMENTS COLLECTED FOR BENCHMARKING

During Academic Year 2013-2014 (Year 3), it is expected that the number of faculty-guided research or creative-activity projects will increase within academic departments. This will be accomplished through an increased focus in introducing, practicing, and reinforcing information literacy skills in general education classes (CORE 110, CORE 210, BCOR 310, ENGL112, and COMS 211), through student creation and production of new information in activities in which they write, present, and perform, and through financial support of *Pursuit* Grants and travel grants for faculty and students and the Undergraduate Research Festival.

Faculty-guided Research

Data is collected during each academic year for faculty-guided research and creative activity projects. Until Year 3 of Pursuit (AY 2013-2014), data will be collected only to provide benchmarks for statistical comparison.

SLO 2.2: Students conduct faculty-guided original work relevant to the field of study.

Objective 2.2.A. Students engaged in faculty-guided work will be able to perform appropriate research steps in the development/creation of discipline-specific projects.

Measurement: Students [receiving *Pursuit* Grants] will keep a *Research Activity Journal* that is graded by a faculty mentor using the *CREATE Rubric* ITEMS ONE, TWO, AND THREE.

Acceptable Target: Each individual item will have 80% of the journals average 3.0 on each item. 80% of the journals will score 80% of the total rubric score.

Ideal Target: Each individual item will have 85% of the journals average 3.0 on each item. 85% of the journals will score 85% of the total rubric score.

Results: In anticipation of collection and assessment of the student's Research Journal, the assessment for this project has been revised. Due to the variety and type of projects from both STEM areas and arts and humanities, a comparison of research journals does not sound feasible for assessment. Instead of using the *CREATE Rubric*, the student will submit a final reflective response answering the following questions in an effort to assist in assessment:

- Have I reached the goals that were prescribed in the beginning of the project? Was the pace of the project appropriate? What results did I find in my project?
- What did I learn? What are the benefits I received from the project? What results were surprising to me? What did I expect to find as a result of the project? What did I **not** expect to find?
- What plans do I have for the future? Will I continue to work on this project or an extension of this project?
- Would you recommend this type of project to another intern? Why or why not? What recommendations for change would you suggest?
- What scholarly product(s) do you expect from the project? What presentations have you made or plan to make?

At the end of 2013-2014 (Year 3), final reflective journal responses will be assessed. Journals are collected each May at the end of the project year.

Objective 2.2.B Students engaged in faculty-guided work will be able to draw sound conclusions from the results of the project in order to identify future directions (use of evaluated results).

Measurement: Students will submit an a *Assessment of Project Report*. This report will be assessed using the *CREATE Rubric* ITEMS FOUR, FIVE, AND SIX.

Acceptable Target: Each individual item will have 80% of the reports average 3.0 on each item. 80% of the reports will score 80% of the total rubric score.

Ideal Target: Each individual item will have 85% of the reports average 3.0 on each item. 85% of the reports will score 85% of the total rubric score.

Amended Targets:

Acceptable Target: 80% of papers or creative work will receive a total score of 15 out of 25 points or higher on the rubric.

Ideal Target: 80% of papers will receive 20 out of 25 points or higher.

Results: In anticipation of collection and assessment of the student's *Assessment of Project Report*, the assessment has been revised due to the variety and type of projects from both STEM areas and arts and humanities. Instead of using the *CREATE Rubric*, the student numerical responses will be scored and used comparatively.

At the end of 2013-2014 (Year 3), student *Assessment of Project Reports* will be assessed. Reports are collected each May at the end of the project year.

Operational Objective 2.2C: The number of faculty-guided research/creative activity projects will increase within academic departments.

Measurement: All academic departments report the number and type of faculty-guided research and creative activity projects conducted on an annual basis. These data are reported in the Annual Assessment Cycle. [Results will be utilized in statistical comparisons beginning in Year 3.]

Acceptable Target: All departments report these data. The increase of faculty-guided research and creative activities will increase by 50% across the institution by Year Five.

Ideal Target: There will be a 75% increase in the number of faculty-guided research and creative activities across the institution by Year Five.

Results: All but 4 departments reported data. Results will be utilized in subsequent years for comparison.

In AY 2012-2013, on the annual outcomes assessment report, faculty reported the following numbers of students who participated:

- 119 completed an independent research project submitted for selection and review beyond a course requirement;
- 189 conducted research with a department faculty mentor;
- 86 presented a research paper or project or poster at a conference or professional meeting, either state or national;
- 162 submitted an original work for a juried show;
- 55 performed for a jury outside a department requirement;
- 12 published an article, chapter, or book related to their discipline;
- 90 participated in the spring ACU Research Festival; and

- 57 conducted or participated in a research activity not mentioned in the list above.
- 465 individual students are represented in these numbers.

Obj 2.2.C	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Indep res beyond course requirement	171	119			
Research w/ fac mentor	168	189			
Presented or co-authored paper/project at confer	73	86			
Orig work for juried show	65	162			
Perf for jury outside dept requirement	26	55			
Published article related to discipline	13	12			
Research Festival	91	90			
Participated in research activity not mentioned above	11	57			
Number of individual students represented	*	465			
Enrollment In fall	3771	3626	3727		

* Note: Previous data found in the descriptions of student involvement in research projects counted the same students multiple times and were, therefore, not mutually exclusive. Beginning in 2012, a data category was added to differentiate the number of individual students represented. As of October 21, 2013, there were four departments who were non-reporting.

SLO 3.1: Students will publicly disseminate independent scholarly, and creative work in a public setting.

Objective 3.1.A. Students will produce independent scholarly and/or creative products.

Measurement: Students producing scholarly or creative work for the Undergraduate Research Festival must submit abstracts describing the product. Faculty reviewers assess the abstracts using the *Review of Submitted Abstracts Rubric*.

Acceptable target: 80% of abstracts will have 3.0 or higher on each item. [Adapted to 7 or higher out of 12]

Ideal target: 80% of abstracts will have a 3.3 or higher on each item. [Adapted to 8 or higher out of 12.]



Obj 3.1.A	Year 1*	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent ≥ 7 out of 12	-	93%			
Acceptable Target (80% of 7 or higher)	-	Met			
Ideal Target (80% of 8 or higher)	-	Met			
Acceptance Rate	85.7%	98.9%			

*Rubric was not utilized in Year 1.

Results: Ninety-eight abstracts were submitted to the ACU Undergraduate Research Festival. ACU students submitted ninety-two abstracts. Only two abstracts were rejected, only one of which was by an ACU student. Before the conference another presentation was withdrawn.

Of the 92 abstracts submitted by ACU students, 86 (93%) reached the Acceptable Target of scoring a 7 or higher on the Submitted Abstracts Rubric. Eighty-three abstracts (90%) reached the Ideal Target of 8 or higher out of 12.

Measurement: Students who received grants from the Office of Undergraduate Research or Pursuit Grants will submit a paper or creative work based on their project to their mentoring faculty member. Faculty members submit the report to the Pursuit Team. Faculty reviewers will assess the work using *Writing Assessment Rubric*.

Acceptable Target: 80% of papers or creative work will receive a total score of 15 out of 25 points or higher on the rubric.

Ideal Target: 80% of papers will receive 20 out of 25 points or higher.

Results: The Office of Undergraduate Research does not require students who receive Summer Stipends to submit a paper summarizing the results of their project. Students who work with a faculty member on Pursuit Research Grants submit two assessment reports at the completion of their projects. Results from those reports will be used for assessment of this objective.

Measurement: Students who received grants from the Office of Undergraduate Research or Pursuit Research Grants will submit a self-assessment entitled *Research Project: Student Self-Assessment of Project Report* to their faculty mentor. Faculty members submit the report to the Pursuit Team.

Acceptable Target: 80% of papers or creative work will receive a total score of 15 out of 25 points or higher on the rubric.

Ideal Target: 80% of papers will receive 20 out of 25 points or higher.

Results: The Office of Undergraduate Research does not require students to complete the *Student Self-Assessment of Project Report*. At the end of 2013-2014 (Year 3), student *Assessment of Project Reports* from Pursuit Research Grants will be assessed using the Acceptable and Ideal Targets. Reports are collected each May at the end of the project year.

Objective 3.1.B Students will demonstrate professionalism in the presentation of scholarly and creative products beyond the classroom.

Measurement: Student work accepted to the Undergraduate Research Festival will be assessed using *Papers/Verbal Presentations Rubric* or *Posters/Presentations Rubric*. Faculty score the papers/posters products.

Acceptable target: 70% of products/presentations will score 38.9 or higher out of a total score of 70 on the rubric.

Ideal target: 80% of products/presentations will score 56 or higher out of a total score of 70 on the rubric

Results:

At the 2013 ACU Undergraduate Research Festival, 101 ACU students gave 90 presentations. Five students from another university also participated in the Research Festival. Their data is not included here.

Verbal Presentations: At the 2013 Undergraduate Research Festival, ACU students made sixty verbal presentations. Of the verbal presentations, **45 presentations (75%) scored above the Acceptable Target** with a total of 38.9 or higher. **Twenty-seven verbal presentations (45%) scored at or above the Ideal Target of 56 or higher.** In 2012, 61% of the verbal presentations scored above the Acceptable Target and 14% scored above the Ideal Target.

Obj 3.1.B Verbal	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent \geq 38.9	61%	75%			
Acceptable Target (70% of 7 or higher)	Not Met	Met			
Ideal Target (80% of 8 or higher)	14% Not Met	45% Not Met			

Poster Presentations: ACU students made thirty poster presentations. Of the 30 poster presentations, **18 presentations scored a total of 36.1 or higher or 60% of presentations scored within the Acceptable Target** on the Poster Presentations Rubric. **Three poster presentations or 10% scored at or above the Ideal Target.** This compares to 66% above the Acceptable Target and 6% above the ideal target in 2012.

Obj 3.1.B Poster	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent \geq 38.9	66%	60%			
Acceptable Target (70% of 7 or higher)	Not Met	Not Met			
Ideal Target (80% of 8 or higher)	6% Not Met	10% Not Met			

Overall Totals: At the 2013 ACU Undergraduate Research Festival, **70% of the presentations scored at or above the acceptable target. Thirty-three percent of the presentations scored at or above the ideal target.** At the 2012 ACU Undergraduate Research Festival, 63% scored at or above the Acceptable Target and 11% scored at or above the Ideal Target.

Obj 3.1.B Overall Presentations	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Percent \geq 38.9	63%	70%			
Acceptable Target (70% of 7 or higher)	Not Met	Met			
Ideal Target (80% of 8 or higher)	11% Not Met	33% Not Met			

Table: Presentations Reaching or Exceeding the Acceptable Target.

In 2012 there were 91 presentations (56 verbal, 35 poster) by ACU students. In 2013, there were 90 presentations (60 verbal, 30 poster) by ACU students.

Acceptable	2012 Number of Presentations (%)	2013 Number of Presentations (%)
Verbal Presentations	34 (61%)	45 (75%)
Poster Presentations	23 (66%)	18 (60%)
Total presentations	57 (63%)	63 (70%)

Table: Presentations Reaching or Exceeding the Ideal Target. In 2012 there were 91 presentations (56 verbal, 35 poster) by ACU students. In 2013, there were 90 presentations (60 verbal, 30 poster) by ACU students.

Ideal	2012 Number of Presentations (%)	2013 Number of Presentations (%)
Verbal Presentations	8 (14%)	27 (45%)
Poster Presentations	2 (6%)	3 (10%)
Total presentations	10 (11%)	30 (33%)

Analysis: This year the goal was met of having 70% of presentations reach the Acceptable Target of 38.9 or higher out of 70 for verbal presentations or 36.1 or higher out of 65 for poster presentations. Several factors may have contributed to reaching this goal. The first is that it was

the 5th ACU Undergraduate Research Festival and faculty mentors have learned how to better advise their students in preparation for the Research Festival. Second, rubrics and helpful hints were provided to the students before the conference to aid the students in their preparation for the Research Festival. Third, a few of the students were sophomores that had received some of the Research Literacy material through the university core courses. However, the vast majority of students were juniors and seniors who had not been through the Research Literacy curriculum as it was implemented after they completed their core courses.

Note: Data will be used as a benchmark for statistical comparisons in subsequent years when students have matriculated through general education classes with student learning outcomes focused on information literacy and the creation and production of new information through writing, presenting, and performing.

Appendix G contains the Undergraduate Research Report for 2012-2013.

Objective 3.1.C Students who present research projects and/or creative activities to audiences external to ACU will demonstrate professionalism in the presentation and contribute to the discipline.

Measurement: Evaluation forms from peer-reviewed conferences.

Acceptable Target: Using the baseline for these categories from 2010, each category will increase 25% from the baseline by the fourth year of the QEP and 35% by the fifth year.

Ideal Target: The percent of increase will be 30% by year four and 40% by year five.

Results: No data has been collected for the baseline during the first year of implementation. It is unclear how this data will be collected to find a reasonable measure and avenue for the collection.

Operational Objective 3.1.D An increase in the number of students submitting research projects and creative works to institutional, local, state, national, and international conferences and juried programs will occur.

Measurement: The number of submissions and acceptances is documented on an annual basis from departmental data found in TaskStream or the Student Research by Department Survey.

Acceptable Target: Using the baseline for these categories from 2010, each category will increase 35% from the baseline by the fourth year of the QEP and 50% by the fifth year.

Ideal Target: The percent of increase will be 40% by year four and 60% by year five.

Number of students submitting research projects and creative works to conferences and juried programs.

Annual Outcomes Assessment Reports Results

In AY 2012-2013, on the annual outcomes assessment report, faculty reported the following levels of student participation:

- 86 presented a research paper or project or poster at a conference or professional meeting, either state or national;
- 162 submitted an original work for a juried show;
- 55 performed for a jury outside a department requirement;
- 12 published an article, chapter, or book related to their discipline; and
- 90 participated in the spring ACU Research Festival.

Pursuit Travel Grant Results

Pursuit Travel Grant Funds were established in Year 2 as a part of ACU’s Quality Enhancement Plan. The purpose of the fund is to support conference expenses of students and their faculty mentors as they present research or scholarship findings, or creative activities.

Pursuit Travel Funds are available for faculty/student travel to conferences to present and showcase research conducted collaboratively between faculty and students. Funding has a maximum of \$2,000 (\$1,000 for the faculty mentor and \$1,000 for the student researcher).

In Year 2, a total of fifty-seven faculty and students were funded for their travel expenses to conferences from the \$20,000 budgeted.

Travel Funding to Conferences	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
# Faculty Funded	25			
# Students Funded	32			
Total Funded	57			

Other Research Programs: Student involvement in research and creative projects is an important part of the climate at ACU. Special programs and groups within the university provide important assistance to encourage student involvement in research and creative projects. Additional information is listed below from McNair Scholars Program and the Undergraduate Research Festival.

- **McNair Scholars Program** is designed to provide qualified college students with effective preparation for doctoral study. The program provides opportunities for student development of research skills. During the summer and fall of 2013, 22 students worked with faculty mentors to learn research skills and to conduct a research study.
- **The Undergraduate Research Festival** is conducted each year during the spring semester. During Spring 2013, 98 abstracts were submitted to the Undergraduate Research Festival; 90 presentations were given by 101 ACU students; 60 of these were verbal presentations and 30 were poster presentations. That is roughly 2.5% of ACU's enrollment total. Note: there is a slight disparity in data from the outcomes assessment report from above.

RESULTS OF CHANGES FROM YEAR 1

The Development Team provided a vision for *Pursuit* in the document found on the *Pursuit* Blog page (<http://blogs.acu.edu/qep/>). In the process of implementation, a few minor adjustments were made in the plan to close the loop as a result of assessments. Year 2 was implemented as planned in the *Pursuit* document.

As a result of the Recommendations from Year 1, the following adjustments were made.

1. *Pursuit* Grant Fellows were asked to revise the student learning outcomes for their grant projects in order for more comprehensive assessment of the projects.
2. Marketing—Videos showcasing faculty and student research were crafted by the Learning Studio. As of the writing of this document, the videos are in limbo, having been lost due to a hardware crash. Those will be redone if the information is not retrieved.
3. *Pursuit* Institute—held in June to work with Capstone faculty and department chairs.
4. Assessments
 - CORE 110—The new annotated bibliography was utilized for the assessment this year.
 - SAILS—percentages of participation increased as a result of faculty encouragement of students.
 - Undergraduate Research—This is still a problem with collection of data but procurement of data has turned over to the Director of Undergraduate Research.

RECOMMENDATIONS from YEAR 2

As a result of findings by Assessment Team I (CORE 110-Cornerstone) and Assessment Team II (CORE 210), recommendations for implementation Year 3 were made and will be implemented in Year 3.

- **CORE 110.** The Director of Assessment Team I, Dr. Laura Carroll, met with Assistant Provost, Dr. Nancy Shankle Jordan, and Director of Cornerstone, Dr. Cliff Barbarick. In the meeting, Cornerstone recommendations were discussed and a revised rubric was shared. On September 24 and 25, presentations were made in the Adams Center to share results of the assessment and recommendations with CORE 110, CORE 210, and other interested faculty. Dr. Cole Bennett, Chair of the Department of Language and Literature, worked with CORE 110 faculty to discuss characteristics of quality annotated bibliographies.

Results and Recommendations

1. Based on recommendations from the 2011-2012 report, continue to use the flash drive system to collect papers. This year 100% of faculty members submitted papers, and we collected papers from 93% of students enrolled (up from 77%).
2. Based on recommendations from the 2011-2012 report, the assignment was adapted to better reflect *EXPLORE* goals. The new assignment, an annotated bibliography, better taught information literacy. As we continue to help CORE 110 instructors teach information literacy more effectively, the following strategies are recommended:
 - 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.

In the weeks leading up to the Informational Literacy assignment, the assessment team will hold professional development sessions for CORE 110 instructors in the Adams Center. These sessions will allow time for the assessment team to discuss findings and recommendations for teaching the assignment and for the instructors to ask questions. In addition, Cole Bennett, Department Chair for Language and Literature, will conduct a faculty meeting with CORE 110 faculty to assist faculty in teaching students how to write a annotated bibliography.

More detail regarding CORE 110 assessment can be found in Appendix C.

3. Continue to refine the *EXPLORE* rubric to allow for the gathering more specific information:
 - a. Split 1.1.A into two categories
 - i. Defining the scope of the question
 - ii. Determining the types of information
 - b. Split 1.1.C
 - i. Using correct citations
 - ii. Using information ethically

Note: The Revised *EXPLORE* 110 Rubric can be found in the Appendix.

- **CORE 210.** The Director of Assessment Team II, Dr. Brenda Bender, met with Assistant Provost, Dr. Nancy Shankle Jordan; Director of CORE 210, Dr. Lauren Lemley; and the CORE 210 Curriculum Committee. In the meeting, CORE 210 recommendations were discussed. On October 2, presentations were made in the Adams Center to share results of the assessment and recommendations with CORE 110, CORE 210, and other interested faculty.

Results and Recommendations

1. Adjust the rubric language to be more general to better fit the variety of topics selected in the writing assignment:
 - a. Specifically refine the language “in the field” and “major theories”. The readers found these terms were too prescriptive for assessing the common assignment.
 - b. Provide a scaffold for readers on SLO 1.1.C – Students will use information ethically and legally. The 4 aspects assessed in this SLO are inter-related and a scaffold will assist readers in assessing this SLO more consistently.
2. Select additional samples if not all submitted papers follow the common writing assignment. Two sections submitted annotated bibliographies instead of the writing assignment.
3. Clarify the common writing assignment requirements across all sections of CORE 210.
 - a. Provide specific expectations for
 - i. Formatting (e.g., page numbers, font type and size, margins)
 - ii. Citation style – MLA was the most frequently used
 - iii. Writing style – some students employed a creative writing style that was difficult to assess
 - b. Complete the assignment earlier in the semester to allow time to provide feedback to the students
 - c. Provide feedback to students on topic choice; narrowing the topic to facilitate a more focused paper
 - d. Provide *EXPLORE* rubric to teachers and students for an understanding of skills being assessed by the assignment.

4. Ensure students meet the course pre-requisites for CORE 210; specifically ENGL 112.

More detail can be found regarding CORE 210 assessment information in Appendix D.

SUMMARY

Year 2 started with a new Provost and a new Assistant Provost of General Education, stabilizing the structure for assessment and providing a more focused approach to implementation.

- Working teams (PIT, IL Team, and Assessment Team I) continued with their tasks for implementation. Each group worked to incorporate recommendations from Year 1. Assessment Team II was formed and assessed the position papers from CORE 210 for the first time.
- Funding for *Pursuit* Research Grant projects were awarded to 22 students and their 11 faculty mentors. Preliminary results and anecdotal responses indicate a successful and productive group of researchers. Reports will not be available for assessment until Year 3 for Pursuit Research Grants.
- The *Pursuit Institute* was conducted in June. The institute was an overwhelming success with 19 faculty participants, many of which have made improvements within their own teaching and classroom behaviors and assignments. The focus of the Institute was Capstone assignments and assessments. A informational meeting will be held on November 6 in the Adams Center to share the rubrics developed and to collect suggestions for improvement.
- Assessments for the second year were implemented.
 - SAILS was given to CORE 110 students in the early fall; 695 students out of 961 freshmen completed the assessment.
 - Position papers were assigned, collected, and assessed from CORE 210 students for the first time.
- Recommendations were determined for alterations in data collection and implementation of the goals and assessments for *Pursuit*. Those are listed above and have been accepted and changes implemented in Fall 2013. These recommendations were shared with the appropriate faculty and other interested faculty.
- As of Fall 2013, Year 3 begins with the following improvements:
 - CORE 110 (Cornerstone) Annotated Bibliography prompt and assessment rubrics have been revised; recommendations were shared with CORE 110 faculty on two different days; and faculty were provided with an informational workshop on how to assist students in writing an annotated bibliography. An informational session regarding annotated bibliographies was conducted in the Adams Center.
 - A director for CORE 210 was selected. The CORE 210 Curriculum Committee met with Assessment Team II to discuss recommendations for the position paper. The Director of Pursuit, the Assistant Provost of General Education, and the Director of CORE 210 met to further discuss recommendations and details for the assessment artifact. The Assessment Team II presented their findings and recommendations to CORE 210 faculty.

- Percentages for students taking SAILS at the beginning of Year 2 have increased from 50% to 72.3%.

In summary, the results of our *Pursuit* are beginning to be more evident. While there are places that could see improvements, faculty and students are working together to enhance student learning. Scores are rising; percentages are approaching the Acceptable Target. The numbers of faculty and students working together on research and creative projects are increasing. As we start Year 3, we continue to refine and revise our strategies to meet the goals described for the *Pursuit* of Research Literacy.



Appendix

Pursuit Goals and Learning Outcomes

Goal 1 Student Learning--Explore--Students will acquire information literacy competencies and skills at both the basic and more advanced research levels through exploration and inquiry.



	Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students	Expected Outcome--The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment	Evidence—collection of Artifacts
EXPLORE	Objective 1.1: Students understand and appropriately use scholarly resources. <i>(Def 1)</i>	1.1.A. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed. 1.1.B. Access needed information effectively and efficiently. 1.1.C. Use information ethically and legally.	CORE 110—I	SAILS in CORE 110 (Pretest)	AY '11-12
				EXPLORE I Rubric	AY '11-12
			CORE 210—P	EXPLORE II Rubric—Items 1-3	AY '12-13
			BCOR 310 ENGL 112 - P	EXPLORE II Rubric Items 1-3	AY '13-14
	Objective 1.2: Students integrate knowledge to frame researchable questions and to develop strategies to seek answers. <i>(Def 2)</i>	1.2.A. Describe major theories in the field relevant to a particular case/problem/situation. 1.2.B. Describe findings and interpretations in the field relevant to a particular case/problem/situation.	CORE 210—P	CORE 210—EXPLORE // rubric--Items 6 & 7	AY '12-13
			BCOR 310-R ENGL 112 - P	EXPLORE II Rubric—Items 6 & 7	AY '13-14
	Objective 1.3: Students analyze, interpret, and/or evaluate information and make and implement research-informed decisions. <i>(Def 3)</i>	1.3.A. Evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system. 1.3.B. Use multiple sources effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.	CORE 210—P	CORE 210—EXPLORE // rubric--Items 4 & 5	AY '12-13
			BCOR 310-R	EXPLORE II Rubric---Items 4 & 5	AY '13-14
Capstone Experience-P ENGL 112 - P			SAILS --(Posttest)	AY '14-15	

Key for year assessment will begin:

Academic Year—2011-2012—QEP Year 1 Academic Year—2012-2013—QEP Year 2 Academic Years—2013-2014 or 2014-2015--QEP Year 3 or Year 4

I= Introduce

P= Practice

R=Reinforce

Goal 2 Student Learning—Create—Students will create and produce new information as they write, present, and perform.



C R E A T E	Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students	Expected Outcome--The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment	Evidence—collection of Artifacts
	Objective 2.1: Students prepare, present, and assess effectiveness of scholarly and creative products. <i>(Def 4)</i>	2.1.A. Demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through written and oral communication 2.1.B. Apply new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance. 2.1.C. Demonstrate effective critical thinking as student develops, produces and evaluates a product or performance.	COMS 211—I	Artifact from Writing Intensive or Capstone Experience – <i>Create</i> Rubric	
			Writing Intensive or Capstone Experience-P		AY '13-'14 and
					AY '14-'15 in Capstone
	Specific Learning Outcomes for Select Undergraduates	Expected Outcome--The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment	Evidence
	Objective 2.2: Students conduct faculty-guided original work relevant to the field of study. <i>(Def 5)</i>	2.2.A. Perform steps of a discipline specific project. 2.2.B. Draw sound conclusions from the results of the project in order to identify future direction. 2.2.C. Operational Objective-The number of faculty-guided research or creative activity projects will increase within academic departments.	Faculty-guided Research-I, P	Departmental Outcomes Assessment, Self-assessment Rubric, Assessment of Project Rubric	AY '13-14 and
			AY '14-15		
		Faculty-guided Research-I, P	Departmental Outcomes Assessment, Self-assessment Rubric, Assessment of Project Rubric	AY '13-14 and	
				AY '14-15	
		Faculty-guided-research-I, P		AY '13-'14 and	
			Departmental Outcomes Assessment	AY '14-'15	

Key for year assessment will begin:

Academic Year—2011-2012—QEP Year 1 Academic Year—2012-2013—QEP Year 2 Academic Years—2013-2014 or 2014-2015—QEP Year 3 or Year 4

I= Introduce

P= Practice

R=Reinforce

Goal 3 Student Learning—Express—Students will express their research through independent scholarly and creative work in a public setting.



EXPRESS	Specific Learning Outcomes for <i>Select Undergraduates</i>	Expected Outcome--The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment	Evidence—collection of Artifacts
	Objective 3.1: Students publicly disseminate independent scholarly and creative work. (Def 6)	3.1.A. Produce an independent scholarly and/or creative product.	Capstone Experience—P; OUR—I, P; Honors Coll.—P; McNair Scholars (3 courses)— I, P	Departmental Outcomes Assessment, Self-assessment Rubric, Assessment of Project Rubric	AY '13-14 and AY '14-15
		3.1.B. Demonstrate professionalism in the presentation of scholarly and creative product beyond the classroom	OUR—I, P; Honors Coll.—P; McNair Scholars (3 courses)— I, P	Departmental Outcomes Assessment, Self-assessment Rubric, Assessment of Project Rubric	AY '13-14 and AY '14-15
		3.1.C. Demonstrate professionalism in the presentation of original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline (external to ACU)	OUR—I, P; Honors Coll.—P; McNair Scholars (3 courses)— I, P	Departmental Outcomes Assessment, Self-assessment Rubric, Assessment of Project Rubric	AY '13-14 and AY '14-15

Key for year assessment will begin:

Academic Year—2011-2012—QEP Year 1 Academic Year—2012-2013—QEP Year 2 Academic Years—2013-2014 or 2014-2015—QEP Year 3 or Year 4

I= Introduce

P= Practice

R=Reinforce

Actions to be Implemented

Student Learning Outcomes—*EXPLORE* Information Literacy

In fall 2010, ACU began a new core curriculum for entering first-year students. In response to the new beginnings encountered by the students and the vision of the concepts of the QEP, a plan for implementing the QEP student learning outcomes along with the new curriculum was prescribed. Faculty will weave the information literacy student learning outcomes from *EXPLORE* into CORE 110: Cornerstone; CORE 210: Human Identity; and BCOR 310: The Search for Meaning.

Student Learning Outcomes	Yr 1 (FY 12) AY 11-12	Yr 2 (FY 13) AY 12-13	Yr 3 (FY 14) AY 13-14	Yr 4 (FY 15) AY 14-15	Yr 5 (FY 16) AY 15-16
<i>EXPLORE</i>					
1.1 All students will understand and appropriately use scholarly sources.	CORE 110				
	CORE 210				
	BCOR 310				
1.2 All students will integrate knowledge to frame researchable questions and to develop strategies to seek answers.	CORE 120				
	CORE 210				
	BCOR 310				
1.3 All students will analyze, interpret, and/or evaluate information and make and implement research-informed decisions.	CORE 120				
	CORE 210				
	BCOR 310				

Student Learning Outcome 1.1: All students will understand and appropriately use scholarly sources. More specifically, students will:

- Determine the nature and extent of the information needed,
- Access needed information effectively and efficiently, and
- Use information ethically and legally.

The broad scope of the concept of information literacy provides for a structured and iterative understanding of the skills and concepts of information literacy. As students work to increase their knowledge, skills, and behaviors of information literacy, they will continue to learn and enhance the knowledge and skills in deeper ways.

Student Learning Outcome 1.2: All students will integrate knowledge to frame researchable questions and to develop strategies to seek answers. More specifically, students will

- Describe major theories in the field relevant to a particular case, problem, or situation, and
- Describe findings and interpretations in the field relevant to a particular case, problem, or situation.

Student Learning Outcome 1.3: Students will analyze, interpret, and/or evaluate information and make and implement research informed decisions. More specifically, students will

- Evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system; and
- Use multiple sources effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

As the QEP Development Team defined the topic of Research Literacy, the student learning outcomes listed above described characteristics for the strategies within the core curriculum providing a foundation for research, scholarship, and creative work for the student's major field of study.

Assessment of *EXPLORE* student learning outcomes. While these skills are introduced in CORE 110, practiced in CORE 210, and reinforced in BCOR 310, students practice these skills throughout their program of study. Because most students take these courses, a consistent assessment of the QEP student learning outcomes will be possible. This will be accomplished through two means:

- Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) is given as a pre-test to all entering first-year students. [The post-test will be administered during CORE 320.]
- A evaluative essay paper is collected and assessed from a cohort group of students in CORE 110 and CORE 220. These artifacts are assessed using the *EXPLORE 110 Rubric* and the *EXPLORE 220 Rubric*. [See Appendix IV for the rubrics.]

Student Learning Outcomes—*CREATE* new information

After students complete their introduction to and practice of information literacy concepts in CORE 110 and CORE 210, they move into a level of learning where they create and produce new information as they write, present, and perform.

Student Learning Outcomes	Yr 1 (FY 12) AY 11-12	Yr 2 (FY 13) AY 12-13	Yr 3 (FY 14) AY 13-14	Yr 4 (FY 15) AY 14-15	Yr 5 (FY 16) AY 15-16
CREATE					
2.1 All students prepare, present, and assess effectiveness of scholarly and creative products.		COMS 211			
			Keystone courses, Capstone Experiences		

Student Learning Outcome 2.1. Students create and produce new information through writing, presentation, and performance. More specifically, students will:

- Demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through written and oral communication;
- Apply new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance; and
- Demonstrate effective critical thinking as the student develops, produces and evaluates a product or performance.

COMS 211. A new course in the core curriculum, COMS 211: Foundations of Speech and Rhetoric introduces students to the development of public speaking knowledge, skills and attitudes through the integration of rhetorical theory, practice and analysis. The COMS 211 student learning outcome states that all students will effectively conduct scholarly research for the rhetorical situation. This course in the beginning core curriculum lays the foundation for student research, scholarship, and creative work. This course is assessed within General Education and will not be a part of the assessment for Pursuit.

Keystone Courses. After COMS 211, concepts are introduced, practiced, and reinforced within a student's major discipline. These are courses or experiences in which the student works with a mentor. Faculty and departments are encouraged to revise existing courses or to design new courses that include research, scholarship, or creative work as a major emphasis. These courses are designated as **keystone courses** in an effort to facilitate support and encouragement for faculty and students to become a part of the community of research. Keystone courses provide the central support for keeping QEP learning outcomes in place, from the cornerstone course in the student's first year leading to the capstone experience in the final year. These courses will be under development over the

Capstone Experiences. ACU has a long history of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). All graduates of ACU successfully complete a course designated as a writing intensive course within their major. Following along the same tradition as WAC, the new general education curriculum and the QEP seek to develop capstone experiences in all majors. Many majors have a capstone course or experience as a part of graduation requirements already.

By the conclusion of the fall semester of 2013, all departments will have developed and submitted a capstone course or experience to the appropriate academic councils for approval. A student's capstone experience provides the final culminating experience for research literacy. [Guidelines for Capstone experiences may be found in Appendix VI.]

Assessment of *CREATE* Student Learning Outcome 2.1. All capstone experiences submit artifacts for assessment to a Team IV--Capstone Assessment Team. The Assessment Team works collaboratively to score all capstone artifacts by the *CREATE Rubric*. [This rubric was developed by Year 2 Pursuit Institute participants.]

Student Learning Outcomes—*CREATE* with faculty

Student learning outcomes spread throughout the core curriculum and into discipline-specific courses allow students to progress in their understanding of the importance of research, scholarship, and creative work within their chosen fields.

Student Learning Outcome 2.2 stresses the importance for students to partner with faculty to *CREATE* scholarly and creative products through faculty-guided projects. Not all students will have the interest or the time to work with a faculty member outside of the classroom to create or conduct original work, so in order to assist students in this time commitment, stipends and equipment and material funds are allocated through the *Pursuit Grant*. Grants from other areas of the campus are publicized on the ACU website and efforts are made to link all students who wish to conduct faculty mentored research, scholarship, or creative endeavor with a faculty member. More specifically, undergraduates who wish to work on a project with a faculty member will:

- Perform steps of a discipline specific project; and
- Draw sound conclusions from the results of the project in order to identify future directions.

Student Learning Outcomes	Yr 1 (FY 12) AY 11-12	Yr 2 (FY 13) AY 12-13	Yr 3 (FY 14) AY 13-14	Yr 4 (FY 15) AY 14-15	Yr 5 (FY 16) AY 15-16
<i>CREATE</i>					
2.2 Students conduct faculty-guided original work relevant to the field of study.				<i>Pursuit Grant, Undergraduate Research Summer Stipend, McNair Scholars, Alpha Chi</i>	

Assessment of *CREATE* Student Learning Outcome 2.2. The Office of Undergraduate Research annually keeps records of student research on campus. All academic departments report the number and type of faculty-guided research and creative activity projects conducted on an annual basis. These data are reported in the Annual Assessment Cycle.

Student Learning Outcomes—*EXPRESS* research, scholarship, or creative work in a public setting

The primary goal of research is to add to the body of knowledge in a discipline.

Student Learning Outcome 3.1, the apex of our student learning outcomes pyramid, provides for the peer-reviewed, public dissemination of a student’s research, scholarship, or creative work. [The pyramid can be found in Section 3-figure 3.1.] This can be accomplished on three levels: within the classroom, across the ACU campus, and external to ACU. Students will:

- Produce an independent scholarly and/or creative product;
- Demonstrate professionalism in the presentation of scholarly and creative product beyond the classroom; and
- Demonstrate professionalism in the presentation of original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline (external to ACU).

Assessment of *EXPRESS* Student Learning Outcome 3.1. The same assessment will be used for Student Learning Outcome 2.2 and Student Learning Outcome 3.1. All academic departments report the number and type of faculty-guided research and creative activity projects conducted on an annual basis. These data are reported in the Annual Assessment Cycle

Professional Development for Faculty—QEP Pursuit Institute

Each May, after the spring semester has concluded, a *Pursuit Institute* will be conducted on campus in the Adams Center for Teaching and Learning. The Institute will consist of ten faculty members selected through an application process. During the institute, fellows will revise existing courses, design new courses, or work on as task as deemed necessary and vital to the implementation of Pursuit. Courses. New courses will be designated as **keystone courses** in an effort to provide support and encouragement for faculty and students. Keystone courses will add an additional information link between QEP learning outcomes in CORE 110 to the capstone experience in the junior or senior year.

Faculty participants in the Institute will work to include activities that develop QEP student learning outcomes and assessments of those outcomes in a course. Adams Center faculty development staff work with fellows to complete course application forms to send through the appropriate academic councils when the course is ready.

Support Services for Faculty—Director of Undergraduate Research

Student Learning Outcomes	Yr 1 (FY 12) AY 11-12	Yr 2 (FY 13) AY 12-13	Yr 3 (FY 14) AY 13-14	Yr 4 (FY 15) AY 14-15	Yr 5 (FY 16) AY 15-16
<i>EXPRESS</i>					
3.1 Students publicly disseminate independent scholarly and creative work.			Undergraduate Research Festival		

Each year the Director of Undergraduate Research works with a large group of faculty to provide an avenue for students to present their research and creative projects in a public venue. This annual event is entitled the Undergraduate Research Festival. It is anticipated that as more and more students are affected by the learning outcomes of Pursuit, that the numbers of students who make oral or poster presentations will increase. It is also anticipated that the quality for those presentations will increase. In order to assist in the increased number of participants, *Pursuit* will provide a .25 FTE reduction in load for the director.

Support Services for Students and Faculty—QEP *Pursuit* Research Grants

QEP *Pursuit Research Grants* provide incentives and funding for faculty and students to work together on research projects beginning in Year 1 of *Pursuit*. Grant funding requires the projects to include students and faculty working together on research, scholarship, or creative projects. Information for the grants and applications will be found on the QEP Blog and on the ACU webpage under the Research tab.

Faculty. The competitive application process provides up to \$5,000 funding for each faculty member. Funding may be used for stipends, for student stipends, for travel, or for expenses related to research or creative activities with students. These grants are awarded on a competitive application basis, much like ACU's Cullen and Math/Science Grants, beginning in Year 1. Final award payments to faculty are made when Student Research Journals, Student Assessment of Project Reports, Final Budget Reports, and Faculty Assessment of Project Reports are submitted.

Students. During the grant project year, students may earn \$1,000/semester for research or creative work with a faculty mentor. This funding is in addition to the faculty funding described. Faculty members may apply to receive funding for student researchers up to \$2000 for one academic year (\$1000/semester). A maximum of four student researchers will receive funding from any one department. Final award payments to students are made when Research Activity Journals, Research Project and Student Self-Assessment Reports are submitted. Stipend amounts can vary depending upon how many students are working with the faculty mentor and are dependent upon decisions made by the faculty in charge of the project.

Project Expenses. \$1,000 is allocated for research or project expenses for use by the faculty or student researchers.

Support Services for Students and Faculty—Travel

Beginning in Year 2, faculty and students traveling to conferences to make presentations regarding their scholarly or creative products may apply for funding to offset travel expenses. A total of \$10,000 for faculty members and a total of \$10,000 for students is allocated in the budget. The *Pursuit* Team will consider funding proportional to costs of travel and make recommendations to the Research Council for final approval. Priority is given for travel to international and national conferences.

SUMMARY

Actions for implementation of the selected learning outcomes have been carefully considered and analyzed in context of the mission and the strategic plan of the University. Each of the actions has been examined from multiple perspectives to insure the impact of the *Pursuit* QEP on students, faculty and staff is realistic and yet manageable and sustainable.

Pursuit: Year 2—Academic Year 2012-2013--Summary Goals, Outcomes, and Assessments

Goal 1 Student Learning-- <i>Explore</i> --Students will acquire information literacy competencies and skills at both the basic and more advanced research levels through exploration and inquiry.						
	Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students	Expected Outcome-- The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment or Rubric	Assessment Results	Targets
EXPLORE	Objective 1.1: Students understand and appropriately use scholarly resources. (Def 1)	1.1.A. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed.	CORE 110—*1	SAILS EXPLORE I Rubric items 1, 2, 3	Pre-test used for Benchmark 71% of students enrolled took assessment 1.1.A. SAILS sections ONE through FOUR 1.1.B. SAILS sections FIVE and SIX 1.1.C SAILS sections SEVEN and EIGHT Students scored worse than the institution-type benchmark on all eight skills sets.	Acceptable target: students will score about the same or exceed institution-type benchmark. Ideal target: scores will exceed institution-type benchmarks.
		1.1.B. Access needed information effectively and efficiently. 1.1.C. Use information ethically and legally.			Annotated Bibliography 1.1.A. 56% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. The average score of all samples was 2.5. 1.1.B. 67% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. The average score of all samples was 2.6. 1.1.C. 55% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.4. 93% of students enrolled submitted bibliographies	1.1.A. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will score 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher. 1.1.B. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will score 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher. 1.1.C. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will score 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher.

* Academic Year—2011-2012—QEP Year 1—I= Introduce

Appendix B

Goal 1 Student Learning-- <i>Explore</i> --Students will acquire information literacy competencies and skills at both the basic and more advanced research levels through exploration and inquiry.						
	Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students	Expected Outcome-- The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment or Rubric	Assessment Results	Targets
EXPLORE	Objective 1.1: Students understand and appropriately use scholarly resources. (Def 1)	1.1.A. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed.	CORE 210-*P	Explore II Rubric items 1, 2, 3	Position Paper 1.1.A. 63.64% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. The average score of all samples was 2.67.	1.1.A. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will average 3.0 or higher AND 70% will have composite score of 21.0 or higher. Ideal target: 85% of samples score 3.0 or higher AND 85% will have composite score of 21.0 or higher.
		1.1.B. Access needed information effectively and efficiently.			1.1.B. Not assessed	1.1.B. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will average 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher.
		1.1.C. Use information ethically and legally.			1.1.C. 70.45% of samples scored 2.5 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.63.	1.1.C. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will score 2.5 or higher. Ideal target: 80% of samples score 2.5 or higher.
		1.2.A. Describe major theories relevant to a particular case, problem, or solution.			1.2.A. 63.4% of samples averaged 2.5 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.5.	1.2.A. Acceptable target: 70% will have average score of 2.5 or higher. Ideal Target: 85% will average 2.5 or higher.

* Academic Year—2011-2012—QEP Year 1—I= Introduce P=Practice

Appendix B

Goal 1 Student Learning-- <i>Explore</i> --Students will acquire information literacy competencies and skills at both the basic and more advanced research levels through exploration and inquiry.						
	Specific Learning Outcomes for All Students	Expected Outcome-- The student will:	Courses or Components	Assessment or Rubric	Assessment Results	Targets
EXPLORE	<p>Objective 1.1: Students understand and appropriately use scholarly resources.</p> <p>(Def 1)</p>	1.2.B. Describe finds and interpretations relevant to a particular case, problem, or solution.	CORE 210-*P	Explore II Rubric items 1, 2, 3	<p>Position Paper</p> <p>1.2.B. 63.64% of samples averaged 2.5 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.53.</p> <p>1.3.A. 50% of samples averaged 3.0 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.27.</p> <p>1.3.B. 65.91% of samples averaged 3.0 or higher. Average score of all samples was 2.67.</p> <p>95.5% of students enrolled submitted artifacts.</p>	<p>1.2.B. Acceptable target: 70% of samples will average 2.5 or higher AND 70% will have composite score of 21.0 or higher. Ideal target: 85% of samples score 3.0 or higher AND 85% will have composite score of 21.0 or higher.</p> <p>1.3.A. Acceptable target: 70% will have an average score of 3.0 or higher. Ideal target: 80% will have an average score of 3.0 or higher.</p> <p>1.3.B. Acceptable target: 70% will have an average score of 3.0 or higher. Ideal target: 80% will have an average score of 3.0 or higher.</p>

* Academic Year—2011-2012—QEP Year 1—I= Introduce P=Practice

Appendix B

Summary of Research Components Implemented during Year 2: 2012-2013

- *CORE 110* (Cornerstone)—Fall 2012 and Spring 2013
 - Artifacts collected—December 2012 and April 2013.
 - Research papers assessed by Assessment Team I—May 2013
 - Analysis of results and report written—June 2013
 - Revisions of research rubric *EXPLORE I* from *CORE 110*—Summer 2013
- *SAILS*—given in Cornerstone—Fall 2012
- *CORE 210*—Fall 2012, January 2013 (*CORE 115*), and Spring 2013
 - Artifacts collected—December 2012, January, 2013, and April 2013.
 - Research papers assessed by Assessment Team II—May 2013
 - Analysis of results and report written—June 2013
 - Revisions of research rubric *EXPLORE II* from *CORE 210*—Summer 2013
- *Pursuit Grants*—Faculty-Student-Mentored Research Funding
 - Grant Applications due January 27, 2013.
 - Applications evaluated and ranked—February 13, 2013
 - Grants selected and recommendations sent to Research Council for final approval—March 2013
 - Grant recipients notified for funding—March 2013
 - Grant contracts signed, FOAPS originated, funding distributed, SLOs revised—April-June 2013
 - Final Reports for Year 1 Research Grants—all submitted on time and funds released
- *Pursuit Institutes*—June 19-20, 2013
 - *Pursuit* Implementation Team—provided initial planning for *Pursuit Institute*
 - *Pursuit* Information Literacy Team—planned, organized, and implemented *Institute*
 - Facilitator—Dr. Joan Hawthorne—University of North Dakota
 - Topic—Capstone Experiences and Rubric
- Undergraduate Research Festival—planned and implemented by Undergraduate Research Council—directed by Dr. Autumn Sutherlin

CORE 110 Assessment –2012-13 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin
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. From a set of 1007 students, 934 papers were collected (93%). Dr. Mark Riggs created a random sample, and 97 papers were assessed.

The same assessment team met for the second 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 agreed to serve for 5 years.

Results (See Appendix for full 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 2012-2013, 56% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.5.

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 2012-2013, 67% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.6.

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 2012-2013, 55% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.4.

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.

Recommendations –

1. Based on recommendations from the 2011-2012 report, continue to use flash drive system to collect papers. This year 100% of faculty members submitted papers, and we collected papers from 93% of students enrolled (up from 77%).
2. Based on recommendations from the 2011-2012 report, the assignment was adapted to better reflect EXPLORE goals. The new assignment, an annotated bibliography, better taught information literacy. As we continue to help CORE 110 instructors teach information literacy more effectively, the following strategies are recommended:
 - 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.

In the weeks leading up to the Informational Literacy assignment, the assessment team will hold professional development sessions for CORE 110 instructors in the Adams Center. These sessions will allow time for the assessment team to discuss findings and recommendations for teaching the assignment and for the instructors to ask questions.

3. Continue to refine the Explore rubric to allow for the gathering more specific information:
 - a. Split 1.1.A into two categories
 - i. Defining the scope of the question
 - ii. Determining the types of information
 - b. Split 1.1.C
 - i. Using correct citations
 - ii. Using information ethically

ACU QEP *EXPLORE 110* Rubric—for use in CORE 110 Annotated Bibliography

Used for assessment in 2012-2013

Student Learning Outcome 1.1. Students will understand and appropriately use scholarly sources.

	Exemplary (4)	Competent (3)	Emerging (2)	Unacceptable (1)	Score
<p>Determine the nature and the extent of information needed</p> <p><i>Obj 1.1.A</i></p>	<p>Effectively defines and narrows the scope of the research question/topic.</p> <p>Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research questions.</p>	<p>Defines the scope of the research question/topic completely.</p> <p>Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.</p>	<p>Defines the scope of the research question/topic or incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.).</p> <p>Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research questions.</p>	<p>Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question/topic.</p> <p>Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research questions.</p>	
<p>Access the needed information effectively and efficiently</p> <p><i>Obj 1.1.B</i></p>	<p>Citations represent various media (e.g. book, journal, websites).</p> <p>All cited resources come from reliable sources.</p> <p>All resources are appropriate for the target audience.</p>	<p>Citations represent various media (e.g. book, journal, websites).</p> <p>Most cited resources come from reliable sources.</p> <p>Most resources are appropriate for the target audience.</p>	<p>Citations represent a limited range of media (e.g. book, journal, websites).</p> <p>Some cited resources come from reliable sources.</p> <p>Some resources are appropriate for the target audience.</p>	<p>Citations are from only one type of media.</p> <p>Few cited resources come from reliable sources.</p> <p>Few resources are appropriate for the target audience.</p>	
<p>Access and inAformatio n ethically and legally (information use strategies)</p> <p><i>Obj 1.1.C</i></p>	<p>Citations and references are correct MLA citation style.</p> <p>Paraphrase, summary, or quotes in ways that are true to original context.</p>	<p>Citations and references are MLA style with few errors.</p> <p>Paraphrase, summary, or quotes are close to the original context, but not rely too heavily on quoting or have too little summary.</p>	<p>Citations and references are consistent, but aren't MLA style.</p> <p>Paraphrase, summary, or quotes are too broad to reflect the original content.</p>	<p>Citations and references do not resemble a citation style.</p> <p>Annotations are absent or do not reflect content of the article.</p>	



CORE 210 Assessment – 2012-13 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin

Dr. Brenda Bender

Background

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A¹, 1.1C³, 1.2A⁴, 1.2B⁵, 1.3A⁶, and 1.3B⁷ from the QEP document, the CORE 210 research artifact was collected. From a set of 383 students, 366 papers were collected (95%). Dr. Mark Riggs created a random sample of 60 papers randomly selected from CORE 210 sections delivered in fall 2012 and spring 2013. Two sections taught in the spring semester submitted annotated bibliography assignments and were excluded from the sample along with one paper identified as being plagiarized. Therefore the total number of papers in the sample was 44.

The assessment team consisted of 5 faculty members from across the university – Dr. Brenda Bender (Communication Disorders), Dr. Joshua Brokaw, (Biology), Dr. Jason Holland (Mathematics), Mr. J. Scott Self (Alpha Academic Services), Dr. Jeanine Varner (Language and Literature) – who have agreed to serve for 5 years.

Prior to assessing rubric scores, inter-rater reliability was evaluated. A paired t-test yielded no significant differences between raters for paired rubric measures. An Intraclass Correlation was calculated and yielded an ICC = 0.567 for single measures and 0.940 for average measures.

These measures indicated acceptable inter-rater agreement therefore the scores from rater 1 and rater 2 were averaged for each SLO for each paper in the sample. These averages scores were used to calculate the following measures. A total average score was calculated for each SLO. A count of the papers in the sample meeting the acceptable target was calculated for each SLO. The count was divided by the N of the sample to calculate the percentage of the sample meeting the target. Composite scores were calculated by adding the rubric scores for each SLO (e.g., 1.1.A + 1.1.C). A count of papers meeting the target and a percentage of the sample meeting the target were also calculated for the composite scores.

SLOs assessed in 2012-2013:

- ¹ Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.
 - ³ Students will use information ethically and legally.
 - ⁴ Student will describe major theories relevant to a particular case or problem.
 - ⁵ Students will describe findings and interpretations relevant to a particular case or problem.
 - ⁶ Students will evaluate information and its sources critically.
 - ⁷ Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
-

Results

SLO 1.1

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher on rubric items ONE, TWO, and THREE and a target composite score of 5.0 or higher. The **ideal target** calls for 85% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and a composite score of 5.0.

ONE	Obj. 1.1.A	Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.67
TWO	Obj. 1.1.B	Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	No assessment
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	No assessment
	Average of all samples	No assessment
THREE	Obj. 1.1.C	Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	70.45%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	MET
	Average of all samples	2.63
COMPOSITE		Year 2
	Percent > 5.0	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	5.29

Appendix D

SLO 1.2

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher on rubric items FOUR and FIVE and a target composite score of 5.0 or higher. The **ideal target** calls for 85% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and a composite score of 5.0.

FOUR	Obj. 1.2.A	Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.5
FIVE	Obj. 1.2.B	Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.53
COMPOSITE		Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	59.10%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	5.03

Appendix D

SLO 1.3

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher on rubric items SIX and SEVEN and a target composite score of 5.0 or higher. The **ideal target** calls for 85% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and a composite score of 5.0.

SIX	Obj. 1.3.A	Year 2
	Percent > 2.5	50%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.27
SEVEN	Obj. 1.3.B	Year 2
	Percent > 5.0	65.91%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.67
COMPOSITE		Year 2
	Percent > 5.0	50%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	4.94

Recommendations –

1. Adjust the rubric language to be more general to better fit the variety of topics selected in the writing assignment:
 - a. Specifically refine the language “in the field” and “major theories”. The readers found these terms were too prescriptive for assessing the common assignment.
 - b. Provide a scaffold for readers on SLO 1.1.C – Students will use information ethically and legally. The 4 aspects assessed in this SLO are inter-related and a scaffold will assist readers in assessing this SLO more consistently.
2. Select additional samples if not all submitted papers follow the common writing assignment. Two sections submitted annotated bibliographies instead of the writing assignment.
3. Clarify the common writing assignment requirements across all sections of CORE 210.
 - a. Provide specific expectations for
 - i. Formatting (e.g., page numbers, font type and size, margins)
 - ii. Citation style – MLA was the most frequently used
 - iii. Writing style – some students employed a creative writing style that was difficult to assess
 - b. Complete the assignment earlier in the semester to allow time to provide feedback to the students
 - c. Provide feedback to students on topic choice; narrowing the topic to facilitate a more focused paper
 - d. Provide EXPLORE rubric to teachers and students for an understanding of skills being assessed by the assignment.
4. Ensure students meet the course pre-requisites for CORE 210; specifically ENGL 112.

EXPLORE II Rubric—for use in CORE 210 and BCOR 310

used 2012-2013

	Exemplary (4)	Competent (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)	Score
Determine the extent of information needed <i>Obj 1.1.A</i>	Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research questions.	Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.	Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.) Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research questions.	Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research questions.	
Access and use information ethically and legally <i>Obj 1.1.C</i>	Students correctly implement all of the following strategies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using citations and references; 2. Paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; in ways that are true to original context; 3. Distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution; and 4. demonstrating a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. 	Students use correctly three of the information use strategies	Students use correctly two of the information use strategies.	Students use correctly one or none of the information use strategies.	

	Exemplary (4)	Competent (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)	Score
<p>Describe major theories in the field relevant to a particular case/problem/situation.</p> <p><i>Obj 1.2.A</i></p>	<p>All theories are thoroughly described and relevance to the case/problem/situation is discussed recognizing the strengths and limitations of each theory.</p>	<p>All theories are identified and adequate description of relevance to the case/problem/situation is provided.</p>	<p>Most theories are identified with limited description of relevance to the case/problem/situation provided.</p>	<p>Several theories are described but are not all relevant to the case/problem/situation. Not all relevant theories are identified and described.</p>	
<p>Describe findings and interpretations in the field relevant to a particular case/problem/situation.</p> <p><i>Obj 1.2.B</i></p>	<p>Findings are thoroughly described using the language of the field. Interpretations of the findings are applied to the case/problem/situation and extensions are made to other relevant cases/problems/situations.</p>	<p>Findings are presented and described in the language of the field. Interpretations of the findings are clearly connected to the case/problem/situation.</p>	<p>Findings are presented and summarized. May lack some professional language for the field. Interpretation of how findings are relevant to the case/problem/situation is limited or incomplete.</p>	<p>Findings are presented in limited terms. Lacks professional language of the field. Little to no interpretation of how the findings are relevant to the case/problem/situation.</p>	
<p>Evaluate information and its sources critically</p> <p><i>Obj 1.3.A</i></p>	<p>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</p>	<p>Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</p>	<p>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware if others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).</p>	<p>Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.</p>	
<p>Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose</p> <p><i>Obj 1.3.B</i></p>	<p>Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth.</p>	<p>Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.</p>	<p>Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.</p>	<p>Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.) so the intended purpose is not achieved.</p>	

Pursuit Institute – 2012-2013 Report

Dr. Phyllis Bolin

Participants (19):

Laura Baker – Brown Library
 Stephen Baldrige – School of Social Work
 Denise Barnett – Communication Disorders
 Brenda Bender -- Communication Disorders
 Dan Brannan – Biology
 Rob Byrd – School of Information Technology and Computing
 Karen Hendrick – Brown Library
 Sara Lee – Chemistry and Biochemistry
 Suzie Macaluso – Communications and Sociology
 Mark McCallon – Brown Library
 Jeanene Reese -- Bible
 Nancy Shankle Jordan -- Assistant Provost for General Education

Consultants: Joan Hawthorne, nationally recognized author and general education consultant from University of North Dakota, facilitated one day of workshop. Goals of the workshop included examination and development of student learning outcomes using backwards design, creation of signature assignments for capstone courses, and creation of a rubric to assess the signature assignments. Nancy Shankle Jordan and Phyllis Bolin facilitated the 2nd day until noon.

Products:

Product 1—Signature Class Assignments: Each group worked together to discuss and redesign an assignment that could be used in Capstone courses.

Product 2—Signature Assignment Rubric: A rubric was written individually, combined in small groups, and, finally, compiled and redesigned in whole group discussion.

Budget and costs:

- Total budgeted: \$10,000 for Institute expenses/stipends for participants and \$2,000 for the consultant fee.
- *Pursuit* Institute Expenses: \$ 8,537.74
 - Joan Hawthorne consulting fee: \$2,000 (\$2,000/day)
 - Residence Inn for consultant: \$215.82
 - Meal for Consultants--\$54.43
 - Meals for two days—\$226.84
 - Travel for consultant--\$608.79
 - Office supplies--\$31.86
 - Stipends to participants--\$5,400

- Luncheon events scheduled for two days in fall for discussion of Capstone signature assignment rubric-TBD (will be taken from remaining \$1,462.26)
- Cost Sharing--Adams Center—classroom space, snacks, and drinks.

Evaluation of Workshop: Towards the end of Day 1, a severe thunderstorm hovered over the Abilene area for more than two hours, in which the electricity went off. The day ended abruptly with participants using their iPhones flashlight applications to finish the day. A Workshop Evaluation for Day 1 was given to participants at the beginning of Day 2.

Three outcomes were the focus for Day 1 of the Institute. Responses for 1-3 correspond to these outcomes. Participants were asked to respond to how well they felt the outcome was achieved. The outcomes and some of their responses are found below:

- 1. Participants will conceptualize a signature assignment for their own course and begin thinking about the details of how that assignment will be structured and conveyed – so each person will be ready to complete a full draft by the end of the day.**
 - Brainstorming about signature assignment good
 - Plan to implement process in other classes
 - More confident in designing an assignment
 - Thinking about “what is a capstone” was especially helpful
 - Backward design was great reminder for course design
 - Enhanced knowledge, met needs at wide variety of levels
 - Nice job looking at course design process and thinking about signature assignment
- 2. Participants will make rough plans for other learning activities and assignments that lead up to the key assignment.**
 - Group discussion about criteria was helpful. Presentation provided additional ideas.
 - Feel prepared to do this.
 - Didn't spend much time here.
 - Excellent. Hands on work resulting in workable product.
 - Mostly focused on signature assignment. Not time to come up with others.
 - Have better understanding of scaffolding assignments.
 - In progress, but can do based on workshop info.
 - Very good. Individual plans flowed from group discussion.
- 3. Participants, collectively, will articulate criterion categories for the rubric that will be used to score student work on the capstone research assignments.**
 - Excellent. Group input in forming this was essential.
 - Group discussion of process was helpful.

- Well done, even in the dark.
- Made good progress on this goal as a group.
- Well done, very effective.
- Highlighted importance of rubric, types of rubrics, and how many goals to articulate.
- Good introduction. Rubrics are challenging, discussion was helpful to begin process.
- Good beginning point for our work at the program level.

4. *What was most useful/most successful in today's workshop?*

- Discussion about what we hope to achieve in capstone assignments.
- Discussion on course design.
- Thinking through goals of capstone course.
- Opportunity to reiterate "begin with end in mind."
- Putting sheets of paper on wall with lists derived from the groups.
- Interaction, leader's facilitation, stayed on task, good outside resources, broad educational terminology.
- Brainstorming on capstone and work products.
- Overview of backward design.
- Assistance thinking through course design, good examples, group discussion.
- Group brainstorming.

5. *What was least useful/least successful in today's workshop?*

- Would have liked to write my course outcomes; brainstorming could have really informed my outcomes.
- Found everything useful.
- Getting to rubric material earlier; this is most challenging aspect of development for me.
- Couldn't be helped, but power outage made rubric discussion difficult.
- Time for discussion about integrating librarians into signature assignments.

6. *What else would be helpful to you as you move forward on the Research Literacy QEP?*

- Database of signature assignments and their scoring rubrics for professors to use.
- Sharing capstone syllabi across the university, not just in councils.
- Critique and suggestions on rubrics.
- Workshops like this. Discussion on specific activities or significant assignments for particular disciplines.
- Time to share problems with individual lessons and getting suggestions about them.

SAILS Summary Information—Fall 2012

Detailed results from Fall 2012 SAILS Skills Sets results and alignment with *Pursuit* objectives are found below:

Fall 2012		Abilene Christian University n=695**	Institution Type: Masters n=26,703	All Institutions n=66,882
Pursuit Objective	SAILS Skill Sets*			
1.1.A	1. Developing a Research Strategy	494 ± 4 (490, 498)	503 + 1 (502, 504)	502 + 0
	2. Selecting Finding Tools	498 ± 5 (493, 503)	507 + 1 (506, 508)	504 + 1 503, 505)
	3. Searching	464 ± 4 (460, 468)	484 + 1 (483, 485)	484 + 0
	4. Using Finding Tool Features	506 ± 6 (500, 512)	530 + 1 (529, 531)	531 + 1 530, 532)
1.1.B	5. Retrieving Sources	488 ± 6 (482, 494)	518 + 1 (517, 519)	518 + 1 (517, 519)
	6. Evaluating Sources	473 ± 5 (468, 478)	481 + 1 (480, 482)	477 + 0
1.1.C	7. Documenting Sources	444 ± 6 (438, 450)	473 + 1 (472, 474)	474 + 1 (473, 475)
	8. Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues	448 ± 5 (443, 453)	466 + 1 (465, 467)	464 + 0

*The Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) is a knowledge test with multiple-choice questions targeting a variety of information literacy skills. Questions on the SAILS test are based directly on two documents authored by the Association of College and Research Libraries. Project SAILS is located at Kent State University in Ohio.

** 695 Students completed the test out of 961 students enrolled in CORE 110.

Undergraduate Research – 2012-2013 Report



ACU Undergraduate Research

Dr. Autumn Sutherlin

3.1: Students will publicly disseminate independent scholarly, and creative work in a public setting.

Objective 3.1.A. Students will produce independent scholarly and/or creative products.

Measurement: Students producing scholarly or creative work for the Undergraduate Research Festival must submit abstracts describing the product. Faculty reviewers assess the abstracts using the Review of Submitted Abstracts Rubric.

Acceptable target: 80% of abstracts will have 3.0 or higher on each item.
[Adapted to 7 or higher out of 12]

Ideal target: 80% of abstracts will have a 3.3 or higher on each item.
[Adapted to 8 or higher out of 12.]

Results: Ninety-eight abstracts were submitted to the ACU Undergraduate Research Festival. Ninety-two of the abstracts were submitted by ACU Students. Only two abstracts were rejected, only one of which was by an ACU student. Before the conference an another presentation was withdrawn.

Of the 92 abstracts submitted by ACU students, 86 (93%) reached the Acceptable Target. Eighty-three abstracts (90%) reached the Ideal Target.

Measurement: Students who received grants from the Office of Undergraduate Research or Pursuit Research Grants will submit a paper or creative work based on their project to their mentoring faculty member. Faculty members submit the report to the Pursuit Team. Faculty reviewers will assess the work using *Writing Assessment Rubric*.

Acceptable Target: 80% of papers or creative work will receive a total score of 15 out of 25 points or higher on the rubric.

Ideal Target: 80% of papers will receive 20 out of 25 points or higher.

Results: No data was collected from OUR Grants.

Measurement: Students who received grants from the Office of Undergraduate Research, Honors College, or Pursuit Grants will submit a self-assessment entitled **Research Project: Student Self-Assessment with their final report to their faculty mentor. Faculty members submit the report to the Pursuit Team.**

Acceptable Target: 80% of papers or creative work will receive a total score of 15 out of 25 points or higher on the rubric.

Ideal Target: 80% of papers will receive 20 out of 25 points or higher.

Results: This information is not collected from OUR Grants.

Objective 3.1.B Students will demonstrate professionalism in the presentation of scholarly and creative products beyond the classroom.

Measurement: Student work accepted to the Undergraduate Research Festival will be assessed using **Papers/Verbal Presentations Rubric or Posters/Presentations Rubric. Faculty score the papers/posters products.**

Acceptable target: 70% of products/presentations will score 50 or higher out of a total score of 90 on the rubric. [Adapted to a total score of 38.9 points out of 70 points on the verbal presentations rubric and 36.1 points out of 65 points on the oral presentations rubric.]

Ideal target: 80% of products/presentations will score 65 or higher out of a total score of 90 on the rubric. [Adapted to 56 out of a total score of 70 points on the verbal presentations rubric and 46.9 points out of 65 points on the oral presentations rubric.]

Results:

At the 2013 ACU Undergraduate Research Festival, 90 presentations were given by 101 ACU students. Five students from another university also participated in the Research Festival. Their data is not included here.

Verbal Presentations: Sixty verbal presentations were made by ACU students at the 2013 Undergraduate Research Festival. Of the verbal presentations, **45 presentations (75%) scored above the Acceptable Target** with a total of 38.9 or higher. **Twenty seven verbal presentations (45%) scored at or above the Ideal Target.** In 2012, 61% of the verbal presentations scored above the Acceptable Target and 14% scored above the Ideal Target.

Appendix G

Poster Presentations: Thirty poster presentations were made by ACU students. Of the 30 poster presentations, **18 presentations scored a total of 36.1 or higher or 60% of presentations scored within the Acceptable Target** on the Poster Presentations Rubric. **Three poster presentations or 10% scored at or above the Ideal Target.** This compares to 66% above the Acceptable Target and 6% above the ideal target in 2012.

Total: At the 2013 ACU Undergraduate Research Festival, **70% of the presentations scored at or above the acceptable target. Thirty-three percent of the presentations scored at or above the ideal target.** At the 2012 ACU Undergraduate Research Festival, 63% scored at or above the Acceptable Target and 11% scored at or above the Ideal Target.

Table: Presentations Reaching or Exceeding the Acceptable Target. In 2012 there were 91 presentations (56 verbal, 35 poster) by ACU students. In 2013, there were 90 presentations (60 verbal, 30 poster) by ACU students.

	2012 Number of Presentations (%)	2013 Number of Presentations (%)
Verbal Presentations	34 (61%)	45 (75%)
Poster Presentations	23 (66%)	18 (60%)
Total presentations	57 (63%)	63 (70%)

Table: Presentations Reaching or Exceeding the Ideal Target. In 2012 there were 91 presentations (56 verbal, 35 poster) by ACU students. In 2013, there were 90 presentations (60 verbal, 30 poster) by ACU students.

	2012 Number of Presentations (%)	2013 Number of Presentations (%)
Verbal Presentations	8 (14%)	27 (45%)
Poster Presentations	2 (6%)	3 (10%)
Total presentations	10 (11%)	30 (33%)

Analysis: This year the goal was met of having 70% of presentations reach the Acceptable Target of 38.9 or higher out of 70 for verbal presentations or 36.1 or higher out of 65 for poster presentations. Several factors may have contributed to reaching this goal. The first is that it was the 5th ACU Undergraduate Research Festival and faculty mentors have learned how to better advise their students in preparation for the Research Festival. Second, rubrics and helpful hints were provided to the students before the conference to aid the students in their preparation for the Research Festival. Third, a few of the students were sophomores that had received some of the Research Literacy material through the university core courses. However, the vast majority of students were juniors and seniors who had not been through the Research Literacy curriculum as it was implemented after they completed their core courses.