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**Background**

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A[[1]](#footnote-1) and 1.1C[[2]](#footnote-2) from the QEP document, the Cornerstone (CORE 110) research artifact was collected. Outcome 1.1.B (Students will access needed information effectively and efficiently) is taught through classroom instruction and librarian support but is difficult to assess. *SAILS* will assist in the assessment of this objective. From a set of 892 students, 689 papers were collected (77%). Dr. Mark Riggs, Chair of Department of Mathematics and Statistical Consultant, created a random sample, and 100 papers were assessed.

The assessment team consisted of 5 faculty members from across the university – Dr. Stephen Baldridge (Social Work), Dr. Laura Carroll, (Language and Literature), Dr. Houston Heflin (Bible, Missions, and Ministry), Dr. Susan Lewis (Journalism and Mass Communications), Dawne Swearingen (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 2011-2012, 61% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.48.

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 2011-2012, 40% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; the average score of all samples was 2.01.

This outcome was divided into 4 sections and we collected information on each section:

1. Using citations and references (68% met)
2. Paraphrasing, summarizing, or quoting in ways that are true to the original contexts, (64.5% met)
3. Distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution (39% met)
4. Demonstrating a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information (16.5% met)

**Recommendations** –

1. Because of the numerous transitions at the university last year, it was difficult to collect all the CORE 110 papers. During the 2012-2013, school year the goal is to collect 90% of CORE 110 papers.
2. Revise the final assignment prompt and syllabus to reflect better the *Explore* goals. The prompt should:
   1. Discuss strategies for cohesion, ranging from typeface, verb tense, intro/conclusion, and transitions.
   2. Explain that for Scaffold 3, the Bible cannot count as two sources, students need to find an additional response that addresses the theology of their issue.
   3. Consider adding scholarly sources to the requirement.
   4. Dedicate a day at the end of the semester to teach how to integrate the three assignments.
3. Update the *Explore* rubric to integrate more specific language and mirror the ENGL 112 research writing rubric:
   1. Exemplary should say “controlling idea and excellent supporting detail, original insights on the part of the writer.”
   2. Competent should say “good response to the topic, adequately supported by detail.”
   3. Emerging should say “routine response, perhaps too generally stated, but more of less held to in token fashion.
   4. Unacceptable should say “there may be a stated controlling idea, but the relation of details is unclear.”

1. Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Students will use information ethically and legally. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)